

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Wednesday, Oct. 14, 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) Secretary	Sally Hall	Present
	alternate	
	Cara Sorrells	
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)	George Griffith	Present
	alternate	
	Sandy Morris	Present
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Excused
	alternate	
	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	
	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	
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:		
Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager		Present
Samantha Brear, E-911 Program Planner		Present
Guests:		
Josh Halterman, IDOT-TraCS/MACH	Doug McCasland, Warren County E911	
Terry McClannahan, Dallas County SO	Scott Schultz, Motorola Solutions	
Shari Schmits, Motorola Solutions	Mike Lauer, ICN	
Laurie Hickok, TCS	Diane Sefrit, SCI	
Greg Brooks, Intrado	Diana Kautzky, Deaf Svcs. Unlimited-Tele. Access Iowa	
Connie Hambly, Story County E911	Crystal Koehn, CenturyLink	
Brent Long, Polk County SO	Jim Lundsted, DHS-OEC	
Andy Buffington, Hancock County E911	Jason Hoffman, Carroll County	
Joe Mayer Motorola	Randy Goddard, HSEMD	
Duane Vos, Racom	Lindsey Mosher, HSEMD	
John Korkie, CenturyLink	Cathy Engel, Senate Dem. Caucus	

Dina McKenna, Story County SO
Doug Houghton, City of Ames
Craig Allen, SWIC

Alan Young, City of Ames
Rob Bowers, Iowa State University
Alice Fulk Wisner, Legislative Services Agency

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Dave Kaus to approve the minutes of the Sept. 9, 2015, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

There is no financial report as this is not the end of the quarter.

Program Update/NexGen 911 update

Mr. DeRouchey – There will be 911 training on the afternoon of Monday, Oct. 19 at Prairie Meadows. The presentation will cover the uses of the carryover fund and grants, 911 service plan, updated forms, Next Gen upgrades, Iowa CASM Portal, etc. The slides of the presentation will be available on the HSEMD website.

Mr. DeRouchey – On Oct. 20 at 11 a.m. at the main office (7900 Hickman Rd., Ste 500, Windsor Heights, IA) there will be a public hearing for administrative rules update. The changes to the administrative rules, updates the language to mirror Chapter 34A. It does add references to text messaging.

Mr. DeRouchey – A contract was signed with LR Kimball to do the study that is due to the legislature on Jan. 1 on the adequacy of the \$1.00 surcharge.

Mr. DeRouchey –The quarterly reports and check process is next week. This will be the last quarterly report that is done prior to the legislature being back in session. The reports will be sent out prior to November meeting.

Mr. DeRouchey – It was mentioned last meeting with Mediacom specifically on the wireline side and PSAP that maintain their own ALI database. I have been working with Mediacom and Intrado this last month to work on a resolution that is palatable for all parties. We are still working on it. I have a meeting with the Attorney General on Friday to further discuss what we can do or help the county service boards to continue to maintain their own database for the Mediacom wireline customers.

Mr. DeRouchey – Language Line – Talking with TCS. Once we had done the Next Gen upgrades you're having trouble transferring wireless calls to Language Line. They use DTMF codes. TCS fakes DTMF codes to replicate those tones so it's not connecting with Language Line.

Ms. Morris – It does connect but with a fifty second delay. I want people to be aware of it. We were struggling for a couple of months to figure out what our issue was with the Language Line. For Des Moines we are working on a solution with Voiance. We are starting this week to try to find solution. A lot of PSAPs have been looking at other vendors thinking their problem was Language Line and have been struggling to figure out what was going on. I just wanted people to know what was going on.

Mr. DeRouchey – Hopefully you saw my email yesterday as far as what we can try to do to make sure and see if that works with you.

Ms. Morris – We can test with Voiance. There is some programming that will have to be done. We have a contract, so to speak, with Language Line. So we will have to get city purchasing to approve that we start

receiving bills to pay for Voiance. There will be some hoops to jump through as we are working toward a solution.

Mr. Kaus – Can that be taken out of the fund that is paid to the PSAP?

Ms. Morris – I don't think there is any cost to putting in those star codes. What I am talking about is the regular bill for using the service.

Mr. Seivert – That will get rid of that fifty second delay?

Ms. Morris – Yes. The delay is caused by the TCS network not recognizing those tones.

Ms. Hickok – TCS is not a dial tone provider. The DTMF tones – what you hear when you are typing in numbers – that right now is being sucked up in to the application. The application that was originally deployed in 2012, we couldn't transfer to ten digit and we then made an exception for Language Line, Poison Control and Suicide Hotline. By that time everything was already in place. In order to out poll DTMF tones – is part of our application. So the application would have to go back to be redesigned.

Mr. DeRouche – The difference is – Language Line you have access in but you have to type in a five- or six-digit code. The other company you are given a specific 1-800 number that is your account access. So we will have to program different 800 numbers.

Mr. Seivert – The Mediacom issue and your conversation with Attorney General. I had sent out an email expressing some concern about the precedent that the telephone company, the wireline company made by just moving their calls to the wireless network. Are they paying the state for that?

Mr. DeRouche – Connie (Hambly) brought up....I think it is somewhat related.

Ms. Hambly – Nevada has done a lot of address changes for the city. When it first started I had printed out some of the customers that were going to be affected by this change. When the street resolution went through I went back in to start changing these numbers and the people are gone. They are not in Intrado's database. So I called them personally and asked them to do a 911 call to see what was showing up and they are Mediacom customers but not in the Intrado database. When I sent in the correction that it was an incorrect address, I get back from my analyst that they are a Mediacom customer and not on the wireline network and the customer is going to have to contact Mediacom and then do a test call. So all of these Mediacom customers just disappeared off my Intrado database. There are at least five that are going to be doing test calls with me this afternoon.

Mr. Seivert – I had a conversation with Diane Sefrit from SCI (South Central Iowa). Just a little history. When Mediacom came into our county they came in as a CLEC. As a CLEC I said fine you can provide 911 service but we are not going to pay you because we are already paying the LEC there to deliver the call. Plus if five of their customers are going to pay a \$1.00 per month surcharge and you are going to charge me \$200.00 a month to deliver those calls, it is not going to work. We do not reimburse Mediacom for the delivery of the call but we do receive the \$1.00 surcharge. That southern county area entered into an agreement with Mediacom to provide the data, customer records and pay for the routing of the call. During our discussion, if they are going to change the contract/agreement and route their calls a different way, stop paying them. Why should the county reimburse them for providing service that is going elsewhere? We also talked about the liability. One of the reasons our county decided to do a local database is we have control. A phone company gives me a record I can double check that record with the customer, MSAG validate it not just within the range but make sure the address really does exist. We found it wasn't unusual for people to give us an address and the address does fit within the MSAG range but it wasn't a valid address. Things like that made us real apprehensive about outsourcing our data because if we are going to be responsible for that end result, matching that address to that callers number. If we make a mistake in Shelby County it's going to be because we made that mistake not because we depended on a third party to do that work for us. With Mediacom doing this I'm not so sure as a group we shouldn't offer a release of liability and ask Mediacom to sign it. Because they are taking ownership – lock, stock and barrel – of that phone number and that customer records. The county has

absolutely no control over what shows up at the PSAP when that person dials 911. Just like what you found out. That's serious.

Mr. Kaus – When they moved them do they actually run that on a radio analog line or is that VoIP?

Mr. DeRouchey – It's VoIP. The step we have to figure out is whether it is coming on wireline or wireless network.

Mr. Kaus – If it's VoIP it's coming in wireless.

Mr. Seivert – We had to have EmergiTech come in and make some adjustments and they were coming in on the wireless trunk. You look at the phone industry, the copper in the ground is getting older and a lot of these small telephone companies may be looking at migrating to VoIP or an internet based protocol. What is to prevent them from saying we'll just route our 911 calls through the wireless network.

Mr. Kaus – Isn't that what we are going to – Next Gen/SIP?

Ms. Hickok – That's not VoIP.

Mr. Kaus – VoIP is a form of SIP.

Ms. Hickok – It is but there are regulations on whether it's static or nomadic VoIP. There are regulations on that and whether you need an MSAG or not.

Mr. Kaus – In other words they can't access that from a different location? It's classified as static?

Ms. Hickok – Verizon and Sprint are doing landline replacement as well. You have a little box that comes up. There are some guidelines with that as well. You can't use the copper, you're doing landline replacement. They are to provide MSAG as well. Verizon has just kind of wiggled through that and they are not. They are going across the wireless network providing latitude and longitude.

Mr. Seivert – Where are those guidelines Laurie?

Ms. Hickok – I can try and find out for you.

Mr. Seivert – So they're your guidelines?

Ms. Hickok and Mr. Kaus – No they are FCC guidelines.

Mr. Koppert – Are they guidelines or regulations?

Ms. Hickok – I can find out for you.

Mr. Koppert – It makes a difference.

Mr. Nichols – The telecoms in the state of Iowa follow....most all opt in to the ITA local tariff which also covers 911. I'll have to check with Dave Duncan what the non-regulations are on the wired and wireless side. Most of the small independents opt into the single tariff so that we don't have this issue with 125 different ones. We all kind of fall into the same pool.

Mr. Seivert – What about the migration of the data center?

Mr. DeRouchey – It was scheduled for the end of September. It got pushed back. We sent out notices to CPE vendors in mid-August requesting that they get moved, the IP addresses get updated. About 31 did not. We are hoping to get cutover by the end of October. I know that CPE vendors are actively at this point changing IP addresses to the new data center. Once that happens TCS will cut that over. Newton will stay active for a little while.

Mr. Kaus – Who do we get a hold of Laurie to do testing? We are waiting for somebody to find out whether we have continuity between Cedar Rapids and Davenport.

Mrs. Hall – Back to the migration. After you sent that email out, I immediately called our vendor. There were some concerns from our vendor. Normally when something like this happens you give a thirty day notice. It was less than thirty. And there were reference that this was just simple keystrokes and it's not just simple keystrokes. As you know what can happen with simple keystrokes can really mess a system up. There were some concerns about the amount of time that was given for that.

Mr. DeRouchev – We sent out the notice Aug. 15 and this change wasn't planned to happen until the end of September. To me that is more than 30 days. And there wasn't a whole lot of feedback that I did get. I will admit I should have probably sent it to the PSAPs up front along with the CPE vendors. Again my understanding at the time was that it was simple keystrokes and it wasn't that big of a deal. It wasn't that big of an issue. Found out later it may have been a little more labor intensive than that. I guess that doesn't relieve the fact that I got no feedback from the CPE vendors that they couldn't do that in that timeline.

Mrs. Hall – Speaking with Marti Litwiller from EmergiTech, she told me the first they heard about it was Aug. 18. That was close. The email sent out indicated that it was to be completed by Sept. 15. Basically it was close to 30 days but not quite. That was one of her concerns. I told her I would bring it before the council. If we can try to give them as much time as possible in the future, that would be good. And like you said if you would also send those types of things out to the PSAPs that will help with this kind of process also.

Mr. DeRouchev – Noted.

Mrs. Hall – Appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. DeRouchev – The FCC has a new reporting tool for PSAPs to report outages. There has always been the reporting tool for customers to report outages of 911. This basically gives PSAPs a way to report. It is separate from the general public. This is on the FCC's website.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals

Mr. Griffith – I had a question. It looks like we are starting to pay wages.

Mr. DeRouchev – You might be looking at some GIS grants. Database management and addressing is allowable for salaries. With the GIS project, that is addressing. So that is why you see that in there.

Mr. Griffith – It just seemed like one county operation was billing another county operation to do what they are supposed to do in the first place.

Mr. DeRouchev – It's the expertise to do that GIS addressing, the GIS coding that we are asking for on the Next Gen upgrades. It can be done by a vendor but a lot of times the expertise also resides in the county if the county has a GIS department. So I think that's what you are seeing. The contract being signed with that other department to do that versus signing with a vendor.

Black Hawk County – Intrado Viper 911 CPE Upgrade to full IP/SIP compatibility. Grant request of \$100,000.

Carroll County – Replace communication center computer system, purchase GeoLynx DMS GIS Data Management Tools, add squelch tones and reprogramming of radios to meet state policies. Grant request of \$79,208.02.

Cedar County – Fire Suppression System for communication center and equipment room. Dispatch console. VHF to 800/700 gateway. Grant request of \$100,000.

Cedar County GIS – Cedar County GIS Department to support data and maintenance. Grant request of \$15,000.

Clayton County – Replace two base stations and purchasing vehicle repeaters. Grant request of \$99,748.50.

Decatur County – Upgrading to a VIPER/Power 911 two-position system. Grant request of \$100,000.

Delaware County GIS – Maintenance and support of GIS data. Grant a request of \$15,000.

Floyd County (Charles City PD) – Motorola two-position MCC7500 P25 compliant console and related equipment. Grant request of \$100,000.

Hamilton County – Eventide voice logging recorder license to be compatible for text and picture capture. Replacement of batteries in UPS system. Grant request of \$13495.40.

Hamilton County GIS – Upgrade information for GIS data creation, maintenance and remediation. Grant request of \$15,000.

Harrison County – EmergiTech IP911 System. Grant request of \$100,000.

Humboldt County – Upgrade telephone answering system to be integrated with 911 call-taking equipment, wireless signal antenna, workstation for backup call-taking position and software maintenance for NG911 call mapping software. Grant request of \$82,037.

Humboldt County GIS – GIS data creation, maintenance and remediation. Grant request of \$15,000.

Kossuth County (Algona PD) – Eleven dual-band mobile radios and ten dual-ban portable radios. Grant request of \$97,670.

Lee County (LeeComm) – Two Cisco switches, SIP licenses, Viper phone system three-year maintenance agreement, upgrade radio system three PCs, software and firmware. Grant request of \$77,078.62.

Linn County (Linn County Sheriff's Office) – Radio transmitter site in the Mt. Vernon-Lisbon area. Grant request of \$100,000.

Mahaska County – Viper 911 call taking system, five-year maintenance and support and Eventide NexLog 740 logging recorder. Grant request of \$99,997.50.

Sac County – Upgrade UP 911 system by go to a direct IP-trunking with the state wireless network, three years of maintenance on this equipment and two years of maintenance on all of the other 911 system. Three new monitors for mapping system. Grant request of \$99,744.44.

Sac County GIS – GeoComm to add layer of five miles of surrounding counties and maintenance. Grant request of \$11,000.

Story County (Ames PD) – Upgrade county wide emergency communications system to rely on a fiber optic loop and eliminating T1 lines. Grant request of \$80,032.

Story County (Story County Sheriff's Office) – – Upgrade county-wide emergency communications system to rely on a fiber optic loop and eliminating T1 lines. Grant request of \$80,032.

Union County – Radio upgrade of 12 mobile radios, twelve vehicular repeaters and installation. Grant request of \$66,297.20.

Wayne County – Eventide NexLog 740 logging recorder and extended warranty. Two dispatch chairs. GIS data conversion, purchase of maps, hard copy map books for emergency responders, service area Pictometry imagery, and three Motorola Xpr8400 repeaters. Grant request of \$99,999.40

Webster County – Three MCC 7500 console operator positions and accessories. Grant request of \$100,000.

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Rob Koppert to recommend for approval all of the above applications. All ayes. Motion passed.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – Dave Kaus

None

Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

Is everyone aware of the activity at state treasurer's office regarding the contract with Motorola for the 700 MHz system? I'm not quite sure where that resides. Craig do you have any additional information on that

Mr. Allen – I don't have any more of an update for you as I have been gone and just got back last night.

Mr. DeRouche – I know nothing other than the email that I sent. Everyone saw it in the newspaper. From our perspective the way Chapter 34A is written, that money stays available until the end of June 2017. So there is a little bit of time for the politics to work its self out.

Mr. Seivert – I guess one of the concerns I had was is that going to delay the roll out/start of the project?

Mr. Allen – That would have to be self-evident. The contract calls for a twenty-four month rollout and that would be what we expect the vendor to provide. That would start when the contract is signed. There are two steps to it. One is the contract service agreement and the other is procurement for the lease/purchase. Once the lease/purchase agreement is signed, that's what starts the clock.

Mr. Seivert – Everybody needs to know about that. The administrative rules Blake mentioned. I don't think there's anything unique in them. I think it is expected based on what was passed last year. Senator Jack Drake passed away this last week. He was a good friend for us in the past and he was an advocate of many 911 issues, fire and EMS. He will be missed in the legislature next year. I am aware that the lobbyist are working very hard this session with the Governor's Office and the other legislators to figure out another way to fund the 700 MHz system without using surcharge. From the information I've received so far that looks positive but obviously that will probably be the hot topic for next year's legislative session.

Joe Mayer (Motorola) – I wanted to clarify and answer some of the questions. To give an update on where the state is at with the Treasurer's Office. It is probably worth noting there are some financing options that are being considered by the treasurer right now. There are several finance packages they are considering now. That process of review is underway and preliminary to that there will be a legislative council session to approve the treasurer entering into that financing agreement. Parallel to that Motorola is continuing to do some background work to prepare to expedite the process of construction. I don't have an exact time frame. I do know there is progress being made toward assembling that legislative council and there is active dialog going on with the Treasurer's Office to make sure all of the financing options are properly reviewed and presented to make sure...to make the decision that is in the best interest of the state.

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

Mr. Allen – Broadband/FirstNet we have had four meetings with two left. A chair and vice-chair have been established in those regions. As we get the regions rolled out we will have a meeting with the chairs and vice-chairs to talk about structure. They will report directly to the board during the meeting giving an

update on what specifically is going on in their region. The intent is as we rollout across Iowa with any of these undertakings.....we have LMR or broadband.....that we get an understanding from the bottom up and from the top down. There is always that chance for that gap in the middle and we are trying to do the best we can to minimize that. We are very excited about the participation so far. The function of that under FirstNet to help the data collection.

Mr. Wagner – I just wanted to acknowledge Rob Koppert as the chair of Region 4.

Mr. Allen – The board working through several policy statements. One is on defining public safety grade. If you recall that is a term that is widely thrown around and not really adequately defined. What the board has an interest in seeing occur is a more laymen's term/definition that we can use in Iowa and that discussion took me to the Project 25 people who are recognized industry wide as public safety grand standards bearers. In conversations with them, they have now agreed, based on Iowa's prodding, to develop a white paper. What would that mean? From a technical perspective it would mean all the way down to the appropriate grounding on your tower, your center, your equipment, the appropriate battery backup, how long does the emergency generator run, etc. Another one is coverage. We tend to think 95 percent portable and 95 percent mobile. There isn't a standard for that. There's an acceptance especially coming out of the manufacturing community and the consumer community. The consumer community wants 95 percent portable coverage but that has a cost to it. The consumer community ends up often times going with the 95 percent mobile. That 95 percent seems to be that number that is widely embraced. If P25 is not the group to identify this as a standard, who is and what would that look like. That definition may get voted on today.

The other policy statement is from the technology committee. They are looking at encryption. As there are several county or multicounty systems in the state in operation, it isn't interoperability as we have defined it in the past, but as we look forward there is an expectation that we will need to encrypt public safety communications. If radios are not keyed perfectly you get dial tone and the other person cannot hear you. So you really have to have absolute rigidity and absolute discipline when you bring encryption into operation. There is a lot of variance for error. The technology committee is looking very carefully at that 1) we are following any Federal guidelines and 2) what does that mean with our existing systems that are operating in Iowa and then providing guidance to anyone that might decide to purchase equipment in the future. I know a couple of months ago this council recommended that funds that were spent would go towards P25 software upgradable to Phase 2. The other piece to that is there is an encryption component. Not that they would have to have encryption in it but if it were to have encryption in it, we would like a policy statement that said this is the way that model should look. So no matter who buys it in the future it would have that capability to work.

Mr. Kaus – Has the ATTIS group been polled as to requirements? ATTIS is the old Bell labs which has rule making and recommendations for interfaces.

Mr. Allen – This encryption model that we are looking at is a NIST standard. It is not as if we are creating something. We are looking at something that has already been established. The board has been struggling with encryption for about five years. It hasn't been clear where we want to go and that it would work. So if we made a recommendation and people spent money, they wouldn't come back and say, you sent me off in the wrong direction. This appears now to be getting settled. It has been settled at the federal level.

Mr. Lundsted – AES 256 standard is the accepted standard for all federal agencies. If you are going to interoperate with a federal agency typically the only way we can operate in the clear is a GSI and live person to interface with your command, your dispatch team. As you look at long term technology investments, if you require that interface and not everybody does, the AES 256 standard is the de facto standard.

Mr. Allen – Within that there are a series of operations as to how that gets done. How that order of operations occurs is also defined for the first twenty slots in the radio. We just want to make sure that when buying equipment today that the salesperson/manufacturer understands what the future may hold so we want to get this out in a policy statement.

Mr. Allen – The technology committee has had discussion about coming up with a best practices policy statement on tones for Point to Point to help reduce the interference that many of you are receiving in dispatch centers coming out of some adjoining states. This came up three or four months ago?

Mr. Koppert – Yes, July.

Mr. Allen – The trouble is that those affects tend to happen more in the summer when the weather is warmer. There was a lot of investigation as to where this was coming from, how this was happening and what can be done to avoid it in the future.

Mr. Seivert – I just want to reinforce that the need for that to get resolved – sooner rather than later. When you talk about the AES encryption five year discussion. This is an urgent operational need at the local level and if indeed the ISICS Board is responsible for that type of resolution, they need to act sooner rather than later and get it resolved. I would hate to see it stretched out for another two to four months.

Mr. Allen – I appreciate your desire for fire but we are going to need a ready, aim _____.

Mr. Koppert – I am on the technology committee and I pretty much started this whole ball rolling. The reason is we are getting interference on Point to Point channels and it's coming from Nebraska. They are using it for a control channel on their VHF trunked system. It's P25 digital. It will sound like static on Point to Point. What is happening dispatchers are turning it down, mine are. I'm not going to have them listen to seven to eight hours of static. What happens when you have to call a fire department from an adjoining county and you can't get them on Point to Point? Well there is a delay. We've looked at putting a CTCSS tone which is an analog tone on that but it is not stopping it. We're having to look at probably a digital code. Most radios are capable of doing that. The problem, Bob is that to put policy out there, 1) first who has governance for this Point to Point channel. In talking with Jim Lundsted this morning it used to be kind of federally handled but it's now down to the regional/states to handle. At issue right now Minnesota and Missouri still use it and of course we have bordering counties with those. We need to coordinate our efforts with them for what we are going to do so that those bordering counties can still use that frequency. Minnesota has pretty much gone to their 800 ARMOR system and they have given our bordering counties radios to get to that but happens if the ARMOR goes down and you have to go back to the VHF system. They have already gone with a CTCSS tone. So we are looking at coordinating with the two states plus the governance and since there is probably nothing federally that can be located anymore, it's probably going under the ISICS Board. That is where it should be for them to provide governance. We need to get that information over to the governance committee so that they can come up with the appropriate wording for that. The process....it won't take five years. In this case it will probably take three or four months. It will happen a lot sooner than some things.

Mr. Allen – Just to remind everyone when we take action at the board level we want to be very careful that we are not doing something that would cause people to spend money and have them go in the wrong direction and then have to do some sort of reprogramming or change. If it is important enough that a consultant needs to be brought in then that is something that the technology committee needs to talk about.

Mr. Dehnert – I would like to ask this audience as a member of the technology committee, we've struggled trying to find any existing rules, guidelines, regulations about Point to Point. There is a general consensus of what it is used for. We just can't find that anywhere on paper. Does anyone know or have some old plans or some document that would have information on Point to Point?

Mr. Koppert – We've recently had our APCO frequency coordinator turn down an application for mobile use on that frequency in Iowa. So we need to get some governance in place that says it's PSAP to PSAP only and not allow mobile use on that frequency. So that's why this going the way it is and we want to do it right the first time and give the frequency coordinator the guidance he needs to say no, I can't give you mobiles and here's why.

Mr. Allen – The P25 issue. For two months the board has been considering joining the P25 (Project25) Group which is....Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) is the big umbrella. Within the big umbrella is a section that deals with wireless and that is TR8 and within TR8 rule making there is a group called Project25. It is largely made up of vendors/manufacturers. It has very few users on that user group. So when they meet they tend to be manufacturers talking to manufacturers as opposed to getting the actual users involved. We had an opportunity to join TIA. The value added is some of the topics we just talked about here. Issues of Point to Point, issues of mobiles and portables, encryption, etc. Iowa is a blend of rural and metro areas. The board is looking at that but this is not without costs and that is where the struggles are.

For those of you who deal with volunteer fire, I see there is a P25 voice paging. More may be coming on that.

This afternoon starting at about 1 p.m. we will be doing an update to our SCIP (Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan). We have seven 24-four month plan.

Today we will elect a chair and vice chair of the board and they will serve for two years.

Items for Discussion

None

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

Mr. Seivert – Next week is the APCO/NENA Conferences and we usually approve council member travel expenses. Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Dan Nichols to approve council member travel expenses to the APCO/NENA Conferences. All ayes. Motion passed.

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Ms. Hambly – I have a question about when the reports are going to be available for the two years the PSAPs reported.

Mr. DeRouche – The report is due to legislature by Jan. 1. I hope to have the report in hand by December.

Mr. Seivert – We are supposed to do that annually.

Mr. DeRouche – That is one of the things I am going to talk about on Monday. The auditor portion of that report has some recommendations on changes to that form. I'm trying to get a meeting with them this week prior to their formal report being issued so I can change the form and get it out to you guys.

Mr. Koppert – I have a couple of questions about the Mediacom issue. Connie so they (customer records) just dropped off when you did a look up? They were no longer in the Intrado database period and what happens when they call 911? What do you get?

Ms. Hambly – It show up on the 911 screen but if you were to search West Fourth Street there are no Mediacom people listed and I know they were there two months ago because I had run a list of people that were going to be affected. So I still have that list. But when I went into change them, they're not on there anymore.

Mr. Allen – So if you run a reverse 911 because some hazard occurred they wouldn't be on the database list to receive the call.

Ms. Hambly – It wouldn't be on the Intrado 9-1-1Net list, no.

Mr. Kaus – Do you get a list of the numbers that are dropped off Intrado's database on a regular basis?

Ms. Hambly – Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. DeRouchey – In the process of talking with the other side, Mediacom would provide an annual update on the database.

Ms. Hambly – I could not figure out where these numbers were going. Because I knew there were five or six on that list that I knew and all of a sudden they are not there and I knew they would not be dropping their telephone service. So I went back and looked up the old numbers and called them and yes they still had service.

Mr. Koppert – When you have done the testing with them and dialed 911 you are getting the appropriate information? How?

Mr. Kaus – You get their street address and everything?

Mr. Seivert – I am going to go back and make some test calls from the list they told us to delete. I will make some calls locally. One of things we talked about in the past is the lack of regulatory authority or the ability of the State to intervene on certain issues. John (Benson) always said the state doesn't have a hammer to enforce things. This is a good example. Chapter 34A doesn't really give the state the authority to intervene. Go to Mediacom and say you can't do this. You can't do this because your customers aren't being served well. If you dial 9-1-1, they may not get the service. They may not be located. It has come up from time to time. Don't know what the fix is but I do recognize it as an issue. Somebody has to have the authority to make these....For a phone company to go in and make these changes – not talk to the local PSAP, not talk to the state and not get it preapproved is just mind boggling to me. It's just a business coming in and you decide you want to do something different and use somebody else's network to deliver the call and not pay them for it. Never mind that the customer may not be served. This is more serious than the casual conversation we are having here. Your interaction with the AG's office is pretty significant. I think he needs to really look at these processes and help us out.

Mr. Koppert – The thing that really scares me more Bob is, as long as we are getting it, somehow, that's ok. That's good. I would rather get that than nothing. But what scares me is when we go....when our dispatchers go through and let's say they are validating this address and finding out this address is in error and you and I both know that Intrado has a process that we can correct those – how is that going to happen in this process?

Ms. Hambly – That's the problem. I was going in to change....we had a street that we completely renumbered. I gave the customer's long enough time for them to call their provider to make the change and if they didn't get it done in a certain amount of time, no big deal, I would go in and get it corrected. I can't even check to see if they got it changed. We had a whole street changed from West Fourth Street to West Third Street and I had two or three customers that aren't on that list. What happened to them? Did they have Mediacom or where did they go?

Ms. Sefrit – I asked Mediacom.....I had a lot of address changes due to the mapping project that was brought up. I got no answer on who I am to send corrections to and now part of my companies I send to Intrado and part of them I don't and now the Mediacom numbers I run through Intrado, they all error out. So there is no avenue to go to. And they tell me that.....

Mr. Koppert – No contacts at Mediacom what so ever?

Ms. Sefrit – No.

Mr. DeRouchey – The only person that I have talked to is a contractor. I can't get anyone from Mediacom to talk to me.

Mr. Koppert – Has anyone at Mediacom asked their lawyers what they should probably not be doing?

Ms. Sefrit – I even sent an email that said we will not be responsible as of this date, if you pull those updates, for anything that goes wrong. I was totally blindsided by the whole thing. I kept asking questions. They kept skirting around it. They came out and said.....

Mr. Koppert – We have Mediacom as a CLEC in Atlantic. They send us a pretty good sized check so I assume they have a sizable amount of customers. If I can't view or update or make changes to that database record as needed, then I don't want the liability when they dial 9-1-1 if that information is wrong.

Ms. Sefrit – We have already had some problems in Clarke County. They were Mediacom numbers.

Mr. Koppert – I am tempted when I go back to come up with some kind of press release and put it out to my local media saying this issue is here. If you are a Mediacom customer talk to Mediacom because we can't do this – make changes or updates or do anything and the company we use has provided excellent service for years wasn't chosen to continue the service and we don't know who is and nobody will respond.

Mr. Seivert – Would you be willing to share that email that you sent to Mediacom? I think there are a lot of other PSAPs that might want to do something similar. Blake has that mailing list for most of us that do our own database.

Mr. Koppert – I think anybody that has Mediacom whether or not they maintain their own database needs to be aware of this.

Mr. Seivert – What was that FCC number you talked about – public safety support center?

Chair Ray – The Federal Trade Commission, 24-hour number, public safety support center?

Mr. Seivert – This that just for outages?

Chair Ray – I think that is just for outages.

Mr. DeRouchey – I contacted the IUB as well. I don't know if it is related. Both Intrado and Mediacom agreed there was a nondisclosure agreement in place. I don't know if that is related to why you can no longer see your records in the database.

Mrs. Hall – I think everyone was working with The Schofield Group. They provided the daily Mediacom updates. Why is it one day it works fine and then the next day it doesn't? What is the difference? I realize they went to the Intrado VoIP Solution but why should that make that kind of difference. I am starting to reach out to my small independent telecos I have in my county and asking them what are your future plans. Are you looking at doing this type of thing – going to a VoIP solution like that? The first two that I talked to so far have said, no they do not plan to do that. If I had every one of the independents in my county do this, it would basically wipe out my database. To go in and try to verify anything using 9-1-1Net, you aren't going to have anything to verify with. Once a year verification, that's not acceptable. I want it every day.

Mr. Dehnert – I was just looking at this public safety support center. It is more than just outages. It also includes: Phase 1 & 2 deployments, E911 location accuracy, text-to-911 service, fraudulent/non-service initialized 911 calls, etc.

Mr. Seivert – Mediacom isn't talking to any of us. Maybe they would talk to a federal agency.

Chair Ray – Did you find that on FCC.gov?

Mr. Dehnert – Yes.

Announcements

The next meeting date falls on a holiday, Nov. 11, 2015, at 9 a.m. We will collaborate amongst the council members and the ISICS Board and figure out what date we will meet in November and get it out to everybody.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary