

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Thursday, June 9, 2016
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, Iowa**

Call to Order

Chair Ray called the meeting to order at 9:01 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	
Iowa State Sheriffs & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	Robert Rotter	Present
alternate	Dean Kruger	
Iowa Peace Officers Association (IPO)	George Griffith	Present
alternate	Sandy Morris	
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Present
alternate	Tom Berger	
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) 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	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
Samantha Brear, E911 Program Planner		Present

Guests:

Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office	Amanda Roush, Story County E911
Tammy Rodriguez, ICN	Terry Brennen, Racom
Diane Sefrit, SCI	Doug McCasland, Warren County E911
Landon Loftsgard, Motorola	Kevin Condon, Iowa Communications Alliance
David Gentleman, Pottawattamie County E911	Robert Andersen, Pottawattamie Co. E911
Sheri Schmitz, Motorola	Mike Myers, Windstream
Mike Lauer, ICN	Suzanne Smith, IUB
Lori Riley, Perry PD	Terry McCallanhan, Dallas Co Sheriff's Office
John Benson, Iowa HSEMD	

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2016, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

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

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

Mr. DeRouchey – There are about \$4 million in grants to close out for this fiscal year. Projects have to be completed by June 30 and the invoices are due to the program manager's office by July 15.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

A second version of the FAQ regarding the changes to Chapter 34A was distributed via email to the Council, PSAPs and it has been posted on the HSEMD website. Webinars have been scheduled for June 27 and 28 and July 1 to discuss changes. You must register in advance. Vendors are welcomed to attend the webinars. The webinar will focus on how PSAPs are going to operate in 2017 and is scheduled for about one and a half hours. Topics covered the final version of the consolidation application, talking about the distribution of the \$4.4 million and what to expect for next year.

A draft of the consolidation application, rules and a list of acceptable consolidation guidelines were distributed. This list is not all encompassing. If anyone has any comments, they are to contact Mr. DeRouchey. Now is the time to make those comments versus waiting.

Mr. DeRouchey – Were there any suggestions or feedback on the draft administrative rules that I passed out at the last council meeting? I attended the Western Iowa and Central Iowa PSAP meetings. I didn't receive any feedback at those meetings. If you have any comments or feedback again now is the time to let us know.

Part of what was tasked of us in Chapter 34A was to study consolidation. I would prefer to call it strategic planning. That involves all of the stakeholders that are involved in what it would take to consolidate physically or virtually. The RFP is out and it is on the DAS website.

Mr. DeRouchey – It has been almost a one and a half years now. We have been talking at a number of meetings regarding the connectivity challenges between VIPER and the TCS network. We have been at a standstill for a while and some of this relates to the master contract for CPE purchases and then what was initially bid on and what pricing is becoming to manage to fix those connectivity challenges. To help with getting us off dead center we have hired LR Kimball to mediate this for us – to bring their expertise in the industry. To let us know if they think we are covered under the master contract and the RFP that initially went out and to dig into the technological solutions and pricings that have been proposed and to give some idea to get off of dead center. There are approximately 33 VIPERs in the state. These are some of the conversations that have been going on since I took over to address these challenges. It has been elevated up to our director. He is acutely aware and has been involved in those discussions as well. I hope to have a report from Kimball within a week or so.

Mr. Seivert – Who pays for the cost of the consolidation study?

Mr. DeRouchey – This one was under the \$5,000 limit that we have to go out to bid so our director did that contract himself. It is out of the 9-1-1 fund but I'm not sure if it is out of our portion of the fund or the carryover but we are paying for that.

One follow up from last month's meeting: We have a new representative from the Attorney General's office who actually represented us previously. I was asked to reach out to the AG representative on his thoughts regarding electronic meetings. The AG representative stated, by all means use the conference call and use the webcast. He recommended that a quorum was established physically in person still but in order to have better transparency, more participation for guest, for the PSAP community by all means open it up to the World Wide Web. That is his recommendation and that would be our recommendation from Homeland Security but it ultimately is a council decision. Steven you can have that brought up as a topic for discussion later.

Chair Ray – We can do that now. Is the council supportive of this?

Mr. Kaus – It would still require a quorum in person here.

Mr. DeRouchey – The other topic that was brought up. When we do have these meetings, for example at the Iowa APCO meeting, or another setting where the technology may not be available, the AG representative didn't think there would be a legal precedence that we would have to worry about. If we could have the capability of having a conference call at any outreach location and still keep up with that openness and try to get it out statewide.

Chair Ray – Yes, physical quorum here but it doesn't preclude a council member or alternate from participating electronically but they would not be able to vote.

Mr. Kaus – If they can't make it and they join electronically does that count as part of the quorum?

Chair Ray – No. They have to be physically where we are at.

Mr. Koppert – They have to be here physically to vote?

Chair Ray – Correct.

Mr. Kaus – Cost of the electronic portion of it?

There was further discussion about the cost of electronic technology, conference line, equipment, coordination of using the same number as ISICSB. Mr. DeRouchey thought the cost could easily come out of the E-911 council's \$100,000 9-1-1 funding.

Chair Ray – We will put that conference call number on the agenda. If that meets the approval of the council, we will need to take some formal action.

Motion by Mr. Koppert, seconded by Mr. Seivert to webcast and have available a conference call for the E-911 Communications Council with the exception of the members of the council must be present at the meeting site to establish a quorum. All ayes. Motion passed.

Mr. DeRouchey – Samantha and I will be attending the National NENA Conference in Indiana next week so response to emails or calls maybe a little delayed. Are there any comments on the information that I handed out? There were no comments at this time.

Mr. Seivert – Blake could you talk about the text-to-911? Where are we at with that and what we can expect?

Mr. DeRouchey – The VIPER connectivity challenges is kind of in that same realm. Cedar County is fully integrated through the network. Emergency Call Works is their vendor. They have been up and running for over a month now. I have reached out to other Emergency Call Works sites to see if they are interested in moving forward with the text-to-911 integration. I have also reached out to other PSAPs about them reaching out to their vendors to move forward with the text-to-911 integration. I haven't heard anything back. That leads me to think that although the vendors have passed the interoperability testing they may not be ready for field deployment yet. They still may be working through some of the same issues that VIPER is working through. I'm not hearing a lot. So if there is any information I would gladly take it. I would gladly schedule any PSAP to go text enabled.

Mr. Andersen – As of right now the federal or state has no deadlines for the PSAPs to do this.

Mr. DeRouchey – We have set a goal of Dec. 31, 2016.

Mr. Seivert – Do you still think we can make that goal?

Mr. DeRouchey – Not particularly.

Mr. Koppert – You mentioned at the western Iowa meeting some cost figures. Can you explain that and bring that up to the council?

Mr. DeRouchey – It's one vendor. When I contacted CenturyLink, West Safety Services would not talk to us directly on pricing. They do their pricing through their channel vendors which are Racom and CenturyLink. So we reached out to both. I had a phone call with CenturyLink and the quick fix is a session border controller in all of the VIPER PSAPs that CenturyLink has. Session border controller through Oracle costs \$150,000 in each PSAP. That is the quick fix. The longer term fix but cheaper is a 90 to 120 days software reprogramming solution and then you're looking at about \$2,000 to \$3,000 per PSAP. That was the pricing that CenturyLink gave. The other component to that, you remember we have secondary ESInet site are also caught up in this. Ten of the 13 sites have VIPER. Those run a little bit more for the 90 to 120 day software reprogramming solution. It is \$35,000 per PSAP. After we had that Western Iowa meeting I had a call from West. At that point they were ready to talk pricing with me because they (WEST) had been contacted by some of the counties about that pricing. I basically confirmed all of those numbers. There was a little discrepancy from what CenturyLink told me initially with the 90 to 120 day reprogramming model. So what I gave you is what West told me and I know what West told LR Kimball, they gave me. Those figures that I gave you are updated to what I gave you at the western Iowa meeting.

Mr. Seivert – It almost seems that it is cost prohibitive for us to move forward to go text-to-911.

Mr. DeRouchey – I'll even go into more details. In the master contract when you read what the RFP said it talks about the bids that were submitted to take into account all current and future NENA i3 standards. Our stance, the directors stance is that MSRP was a future/is a current NENA i3 standard and that pricing should have been included with the bids that were submitted two years. So this is our stance outside that bid.

Mr. Andersen – You said there are 33 VIPERs in the state, give or take. How is that population-wise? Is it 50 percent of the state won't have text-to-911?

Mr. Koppert – Would it help if the council passed a resolution or voted in support that we believe, along with the director, that the standard should be under the master contract?

Mr. DeRouchey – It can't hurt.

Mr. Dehnert – What does this master contract mean?

Mr. DeRouchey – The master contract was done to help local PSAPs with their purchasing – to get a standardized pricing. Example: If you wanted to buy EmergiTech you knew going into that if you had two seats this is what is going to cost. There's some clauses in there if you cannot achieve connectivity to the state network you will no longer be able to have your product in Iowa.

Mr. Dehnert – Does that apply across all CPE vendors or particular CPE vendors?

Mr. DeRouchey – All CPE vendors.

Mr. Seivert – With that last upgrade, I thought we were ready to take text. That was the whole purpose in upgrading.

Mr. DeRouchey – They have all passed the test texting-to-911 in the lab.

Mr. Koppert – All the CPEs with the exception of the VIPER?

Mr. DeRouchey – Even VIPER did.

Mr. Kaus & Mr. Seivert – What's the holdup then?

Mr. Kaus – If that part of the master contract is to take care of all current and future technologies I would say in a court of law that would hold up.

Chair Ray – I seems like they don't want to offer any service that also isn't being paid for.

Mr. DeRouchey – That is why we have asked L.R. Kimball to bring their expertise both on the legal side and on a technology side to give some advice. The director is very close at pushing some letters to the industry to talk about this situation. The APCO, NENA, NASNA. He held off as we continue to work

through this. I know that is still on the table at some point and I know that Pottawattamie has talked about going to the media – coordinating or the state doing it as well. I don't think our director would shy away from that if that is what it comes to.

Mr. Seivert – I think the public needs to know. We promised them this December date for quite some time. Spent a lot of money doing it and now all of a sudden it is an open-ended date.

Mr. DeRouche – And we are kind of in the same boat. During budget hearing meetings that all of the departments have, our director told the governor Dec. 31. We are also very acutely aware.

Mr. Seivert – I think their cause or reason should be put out there too.

Mr. Kaus – This is part of NextGen is it not? Is NextGen mandated by the FCC?

Mr. DeRouche – It is getting real close to be. The FCC is trying to do everything in its current legislative mandate to push to NextGen upgrades. But they are a little bit limited by Congress on what the FCC can do at this point.

Mr. Seivert – So the director is going to send out a letter in packets? Rob (Koppert) mentioned a letter from the council on letterhead from our perspective supporting those thoughts. Would that carry some weight?

Mr. Koppert – It would certainly look better.

Mr. Halterman – With the issuance of the master contract so everyone would understand what the requirements were, there was no signature line by any of the vendors on that contract that would make it a binding contract.

Mr. DeRouche – I would have to look at that. Part of what we are dealing with is that everyone that was involved with that is no longer with us. Again that is the reason we have asked L.R. Kimball to take a look at it for us.

Mr. Halterman – If there are no signatures doesn't really mean it is a binding contract. It's more or less a broad-based RFP out there. Is this what we want? With no ramifications or anybody's feet held to the fire? Making a resolution while it puts forth the wishes of the council that's all it does – right?

Chair Ray – Yes, pretty much.

Mr. Koppert – You make a good point but if it was something more along the line of an RFP and you were following everything in the RFP making an exception to that future upgrade. By submitting that quote that could also mean that you are accepting the fact that you are going to provide future upgrades per what was written in the RFP they should have made an except to that line item.

Mr. Halterman – But then it comes down to the local PSAP that's purchasing that equipment. Their contract with that vendor doesn't specify those types of parameters. Then it really becomes the local PSAPs responsibility to go back to the vendor and say "Hey look – this is what you said, now you're not even doing it."

Mr. Dehnert – What about the PSAPs that didn't purchase under that master contract? My center is in that boat. I've had it for 10-12 years. It was a contract that we had with the vendor. I know what our quote is to upgrade. Ours was much higher than what you mentioned which is why we are looking at alternatives. Polk County was yours under this master contract? You have had it for a while so it is doubtful. Pott is yours? So getting back to your point, it doesn't matter. It's under those terms of the contract.

Chair Ray – There is nothing that is really mandated. Other than the systems that are saying they will have it available.

Mr. Seivert – How many states are there that are capable of text-to-911 right now?

Mr. DeRouche – We are slipping. There are some that are exactly where we are at and there are some that haven't even talked about it.

Mr. Seivert – We talked about efficiencies and we took some of our small PSAPs and the cost of delivering the 911 call and they only get three or four calls a week. You apply that same philosophy to our text-to-911 we're seeing that there aren't that many text-to-911 calls being placed.

Mr. Koppert – I don't know if that is the issue, Bob, or can it be an issue that's germane to the thing? We don't have a lot of deaf people but we still have to have TDDs.

Mr. Kaus – TDDs are being discontinued.

Mr. Koppert – I know that but we still have to have them till someone tells us we don't have to have them.

Chair Ray – Whether there is a mandate or not we have been talking about this long enough in Iowa publicly.

Mr. Kaus – Do we have enough money in the carryover fund to fund this?

Mr. DeRouche – I'm not sure we have the legal authority to do it.

Mr. Benson – Yes there is enough money. Can we create a legal pathway?

Mr. Kaus – If we created the legal pathway to do it, would that not be the most logically way to do it?

Mr. Benson – No. I personally have a problem with throwing money down a hole when there shouldn't be a hole based on the master contract. Based on what I've got back from L.R. Kimball, is if that master contract says "thou shalt"...if you are making purchasing off of that. Let me back up a second. On that master contract when a state does that, we go out to a RFP. Companies reply to that particular RFP they say "this is our pricing model." We meet all of the specifications inside that RFP. So the question of if you purchased it locally, you went your own way but if you purchased off the state contract. They essentially signed a contract with the state to meet all of those requirements inside that contract. Locals can come in and use that contract to make purchases. The question is then becomes if that – the way the RFP was written and the way they replied to the RFP – if those all match up, and it said they've got to interface with the state ESInet to deliver text, whatever that looks like you bid it. You can't come back and say it is going to be an extra \$3, whatever the dollar amount might be. That's why I don't want to do down that path and say we'll just pay it and get rid of it. No, that's not prudent. That's not an effective use of state dollars. You've got to remember it is the citizen's dollars. We have to account for the use of that money. So we are going to pursue what that contract looks like and get that ironed out. Now are there other avenues to pursue if that fails? Yes there are. But we are at A – if the contract says you've got to provide it then you've got to provide.

Mr. Halterman – So is it in Kimball's hands now?

Mr. DeRouche – They have already involved their legal department. They have talked to West twice. They've talked to TCS to get the technological issues. We are expecting a report within a week or two.

Mr. Kaus – Can we provide text to any of the PSAPs that are not VIPER-equipped?

Mr. DeRouche – Cedar County has it now and that is integrated the way we want to do it. There are the other eight or nine that are doing text on the GEM Web browser. By the way, that is free and we can do that today – if the PSAPs have access to the outside Internet. But we don't want to do that because it is a different terminal.

Mr. Benson – That is possible. Is it a temporary solution? Throw out the GEM Client across the state, go through the consolidation process, consolidate technologies, we can truthfully for that digital phone switch capability....South Dakota is running the entire state on two of them. Why do we have however many we have in the state? That's just one vendor. All of them across the state. How many of them are there? One hundred. Why do we need 100?

Mr. DeRouche – In South Dakota the state mandates what CPE that you use. I'm not sure we are ready to do that. You guys are all very familiar and like your call-taking screens and CPE vendors. We are not talking about that. As a "for instance" it is possible.

Mr. Benson – That's why when we do sign a contract with a vendor to do the consolidation feasibility study, it is paramount that we have local participation because you will determine your future.

Mr. Kaus – When will you find out whether the other CPE vendors are capable of doing text?

Mr. DeRouche – I asked multiple times. Again, they have met interoperability testing in the lab. When I have asked that, "Ok let's roll this out, pick your PSAP" or I have asked the PSAP, "Push your vendors. You're ready, I'm ready." I have heard nothing back.

Mr. Seivert – So in other words we need to help ourselves a little bit.

Mr. Halterman – Pottawattamie County, where do you guys sit?

Mr. Andersen – We're in the same boat. We've got a VIPER. I have reached out to my sheriff and we have pressed the state several times. We've got to the vendors, to TCS, West, CenturyLink. CenturyLink was in my office last week trying to get me to sign this service software agreement for the next two years and I denied it. I said until this gets worked out I'm not going to sign an agreement with you guys. I am probably going to go and look at other options right now. Currently, we make up a part of a much larger metropolitan area with Omaha and the Bellevue area and they have been texting for over a year and a half. We have a large deaf community with the Iowa School for the Deaf. We feel we have the need to provide this service to our citizens that make up in the metropolitan area. You cross over a bridge and that service goes away. Along with the deaf that are in our community. Four or five years ago when we began talking about this it was a personal goal for Pottawattamie County to be one of the first to go live with this and looks like we are going to be one of the last. Not only are we VIPER but we are also one of the multi-911 trunks along with multi-noded with Douglas County core backup center. We have a lot of complexity with our system. As of right now we are doing everything we can do to push the vendors. We are probably going to start looking at alternative vendors because this is not working out for us any longer. The media is going to be our next option that we have for our site.

Mr. Kaus – Isn't TCS eventually under the NextGen supposed to furnish message session relay protocol?

Mr. DeRouche – They are. The network is ready.

Mr. Kaus – If the PSAP is accepting, are they still converting it back to analog?

Mr. DeRouche – To get the integrated text, it has to be IP end-to-end, so it has to be SIP-enabled. Over 50 percent of the PSAPs are SIP-enabled. So it applies to those 50 percent that aren't.

Mr. Kaus – So if they are SIP-enabled can they not take SIP text?

Mr. DeRouche – MSRP is part of the SIP protocol.

Chair Ray – The public has these expectations too. Voice is always going to be primary. But what it is, is a peace of mind for people that know that it is there.

Mr. Halterman – Or those individuals that it's their only mode of communication.

Chair Ray – Based on the...waiting for L.R. Kimball, I'm not so sure it wouldn't be better for the council to take action in July after we know what comes back from them.

Mr. Seivert – I think that would be appropriate. I don't think it would be appropriate for the council to be silent on the matter.

Chair Ray – No. But I think it would be a lot more helpful for you to make that voice after we know what L.R. Kimball comes back with. But that's just my suggestion.

Mr. Koppert – Or would it be better to make that voice now so that L.R. Kimball is aware and can document it?

Mr. DeRouchey – My personal preference would be that it's done now and have that information as part of the report.

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Rob Koppert that the council draft a letter regarding the delay of text-to-911 in Iowa and encouraging the parties involved to resolve it rapidly because our citizens 1) believe that's currently available and 2) it's a public safety issue.

Discussion:

Mr. Kaus – Is L.R. Kimball aware of the FCC ruling on TTY?

Mr. Seivert – I'm sure they are and Mr. Chair, we can follow up on that again in July.

Mr. Halterman – So your motion is to draft that letter to...?

Mr. Seivert – To the Director of Homeland Security – and do we need to send it to L.R. Kimball? I assume that Homeland Security will as they are their contractor. Why not send it to the vendor that is involved as well? So they are clear on the position of the council.

Mr. Koppert – Instead of sending it to a vendor, I think we need to send it to all vendors. There may not be that big of an issue – \$150,000 issue – with all CPE vendors, but there may be some issue there.

Mr. Seivert – I guess I don't have a problem with that either. If this council does represent public safety agencies, that's what we are composed of. So let's use that to strengthen our membership. That was a motion.

Call for the vote. All ayes. Motion passed.

Mr. Halterman – Who is going to draft that letter?

Chair Ray – I will draft the letter.

Mrs. Hall – When we were talking about the electronic meetings, we will need to update our bylaws to include that. I will work on that. It may not get done for the July meeting but hopefully by our August meeting for presentation to the council.

Mr. Halterman – Will that be an addendum to the bylaws or will it have to be a total rewrite?

Mrs. Hall – It can be as an amendment to the bylaws.

Chair Ray – So you can bring a draft and we can review that?

Mrs. Hall – Yes.

There was further discussion regarding the electronic meetings.

- We will start the electronic meetings in July
- Mr. Wagner offered to set this up for the council
- Discussed whether to purchase a phone out of the council funds to have when the council travels.
 - When the council has traveled, there usually has been a phone for a teleconference at the location.
 - It was reiterated that the AG representative stated there isn't a precedence that the council has to worry about if on the road if the meeting isn't held electronically.

Mr. Bryant – At the last meeting we talked about some of the changes to Chapter 34A and the mapping issue and the counties that had taken advantage of the GIS grant this fiscal year. We want the mapping

standardized across the state. Is it not possible to pay for that out of the whole infrastructure, part of the network costs. I don't know who determines the pieces of the puzzle where that's paid for.

Mr. DeRouche – Our contract with GeoComm is going to be part of the network cost going forward. On the quarterly report there is a new line item. It was zero on the last quarterly report, but it was there. That was GeoComm as part of the network costs. That was the cost of them to host the portal and run analysis on the data the locals provide and make sure that data set is seamless. All of the feedback that we have heard – all that data is done at the local level. It's very hard for a state or a state contractor to come in and say that's a new road or house I have to update the statewide GIS dataset. That is a local function. There are also local reasons other than 9-1-1 why you need that data updated. So it would be redundant to do it at the local level and at the state level. And the other thing is we don't want to pick your vendor in this situation. The vast majority of locals have either used their own departments or GeoComm as their GIS data maintenance manager but not everyone has. That is not anything we've wanted to mandate that you have to use the state vendor.

Mr. Seivert – Why wouldn't we consider that the same as the CPE equipment that you pay to update? Everybody has different CPE equipment as well but we said that it needed to be Phase 2 text-capable and we paid for that out of the infrastructure portion. If we don't make arrangements to bring everybody up to the same standard then we are going to have holes in the state. Those counties that aren't going to get that \$15,000 they're simply not going to do it.

Mr. DeRouche – There have only been a handful of counties that haven't done anything. They are making strides even without the grant this year. With the grant in existence, they have still done the work. This is the same message that I brought last month – that work still needs to continue from here until whatever comes after Next Generation. Unfortunately that funding aid isn't going to be there.

Mr. Bryant – Who makes the decision? Does the director make the decision which parts of the puzzle are considered part of that? We want it to be the same standard.

Mr. DeRouche – We have a GIS standards document. It has been in a draft form for a while now but we are going to stamp "final" on it now. That is how GIS technicians are going to code their GIS stuff. The other thing we have done is a field mapping spreadsheet. If you have done your GIS stuff a certain way forever and ever, and it's not the way we want it in the standards, then you can fill out this spreadsheet. Example: In actuality this means this. So when it gets uploaded the computer runs it and puts it in the right format. So the local doesn't have to change their data but it is reflected in the statewide dataset. We have done two data exchanges so those locals have had that chance to try and get their standards up to that level and make those corrections and enter that maintenance phase. Yes there is always going to be – you are never going to get the data 100 percent. So continue to make those upgrades when you build a new road. Make sure you include that in your next upload to the state.

Mr. Bryant – It kind of falls back to that it fell out of part of the legislation that I didn't catch during the legislative session.

Mr. DeRouche – It's a couple of things. It's the cap. That \$4.4 million that we are now authorized to spend is hindering this. The language talking about grants in general. That language was removed and change to automatic pass through. It's kind of twofold.

Mr. Bryant – I don't know if it is worth opening up a can of worms next session for just that topic if that's the only thing that is there. If something else or someone else opens a can of worms, I think it is then a piece of the puzzle we throw back into the mix. John (Benson) is that a worthy part to at least look at if something comes up in the future again?

Mr. Benson – I'm not going to say yes or no. I think the thing you have to keep in mind is that with the increase of the pass through....If you forget that there are any funds in the carryover now, and if you were to look at it strictly as a revenue source with the increase in the pass through, that's an additional \$4 million going down to the local level. I think the legislature envisioned that additional money was going to absorb some of that load you are talking about. I think that would be the primary concern. At least that is the way I view it. The legislature would say "Listen, we gave you more money and now you are coming back for more."

Mr. Seivert – Not more. Just the rest of it.

Mr. Benson – From the logistics standpoint, I think that would be the challenge you would face.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

Mr. Kaus – How did we come out on those two that were in question?

Mr. DeRouchey – All of the backend paperwork for Chickasaw County came in. So that one is good to go. Rob (Koppert) do you want to talk about Osceola County?

Mr. Koppert – When I reviewed the Osceola County application I noticed that some of their radios were not P25. I called the radio salesperson and told him there is a P25 requirement and asked if these radios could be flash upgrade and the salesperson confirmed they could not. He did bring that up to their 9-1-1 coordinator in Osceola County. There was also an issue with a tower they are putting up. Most of Osceola County's communications infrastructure is on a tower owned by Alliant Energy and Alliant is taking that tower down and putting up a new tower. Of course this affects the county as they don't have a say in it. As you can see the line item expenses for the tower was \$24,695 and that was for everything. I did call the salesperson again this morning. He sent a blanket email they can provide P25 conventional VHF radios at a cost of \$1443 apiece, and of course this would be contingent on whether Osceola County accepts that or not. They are going to lose them but they are going to lose part of that tower project anyway so they might as well accept these. They gave a generic ballpark of \$12,000 for the equipment for the tower that they can have in by the end of the month. Which is the coaxial cable for the tower, the antennas, the hangers, surge suppressors – all of the hardware that's needed to do that. Then the rest of that looked okay. I think we do want to help them out as much as possible within the framework of the rules.

Mr. DeRouchey – Just to further clarify: the generator and mobile terminals there is no problem? So we are just looking at the radios and the tower equipment?

Chair Ray – The portables. That is almost twice the amount they had.

Mr. Koppert – Yes. They will probably be losing some or all of the tower part. I would hope they would accept a better radio.

Mr. Dehnert – Is there a requirement or recommendation for P25 radio programming?

Mr. Koppert – They have to be either P25 or flash upgradable to P25.

Motion by Rob Dehnert, seconded by Rob Koppert to recommend for approval all of the following applications except Osceola County.

Chair Ray – I need to recuse myself from the vote on Boone County. I would like to pull that one.

Discussion:

Mr. Halterman – Is Osceola's out in its entirety?

Chair Ray – Do you want to pull it as well and come back and vote on what part you want to approve?

Mr. Dehnert – My motion is that it's out right now.

Mr. Seivert – I don't think we should pull them out. We would have to basically vote "no" on your motion. I don't think we want to throw them out of the entire process. This is just one little element of it. I think we can make approval of their grant request contingent on them accepting the P25 upgradable radios and then it is in their hands.

Dallas County (Perry PD) – Purchase eight mobile data terminals for computer aided dispatch. Grant request of \$45,440.

Hamilton County – Upgrading two radio consoles, radio file server, 10 headsets for the dispatchers and one year of support for software on the VIPER computer. Grant request of \$26,020.

Jones County – Backup 16KW power generator. Grant request of \$5,043.55.

Madison County – Two dispatch chairs and six P25 upgradeable portable radios. Grant request of \$20,419.18.

Muscatine County – Purchase eight P25 portable radios. Grant request of \$26,458.80.

Union County – Replace two computers and software. Grant request of \$3,410.

Adams County – Replace seven battery backups, two external battery packs, two dispatch chairs, one computer with monitor and software. Grant request of \$3,777.84.

Clinton County – Upgrade console communication system with three Zetron Max radio consoles. Grant request of \$100,000.

Chickasaw County – P25 base repeater, antenna and associated equipment for radio tower move. Grant request of \$21,054.90.

Clarke County – Updating of GIS mapping. Grant request of \$24,900.

Call for the vote. All ayes. Motion passed.

Boone County – Upgrade E-911 call mapping system for NG911 with the GeoLynx Server Dispatch Mapping and purchase a new server for the mapping. Grant request of \$62,374.38.

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Rob Dehnert to recommend for approval the Boone County application. All ayes except Steven Ray abstained. Motion passed.

Osceola County – Moving radio tower equipment, generator, four laptops, four portable radios. Grant request of \$47,677.

Motion by Bob Seivert to accept Osceola County grant request contingent on them accepting upgradeable P25 portable radios or the radios will be disallowed.

There was further discussion on the Osceola County grant request. The tower project not being completed by June 30, noncompliant radios, and no detail in the eligible portion of the tower project.

The council discussed the process of approving the grant requests. In previous grants, portions were disallowed because of the ineligibility and the remainder of the request was approved.

Clarification on the motion – everything in the request would be approved except the tower. What is to be approved is the generator, the laptops and the acceptance of the portable radios that are to be P25 upgradeable (increasing the portable radios to \$5,772). The tower is excluded out of the request. Total request would be \$26,454. The acceptance letter to Osceola County will be written in detail as to what was approved.

Discussion on who seconded the motion. Dave Kaus then seconded the motion.

Motion was restated.

Mr. Seivert – Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Dave Kaus to approve the Osceola County grant request as follows:

- Portable radios accepted contingent on Osceola County accepting the portable radios being capable of P25 upgradeable. If they do not accept the change to the P25 upgradeable portable radios then that portion is disallowed.
- Tower disallowed
- Laptops approved
- Generator approved

Total Grant request is now \$26,454. This includes the increased cost of P25 upgradeable radios. Call for the vote. All ayes. Motion passed.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory – open comments of interest from our technical/telecommunication partners
None

Legislative Updates – Vice Chair Bob Seivert

Mr. Seivert – Everyone needs to stay on top of the administrative rules approving process. All of us need to be aware that things in Iowa are moving very rapidly in communications with legislation and if you don't pay attention to what's happening you are going to be left in the dark. Now is the time to become active in your associations and help guide the future. Otherwise you are going to be coming along for the ride.

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

No report.

Items for Discussion

None

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Mr. Benson – Regarding the administrative rules – we will let you know when we file those, and obviously it still has to go through the public comment period. As in the past we have always solicited advice from the council prior to going through the formal process.

Mrs. Hall – I received an email from Wendi Hess from Woodbury County in regards to the NSI (no service/uninitialized) cell phones. Ms. Hess has been contacted by the FCC and APCO regarding the number of abandoned wireless calls. The FCC is considering doing away with the ruling that all NSI phones must transmit to 9-1-1. Woodbury County has been tracking the number of abandoned wireless calls from NSI phones since FY2011. Ms. Hess stated that she will be sending an electronic filing sharing their statistics and encourages others to file comments. The PS Docket No. is 08-51.

Announcements

The next meeting will be on Thursday, July 14, 2016 at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary