

E911 TELEPHONE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 02, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Rick Reigenborn at 4:01p.m.

Rick Reigenborn, Chairman – Present

Stuart Sunderland, Treasurer - Present

Dave Ramos – Present

Clint Nichols – Present- Zoom

Jim May – Present

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Joel Estes – Adams County Communications Center

Teneyia Wilson – Adams County Communications Center

Tonia Fuller - Adams County Communication Center

Ryan Tharp – Attorney to the Board

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 8, 2021- Not sent to board.

Motion: Dave Ramos made a motion to table the approval of the
December 8, 2021, minutes for next meeting

Second: Jim May

Approval: Motion Carried

3. TREASURER'S REPORT:

a. Authority Financials:

Stuart Sunderland – Those were sent out. There is nothing remarkable about the
financials. Any discussion? No questions at this time.

Motion: Jim May made a motion to approve the Treasurer's report.

Second: Dave Ramos

Approval: Motion Carried

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. 911 Fee Increase.

Ryan Tharp – The Board received a copy of the letter. The letter was sent out to the
appropriate stakeholders. The purpose of this portion of the meeting is to give anyone
that has shown up the to ask questions. It looks like no one is here. Do any
stakeholders want to address the board? No would be the time for the questions. If no
questions, then the meeting can be turned over to the board for discussion. Jim May –
When they were going over the first IGA, the first paragraph states we will not go over
a 1.71 and top out at \$1.75. It is confusing for some of the people that have been
looking at it. They felt we would have to go back and do a new IGA and give it to our
councils and to our authorities, the language is a little confusing. The city attorney and
Ryan talked and the understand that it does not mean that, but it is hard to Jim to have a
meeting with Northglenn Council on Monday night and try to explain that. Jim would
feel more comfortable to approve the increase to 1.75 like in the IGA, and then come
back and clean up the language. We would explain that it will be bumped up to the
PUC recommendation from here on out. So, we don't have to it then have another
meeting/vote. It is a little less money but then we could move forward with the IGA
and move to the PUC amount of \$1.81. Stuart Sunderland was not aware and when he
read it, he also was wondering. Can we legally do the \$1.81 or are we bound by \$1.75?

Stuart has presented it to his stakeholders and have no comment in their feedback.

Ryan Tharp – There is some ambiguity like my email to you said. I think the intent of that provision was to say, back in 2015, we are going to go from \$.70 and we don't know where, but it might be as high as \$1.75, and we are not going to go above \$1.75 in 2015. It was also the intent to say in the future you can just follow the statute. That is where the confusion today comes in. In talking with Cory this morning, the Northglenn attorney, His opinion was it probably did give the Authority to increase it to \$1.81, because it does say, you have to do it in conformance with the law. That may be a winning argument, but it is also doesn't feel right. I think it is a board decision. I think there is a good legal argument for the Board to go higher, but he also completely understands if the Board felt that due to that ambiguity it would be more prudent to stay at \$1.75 and do an amendment or short of an amendment, go back out to the agencies for clarity. Ask if they have an issue with us doing this, if they say yes, we can do the amendment. If they say no, then we can go to \$1.82. Jim May – Is there any restriction how many increases we can do in a year? We want to make sure we hit that June date. If we lay it out in the document and clear up the IGA, the cleaner we can do this document, then we don't have to come back unless there is something major. Ryan Tharp – we can raise it as many times as we want annually for the next 20 years unless they change the statute. The IGA gives the Authority the approval to raise it. We could raise it to the \$1.75 today or next week, whenever we decide to do it by June 1. And then do an amended IGA in addition to that provided we get that done by the November meeting, we could vote at the November meeting to increase it and have it effective Feb 1, 2023. Jim May – we could clean up the agreement language. Ryan – We could go to \$1.81 now and then do an amendment in the Spring or the Summer so that it is crystal clear. Dave Ramo – If we did go forward, and had an objection, then it takes a considerable amount of time to go back to the agencies and change the agreement. We could have one more meeting in March, post 17th and if there is no push back, we can raise it to \$1.81 and then clean up the agreement as appropriate. We can discuss with our agencies and if Corey says it will work to change the verbiage, then move forward. Jim May – Since it is his agency only, we can wait to see what they say. Dave Ramos - Once we have done it as an interpretation, then we are done. We will not be asking again of the stakeholders in the future. We are assuming they said to move forward. This was a one-time action to capture inflation. Ryan sent the document out to all board members, and they will have sent it out to their stakeholders. The only question back came from Northglenn. Rick agrees if one agency is not okay with it, we should wait and re do it. Discussion? Stuart Sunderland - Are we waiting to go to \$.175 depending on the Northglenn Council and if they are okay with \$1.81, then we will go with it and change the IGA. Ryan Tharp – If they are okay with that interpretation, then at the next meeting, we can have an approved resolution. If we need to amend, we should rewrite it. Dave Ramos – And we can address some of the things that were brought up and clean it up.

b. 911 Task Force Update:

Joel Estes – The task force brought up some FCC proceedings. They talked about the fact that there is a push now from the FCC to weigh in on this issue where originally service providers, basically cellphone, they want them to issue rules that require OSPs to deliver 911 calls to network service providers that we call BESP in Colorado. Lumen, CenturyLink, in a SIP format or a NIN13 format as appropriate, as we move into the NexGen911 environment. Right now, it is not a big deal. But it is going to be a big deal as we start getting some of the more advanced applications available, because

we are going to need that SIP for NIN13 format for it to work properly. ADCOM is still running on the old CAMO Trunks which is fine for what we are doing at the moment. But as soon as we get these new applications, we are going to have to start moving into the SIP environment. There is a cost for that. He has asked ConvergeOne to provide some costs to cut over to SIP. We are going to have to do that as we are having some issues with the ESiNet as we are still in CAMO mode. We were told it would not be a problem, but it is turning out to be a problem with dropping some calls occasionally, not very frequently, every once in a while, we try to transfer a call to Thornton, it doesn't go through the way it is supposed to. This is the direction the FCC is wanting to go to, so we are moving in that direction ourselves.

Tariff Change – Lumen wants to include ECats and some other things in the Tariff. They are moving forward with this change for additional functionality. ADCOM is already using ECats. It would mean that ADCOM doesn't have to pay for it. The Tariff would pay for this. It would be a good thing.

Adcom Update:

Joel Estes – The Task Force wanted us to participate in Strategic Planning for 911. A lot of issues came up. The group talked about several different things going on the NextGen 911 world. Lumen was the presenter, they talked about the ESiNet architecture, Cyber Security, GIS and Geospatial Routing, and ECats again. There is some new functionality and new services they want to come out with, however, they have yet to rollout the date they want to go online. They will get some dates out to us as soon as they are available. It is coming, just do not know when.

ADCOM Building – It is moving forward. The underground diesel tank removed and out of the ground. It was huge. It still had 500 gallons of diesel fuel that was more sludgy than anything else. Mitigation for tile has been taken care of. Xcel not available to cut power to building They are behind and cannot get it done for a couple of weeks. We are also waiting on a couple of permits, so it is not that big of a deal. We think things will start moving more smoothly in the next couple of weeks.

CAD to CAD continues to move forward. Additional issues identified in testing. We have a commitment from Central Square to have their developer more involved. April 5th is go-live date. They are trying to get everything done so it can happen.

911 Rollovers Meeting – There was a meeting to discuss 911 rollovers with the larger PSAPs in the metro area. Specifically, Aurora, Denver, Jeffcom, us because right now all of our 911 calls roll to Arapahoe. They are not big enough to handle that rollover when we have any kind of an outage. We are talking about a new way to do this. With ESiNet environment, we can change that, we can split it up to different places. It is being discussed so we don't overwhelm Arapahoe every time we have a problem with our 911.

IP Logger – We are bringing this online soon for the radio system so we are not reliant on Weld County for that back up.

c. Legal Update:

Ryan Tharp – Dish Wireless application to be an eligible telecom carrier to provide lifeline services to low income people for a low cost. Several other carriers do this. If do it is on a prepaid basis, the question is do they do pay 911 fees. The position has been always yes. Most carriers were fine with that. TRAC Phone was not fine with it. It was litigated at the PUC and it ended up winning. And they were ordered to pay 911 fees. In talking with Daryl Branson at the PUC, it has been a couple of years since any of these carriers have made one of these applications. The commission staff and commissioners have turned over. So he asked that we intervene and argue that they should have to pay this. We haven't gotten to the point yet to know what Dish is going to say one way or the other. This is something the PUC needs to take seriously. The PUC has mandated this to all carriers. They have asked several PSAPs to intervene and file a motion for intervention. Ryan is pretty sure it will be granted. Not sure if Dish will fight it or not. If they fight it, we are going to try to make sure the PUC fights back.

Tariff – There are 3-911 charges – There is the E911 fee, Prepaid fee, and the State-wide surcharge. That gets paid to the PUC and the PUC has a formula to divvy up the money to all the 911 Authorities across the state. They were they divvy that money up based on the number of concurrent sessions that each 911 Authority has in its jurisdiction. Last year, ADCOM built the Backup Center and increased the number of its concurrent sessions. We are eligible to have our funding for that increase to cover those concurrent sessions costs. The initial costs were paid by the grant. To get this covered on an on-going basis, we need to file an application with the public utilities commission to have it continued to be covered. We need to get it filed, we will hit the next deadline for when they change the allocations and then going forward, we will be in the high allocation bracket. Ryan would like the Boards approval to go forward with this process

Motion: Dave Ramos made a motion to give Ryan the approval to complete the application process.
Second: Stuart Sunderland
Approval: Motion Carried

Stuart Sunderland – what is the State Surcharge fee for prepaid? Ryan Tharp – it is for \$.11 or \$.09. The PUC sets that amount every year. The whole purchase of that fee is to pay the Tariff costs. The prepaid is collected by the store and sent to Colorado Department of Revenue. They calculate what is being spent state-wide and then the divide it and send to the 911 Authorities.

5. NEW BUSINESS

6. PUBLIC COMMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Dave Ramos made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:36 P.M.
Second: Stuart Sunderland
Approval: Motion Carried