

Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Thursday, Aug. 11, 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	
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	
alternate	Tom Berger	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA) Vice-Chairperson	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS) Chairperson	Steven P. Ray	Present
alternate	Adam Buck	
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Rob Dehnert	Present
alternate	Paul Andorf	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	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:

Glen Sedivy, Woodbury County 911	Duane Vos, Racom
James Lundsted, DHS/OEC	Tim Aaron, Motorola
Shari Schmitz, Motorola	John Benson, Iowa HSEMD
Terry McClannahan, Dallas Co Sheriff Comm.	Tammy Rodriguez, ICN
Larry Oliver, Harrison County EMA/911	Crystal Koehn, CenturyLink
JC Cunningham, CenturyLink	Greg Brooks, West Safety Services
Brian Magdwell, Westcom	Brenda Vande Voorde, Fayette County 911
Terry Brennan, Racom	Amanda Roush, Story County E911
Diane Seifrit, SCI	Suzanne Smith, IUB
Helen Troyanovich, ICN/Deputy SWIC	Craig Allen, SWIC

Guest present by teleconference:

Dave Skou, Cherokee County
Diana Richardson, Racom

Ed Roach, Jasper County

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 July 14, 2016, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

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

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)**911 Program Financial Reports**

Handouts of the Calendar Q2 2016 Wireless Expenditure Report, Quarterly Payments to PSAPs were distributed.

Mr. DeRouchey – We made an error in a couple of the payments but that has been corrected.

Calendar Q1 2016 Wireless Expenditure Report			
Quarterly Revenues Summary		Quarterly Expenditures Summary	
Wireless Surcharge	\$ 6,707,521.75	Wireless Service Providers 10% of the fund \$913,854.86	\$ (127,723.89)
Interest	\$ 41,002.64	Network Costs (TCS, ICN)	\$ (613,689.12)
Misc Reimbursement	\$ 3,062.64		
Prepaid Card Revenue	\$ 510,905.28	PSAP Funding 46% of Total Surcharge	\$ (3,320,476.43)
Total Revenue	\$ 7,262,492.31	Total Expenditures	\$ (4,252,323.44)
Total Surcharge (excluding interest)	\$ 7,218,427.03		
HSEMD Funding (yearly)	\$		
Amount transferred to Operating Surplus			\$ 3,010,168.87

Operating Surplus Summary		
Previous Quarter Total Funds in Operating Surplus		\$ 20,948,996.98
SFY 16 Operating Surplus Revenue from previous quarter	\$ 9,136,559.94	
SFY 16 YTD Operating Surplus Revenue	\$ 12,146,728.81	
Quarterly Operating Surplus Expenditures		\$ (7,683,135.95)
SFY 16 YTD Total Grants Approved		\$ (11,096,138.82)
SFY 16 YTD Grants Paid	\$ (11,096,138.82)	
Y 16 YTD Total Grants Obligated (not yet paid)		
Total Funds In Operating Surplus (Current Quarter)		\$ 16,276,029.90
Total Unobligated Funds in Operating Surplus		\$ 8,476,029.90

Future/Ongoing NG911 Projects			
(Multi-year projects)	Projected	Obligated / Encumbered	Expended
Catastrophic Network Failure	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$	\$
Network Capacity Increase	\$ 2,175,000.00	\$ 643,492.00	\$ 776,808.55
NG911 GIS Project	\$ 8,275,000.00	\$ 7,298,434.00	\$ 976,566.00
NG911 Statewide Imagery Service	\$ 1,300,000.00	\$ 936,114.28	\$ 363,885.72
Data Center Upgrades	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 200,000.00
Travel/Public Education	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 3,693.59
LMR Radio	\$ 8,300,000.00	\$ 4,300,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00
Totals	\$ 19,860,000.00	\$ 13,188,040.28	\$ 6,320,953.86

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

Other handouts – Two maps. One showing the 2016 Traditional Carryover Grant – Amount Expended (\$10,096,516.20 or 89 percent of the statewide maximum) and 2016 GIS Grant – Amount Expended (\$999,622.62 or 61 percent of the statewide maximum).

T911 Deployment – Total PSAPs – This was a follow up from the last meeting regarding the FCC register of the text-to-911 deployment for the nation. Also the PSAPs across the nation that have text-to-911 direct IP deployment. Some corrections to the FCC handout were noted by Mr. DeRouchey.

Statewide Imagery Project – This imagery will be sharable through all the PSAPs, all levels of government, schools, DNR whoever needs it. The flights occurred back in the spring with the eastern portion of the state being completed. This imagery will be available around November or December. The remainder of the state will be flown next spring. If there is any imagery that is not quality, they have five years to capture the full statewide dataset. Depending on how well it is received, how well it is used we will continue to update that imagery.

We have some tentative dates for meetings regarding the consolidation study. Probably at the end of September for meetings in eastern and western Iowa. Probably a Tuesday and Thursday. Maybe the 27th and the 29th. We want to cast a wide net. We need a broad audience. Telco, vendors, sheriffs police chiefs, telecommunicators, etc. We will also look to have specific meetings with telcos, wireless providers. We will also have some meetings in the Des Moines as well. (Late September/early October). Prior to those meetings look for a survey to come out to get a baseline of how we feel about consolidation.

Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

Chair Ray – We have four applications for the E-911 Intent to Consolidate grant.

Black Hawk County – Virtual consolidation efforts with the City of Cedar Rapids. Microwave connectivity and sharing console technology. Grant request of \$200,000.

Jasper County – Virtual consolidation efforts with the Polk County Sheriff's Office to use and expand their 7/800 MHz P25 radio system. Grant request of \$200,000.

Marion County – Virtual consolidation efforts to use the State of Iowa 700 MHz P25 radio system. Purchase new console with 700 MHz P25 wireless connectivity, multi-band mobiles and portables for interoperability communication on the State's shared network and to maintain existing legacy communications with VHF partner agencies. Grant request of \$200,000.

Woodbury County – Virtual consolidation efforts to use the Iowa Statewide Radio System. Upgrade the current Starcomm (Siouxland Tri-State Area Radio Communications) Motorola P25 800 MHz system from FDMA (frequency division multiple access) to TDMA (time division multiple access) to allow the Iowa Statewide Radio System to have their communications hardware on the Starcomm towers. Grant request of \$200,000.

Motion by Rob Dehnert to recommend to the E911 Program Manager approval of the four submitted consolidation grant applications contingent on the adoption of the proposed administrative rules. Motion died for the lack of a second to the motion.

Chair Ray asked for any discussion.

Mr. Seivert - The vote, if today, would have been no from the Emergency Managers the vote. The reason for that is yesterday's meeting generated a lot of discussion about the grants and the potential of setting a precedence. Consolidation was never adequately defined by the legislature. It is still undefined by the proposed administrative rules. The action that we would take today doesn't have to be taken today. We can defer it for a couple of weeks. We can have a special meeting. Give us some time to go back to our individual associations to present the information and discussions. When we come back and vote on these applications we know exactly what we are doing. We don't want to set those precedents that will be looked at and moved forward with the limited amount of information we have on consolidation. The two that really concern me are the purchase of mobiles and portables to facilitate connection to the LMR

system. In my opinion we have enhanced our operational capability by doing that but is that what you really consider consolidation. At the same time we do that, we have opened the door for our larger counties to match the grant to move forward with the purchase of that equipment and at the same time that pool of money that is partially meant for equally distribution back to the PSAP becomes significantly reduced. The four applications we have in front of us today is \$800,000 which equals approximately 20 percent of the \$4.4 million that is available. Resulting in approximately a 20 percent reduction in the amount of funds available. At the same time we are helping out some counties, our smaller counties need do to the same thing that our larger counties...are now at a greater disadvantage. That's the emergency manager's position today. If we had a special meeting in two weeks it may be different but at this time this is where we stand.

Mr. Koppert – I also feel the same as Bob does. After the meeting yesterday I did an email poll of the entire officers of NENA. I only heard back from one. So I don't feel comfortable in making any kind of vote today. If it did come up to a vote today, Iowa NENA would vote no. Once I have a chance to confer with my officers that could change. I would like to see this deferred two weeks out at a special meeting to consider the grants.

Mr. Bryant – Yesterday there was a lot of discussion. I spent a lot of time on the phone with my association. The virtual consolidation concept compared to the physical. My county, Story County, currently shares between the sheriff's office and the City of Ames. Since they already do it would they still qualify for this process?

Mr. DeRouchey – The way we wrote the application guidance/instructions, there is no grandfather clause. If there is a need to make that more robust, if there are new non-recurring costs, I would take a look at that as program manager.

Mr. Bryant – I'm here representing my organization. Most of those folks are in larger communities, larger counties and population. I also struggle between the "biggs" and "littles." The possibility exists with 22 applications. That would be potentially 44 PSAPs. Whether we take 22 times \$200,000 or 44 times \$100,000 and may be \$38,000 is more important to the smaller areas. If you take 22 or 44 the smaller ones come up zero. My goal is to make it like it is on TV. I don't want to sacrifice operability or interoperability. If we vote today I would vote no. I'm in favor of the delaying of this, not forever. I want it to be a longer process so I can gather as much information to make the best decision. As Blake mentioned yesterday, the message from the governor's office is to make sure that we were consistent. We can be consistent but is it really a fair system. What are you going to do if five applications show up and it is number 20 and 26 on the same day. If we are doing it by first come first serve, how do you determine....How do decide when there are five openings left and 10 applications come in on the same day? Is it the order how we open the envelopes or do we draw them out of a hat. There's a system that would work – first come first serve – but it's not without potentially some flaws also.

Mr. DeRouchey – I have a couple of questions with what has been said today. Is it the opinion of the council that we should not approve any grants? Because that's kind of what I am hearing. If a grant was before us today and it was a picture perfect physical consolidation, what's the argument? Is the argument still big county-small county, we want more to pass through, or is the argument here really on radios that's kind of undefined? So the way I read the code, we have a grant program to administer. Whether we like it or not it's the first priority. So it's really coming down to the radios. I agree that's a hard topic to craft. Some of the conversation concerns me. It sounds like we're not wanting to do a grant program and we don't have that option.

Mr. Seivert – I kind of agree with what you said but we're not trying to defer the grant program or say that it's not valuable. I think the wording of the consolidation needs to be more defined. We didn't have any idea that these applications were coming in the type of grants we were getting. I think taking a little bit of time. Mike made a good point. What if we get 40 applications? And if we just go on a "first-come first-served" that 39th application may have been between Shelby and Cass County and we want to become Shelby County/Cass County joint. What would be done then? Maybe the thing we should look at is setting a deadline for the applications to come in and ranking the applications so that true consolidation would be given a higher priority than simply purchasing radios. The purchasing of the radio. The legislators want us to consolidate and then they leave it open for us to define that consolidation. If we approve the two

applications for the radios, after those funds are spent, there's still going to be the same number of PSAPs in this state. There's still going to be the same number of radios in this state. So how have we reduced anything or how have we consolidated. That's what needs to be answered.

Mr. Koppert – I see both sides of this. I'm torn between the issues. I understand both sides of the issues. I think we need to contact Representative Worthan and Senator Danielson and see exactly what their intent was. Representative Worthan said to ask the council. The council doesn't know what's in the mind of the legislature. We can try to guess. There are a lot of things that are cut and dry and easy to figure but it seems that everybody is having issues with the radios.

Chair Ray – I don't think it makes any difference because what's written in the code is what's there. For me what their intent is makes no difference now until it's changed by the legislature.

Mr. Bryant – It is difficult for me because I don't want to alienate Representative Worthan, who I have a lot of respect for. We discussed this yesterday. The physical versus the virtual. While I don't know what's in the legislator's minds and we don't have the luxury of them being here and this isn't against John Benson helping to define the physical/virtual thing but I never heard anything about the virtual when I had meetings with those folks. It was about reducing the number of PSAPs. As I mentioned yesterday part of the problem of this is the legislation was passed in the midnight hour in a hurry. This should be so easy to read that a layperson could read it and know what to do. We have all of these convoluted pieces in 34A that don't build a complete puzzle anymore. It's hard to work within the code that is set out in front of us. What I have learned from the legislators, if they don't understand something or it gets too complex, they shut down. I don't think we are doing anything different and I don't think we are backing out of our responsibility but they have put us in a real hard spot.

Mr. Dehnert – Yesterday we had a workshop. The reason it sold it for me and I made the motion to approve these consolidation grant applications was the sentence after the "or" that talks about utilizing shared services technology to combine public safety answering point systems, including but not limited to 9-1-1 call-processing equipment, computer-aided dispatch, mapping, radio and logging recorders. I absolutely agree that this consolidation word seems to conjure up ideas of taking PSAP A and PSAP B and creating PSAP C and it now covers all of the A and B area. I get that and I don't disagree with that but this second half of this that talks specifically about systems, call processing equipment, technology that's what these four applications are. They're making that step forward. Maybe at some point down the road that will be physical consolidation. I really apologize to Woodbury, Jasper, Marion, and Black Hawk. I think we are failing you. I think there is this deadline of December and you have an opportunity to do some things. Shame on us. Now we're putting delays on this that you're not going to be able to get that done.

Mr. Sedivy – I just wanted to clarify our application has nothing to do with purchasing end user radios. We've budgeted over \$2 million to hopefully purchase radios next summer and capital improvements. Our application was to bring Starcomm 800 MHz P25 trunked system to the same platform as the ISICS system. Coming from FDMA technology to TDMA technology which creates our five working channels to 10 working channels. We had a meeting with Motorola yesterday and we will be connecting our Starcomm to the state ISICS system by the end of the year. Since day one we have allowed every law enforcement officer whether it was local, state, federal that was stationed in our county if their agency didn't purchase radios, we purchased them for them. So every Iowa State Patrolman, every DNR, DOT enforcement officers carried handhels that we provided. We know as the state infrastructure continues to grow that it is going to task our infrastructure without being able to convert to TDMA technology so that is what our application is for. We have everybody from the 185th Air Force that has radios on our system. We have control stations in Plymouth County, Monona County. The Nebraska side, we have Nebraska DNR, Nebraska State Patrol. We just want to get our infrastructure upgraded so that we can handle the activity.

Mr. Seivert – Glen, how much money are you talking about?

Mr. Sedivy – \$598,000.

Mr. Seivert – So the \$200,000 would make your investment \$398,000. The reason I ask that is that I see that in all four applications. The amount of the investment on the local part seems to be more than what is available and I think we need to be aware of that as well.

Mr. Brooks – Is the board considering, for these folks that are trying to do consolidation, proving that they are really saving money? If they didn't do this, what is it going to cost the taxpayers? It seems that this consolidation hasn't been defined. Someone mentioned it's not fair. I don't think these grants in the past have been fair. I don't know how it is going to be fair doing forward. But if a PSAP can prove their _____ whether it's financial or improved efficiencies. Some of these grants should be approved. Are they just limited one time? Can you do one for CAD, for radio, for CPE? It just doesn't seem to be defined. You're in the middle of a consolidation study that hasn't been complete yet. If these four applications prove that they are saving money, then they should be approved. In my opinion.

Sheriff Rotter – Just starting off...the original motion to approve, I didn't provide a second because I knew there was going to be discussion that needed to take place and I am glad it did. What I see here is a poorly constructed section of the Iowa code. What I see is we are the judge here that has to interpret this code and there is nothing more annoying to me than seeing legislation from the bench. I think what we are trying to do is fix a poorly constructed code and we don't have the authority to do that. We can talk about it a long time but we will never be able to fix that poorly constructed code. As I look at 34A and I look at these applications, I don't see anything that says we shouldn't approve those. My point is, I'm not against having further meetings but I don't see that we are going to be able to accomplish what a lot of people on this board want to accomplish and that is fixing this code section. We are stuck with what we have and we do have to administer this grant program and hopefully as we do that the legislature will fix this code but it's not going to happen now, not with the deadlines that we have and I don't see a point in delaying these projects in an effort to fix something that we cannot fix.

Mr. Pion – I would like to briefly review the document that Jasper County's application and why some of the discussion of mobile and portable radios. Jasper County has clearly identified \$251,000 for P25 site equipment. They're asking for \$200,000. Clearly \$200,000 goes to the site purchase and has nothing to do with mobile and portable concerns. So please keep that in mind. There has been a lot of discussion of at a physical address and joining PSAPs together. Polk County is working with all of our regional partners on ways to save money for our folks. Provide backup services. Be able to partner together and it's not moving one address to another. It is systems. There may be some hang up on the radios in relation to operability and interoperability. I know that's a bone of contention. Jasper County's grant, to work with us an expanded system, doesn't have anything to do with mobiles or portables. They are asking for P25 site equipment. That doesn't have anything to do with those other concerns. I think the intent is clear that the systems are supported under the code and I would request that there be a second to move on this for Jasper and Polk County and then we can look forward to future endeavors that Polk County is interested in with all of our local partners. Whether they're adjoining counties or those folks to the east that also have the Racom system that we are looking at and talking at ways to try and expand our capabilities as our folks travel the state. I just encourage you to not get hung up on the equipment in the cars and radios on the hips. This really is for systems.

Mr. Bryant – To show you how I wrestle with this, I have a side of me that is very clear: pass it. Let's get money to 22 or 44 places that maybe the other 70 people that get zero will get really excited and get a hold of their legislators and get involved in the process. What avenue do I go to, to accomplish the best for the all? I agree with the sheriff. It may take more than one session for the legislation to change/fix the code. I respect John (Benson) and he is on the hill a lot more than I am and I would like to hear John's thoughts.

Mr. Benson – What was the legislative intent? If you were to call Representative Worthan and ask him what his intent was on consolidation, his answer to you will be that he wants the council to define what consolidation should be at least in terms of this grant. Please keep in mind that the way that legislation was written, it is a one year process. They will be looking for input from the 9-1-1 committee as a whole of what that should look like when they come back in January. That will piggyback with the consolidation study that is due on January 15 which you guys will help to develop. We recognized we were going to have some type of problem on the back end of this when it came to consolidation. When the conversation first started it was strictly physical consolidation. To which my guidance to them was there might be one

place in the state that might happen and that's it. You are not going to make any headway on what your goal is. Which, technology does allow you to do some things. One of the things we have to look at is the strict instructions view of what that law says, what Chapter 34A says. Even though it is poorly written it talks about the consolidation of two or more PSAPs coming together and I'm going to talk about the shared services. Coming together to do shared services. I haven't looked at the applications that you have in front of you so I can't provide comment on those. You do have some options before you since this is a one year program. We will be coming back to this very same issue again next year talking about doing rules again. There is a desire inside the community to get it correctly defined this time. I don't know if we can get there. The language you have in front of you, I think you recognize it's not a simple fix. So we will have to work on that and I know the legislature will expect this body to provide information to them about what it should look like going forward. If you do not satisfy that need out of the legislature, that's your problem. That will not be our agency. That will be your problem as a council. There is an expectation that you will bring forward some ideas on how to make this thing work right. They will be leaning heavily upon all of you that sit on this council. I don't know what the answers are at this point. As I look at the language and I discuss this with Blake more and more, I can argue that you should fund all of the radio stuff. I can also argue that you shouldn't fund any of it. I enjoy the statement of fairness. There's always been a hint of socialism inside the 9-1-1 system. When we first rolled out wireless, it was that way too. Our responsibility as an agency is to get it deployed across the entire state. Does that mean we have to make some unfair decisions? Yes. We are kind of in that same position again. Does that mean it is going to be equitable and fair? I can't stand here and say that it is going to be. But we have to figure out how to do it and you are the experts in the community. You are our ultimate sounding board. Which I think is unique in state government. Since 1990, I think we have only gone against the council once or twice. We recognize there is some pretty questionable language. Process-wise, we weren't able to get on the agenda with the administrative rules committee to get the emergency rule adopted and in hindsight I'm actually glad now based on the discussions that you have been having. They will meet on 13th so we will have the ability to make changes to that rule up to September 12. We will go through the meeting on the 13th. I am assuming we will get their approval to do it. We will then be able to start sending money out. I just want to stress to please keep in mind this is a one-year deal we are talking about. They did that very intentionally.

Mr. Kaus – I guess my hang up is the \$4.4 million. That leaves \$8.4 million unaccounted for. We can't touch. To me that's wrong. It's our money to start with. Say this consolidation goes for 22 PSAPs and we use all \$4.4 million and we get a couple more, we've defeated the process of what consolidation is supposed to do. If we had access to the \$8.4 million, we could grant them that money. Consolidation as far as technology it's going to come. It's probably not going to save a bunch of money that everybody expects. It will make for a more efficient 9-1-1 system. But there again that money was collected specifically for 9-1-1 services and that's part of the 9-1-1 services.

Mr. Benson – The cap of \$4.4 million was a very conscious calculated effort by the legislator to create this situation that you are speaking of. There is money in that fund and there will be money in that fund come July 1. There will be \$8.4 million plus a little interest. That is the number they wanted in there. Do most people understand why they wanted that money there? The reason why they want that money there, they want another possibility of a parachute for the LMR system. Similar to what they did in year one and year two. In talking with the legislators over the course of this session, do they want to come back to the 9-1-1 fund to pay for the state LMR back bone again? Partially incorrect. They would prefer to do it out of another funding source. As the session progressed and how the budget came together and the funds from other resources evaporated, they came back. Their intent is to find another method of paying for it but they want to have a parachute on the back end if something bad happens. Our department, our point with the money sitting there is similar to what Dave is talking about. Those monies are designated for 9-1-1 and if we are going to talk about consolidation efforts, typically that is going to take some capital up front. Specifically we are talking about pulling the wireline network into the wireless network. There are going to have to be some capital things that are going to have to happen. We have a funding source to do that. We don't have to go back to the legislature to ask for additional funds. That's what we would prefer to see that money used for. We have been having that discussion with the governor's office since the close of the legislative session. We do have a plan. We do have a funding source. Let us do our job. That's what our department's marching orders are going to be as we work with the governor's office on a budget.

Mr. Kaus – If they decide to fund the LMR system that takes what the money can be used for out of the equation. To go back and ask for an increase in the amount of surcharge collected is going to be kind of hard to pass. My hang up is still – let's use it for 9-1-1 and hopefully we can tell the legislature and we will spend it in the way it is intended to be spent.

Mr. Dehnert – I make a motion to recommend to the E-911 Program Manager to disburse the remaining and existing funds from operating surplus equally to each PSAP for the following costs:

- a. Costs related to the receipt and disposition of 9-1-1 calls, including hardware and software for an internet protocol-enabled next generation 9-1-1 network as specified in the Wireless NG911 Implementation and Operations Plan
- b. Local costs related to access the statewide interoperable communications system as defined in Code of Iowa 29C.23."

Motion was seconded by Bob Seivert.

Mr. Koppert – Which money is this for?

Mr. Dehnert – This is the \$8.4 million carryover money?

Chair Ray called for the vote. All Ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Bryant – With what Mr. Benson has told us I would suggest two things. 1) As quick as we can we need to decide if there is anything we want to change in the administrative rules. 2) We need to decide whether the council or a special committee needs to be formed to prepare for the next legislative session. We need to figure out how to coordinate and build this effort to get our associations, our legislators, our lobbyist informed of how we accomplish the best possible outcome for the next session. Fix as much as we can to get as much as we want. We need a consolidated effort to get that done.

Mr. Dehnert – Is anyone interested in trying this again individually?

Mr. Koppert – I think that was part of the issue actually. I think they should be approved individually and on their own merit.

Mr. Dehnert – Alright let's do it alphabetically.

Mr. Griffith – Rob?

Mr. Dehnert – Yes?

Mr. Griffith – One of the things I'm looking at is I try to interpret the legislation the best I can. I think the intent, from what I hear from Mr. Benson, we can sit on this and delay this. People have projects. I would just like to reinstitute what you said in your motion and pass the four of them. Get something done today for those people so they can get going. We can revisit legislation. We can revise it. We can act like legislators later if we want to and try to rewrite some policy. Not everyone is going to be happy. My motion right now would be to redo your motion to pass the four. The content of Mr. Dehnert's motion follows:

To recommend to the E-911 Program Manager approval of the four submitted consolidation grant applications contingent on the adoption of the proposed administrative rules.

The motion was seconded by Rob Dehnert.

Discussion:

Mr. Seivert – I thought we were going down the path of approving them one at a time.

Chair Ray – Well this is what he brought up.

Mr. Dehnert – I was asking if people were interested in that. George then wanted to say something and I was going to make a motion. So there is a motion and a second.

Mr. Seivert – So the motion is essentially what you originally made?

Mr. Griffith – That's the way I am looking at it, yes.

Mr. Seivert – Mr. Chair, could I ask for a roll-call vote please?

Ayes: Robert Rotter, George Griffith, Tom Berger, Steven Ray, Rob Dehnert, Jack DeAngelo, Dan Halterman, Dave Kaus, and Sally Hall. Nays: Rob Koppert, Mike Bryant, and Bob Seivert.

Chair Ray declared the motion as passed and all four of the applications are approved.

Mr. Brennan – Rob appreciate the motion you made regarding the \$8.4 million and making that available to all of the PSAPs. Conceptually, I agree with that and support that. You identified it could be for two things. One was for NextGen911 and the second was for participation in the LMR system. If you are defining and choosing the way for locals to share radio technology is and only is to join the state system, I think then you are alienating a lot of local regional efforts for people to consolidate those. That's something I would ask you to reconsider. Polk has some initiatives going on. Cedar Rapids, Linn County and Iowa City have regional efforts going on. And frankly there are probably a large number of smaller counties that sharing VFH conventional systems might be a way to accomplish the same objectives. Rather than try to choose and dictate that the way and the only way this board and the State is going to support is if you join their network.

Mr. Sedivy – I just want to thank you for consideration of our grant application.

Mr. Bryant – I have a question regarding the motion and contingent of the approval of the administrative rules being passed.

Mr. Griffith – My motion was to redo Rob's motion.

Mr. Bryant – So what happens if the language changes between now and September 13 that would not be in line with today?

Chair Ray – What was passed today was passed in good faith.

Mr. Bryant – I am asking for my understanding and the four applicants because something could change in the administrative rules that would void the applications. Not be in alignment with – if something happens before September 13.

Sheriff Rotter – Mr. Chair, what we are waiting on is the disbursement of the money can't go out the door until the administrative rules are adopted. The chances of the rules interfering with the grant are minimal.

Chair Ray – The letter that I drafted on behalf of the council is to support what is already reflected in there which at this point in time would not preclude any of these applications just approved. I don't see there is going to be an issue there at all.

Mr. Sedivy – It is Woodbury's intent they are going to move forward because of the discounts we can get from Motorola. I just to make sure that once the rules are approved in September that we are not going to be rejected because we sign a contract prior to that date.

Chair Ray – I'm not concerned about that unless you are.

Mr. DeRouchey – I'm not concerned about that.

Mr. Sedivy – Because it is a \$90,000+ discount.

Chair Ray – It is the chair’s opinion the grants were approved. Our approval of the grants, it’s just an approval. The program manager and the director have the final say.

Mr. Sedivy – I just don’t want a date and signature throwing up a red flag.

Mr. Seivert – A question for John: The fiscal notes dated April 19, 2016. The carryover amount at the end of FY2017 is \$5.4 million and then it is brought forward into FY2018 total revenue. Am I correct that the total amount that goes to the PSAP is based on revenue and not what’s brought forward? Then you look at the grant amount legislative or available. FY2017 we are at \$4.4 million. FY2018 it’s \$6.5 million. Moving forward it really should have probably been \$4.4 million because that’s the way it exists. If it remains that \$4.4 million is the cap and the amount coming back to the PSAP fixed. Where’s the rest of that money going to go? Is it going to contribute to that \$8.4 million or this that going to go in to the pot of the total project operating surplus?

Mr. Benson – What Bob is referring to during the legislative session where that dollar figure comes from is when you look at the revenue stream which we anticipate at \$28 million and then you look at the expense we have to operate the network, the 60 percent increase for the pass through to the PSAP. You take all of your expenses versus your revenue to get to that \$28 million figure. You are left with about \$4.4 million. Are we going to be generating precisely \$28 million in a year, yes, no, maybe? That dollar figure actually came from Senator Danielson whose intent was that he would spend between 99 percent and 99.5 percent revenue received within the fiscal year. So essentially what he is doing is for this year only. That’s why I stress this is a one-year deal. So when you put all of your expenses plus that \$4.4 million that ends up to about 99 percent of the revenues received inside the fiscal year. Monies received that are in the account prior to that it does not account for those. It doesn’t have us spending those monies that are sitting there. That gets back to the theory that we had before. We ended the year on June 30. There is a dollar figure in the carryover fund. June 30 of this year we are in right now, it will roughly be the same dollar figure in the carryover fund because of the revenue generated this year will be expended out the door.

Mr. Seivert – Not as much as how it got there but it seems to me that were are losing \$2+ million.

Mr. Benson – Anything beyond that will go into the larger carryover. That money is not going to disappear. We just can’t go spend it willy-nilly. We have plainly described instructions in the Code of Iowa right now on how we spend that money.

Mr. Seivert – While the cap this year was set at \$4.4 million. Will the legislators be voting on that cap every year based on clearing out to 99 percent?

Mr. Benson – Could they? Yes. Do I think they should do it that way? Absolutely not. The year-to-year process is a disaster and it is a pain to administer that way. This fiscal year is the stop-gap to get some of these larger questions put on the table. Primary long term funding of the LMR system and consolidation within the 9-1-1 system. We would prefer that we come out of this next legislative session with a long-term solution not a year-to-year solution – so this process can move forward without a dark cloud hanging over everybody of, “how are we going to pay for everything?”

Chair Ray – One last request here for those that are questionable representing those organizations, please get that worked out with them before we get back here in September. We have four more months left for applications and right now how the law is written and what is going to be presented and hopefully adopted by the Administrative Rules Committee at this point in time doesn’t preclude anything that was already applied for. If we don’t make these decisions on how this money is going to be spent, it will be made for us.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

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

None

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

Mr. Allen – 1. Board is working on FirstNet. We have a program called Wise Schools that was just rolled out. The three communities involved are Norwalk, Martindale and Marshalltown. We are trying to replicate how we perceive how FirstNet will work doing it at high schools. The purpose of that is, police, fire and EMS and roll up and upload and download at extraordinary high speeds. This is a pilot test. We are excited that Iowa is out in the front on this testing.

2. LMR System – There will be a detailed designed review on October 11 and 12.

3. Training – There is a thing through DHS called Technical Assistance. Each state is afforded five opportunities. We are fortunate that Denise Pavlik from Scott County has agreed to chair the Training committee since the retirement of Tom Boeckman. Captain Walser has agreed to be the vice chair. A lot of the money coming out of Homeland Security is IT, security, NG911 driven. One of the grants we got last year dealt with NG911. To be clear, interoperability is not trying to get in the 9-1-1 lane but that's where the money comes from. We look to be having that training sometime in September.

We have a couple of new board members. Public Health has appointed Randy Smith to replace Tom Boeckman. Chief Dave Lorensen from the DOT will replace Bob Younie.

We are the interoperability board but you can't talk about interoperability if you don't have operability.

Chair Ray – I will say on that WISE as it expands one of the byproducts of that is a benefit of public safety presence at our schools.

Items for Discussion

Mr. Koppert – With regard to the outreach program, I will be meeting with someone from the CIO with regards to a website for the 9-1-1 Council and in general for 9-1-1 in Iowa. We have the streaming that is going on right now and the conference bridge. We have a YouTube channel for the Iowa E-911 Communications Council. Recordings of these meetings and training meetings can be uploaded into that channel for viewing for the 9-1-1 community. With regards to this room there is one item of need – additional microphones. I would like work with the City of West Des Moines to see what it would take to augment their system.

Mr. Dehnert – The ISICS board has also asked the city if there was anything additional they needed in the room. It was about a \$500,000 upgrade. I don't think West Des Moines IT has provided anything to you (Mr. Allen), correct? I would recommend waiting until we hear from the IT department what specifically could be added to enhance the board and council's experience in here.

Mr. Koppert – Do we want to look at some kind of remuneration for the personnel that West Des Moines provides?

Chair Ray – Rob, you will keep us posted?

Bylaws

Ms. Hall – Copies of the proposed amendment to the council's bylaws was presented to the members at yesterday's meeting. The amendment is adding the means for electronic meetings. If you have any input or comments please let me know. This will be put on the September agenda for final approval.

Chair Ray – If you have any comments or suggested changes contact Sally directly.

Mr. Seivert – With all of the discussion today, I think the Council needs to meet before September 8 to work on the definition of consolidation.

Mr. Dehnert – Wasn't that the workshop yesterday?

Chair Ray – The only thing that I want to clarify is the way the rules are now and how they are going to be submitted is what I reaffirmed in the letter to them that their chair and vice chair have already received. So I guess now you're saying regardless of the letter we still want to get together and say more changes.

Mr. Seivert – Absolutely. If we continue to approve the applications that come in without further definition, what have we done here? That was the purpose of yesterday’s meeting, but did we come to any conclusions? No. Further, we pretty well muddied up the water even more.

Mr. Koppert – With response to that Bob, I agree with you on that, however I don’t know if it is a valid point anymore. We have voted and we have set precedence. I don’t know if defining consolidation means anything anymore.

Chair Ray – I know where you are going Bob, but at this point in time my recommendation would be that we move forward with what we are doing, approving how we believe it is ok to be approved, and if there is an issue that still needs to be addressed I think that’s for the next session. But if there is an overwhelming desire from the council to have a meeting before the next regular meeting we can have one before September 8.

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

None

Announcements

The next meeting will be on Thursday, Sept. 8, 2016, at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

Motion by Rob Dehnert, seconded by Rob Koppert to adjourn. All ayes. Motion passed. 10:39 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary