

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Wednesday, May 12, 2016
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, Iowa**

Call to Order

Chair Ray called the meeting to order 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)	Rob Koppert	Present
alternate	Kirk Hundertmark	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	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Excused
alternate	Tom Berger	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) Vice-Chairperson	Bob Seivert	Excused
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	Jack DeAngelo	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

Guests:

Craig Allen, ISICSB SWIC	Helen Troyanovich, Deputy SWIC
John Benson, Iowa HSEMD	Tony Day, CenturyLink
Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office	Josh Halterman, Iowa DOT-TraCS/MACH
Jon Paoli, Iowa HSEMD	Amanda Roush, Story County E-911
Tammy Rodriguez, ICN	Shweta Agrahari, ICN
Duane Vos, Racom	Terry Brennen, Racom
Ed Roach, Jasper County E-911	Diane Sefrit, SC
Dave Hanson, Calhoun County E-911	Doug McCauland, Warren County E-911
Landon Loftsgard, Motorola	Tim Aaron, Motorola
Kevin Condon, Iowa Communications Alliance	

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Dan Halterman to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2016, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Rob Rotter to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

Mr. DeRouchey distributed the quarterly wireless expenditure report and the quarterly PSAP payment report. These reports are also available on the HSEMD website.

Calendar Q1 2016 Wireless Expenditure Report			
Quarterly Revenues Summary		Quarterly Expenditures Summary	
Wireless Surcharge	\$ 6,646,245.50	Wireless Service Providers 10% of the fund \$913,854.86	\$ (129,922.24)
Interest	\$ 26,970.40	Network Costs (TCS, ICN)	\$ (620,369.07)
Prepaid Card Revenue	\$ 556,179.36	PSAP Funding 46% of Total Surcharge	\$ (3,313,115.39)
Total Revenue	\$ 7,229,395.16	Total Expenditures	\$ (4,063,406.70)
Total Surcharge (excluding interest)	\$ 7,202,424.76		
HSEMD Funding (yearly)	\$		
Amount transferred to Operating Surplus			\$ 3,165,988.46

Operating Surplus Summary		
Previous Quarter Total Funds in Operating Surplus		\$ 20,655,823.52
SFY 16 Operating Surplus Revenue from previous quarter	\$ 5,970,571.48	
SFY 16 YTD Operating Surplus Revenue	\$ 9,136,559.94	
Quarterly Operating Surplus Expenditures		\$ (2,872,815.00)
SFY 16 YTD Total Grants Approved		\$ (9,641,158.97)
SFY 16 YTD Grants Paid	\$ (3,361,475.53)	
Y 16 YTD Total Grants Obligated (not yet paid)	\$ (6,279,683.44)	
Total Funds In Operating Surplus (Current Quarter)		\$ 20,948,996.98
Total Unobligated Funds in Operating Surplus		\$ 14,669,313.54

Future/Ongoing NG911 Projects			
(Multi-year projects)	Projected	Obligated / Encumbered	Expended
Catastrophic Network Failure	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$	\$
Network Capacity Increase	\$ 2,175,000.00	\$ 343,492.00	\$ 753,408.74
NG911 GIS Project	\$ 8,275,000.00	\$ 3,808,680.00	\$ 786,132.00
NG911 Statewide Imagery Service	\$ 1,300,000.00	\$ 1,300,000.00	\$
Data Center Upgrades	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 200,000.00
Travel/Public Education	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 1,229.29
LMR Radio	\$ 4,000,000.00		\$ 4,000,000.00
Totals	\$ 19,860,000.00	\$ 5,462,172.00	\$ 5,740,770.03

Mr. DeRouchey – Attachment C Request for Wireless E-911 Funds is due May 16. There are five service boards that have not submitted the form as of today. Multiple reminders have been sent to those counties. If the form is not submitted, those service boards will not receive any wireless funds.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

Mr. DeRouchey – We have turned up Cedar County for the CPE integrated text-to-911. Thank you to Cedar County, Emergency Call Works and TCS. If there are any other vendors that are ready please let us know.

