

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Wednesday, Dec. 3, 2014
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, Iowa**

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

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steven P. Ray at 9 a.m. A quorum was determined from the roll call as indicated below.

<u>Roll Call</u>	Representative	Attendance
Iowa Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) Secretary	Sally Hall	Present
alternate	Cara Sorrells	Present
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Kirk Hundertmark	Present
alternate	Gloria Fitzpatrick	
Iowa State Sheriffs & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	Robert Rotter	Present
alternate	Dean Kruger	
Iowa Peace Officers Association (IPO)	Tim Sittig	Present
alternate	Sandy Morris	Present
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Present
alternate	Tom Berger	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA)		
Vice-Chairperson	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS)		
Chairperson	Steven P. Ray	Present
alternate	Adam Buck	Present
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Rob Dehnert	Present
alternate	Paul Andorf	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	Daniel Nichols	Excused
alternate	Pat Snyder	
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	Dan Halterman	Present
alternate	Wayne Johnson	
Cellular Providers	Steve Zimmer	Absent
alternate	Bill Tortoriello	Excused
PCS Providers	David Kaus	Present
alternate	Joe Sargent	
Auditor of the State, Ex-Officio member	Warren Jenkins	Absent
 Staff:		
Barbara Vos, E-911 Program Manager		Present
 Guests:		
Jeff Andersen, Marion County	Kim Pettyjohn, Marion County	
Doug McCasland, Warren County E911	Dina McKenna, Story County	
Suzanne Smith, Iowa Utilities Board	David J. Sabinash, Retired	
Eric Dau, Clinton County Communications	Diane Sefrit, South Central Iowa	
Doug Hawn, Greene County 911	Butch Hancock, CenturyLink	
Amy Olson, Windstream	Rob Koppert, Cass County E911	
John Paoli, HSEMD	Laurie Hickok, TCS	
Blake Derouchey, HSEMD	Terry McClannahan, Dallas County SO	
Tammy Rodriguez, ICN	Danny McGinnis, TCS	
Randy Goddard, HSEMD	Marie ??? University	

Connie Hambly, Story County E911
Tom Lampe, ISICSB
Sarah McClure, Ames Communication

John O'Conner CenturyLink
Racom ?????
Tim Malott, Cedar County EMA/911

Introductions

Chairperson Steven P. Ray welcomed everyone. Board members and those in attendance introduced themselves.

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Kirk Hundertmark, seconded by Mark Murphy to approve the minutes of the Oct. 29, 2014, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Tim Sittig to approve the agenda with the following addition: Unfinished Business B. Wireless Carryover Funds – Bob Seivert. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Barbara Vos)

911 Program Financial Report

There was no financial report since this is not the end of a quarter.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

An email was sent out a couple of weeks ago informing everyone that all information needs to be sent to Mrs. Vos now and she will disseminate the information.

GIS Project – We have discussed the grant applications that have been coming in for aerial photography and imagery – as a State we want to take care of that and provide it to everybody. So we will quit accepting grant applications for those two things.

John Paoli – A lot of money is put into imagery every year at the county level so what we would like to do is figure out how to do a statewide imagery program. Approximately forty other states do some type of imagery program along with a portal to access data. Historically a county receives grant money to do an imagery project and that information stays in that county. With NextGen 911 the hope is to have the data imagery coming back to this portal where everybody would have access to this data and everyone would have a consistent product statewide. As counties make imagery available, we will have an enterprise solution. The simplest way to do this is to have a statewide imagery program for NextGen 911 so we are not funding counties to the tune of \$50,000 and only getting one county map. Funding the whole state and every three years we can ensure that funding can go into statewide imagery and everyone would have access to it. That is kind of the direction we are going and the same with the GIS data. This will ensure there is an interoperable product.

Mrs. Hall – In Iowa County we have areas of the county that are captured at a higher resolution. (i.e. cities, I-80, rural subdivisions, etc.) Is there going to be one resolution for the entire state or are you going to have a higher resolution for the cities?

Mr. Paoli – What has been done across the country is a standard resolution. For example a 12” or 6” resolution pixel. Basically you figure out the cost per acre. So if I am a county that flies 3” imagery, I can then take the balance of the dollars that I would have got from a 12” or 6” product and put it towards a 3” product.

Mrs. Hall – You mean on our end?

Mr. Paoli – You would work with whatever vendor is selected and the county would pay the difference between the standard resolution and a higher resolution. The benefit is to stop funding these projects that you get no data back from. If we were to send people all over the state to gather this data, we would spend as much money gathering the data and making the products available as with going with a vendor to provide a statewide standard product.

Mr. Dehnert – So am I to understand that this project would be funded by 911 funds at the state level. So how about that frequency of three years? What if we are an area that we want to fly every year? Is that potentially open to applying for funds?

Mr. Paoli – We have looked at that and that is where you get into the usage – the assessor uses it especially in rapidly changing areas. I think it's fair to state that we are going to do this every three years. The intent is to have a consistent product across the state.

Mr. Seivert – So at the local level I can bring this back to our auditor and assessor and say that we do not need to have our aerial imagery vendor fly it because state is going to do it.

Mr. Paoli – Some counties may be under contract to fly more often. So this is something that they can plan ahead. Some counties may not want to use the vendor especially for 911 use. The 12" pixel is pretty good, 6" even better. There might be some assessors that want to still fly.

Mr. Seivert – That would be redundant. The same company flying the same equipment around getting paid double for it. If we can take advantage of it at the local level, then we can save some money.

Mr. Paoli – Right now you have the data but your neighboring counties can't use it.

Mr. Seivert – We share with neighboring counties.

Mr. Paoli – They can't use it in an open format. You can share the imagery with them but the vendor has to administer the oblique imagery.

Mr. Seivert – When is this scheduled to start?

Mr. Paoli – I think we were looking at next spring so at the local level they can plan so we can have this program available by 2016. In most counties, they want the leaf off imagery so they can see the structures.

Mr. Seivert – Right now we share the cost between 911 and the assessor. That seems a little more appropriate use of our funds at the local level. It appears that you are going to take the entire project out of state 911 money and it will be used by assessors and other agencies.

Mr. Paoli – Not annually. Depending on the product you get, you (911), the assessor or other funds might have to still kick in a little bit to cover the entire project.

Mrs. Hall – For the counties that want to do a more enhanced resolution what would be the process for that? Is that going to be out of your office?

Mr. Paoli – Depending on the vendor that the state would go with, we obviously would manage the project out of our office. We would let this group know and the 911 community know the different options. Again I am not here dictating this but these are some of the discussion points.

Mrs. Vos – We have been busy with transition back to our office.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals

Carroll County – Carroll City/County Communications Center – GIS Software Upgrade. Grant request of \$100,000.

Cherokee County – New radio consoles. Grant request \$100,000.

Decatur County – Aerial Photography-update road and address points. Grant request \$55,720.

Floyd County – Paging Software Upgrade. Grant request of \$49,289.

Hamilton County – Positron Viper System. Grant request of \$100,000.

Scott County – Positron Viper System & headsets. Grant request of \$97,929.01.

Motion by Rob Dehnert, seconded by Mark Murphy to recommend for approval all of the above applications. All ayes. Passed.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – Dave Kaus

The phantom calls in eastern Iowa has been solved. The calls were coming from an unactivated cell phone in the possession of a mentally challenged person. All those that think giving unactivated cell phones out is a good thing, this is the icing on the cake that this is not a good thing to do.

Ad Hoc Chair/Vice-Chair selection committee update

Nothing to report. Just as a reminder that vote will take place at our meeting in January.

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

Tom Lampe – On Nov. 18 we finished the FirstNet state consultation. The FirstNet broadband committee met yesterday. They are working on users and coverage. There will probably be another meeting mid-summer. The goal is to decide whether the State of Iowa is opting in or opting out of the network.

We are continuing to work on committees. The RICs are growing at a rapid pace – 200+. John Benson will be organizing those. I have a chart of committees. If there is one that you would like to join, let us know.

Mr. Kaus – How is FirstNet going to be funded?

Mr. Lampe – FirstNet is funded from the auctions of the spectrum. The first \$7 million has been allocated by Congress.

Mrs. Kaus – What bandwidth is that?

Mr. Lampe – FirstNet band? 700 MHz.

Items for Discussion

None

Unfinished Business

A. SCIP committee reviews for 2014/2015 plan actions

Chair Ray – We made some changes to the items that we had listed and the things that we were working on. I have talked to Craig (Allen, SWIC) about the updated plan. There are some things coming up in 2015. Since Craig is not here today we will get the updated SCIP with things that pertain to the Council and hopefully at the January meeting we will divide the council members up and work on those areas that we designated important to the council. The SCIP is a work in progress. This is not something you do and put on the shelf. That is not what it is for.

Mr. Bryant – Craig had brought up last time about the logistics of the meeting and the end of the year report. There was some discussion about moving the meeting away from the last Wednesday of the month because of Thanksgiving and not having a meeting in December at the end of the month. Have you discussed this further?

Mr. Lampe – We have not made a decision on this.

Mr. Bryant – There was discussion of a different day of the week and a different Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Lampe – We discussed the first part of the month.

Mr. Bryant – For the benefit of them, while we're here, is there a day of the week that is better?

Chair Ray – I see that there is probably a value to having it at the beginning due to some of these things coming up at the end of the year. Anyone that has serious reservations about that, speak now.

Mr. Kaus – Is the first part of the month any busier than the middle part of the month? Usually the first part of the month, in any business, is a little busier. I would suggest taking a look at it and decide whether it pays to move it.

Chair Ray – I think Wednesday is probably the better day. The second Wednesday probably falls more consistent because the first Wednesday could be a first day of the month.

Mr. Bryant – I would think the second Wednesday because you will conflict with more holidays on the first Wednesday.

Chair Ray – Does anyone have any reservations about the second Wednesday of the month?

Mr. Kaus – I guess I wonder why? Why move it?

Mr. Bryant – Because Craig has a report to do.

Tom Lampe – The annual report is due the first day in January and is an extensive report. The second reason is today we are meeting at the first of the month because of the holidays. Whatever the majority of our board wants to do, we will do. It was more of a discussion at the meeting in Scott County.

Mr. Kaus – It only happens the last two months. What is to be gained?

Chair Ray – Where it involves us is we want to have our meetings the same time as ISICSB. Clearly if they were making that request for change that is why we would move ours up.

Mr. Bryant – Actually we are losing a meeting a year now. That may not be a big deal. But we are also getting ready for the legislative session and we have this process of November/December getting ready for the January session. I personally think, from the legislative stand point, it is good to have that extra meeting.

Mrs. Hall – If we start in January that will interfere with the NENA/APCO conferences.

Mr. Bryant – Is there a benefit of having our meeting during the NENA APCO conferences?

Mrs. Hall – At the Spring conference it is pretty full with the conference presentations, banquet, vendors, etc.

Mr. Bryant – It is nice to have it the same day of the week every month. As long as the schedule for the meetings is out months in advance and you know there is a conflict I don't see a problem having the meetings on a different day or week of the month.

Chair Ray – The other opinion would be is that you could move it but maybe in those months, have it in the third week. That won't affect December.

Mr. Bryant – It sounds like the simplest way is to leave it the way we have it now and change it for November and December. When is the fall conference – second week in November?

Mrs. Hall – Traditional. Sometimes it has been in the latter part of October depending on when the venue is available.

Mr. Bryant – If we did the second week in November and December that would solve the problem and leave the rest of the meetings on the last Wednesday.

Chair Ray – Of course you have your meeting on October 29 this year and then you are back the second week in November. I guess it does not make any difference.

Mr. Dehnert – I actually like the idea of concurrence with the conference. We have done that before. The last one was at the end of the day. There are the regulars that always attend the meetings but that is a different audience.

Chair Ray – We can be relatively adaptive to that. If we do it in the afternoon. The banquet starts at six?

Mr. Bryant – I don't know how we are going to tie that in with the ISICS Board if we are going to do it at four or five on a banquet day.

Chair Ray – Those weeks we could have it on an afternoon the day before the conference starts.

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Rob Dehnert to advise the ISICS Board that the E911 Communications Council has a willingness to change the meeting day to the first part of the month and the Council is interested in holding the meetings in concurrence with the APCO/NENA Conference. All ayes except Dave Kaus and Sally Hall voted nay. Motion passed.

Wireless Carryover Funds – Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – At the last E911 Council meeting in Davenport when Mrs. Vos presented the quarterly financial report it was apparent that the balance of funds in the wireless carryover fund is large. The discussion centered around whether we wanted to be proactive and come up with an idea as to how to spend that money down in an appropriate way versus that money sitting out there as a target for other state agencies or legislators seeing it as a big plum to use for a project of their own. I offered to draft a white paper and make some proposals. The first draft we thought about a couple of different things. The biggest is to try to get the money back to the local level. We can do that by increasing the \$100,000 to \$150,000 or \$200,000 through the grant process. The other issue was to open up the funding for items that are not directly located at the PSAP. I think that everyone is well aware of that a 911 system encompasses a broad range of radio towers and communications equipment that does not sit right at the PSAP. Those are two issues. The other issues is we (the Council) do not have funds available and separate from the Homeland Security allocation for the expenses of the 911 Council nor do we have funds available that we could generate public service announcements related to texting to 911 and all of the features of next generation. We put a number out there of \$100,000 for that. We brought this proposal to the Emergency Managers Association at their annual meeting and at that point there was a lot of discussion as to why even have the grant program, do away with the grant program and instead of the PSAPs getting 46 percent of the funds take that grant money and roll it down into a higher percentage that goes back to the PSAPs. The money could then be spent for the receipt and disposition of the 911 call and not restricted to just elements within the PSAP. Based on that and I have worked with Barb over the last month trying to articulate this and come up with the numbers and justifications.

I was made aware that the Iowa State Sheriff's and Deputies Association were also looking at this and I don't know how far they actually are with their planning.

(Documents were handed out by Mr. Seivert.) This is the actual reference to the Iowa Code and what would need to change in order to facilitate these changes. I believe there are a couple of representatives that have been made aware of that and are interested in this. After today and the Council approves this as our proposal, I think it is time to get this in front of them and try to get it in the legislative process. The second paper that is going around – the biggest question and change would be going to from 46 percent to 83 percent for the PSAPs and in order to articulate why and how we are coming up with those numbers – I rounded instead of working to the penny. In discussions with Barb, the cost of the switches is something that we need to set aside money for and the amount of equipment at each PSAP has a value as well. The life of that equipment in today's technology, if you look at three to five years you are okay. For the purposes of this document we budgeted for a three year turn around on that equipment. I believe there is flexibility within this to allow funding for the GIS Project in its entirety, set aside money for the state to replace their equipment and not make that fund so tight that if something unexpected happened that we still can't pay it from the wireless fund.

One of the other things I was asked to bring to the attention of the Council is that there are some PSAPs out there that are engaged in huge projects. As they move forward with these huge projects \$100,000 is maybe a small percentage of their project. Example: Cass County is moving their PSAP and updating it in its entirety and that is going to cost more than \$100,000. The Emergency Managers would like to see some process put in place that allows extra funds be provided to those PSAPs that are engaged in these huge projects. The understanding is that if for example we provide \$500,000 to Cass County this year. In the subsequent years there is not going to be any need for that \$100,000 because they have replaced all of their equipment. Maybe there is a way that we can look at increasing and funding these projects on an annual basis or a limited number of these projects with the understanding that they waive access to these funds for a couple of years. I think that is something we should look at and see if we can accommodate.

Mr. Bryant – Mrs. Vos had made a comment per an email that I received about the switches being \$2 million but I see we have it listed as \$1 million.

Mrs. Vos – That should be \$2 million for each switch. That is what it would approximately cost to replace everything at each one of those sites. We just paid TCS for all of the equipment at the Davenport site.

Mr. Kaus – When is that going to take place?

Mrs. Vos – They are going to start installing equipment the week of January 5.

Mr. Kaus – Have you sent letters out to the carriers?

Mrs. Vos – The emails are going out this week.

Mr. Kaus – Who is going to pay for that cost?

Mrs. Vos – The same person who paid for it

Mr. Kaus – That's right. Is there a possibility if we have excess funds that the carriers could be reimbursed for the cost of moving to Davenport?

Mrs. Vos – Not under the current legislation.

Mr. Kaus – That's right and neither is any of this under the current legislation.

Mr. Seivert – My thought on that is I looked at those numbers and made some changes but I didn't distribute them to this group. In 2016 that 13 percent in its entirety goes back into the fund. The numbers that are rounded are rounded conservatively so that accommodating that change in the switch I believe is within that 83 percent. It is not going to hamper....

Mrs. Vos – I didn't know how you rounded up. I just wanted to make sure I pointed that out.

Mr. Seivert – I am comfortable that I have rounded conservatively enough just for things that you are talking about and what Dave is talking about. I believe there is some flexibility in those funds that we can accommodate that.

Mr. Kaus – What does it take to make that happen? Change in Chapter 34A?

Mr. Seivert – Yes, that first paper that was distributed would be the specific changes to Chapter 34A that would allow this to happen. I didn't have time to plug in the numbers to that overall spreadsheet that would show the impact on each counties 911 service board. I think that is a relatively straight forward percentage.

Mr. Bryant – So would that number be a direct proportion from 46 to 83 percent?

Mrs. Vos – The same distribution formula would be used based on the number of calls and square mileage. It would just be the percentage of the overall funds that would change from 46 to 83 percent.

Mr. Seivert – Sheriff have you been in contact with your association? Do you know any specifics about what they are proposing?

Sheriff Rotter – I know they are looking at their legislative agendas right now. The winter school is next week. There will probably be a lot more talked about it then.

Mr. Seivert – I think our strength here as a Council is that our various associations support one piece of legislation and one proposal. If the council would approve moving forward with this then that is what I would ask that we do with our associations that are represented on this Council. That we all get behind this proposal or if you want to change it today, so be it. That's the strength of the Council.

Chair Ray – Bob did you say that you already had some legislative interest in this?

Mr. Seivert – Barb provided a name of a legislator – Rep. Kressig.

Mrs. Vos - He called me. That is why I provided it to you. He was asking questions about the program in general. He also sits on the Interop Board and I give reports to them and he follows what we are doing. He had a couple of PSAPs that reached out to him so he called asking some general questions about future plans, etc. That is why I sent that information to Bob. He might be somebody to reach out to because he has some interest.

Mr. Seivert – I have not done that pending the outcome of today. I know Tim Mallot has been working with a Representative.

Mr. Mallot – My representative has a copy of the draft. He and I have sat down and had various discussions. Personally I believe this Council has a very critical role in the 911 system and how you guys go forward. I agree with this except one part – the increase from 46 to 83 percent. I think that is taking the State of Iowa backwards. I think we need to think about what just happened in this state. We have a lot of PSAPs that are jumping through hoops to catch up. They haven't been keeping up with updating their PSAPs. Our PSAP was one that didn't keep up prior to me getting there. When we were getting ready to do the transition, Barb said you are going to do it on this date. I said I can't because we have a seven digit system. She said no we do not have any seven digit systems left. Cedar County is still seven digit. But with the funds, if you allow it to continue the way you have been and increase.....we need the funding for training. In talking to my Representative he understands that and is behind that \$100,000 especially with text messaging coming. He understands and he is behind me now with expending the funds to care for the 911 system – the towers and the other communications not keeping it there. I told him what we are really doing is we would like to take the carryover fund to match the other verbiage because at one time there was three. Now there's two kind of and let's get one. He understands that. This percentage is going to muddy the waters. Some want it high. Some want it low. But this Council needs to ensure that going forward we keep up with technology. It's changing so quickly. I think Bob came up with a great thought. If you keep a grant program and its focus is improving technology and you have a little more that you can help so many and say those stay out for a couple of years or whatever it takes with technology changing. You have the funds and you have the ability to guide the state to keep up with technology. We can say we have but we have not. Some of the counties have done very well but some of the counties have done terrible. You have the ability to keep everybody on the same level as we move forward with the grant program. Nobody has been disapproved. I agree with this except the percentage. Yes, there are PSAPs that want more money because they have not planned, they have not replaced items every year to keep up. So yes it will fix today but in five years are we going to be in the same boat when we change technology again?

Ms. Morris – There are carryover grants that didn't make it through the process. So you can't say that none have been disapproved. They were stopped at Barb because they didn't meet the requirements.

Mr. Mallot – They didn't make it to this process? Did they meet all of the requirements that were in the guidelines?

Ms. Morris – No and that's what part of problem is. The requirements are so restrictive. People need equipment beyond what's inside the PSAP.

Mr. Mallot – That's why we put this in here. To add that part on and I agree with that. So people were told they were disapproved at one of the meetings it was said they were disapprove at this level and they were not.

Ms. Morris – I agree no one been disapproved here because it has made it through the process. It has been reviewed by Barb and the Council gives it a final oversight.

Mr. Mallot – I have asked my representative to work with John Benson and this group very closely to be sure that it goes forward. I have already talked to the Board of Supervisors and asked them to go to their association and work with it. My board is also on board with that. I have talked to my Sheriff. He came back from the association meeting and asked me questions about what went on up there. They had questions about texting and using the web based solution. They were upset about that and I understand that and I want to use one that will fit the whole state and that's what you have to look at. What is best for the state, how we can move the state forward and not fall behind like we did in some counties? How many counties are ready to do text to 911 right now? How many can turn it on today?

Mr. Seivert – Tim you seem to indicate that you want to keep the grant process there rather than the funds coming directly back to the PSAP. I guess I would challenge that from the perspective of – how many counties have utilized these funds today?

Mrs. Vos – At least half of them but not all of them for the CPE and not for the full amount (\$100,000).

Mr. Seivert – And that would be maybe because the projects are limited in scope to just the PSAP and not the entire distribution system for 911. There are some PSAPs – for instance I get a check every quarter for wireless surcharge for about \$24,000 to \$25,000 and if this would move forward and we looked at just about doubling the amount – that is \$100,000 that is going to come to me to be used for the receipt and disposition of that call. We have counties in Iowa that can't pay their recurring costs of delivering calls today and have to take it from local funds. If we remain through the grant process, money is not available for them to do that because it is for equipment. We've got counties because it is a grant process are not knowledgeable. We've got sheriffs and police chiefs and PSAPs that you have never seen at these meetings. You don't see them at the Sheriff and Deputies, Police Chiefs and Police Associations meetings. They don't go to those things. They don't avail themselves to the grant process. They are not knowledgeable of the grant process. The grant itself by terminology turns them off. If it's a grant they don't want to go after it. The people in this room know that it is simple and that is not the people that I am speaking to. I am talking about those people that don't show up and they are not going to avail themselves of this grant process. So their technological upgrading and up bringing is going to be bought just as it is today. When it is force feed from the top down instead of from the bottom up. I think the grant process in itself is somewhat self-defeating. If you talk to other people around the state, PSAPs want this money at the local level. They don't want to have to go through a grant process to get it every year. That is what I would have you consider as well.

Mr. Mallot – I agree with you but past history shows that it has not been spent correctly. That's what this Council is to ensure that the wireless 911 service under your umbrella works throughout the whole state.

Mr. Dehnert – Barb can you clarify, I think you said about only half of the PSAPs in the state have not gone after the grant money.

Mrs. Vos – I am not for sure without looking at the numbers. I'm just guessing.

Mr. Dehnert – That is astonishing that half of the PSAPs don't go after this \$100,000 – I don't know if I want to say free money – I am dumfounded by that.

Mr. Kaus – My problem is if we move that to 83 percent the monies that go back to the PSAPs is a pretty sizable amount. Are any of the PSAPs willing to put some of that money away for the next upgrade in three years?

Mr. Seivert – I believe that is what you will see.

Mr. Kaus – I am hoping because we've got PSAPs out there that are still operating on baling wire.

Mr. Seivert – That same group of counties that I am talking about that never apply for this stuff, they are happy with what they have. It has worked for fifty years why should they upgrade. It will work for another fifty as far as they're concerned. In some degree that level of technology has to be accepted at the local level to be implemented. That is what we lack today. We lack a reserve to build for those.

Mr. Kaus – I guess what I am saying is there any way we could put a caveat in there that 2 percent or 10 percent or a dollar amount would have to be set aside for upgrading their equipment as technology moves ahead?

Mr. Dehnert – I am not sure that it is forcing them to put money away but I wonder if it comes back to the SCIP. Is that our place? Is that our mechanism to drive – here's the baseline standards across the state – to be at NENA i3 compliant phone systems or whatever it is. Is that the document or is that the piece that is going to drive ever PSAP in the state to come to some baseline level of service. That "us", we are agreeing this is the level of 911 to meet. How do you get there? Save up your money, save your pennies and get there. But I think it starts back here with the SCIP or some other definition.

Ms. Morris – Those agencies that are content with the system they have now whether it is adequate or not, are not going to change regardless if the money comes through a grant or the money goes directly to the PSAP. They are probably more likely if the money goes directly to the PSAP because they have the money in their hand and didn't have to go through this process and get the state to approve and all of this other stuff. If the argument is that we want people to move forward more quickly then I think we want to give the funds directly to them. Because I think what we are seeing now is people are not utilizing the carryover grants to the maximum capability. But if you have the money in the bank you are more likely to do that.

Mr. Seivert – It can be used for a wider variety of things. When we went narrowband a lot of people were told no you do not need to improve your radio infrastructure it will be fine. The reality is that it is not fine. There are a lot of counties out there struggling with reception issues today that don't have the funds to improve that. The narrowbanding process is going to happen again. That is going to further complicate that system down the road. We've got this FirstNet project coming out. Tom (Lampe) if Shelby County wants to get on the band with FirstNet in future. What is the plan for that?

Mr. Lampe – Go through the board, call FirstNet, activate a device, get a subscription fee.

Mr. Seivert – Who pays those subscription fees?

Mr. Lampe – If you pay Verizon now to run your computer, you continue to pay on the commercial side or you switch to FirstNet and pay.

Mr. Seivert – That's what I'm after. When FirstNet comes on board that's an example of a technology that can be used for the receipt and disposition of a 911 call. If those funds are available at the local level and they aren't restricted. We've got things that we know are coming that we need money for at the local level.

Ms. Morris – By getting that bigger pot of money now, we can start saving for it. Where we can only get one \$100,000 grant a year and we have to spend it in that same year or \$150,000 or whatever, that money cannot be put in a pot to be saved for a big project. So if you need \$500,000 then the increased surcharge will allow you to save up to get to the \$500,000, where it is going to take you five years to get to the \$500,000 with the carryover grant.

Mr. Lampe – I agree with you. You have operability issues across the state for radios and you have major interoperability issues across the state. If you can't dispatch your cars because they can't hear you and

the sheriffs, deputies, the Troopers and EMS can't talk to each other even operability let alone interoperability. That is a huge issue. It makes sense if they can buy equipment to help themselves.

Mr. Seivert – The single biggest hindrance is the cost of standardizing that equipment across a broad range of counties and services.

Mr. Mallot – I agree that's what we need to do. This Council has a very important part. How many counties have gone out and bought MotoTurbos. That is a Motorola radio that is not a P25 radio and for a unit that is going P25 the minute you kick it on your system, you can no longer talk to a MotoTurbo. So now you have caused issues. That is why you need to be the guidance for the state – the P25, the NENA/APCO standards going forward...interoperability.

Mr. Dau – One of the concerns I see with the grant program and speaking from someone that runs a medium size PSAP and no offense to Cedar County but \$100,000 for a project will go a lot further in Cedar County than Clinton County just because of the positions. Licensing per position and other things like that. I like the percentage because the distribution formula reflects the higher call volume and larger service area.

Mr. Koppert – We are moving to another location and are in the process of updating our entire system. I will be spending roughly \$601,000 this year alone in technology upgrades in my 911 center. Just the radio consoles and backroom equipment was over \$205,000. My 911 system three positions plus a portable laptop position is right at \$150,000. What I'm getting at is I am a small county. I saved up about \$175,000. It took me five years to get that \$175,000 because I had to pay for other things. For instance narrowbanding. I am lucky I even got a FEMA grant to pay for a large part of the narrowbanding for the fire departments – didn't take into consideration the Sheriff's Office. When we went narrowband we lost a significant amount of coverage in our county. We had to go P25. There was no choice in order to get the coverage met. I think there is a solution here that is between Tim's and Bob's and perhaps instead of jumping to the 83 percent maybe go to 65 percent since that is about in the middle and use that other, 65 to 83 percent for grant money for those larger projects as counties are upgrading. While we are tickled to get the \$100,000 you can see that it doesn't even pay for 2/3s of my CPE equipment in the PSAP. I have a lot more that's going into the PSAP. It would be nice to be able to get more funding for that thing. I can't wait until July 1 and it has to be new equipment and things like that. Some of the standards and the requirements are a little stringent and it would be nice to get additional funding. There is a lot of money in there right now. If you went to \$150,000 or \$200,000 and make it retroactive for this year so that I could grab on to it, that would be significant for my county. We do not have a lot of money from our tax base going into my system other than personnel costs and things like that. Otherwise I live on the 911 dollars. I appreciate what I get but it would be nice to get more.

Mr. Mallot – I think we all agree on this thing 100 percent but the part we don't agree on is the percentage. I think we pass everything but that right now and get this started where you get your training dollars because we have text to 911 coming. I have talked to a couple of other states and they have said that training dollars is the biggest issue to get ready for the text to 911 and that can cause it to be a failure or a success. I think we realize that we need to put some money into things outside the PSAP.

Mr. Bryant – Are we back to the same question or problem that we are an advisory board without any real power but figuring out how we find consistency across the state so that everyone is compatible so we are not spending money going the wrong direction as we talked about early with the mapping. Would the percentage be okay if we could figure out how to make everybody similar?

Mr. Mallot – I'm happy with whatever you guys are. But I'm just thinking as the Council you've got a chance I'll take the 83 percent.

Mr. Bryant – But the problem with that is finding the... so the money isn't spent foolishly, wrongly.....

Mr. Mallot – Preparing the state for FirstNet and the next narrowband.

Mr. Bryant – How do we guide or direct? Is that separate from this?

Mr. Seivert – It is very separate. This is a piece of legislation that is identifying an issue. We are not asking for new money. We are not directing PSAPs to spend money in a particular way. We are just enabling a change in how existing money is distributed. If we want to move and we actually are. The ISICS Board is moving forward with developing those standards on a statewide basis. As they bring those policies online and those standards are set that's going to accomplish what you want. The problem is there is no hammer to make the counties comply. And the reason there is no hammer to make the counties comply is because we all have disparate radio systems that we are desperately in love with and we don't ever want to give them up. When we change that mindset, I guess we can move forward with that. That would be a full piece of legislation that would literally take years to develop. As we move forward with any piece of legislation and you put a percentage out there that is where the point of debate lies and believe me when this moves forward in this format that will be a point of discussion. What I have done today is provide a background for the 83 percent. We need to move this forward today.

Mr. Murphy – I am definitely for this. I just want to make sure that...I know that we are going text messaging. The capability is coming out over the web. I have received lots of calls recently that we are all buying this great equipment that can handle text messaging and we are going over the web. Are we planning to put enough money aside for the text to 911 through the CPE verses web browser? I just want to make sure that statewide we're looking forward to let those counties use their own equipment and we are putting the money aside.

Mrs. Vos – I don't know without crunching the numbers.

Mr. Murphy – I think as a board we need to look at that.

Ms. Hickok – I want to clarify one thing. It is not like the web browser would go down. It traverses the ESInet. So the ESInet would have to be down.

Mr. Murphy – In my center once a month they shut all of the computers down except for my phone system so I am still able to do all my phone stuff. If a text message came in at that time.

Ms. Hickok – You would have to be logged in otherwise there would be a bounce back message.

Mr. Murphy – But if it came in on my phone system.

Ms. Hickok – You have to be logged in to the server. If you are not logged into the server, you would not get the text message.

Mrs. Vos – If the only thing that is up is your phone system, the text message would not go into the phone system without going through the network. You have to be logged into the web browser to those calls by TCS.

Ms. Hickok – You have to be logged into the GEM portal otherwise if someone tried to text you they would get a bounce back message.

Mr. Murphy – But if the system was able to come right into the CPE instead of through a web – into my phone system which is separate. Black Hawk County is doing it now. They are getting their text messaging through their phone system.

Ms. Hickok – You've got a separate circuit that is installed at their site that does that. It's not traversing the ESInet.

Mr. Murphy – But we need to look at other options other than the web browser in the future.

Mrs. Vos – That's what the plan is as we go down the road.

Mr. Murphy – I just wanted to make sure that we are putting enough funding aside to do that. That we are not giving it all away to the PSAPs who need it but we need to be setting enough aside that we as a 911 Council are looking to make that happen.

Mr. Paoli – We all know that the NextGen911 the GIS data is a pretty important. So does this change account for the need for statewide data because this state has demonstrated that we do not share and collaborate very well with data. This is not a 911 thing. This is a data thing. We never share GIS data well – county to county to region to state. The goal of NextGen911 is to have ninety-nine counties with consistent data. Is there money in your proposal to accomplish that?

Mr. Seivert – Not knowing the dollar amount that you are talking about there is no way to answer that question. I think there is. There is plenty of flexibility with these numbers and with this percent that the state will maintain a substantial amount of money to maintain the network, develop it and improve it.

Mr. Paoli – The reason I ask is some states have gone the way of no overhead to create a portal for data coming and going to all PSAPs.

Mr. Bryant – I am in favor of this, I want to make that clear. I am always cautious about doing something that the consequence further adds to an existing problem or makes it bigger. I don't think it's going to make anything bigger but I don't know if it is not going to continue to go on. Going forward I have a couple of Senators that are in my organization that I can talk to. There is a Joint Public Safety Coalition meeting on Saturday morning. We are never all going to agree but one thing if have learned legislatively that if you have an organization and you start going a lot of different directions with the legislators – they tend to shy away from doing anything. So I think it is important that we try as much as we can to come up with a united front going forward for this potential legislation. My organization is in favor of this.

Motion by Mark Murphy, seconded by Rob Dehnert to move forward with the proposal presented. All ayes. Motion passed.

New Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Mr. Koppert – I have received some calls about this and I see it was on the APCO forum this morning about calling 112. 112 is the emergency number in continental Europe. Apparently there is a lot of information on social media that you can dial 112 in the United States and get 911. I believe AT&T is redirecting 112 calls to 911. I tried it with my Verizon phone in my PSAP and it went no where but interestingly my phone did say emergency mode.

Chair Ray – Was there anything on there that indicated why anyone would call those three numbers opposed to 911?

Mr. Koppert – We had a situation the other night with a mentally challenged women who was not sure the uniformed officer that pulled her over was a real officer and that the tow truck driver was a tow truck driver. The woman was dialing 112 because she had heard that 112 will allow you to verify that is a real police officer, deputy or trooper. She dialed 911 and questioned whether we were a real 911 center. In researching it, it is out there on Facebook and social media that you can dial 112 to verify if someone is an actual officer, etc. This is national.

Chair Ray – What you're mentioning Rob goes to why we need to have some funding for PSAs (Public Service Announcements).

Ms. McClure – I just wanted to make sure that in all of the discussion there has been, that the first line people have a great concern about the web based text to 911. It is getting one more piece of failure for my front line folks. What I am concerned about is the people that are going to intercept these very first calls – that text – that they are being thought of in this. I get it that we have to have the technology to get

it there. We need to think about the impact and burden we are putting on those people. Right now their technology is changing faster than we can keep up with and they are human and they are responsible for human lives out there. I am concerned that we have not heard any discussion about...there has been a little discussion about the training for the personnel. With all of these changes, we do need to know what the plan is. Is the web based a temporary or to get us from one piece to the next. We need to know what that is. My people need to feel secure when they sit down and a phone call comes in that they can answer it, transfer it and do what they need to do. And I don't know if I can give them that.

Chair Ray – And to avoid a lot of confusion because there's a lot of vendors out there that their product will take the text but then we can't do it that way because this is how we are going to start out.

Ms. McClure – The point is I have to introduce a new piece of technology or piece of software that they have to learn aside from the phone and radio. This technology is not as stable as the can and string.

Announcements

Next meeting date – Wednesday, Jan. 28, 2015 at West Des Moines City Hall Council Chambers – 9 a.m.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary