

Note: These minutes are a draft and are not to be considered official until approved at the next meeting.



Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Thursday, July 14, 2016
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, Iowa

Call to Order

Chair Ray called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. A quorum was determined from the roll call as indicated below.

Roll Call

		Representative	Attendance
Iowa Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) Secretary	alternate	Sally Hall Cara Sorrells	Present
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	alternate	Rob Koppert Kirk Hundertmark	Present
Iowa State Sheriffs & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	alternate	Robert Rotter	Present
Iowa Peace Officers Association (IPO)	alternate	Dean Kruger	Present
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	alternate	George Griffith Sandy Morris	Present
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	alternate	Mike S. Bryant Doug Neys	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) Vice-Chairperson	alternate	Mark Murphy Tom Berger	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS) Chairperson	alternate	Bob Seivert Jo Duckworth	Excused Present
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association	alternate (IEMSA)	Steven P. Ray Adam Buck	Present
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	alternate	Rob Dehnert Paul Andorf	Present
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	alternate	Jack DeAngelo Pat Snyder	Excused
Cellular Providers	alternate	Dan Halterman Wayne Johnson	Present
PCS Providers	alternate	Steve Zimmer Bill Tortoriello	Absent
Auditor of the State, Ex-Officio member	alternate	David Kaus Joe Sargent	Excused
		Warren Jenkins	Present
Staff:			
Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager		Present	
Samantha Brear, E911 Program Planner		Present	

Guests:

Brian Maydwell, Westcom	Dina McKenna, Story County SO
Doug Houghton, Ames PD	Tammy Rodriguez, ICN
Kevin Condon, ICA	Dave Duncan, ICA
Diane Sefrit, SCI	Amanda Roush, Story County E911
Diana Richardson, Racom	Doug McCasland, Warren County E911
Suzanne Smith, IUB	Tracey L. Bearden, PCEMA
Bob Kordick, Comtech	John Benson, IHSEMD
Helen Troyanovich, Deputy SWIC	Andy Buffington, Hancock County EMA

Tim Malott, Cedar County EMA
Landon Loftsgard, Motorola
Shari Schmitz, Motorola
Craig Allen, SWIC

Laurie Hickok, Comtech TCS
Tim Aaron, Motorola
_____, Legislative Services

Guest present by teleconference:
Brenda VandeVoorde, Fayette County 911
Bobbie Wells, Sac County
David Gentleman, Pottawattamie County

Greg Brooks, West Safety Services
Jason Study, Pottawattamie County
Christine Rethmeier, Pottawattamie County

Introductions

Chair Ray welcomed everyone. Board members and those in attendance introduced themselves.

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Dave Kaus to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2016 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Dave Kaus to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

No report since this is not the end of the quarter.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

Mr. DeRouchey – This is a follow up to the last meeting regarding where Iowa is in comparison to other states in the deployment of Text to 911.

A handout from the NASNA meeting held last month was distributed. The information was taken off of the FCC directory.

Mr. DeRouchey – There are now five states that are 100% deployed for Text to 911. The states are rolling Text to 911 out in different manners. TTY, some are doing it by web portal and some are doing it other ways that are authorized by NENA. Iowa is doing a full integrated type of Text to 911. We (Iowa) are trying to jump to the end-state versus going back to the drawing board in a couple of years and redoing everything. While the end user – the person texting – may not notice the difference, it is going to save us a whole lot of work. We are experiencing some growing pains with that. We have had some discussions here specifically regarding VIPER and West. The Council did recommend with a written letter to be sent to all of the CPE vendors not to go above and beyond the pricing that was provided in the master contract. West had provided a quote around \$35,000 per PSAP for the secondary PSAPs. Those are the secondary ESInet PSAPs. The remaining ten largest PSAPs in Iowa that have dual connectivity. We have decided because that was a newly introduced factor that was not considered as part of the master contract that the State of Iowa would pick up the cost for those ten PSAPs. That notification was provided to West along with those ten PSAPs earlier this week. This is not dissimilar to what we did in the other three PSAPs that are part of the thirteen PSAPs that make up the secondary ESInet. We have been told that will be a 90 to 120 day software upgrade. The other 23 PSAPs that are VIPERs, I gave West the ok to do their software upgrades about three weeks ago. That is also a 90 to 120 day software solution. That pricing was about \$2,000 to \$3,000 per PSAP. That will be the responsibility of the PSAPs. EmergiTech is in the \$3,000 to \$4,000 pricing range. Again the PSAP will be responsible to pay for this. I did hear from Racom regarding their Zetron sites and they are anticipating rolling out in early August their first integrated Text to 911 site. I have also met with Emergency CallWorks. What they did in Cedar County was almost like a beta test. This was a totally new CPE. They will be doing software upgrades at their other six sites by this fall and hope to have Text to 911 going by the end of this year. Those are free of cost to their PSAPs.

Mr. DeRouchey – Later today we are going to be awarding the contract for the statewide consolidation study. That was tasked in HF2439. Two council members were on the review panel as well as someone from ICN, and two from HSEMD. We might see some surveys and stakeholder meetings around the state on what 911 consolidation might look like. That report is due to the Legislature by January 15th. Your participation is highly encouraged. What we have been telling people, right, wrong or indifferent, the Legislature has strongly indicated their interest in consolidation over the last two years. We have kind of

gotten them to hold off in telling us what to do. We want to present the idea of how to consolidate and what cost savings can be achieved. So by all means please participate in those meetings so you are a part of the future and part of the solution versus being mandated what our future could look like in the state.

The meeting paused for a moment due to a technical issue regarding the teleconference.

Chair Ray asked if there was anyone on the phone that was joining.

Those participating via teleconference are indicated above.

Mr. DeRouchey – Just a reminder that 2016 grant invoices are due into our office tomorrow. There are five outstanding grants. Two from Mills County, Louisa County, Clinton County and Johnson County. This is just under \$500,000 outstanding. They have been contacted.

Mr. DeRouchey – Our office and Polk County EMA were contacted by a law firm regarding surcharge remittances from telephone providers – wireless and landline. Our office is working with the AG's Office and the Polk County Attorneys to figure out what is exactly going on – what we can or cannot release. There is some confusion as to whether they are doing this as a qui tam case which would be on the behalf of the State of Iowa. If any other counties are approached by Attorney Matt Dummermuth make sure you contact your county attorney and/or contact the State of Iowa to let us know what is going on. At this point we have not released any information as it is held confidential.

Mr. Koppert – I had a lengthy talked to my CPE vendor EmergiTech reference the session border controllers to get the Text to 911 to work. There was concern whether the cost should be borne onto the PSAPs through them or whether that is actually more of a network issue. EmergiTech asked for clarification from TCS regarding the architecture of the ESInet to allow texting and went into proceeding with certification of their product for texting, hadn't received that clarification, texted through a VPN setup between EmergiTech and TCS somehow which I guess isn't the same architecture as the ESInet as we know it through TCS and then received after the fact the information that they needed from TCS. I also contacted Greg Brooks and he said pretty much the same thing. I question whether the cost to upgrade CPE equipment for the PSAPs should be borne by the PSAPs or if this is a cost because of a network issue and should come from the network expenses.

Mr. DeRouchey – My understanding is the way that TCS is sending this through is two IP addresses – one for voice and one for data. If we were just thinking about text and we had our blinders on and we weren't thinking about NexGen, yes they could do text and voice on one IP address. But we want to think about video and pictures and at some point we want to integrate those as well. We are going to need two IP addresses to be sent. So that is what we are doing now with text. That is why we are thinking that the single PSAPs should be paying by PSAP for the text integration. Most of those bids on the master contract there is a line item that says how much, if you wanted to include text, it would be from the CPE vendor when they reply to the master contract. There is also verbiage in there that talked about that CPE vendors must conform to the state of Iowa Network. Most of what we are seeing for those prices coming in now for the single sites is pretty close to what they quoted in the master contract. The PSAPs entered into knowingly. It is the PSAPs contract with the CPE vendor not the state of Iowa vendor. It is nothing that we did to change the network.

Mr. Koppert – As a follow up why is the Iowa network so much different from other state networks that requires this session border controller which apparently varies in price because of the nature of it. There is a lesser version and a higher up version. Why do we need this and some other states don't and we are using some of the same equipment?

Mr. DeRouchey – Laurie I invite you up to share on this as well. We are pushing the envelope on MSRP. How we are proceeding with network design as it relates to text.

Mr. Koppert – So basically some of these PSAPs on this sheet that you passed out are not doing full MSRP.

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct. They are doing the web browser. Indiana, which is now 100%, is 100% web browser. Some of those others are doing TTY. They are doing those interim steps that may not authorize versus the full blown integrated MSRP network.

Mr. Koppert – I wondered why we had nine PSAPs in Iowa but those are including those that are using the GEM Client.

Mr. DeRoucheay – That handout is a little deceptive but the end user doesn't care how we are doing it. We do. We're doing it the right way I guess. There's nuance in that slide.

Mr. Koppert – We're pushing ahead with full MSRP integration and not doing something half way and then having to do something in the future that's going to have to change the makeup of it again.

Ms. Hickok – TCS itself has a lot of GEM users. NTTCOG all forty are GEM users. All are URL based text. A lot of PSAPs are doing exactly that. One clarification we are only using one IP at the PSAP. Where the multiple IPs comes in at is where we have IPs going to the data centers for voice and we have a different path for text that goes to the TCCs (test control centers). I don't think there is any way to get around that. We have to get to the TCCs in order to pass the text.

Mr. Bryant – On the surcharge information for the lawyer. What information are you looking for?

Mr. DeRoucheay – He basically wanted us to release what we received in wireless surcharge from the various wireless providers. By the Code of Iowa Chapter 34A, that's confidential. I treated their first request as a release for information – freedom of information act. We don't release that even in a lawyer request. They are trying to get at telcos and wireless providers not providing the full amount of surcharge they should be.

Mr. Bryant – Earlier you mentioned ten PSAPs at \$35,000 cost. That \$350,000 the state is going to pay for, which pot of money is that \$350,000 coming out of?

Mr. DeRoucheay – We are going to fund that out of old carryover.

Mr. Bryant – Is that in that \$8 million?

Mr. DeRoucheay – We haven't run the final fiscal year numbers yet. It's not going to be that low. It is probably going to be in the \$16 million range.

Mr. Koppert – On this handout is there a way to differentiate MSRP only out of this?

Mr. DeRoucheay – I can do that manually. This is all public on the FCC registry site. When we register a PSAP on the FCC site we have to list how we are receiving that message.

Mr. Koppert – I was kind of concerned. We have the nine and we are at 8% and to my knowledge we have one that is MSRP?

Mr. DeRoucheay – Correct.

Mr. Koppert – That makes a whole lot of difference what this document says as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. Malott – I have a couple of questions about this consolidation. There will be a cost to pay for lines in between PSAPs that we have today. When we get rid of a PSAP or you want one to do a virtual consolidation. Who's going to pay that fee? Because we are talking thousands of dollars. If we did a virtual consolidation, would you take the surcharge away from that PSAP? I'm asking those questions because as you know I have a system that runs full text at this time. The system I put in was a beta. It's a 4.0 and I will be doing an upgrade to a 4.2 in August or September of this year. It will take about three to four minutes. The system I have which is an Emergency CallWorks System does have the ability to do the virtual. I can do multiple counties with the system I have today. So if I consolidated with another county, who would pay the maintenance cost for the equipment in their back room? Because this is not just hooking in and moving. There will be a cost for a piece of equipment in their backroom. It will not be a complete phone system but there is a lot that has to go in their backroom. The real question I have is before we do this, what will be the end product versus PSAP versus dispatch. Because in the longer run we're going to decide to put, and I'm just throwing this number out there, ten PSAPS in Iowa. How many dispatch centers are you going to have? Ten or are you going to have fifty? Because why should we invest millions of dollars in this state if we are looking to save money if we don't look at the long run. So that brings up the cost. If we do the consolidation, who is going to pay for that additional cost for maintenance and for the phone lines or microwave or if we can get on the ICN there's still going to be a

cost. Is that going to be through surcharge you're going to put to each of those counties or are you going to place that on the county? Because for one I don't have any money coming in from the county. I don't get a penny from my county so how would I keep the PSAP going or the dispatch center going? I don't charge for dispatching to any of my emergency responders. We do that as a service. And we dispatch for not only fire, police/law we also do roads, conservation and DNR if they come in. So we do 100%. We even do it for the nonprofits if we have a disaster. We dispatch them out of the center. So my question to the board is when we do.....think about this what is the cost savings for consolidation if we have all these fees and are we thinking about that when we do that and I understand you are going to have your commission then. That's the question I'm asking today before we move forward because with the new programs on the grants....that was my funding source to upgrade my county over the last seven years. That's how I did it; through grants and now that we have taken that away and taken the \$100,000 from each county away. I'm worried because every five years you need to put antennas out there. You have to update your towers. You have to update your backroom. You have to do your maintenances on your systems. Where's that money going to come from? If you consolidate, which honestly I think that's a good way, we're going to have to go and I see my county as one that would go away as a small county. One of the other major things you can think about, and TCS will tell you this, what kind of internet connection do you have. That was one of our biggest issues we had when we jumped to Text to 911. The place didn't pay the bill and the internet was down for six hours until we could get going. That was the only issue we had. I think those are questions that need to be asked and that is why I came here today. I think this council has to think about those things. So the ones that are out there actually doing this, this could be a costly thing for us. This could turn around and backfire. Because if you pull the surcharge then I have to tell my citizens I have to create a new tax and I have to tell them here's where it came from.

Mr. Koppert – One of the things that we looked at is getting some legislation that the ICN would be allowable to be used by public safety agencies and that didn't get through the legislature the last couple of years and that needs to be reviewed. While there would be some costs it would probably be more expensive than microwave than copper circuits to get your data from point to another. I don't think any member of the council wanted to see the \$100,000 grant go away. It was the legislature that decided to do things. At least that is my opinion from what I have seen happen. Your voice is heard and we understand but there's not a whole lot we can do about it except to bring it forward to our legislative body next year. You want these things but these things cost money. Consolidation cost money. I had a conversation through email with some council members last week and this whole consolidation grant process is going to be so new and so involved in the things that can and probably can't be considered as consolidation that I think we need to sit down and have a daylong meeting where we discuss some of these things as to what can and can't be done. Basically I don't see the council as a supreme court thing but if you look at the proposed administrative rules it says the council shall consult with the 911 program manager and the HSEMD. While I don't see that we are a supreme court type body where we're trying to interpret what the legislature thinks. I think it is our due diligence as a council to almost do exactly that and develop a litmus test, if you will, of these consolidation grants. Does this reduce the number of PSAPs? Does this save money somehow with regards to the PSAPs? If it going to end up costing more money, then it's ridiculous to go ahead and do the project.

Chair Ray – I know HSEMD is doing some internal discussions regarding the virtual process.

Mr. DeRouchey – There's probably a few times where the legislature is open to more than just tweaking code language and it seems like this is a real good opportunity to have those stakeholder meetings for those concerns. Chapter 34A could use some modernization. Small things like changing E911 to NG911 and big things like how we do 911 in Iowa. So they are open to that. We need the modernization of that Code section. So let's do that. We have no preconceived notions of how we are going to do it but let's get together multiple times and have those conversations. Let's look at all the concerns brought up and how to use the surcharge in the future and who pays for those expenses. Those are the perfect conversations that we want to have as we look at moving that forward. We had four webinars to go over the 2017 changes to the Code and spent time talking about the 2017 grant process. We did receive two applications in time for this meeting. Another topic we need to discuss is the administrative rules. Questions were raised because the administrative rules updates have not been formally approved. Both applications were for virtual consolidation. There weren't a lot of comments or pushback when the webinars were held. This body can do that now. The virtual consolidation of radio systems is right there in HF2439 that radio systems are to be considered for virtual consolidation. When it is one county wanting to get on a regional network. That makes sense. The sticking point comes if one county wants to get on the State's LMR system. Now you are looking at one county consolidating with what. With the

state, with a larger group – with the region of Iowa basically but it's still one PSAP. HF2439 does say two PSAPs but I can't delineate the difference.

Mr. Koppert – This is why I think we need a daylong meeting to discuss these questions. This is all very new to all of us and we need to come up with some kind of test to see if it meets the requirements of Chapter 34A and the Administrative Rules changes or see if they don't and what is and what isn't going to be allowed for virtual consolidation. This is something that we need to act on very soon because of the timeframe.

Mr. Benson – As I have done in the past, I will be the one shepherding the rules through. We do have a couple of options on how we can treat this. I think Rob is 100% correct. When Blake came to me and asked, what do you think about this? The draft rule as it is right now doesn't necessarily address this issue specifically. The draft rule as written is essentially a one year rule. The changes to Chapter 34A is for one year. I believe an option we have available to us historically speaking and this has met approval from the auditor's office. When the program does issue the requirements for what the carryover grants are going to look like for the year, this would fit into the \$200,000 consolidation grant as well. We put what the requirements are as well. I do recall the Council said if it is going to be radios it has to be P25 upgradable. That went into the document and that became the policy of the program for that fiscal year. So we could do the same thing. We could move the draft rule forward, get it in place, and then in the application process, if you decide to further define that. Does it truly have to be two PSAPs or as Blake was talking about this larger PSAP. To get on the state LMR system it would be an agreement between PSAP A and all of these other PSAPs that are on the system. We could go that route with it. One of the things we are going to have an issue with is timing. A standard rule making process will take you in excess of 100 days. If we follow that process that will put us into November before we could legally start paying money. The work around on that is referred to as an emergency rule filing where you get the rule into effect immediately. It is a little more onerous than it used to be. You have to go in front of the Administrative Rules Committee and ask for permission to do it. They only meet once a month. The nice thing about it is as soon as they pass it, it is in effect. Their next meeting is August 5th. The caveat that goes with that where we would need your help specifically is to have the Council indicate that you have worked with the department and provide a formal letter from the Council to the Administrative Rules Committee in support of this. I think that is going to be the most efficient way to get this done. If we can get the rule into effect on August 5th, that allows us to settle on what the official policies will be for those applications.

Mr. Bryant – When we talked, a PSAP joining the state LMR system, I thought we had an email that said there would be ongoing costs to join the LMR.

Mr. Benson – To use the LMR.

Mr. Bryant – But how do we join something that isn't up and working yet.

Mr. Benson – It's up. A county or city expresses interest to the Interop Board in joining the network. That goes into their formal process. It goes to their user group committee. They outreach to that entity to find out what their needs are. Based on what their needs are that will create a MOA for that entity to sign and that starts the formal process where you work with the vendor who's running the network. The only cost is if you need to improve your capacity, upgrade radios, etc.

Mr. Kaus – What is the network that you talking about? Is that FirstNet?

Mr. Benson – No, the Iowa Statewide Interoperable Communications System.

Mr. Kaus – If we join or consolidate virtual networks, what happens to the cost? Because to me the cost is going to be greater because we haven't done any with the dispatch centers. When you consolidate, I assume dispatch centers consolidate also. But what I'm hearing now is nothing more than consolidating facilities.

Mr. Benson – In HF2439 there are two types of consolidation. Physical and technical where you are talking about shared services environment. The law says two or more PSAPs. That is where the discussion is. What do you guys think on this? A portion of that legislation increases our engagement with the Council. I asked Rep. Gary Worthan the day the governor signed the bill, if we have questions regarding the bill, how do you envision us getting answers? He said you ask the Council and the Council will help you get those answers. That is how I see it working.

Mr. Kaus – It all comes down to the bottom line, correct?

Mr. Benson – We don't know if it is going to cost more. Bottom line is we don't have facts in front of us. That is why we went out to the RFP. We need someone that has the expertise to do it.

Mr. Koppert – We need to start discussing a lot of interpretation of the administrative rule and what the legislature's intent was and what isn't.

Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded Rob Rotter. The council drafts and writes a letter to the appropriate body supporting the emergency passage of the proposed administrative rules in August so we can get this rolling before the end of the calendar year and starting running into some road blocks with some of the financials.

Discussion:

Mr. Malott – I did do some numbers and I sit in between four of the top ten cities. There are some questions especially on the radio side. Who is going to pay for the cost of the update? Cedar County has 450 radios and if we did the upgrade to the new system. Who is going to pay that \$2.25 million? Who is going to pay the \$4.5 million for towers and the towers that I do have I can upgrade my microwave. That's \$500,000. To upgrade my _____ base system for all my departments – one only – is \$87,000. And then the real question comes, why are we doing all of this? Hopefully we are doing is because when an all hazard event hits we can talk to each other on interop. Right? I had an event yesterday. National Weather called and said you have a supercell headed to your county fair that is going to hit between 2:30 and 2:45. I go to the fair grounds. I operate all my nongovernment organizations, the people that are going to help me with everything, on VHF. And I haven't even put those numbers in. We had everyone on scene and everything torn down within 20 minutes because our VHF radio system because we could all talk. Now I have to change all of that too. So when a disaster comes I am not going to use the 800 system. I'm going to use my VHF system. That works. So how is this system helping us? It's great for the emergency responders. It does nothing for all hazard tornado, flood or major incident. That's what we have to start thinking about. The citizens. That is a big concern of mine and that is why I have taken the time and told my county that I have built out the system. When we radio consolidate are you going to allow me to use a P25 bridge for my VHF to an 800? Because when we all started this that was band aids and baling wire. Because I do have a bridge. I can touch two buttons and make my VHF talk to an 800 and they don't have to have a different radio. And I agree with P25. How does that fit into Project 33? How you should setup your dispatch center and PSAP. That's another project out there. And I have actually set mine up that way. I think those are questions that we ask and are out there. I know that the best thing for this state is virtual consolidation and PSAP consolidation. I gave Blake's office an article. The state of Illinois has decided if you don't take 25,000 calls, you have to turn your dispatch center down and they're not asking them to do that. They just mandated it. The reason I'm coming is I want you to talk in front. I don't want us to move forward and fight for five years to get to a point. I like what I hear about having a meeting. Because the legislators have to be educated on what this is going to do. Because honestly, if I jump on this new system, it sets me back ten years. So I won't do that. If you do consolidation, your single point of contact is gone because I will dissolve my 911 board.

Mr. Allen – Tim brings up some very good points. One of them is the need for a migration plan. What we don't have today is a strategic plan for all of the elements of the technical consolidation. If you've got a plan, I haven't seen it. The federal government is attempting to do that through TFOPA (Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture). I read the article yesterday. I know several people that serve on that and I called them. This is the first volley. The way we have to approach this is; where do we need to be ten years from now? How much stuff can we send onto two screens and expect a human to do something with it promptly and effectively. There is a limit to the capacity. We have to find a way to manage that technology appropriately. He's gotten ahead of the curve. He's actually gotten in front of the state and regional radio systems and did the same thing. They couldn't wait any longer. They've had events that have occurred and they had to act and the state as a whole was slow. So now we have a system that is progressive. It can do everything that Tim said his system can do. There some ways it has to be adjusted perhaps in every location to solve that. I can't validate the numbers that he gave. They may or may not be accurate. The system at the end of the day....when Blake asked the question when I've connected two systems, I've connected something in the region but if I connect one to the statewide cloud, then every PSAP become a possible backup not just one. Anyone that you choose to have the relationship with is available to you. Now, this isn't my wheelhouse yet. Interoperability right now is laying out on LMR and FirstNet. But if you push forward and take it out ten years, this is the conversation

I had with the people on that board and the FCC. Where are you on CAD? Where does CAD, RMS, call check recorder, digital emergency playback stand on this and where are all the standards for that? There are a lot of moving parts to this and we don't have standards. Public safety grade is going to start finding itself in all of these elements. They put out a report that was completely void of public safety grade and if what they are talking about at the FCC is important, public safety grade drives that bus. We have to take the worse possible conditions, as Tim pointed out, and find a way to make all these elements work together. It can be done but what I would encourage the board to do as you look forward....Start ten years out and then look back. Let that be a part of the strategic plan. That's where there can be a real collaboration between the E911 Council and the ISICS Board. The future is bright for technology. I think when we start looking ten years forward a lot of these smaller counties just aren't going to be able to afford to cover the cost of things like labor. The labor costs continue to go up and certainly it's not the technology. To your point – If everyone buys a VIPER and everyone buys a radio system you have hundreds of millions of dollars being spent. So we collaborate and find ways to push this out into a cloud environment, everyone wins. The costs for the locals goes down. The local control remains because the cloud can be controlled. The LMR system and the FirstNet are just the first bite of the apple of some of the wonderful things that can happen and some of the challenges that we face because the stuff we bought before, the Model A and the Model T Fords, though they run today aren't going to do the thing that needs to be done tomorrow. Keep in mind thirty-six of our counties touch other states. They get as much out of that other state as they get out of ours. We can't be naïve to that. When you go down the east and west side, it's all about that water when it comes in abundance and how do we manage that or how do we manage getting people away from that. I ask the Council to consider the viability of adopting the statewide system with regard to any of these grants. Just like you have adopted the ESInet system. How are they different? It serves the same purpose in many ways. The next one, it is not here yet, when the state gets FirstNet, would we not want to be similarly situated where we've got a system that not only works for all of the counties but works across the nation so those thirty-six counties that touch other states are equally protected. When they make investments they know what they are doing. To John Benson's point, a lot of people make investments in radios that they can't use on the system today because they don't have dial tone there. Dial tone is coming. When it is, it's a flash of the radio and it works. I would strongly encourage you to think strategically and have a strategic plan so that these communities that are looking to spend money are not spending it short sited. I was asked to go to a county meeting where a consultant came in and recommended a multimillion dollar operation. This is what you need to do to fix it. My question to them was; what can they do to get by for twenty-four months. Well, that multimillion dollar project worked down to \$60,000. Well now guess what. The statewide radio system is in place. That county now has an option. I'm not saying they aren't going to spend multimillion dollars to build their own system but those taxpayers have an option to get something for next to nothing. Certainly not the infrastructure costs and not the infrastructure maintenance which is enormous in these systems. The software backend in these is just huge. The state system has that embedded in it and that cost is contained in the long term lease. They don't have that exposure.

Call for the vote:

All ayes. Motion passed.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

None for this meeting.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – open comments of interest from our technical/telecommunication partners

Mr. Koppert – Those that have IPHones that are playing Pokémon Go be aware there is a major security flaw with that. It opens up everything on your phone and puts data out there that you may not want out there.

Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

None

Interoperability Governance Board – Iowa Statewide Interoperable Communications System Board (ISICSB) – Craig Allen

Mr. Allen – The LMR system webinars were completed on general information about the platform features, functions and there were additional webinars on the technical aspects.

The users group committee application process – there will be a meeting July 28th. Several individuals from other states – Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri – will be here to help us to develop some best practices for Iowa.

The platform is being used today with regards to the National Governor's Conference that is being held here in Des Moines.

FirstNet – The RIC work continues in identifying representatives from each agency and getting that information into the CASM Tool. We are developing updated presentation for level 201 and 301. The 101 level was where we went out to each county. We are getting a lot of questions with regards to people getting ready to spend money – is now the right time or if I held off what would that do. So we are trying to get out there and help them understand. We don't have an answer because the vendors haven't been selected and won't be selected for FirstNet until this fall. Once that happens we will get a better understanding of what it looks like for Iowa and Iowa will get a chance to either opt in or opt out.

We've got two new board members. Denise Pavlik from Scott County and Captain David Ness of the Des Moines Police Department. Denise will chair the training and exercise committee.

The board is advancing a number of policy issues. They are working their way through various committees. They may or may not resolve in policy statements.

I recently read through the Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture (TFOPA). That conversation really needs to advance.

Items for Discussion

August 10th was set as the date for the Council to meet and discuss guidelines for the consolidation grant applications as well as some strategic planning items. This will be no less than a half a day.

A question was raised regarding location proximity and staying overnight. Mr. DeRouchey didn't think the state's proximity rule could be waived but the travel costs would qualify.

Chair Ray – I will discuss with Blake to determine what hours for the meeting.

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Jason Study, Pottawattamie County via teleconference – We have a question about integration between PSAPs. We had an incident a couple of weeks ago and we thought we were going to have to evacuate the courthouse because of a water incident and that would mean we would have to go to our extension site in Omaha, NE. If that would have been the case, we would not have been able to answer our 911 in the condition 3 routing. It would send our wireless to state patrol. Now the state had an issue with that one time when it overwhelmed the state patrol and they installed the Windstream lines in our backup center so if the primary network went down the backup lines would take over so we wouldn't overwhelm the state. This presents a problem for the state. If we had to evacuate our primary site due to whatever issue, the condition 3 reroute could possibly overwhelm the state again and we were wondering what the state's stance is on possibly paying for installation and so forth for the lines being ran over to our extension site if that happens. That way the state is protected. It wouldn't overwhelm the state patrol if that should happen.

Mr. DeRouchey – Jason I'm a little confused because we are having conference calls on a weekly basis where we are working through some of those issues. The contract we have with TCS basically gives them the authorization to work within the state of Iowa and only the state of Iowa. Bob sent part of his ANI/AI over when we were trying to make the multi-node and on the Iowa side and have Nebraska come across the river and connect that way. There are a couple of issues we are working through with CenturyLink, TCS and Douglas County. I think that's an excellent chance to take advantage of the \$200,000 consolidation grant that would be available to you. At least on your end for the cost that you might have. We fully support the integration. We just have to look in to what we can do legally and contractually with TCS.

Ms. Richardson – From the conversation that has been presented today, I wanted the Board to consider because we have been hearing this as an interest from a lot of our folks in regard to the technology applications that are going to be available under the consolidation grant funds. They are wondering if you will consider the backup PSAP site being other counties or PSAPs being their backup. Funding any additional hardware needed at those sites via the consolidation grant because it avoids a county investing in setting up all their own dispatch equipment, consoles, the paging equipment, logging recorders, etc. If they can start looking at utilizing that equipment in another PSAP if that could be considered part of the consolidation grant fund eligibility. Tim was talking about the issue we have with public works and some of the other entities that aren't necessarily going to be on the same channels that the law enforcement are. One of the other things we want to bring up and suggest that has been asked of us is that multiband radios be considered a method of consolidation because in a case like that if they had a multiband radio they would be able to talk to other entities without everybody everyday having to be on the same system. Multiband radios, we see them as a piece of your consolidation versus someone having to carry two radios, having to install two radios in their car. One multiband will allow them to connect up to these networks. Now they do not have to push everyone over to the same infrastructure necessarily but they are getting them to talk together. As a follow up to that also thinking about the console equipment as an eligible component for the consolidation. Because consoles now have the capability of joining those networks together. The newer consoles can put the VHF and the P25 and create permanent patches with them to allow them to talk. Those three things are things that have come to us as questions and so we wanted to present them to the board for consideration as things that would be eligible under the rules for the consolidation grant.

Chair Ray – I just wanted to point out that one of the applications that would have been here today fits that exactly. That she was discussing. So that will be another item we will have to discuss.

Mr. DeRouche – I have an email that documents those considerations.

Mr. Bryant – With the revenue stream. With the legislation and talking about the future when I gave my report last month at our convention, it was interesting to me that the important part of the two year study that talked about funding source and funding both systems was to raise the surcharge by \$.25 and we know that wasn't going to fly with the election process coming this fall. I learned at my convention, one of the key legislators in Senate seems to have a hard time understanding how many PSAPs he has in his county, had no recollection of that part of the two year study. Whether that was convenient or just the fact that he didn't read that page or remember that he read that page, I'm not sure. There are those events, that legislators are holding, that are taking place on a daily basis. From my perspective that is an important part, with the upcoming session, that we consider pursuing that \$.25. So as we go forward between now and election day, that would be a very important piece of talking information to have with your legislators.

Mr. DeRouche – Along those same lines. I have had discussion with a few people of trying to replicate 911 Goes to Washington locally. 911 Goes to the Capitol type day early in the session. I've talked to Steven and John Benson how logically we could do that.

Mr. Bryant – There are those Public Safety Coalition meetings that take place the first Saturday in December. A lot of the organizations do have a lobby day breakfast and meetings at the Capitol. Rep. Worthan – not all legislators are like him. They all don't take the time to educate themselves and understand as he has. They have a lot going on and a lot they need to learn but if we are going to be talking about this whole process and consolidation. I think we need to involve those people as well in part of this process to ask....where do they want to go? They need to see where we need to go in ten years and work it backwards as Craig said. So they understand why we are coming at them with different possibilities in the future. Whether it be, revenue or rule changes or laws or legislation. Whatever it is.

Announcements

The next meeting will be on Thursday, August 11, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary

