

**MINUTES  
of the Meeting of the  
CARSON CITY  
9-1-1 SURCHARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**June 1, 2010**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Anne Keast called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**2. Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum**

Members present were Dan Berger (by telephone), Anne Keast, Karin Mracek, Tina Petersen, and Bernie Sease, which constituted a quorum.

Also present were Stacey Giomi, Carson City Fire Chief; Pat Irwin, AT&T; and Kent Ames, AT&T.

**3. Approval of March 2, 2010, Meeting Minutes**

It was moved by Bernie Sease, seconded by Tina Peterson, with motion carried, that the March 2 meeting minutes be approved as submitted.

**4. Public Comments on Non-Agendized Items**

There were no public comments.

**5. Report on Funds Collected from the 9-1-1 Surcharge**

Stacey Giomi reported on the funds collected to date from the surcharge, which included over \$43,000 for FY 2008/09 and \$185,228.04 for FY 2009/10. He mentioned that the accounting issues with AT&T have been straightened out where some of the money from the Nevada Bell part of AT&T had been sent to Washoe County instead of Carson City. It was noted that they were now averaging collections of over \$18,000 a month and that the Master Plan's revised budget numbers were based on these figures.

**6. Review of Quote Submitted by AT&T for 9-1-1- Equipment**

Pat Irwin said that rather than a quote, what he submitted was actually a comparison of numbers in order for the committee to compare approximate monthly fees of what they might want for the community to the monthly income the City was receiving from the surcharge. He said that the fees listed on the first page were based on the pricing AT&T recently did for Douglas County based on positions. However, as that pricing was quoted a

couple of years ago, those figures would change based on today's prices when they went out to quote.

Pat said that the first figures were strictly for the network as it is today and the bottom figures were for the wireless network. The second page reflected equipment costs for a VESTA Sentinel/Patriot system based on six positions and sixteen time clocks. The cost for the T1 Circuit was based on the T1s coming into the community from the host situated in Reno, and this would decrease the cost of the ALI trunks because they would be positioned in the Reno office.

After further discussion regarding this matter, Pat went over the summary on the last page, which showed a total monthly cost of \$13,308.48, which included the customer-provided equipment, the Voice over IP system, the ALI trunks, the T1s, and the wire line and wireless trunks (which was the exact same system designed for Douglas County). Based on a monthly income from the surcharge of \$18,500 and the monthly costs currently budgeted that would no longer be needed for the system being used today (\$2,134.43 for maintenance in addition to \$650 for ALI and \$650 for CAMA trunks), the City would have approximately \$21,934.43 available per month, allowing it to save between \$7,000 and \$10,000 a month with the move to a Voice over IP solution.

Pat mentioned that the backbone of the system in the Dispatch Center was quite old as the standard Concentrex system that was in the old jail had been moved to the new Dispatch Center, with the Vesta just put in front of it. So he felt it was time to move onto another system as the current one has reached its limits. He mentioned that the reason they did a hosted type of solution was to take the ownership away from the City and put it on AT&T's back, so any repairs, upgrades, etc., would be done by AT&T under a five-year contract with the City.

In response to a question by Bernie Sease as to when they planned to move on this, Stacey Giomi replied that whenever Karin Mracek wanted to move ahead. He said that the committee would not need to approve this matter as it was in the Master Plan to go forward, and now that it's been verified that the money is there, it will be a staff issue to move forward. Karin said that they had been waiting to see how well the system worked with Douglas County and that they were now ready to go ahead with it. Pat said that once the City indicated it was ready to go, it would take him about 30 days to prepare a contract—and once that contract with pricing was in place, they would start the process, which would take approximately another 60 days.

After some discussion regarding purchasing issues, Pat mentioned that the City could be part of the same whole package with Douglas County, with the system then needing to be sole-sourced in order to be integrated the same way. Karin mentioned that other alternatives had been looked at a couple of years ago—VIPER and Positron—but that they liked AT&T as it linked up with Douglas County and potentially the other surrounding counties.

Although the committee did not need to take any action regarding this matter as staff will proceed with it because it was in the Plan to move forward, Stacey mentioned that a running item could be kept on the agenda regarding its progress.

**7. Discussion on Report Sent to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Regarding Collection of Information Mandated by the New and Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008 Relative to 911 Fees and Their Uses**

Stacey Giomi said that he received the letter regarding this request directly from the FCC this year instead of from the Nevada Association of Counties (NAC) as he had last year. The FCC had directed last year's letter to the Governor who, in turn, requested the NAC to help because the state did not have a central depository for this information, and that this information was required to be provided under the Freedom of Information Act.

Stacey reviewed the letter he sent to the FCC (previously e-mailed to the committee) which replied to its questions regarding how the 911 fees were established, how much was charged, how the funds were made available to localities, who had the authority to approve fees, etc. He said that the above-referenced Act mandated that the FCC report to Congress annually regarding the collection and expenditure of fees established by states or other jurisdictions in connection with 911/E911 services, so the FCC was complying with that mandate by sending out these requests for information. He said that as this information will be requested every year, he will copy the committee on all future responses he sends to the FCC.

**8. Committee Member Reports**

There were no committee member reports.

**9. Next Meeting Date**

The committee's next meeting is scheduled for September 7 at 8:30 a.m. in the meeting room of Fire Station #1. As Anne Keast will be out of state on that date and possibly not available by phone, Dan Berger will conduct the meeting as Vice Chair.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 a.m.

Recorder: Judy Dietrich/Rachel Albee