The technical issues that are occurring regarding some of the larger PSAP that have a secondary ESInet and the issue that affects some of the PSAPs in relations to text messaging. Director Shouten has gotten fully engaged in some of the negotiations and disputes regarding text messaging and the master CPE

contract. This kind of relates to the CPE vendors in some of the bigger PSAPs. We don't really have anything to update you on right now. We have been having weekly communications with those vendors and PSAPs to make sure that people are aware of what is going on. We are hoping to get a solution relatively soon. I think the technical solution has been discovered and it is now the negotiation on who is going to pay for what.

Mr. Kaus – Is that IP from TCS to the PSAP?

Mr. DeRouchev – It's basically how it connects to IP addresses.

Mr. Kaus – There's nothing on the carrier side though?

Mr. DeRouchev – Correct. It's CPEs, vendors, TCS and the PSAP.

Mr. DeRouchev – I will be sending out shortly is a BETA version of the different PSAP contacts. These contacts have been put into a map. We will be asking for your input on whether this is a usable format for you. The 24/7 contact numbers have been removed because sometimes those are personal cellphones. If you like this, it will be put on the website.

Mr. DeRouchev – We have put together a list of frequently asked questions (FAQ) regarding the changes this last legislative session. Some of the changes in HF 2439 are:

- The pass through amount to the PSAPs has increased from 46 percent to 60 percent. You can't really assume this is a 14 percent increase to your local PSAP. Remember the formula is weighted to the square area and the call count of your service area. The "pot" is 14 percent bigger that we are passing through, but you can't directly draw the conclusion you are going to directly get 14 percent more.
- It puts a \$4.4 million cap on what we can pass through of the carryover. To give you an idea, we are going to pass through about \$11 million in 2016 for traditional and GIS grants. In 2017 the legislators put a \$4.4 million cap on what we are allowed to pass through.
- It also gives us the task of doing a study. I would prefer to call it a strategic plan development, of where we want to go with 9-1-1 in the future. If that's a virtual or physical consolidation and we want the message to be that this is collaborative. We want to have meetings all over the state. Get input from everyone. The E-911 council, PSAPs, sheriffs, local telecos, etc. I don't think anything is off the table. That RFP is in development now. It is a strategic plan looking at how consolidation can best be done. We are not looking at automatically shutting anyone's doors. Part of that is also going to be looking at, getting the right people in the room and seeing what it would take to get the wireline traffic on to the wireless ESInet. I'm not saying that it is going to happen but to look at it and start the discussion.

Mr. DeRouchev distributed a draft of the proposed administrative rule changes.

Mr. Koppert – Will the remaining cap number to PSAPs be equal or based on a formula of some kind?

Mr. DeRouchev – That equal language was also there when it was specified as grants. We've always interpreted that as an equal dollar amount. So I don't think that is going to change.

Mr. Koppert – The legislature has indicated that they will revisit treatment of the surplus. Does that mean the legislature will decide the fate of existing funds and obviously decide to provide further funding for the state LMR system?

Mr. DeRouchev – I would say that is an accurate interpretation on your part. The \$4.4 million cap is for one year. So in affect you are going to see that carryover surplus grow or at least stay the same. So there is still that money that is sitting there.

Mr. Koppert – Since we are about six weeks from the end of the fiscal year can you give us a rough estimate on the amount of funds that will be carried over to next fiscal year?

Mr. DeRouchev – We expect about \$14.6 million at this time. That is the balance we have now. Knowing we have grants this month and next month to approve.

Mr. Koppert – The applications that we have today and next month will be coming out of the \$14.6 million.

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct.

Mr. Bryant – Does the \$4.4 million for the LMR come out of that as well?

Mr. DeRouchey – The \$4.4 million for the LMR does not show up on this.

Mr. Koppert – So that will have to be taken out of that \$14.6 million.

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct.

Mr. Kaus – Is that a standard contribution every year?

Mr. DeRouchey – The lease payment changes.

Mr. Benson – It is a one year payment right now. The law does not go beyond 2017.

Mr. Koppert – Since there is not going to be a GIS grant. Does that mean the flyovers are going away?

Mr. DeRouchey – No. The imagery contract is signed. We are going full speed ahead with that. We were able to fly about 50 percent of the state this year. That will be paid out of a network cost. Just like the state portion of the GeoComm maintenance of the portal site that you all upload your information to. That part is still covered.

Mr. Koppert – What is your opinion on the negative impact of not continuing to provide GIS funding opportunities especially for smaller PSAPs who don't have full time GIS personnel or contracted out. What kind of affect is this going to have on them for the future of NG911 if counties can't afford, through those 9-1-1 funds and have to revert to property tax dollars, to correct that GIS data and then maintain the data.

Mr. DeRouchey – I acknowledge that and that is a concern of mine as well. They can still fund it through any other source of surcharge as well. They are getting a higher percentage passed through. There will mostly likely be something passed through in a form of the carryover money. That GIS does have to continue. It's unfortunate. We passed \$1 million just in GIS funding this year to the locals. It is going to be the future. How call location and call routing is done in a NextGen environment. I think we have to start on it but you're spot on. The maintenance has to continue.

Mr. Koppert – The concern is and I understand you said there will probably be some funds that will be carried over. Go back to the legislature revisiting this whole thing. They could take \$10 million. In fact doesn't the payment go up to \$6.8 million in the next couple of year? They could take a lot out of there that's not going to be flowing back down to the PSAPs.

Mr. Kaus – What they take out of the carryover fund doesn't say it has to be spent on safety-related product. Is it? In other words if in 2018 we still have a carryover fund of \$6 million. Is there anything that says the legislature can't spend it on anything they like?

Mr. Bryant – I think there is language in 34A that it can't revert back to the general fund.

Mr. Kaus – It can't go back to the general fund but what happens if they divert it to a special segment of the government to spend it some place.

Mr. Bryant – Some years back, I don't know if you were on the board, they took extra money to upgrade the state radio system.

Ms. Morris – The \$4.4 million cap is how much money we can use for carryover grants. Is that right?

Mr. DeRouchey – Right. The priority for that \$4.4 million is for consolidation. It talks about physical and virtual. We have to build some rules around what the virtual piece means. Those encouragements to consolidation funds are available until 2022. That's out there as well. That has to be considered first prior to disbursing equally the remaining \$4.4 million cap to the rest of the PSAPs. So what the FAQ speaks to is an open application period where counties who are interested tell us that they are going to

consolidation (virtually/physically/shared services) and it needs to be done this fiscal year to make that cap really work. Once we get those applications/notices of intent that you are going to consolidate, then we'll take whatever money is left over and divide it up.

Ms. Morris – So it will just be divided. There won't be carryover grants?

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct. That's our intent right now. You fill out the Attachment C at the beginning of the year anyway and tell us how you are going to spend your surcharge. We pass money through on the front end. This is just another way to pass money through on the back end. You all have to follow 34A just like we do.

Ms. Morris – On the consolidation, would an RFP for a consultant be considered?

Mr. DeRouchey – That's one of the things we are talking about. We're fully aware that you guys will come up with ideas that we haven't thought of yet. So as you come with those ideas let us talk through it now rather than waiting until July to address those. I doubt that will be considered but I'm not sure. In June we'll have a webinar or conference call with all of the PSAPs, and the council members will be invited as well, to give you our final product on how things are going to look in the future.

Mr. Koppert – As far as the \$4.4 million, if no one takes anything for consolidation it will all be disbursed equally and that is going to be at the end of next fiscal year?

Mr. DeRouchey – It will be sometime after December. There has been a little bit of talk about that money that's generated during 2017. The \$4.4 million comes from that new money. Not only do we have to wait to see if there are any takers on that consolidation, we have to build that \$4.4 million up over the course of the first two quarters.

Mr. Bryant asked for clarification regarding the GIS grant.

Mr. DeRouchey – The FAQ addresses the \$15,000 GIS grant that local PSAPs can apply for. The data creation and data maintenance for layers on their maps. The imagery is totally separate. The GIS grant came out of the carryover funds just like the traditional grant. The GIS grant will no longer exist. Those expenditures will have to come out of local funds now. We have done over \$1 million in GIS grants this year. The \$4.4 million cap is for one year.

Mr. Bryant – I am just building for next legislative session.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

Adams County – Two dispatch chairs, computer/software/monitor, large format monitor, six portable radios and repeater box. Grant request of \$10,032.49.

Audubon County – Zetron Model 4219 dispatch radio console and five-year maintenance and support. Grant request of \$84,650.

Carroll County – Purchase five dual-band P25 digital mobile radios. Grant request of \$20,791.98.

Dickinson County – Simulcast paging system project phase I. Grant request of \$39,100.

Franklin County (Hampton PD) – Eventide Logging Recorder and maintenance and 40 P25 mobile radios. Grant request of \$82,163.

Henry County GIS – Aerial alignment of site/structure address points. Grant request of \$15,000.

Howard County – Purchase P25 compliant/upgradable pagers (23) and radios (1 mobile & 9 portable). Grant request of \$24,651.

Marion County – Three dispatch chairs, third 9-1-1 workstation and mobile radios. Grant request of \$65,460.

Sioux County – Simulcast paging project. Grant request of \$100,000.

Tama County GIS – ESZ layer development and road updates at intersections. Grant request of \$14,952.

Winneshiek County (Decorah PD) – Replace radio system equipment and move equipment from a water tower into a radio shelter. Grant request of \$100,000.

Worth County – PowerPhone EMD call handling system. Grant request of \$44,918.

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

Cass County – PSAP Master Clock System. Grant request of \$6,380.

Motion by Rob Dehnert, seconded by Dave Kaus to recommend for approval the Cass County grant application. All ayes except Rob Koppert abstained. Motion passed.

Polk County (Westcom) – Data center virtual storage upgrade. Grant request of \$100,000.

Dallas County GIS (Perry PD) – GIS address point and points of interest data creation. Grant request of \$4,160.

Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Dave Kaus to recommend for approval the Dallas County and Polk County (Westcom) applications. All ayes except Rob Dehnert and George Griffith abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Bryant – How many counties were recipients of the \$15,000 GIS grant?

Mr. DeRouchey – About 65 percent. This was \$15,000 per PSAP.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – open comments of interest from our technical/telecommunication partners

Dave Kaus – CCA which is Competitive Carrier Association has issued an alert for wireless carriers. They can ask for a waiver to discontinue the TTY service. That has to be approved by the FCC. That falls under their jurisdiction as to whether that covers everything. It probably will happen in July. Each carrier has to apply for the waiver separately.

Legislative Updates – Mike Bryant

Mr. Bryant – Blake covered most of it. In the session itself, the governor's office or the governor had the attitude there is going to be more money available. Again I don't know where that came from because up to that point.... The results of the two-year study were good and if there wasn't enough money available to support both parts. I think in the study it talked about the surcharge needed to be raised about a \$.25 to cover both parts. The fact is that it's not going to happen in an election year. It is a viable solution but it wasn't going to happen. My opinion is they are going to pay for this (state 700 MHz LMR system) for eight more years out of this fund, one way or another. One of my ideas is...there's an attitude out there that this is a one-year deal and this will be a good cost savings for government on property taxes. The fact of the matter is you can add up \$8 million divided by 113 and figure out what you lost. It is already a burden. That said, one of the options is the surcharge goes up \$.25 in the future. I don't know where new money is going to be generated from or where new money is going to be available to use. That doesn't mean it has to or that doesn't mean it will fly. A lot of things went on at the end. The public safety coalition groups that I was a part of. My organization felt that, well if the governor thinks there is going to be that much money available then they should be willing to be at the back of the line because there is going to be plenty of "food" left. You can take it if it's there, kind of attitude. From what I understood, Rep. Worthan told the governor's office there isn't enough money for the ten year plan to do that. That's how it kind of ended up being a one year deal. It doesn't mean it is over and done with. I have high regard for Rep. Worthan for saying that we can't do this for eight more years. I think it is a fight that will continue. It's just a matter of are there other options, other ways to get this done in the future. We need to be looking ahead to next year. The payment is going to go up another couple million dollars.

Mr. Koppert – You have been 9-1-1 program manager about a year and a half roughly and of course Barb (Vos) was here quite some time and before that was John (Benson). So we have two very learned individuals in the room that have dealt with the 9-1-1 program manager in the last good number of years. There has been \$28 million projected in the spreadsheets for income for every year for the wireless

surcharge. But yet the governor's office say it's going to be somewhere around \$32 million. Where did the governor find such learned individuals to tell him this? If he can't look at his own 9-1-1 program manager or past program manager, who I would think would be the experts.

Mr. Benson – I was asked at some point during the session to take a look at the increases in the revenue streams that we have seen over the past three or four years and then apply that out over the course of the next 10 years. I presented those figures to the governor's office and said of all of the information that I have every presented to you in regard to this, these numbers are the ones that I would trust the very least. The absolute least. Because if you talk to anybody in the industry, they will tell you that you are not going to see an increase in the numbers. The state is essentially saturated with roughly two million wireless numbers and we have three million people and you're seeing people departing from the multiple device concept. So those numbers came from me. My guidance to them was that I would not trust these numbers at all. My opinion was that they are completely inaccurate.

Mr. Koppert – But you didn't tell them that we have had the \$28 million and the governor's thinking \$32 million. Where did he get the \$32 million?

Mr. Benson – That \$32 million would have been in the tenth year. It was not right now. It was based on what the surcharge has done over the course of the last three or four years. It was based on about \$300,000 increase a year. So if you take that \$300,000 and you take that over the course of a 10-year lease then you get up to that dollar figure you're talking about. It was not a \$28 million to \$32 million next year jump. It was a \$28.3 to \$28.6 to \$28.9 etc. The \$32 million didn't show up until 10 years out. Mathematically is there logic behind it, yes. Is it based on reality, my opinion is no and I did communicate that to him. Our projections have always been based on \$28 million. Right now it has been hovering around there and I don't like projecting revenue when I don't know what's coming. We are really nervous projecting on growth and basing expenditures on that growth and the growth doesn't happen. We ran in the red for a number of years and we are not going back to that.

Mr. Kaus – Has that been relayed to the appropriate...?

Mr. Benson – Very much so.

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

Mr. Allen – We have been spending a great amount of time of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the radio system. This was passed at last month's board meeting. Now that we have a MOA in place that is the process that will be used to come onto the system. There are different types of users:

- Basic interoperability user – just want to use the system to talk for interoperability
- Interoperability and operability user and need talk groups
- Interoperability and need to improve coverage – need to add additional capacity to the system to make it work
- User that wants to create a subsystem within the system

The MOA application processes is reviewed by the users group committee and a recommendation is made to the board whether to approve or not but with a "no, but." This is what needs to be done for this to work.

Westcom and Woodbury County had been included in the proposal from the vendor as offering coverage for parts of the state. That footprint provided their solution to the part of the RFP that said they had to use existing infrastructure to the degree they could. Those two are going through the MOA process. Dallas County has also applied.

The governor's conference is coming up in July. That is a primary purpose to use the system for those 30+ governors and their security teams that come in. After that, Motorola has a rollout plan to have the state done in somewhere around 24 months. Motorola was not required but is assisting with the governor's conference. There is a body of folks that are calling on a regular basis asking questions about the system. The board's primary purpose is to do two things. One is a statewide LMR system and the other is mobile data or data. FirstNet is serving the purpose of a statewide broadband network and the LMR system is satisfying the other. Whether or not people decide to use it, those are not technical decision. Those are political decisions.

When you put out a statewide system there are seven systems that work in Iowa today and of those seven it makes sense to see how those systems would interoperate with a statewide system. Each vendor interprets how certain things work. How do we align the different technology? The governance committee will be dealing with that as we move forward.

Ms. Troyanovich – FirstNet has been doing outreach activities with RICs. We have also been encompassing some ISICS radio system activities. We have some additional items posted on our website and Facebook page. We have included somethings that would interest the 9-1-1 community as well. FirstNet has been a little quiet. There was a congressional report that was recently put out and they are doing some environmental studies right now. Mostly we are working with the regional chairs that are going to be on the user group committee to help them to communicate with the different disciplines. We did go up to Post 8 at Mason City this week and talked about FirstNet and the LMR system. We want the regions to tell us how they want this done in their regions. We are looking for the regional feedback.

Mr. Bryant – Being involved on the conference calls from the outreach committee, there are some webinars coming up and some discussions of a conference next spring.

Mr. Allen – The people that come to these meetings and the people that are on the 9-1-1 council here, if you have an interest of being on the ISICS Board, there is an application process. There is a requirement for a number of positions. They are required by law, by discipline. In political appointments there has to be a diversity of gender and political affiliation. We have an at large seat and the rest are assigned by discipline that are open. If you aren't appointed this year or in the year the vacancy occurs that doesn't mean you would have to reapply. They only look at applications that are less than 11 to 12 months old.

Items for Discussion

Chair Ray there are none listed but I will add that Shawn Wagner was here this morning. The ISICS Board is now having their meetings broadcast on cable. Shawn was willing to set that up for us. However we had just begun the day and this really isn't the type of setup we need here for the council to make the camera angle work. We dispensed with that idea this time but hopefully in June we will be recording the meeting. So just wanted to make everyone aware of that.

Mr. Koppert – I do have one concern on that. Obviously, if it is just recorded and it is uploaded onto YouTube or whatever, I don't have a concern with that. I think if we start to broadcast our meetings or setup the telephone conference bridge that is going to limit us to this facility. We won't be able to do any type of outreach meetings unless we provide those types of technologies. Before we do that I think we need to have the AG give their opinion on this. What precedence that would mean if this was not offered at all meetings.

Chair Ray – I see your point on that Rob. Craig, the board has made this decision and discussed it. Clearly you must have had some guidance on that at some point.

Mr. Allen – I can speak to the aspect of the board and why we are doing that and that is the transparency. We did traveling in 2014 and that was a large waste of financial resources. It wasn't a good return on the investment. The people would come to one meeting and they would not come any more. We opened the phone line initially. We did get an AG's opinion that we could do that. And then the next step is, as you started getting into these more complicated issues. Particularly the broadband area with FirstNet and the presentations from the vendor on project management and how that is rolling out. There are some real interested parties that can't leave their desks. The teleconferences helped drive up participation. I want to thank Rob Koppert. He initially helped us get that setup where it would go on YouTube. I am not clear on the specifics of how this was setup. I think it may have been a benevolent offer.

Chair Ray – Blake, we maybe need to check on the telephone conference again.

Mr. DeRouchey – I was going to bring this up. We have had another switch in AG representation. I will present those questions to the AG representative.

Mr. Koppert – The second concern I have is would we allow members to view from home and not come to a central location and be able to vote.

Mr. DeRouchey – I will present all those options to the AG representative.

Mr. Bryant – The teleconference and getting a quorum are issues I have dealt with in the fire service. It wasn't the choice of the group. Having been on council over 20 years and having done the outreach stuff. One of the reasons we saw the same people was we held the meeting during the daytime working hours. One of the benefits and the purpose of going on the road in the past before it was a joint effort between the two groups, those people that attended those meetings were the volunteers. The people that had jobs during the day and couldn't get off to go to a meeting during the day. One of the primary reasons why the attendance didn't grow or change was because of the type. If they would have been in the evening and I realize that wouldn't have been the choice of the ISICS Board. I think it would have been ok with us. We didn't have them in the evening hours when a lot of those people would have been available. Maybe that doesn't reflect the same now as when we did this in the past. I see the timing of the meeting as the primary cause why we did get more people attending.

Mr. Allen – To Mike's point that is exactly right. When we tried holding meetings in hours other than regular business hours, we couldn't get a quorum together. Some people have other jobs. It just wasn't workable for the board. We, by law, have to have a quorum. I don't believe there is a quorum requirement for your activities.

Mrs. Hall – Yes there is.

Mr. Allen – We struggle with the same thing. We have to have 12.

Chair Ray – It is pretty hard to predict from one meeting to another. We will address that with the AG representative.

Mr. Koppert – I'm not an advocate of going out like the outreach thing like way back when....quarterly meetings in the four corners of the state. I'm not saying we need to do that but I like the idea of having some flexibility like last month we held our meeting in coordination with APCO and a number of people that don't usually come were able to come that night. I like that idea of outreach but I don't think necessarily that we need to go to the four corners of the state to do that.

Chair Ray – And to that point our choice and we have done this before of having it during the conference. That's an opportunity, during NENA and APCO, for people that do have an interest in this. Those off times, people want to come here and be able to know now that on the second Thursday of the month they can attend this meeting and ISICSB also. There is valid reason for that also. We will nail down the issue with the video and then proceed with that.

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

Mr. Koppert – I would like to make a request to attend National APCO in Orlando, Fla., in August. Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Dave Kaus to approve Mr. Koppert's travel request. All ayes. Passed.

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Mr. Bryant – Have we come up with any resolve with the Mediacom issue?

Mrs. Hall – It is still ongoing. I recently received a call from Kristina Swegan at West Safety Services about setting up a conference call between our CPE vendor, West, Mediacom and myself to see if something could be worked out. Whether it is a vendor issue or what. So I have to set that meeting up.

Mr. Bryant – Will Blake be involved in that meeting?

Mrs. Hall – Yes, he certainly can.

Mr. Bryant – I am just looking at the central clearinghouse. That's the way I look at you (Blake) as.

Ms. Sefrit – We did have a conference call with Mediacom and our board chair was involved in that. It basically came back to Intrado (West) is where the responsibility is laying right now. It had to do with the 30W platform because there are variations there. They didn't think they had the right one. So right now from the last email I saw they are working with Racom on trying to get this right.

Mr. DeRouchey – I guess I see my role throughout this as more of a facilitator. Trying to figure out whose court the ball is in. If it's TCS's failure, getting on them to correct it. That is what I have been doing. Making those connections.

Mr. Bryant – Back to the GIS grants. I missed this part not being included. For those counties that did submit an application and were recipients of the grant money this year. . . . Those counties that didn't apply in the anticipation of the grant being available again next year are not going to get that money now.

Mr. DeRouchey – I think some of the counties were doing it on their own anyway or it didn't cross their mind or they just haven't done the work yet. That's a couple reasons why somebody didn't apply.

Mr. Bryant – I don't think it was a big enough number to change the way things ended up anyway. I feel from my perspective it's my job that big or small that all people have an equal opportunity and I hate to see 30-some people not have that same opportunity in this next year or two that people had a year ago. So in the future I don't think it is a big enough factor. Help me out – John, did it not get talked about? Was this a small part that fell through the cracks, was not included or was it deliberate?

Mr. Benson – All of the above. This is my personal observation. The community as a whole got fixated on "we want our 60 percent." There was the desire by the legislature to have the LMR payment made and the incentive for consolidation. So when you throw all of those into a pile what you see in front of you is what showed up. Yes it did create a situation for the folks that were going to access that grant this next year because that is gone but the work is still eligible as an expenditure using surcharge money that is passed through.

Mr. DeRouchey – There might be some that didn't apply for it this year because they weren't ready but anticipating that it would be available next year. We multiple times said we anticipated that being available next year. We wanted it to be available. But we also did three webinars with GeoComm not only to talk about the process for the data and maintenance remediation but also the funding mechanism. We sent far and wide. We promoted. We advertised. If they were listening or paying an ounce of attention they should have been aware of the grant.

Mr. Bryant – I recognize you guys try to get the information out there. I'm not blaming your guys. I don't know how big of an issue it's going to be – of those that were left. Maybe some may have never applied. Maybe some would have. But for some I'm sure it's going to be a hardship. I don't think it's going to be a big number but I think I will have conversations with the fact that we left out this group and put this on our wish list for next year. If this group doesn't agree with me, I don't want to be the only one that is thinking that way. I appreciate any input. That is why I am bringing it up here. We are in the middle of a process and we kind of cut the process short. And I think it is only fair to continue that process for everybody.

Mr. Koppert – There were a lot of things that happened in the last hours of the legislative session. It is virtually impossible to keep tabs on.

Announcements

The next meeting will be on Thursday, June 9, 2016, at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

There being no further business, Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 10:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary