

**Iowa E-911 Communications Council Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, Sept. 8, 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.

**Roll Call**

	Representative	Attendance
Iowa Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) <b>Secretary</b>	Sally Hall	Present
alternate	Cara Sorrells	
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Rob Koppert	Present
alternate	Kirk Hundertmark	
Iowa State Sheriffs & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	Robert Rotter	Present
alternate	Dean Kruger	Present
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	
alternate	Tom Berger	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA)		
<b>Vice-Chairperson</b>	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS)		
<b>Chairperson</b>	Steven P. Ray	Present
alternate	Adam Buck	
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Rob Dehnert	Present
alternate	Paul Andorf	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	Jack DeAngelo	Present
alternate	Pat Snyder	
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	Dan Halterman	Present
alternate	Wayne Johnson	Excused
Cellular Providers	Steve Zimmer	Absent
alternate	Bill Tortoriello	Excused
PCS Providers	David Kaus	Present
alternate	Joe Sargent	
Auditor of the State, Ex-Officio member	Bernardo Granwehr	Absent

**Staff:**

Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager Present

**Guests:**

Diane Sefrit, SCI	Brian Magdwell, Westcom
Tammy Rodriguez, ICN	Micheal Lauer, LCN
Bob Kordick, Comtech	Greg Brooks, West Safety Services
Crystal Koehn, CenturyLink	Tracey L. Bearden, Polk County EMA
Staci Griffin, Louisa County EMA	Josh Humphrey, Iowa County EMA
Jamey Robinson, Mahaska County EMA/911	Marcia Slycord, Pella Police Department
Jeff Anderson, Marion County EMA/911	Duane Vos, RACOM
Larry Oliver, Harrison County EMA/911	Andy Buffington, Hancock County EMA

**Guest present by teleconference:**

Brenda Vande Voorde, Fayette County E911

**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 Aug. 10, 2016, special meeting and Aug. 11, 2016, regular meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **Approve the Agenda**

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by George Griffith to approve the agenda. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)**

#### **911 Program Financial Reports**

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

#### **Program Update/NexGen 911 Update**

Mr. DeRouchey – The Administrative Rules Committee meeting is scheduled for Sept. 13, 2016 at 11:40 a.m. in Room 116 at the State Capitol. It could be anytime between 11 a.m. and Noon.

Mr. DeRouchey – The Consolidation workshops will be held on Sept. 27 in Sioux City, Sept. 29 in Cedar Rapids. There will be two sessions on Oct. 7 at Joint Forces Headquarters in the State EOC – one session in the morning and one in the afternoon. The afternoon session will be targeted primarily toward vendors. Oct. 24 will be at the Ramada Tropics in the morning. This is the day before the APCO/NENA Conference. Also on the afternoon of Oct. 24 at the Ramada Tropics will be the 9-1-1 program update. The agenda is forthcoming. The registration link will be sent out tomorrow. Part of the registration progress will be asking for any topics that you would like to discuss.

Mr. DeRouchey – The text-to-911 connectivity challenges between the ComTech network and the various CPE vendors. We have talked about in the past that we were going to pay for the 13 ESInet secondary sites being that we caused those sites to be a little different. We have received pushback on that. We continue to have ongoing discussions on what is the right way to pay for that or to make it right. We have decided that we will pay for that service statewide. We have gone out for RFP through Department of Administrative Services (DAS). That is on their website right now. Basically we want to see what the price is going to be from the CPE vendors with their customers site by site. I can't say too much about it since that is open right now. The RFP will close the week of Sept. 21.

Mr. DeRouchey – At one of the regional PSAP meetings, there was a decision from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) at the federal level to not classify dispatchers into a different personnel class. NASNA has written an appeal to OMB to try and get them to reconsider that. I have the letter and if any of you or your organizations want to use that as a template I will forward that to you.

Mr. DeRouchey – Also, brought up at one of the regional PSAP meetings was the different ways to promote 9-1-1. We have a budget that the legislature has given us the last couple of years for public education. We have looked into coordinating with the Chief Information Officer (CIO) of the state to have a website. Shawn (Wagner) is putting together some videos for the ISICS Board and he brought up that he could also do that for the 9-1-1. This could help paint the picture of what telecommunicators do in centers and especially when text-to-911 becomes more prevalent to be able to show those short two minutes videos and have them available online – on YouTube, shared on Facebook, etc.

Mr. Wagner – A printed sample of the ISICS Board's new website was distributed. This website is built specifically for boards. Uploading meeting minutes, making sure that your agendas are posted, taking care of policy stuff, members, all that is built into this. It is built so non-IT persons can do it. It is a very easy solution. It should be a very easy build depending on what template your council decides to go with. We will be posting the COML video later this week.

Mr. DeRouchey – I passed out the financials last month. Just to update everyone there was another \$4.3 million allocated to Public Safety for the lease payment for the build out of the State LMR. This has been moved over to the DPS.

Mr. Dehnert – Has there been any update or move on the motion from last month's meeting about disbursing the existing funds from the operating surplus to each PSAP?

Mr. DeRouchey – We are not legally able to do that. If you would like a formal letter, I'm sure we can do that.

Mr. Dehnert – I wonder if we shouldn't have something since we made the recommendation to the program manager that this would be a return communication.

Chair Ray – Could you write a letter? I assume that would be through your department attorney.

Mr. DeRouche – No problem.

Mr. Koppert – I did have a question from another communication center director regarding the consolidation grants and the reimbursement or how the payments were going to be made. For example, if they have a \$500,000 project of course they would be eligible for \$200,000 of that, if they have to outlay the entire \$500,000 and then get a reimbursement for \$200,000 or do they just have to outlay the \$300,000 and then send an invoice to the state for the other \$200,000.

Mr. DeRouche – We are only able to reimbursement county service boards. We need invoice that shows that we are paying half. If the invoice is for \$300,000 we will pay half of that (\$150,000). An invoice for \$400,000 or more would be \$200,000.

Mr. Bryant – There is approximately \$3.4 million in grant applications today with about \$1 million remaining on a first-come, first-served basis. If 10 applications show up tomorrow, what are you going to do?

Mr. DeRouche – We have an internal GA/QC process that we go through when we get an application. Once a grant comes in and it passes through that so it's filled out correctly and accurately, that's when it will be put in the pile for approval. If someone sends in an application and it is totally messed up, it's totally wrong, that doesn't go in the pile yet. You just can't hurry up and put an application together. It needs to be done correctly from our point of view to be put in the pile for approval next month. Once we pass the threshold of what is left (approximately \$1.1 million) as we continue to receive applications throughout the month, we will be sure to let the county or the PSAP know they are on a separate stack right now if something falls through or something is not approved we will pull from the top of that separate stack. I received a number of phone calls/emails regarding the first-come, first-served. Again our message is that it has always been that way. It's always subject to funds available and it's always based on the order that we get done/approved by us. The \$4.4 million puts a little bit more urgency on it.

Mr. Bryant – Assuming there are no legislative changes meaning it is as is for next year. What happens when in July next year you get 40 applications? Or for the remaining money this year? Is it how you pick them up off the pile? That's potentially going to happen on any given day.

Mr. DeRouche – We rarely get any applications in the mail but yes it is possible. Most are by email. If everything stays the same and there is another cap. Whatever that dollar amount is and we get more applications than the cap. There were things we talked about during the special session. I like the competitive grant perspective. As a council, we're able to choose which ones meet the criteria. This would have been difficult to do this and change midstream during the grant cycle this year. But there is nothing set in stone saying that we can't do that.

Mr. Brooks – Blake, has the criteria been established? Last month you said you didn't have it you put it on the board to establish those criteria for consolidation.

Mr. DeRouche – A lot of the criteria was written legislatively. I'd say the nuance of what is being applied for was established by those approved.

Mr. Brooks – Last month we were here and the board didn't approve any of those grants.

Mr. DeRouche – We approved all of them.

Mr. Brooks – Initially. We talked about it wasn't the fund. Consolidation, what that means, and the governor put it on you or your board to do it. And you asked this board to do it. I'm just wondering – has it been defined? I see a lot of money being approved and there are 10 more today and has it been defined and at the end of the month we are going to start discussing what consolidation really is.

Mr. DeRouche – The precedent that was set with the approval gave us the guidelines for what is or is not going to be considered. So what you are commenting on is correct and it was discussed. We have been tasked with doing a study on consolidation with a report due to the legislature in January, yet we also have to approve consolidation grants. You're right – the cart is a little bit before the horse, but at the same time you have grants to approve.

Chair Ray – The final draft of the administrative rules has been provided to all council members and that is what is going to be submitted and it pretty much falls in line with what has already been approved.

Mr. DeRouche – We talked about it last month. It has to include a PSAP. Well, what is a PSAP? Radios are listed among the items that can be consolidated and that is what the vast majority of the applications have been.

Mr. Malott – I'm glad you said that radios are. My understanding was when there was consolidation of PSAPs, it had to be physical where one would no longer exist. But now I understand we can purchase multiband radios for all of our emergency responders and in prep to get on the LMR?

Mr. DeRouche – Within the legislation it was both physical and virtual.

Mr. Mallot – So, I can put in a grant to purchase a million dollars and I understand that you only pay \$200,000 of multiband radios to put in every one of my emergency vehicles, so they would be in preparation to go on the LMR if they choose to?

Chair Ray – Yes, with the exception of, I believe, the radios have to meet minimum of what the ISICS Board has established.

Mr. Bryant – The reason I asked the question and it wasn't to put Blake on the spot, but in preparation for the next legislative session to discuss with the legislators language tweaking of Chapter 34A where some of the pieces don't exactly fit into the puzzle and have a clearer direction next year. Be more proactive then reactive.

#### Wireless Carryover Fund PSAP Application Approvals.

Davis County – Virtual consolidation efforts with Appanoose County Sheriff's Office, Monroe County Sheriff's Office Wapello County Sheriff's Office and Ottumwa PD. Purchase multi-technology radio dispatch equipment, microwave interconnectivity, P25 site equipment, P25 Phase ½ and multiband radios and full back up equipment. Grant request of \$106,562.38.

Fayette County – Virtual consolidation efforts with Oelwein PD and Fayette County Sheriff's Office.  
Black Hawk County – Virtual consolidation efforts with the City of Cedar Rapids. Microwave connectivity and sharing console technology. Grant request of \$200,000.

Fayette County Oelwein PD – Virtual consolidation efforts with Oelwein PD and Black Hawk County Consolidated Communication Center to purchase microwave equipment for connectivity to Black Hawk county, console upgrades, wireless interfaces and P25 gateways. Grant request of \$200,000.

Harrison County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Washington and Douglas Counties in Nebraska to purchase MCC 7500 dispatch console. Grant request of \$200,000.

Humboldt County - Virtual consolidation efforts with State of Iowa 700 MHz P25 radio system to purchase multiband mobile and portable radios making it possible, through a 28E agreement, to fully utilize the Wright County Communication Center as a backup dispatch. Grant request of \$80,817.00.

Lucas County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Appanoose County and Wayne County to use and expand the Monroe County Sheriff's Office P25 System by purchasing multi-technology radio P25 site equipment, P25 PH1/2 and multiband radios to allow access to state and regional systems. Grant request of \$48,515.50.

Mahaska County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Ottumwa PD, Wapello County, Jasper County, Poweshiek County, Pella PD and Monroe County to purchase IP multi-technology radio dispatch and regional P25 dispatch console site equipment, multiband control radios and multiband backup systems. Grant request of \$122,570.00.

Marshall County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Jasper county to use and expand the 7/800 MHz P25 radio system in Jasper County by purchasing P25 mobiles, VRS interface, antenna and P25 portables. Grant request of \$62,823.00.

Mills County - Virtual consolidation efforts with the State of Iowa 700 MHz LMR system by purchasing multiband mobile and portable radios. Grant request of \$199,091.87.

Polk County – Des Moines PD - Virtual consolidation efforts with City of Des Moines, State of Iowa, Westcom, and Polk County by purchasing APX7500 Dual Band Mid Power. Grant request of \$200,000.

Wapello County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Ottumwa PD to upgrade current mapping program. Grant request of \$49,344.64.

Wayne County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Wayne County, Appanoose County, and Monroe County to purchase P25 site equipment, P25 mobiles, VRS interface, antenna, P25 portables. Grant request of \$71,684.83.

Wright County - Virtual consolidation efforts with the State of Iowa 700 MHz P25 radio system. Grant request of \$200,000.

Motion by Sheriff Rotter, seconded by Rob Dehnert to recommend for approval all of the above grant applications. All ayes. Motion passed.

Dubuque County – Virtual consolidation efforts with Cedar Rapids Joint Comm. Agency. Purchase radio consoles, gateway equipment and P25 software upgrades to be used toward radio communication consolidation to join SARA. Grant request of \$200,000. Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Sheriff Rotter to recommend for approval the Dubuque County grant application. All ayes except Tom Berger abstained. Motion passed.

Linn County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Linn County, Cedar Rapids, Marion and Iowa County to purchase P25 Site Controller Expansion. Grant request of \$407,887.03. Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Tom Berger to recommend for approval the Linn County grant application. All ayes except Sheriff Rotter and Sally Hall abstained. Motion passed.

Iowa County - Virtual consolidation efforts with Cedar Rapids Joint Comm. Agency to purchase site equipment/P25 infrastructure to connect to the Linn County core and microwave link to connect to SARA network South Site. Grant request of \$200,000. Motion by Dan Halterman, seconded by Dave Kaus to recommend for approval the Iowa County grant application. All ayes except Sheriff Rotter and Sally Hall abstained. Motion passed.

Shelby County - Virtual consolidation efforts with the State of Iowa 700 MHz LMR system by purchasing P25 Zetron Max Radio Console and multiband mobile radios and portable radios. Grant request of \$200,000. Motion by Sheriff Rotter, seconded by Dan Halterman to recommend for approval the Shelby County grant application. All ayes except Bob Seivert abstained. Motion passed.

### **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

None

#### Legislative

Mr. Seivert – Since the last session we have talked about expanding the council membership by including a GIS person. If that would be an initiative that the council would like to move forward with, we would need to let our partners know about that and get that into the legislation. Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Mike Bryant to make it a legislative initiative of the E-911 Communications Council to expand the council membership by adding a GIS person. All ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Seivert – The initiatives as a council. We don't have a lobbyist so we depend on our associations to move our agendas forward if we have a particular agenda. As a council, if there is an initiative we want to see moved forward, we need to make that known. I would use the consolidations grants as an example. The \$8.4 million unobligated carryover fund that's just sitting there. If we as a council what to see changes in those areas, we should probably do a white paper or something that we can show our associations we're in favor of that.

Mr. Bryant – I would just add to that. I believe in being proactive rather than reactive to the session. I heard at last month's meeting from John Benson and Blake some similarities on our motion on the \$8.4 million and their looking into the future. I think it's the only time I've actually heard that the Homeland Security coming out with discussion similar to what we want. I think it would be a wasted opportunity to not work with them. We've had discussions of what the legislators mean – their intent. We've had discussions with the governor's office. It seems to me this screams for an ad hoc committee/panel/group to be working on this to do something. We see what happens when you try to get legislation at the last minute at the end of the session. Every effort needs to be made to do as much as we can before the session starts by today. It's September. It's only three months away. We need to figure out what the issues are, what the problems are, what we can agree on and if we can't agree at least then we know what we disagree on. It doesn't mean that we have to do or be in the same thing. Where there's potential here to try and fix something. The pieces of the puzzle, to me, don't fit together in 34A. We've chopped it up several different times. A few years ago we kind of got it cleaned up and now there are several pieces of the puzzle that aren't clear. It should be so simple that the laymen could understand it. We need to be a part of it. That's a suggestion. We are going to run out of grant money and it looks like several are using this process to help get ready for the LMR. What I see happening on this first come first serve basis there isn't something there that says, you got it this year, somebody who didn't gets a priority for next year. It's a piece meal world. I don't know if everybody is going to get enough out of this the way it's setup with the virtual to get all of the parts and pieces they need. There are some potential pitfalls with a first come first serve basis.

Sheriff Rotter – I agree with what you said. When we talked about legislation and how we would approach that with white papers. I think it is something that we need to put on the front burner because I'm sure our associations have a process for vetting those and putting them to our boards. We really can't wait around. The sheriff's association looks at doing that at the winter schools. If we don't have that formulated by then, a lot of that comes too late. I think we need to get on it right now.

Mr. DeRouchey – One thing that we did in the contract with LR Kimball was to engage a legislative specialist as well. I have started funneling information to that person regarding modernizing the code section. The idea being, when the consolidation workshops are done, you basically have a new code section/replacement. All of our ideas incorporated of what we want to do as a group, as a state so we can get on the same page and be able to produce that kind of legislation. We might differ in some ideas and by all means if it isn't what the council or your agencies want, we can have kind of two sets that we are working off of but would be more than willing to work with you or the council on what that final document looks like to help move that code section forward.

Chair Ray – Clearly the individual associations carry a lot of weight when it comes to these legislative initiatives that we try to put forward for the 9-1-1 community. In the essence of time, Bob and Mike, were you willing to put together a white paper and get it back to us by the next meeting? We can get that discussed here and what's a priority and get it to Blake so he can match that up with what LR Kimball is doing.

Mr. Koppert – In an answer to Greg Brooks' question regarding the definition of consolidation: the legislature threw us a curve ball and a fast ball at the same time. There was a difference in opinion on this council. That tells this topic, while this council may have some thoughts and individual members may have some thoughts and associations may have some different thoughts. I think that it is technically up to the legislature to define what consolidation is. You don't throw out the word and say "Hey, let somebody else define this word". I don't want to say that I didn't appreciate what the legislature did last year but quite frankly it was two things. It was irresponsible to assign \$4.4 million to a grant project that we don't have any idea what the problem is until we get that LR Kimball report. Until we see what the consolidation study looks like. How can we make a fair assessment of what consolidation actually is until we see what the problems are? I would like to bounce this back to the legislature. Maybe we need to consult with Rep. Worthan or Sen. Danielson to see exactly what they meant when they said consolidation because it wasn't clearly defined in the Iowa Code and as it moves into the Administrative Rules section either. We

can interpret what they think but I don't want to interpret what a representative or a senator is thinking. I have no idea what's in their mind. They don't know what's in my mind. I see consolidation as something, Rob Dehnert sees consolidation as something else, and Greg Brooks sees it as something else. We all see this differently. When you get 15 people on a council trying to determine what it is, representing 15 different organizations and you multiply it by 100+ people in those organizations, we're never going to get a definition. We need to request the legislature to firmly identify what consolidation is and what is and is not eligible expenses for consolidation grants in the future and take it off this board. We aren't the ones spending \$4.4 million. The legislature is. They should be the ones telling us what we can and cannot spend it on. Just my thoughts.

Mr. Dehnert – I'm concerned about those thoughts because it seems that you're placing a lot of confidence on the legislature's ability to determine how funds should be used at the local level for the jobs that we do and I think that's what we need to do as the council. We hear almost every month that we need to have this legislative agenda and we do. We need to develop these positions. I think they need to look at us. We need to drive this bus. Not sit back and wait for the legislature and tell us how we should be doing our business. We should be telling them what we need.

Mr. Koppert – To a good point, I agree.

Mr. Dehnert – But it's the opposite of what you said – that you're asking the legislature to tell us what consolidation is. I think we should be telling the legislature what consolidation is.

Mr. Koppert – Well, we can give them our opinion of what it is. It a balance of both.

Mr. Bryant – How many of you have had your legislator in your PSAP? That's a huge problem. That's the answer to your problem right there. I preach to everyone that you need to be going to their things. They need to know you on a first name basis. They work for you. You elect them. In the fire service we have what is called HOT (hands-on training) where we have council people, mayors, legislators in fire gear and go into fire simulators. They aren't going to understand what you do and what you need until they are there.

Mr. Malott – And I want to echo what Mike just said because I have had my legislators in my PSAP, [with me] explaining why I moved to P25. Why I moved forward with solar energy. Why I moved forward with an 800 bridge to VHF. Why I have moved forward putting a fire-suppression system and not one of them went against it when they saw why I pushed this forward to do that. That's why we got everything when we asked the first time. We didn't have to go back and explain why we were doing things, they were pushing us to do it. I agree with Mike 100 percent. It will help us 100 percent.

Mr. DeRouchey – Another thing on the legislative thing. Steven and I have talked and I have talked to John Benson as well. At the federal level, they have a "9-1-1 Goes to Washington." I think replicating that here would be a good idea as well. I think that would help if we had a "9-1-1 Goes to the Capitol".

Chair Ray – Consolidation will be brought up again next session. I'll guarantee that. Part of it is we know there's not a big push out there for agencies to close down PSAPs although I think there are some legislators that who believe that was the intended purpose was to reduce the number of PSAPs but along the way it ended up becoming, well if we consolidate virtually those things would be accepted. So there's two different thought processes going on. They all have to merge at some point if it's going to work the way people want it to. I don't know what the answer is on that. A lot of that as far as the consolidation point, Homeland Security is discharged with that duty to expend those funds. A lot of it is going to have to come from your agency to ask for those clarifications that your director can make.

### **Items for Discussion**

Chair Ray – In the past we have held the 9-1-1 council meeting in conjunction with the APCO/NENA conference time frame, and it was brought up again. Is there any interest in us trying to have it during that time period? Our normal meeting would be Oct. 13. If we waited and had it during the conference, we would be having another meeting 10 days later. I also understand it is difficult to arrange a meeting to fit within the conference agenda.

Mr. Koppert – With APCO/NENA being on Oct. 24, 25 and 26, I really don't see any reason to move the council meeting. I think we just stay at the same date and time.

Mr. Seivert – I think that is the best idea. If we have our legislative initiatives approved early in October, we can bring those to the conference and move them forward.

Mr. DeRouchey – One thing I will point out, and I don't know if it makes a difference to the council members. That is the same week of our homeland security conference. A lot of emergency managers go to that.

Chair Ray – It sounds like we are going to stay on Oct.13.

### **Unfinished Business**

#### **Bylaws Update and Adoption**

Mrs. Hall reported that she had received only one comment regarding the proposed amendment to the E-911 council bylaws. Comment was they thought section 7 may be redundant, therefore not necessary and that the update to section 6. Quorum and the update to section 8 voting covered this. Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Dave Kaus to strike section 7 of the proposed amendment to the E-911 council bylaws which stated, "A council member may attend a council meeting by electronic means and shall be allowed to participate in the discussion of matters brought before the council," and to leave section 6 as is. It is pretty much a given that if you are not here that you can listen in but in order to vote you must be present. All ayes. Motion passed.

Motion by Sheriff Rotter, seconded by Rob Koppert to accept the updated proposed amendment to the E-911 council bylaws. All ayes. Motion passed.

### **Travel Requests**

Mr. Koppert stated that he would give a report on the 2016 National APCO at next E-911 council meeting.

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Mike Bryant to approve any member of the E-911 Council to attend the APCO/NENA conference following the reimbursement guidelines set forth by the state. All ayes. Motion passed.

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

None

### **Announcements**

The next meeting will be on Thursday, Oct. 13, 2016, at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

There being no further business Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 9:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary