

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Wednesday, Jan., 28, 2015
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, IA**

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steven P. Ray at 9:02 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	Sally Hall	Present
alternate	Cara Sorrells	Present
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Kirk Hundertmark	Excused
alternate	Rob Koppert	Present
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	Excused
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	Present
alternate	Pat Snyder	
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	Dan Halterman	Present
alternate	Wayne Johnson	Present
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:		
Jenna Cargill, Henry County E911	Suzanne Smith, Iowa Utilities Board	
Todd Misel, DPS	Tom Lampe, DPS/ISICSB	
Terry McClannahan, Dallas County SO	Scott Schultz, Motorola	
David Gentleman, Pottawattamie County	Bob Andersen, Pottawattamie County	
Jason Study, Pottawattamie County	Dan Pickett, Bremer County	
Aubyn Giampolo, Westcom	Brent Long, Polk County	
Scott Locker, Polk County	Sherry Murphy, Iowa DPS	
Ken Rasing, Chickasaw County E911	Lt. Brad Shutts, Jasper County Communications	
Chris Fee, Allamakee County	Josh Halterman, DOT-TraCS	
Terry Brennan, RACOM	Butch Hancock, CenturyLink	
Kim Leigh, Intrado	David Marley, ICN	
Marilyn Stayner, Worth County E911	Paula S. Harris, Worth County Sheriff's Office	

Ginger Thompson, Mitchell County E911
Marie Carlson, Iowa State University Police
Connie Hambly, Story County E911
Amy Olson, Windstream
Lori Riley, Perry PD
Wendy Hess, Woodbury E911
Larry Smith, Washington/Keokuk EMA
John Benson, HSEMD
Cherese Sexe, Humboldt County E911
Blake Derouchey, HSEMD

Kathy Herrick, Floyd County E911
Dina McKenna, Story County
Nic Briseno, Story County Sheriff's Office
Doug Hawn, Greene County 911
Diane Sefrit, South Central Iowa
Samantha Brear, Polk County EMA/E911
Randy Goddard, HSEMD
Tammy Rodriguez, ICN
Laurie Hickok, TCS

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion Rob Dehnert, seconded by David Kaus to approve the minutes of the Dec. 3, 2014 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by David Kaus, seconded by Dan Halterman to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Barbara Vos)

GEM 911 – Danny McGinnis & Rod Robinson

At this time there was a live demonstration of the TCS GEM911 web browser solution for text delivery to 911.

Mr. Robinson – GEM911 does not require an application on the computer desktop but it does require connectivity back to our servers. You can reply to a text message using a free form or canned messages that can be setup. The communication time between sending the message and getting the message response usually takes about three seconds. The telecommunicator will be able to track queue sessions of other telecommunicators. The first message that you get from the carrier will use the equivalent of a Phase 1 location. Once the session is anchored, a refresh location can be done which is similar to a rebid. Phase 1 and Phase 2 is not used but course and course enhanced. We receive the message from the carrier, we request location from the carrier and from that point on it is all between us and the PSAP.

Some questions asked were:

Ms. Hess - Where does the map come from?

Mrs. Vos - This one is Bing. In production we are using Navteq-Navtel.

Mr. Kaus – Who provides the Lat/Long?

Mrs. Vos – The carriers do. Just like they do with the phone call.

Mr. Smith – Can the refresh location be stored and plotted later? (if the caller was on the move)

Mr. Robinson – Yes it does. Every time that you refresh it will leave a flag or “bread crumb” that you can track.

Mr. Koppert – What can be dumped into CAD?

Mr. Robinson – With the web browser, we do not have the ability to directly spill into CAD. We have some loose integrations with some CPE vendors that we are currently certifying. Several other CPE vendors to be able to accept the text natively on their CPE they provide.

Mrs. Vos – This is an interim solution. Until the vendors are at MSRP (message session relay protocol) to be able to integrate them between what TCS is doing and your equipment. That is not going to happen. You will be able to save this information. As an administrator, you will be able to retrieve that information but you can't dump it into CAD at this point.

Mrs. Thompson – A lot times when I send text people don't get it right away. If you are in a texting emergency what if there is a delay in either their response getting back to you or yours to them?

Mrs. Vos – There really isn't anything in the system that prevents that, correct? It still could possibly happen?

Mr. Robinson – It still could possibly once in a while. I have seen that maybe twice in the two years that I have been giving demos. If the message that I send from the console here does not arrive, you will see a big red X. Message not delivered. The out of sequence thing is a little of a bit different problem. It is going to be inherent to a.... It is different with each SMS system and each SMS carrier. The rapidness of how the messages came out. I have seen if you type really fast and hit send about 3-5 seconds or so you may see an out of sequence message. We have not seen any in production that completely dropped.

Mrs. Vos – I put that information in the educational materials that you can use. You will experience delays if you are in areas where big events are going on. It is something that the public needs to be aware of.

Mr. Robinson also spoke about the administration of the application – user setup, canned messages, reports, alternate PSAPs, etc. If you are out of service for what ever reason, you can have your texts routed to an alternate PSAP.

Mrs. Vos – That is only going to be playing into it when your alternate PSAP has text to 911. Right now we are sending off the requests as PSAPs become ready. We have 12 requests right now. We have talked to Steven (Ray) and the text-to-911 can all route to them just like we do for wireless 911 calls – as an option. So until other PSAPs are on board, we can set it up to go to them. That will come into play as PSAPs all have that capability. So at the beginning for those first twelve, you are going to have to work them. You can't transfer them and you can only setup alternate routing to those that can handle text messaging.

Mr. Andersen – What about the bordering states if they accept texting?

Mrs. Vos – If the one in Nebraska accepts them, we will have to figure that out. Can they use them as their alternate?

Ms. Hickok – At this point Nebraska is not on the ESInet. We are using the ESInet as the vehicle to take the text to the TCC.

Mrs. Vos – Probably not right now.

Mr. Anderson – Douglas County is.

Mrs. Vos – But they are not on the ESInet which is our network. You guys that have that intertandem trunking setup that is different. It is not running across our network. So that is why it possibly won't work.

Ms. Hickok – You might have to have some kind of point to point circuit to transfer that data.

Ms. Hess – We have not upgraded our phone equipment in Woodbury County but, correct me if I am wrong, but we could start text tomorrow because this is just a web based thing that is not requiring any change to our phone system.

Mrs. Vos – Correct. But have been waiting until everybody is upgraded and migrated to SIP before we are sending in the request to the carriers. No, it actually would not be on the network yet until you get your new equipment. That is what it is. Because you are not tied into the new system. So that is why we are waiting until everybody gets to that SIP part of it so you are on the network with the text.

Mrs. Vos – The administrator part you can assign who your administrator is for adding things into the system, who can get reports from the calls that have been happening, you add your users, add the pre-canned messages. At the last demo there was the question as to how many pre-canned can be setup. We can't image you will have more than the system will hold but if you do we will have to let you know.

????? – Is there any cost associated with this?

Mrs. Vos – Not on our end but I do not know about your CPE vendor. You need to ask them if there is anything that you need to have to do this.

Ms. Hickok – You will need a web browser. It does not have to have open internet. You can have Chrome, Windows Internet Explorer, Firefox and you have to have access to that on your call taker workstation.

Mrs. Thompson – When do you project this is going to go into effect and everyone is SIP ready?

Mrs. Vos – It is going to be on going from this point on. We have 12 that are going online in April. Once we make the request, the carriers have six months to provide it to you.

Mr. Seivert – There are some counties that are saying that they don't like the interim solution and that there is a better solution that can dump right into their CAD and use their existing CPE equipment. If they want to go a different direction can they do that?

Ms. Hickok – The MSRP (message session relay protocol) is a NENA i3 standard for text messaging. We have talked to the vendors and no one is MSRP ready today. We are working with some vendors to do interop testing with them to get them to the MSRP. At that point I believe, Eventide and some of the SIP recorders that are coming in that will send a SIP stream in and it records differently. Not until MSRP is in place.

Mr. Seivert – Those counties that have Vipers, they are saying that they can do this on their own. They don't need an interim solution. What do we say to them?

Ms. Hickok – They need to do something differently. You are going to have to order a circuit in. It is not traversing a true ESInet.

Mrs. Vos – If they do that, it is not going across the wireless network we have in place. I have talked to Intrado to see if they are capable of doing MSRP and they have not responded back. That is how it is going to tie together going across our ESInet.

Ms. Hickok – The other interim solution and I don't know if there is a cost it is also an interim solution because it is not i3. Either way you look at it they're interim solutions.

Ms. Herrick – Say we are ready in April equipment wise but one of our main cellular vendors is US Cellular and they are not ready. So our board is wondering do we want to put it out there when the majority of the cell phones are with a different carrier and confuse people.

Mrs. Vos – US Cellular should be ready. They all had to be ready by the end of the year (2014).

Ms. Herrick – Last I heard they told us April.

Mrs. Vos – They have request in now for the first twelve and they did not come back and say they would not be ready to deliver that...

Mrs. Vos – The other side of it is the education of it. If it is not available by their carrier they are going to get that bounce back message that says "It is not available. Please call 911." And that is going to happen for anything that is roaming through your county.

????? – What PC are you suggesting this run on? How are you planning on integrating that?

Mrs. Vos – I think it is up to the PSAP where you want it. Where are you going to have someone available to handle this? Some of them in the states that have this have it on the calltaker's PC that is in front of them because it is just a little pop up browser that pops up. It just lays down in your tray. It flashes or makes that noise. You click on it and it comes up and you start working it from there.

????? – Is there going to be a problem integrating your CAD PC with the CPE equipment if you are delivering it on the ESI network?

Mrs. Vos – It is not going to dump into your CAD anyway. So I am sure why you would want to put it on your CAD PC.

Ms. Hess – We would have to put it on our CAD PC because that would be the only one that we would have access to log in to their network.

Mrs. Vos – It just depends how you have it setup. Everyone has it different within their PSAP. That is something we will have to discuss when we come in to set up the GEM.

Ms. Hickok – There will be training.

Ms. Hess – Have you had any firewall issues? We have a robust network and our IT people have it very locked down. Usually when we have a new application installed, we have some issues then. Do you know how that is set up?

Ms. Hickok – It is an URL that you point it to. It is not like it is a software loading on necessarily. You point to it, you login. If you are not logged in, they will get a bounce back message.

Mr. Koppert – This is using the ESInet and for those of us that have...my calltaker is part of my CAD. Is this going to require a separate network connection?

Mrs. Vos – No.

Mr. Koppert – So how does the ESInet get into our CAD or whatever we use?

Ms. Hickok – In the case of SIP ready our Juniper goes directly into your....however your vendor is putting it. A lot of them have routers. That comes into your CPE. So today you have Audio Codes that meet a gateway. That goes away when we go SIP. We do a direct connect from our firewall into the CPE.

Mr. Koppert – But we are not using our CPE.

Mrs. Vos – You will use your CPE equipment but it won't dump into CAD.

911 Program Financial Report

Mrs. Vos passed the presentation of the financial report on to Blake DeRouchey.

Mr. DeRouchey – I have been in the 911 program for about three months. I have been in Homeland Security and Emergency Management since 2008. I am going to be the point of contact going forward in the interim. A new email account has been setup that can be shared amongst the team of myself, Randy Goddard and John Paoli. It is e911@iowa.gov and you can access this email in Barb's absence.

Calendar Q4 2014 Wireless Expenditure Report			
Funds Received	\$6,530,374.72	Expenditures	
HLSEM Funding	(\$62,500.00)	Wireless Service Providers	
Interest	\$18,685.29	13% of Fund - \$907,788.43	\$138,525.52
Prepaid Card Revenue	\$496,454.88	Cricket	
-prepaid comes from Dept of Revenue		iWireless	
Expenditures	(\$27.00)	RSA 1 Ltd Partnership (Chat Mobility)	
Funds Available	\$6,982,987.89	Sprint PCS	
		US Cellular	
		LEC Transport & ALI/Selective Routing Actual Costs	\$588,777.84
		--TCS (contract)	\$416,804.63
		--ICN (network)	\$171,973.21
		--Carriers ALI/SR	
Carryover		PSAP Funding 46% of Fund	\$3,212,174.43
Network Capacity Increase	\$3,000,000.00	Total Expended	\$3,939,477.79
Carryover PSAP Projects	\$6,962,104.61	Q4 Carryover	\$3,043,410.10
NG911 GIS Project	\$10,000,000.00	SFY15 Carryover	\$6,177,719.09
Data Center Move	\$2,000,000.00		
Total Obligated	\$21,962,104.61	Carryover Expenditures	\$1,511,829.61
Total Funds in Carryover			
			\$21,740,736.48

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals

Benton County – Upgrade telephone system hardware and software to allow PRI interface and upgrade mapping system. Grant request of \$89,367.18.

Black Hawk County – GIS Map Data updates for NG9-1-1. Grant request \$75,125.

Butler County – Zetron MAX CT Core Call Taking – two positions. Grant request of \$100,000.

Chickasaw County – Back up batteries for radio system, upgrade EmergiTech 911 System to the SIP platform and integrate headsets to work with the phone system. Grant request of \$13,169.

Emmet County – EmergiTech IP9-1-1 Solution. Grant request of \$47,181.

Lee County (LeeComm) – Replacing two switches to allow text to 911. Grant request of \$14,940.72.

Marshall County (Marshalltown/Marshall County Communication Center) – Install a NetClock GPS modular time and frequency synchronization system. Grant request of \$10,450.

Polk County (City of Des Moines) – Fee to perform a feasibility study of combining Polk County Dispatch with the City of Des Moines Dispatch Center. Grant request of \$32,275.00.

Sioux County – SIP Migration, Nexlog 740 Eventide Logger and UPS backup system. Grant request of \$81,343.74.

Van Buren County – Solacom IP upgrade. Grant request of \$52,445.

Woodbury County – NG9-1-1 Dispatch GIS Software upgrade. Grant request of \$100,000.

Wright County – TAC 10 CAD, NCIC, E911 and mapping interface. Grant request of \$31,111.

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

Boone County – Upgrading computers, phone, PSAP video monitoring and storage equipment, electrical upgrades to support climate control in the PSAP in the event of a power failure, quad band and backup mobile radio. Grant request of \$74,764.25

Shelby County – EmergiTech IP9-1-1 Solution upgrade, upgrading GeoComm mapping and Priority Dispatch EMD and EPD. Grant request of \$100,000.

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Rob Dehnert to recommend for approval all of the above applications. All ayes except Steven Ray and Bob Seivert abstained. Passed.

Chair Ray spoke regarding the retirement of E911 Program Manager Barbara Vos. Chair Ray expressed

At this time Lt. Adam Buck and Maj. Todd Misel from the Iowa Department of Public Safety/Iowa State Patrol gave Mrs. Vos a gift and Certificate of Appreciation.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – Dave Kaus

As of tomorrow the FCC is supposed to put out the new requirements for location accuracy.

Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – Our proposal to change the percentage coming back to the PSAPs is being drafted. Representative Coffman is drafting it on the House side and Senator Brase will draft a mirror bill on the Senate side after the house side comes out. We are waiting for a bill number. What we are asking for is to change the amount that is coming back to the PSAPs from 46 percent to 83 percent and we are asking that the funds be allowed to be spent for receipt and disposition of the 911 call versus just at the PSAPs. We are also asking for \$100,000 to be set aside for E911 Council expenses and probably more importantly for public information to be provided to schools, media, etc. about the texting to 911. Currently the Council is funded in the stipend that the HSEMD gets for funding and they are using probably about 100 percent of that. This just kind of sets that money aside. I put out a white paper that justifies the 83 percent and since that went out there have been some changes and some additions. (A re-draft was distributed) We have to pick a number somehow, someway. We can either pick it or we can let somebody pick it for us. The 83 percent I feel is justified. The goal was to make sure the needs of the State are taken care of. They have to have enough money to run the network, provide the upgrades and replace the equipment. They own the equipment at the PSAP. Obviously that has a life span that needs to be acknowledged and money needs to be set aside for that. We are accumulating wireless surcharge at about \$3 million per quarter. If you extrapolate that it is \$12,172,000 per year that is going into the wireless carryover fund. We have 115 PSAPs. If every single PSAP spent their entire allocation of \$100,000 every year, that is only \$11,500,000. So we are never going to spend all of that money. The last applications that we voted on today, of the first 11 that came in, they are only using 51 percent of the \$100,000. A lot of applications are coming in for around \$30,000. Only two

requested the full \$100,000. You can see that the funds are going to continue to grow. They are going to become a target, if they are not already a target this session. I would fully expect a challenge for someone to want to siphon those funds off for another project. Rather than be reactive the Council wanted to be proactive. No matter what we do, if we pass a bill this session and we change this from 46 percent to 83 percent, in the meantime we have two more quarters of wireless funds that are going to accrue. That is going to put \$6 million more into that fund.

Mr. Seivert reviewed the re-drafted white paper that was distributed which showed the justification for 83 percent. The numbers included in the white paper were from the quarterly report distributed earlier. The white paper follows:

Iowa E911 Council
January 28, 2015

This is a document which provides a fair assessment, in rounded numbers, of how much of the wireless revenue can be shifted from the current grant process, directly to the local E911 Service Boards. These funds would be used for the receipt and disposition of the 911 call, and not be limited to equipment located at the PSAP. (12 month averages)

Why 83%

Income / Qtr
Wireless income including interest, prepaid card Revenue per Qtr looks to be approx. \$6,963,371

Expenses / Qtr
 HLSEM \$62,500
 Wireless Service Providers \$118,490 (ends in 2016)
 LEC Transport ALI Selective Routing \$596,544

Available for the Network and PSAPS: \$6,185,837 /Qtr

HLSEM needs money set aside for equipment the State owns,
 Two switches \$2,000,000 each Total \$4,000,000
 Each of 115 PSAPS have state owned equip at approx. \$15,000
 Each for a total: \$1,725,000,
 Technology replacement for equipment should be 3-5 years, for this I am using 3yr, that makes for an annual cost of \$1,908,333 or \$477,083 per quarter

We need to honor present PSAP Grant obligations	\$6,962,104	
Network capacity increase	\$3,000,000	
NG911GIS Project	\$10,000,000	
Datacenter move	\$2,000,000	
Total obligations:		\$21,962,104

That amount would be approximately the balance of the Wireless fund today: \$21,740,736

Leaving that alone and using just the wireless funds received moving forward:

Setting aside New Obligation for Education and E911	
Council Expenses \$100,000 /yr or \$25,000 /Qtr	\$25,000
Setting aside money for State owned equipment switches and at the PSAP \$1,908,333 /yr or \$477,083 /Qtr	\$477,083
New Backup Network \$200,000 yr or \$50,000/Qtr	\$50,000

Leaves \$5,633,754 for distribution to PSAPS which would equate to a percentage of 81 percent vs the current 46 percent. This should satisfy the States need to operate the network, and is loose enough to provide for network enhancements as they are made technologically feasible, and, at the same time provide much needed funding at the local level, without the cumbersome restrictions of a grant program.

Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – When the bill comes out, if we can all jump on board with the same message to our associations and speak with a loud voice, I am hopeful that we can get this done.

Wayne Johnson – There has been discussion in past meetings about back up centers. There was discussion about legislative language about upgrades to backup centers with equipment to match their primary centers. Does that proposed language change address that issue or would that be a separate bill?

Mr. Seivert – What this would do is put the money in the hands of the local E911 service board. Just for the receipt and disposition of the 911 call. If they have enough money after paying for the ongoing expenses, putting in a backup center, I don't think that would be unreasonable.

Mrs. Vos - If one has a backup center they are not on the ESInet. It is up to them if they want to use the money for equipment but that may not solve their problem because there is no connectivity to the backup center.

Ms. Hickok – We can add them.

Mr. Seivert – The option is there but the technology may not allow it. When you go to a backup center you may have all of your services. There are a couple of other things to consider. The justification when you are talking to your legislators. Many of us experience a lack of radio reception when we moved into the narrowband arena and some of those things need to be resolved. We need more towers. We need radios. The push is for P25. The State has this great FirstNet project rolling out – 700 mhz system – and the locals are going to be asked to buy into some of this stuff. These funds could be used by local PSAPs to help support those initiatives. I think we need to be proactive on these things or somebody is going to make some proposals to take the money.

Larry Smith – The Iowa Firefighters Association has a real strong lobbying effort out there. Tom are they pretty much on board with this big jump?

Tom Berger – I don't know how much has been shared with them. I think they are waiting for the language to come out. The IFA board of directors is aware of it. The past president is on board with it.

Mr. Bryant – I would suggest that you get to know who your legislators are. Attend their legislative coffee meetings. They should know your name. So when you come to ask for something they know who you are.

Mr. Koppert presented a letter to the E911 Council that described the scope of the massive project that Cass County is undergoing. The Cass County Public Safety Commission and E911 Service were asking the E911 Council to support raising the wireless carryover fund for the current fiscal year to \$200,000 and allow the E911 service boards that have already applied and received the maximum of \$100,000 to apply for an additional \$100,000. Also to raise the maximum wireless carryover amount to \$200,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015, and to increase the percentage of the quarterly wireless surcharge disbursement to the PSAPs to at least 70 percent for the fiscal beginning July 1, 2016. Following is that letter:

January 27, 2015

Dear Iowa 911 Advisory Council;

Over the past year, the Cass County Public Safety Commission, Cass County E911 Service Board and Cass County Board of Supervisors have been working on updating 911 communications in Cass County. We've purchased a building located across the street from the current location of the 911 center, and to date have spent just shy of \$750,000 for building acquisition and renovation.

The vast majority of the equipment in the current 911 center is out of date and most have far surpassed their manufacturers suggested life span. This includes 911 system, radio console system, voice and data recorder, mapping server, dispatch position computers and a wide variety of other equipment necessary for the receipt and disposition of 911 and routine calls for service.

This fiscal year alone, the Cass County E911 Service Board will be expending approximately \$570,000 for much of the above equipment. The Cass County E911 Service Board did apply for, and receive notification of award of a \$100,000 grant from the wireless carryover funds for the purchase of an Emergitech IP911 system. The remaining

\$470,000 is comprised of surcharge funds that have been set aside for the project, plus a bank loan to be acquired by the Cass County Board of Supervisors on behalf of the Cass County E911 Service Board in the amount of \$324,000.

As you can see you can see, the Cass County E911 Service Board is taking on a large debt to provide up-to-date 911 services to the citizens and visitors of Cass County. We're aware of the large amount of wireless carryover funds available to 911 service boards across the state and how this fund continues to grow and feel that Cass County is not the only county in Iowa undergoing a large amount of expenses this fiscal year (and next) as the states PSAPs gear up for NG911.

Therefore, the Cass County E911 Service Board and the Cass County Public Safety Commission respectfully request of the Iowa 911 Advisory Council, to support raising the carryover surcharge for the current fiscal year to \$200,000, allow those 911 service boards that have already applied or received the current maximum of \$100,000 to apply for an additional \$100,000; raise the maximum carryover surcharge for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015 to \$200,000 and increase the percentage of wireless surcharge dispersed to the states PSAPs to at least 70% beginning July 1, 2016.

Sincerely,

Rob Koppert
E911 Director

Mr. Koppert – It is only going to get more expensive as we get more equipment.

Chair Ray – Unfortunately we cannot make any changes this fiscal year because we have been told several times by the auditor that we cannot change in the middle of a fiscal year. Is that not correct Barb?

Mrs. Vos – I have not heard back from them when I asked that question again. The other side of it is at this point it is going to be hard for anyone to purchase equipment and get everything done by the end of the fiscal year. We are going to struggle to get everyone installed by the end of June as it is now. I will reach out to them again this afternoon.

Mr. Seivert – I would like to see the council support what Rob is saying especially when they have a project of this nature. I see the PSAPs are not fully utilizing their \$100,000 maybe there is a way that the money that is not being utilized could go into a large project like that. It would be an exception to the way we are doing things. But I really don't know of anything in rules that precludes Homeland Security from making those exceptions. As long as we stay less than than \$11,500,000, why don't we do this? Help out these projects that are happening right now. I would fully support that. I would make that a motion. Motion by Bob Seivert that the E911 Council make a recommendation to Homeland Security that allows for special projects and extra funding be approved on a case by case basis. Motion died for the lack of a second.

Chair Ray – Blake perhaps you can get an answer from the Auditor's Office for the E911 Council regarding this by the Feb. 11 meeting. Some of this also plays into what potentially could become into the law change that you are seeking too.

John Benson – From the discussion if have heard you have an increase in the pass through percentage from 46 percent to 83 percent and you also simultaneously have an interest in increasing the amount that is coming out of the carryover fund. Simple mathematics says those two cannot occur simultaneously. If a bill comes out and it comes out at 83 percent and it manages to pass, essentially the carryover fund will no longer exist. There will no longer be an opportunity for the locals to come in and access that money for capital projects like Rob is referencing. All that money is going straight out the door into your pockets and that is how you are going to make your 911 systems continue to work. Why I say this is essentially we are charged with the administration of the network to support all 115 PSAPs and that is our first obligation – to make sure the network works correctly. We do not have the capability to run back to the legislature and ask for more funding. We could but it would be resoundly shut down. That is the one caution I will give to you. Remember you can't have your cake and eat it too in this situation. We have two things going on here at the same time. If you want it on the front end you won't have it on the back end. That will be gone but you will have more on the front end to do with it how you see fit. We fully support the concept of surcharge money being spent as surcharge money. There used to be three requirements as to how you spent your surcharge money and we got it down to two. Getting it down to one is something we have always been in support of and if it did get up to 83 percent and it was all in the front end, the secondary

issue would go away. You most likely would not be receiving money out of the carryover. That is where the problem is with the carryover. I just wanted to make sure that you are fully aware of that. If you are gaining on one end it has to go down on the other.

Mr. Bryant – If the legislators hear different stories, they back up and run and shut the door. Changing that percentage is not big deal but if you get two things going on they think there is not a consensus in that community then they do not want to get involved. I think we need to provide a united front. That is the reason I did not second the motion. It is really important that we go with one message if we want to get anything accomplished up on the Hill.

Mr. Seivert – The numbers that we gave for the state costs do you see any problems with those? Are there other costs that we need to be aware of that are not included in this?

Mr. Benson – Some of it I know is right but I have some questions. The ongoing expenses that will occur with the GIS project. It essentially is going to become another network that will have reoccurring costs to make it work right. The initial spend down of what is there now I intend to agree with where you are at but it is when we move into the ongoing expenses. Most of you know with a data driven system it is only as good as the data you have in it and that data will be changing constantly. That is where I need to look at it.

Mr. Seivert – As you look at this proposal if there is a different number that fits better, I think that it is important that you work with the Council and the associations that we represent. When that negotiation occurs – when that piece of legislation comes out and it has 83 percent on it – if there is a reason that it shouldn't be 83 percent. Then we can all get on board at the same time.

Mr. Benson – I do not want to paint the picture that we are being adversarial. We have obligations that we have to take care of and you have obligations that you need to take care. The only reason why the department has not weighed in on this is a) we do not have a bill and b) I have heard multiple versions of this same concept. Until I see a bill I don't want to engage in that discussion yet. Depending on how the bill goes, I suspect that one of the bills will get run into Ways & Means since it is a "taxing" type bill. Maybe Appropriations. If it goes either of those ways we will not be under those time constraints of meeting funnel dates, etc. When we see a bill we can then run the figures.

Chair Ray – It is clear that the information that you have the house member may pick up. The things that Rob is talking about and including raising the grant money is contingent on where this is to go.

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

FirstNet has been presented in over 75 counties now. There are well over 200 people that have expressed an interest in that aspect of ISICSB. We will be sending some documents out some reaching out to those folks. The optimum of that is to set up regional interoperable committee in each of the six regions.

A tentative date of June 9 and 10 has been set for ISICSB and the E911 Council to meet and review the SCIP. We will be looking at what is going on in Iowa as well as nationally.

Items for Discussion

None

Unfinished Business

A. Election of Officers for January 2015 – January 2018

Chair – Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Mike Bryant to nominate Steven Ray for Chair. Motion by Tim Sittig, seconded by Rob Dehnert to close the nominations. All ayes. Passed. All ayes for Steven Ray to remain Chair. Motion passed.

Vice Chair – Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Tom Berger to nominate Bob Seivert for Vice Chair. Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Rob Dehnert to close the nominations. All ayes. Passed. All ayes for Bob Seivert to remain Vice Chair. Motion passed.

Secretary – Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Mike Bryant to nominate Sally Hall for Secretary. Motion by Steven Ray, seconded by Tim Sittig to close nominations. All ayes. Passed. All ayes for Sally Hall to remain Secretary. Motion passed.

B. SCIP committee reviews for 2014/2015 plan actions

See above under ISICSB report.

New Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Mr. Koppert – An update on legislative issues. Senator Brase introduced SF20 which would provide access and communications through the ICN between law enforcement agencies, E911 PSAPs and other related facilities. The gist of this bill came from a conversation that Tom Ling and I had with Senator Brase last July or so. In SW Iowa we are working on a project of connecting various PSAPs. Mills, Montgomery, Page, Fremont and Cass are all buying the same radio console and we would like to be able to interconnect them so in the event there was something at one of the other PSAPs, we would take over or for instance RAGBRAI we could augment Mills County by making one of our positions in Cass County, by a simple push of a button, it becomes Mills County and the same throughout the area. There was a subcommittee meeting on the twentieth and I have not heard how that did but I think it behooves everyone to support that.

Craig Allen – What Rob just described is not only important today but as we move forward it is going to be really important. When we start getting into FirstNet and NG911 one of the terms that I would like to make you aware of is public safety grade. It needs to be that unit that provides the best coverage. P25 is the standards that we used in public safety radio. LTE is the standard that you use in broadband. We are developing another set of standards which would kind of amalgamate those into something the vendors, manufacturers and providers would have some understanding.

Ken Rasing – For budget purposes are we still at the \$100,000 for next year then or are we going to \$200,000?

Chair Ray – No. We will probably have to have that discussion in some subsequent meetings. Right now there is nothing formalized to have that changed. It could July first but nothing formal yet.

Mr. Benson spoke regarding Mrs. Vos retiring and leaving the E911 Program. He shared some very heartfelt memories and praise that the State of Iowa E911 Program would not be where it is at if it were not for her. There will be a huge hole to fill.

Announcements

Next meeting date – Wednesday, Feb. 11, 2015, at West Des Moines City Hall Council Chambers – 9 a.m.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:31 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary