

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting**  
**Thursday, Feb. 11, 2016**  
**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.

<b><u>Roll Call</u></b>	Representative	Attendance
Iowa Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) <b>Secretary</b>	Sally Hall	Present
alternate	Cara Sorrells	
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Rob Koppert	Present
alternate	Kirk Hundertmark	
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	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Excused
alternate	Tom Berger	Excused
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	Present
alternate	Paul Andorf	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	Daniel Nichols	Absent
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:		
Mindy Benson, Tama County EMA/911	Brian Maydwell, Westcom	
Duane Vos, Racom	Amy Olson, INS Alliance Connect	
Brenda VandeVoorde, Fayette County 911	Andy Buffington, Hancock County 911	
Dina McKenna, Story County	Marie Carlson, ISU Police	
Diane Sefrit, SCI	Landon Loftsgard, Motorola	
Craig Allen, SWIC	Helen Troyanovich, Deputy SWIC	
Bill Peard, Iowa Cable & Telecommunications Assoc.	Shari Schmitz, Motorola	
Tim Aaron, Motorola	Sarah Brooke, Motorola	
Gayle Boeke, Telecommunications Access Iowa	Lindsey Mosher, HSEMD	
Randy Goddard, HSEMD	Tammy Rodriquez, ICN	
Micheal Lauer, ICN	Nic Briseno, Story County	
Tim Mallot, Cedar County EMA/911	Staci Griffin, Louisa County EMA	
Doug McCasland, Warren County E911	Shawn Wagner, ISICSB Outreach	
Danny Wahl, CenturyLink		

## Introductions

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

## Approve the Minutes

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded Dan Halterman to approve the minutes of the Jan. 14, 2016 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

## Approve the Agenda

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

## State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

### 911 Program Financial Reports

Mr. DeRouchey distributed the following reports:

- Quarterly financial report for Calendar Q4 2015
  - \$7,132,120.10 has been approved in carryover grants. Not all of that has been expended yet. Still haven't seen the \$4 million Motorola invoice.
- Quarterly PSAP report for Calendar Q4 2015
  - This report includes the payment made to the service boards for each PSAP, the square miles of the service area and the number of wireless calls.
- Map of the 2016 Traditional Carryover Grant by County.
  - Total grant funds obligated/expended are \$7,923,936.04 or 69.5 percent of the statewide maximum. This includes the grants if approved today. Fifteen county service boards have not applied for the grant.

<b>Calendar Q3 2015 Wireless Expenditure Report</b>			
<b>Quarterly Revenues Summary</b>		<b>Quarterly Expenditures Summary</b>	
Wireless Surcharge	\$ 6,670,314.90	Wireless Service Providers 10% of the fund \$940.617.50	\$ (137,209.39)
Interest	\$ 27,687.79	LEC Transport & ALI/Selective Routing	\$ (619,500.06)
Prepaid Card Revenue	\$ 565,204.32	PSAP Funding 46% of Total Surcharge	\$ (3,328,338.84)
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 7,263,207.01</b>	<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ (4,084,868.29)</b>
<b>Total Surcharge</b> (excluding interest)	<b>\$ 7,235,519.22</b>		
<b>Amount transferred to Operating Surplus</b>			<b>\$ 3,178,338.72</b>

<b>Operating Surplus Summary</b>		
Previous Quarter Total Funds in Operating Surplus		\$ 18,429,397.36
SFY 16 Operating Surplus Revenue from previous quarter	\$ 2,792,232.76	
SFY 16 YTD Operating Surplus Revenue	\$ 5,970,571.48	
<b>Quarterly Operating Surplus Expenditures</b>		\$ (951,912.56)
<b>SFY 16 YTD Total Grants Approved</b>		\$ (7,132,120.10)
SFY 16 YTD Grants Paid	\$ (1,785,572.39)	
<b>Total Funds In Operating Surplus (Current Quarter)</b>		<b>\$ 20,655,823.52</b>
<b>Total Unobligated Funds in Operating Surplus</b>		<b>\$ 13,523,703.42</b>

<b>Future/Ongoing NG911 Projects</b>			
<b>(Multi-year projects)</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Obligated / Encumbered</b>	<b>Expended</b>
Catastrophic Network Failure	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$	\$
Network Capacity Increase	\$ 2,175,000.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 687,000.00
NG911 GIS Project	\$ 8,275,000.00	\$ 4,342,384.00	\$ 232,428.00
NG911 Statewide Imagery Service	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$	\$
Data Center Upgrades	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 200,000.00
Travel/Public Education	\$ 100,000.00		
LMR Radio	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 22,060,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 8,427,384.00</b>	<b>\$ 1,119,428.00</b>

I know there are vendors in the room that are probably wishing to make a sale so if you are interested in what counties have remaining or what counties have done that is all open records and I will gladly share it with you.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

Adams County – Radio upgrade to provide and improve more efficient communication within and between agencies. Grant request of \$81,933.30.

Allamakee County – Purchase GPS Netclock to synchronize call times. Grant request of \$12,708.

Cherokee County – Purchase UPS, switch replacement, server for GeoComm files, two workstation computers, seconded position of GeoComm mapping with AVL, five-year maintenance along with ANI/ALI spill migration to recorder. Grant request of \$46,172.58.

Dallas County GIS – GeoComm NG911 GIS Data road layer update, development of PSAP boundary and authoritative boundary. Grant request of \$14,856.

Hamilton County – Backup microwave system for radio towers and replace aging channel bank. Grant request of \$64,350.

Jackson County – Maquoketa PD – Replace radio antennas and cables, two radio repeaters, two CAD interface computers and two CAD workstation computers. Grant request of \$56,113.25.

Keokuk County GIS – NG911 data maintenance and support. Grant request of \$15,000.

Louisa County – Upgrade backup 911 phone system to a digital system and mobile data terminals for emergency responders to access CAD information. Grant request of \$99,218.13.

Lucas County – Upgrade radio dispatch console system to a Zetron IP based system and purchase an Eventide Logging Recorder. Grant request of \$100,000.

Marion County – Eventide NexLog 740 logging recorder and five years maintenance. Grant request of \$34,540.

Mitchell County – Replace telecommunication equipment to improve 911 service for subscribers in the Mona, Iowa, exchange, upgrade the communication center phone system and integrate with the 911 phone system. Grant request of \$79,998.92.

Mitchell County GIS – Add surrounding county GIS information to 911 mapping. Grant request of \$1,750.

Monona County – TCS XT911, NG911 IP based call handling and MIS reporting for two call-taking positions. Grant request of \$100,000.

Osceola County – Two dispatch chairs and update county 911 address maps. Grant request of \$10,280.

Palo Alto County – Purchase pagers, mobile radios with vehicular repeaters and handheld radios for emergency responders. Grant request of \$100,000.

Pocahontas County GIS – Clean up address point layer and road centerline layer and develop fire/law/EMS data layer. Grant request of \$11,170.

Ringgold County – Mobile data computers, two VHF repeaters and upgrade 911 phone system to become fully SIP enabled. Grant request of \$84,492.45.

Taylor County – Upgrade Eventide Nexlog 740 with additional VoIP licensing to record SIP calls. Grant request of \$3,900.

Van Buren County – Radio console upgrade and repeater installation. Grant request of \$44,570.31.

Wapello County – Purchase P25 radio equipment and a second 911 dispatch position. Grant request of \$91,200.

Wapello County – Ottumwa PD – Purchase P25 radio and computer equipment to increase interoperability and two additional dispatch workstations. Grant request of \$91,200.

Warren County – Annual maintenance agreement for 911 phones, mapping and CAD. Replace radio circuit with fiber optics. Replace 911 phone computers and upgrade SolaCom 911 server. Install P25 portable dual band radios at each dispatch position to serve as backup communications for dispatcher. Replace aging dispatch touch monitors and computers. Grant request of \$100,000.

Washington County – 911 Datamaster 12 month maintenance and support. Grant request of \$3,675.

Motion by Dave Kaus, 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

Mr. Kaus – There is stuff going around in the wireless that world people are having problems with getting hacked. It comes down to the point where people think their cellphones are closed. They leave an app open which leaves it wide open for anybody to get into their cellphone. So when you close your cellphone down, close all the apps also.

#### Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – There's really not a lot out there right now. SSB3106 talks about funding to pay for the LMR system, \$23.7 million and right now they are looking at that coming from the ending balance. There is a lot of discussion right now. There is a group of lobbyist working together with the various representatives to follow up on Rep. Worthan's proposal from last year. Various percentages are being thrown about anywhere from 46 to 60 to 65 and various numbers in between. We don't really have anything concrete to offer comparisons as to how that will affect each individual PSAP down the road; one of the surprises we had since our last meeting was that when we worked the projection last year...let me go back. Last year the goal was to increase the percentage coming back to the PSAP to the maximum amount possible. The philosophy last year was we didn't care as much if we didn't have a grant to go on into the next year. We wanted that money to be placed in the hand of the PSAP. That has changed. That consensus no longer exists. There are many people that like the grant, that support the grant concept. In the process of looking at the various formulas and applying a long range dollar that John Benson projected in a 10-year estimate. If you break that down to the individual PSAP you'll see that many of our smaller PSAPs will get paid less going forward with that combination of grant and a higher percentage. Having said that, there are so many variables in that long-term projection that need to be considered that you really need to be aware of the numbers that will change from year to year. Everything from the revenue that comes in to some of the contracted expenses that are projected but not secured yet. Like the aerial flyover. There's a rough \$1 million estimate going forward for 10 years to pay for that. That is an estimate. That is not a contracted amount. You look at this particular graphic here. Any monies not spent by the counties obviously carries over to that fund as well. There is going to be some type of variable, some type of fluctuation. When you look at these spreadsheets that come out it makes your head spin. Let's wait to see what comes out from the Legislative Service Bureau and what bill gets sponsored. What it says and then we can realistically apply that to an individual county to see how it affects us in the long run.

Mr. DeRouchey – We have run a handful of them (spreadsheets). We have given folks an idea of what the fund does when you do different stuff to it and we are waiting as well. Probably something this week. Once that is on paper we will be able to run some more estimates and analyze it to determine what it means on a PSAP or service board basis.

Mr. Seivert – I think our focus now is if there is language change that needs to be made...there is a portion of 34A that talks about the surplus fund may be used or may be brought back to the counties. We want to change that may to shall and we want to put wording in 34A so that at the end of the fiscal year – June 30 – the money that's left in the 911 service fund is the money that's made available in its entirety. We want all the money to go back to the local PSAP. That's what we want moving forward to get that language changed.

Mr. Mallot – Is there any thought of bringing the wireline under the same umbrella as the wireless and looking at a greater saving for the state and saving some money for that?

Mr. DeRouchey – That is something we are interested in. That was something that was recommended in the cost study done by L.R. Kimball. Talking with John Benson that is something he would like to see as well. We were also talking about an incentive plan for consolidation at the PSAP whether it would be a physical or technology consolidation. We would need a law change to move those two networks together and along with a change in the percentage language to offset that lost revenue. We are interested in that but I don't think that can be done this session because of the amount of time it would take to analyze, develop an RFP, build a consensus, etc.

Mr. Mallot – The year before we went to the ICN the cost for one of the transmission lines to my PSAP was \$80 and some cents and the other was \$113. Today one is \$596 and the other is \$634. The savings that occurred with the wireless network, the savings there would be if the wireline was under the same umbrella as the wireless...this state would be wrong not to do this.

Mr. DeRouchey – We do talk about the amount of savings with the new wireless network. Knowing the type of payments you all make on the wireline, it's just knowing how to get there.

Mr. Mallot – If you need someone to be a guinea pig, I have 11 phone companies that I pay to on wireline. If I could reduce that down, I would be more than willing to do that.

Mr. Koppert – I see your point. The issue that is going to come up is, when we do that we are also going to have to forfeit our local wireline surcharge to the state and whether or not we get an equitable share back is something that is going to have to be worked out.

Mr. Mallot – I agree, but if they are going to take the cost why not give it to them? Let's think about the future for the wireline. I'll give you all of my wireline surcharge if you give me 54.

Mr. Koppert – I don't know if all of the wireline telecos can get or have switches IP-capable to get to the network. There are going to be some issues there.

Mr. Mallot – The reason why I said I would be a guinea pig is 90 percent of my telecos are now fiber line.

Mr. Johnson – That day is coming. The transmission is ongoing. There are still things that need to be done to modernize. It could probably be transported to a switch capable or a peering point somewhere but that would require network engineering.

Mr. Halterman – Even Frontier is in the same boat. Our switches aren't capable of delivery over the broadband network. A lot of the smaller independents are probably capable compared to the larger telecos that are not.

Mr. DeRouchey – We understand that we have to do offsetting pass through amounts to make up for that difference. That's a given.

Mr. Koppert – I agreed with Tim, but I don't think it's going to happen within the next three years or longer.

Mr. Mallot – Iowa is one of the few states that pays for transmission line at a business rate instead of a wholesale rate which a lot of other state do.

Mr. Koppert – I have eight telecos that I pay. My trunk fees range from \$69 to over \$500.

Ms. VandeVoorde – Regarding the legislative talk about consolidation – is it the State's goal to get under a certain number of PSAPs? The PSAP expenditures, I see for SCI their budget is around \$9 million. At first glance it doesn't appear to be much cost savings to PSAP consolidation. My thought as a smaller county is are they looking at doing away with every county having a PSAP.

Chair Ray – That would be awfully tough. If you remember from last session when the Governor took action on the bill it's his desire to see that consolidation. To what extent that is, I don't know.

Mr. Mallot – There was a comment during one of the sessions when we were talking they would like to see 50. I don't think they realize that most PSAPs have dual duties.

Mr. DeRouchey – Those were issues that we pointed out and L.R. Kimball pointed out in their report. Consolidation could just be technological. Does everyone need a CPE? Not in a NextGen world. There are a lot of additional duties that go on at a PSAP. That's what we have been talking about to Representatives and Senators. More technological than physical consolidation. I'm not sure there is a number. In general we are interested in shrinking that number whatever that number is.

Ms. VandeVoorde – When we were looking at purchasing our CPE equipment there was no cost savings to connect PSAP to PSAP. If you share equipment you have to have some way to connect them. T1 lines are very expensive. I am trying to take something back to by board and give them some kind of idea of what we are going to have to do – if we're going to have to consolidate with another county.

Chair Ray – I think at this point the consolidation concept would be on a voluntary basis. There's no mandate that I am aware of that it would be coming. I think that some of the technological things could be shared. At the end of the day you have to understand that each county has an elected board of supervisors, you have elected sheriffs, and those voices are sometimes stronger than what is on the hill. There are a lot of things we have to work through.

Mr. Koppert – To address the consolidation issue again. Yes, T1 are very expensive. Last year we tried to get the Legislature to open up the bandwidth on the ICN so it can be used PSAP to PSAP. That would be beneficial for a lot of PSAPs to have that connectivity. Several counties have the same radio console equipment so if there are issues with another county's console it can be accessed in another county and provide dispatch capabilities in that county. You can't do that when you are talking about huge network costs like T1. The Legislature needs to understand that.

Mr. Mallot – There is a way to do it by going through microwaves.

Mr. Koppert – But again there is a substantial cost to setup that all up.

Mr. Bryant – There is the feeling by a lot of legislators that: do we need 114 PSAPs? In Black Hawk County/Waterloo/Cedar Falls and UNI they only have one site. Story County and Ames are already sharing and they are two sites. There would be an increase in costs to physically consolidate because there still needs to be people at each site to answer administrative phones. I don't know what that would be three or five years down the road. That's my message that I'm telling the legislators. I don't see the cost savings. Prove to me that we need 50 or 116 or five or one or 250, but I don't see that it saves money. I told Rep. Worthan last year with the incentive of a 25 percent increase I don't think you are going to get any takers. I think it needs to be a greater amount. Rep. Worthan said it was a place to start.

Mr. Bryant – The results of the two-year study I have heard nothing but positive comments. (i.e. we see the need, we are glad to have numbers.) There was value to educating the legislators with the information. There has been positive reinforcement that we need the money going back to the locals. There was budgeting issues talked about last session. With the budgets being certified in March we never knew what the grant process was going to be for the upcoming fiscal year. There was greater concern when there was matching money than when no matching money needed. Bob's comments that we were looking at maximizing the percentage and considering doing away with the grant process. The group that is most negatively affected is the smaller counties. The 58-60 percent that we were at last year it is flexible. It may not change at all. John Benson wants to see a \$3 to \$3.5 million piggy bank for unexpected things. We probably are not going to be able to continue the \$100,000 or more for a long term with potential forthcoming expenses. The round numbers are the \$50,000 to \$75,000 in the grant process per year. Those are the conversations that I hear. I have heard talk from the Democrats and the Republicans in the House and the Senate that seems to be a workable thing. I don't think we are 100 percent out of the woods of the possibility of someone coming after the money.

#### Public Education/Budgeting Committee – Rob Dehnert/Rob Koppert

Mr. Koppert – We have brought two more on board to the committee – Wendy Hess and Brenda VandeVoorde. We have had some good email discussions and we have reached out to the CIO regarding a 911 console webpage that would be hosted on the State of Iowa servers 911.iowa.gov. It would be the official repository for 911 information. This would be a dual purpose website. The public could get information on 911 in the State of Iowa and 911 professionals would be able to get information also. Not everyone can read the minutes. It is one of our main goals to bring the E911 Council down to the local level.

Mr. Bryant – On the outreach committee on the ISICS Board there is discussion about the consolidation of conferences. It is my belief that using some of these funds that we have for public education for conferences. If we are educating the 911 people around the state at these conferences they are going back and serving and educating the people in their communities. I would ask that you talk about that as well. Promoting the topics that we would have at those conferences as well.

Mr. Koppert – Blake brought up last month about the combining or better coordinating the homeland security conference and the APCO/NENA conferences especially in the fall. The APCO/NENA officers have discussed this. We see the benefits of doing that in one big week but the question is how many people is that really going to affect? Would it be better to break them up and have one this week and the others the next week? The general consensus at least from the APCO side was to coordinate them but keep them separate. There were some concerns of moving the APCO/NENA conference downtown to the facility that the homeland security conference uses. What the increased cost would be for that? Increased cost to the membership to attend, the availability of parking downtown, etc. Another venue that would be more cost effective. It is not going to happen this fall. APCO/NENA already has dates and has a venue lined up. As of three weeks ago when I asked Samantha, homeland security didn't have anything on the master calendar for the HSEMD conference.

Mr. Mallot – Keep them separate but don't have them same week.

Mr. Koppert – It was out of our control last fall, Tim and the reason for that was our dates at Prairie Meadows got changed on us and it caused a conflict and we apologize for that.

Mr. Bryant – I was looking at it from the perspective....we have a committee setup to look at the report that said "actions to establish an office of emergency communications." To avoid problems that we had last year legislatively. I was looking at it as possibly part of a half day being included so that we are...one of our problems of getting things done legislatively, we don't have one voice. When legislators don't hear a common message....there are difference opinions within each group-ISSDA, EMA, firemen, etc. If we can promote working for a common goal. That is why I was looking at it that way.

Mr. Allen – Is there a meeting where the public safety groups come together and talk about their legislative initiatives?

Mr. Bryant – The most common one I am familiar with is on the first Saturday in December and has been ongoing for decades. The public safety coalition which includes several police organizations, fire, highway patrol, sheriffs and deputies.....

Mr. Allen – Within the consortium of APCO/NENA group is there any communications centered centric group?

Mr. Bryant – No.

Mr. Allen – And would there be value in that. As we move forward with the RICs this may be a part that fits. As we desire to have a couple of representatives from every agency it may not be the representative that the 911 council would select but we are trying to find mechanism to drive information from a FirstNet perspective and then from a LMR perspective second, and there seems like there is an overlay of the uses of that. I think there is a value added of having the communication center involved with how FirstNet moves forward. Collaboration is a recipe for success and another thing – it stops the hard feelings.

Mr. Bryant – In the fire service we have what are called "hot classes" where we bring in elected officials and we have them go through whether is it a fire simulator or a hazmat. There are things specific to firefighters in the hazmat world, running instruments is separate and would not be good to have a class overlap with city managers. But the city manager are involved with the budget process they need to know why we need certain things. What better way than to make them get dirty in my world and understand why we need this stuff or why we can only do things for 15 minutes and then have to rotate a whole new crew in and this isn't a two-hour process but a 12-hour process. That's where there is value getting appointed and elected officials involved. One of our discussions was if they were going to get involved with the city manager's group conference. In the big picture that is where I am coming from of working together and if a few thousand dollars to help get us in the door and be a part of what we want to tell them – what we are and what we do. So if you happen to have money and are looking at a place to spend if you would consider this.

OEC Study Committee – Bob Seivert, Mike Bryant and Rob Koppert

Mr. Seivert – We haven't met but we will before the next meeting. Why we are doing this? If you remember a couple of years ago that GeoComm did a study similar to the L.R. Kimball study. One of the things they identified in that study was that 911 world in Iowa, there's no uniformity. A dispatcher in my county doesn't do the same thing as a dispatcher in Polk County. They are not trained the same, even as far as providing instructions to the public in CPR. Their uniformity. Some dispatch centers forbid their people from doing that while others embrace it fully. There is no central organization. Everything from the management of the PSAP to the governing boards, to the way they are operated – it's so fragmented that it is an unidentifiable resource in the state. They didn't offer any suggestions to correct it. They rather said this is a problem and it needs to be addressed. The L.R. Kimball report comes out this year and it pretty much addresses it head on and identifies it as a need. It even gives it a name as an office of emergency communications. It even suggests a place for it to nest which Tim referred to as maybe in emergency management. Maybe, maybe not. I don't think that's the goal. I think the goal is that technology and the function of the communication center in the 911 world has evolved to the point where it needs to have its own identity. It needs to have a board that is responsible to the public and has some authority to enforce the code and to leverage penalties in necessary and to take action when things don't go right. So that is the nexus for the committee. My understanding is that the committee is going to look at what an office of emergency communications in Iowa would look like. Four things – 911, communications, public notification, and public warning. They all nest right in your PSAP – right in your 911 centers. Those would be the functions that I would look at as being part of that.

Mr. Koppert – One of the things I would like to see I looked at: 34A and 29C, and compare them side by side, and the goal here isn't to force a change on how things are done in the state of Iowa at this point in time. Whoever wants to run the communication center whether it is the sheriff's office, police department, fire, EMA or a 28E, that's fine. In my opinion there needs to be a fifth option. That fifth option is to take the language that exists in 29C with regards to making emergency management commissions its own municipality, you're to certify a budget, etc. and here's how you fund the budget. Take that exact same wording and put into 34A to give the 911 service boards that same authority. Instead of trying to push this into the existing 34A, write a whole new chapter and the first thing in that chapter is the joint 911 service board may establish a local office of emergency communications. In Cass County my communications center runs under a 28E organization. Four of the eight cities participated in that. In the last two years, two of the other cities pulled out because....their feeling was why should we if the other four aren't required to be there and provide some kind of funding or have some kind of say. That's kind of the reason why I am writing in this way is that it allows it to do that.

Mr. Mallot – There's no funding mechanism for this department you are talking about. There is no tax in any county fund coming to the 911.

- Funding mechanism for the OEC
- Membership of the 911 service boards and EMA commissions
- Difference in authority of spending money between 911 service boards and EMA commissions
- Costs of 911 – sheriffs saying they are going to assess communities fees
- Difference between EMA and 911
  - EMA has a national and a state organization. You pay to be a member as both levels.
  - 911 you only have a national and you pay to the national organization. There isn't a state organization that is separate from the national.
  - NENA/APCO you have members who are dispatchers who can't make a decision. If they tell a board of supervisor or a sheriff they are going to do something and they don't come to that meeting they can't make that decision.

That's what the organization changes are going to have to be. That's what you are going to have to look at to make this communications. It is right in ESF 2. I agree with all four items you said. It's just, how are you going to fund it?

Mr. Koppert – That's the reason I took the exact language out of 29C which is the emergency management.

Mr. Mallot – That's only one of them.

Mr. Koppert – It says the 911 service board may do this. The rest is the same as emergency management. The 911 service board is the certifying budget authority which obviously it means they are

going to have to be the elected officials to be able to do that. It is exactly what 29C says and I have changed it to say the E911 operating fund may be funded by a combination of the following which is up to the board of supervisors to determine what's best. So it's not on the actual service board to say "this is how we are going to fund it. Here's our budget – board of supervisors, you do that."

There was further discussion

- The EMA budgeting process
- Chapter 29C and the board of supervisors responsibilities
- Once budget is certified it is up to the board of supervisors to figure out how to spread the tax.

Mr. Seivert – The discussions are great. We need to meet and talk and come up with a format and bring something to the table. A white paper or something like that. Tim, your comment about little towns getting hooked for a lot of money they don't have. When we talked about this, I didn't even look at it as a funding issue. The PSAPs are paid for today. It's a function that exists today. It might be a little bit of a reorganization as to how those funds flow in but we are not going to ask the counties or any other 911 center to increase their budgets. This is not a cost issue. This is a reorganization of a function. So let's just bring the discussion and see where they go.

Mr. Koppert – A lot of it is education with local public officials of what they can and cannot do regarding what the language says.

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

Mr. Allen – The board is reworking the website. Trying to move it in the state's CIO's website. Instead of keep the P25 standards on the website there will be a link to where you can get those standards. Anyone that has a governmental email and get those at no cost.

During the month we have spent a lot of time meeting and answer questions about the LMR system.

- Talk groups and user IDs within the system.
- Detailed design review
  - Fleet map, code plug, interoperability
  - Looking at ways to drive costs down up front
  - Best practices

Attended TIA/TR8 P25 meeting. The board took the task of defining public safety grade and it has really spurred conversation now. There are standards in some and not in others. For example there isn't a standard in coverage for a radio system. There's kind of agreed to 95 percent. In public safety grade best efforts don't work. It has to work when everything else fails. After September 11, we had lots of money. Before September 11, it was hard to get money. So you are going to pay. The question is what are you going to pay and what are the consequences.

National Council of SWICs has now taking on the conversation of public safety grade. The technology and policy committees have taken that on.

National Governor's Association Conference is coming in June. There will be a lot of getting ready for that. Not necessarily from the operational perspective but from the communications perspective.

User Groups – Those members are the RIC chairs which are the voting members of the committee. We will now finish up the SCIP to be passed by the board.

Helen – The RICs had a Feb. 1 deadline to setup their meetings and establish their monthly calendar. That has been completed. There was a CASM webinar with 55 attendees.

#### **Items for Discussion**

None

#### **Unfinished Business**

##### Updating Council Bylaws

Mrs. Hall – There was discussion regarding the notice of minutes from the last E911 council meeting. It is in article seven, meetings section four. Notice of meetings and article eight special meetings. The verbiage is the same in both articles. This was in discussion with the chair, vice chair and Blake.

Mr. Seivert – Sally clarified a lot things and cleared up some language. If you are looking at a motion to approve them, I think we have met that notification I would make that motion.

Motion to approve Bob Seivert, seconded by Dave Kaus. To approve the bylaws of the State of Iowa E911 Communications Council as presented. All ayes. Motion passed.

**Travel Requests**

Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Sally Hall to approve Bob Seivert's travel to the National NENA Conference at Indianapolis in June. All ayes. Motion passed.

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

Shawn Wagner asked the council if they were receiving the emails that are being sent out.

**Announcements**

Next meeting will be Thursday, March 10, 2016 at 9 a.m. at the West Des Moines City Hall council chambers.

There being no further business Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary