

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting  
Tuesday, July 8, 2015  
West Des Moines City Council Chambers  
West Des Moines, Iowa**

**Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order Chairperson Steven P. Ray at 9 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) <b>Secretary</b>	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	Excused
alternate	Dean Kruger	Absent
Iowa Peace Officers Association (IPO)	George Griffith	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	
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) <b>Vice-Chairperson</b>	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS) <b>Chairperson</b>	Steven P. Ray	Present
alternate	Adam Buck	
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Rob Dehnert	Absent
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	Excused
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
<b>Staff:</b>		
Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager		Present
<b>Guests:</b>		
John Benson, HSEMD	Sarah McClure, Ames PD	
Josh Halterman, DOT-TraCS/MACH	Stacen Gross, GeoComm	
Duane Vos, Racom	Diane Sefrit, SCI	
Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office	Lindsey Mosher, HSEMD	
Doug McCasland, Warren County E911	Terry McClannahan, Dallas Co. Sheriff's Comm.	
Laurie Hickok, TCS	Craig Allen, SWIC	
Randy Goddard, HSEMD	Butch Hancock, CenturyLink	
James Lundsted, DHS/NPPD/OEC	Dave Duncan, Iowa Communications Alliance	
Mike Ehret, Dickinson County E911	Shawn Wagner, ISICSB	
Scott Schultz, Motorola	Amy Olson, Windstream	
Samatha Brear, Polk County EMA/E911	Eric Dau, Clinton County E911	
Joe Mayer, Motorola	Kent Hartwig, Advocacy Strategies	

Jon Paoli, HSEMD  
Alice \_\_\_\_\_, Legislative Services

Carol Lund-Smith

### **Introductions**

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

### **Approve the Minutes**

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Dan Nichols to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2015 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **Approve the Agenda**

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the agenda with the following addition: New Business – Discussion from Shawn Wagner. All ayes. Motion passed.

Mike Bryant asked for a moment of silence in memory of Mark Ferran Fire Chief at Colo who passed away yesterday. Mark Ferran served 39 years in the fire service and 32 of those years as fire chief. He was also one of the five original members of the Story County E911 Service Board serving since 1989 for 26 years.

### **State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)**

#### **911 Program Financial Reports**

None since this is not the end of the quarter.

#### **Program Update/NexGen 911 update**

Mr. DeRouchey reported that he is currently working on the carryover funding map that the council requested. This is for the grant cycle that just ended. Mr. DeRouchey was waiting to finish this when all of the grants are closed out.

There are four grant applications that are still open. A reminder was sent to those counties this morning. It is estimated that the final amount expended for the grant applications will be \$9.8 million.

Mr. DeRouchey expressed that it is important that the 911 email account be utilized when trying to contact the 911 program. HSEMD is looking at bringing on an assistant for Mr. DeRouchey.

Carryover Grant Applications for 2016 – Mr. DeRouchey has requested approval from the department to send out the final applications. It was in draft form while waiting for the Governor's signature on HF651. As that has been settled now, Mr. DeRouchey is waiting the department authorization to send out the applications. There will be two separate applications. The traditional carryover grant funding will still be at \$100,000 and an additional grant for GIS will be \$15,000. The application has been expanded a little along with more clarification on what is and is not eligible. The P25 software upgradeable was added.

Administrative rules for the Council's annual \$100,000 allotment for travel and education need to be developed. There is 120 day period that this must be done. They will be advertised through the council by email as well as the HSEMD website. Anyone that wants to participate in that process can.

Mr. DeRouchey reported that very soon they will start working on the report that is due to the legislature on the adequacy of the \$1.00 surcharge. The audit that is part of the requirement will begin on July 20 and will be ongoing for two weeks. Some of that will be done at the 911 Program office and in the field at the county PSAPs. If you are a PSAP Manager and the State Auditor wants to come and visit you that is what it is in regards to. As mentioned in previous meeting Mr. DeRouchey stated that he had discussed with the State Auditor's Office that he didn't want this to be a punitive type of audit but just wanted to make sure that the right information was being submitted. This is the first report and did not think that anyone was hiding or changing numbers. Just want the right information from the right source.

Alert Iowa Data legislation. Lindsey Moser is the Alert Iowa Program Manager. Ms. Moser reported that the bill goes into effect July 1, 2015. This bill allows the use of 911 contact information for statewide messaging purposes. The information will be uploaded into the system.

Mr. DeRouchey – Some PSAPs have already submitted the information.

ESInet Update – There are three PSAPs remaining for that redundant network. Work should be done on that relatively soon.

GEM Web Browser Text to 911 – Five counties have been fully tested on text to 911. The sixth county is in the process of testing. The first real text to 911 was received in Cedar County last week.

Mr. Bryant – I would like to submit a motion to stimulate discussion among the council for a variety of reasons, given the current legislation, given the current expenses that we are aware of, that consideration be given to raising the carryover grant applications to \$150,000 for fiscal year 2015-2016. Motion seconded by Rob Koppert. Voice vote then there was a roll call vote: Ayes: Hall, Koppert, Bryant, Murphy, Seivert. Nays: Griffith, Ray, Nichols, Halterman, Kaus. Vote was tied.

Mr. Seivert – Mr. Chairman I respectfully ask that this be discussed.

Chair Ray – Go ahead.

Mr. Seivert – Some of the reasons for requesting the increase – obviously the Governor vetoed the 46 percent to 58 percent increase to the PSAPs. The maximum use of the surcharge by the counties on an ongoing basis will still generate an excess amount of money that goes into the wireless carryover fund and we've seen that money becomes a target for other agencies and uses other than money being redistributed back to the PSAP. In lieu of that, I don't believe \$150,000 is an unreal request for the PSAPs. The fact that we opened up the funds for the receipt and disposition of the 911 call will certainly encourage those counties that may not have maximized that \$100,000 grant in the past to now use that money effectively at the local level.

Mr. Bryant – The language we added for the radios to be P25 software upgradable works toward the ultimate goal of the alternate uses that have been proposed for the use of those funds. The discussions I have had with the PSAPs over the past five days that would be one of the main areas that they would be using those funds for.

Mr. Koppert – The reason I seconded and voted for it is there are still a lot of PSAPs that have not upgraded their equipment to NG911 or are in the process of doing so. There are quite a number of those. We went through it and it was \$160,000 to upgrade our 911 system. The need is there. We can actually be spending this money for its intended purpose instead of letting it slip through our fingers somewhere else. It is important this is approved because there are a lot of PSAPs that are going to be spending a lot of money yet this year. It wasn't just last year that a lot of these systems were bought it is continuing this year.

Mr. Bryant – In talking to members of the nine county group in north central Iowa there is a discussion of adding to a tower, since the language has changed, that a two county area could share. There are lots of areas this money can be used for since the language has changed. It will help the counties that want to be a part of the 700 MHz platform. It helps them build towards that. This is not going against this end use.

Chair Ray – This is the reason why I said no. I'm not sure we can sustain that over time. That's my only concern. Next year we go to \$200,000? What are we going to do?

Mr. Bryant – I made the motion for the 2015-2016 year. I look at it that if we want to go back to....I repeat a couple of years ago when we had the language we didn't know what the revenue was going to generate. We didn't know what prepaid phones were going to generate. We didn't know. We eased into this because, as Mr. Benson mentioned, there was a time that we operated in the red and we didn't want to go back to that and I totally agree. We came out very cautiously with the 50/50 match the first year. The fund grew. We raised it to \$100,000. There is no doubt if you take anybody's numbers that you want to at \$100,000 given the governor's veto, it is going to continue to grow. There was no intent that I have ever been told or remember of why that fund needs to continue to grow. \$150,000 if every PSAP used

it....I don't have the exact numbers. I'm assuming next month we will get an updated report as we close this final round. Every quarter you look at it, it is continuing to grow. I don't see any reason why...the only reason the carryover fund was established so when there was extra money we didn't....as John mentioned have some in reserve for unexpected expenses but also we didn't have to turn it back over at the end of the year to the general fund. I beg for explanations of why do we want the carryover fund to continue to grow from the council's perspective. I see absolutely no reason. If anybody has them maybe I will change my vote. I don't see any reason why we would want that to happen. I think just like the formula....everything I got from the session, the vast majority of people, they don't want a carryover grant program. It is a cumbersome process. They have already submitted budgets last March for this fiscal year not even knowing today what the budget for sure was going to be. They want it coming back in....whatever that number is in the formula. Whether it's 46 or 82 or 19 ½ or 36.4. Whatever the number is in the formula....adjust the formula so that the money comes back on a quarterly basis regularly so that they can earmark the money. My county in particular would then be able to, if they are doing upgrades, they can stockpile their own money, if you want to say, establish their own carryover fund to plan for a replacement project in the future. Unless I am hearing wrong the vast majority of people told me they don't want a carryover grant process. It would be less for Homeland Security to go through a grant process. They want the formula adjusted to be a number that is sustainable over time. But even if the Governor would have signed the legislation by the sheet that John and Blake presented to us last month we couldn't sustain the \$100,000 for two more years. It was going to have to be adjusted. I don't see that as a reason to....and maybe it needs to be \$200,000 next year. I don't know. Maybe it needs to be \$75,000 next year. But at this particular moment, I'm searching. I've talked to the PSAPs. I've talked to..... Why would we want the carryover fund to grow? I don't have a good reason to. Why do we want to accumulate funds in that when there are places out there that need the money to sustain today's level of operability. I'm not against the 700 system, myself. I'm not against interoperability. I'm not against....if Ames has a tornado and Dubuque comes to help, to have the interoperability. But I see it as we are potentially going to erode the foundation of operability by not sustaining what needs to be done. When my Sheriff in Wright County tells me that we are still on an antiquated system back home. They need to do an upgrade that far more than \$100,000. Faces the bird flu. They are losing 1500 people, jobs. They don't have the money. They are going backwards and that is part of the nine county North Central Iowa group. He needs to do things to his dispatch center this year and \$100,000 is not enough. The taxation is not going to be there when these businesses are gone. They are taking a hit with the population. People are going to be leaving. It doesn't matter to me if it is my county, Story County, one of the bigger counties or one of the smaller counties from my back home area. We can use the money now to upgrade what we need to do to maintain operability.

Chair Ray – Blake, I'm sure there have been some preliminary projections. Where would \$150,000 take us?

Mr. DeRouchey – We have run the figures at \$100,000 and that would basically balance us out so we maintain the \$100,000 for the next 10 years. But it also keeps us at our goal of a \$3 million buffer in case something catastrophic would happen. So when we saw that would balance and we were able to maintain the \$100,000 into the foreseeable future – 10 plus years – that's where we stopped our projections.

Chair Ray – So an extra \$50,000 per PSAP would start to erode that buffer your department wants to have?

Mr. DeRouchey – It would be another \$5.7 million coming out of the fund every year.

Mr. Koppert – I think the motion was for one year not every year. It can be looked at every year. You just told us Blake that you had \$9.8 million and there are how many PSAPs? That's almost \$3 million that is not being used this year alone. That's 50 percent of the 50 percent. That's half of the \$50,000 right there.

Chair Ray – That was my point that I was getting at. I was aware of what Homeland Security wanted for that buffer and that was my only concern that it would begin to eat into that.

Mr. Bryant – I would ask this, if it is allowable, for those folks in the audience or at the table that deal with PSAPs. I'm I wrong in saying that we want the carryover grant to go away? I'm not trying to argue with

Blake. Sorry to repeat but I don't care if we have a carryover program in two years. I don't need a sustainability grant program 10 years from now. If I'm wrong tell me.

Mr. Kaus – That's the problem with not having a place where we can go to have....Should something happen, we've never had the funds to fund it. So we wait until everything goes to pot, everything breaks down and then we try to figure out how we are going to pay for it.

Mr. Bryant – But you just said they need the \$2 to \$3 million, or that number is what I have been told, but we've got \$25 million.

Mr. Kaus – But all of the PSAPs are not going to get that.

Mr. Bryant – All the PSAPs are not going to get what?

Mr. Kaus – The \$100,000 or \$150,000. If you are figuring on 120 PSAPs going to apply for the \$150,000 so be it. But the ones that are already upgraded how are they going to.....Are they going to feel left out? I would say it is unfair.

Mr. Bryant – I would argue that every PSAP could use \$150,000 this fiscal year as long as they are....if they don't have a particular operability thing to update, they have things to buy to build for the future. As we just talk about a P25 radio, mobile radios. Tell me if I'm wrong. Again, at \$100,000 if it is a wash with what comes in, what do we need \$25 million of excess funds sitting there for. I can't run the numbers fast enough but if it is \$150,000 and that is \$6 million, if everything stayed the same, there's four years of sustainability at \$150,000, that wasn't the motion, the most we're going to take out of that \$20....Blake am I right there's about \$20 some million that's in the carryover fund. \$25, \$23.

Mr. DeRouchey - \$19 million.

Mr. Bryant – Does that include the \$4 million that's obligated now to the.....

Mr. DeRouchey – That's not been taken out yet.

Mr. Bryant – So it would be \$15 million roughly. So if we take an extra \$5 million out of there we would still have in excess of \$10 million in the carryover fund. I think it is irresponsible as a council if we don't ask for it. How do you go back to your locals back home who need money and tell them.....We're sitting on \$10 million...\$15 million and we are going to just sit on it.

Chair Ray – I am one of them. I sit on that board. I'd like the money too. My whole goal is that Homeland Security needs to have a buffer and we are forgetting the fact that we have a mapping project that's coming in here. We have to have money to maintain the network. If we just deplete it down to nothing, I don't want the program to be in jeopardy.

Mr. Seivert – For clarification, the mapping, the GIS, the aerial flyovers, they are already budgeted for. Correct John, Blake?

Chair Ray – Yes.

Mr. Seivert – Those funds are already secured.

Chair Ray – Right.

Mr. Seivert – The \$3 million is the dollar amount that John and Blake have identified as necessary to maintain the network. That money is already set aside. That's kind of like a not to excess dollar amount at the bottom of the checkbook. Those are taken care of. Those are secured. The \$150,000 would not affect those. They would remain. Everybody thinks this carryover grant is intended to go on. It was never...Number one it was never intended to be there at this level in the first place. It was a surprise. It was generated because of savings in the cost of the network that the state realized over time. The dollar

amount is dependent on what ends up there. Let's say that both switches in Des Moines and Newton blow up or whatever and the state would have to replace those. Well, that is what that \$3 million is for. If it goes beyond that \$3 million and in that next year we can't...the state can't issue that \$100,000 grant. It might be \$50,000, maybe \$60,000. I believe the intent has always been that the money be looked at on an annual basis. Based on the balance that's there and the obligations that are there and adjust it. Now that we are looking at the dollars and we know where we ended up this year, what our obligations are...that's why I am in favor of increasing it this year. Again next year looking at it and it might be \$75,000. It might be less. Can we ask the people in the audience who run PSAPs would you rather have the money in an annual grant that you have to apply for or would rather have an increase in the percentage that comes to you on a quarterly basis?

Mr. Ehret – I would rather have the percentage increased. I have a large project. I get the grant for part of the project one year and the rest of it the next. I would rather just save it myself year after year and build up to what I need to get whatever that project is and not have to do the extra paperwork and sending in invoices, etc.

Ms. Brear – Coming from a larger county (Polk County), we would like the percentage increase because we would get a lot more money than the \$100,000 grant.

Mr. McCasland – I would rather see the percentage increased.

Mr. Bryant – My intent was not to jeopardize any of the projects that have been done. It wasn't to jeopardize running the balance dangerously low for any unforeseen problems. I am just amazed....baffled why we would want the carryover fund to continue to grow and it is going to grow. Or at the very minimum it is going to stay at the exact same amount and why do we need \$15 million. You just heard them say we need \$3 million.

Mr. Seivert – Mr. Chair would it be proper for us to re-entertain another motion. Re-poll the council after the discussion to see if there are any changes in the position on that?

Chair Ray – That is fine.

Motion by Seivert to reintroduce the recommendation from the council to the State E911 Program Manager that the carryover grant applications be increased for this year to \$150,000. Seconded by Koppert.

Discussion:

Mr. Bryant – Before we vote I have a question which could lead to some more discussion, which I think is appropriate before a vote, I'd like to ask the folks representing the telecos, when the surcharge was increased, if the customer asks why that money is not being returned to the local level. Why are we stockpiling a \$15 million pot, what would your answer be?

Mr. Halterman – The increase occurred in the wireless side of it. That has nothing to do with us.

Mr. Bryant – We don't have a wireless representative?

Mr. Kaus – First of all they are going to say how's come they are collecting a dollar. The next thing is why can't we put it back to 50 cents like it was before.

Mr. Bryant – And what would your answer be?

Mr. Kaus – I'd vote for the 50 cents.

Mr. Bryant – And I would say we don't have enough money yet to do the things we need to do at the PSAP. A dollar is not enough. In fact later I want to talk about a subject. Why aren't we collecting a dollar

surcharge on every wireless number that is out there? Which includes iPads, hot boxes and everything else.

Mr. Kaus – We collect it on everything that is capable of transmitting voice is the way it was set up. There are some numbers that are there for data which cannot access the 911 network so we don't collect it.

Chair Ray – We have a motion and second. Roll Call vote. Ayes: Hall, Koppert, Bryant, Murphy, Seivert. Nays: Griffith, Ray, Nichols, Halterman, Kaus. Vote was tied.

Chair Ray – So in respect for the motion my recommendation would be the recommendation for the \$150,000 should be turned back over to Blake and you may just have to ask your director what he wants to do.

Mr. DeRouche – And I believe that's why it said \$100,000.

Mr. Benson – Just for process so everybody understands, we will take what the council said today back to the Director. Anything the council says or does we convey that back to the Director. He is keenly interested in the discussion around this issue. Please understand that Blake and I know and we will convey this to the Director.

Mr. Halterman – Might I add that I would like to see the numbers run again.

Mr. DeRouche – At what level

Mr. Halterman - \$100,000 and \$150,000.

#### Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals

None

#### **Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees**

##### Technical Advisory – Dave Kaus

What are we going to do about drones that everybody is getting and has the capability of reporting back situations that are emergencies. Has anybody ever thought of that? The potential is there.

Chair Ray – And I assume the drones will have, at the very minimum, access to the data on the network.

Mrs. Hall – So that is something that we are going to have to have the equipment at the local level to be able to receive that kind of data.

Mr. Kaus – But you don't know what kind of.....

Mrs. Hall – No. We won't know what it will be but we are going to have to anticipate that. Try to be ahead of the game. And again that takes money.

Mr. Koppert – What are you expecting to see from a drone? I own a drone. I fly it. It doesn't talk to anybody but my Wi-Fi on my iPhone to download a video and things like that.

Mr. Kaus – Your's doesn't but when you get to NextGen, that is if I'm not mistaken, that will be generating video also will it not?

Mr. Koppert – I can generate video now.

Mr. Kaus – You can, yes but I mean NextGen on the 911 and interoperability will ask for the ability to transmit video around the state or to the PSAP.

Mr. Koppert – Are we talking about the little consumer drones or are we talking about the larger commercial drones.

Mr. Kaus – I'm talking about any drone. I'm not a drone expert. I have never seen one so I can't answer your questions.

Mr. Koppert – I guess I am curious because I haven't seen anything in the e-magazines that I subscribe to regarding drones about accessing the cellular network.

Mr. Seivert – But don't you run your drone...you have your cell phone and that's what you are looking at?

Mr. Koppert – It's a direct Wi-Fi from the drone down to.....

Mr. Seivert – So you tape it and you have a hazmat event.

Mr. Koppert – The taping is actually done on a camera. It just slides the video down for the person to view. It doesn't actually record on to the iPhone.

Mr. Seivert – You can't record it.

Mr. Koppert – I can download video from it. Yes eventually but it would be the same as sending it from my iPhone.

Mr. Seivert – I can see a lot of public safety applications for them in the future.

Mr. Koppert – We have already used it.

Mr. DeRouchey – I think in general there is going to have to be some thought in the coming years of legislation where we try and get on the same page with NextGen upgrades. We're not there yet. We're multimedia testing but we will be and what does that mean for any revenue. The same way with incoming text. Does that at some point enter into the formula or any other new random devices that come up in the future that can access 911. I guess in the back of my mind, yes we need to take a look at it at some point down the road.

#### Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – What I am passing out is a document from the Governor's Office regarding HF651. This is the actual veto language, the strike outs. This is the defining document of what was taken out and what was left in. From the 911 perspective we did retain the ability to use the carryover fund for the receipt and disposition of the 911 call. We did obtain the \$100,000 for 911 Council expenses and programs that will educate the public on the use of text to 911 and 911 features and be used for educating the PSAP managers on the technological side of the 911 puzzle. We lost the 58 percent. That remains at 46 percent. You can read the explanation the Governor offers. He also provided for the \$4 million to be used for the 700 MHz radio system. There is not an ongoing element to that. It is a onetime disbursement. As far as the actions that need to be taken or can be taken regarding the legislation this year, it is going to be up to each of our associations to work towards identifying what their priorities are, where they want to go and how they want to approach this situation. I can say this year has been one of the most challenging years I have ever been associated with during a legislative session. There was a lot of time involved. A lot of back and forth that went on. Very intense at times. There was a lot of disappointment because of the Governor's veto after a lot of time and effort was put into the compromise that was reached. There is a lot of fear out there that this is going to be an ongoing battle. Maybe right. Maybe wrong. As our associations look forward to next year, we need to strategize and partner so that we can optimize our opportunities to move forward with the goal of getting the money back to the local level.

Mr. Bryant – There was a large compromise. There was a lot of work by a lot of people. It was a different session for me. Probably so because of my union position. Usually I have a stronger Democratic support team than Republican. There was a significant amount of good will and time given from the Republican Party as well towards this. It was a good compromise bill and unfortunately the Governor knows better than all of those people who worked on it. I believe it has setup a huge barrier going forward for the next session. I believe tensions are high. My hope is that it really angers a lot of people and they will get

involved, those that didn't. The same ones will still be involved and even more will be involved the next session. Because they need to be. I don't know where we are going to go with contacts but I guess for the lack of better terms, I am retired, I do have time and I will be contacting people who I don't feel got involved this last session and ask them to be involved. That's all. I don't really care. Win, lose or draw this was a compromise and that's what's frustrating to me. I have been beat bad before but I felt terrible that a well compromised bill was wiped out. There was a meeting last week. Between the two fire associations, APCO, NENA, Sheriff's and Deputies – where we met, I think there were some EMA people there as well – where we met with one of the Governor's staff and expressed our support for the passing of the bill in its entirety. Also there was an offer made on our part that we would be more than willing to establish a group to meet with a group from the Governor's Office to work on this issue before the session to avoid any surprises that seemed to appear this past session. At the very least to agree to disagree so there aren't those surprises and so there is an effort of working...so that everyone's opinions and ideas are out on the table. At least from my perspective and from my organization, the Iowa Professional Firefighters, we feel there is a group of Representatives and Senators that deserve recognition. I would ask that this list go into the records as supporting their efforts towards public safety and 911. Representative Worthan is at the top of my list. For someone I had never met that spent a lot of time understanding the issue from the first time we met until the end of the process. Representative Kressig, Representative Kaufmann, Representative Paulsen, Representative Upmeyer, Representative Todd Taylor, Representative Pettengill, Senator Dvorsky, Senator Danielson, Senator Brase, Senator McCoy, Senator Kinney, Senator Courtney, Senator Bowman, Senator Chapman, Senator Bertrand, Senator Gronstal, Senator Jochum, Senator Schoenjahn and Senator Bisignano. I would encourage those that are here, their organizations to do the same as mine will do, to send a letter of appreciation for the time and effort that these legislators put into understanding everyone's position and working on the bill. Thanking them for their work this last session and building a coalition in the group that we are going to need for ongoing discussions in the future.

Mr. Koppert – I had a couple of people talk to me over...and send me an email after the veto and I think one of the things being overlooked is how this is going to affect future relations. I am for the 700 MHz system. I think that it is needed. It is desperately needed for in the state for operability and interoperability of departments and various cities and counties in the state. However there's some people that are now much more fiercely upset with the fact that the interoperability project is receiving \$4 million when the PSAPs were not. Basically one of the things that was said, you want food out of my dog dish make sure you save me some too. And that didn't happen and I am afraid that could create some more divisiveness among the parties next year or six months when we go to the legislature and do some more things here. I wish the Governor won't have vetoed it for that reason because I think that is exactly correct. There's going to be a lot more people that are going to be against the 700 MHz system because of the line item veto. I hope he took that into account but I don't think that was looked at.

Mr. Bryant – I think what else got overshadowed is the compromise in the entire bill put a lot of people at ease with the language that we could hookup to the system for no charge was deleted and we got the emails from the Chair (Ray) forwarded from the Director (of DPS). While I believe the true integrity and honesty of the Director and the intent of that email, the Director still serves at the pleasure of the Governor. And if the Governor says there will be a charge. All that Director can do is salute and say what's the charge going to be and what do you want me to pass on sir. It is as simple as that. The email is no different than a piece of paper to be recycled. That's the part...I was okay with the bill, with the compromise and I was even okay because of its entirety. And that calmed everybody when that email came out. That's the bigger fear to me. The trust factor, the relationship going forward. What frustrates me in the whole overall political world, when a time when things are tough we should be working more together and we seem to be work farther apart. We seem to be building bigger walls. That's the frustrating part. I will say if it ever happens, I told you so, on the fees. Normally I don't say that. But I will on this one. Because it's in the policy that's been adopted by the Interop Board that there could be or may be. However it is worded. It's only an email. If it comes about, I'll be one of the first to tell you I told you so. Be careful. With that while we are on legislative issues, I need help understanding.....

Chair Ray – Mike, no we're not done. Does anyone have anything else to say about this before I get started. First of all the email that Mike is referring to I'm rather confident that will be as written. And you are exactly right. What the Governor says is what we are going to do. Now I'm talking as DPS right now,

I'm talking as Steven Ray. However as an executive branch employee, I can assure you when we get direction from above, that's what we do. I know there is a lot of upset people about how this came about but the reality of it is that this network is going to be built. And it is going to get paid for one way or another. Now I know there's been a couple of funds out there that were looked out during this legislative session, the Technology Fund and those type of things. But I think at the end of the day the Governor realized this still is a public safety issue and the state collects wireless surcharge which is a public safety related issue. And I'm confident that is the reason the Governor took the path he took. Now will this affect all of you back home. Yes. It affects me back home. We've got some projects back home I would like to see done. But at the end of the day the decision that was made is what it is and I have no idea what next year will bring. It every well may be the Governor may say to take it out of there. And I would say that is probably a very good reality. But I don't look at what happened as a way to be divisive. In fact I look at this....the Department of Public Safety, DOT and the joint venture with this radio system is a way for us to be an advocate for the locals. Because in the end I believe this system once it's built will prove invaluable beyond the cost of what we are building it for.

Mr. Bryant – I've been approached by a couple of people, and I don't understand devices, computer stuff, tablets and all of these things, and back to the previous part and the discussion with Dave and myself. I believe the language is not just with voice but any devices that contact 911. Help me understand, I guess tablets and laptops and whatever, are we not at a point where some of these devices will be able to contact 911 or not? Is it only through texting and it is only on a cell phone or are these tablets not capable of contacting 911?

Mr. Kaus – Most tablets don't have voice.

Chair Ray – However the technology is there. They could.

Mr. Kaus – Some of them could. Most of the ones we handle do not. They have data. That data as it comes from their...is blocked from going to 911. I think but I'm not sure. Most of the 911 texting comes from a handset. So that's why we collect it on.....

Chair Ray – Doesn't it have to be GPS enabled?

Mr. Kaus – No it doesn't.

Mr. Bryant – So, I don't understand all about FirstNet and I don't think all of the answers are out there about FirstNet but with FirstNet will that help these devices contacting 911. We will get to the point where there will be email I don't know. I'm just asking.

Mr. Allen – FirstNet is designed to be a public safety exclusive network. When police, fire, EMS utilizes a device it's to go over FirstNet so that the private networks that tend to get clogged when the tornados and what not come through, they have access back to whom they need to speak to on an uncluttered network. The legislation would not, as written, address FirstNet. The devices that can go on, Verizon, AT&T, T-Mobile, you name it, pay the fee. FirstNet, if that's the only place it goes, there wouldn't be a fee. And it is more communicating with and being able to receive from the dispatch center. The NG911 piece of it gives a pipe to do more things with it once it's collected. If that makes sense. Once the PSAP gets it and now wants to do something with it, that FirstNet pipe is the pipe it goes out on. It isn't the pipe it comes in on. Unless it comes from Rob's hovercraft over there. Tornado over here. There's a body here and we need to get somebody in there.

Mr. Bryant – I got asked the question when I was talking to some people about this whole topic and you know what, I'm not the guy that can answer that because I don't know. I don't have a tablet and I have an old cellphone and I don't use a laptop. So I'm going to ask and I'm going to find out. Maybe that's a definition that does or doesn't need to be change. Maybe the surcharge amount will be changed in the future. Maybe the definitions will be changed in the future. I don't know what we look at for potential different sources of revenue if there are. Maybe it's time we do look at that. But it was asked of me why aren't we charging the surcharge on all of the devices that have a cellular number attached to them and I told them I don't know. I told them that I would bring it up to this group and ask.

Mr. DeRouchev – I have the wording of the law and I will read it. The director shall adopt by rule a monthly surcharge of \$1.00 to be imposed on each communications service number provided in this state.

Chair Ray – So it's the definition of communications.

Mr. Kaus – It's pretty broad. We...

Mr. Seivert – We asked for that change a couple to three years ago. Recognizing this discussion.

Mr. Bryant – Tell me what that means in your terms Blake.

Mr. DeRouchev – I'd say if there is a number associated with a device they should be charged a surcharge.

Mr. Kaus – If it's got...If it will do communications but that also does away with paging. There is a number associated with paging. Pagers have no access to 911. So there is no charge collected on it.

Chair Ray – That's a good question but it really does come down to what is defined as communications. That means it has to access 911 in order to be.....

Mr. Kaus – Yes, absolutely. We collect on VoIP.

Mr. Seivert – That's not uncommon. We've got other applications in the past that have been approved for not collecting surcharge because they don't have access to 911.

Mr. Koppert – Dave and Mike have brought this up. It seems that Vonage has recently been running some commercials where as you can put an app on a tablet or something wherever you have Wi-Fi access to your Vonage and you can make phone calls. It's not technically using the cellular network. It's using Wi-Fi somewhere but it's still getting there.

Mr. Kaus – But if you take a look at what our software at the PSAPs....They will not accept an app – 911 or should not.

Mr. Koppert – So if I have Vonage and have this on my iPad which is Wi-Fi only and I have Wi-Fi signal in here and I use that Vonage and dial 911, it should not go through?

Mr. Kaus – It will go through but your...it should get kick out at the PSAP.

Mr. Allen – So if I've got inside cable, inside Wi-Fi and an inside phone line and Rob comes over to my house and uses Wi-Fi, it's going to kick it out at the PSAP but it won't kick it out if I call in on the phone over the same. That just seems awkward to me.

Mr. Kaus – if he is using an app.

Mr. Allen – How's it going to know?

Mr. Kaus – You don't think it knows? It does.

Chair Ray - But even if it got through, it won't have any data with. It would just be voice, right?

Mr. Kaus – If it gets through it will go to the administrative lines. It will through as Phase 0. It will not go as Phase 1 or Phase 2.

Ms. Hickok – You're getting really confused with data and voice. Voice goes across our network today. When we do text when it comes into our TCC (text control center) it comes into the voice platform and it

goes back out the voice platform. Data is multimedia. That is not happening today. It will not traverse the ESInet. That is data. So when you go through a Wi-Fi application, you're mixing and changing voice and data.

Mr. Kaus – I think APCO within the last two months has written a letter to the FCC in order to make sure that there are no 911 apps distributed.

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

Mr. Allen thanked those that attended the two day SCIP review work session. DHS has sent a draft document to Mr. Allen. We will not be working on it today but possibly next month. The Board will not be taking any action on it. That is probably 90 days out.

Mr. Allen has been spending a good deal of time in the P25 realm. There are a lot of changing dynamics going on in the world and recognition that the public safety community needs tools that are available but we have to get the vendors to agree to work together. The Board has allowed Mr. Allen to attend two meetings and at those meetings the Board's definition of public safety grade definition has been shared. The definition is on the website.

Mr. Allen – We too are waiting to see what happens next with the legislation. For those of you that have an interest there was a user group established last March but that has been held up do to the lack of legislation or the lack of a potential system there wasn't a trigger for it. Now that trigger seems to have fired. I don't know what they will do with that because obviously they are meeting after you so I am reporting before their meeting what may or may not occur. I would like to say one thing about the system. The discussions going on here are not dissimilar to those discussions that went on in every other state that attempted to roll out some kind of statewide system. It's just the nature of the beast. It's the distrust when the federal government tries to do something all the states go, that doesn't make any sense. What happens is after it gets started, the people see the value added it has for them and the cost containment it has for them. It truly gets put to the test. That's when you begin to see great volumes of people saying – that makes sense, I can't believe how we got along without it. Sort of like your cellphone when it first came out. The point is as this whole thing unfolds it's a value added how it shows up assuming it will in a way that is useful for those people that need it on a daily basis and use it on a daily basis. The operability comes first. The interoperability piece comes by default. Talk to your neighbors in adjoining states and find out what their assessment is. It is going to take a little while. It is going to take about two years to build out and then about a year or two after that for the realization of the system.

#### **Items for Discussion**

##### Iowa Attorney General's Opinion on meeting offering conference call

Chair Ray – We had someone ask at the last meeting about the possibility of having a conference call – the availability to call in here. I know that Barb had asked in the past and had an Attorney General's opinion on that. In the past it was the AG's opinion that practice be avoided. That practice will not take place. Blake did check again and they upheld that same thought process. We won't be putting out a conference call line.

#### **Unfinished Business**

None

#### **Travel Requests**

None

#### Iowa CASM Portal

Shawn Wagner spoke on the Iowa CASM Portal. A concept document was handed out. The concept group consists of OCIO/ICN, Iowa HSEMD, IDPS, Polk County EMA, DHS-OEC/ICTAP and FirstNet Outreach. The document executive summary is as follows: Since the start of our statewide outreach effort we have found that we were struggling to work with agencies to share the most current contact information between all parties. This problem seems to continue as we are notified by people that they never received information or communication concerning key events or information. Currently, there is no

single system that is maintained and available, which contains all public safety contact information. The time of our FirstNet data collection effort provides us a unique opportunity to work in collaboration with multiple agencies to develop a platform to collect and store this information.

Mr. DeRouchey – Our office is required to distribute documents and information to several lists of recipients. So if we can combine this it will save some effort and be usable for the entire committee.

Ms. Brear – It is a good tool for us to have access for the points of contact with a database and in the future Polk County can build out our radio information that can be used during responses.

Chair Ray – Our main topic of discussion was we wanted to make this as simple as possible. It will also assist on the CASM end that is a little more technically complicated for the average user.

Mr. Seivert – Are you looking for another point of contact other than the one that is already established?

Mr. Wagner – This is beyond the state designated as far as 911 as far as FirstNet must be the county point of contact. This is further than that. You can have additional points of contact. You can also setup who's your primary, secondary, third, you may have more than one primary. So that we have a chain of communications so we can send out it to the county and haven't received it. When doing the outreach it was a prime example of the message not being received. People would comment they hadn't received any information. We are trying to take away the barriers of people not receiving the information at the county and agency level.

Mr. Seivert – You're looking at expanding that point of contact that we have today?

Mr. DeRouchey – Keeping in mind that I already collect more information than just that single point of contact. It is kind of centralizing that into a database that the rest of the community can.....

Mr. Seivert – I'm with you. I just don't want....We have a single point of contact. It's legislated. We shouldn't have another single point of contact for the ISICS Board and the 911 issues within our county. It should be the same person and if you want to expand it to two or three I'm okay with that.

Mr. DeRouchey – When I gather that single point of contact sometimes it is the PSAP contact, sometimes it's the wireless contact, sometimes it's the service board and sometimes it's a random person. I think where we are going here is if you strike out on first person you call you have another place to go.

Chair Ray – I think for the purposes of this Bob, we want to have someone....a point of contact that would be related to the issue. The single point of contact legislation, if no one is appointed there is a default – service board chair – who can then appoint anybody. You could be a county where the chairman of the board of supervisors could be the point of contact.

Mr. Wagner – Everything that we are building is built on the foundation of what's already being collected as part of the FirstNet data gathering and the CASM. This portal is being built off an existing foundation and has room to evolve. This will also be reported at the ISICS Board meeting today.

### **Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs**

Mr. Seivert – The Council paid for my travel to the National NENA Conference in Denver and I appreciate that. Not very many people from Iowa showed up. The discussion about big data continues and the amount of information that is going to be available to the PSAP if you chose to use it. This is probably the third year I've heard that. If you have an incident occurring you are going to have the availability to tap into many different national databases that will give you more information that you can relay onto your officers for their safety, for perimeter security. Part of the discussion was, does that need to come from the dispatcher or does that need to go to an incident command in the field.

We have legislation here. That was a big topic in almost every classroom that I attended. I think we are doing very well here in Iowa. Many of the legislative efforts that are increasing surcharges and making changes, they are six years in the making. And it seems like every time we do make a proposal within our

state we do gain ground. Even this session when it looked like it was all gloom and doom. It really isn't. We have made steps. Steps are no more than education and continuing that path. There are a lot of states out there that aren't even touching things that we do and it is good to go to a venue to see that what we are doing is the right thing and we are on a good map. There are many others that are way behind us. There are a few that are more advanced than us. Texas is really good. I picked up on a little bit of a discussion from a presenter from the state of Maine. They have 26 PSAPs there. They have a lot more counties than that. During the presentation it was clear that those twenty-six PSAPs receive the 911 calls then they transfer that call to a local agency so they can dispatch fire, EMS and rescue. So even though there was a consolidation effort done in the 911 world, they still have local PSAPs that have to do the physical dispatching. That is something to think about.

The wireless world. The XY and now Z coordinates coming up. A lot of discussion on that. How it is going to impact us. How it is going to look. I believe the FCC is probably getting some rules on how that is going to happen.

Everybody has been calling about apps today. One of the last sessions I attended was put on by people that design apps. Everybody can design apps. The security of the apps is a huge issue. Most of them are totally unsecure. Once you've downloaded them on your phone, you've actually allowed a back door entrance into your device. They were just adamant that when public safety uses apps they need to be very cautious and investigate the security portion of that app and make sure that it's not opening pathways that you are not anticipating.

Thanks again for allowing me to travel. There are benefits and I encourage other council members to take advantage of some of those funds.

Mr. Allen – You need to read the fine print. On one app it said it will allow the application to turn your phone on, it will allow the application to convert voice to text and retain the text.

#### **Announcements**

Next meeting date – Wednesday, Aug. 12 at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Council Chambers.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary