

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Thursday, Jan. 12, 2017
West Des Moines City Council Chambers
West Des Moines, Iowa**

Call to Order

Vice Chair Seivert 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 via phone
	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	Present via phone
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA)		
Vice-Chairperson	Bob Seivert	Present
	alternate	
	Jo Duckworth	
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS)		
Chairperson	Steven P. Ray	Excused
	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	James Chambers	Present
	alternate	
	Wayne Johnson	
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
Samantha Brear, E911 Program Planner	Present

Guests:

Terry McClannahan, Dallas County Sheriff's Office	Craig Allen, SWIC
Eric Dau, Clinton County E911	Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office
Mike Lauer, ICN	Jason Study, Pottawattamie County E911
Robert Andersen, Pottawattamie County E911	Angela Dobyms, Pottawattamie County E911
Diane Sefrit, SCI	Brian Magdwell, Westcom
Kaitlin Jarzen, Iowa Communications Alliance	Josh Humphrey, Iowa County EMA
Terry Brennan, RACOM	Robert Bokinsky, Pella Police Department
Marcia Slycord, Pella Police Department	Jeff Andersen, Marion County EMA/E911
Duane Vos, RACOM	Amanda Roush, Story County E911
Joseph McCarville, Cedar Rapids JCA	Charlie McClintock, Cedar Rapids JCA

Guest present by teleconference:

Tom Berger, Dubuque County EMA
Tim Malott, Cedar County EMA/911

Shane Birch, TriTech Software Systems
Rob Koppert, Cass County/Iowa NENA

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Mark Murphy to approve the minutes of the Dec. 8, 2016 meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Dave Kaus to amend and approve the agenda with the addition under Items for Discussion – Request for Funding from Iowa APCO and Iowa NENA. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

No reports, as it is not the end of the quarter.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

Mr. DeRouchey – There have been a number of Text-to-911 migrations that have been scheduled. There are currently 13 PSAPs that are capable of receiving Text-to-911. Several of those are being migrated to the Text-to-911 integrated solution. The last migration was Jones County and that took about 30 minutes. Zetron is their vendor. When this process was first started it was taking a couple of days. We anticipate that the first migration for a CPE vendor might take a while but after that we see it as a much quicker process.

Mr. DeRouchey – Jan. 1 was the deadline for several forms that are due to our office. Still waiting on a couple of PSAP contact information forms and expenditure forms. The administrative deadline for the PSAP expenditure form is Jan. 1 but the legal deadline is March 31. We don't start withholding surcharge until April. The Jan. 1 date allows us to do additional quality control if a PSAP needs to make any corrections and get the form back to the office in time.

Mr. DeRouchey – 911 Consolidation Study Report – I want to clarify what the report says versus what we are going to try and push for this legislative session.

Executive Summary

- Merging the wireline and wireless networks.

We have talked about this in the office and talked about it at the consolidation workshops. Moving the wireline up to a NextGen level of network. There would be the same capabilities built into that network the call would be traversing.

- Create virtual host/remote environment using six CPEs throughout the five LATA boundaries that local PSAPs could access.

The above two points would be implemented together in order to achieve the cost savings we are looking for. The reason for putting in six state-owned, state-hosted CPEs is to cut down on costs of tariffs as the wireline call traverses the LATA boundaries. Our thought process is there is still money to be made out there by the small local telecos. Perhaps instead of the direct trunking to the PSAP, the call would go to a CPE point of presence in the LATA boundaries. At that point it is converted to IP and it can trunk across the state anywhere.

What we are looking at this legislative session is to give us the authority to engineer that. Not to necessarily do it this year but to engineering. The reason we need that authority is currently in Chapter 34A we don't have the authority to touch wireline. We asking the legislature to give us the authority to do

engineering, the technical background and the cost analysis behind that. We think we can save the local folks a whole of money by doing it this way. That means we use the purchasing power of the State. We takeover some or all of those costs. That would be an expense the local PSAPs would no longer have to bear.

The following two points are already in progress. The recommendation from the study was to continue those and to incorporate that into a combined network environment.

- Designing the network to have built-in capacity to handle text, video, social media, telematics and future technologies.
- Constructing the network with diverse fiber networks from redundant providers.

We have this with the secondary ESI network. The primary network runs across the ICN and we have Windstream secondary connective into the 13 biggest PSAPs. If there was ever an ICN outage, those 13 PSAPs would receive all the calls.

- Providing a funding mechanism for local activities related to NG9-1-1 GIS which feeds the statewide consolidated network.
-

The bill that is being drafted does incorporate NextGen GIS grants back into that.

- Returning the percentage of surcharge disbursed to 46 percent to pay for the network in the short term.

We are not going to recommend that. We will keep it at 60 percent.

- Establish a funding structure based on system costs and pairing any decrease in distributions with a shift in cost responsibility so that a new funding structure would not create a shortage.

What we asking for this legislative session is the ability to analyze exactly what those costs are going to be. If we can take over those costs that is multiple dollars a PSAP doesn't have to spend.

- Maintain the current \$200,000 consolidation grant for physical consolidation only.

This is one that we will be recommending. The reason for that is primarily because we will, hopefully, be implementing the virtual consolidation environment ourselves. It also gets down to, while radios are an eligible cost, we are not running a radio program. It kind of eliminates that nebulous area if radios are virtual consolidation or not. So physical only will be that grant program moving forward.

- Update current legislation to provide for the funding, governance and authority necessary to implement a successful and efficient NG9-1-1 system.

Mr. Kaus – Have you settled on any of the six locations for CPE?

Mr. DeRouchey – No. Other than the five LATA boundaries plus one. If the authority for all of this gets passed, we would go out for probably a RFI to see what entities can do this for us. We would have some cost information, we'd have engineering that would be specific, design of what we are looking at and that is when we would start looking at those potential locations. We are not advocating closing any doors. If you at the locals what to close doors, we'll help you but we are not advocating closing any doors. Your calltakers won't notice any difference. They still have their screen in front of them. Your backroom equipment might be elsewhere. We are not going to make it mandatory. We are going to try and make this such a sweet deal taking over a lot of your costs that it's going to be hard to say no to it.

Mr. McClintock – Page 27 of the report shows the thirteen secondary ESInet PSAPs. Cedar Rapids Joint Communications is one of those. One of the questions I have regarding the ESInet and Next Generation 911. Cedar Rapids has wanted to implement Text-to-911 for some time. We've had conversations about it as well as our vendors. We use the Zetron MAX system. One of the problems we've had implementing

Text-to-911 was because of the diversity shot it came in. The protocol both with the vendor struggling and the State side being able to address that. That's not a specific problem to Cedar Rapids and our vendor. It seems to be a problem with any one of these, I believe, that has the diversity shot in it because of how that technology changes when goes from a single to a dual redundancy shot. Can you give us any update as to when that is going to be addressed? Obviously this redundant network and.... These are the populous areas of the entire state. Clearly, I'll give my opinion, these may be the last people standing if it comes down to consolidation whether voluntarily or forced within the state. That's my opinion but you can read the report and draw that conclusion yourself. These are going to be crucial for Text-to-911 in an NG network.

Mr. DeRouchey – Without getting specifically into the issues and where they're at PSAP by PSAP, I would say the difference of what we are talking is that secondary network was introduced after everything was already completed and local infrastructure in place – after you had already purchased your CPE. It was kind of an add-on and it was a good idea but it was one of those things we didn't take into consideration of how it would affect...we didn't know it would affect CPE vendors the way it has. Moving forward, that will be a known part of any RFI or RFP that we get. We have to keep that incorporated due to those specific things like text. Regarding the text issues that you were talking about – my last update is that RACOM has started to schedule the Viper sites that have that issue. CenturyLink is still testing that new software that was released by West and will soon be scheduling those conversions as well. I am not exactly sure where the Zetron fix is for that.

Mr. McClintock – Obviously it is a concern. At our larger PSAP, we have backup agreements with Black Hawk County and Johnson County and they are in the same boat as us. We need to come up at the same time with Text-to-911. We've got small counties around us that are implementing it, yet as a major populous area we can't seem to get it off the ground which is a concern.

Mr. DeRouchey – I don't mean this to be a total sales pitch, either. One of the benefits of what we are proposing here is just like the Cedar Rapids and Linn County areas experience...be this fall into play. With this now your wireline and wireless can be transferred to anywhere in the state automatically. So you can go to any PSAP and start to receive your calls just like you were sitting in your own PSAP. So now that redundancy or backup can be anywhere in the state. It will be on the same system, the same network. It's seamless for those folks. It's another positive. Our goal/plan is to get the whole state up on Text-to-911 by end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Koppert – What do you expect will happen with the wireline surcharge if it does go to the ESInet? Will it go to the PSAPs or will it go to the state?

Mr. DeRouchey – It will remain with the PSAPs. We are not proposing to touch the wireline surcharge at all.

Vice Chair Seivert asked those that were on the teleconference to identify themselves.

Mr. DeRouchey – Just to reiterate. We are not talking about touching wireline surcharge or the pass through amounts. What we are talking about is a host/remote situation with your calltakers screens. We're not talking about closing doors either. I just want to make that perfectly clear. There has been a lot of information and misinformation. I agree some of the terminology is hard to grasp and continually changes as well. We are not talking about doing a lot of those things that I know folks are a little bit fearful about. We're just trying to make an offer, if that makes sense, to save the state money. To take some expenses away from the local jurisdictions and to make sense for the PSAPs and communities to join this virtual system.

Vice Chair Seivert – As people read it and digest it if you do have questions please contact Blake.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

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

Mr. Kaus – When we do this consolidation of landline and wireless, I presume all of the landline ITCs can handle SIP and what version SIP are they going to have which would enable them to transmit the IP signal to the

Mr. DeRouchey – I think that goes into some of the engineering that still has to be done. This is the rough draft or plan or concept. The next step is those finite details. This report helps write some of that as far as what “the ask” is of the ICNs, Aureons, CenturyLinks, Windstreams that want to look at providing that backbone. That’s something that we definitely need information on but I’m not sure I know that yet.

Mr. Kaus – One of the reasons I am questioning is that any time you make a conversion to SIP or from SIP it adds delay and we’re dealing with data. Delay is a real ugly opponent.

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

Mr. Allen – The Board is working on several items. We reposted a revised a policy 2012-5 regarding Minimum Interoperable Radio channels & Nomenclature. .

The statewide platform has one ISSI switch allowing one system to interface with another. This is expensive undertaking. We have been reaching out to people that have been doing this for many years. We are learning there are a lot of opportunities and challenges. In Iowa we have a broad array of systems that might need to be interfaced. Who pays that cost? The board will be asked today to cut back on their budget because of state across the board cuts. In the future where will those funds come from? Does the county or local government that wants to interface, do they pay a fee or does the state pay the fee. Who pays for the switch? That may or may not be an actual bylaw option at this time for Iowa. Keeping your software up to date is the most critical aspect as people buy equipment. When you have interfacing systems if one of the two systems upgrades and the other doesn’t it gets very complicated. Those that are involved with the platform, we have required that they keep their software up to date. Anything they add to the system has to be able to update simultaneously.

We will be doing a SCIP review in 2017. I think you find this far more valuable. It will be less complicated. Aligning along three tracks. Land Mobile Radio, broadband, administration and perhaps 911 if you so choose to have that incorporated.

For those that are buying radios. If you remember back, any funding that went into equipment had to be TDMA (Time Division Multiple Access) capable. The statewide platform is a TDMA as opposed to FDMA (Frequency Division Multiple Access). You basically get two talk paths for every single talk path on FDMA. Technology is being deployed. My suggestion is as you review how you award grants in the future you may think about TDMA mandatory in the radio.

Legislative Issues

Mr. Bryant – At the last meeting we talked about having a “911 Day on the Hill.” My recommendation would be is that we do have a “911 Day on the Hill” and that we organize that through our Public Safety Coalition lobbyists. The firefighters are having a breakfast on Feb. 23. I know space get hard to find up there. My question to the council is do we still want to have a “911 Day on the Hill” and do we proceed to get that?

Sheriff Rotter – Blake, if a coalition from this group went, I would definitely like to be a part of that.

Mrs. Hall – I sent an email to the Iowa APCO leadership and they showed interest in participating also.

Mr. DeRouchey – I think you are on the absolute right track. I have been in touch with John Benson our legislative liaison and he was going to be in touch with the APCO/NENA lobbyist to make sure they were aware how to go about doing that. It’s better if those entities take a lead on that. It should be in motion. I checked with that person to see where it is at. I definitely think you should do it.

Vice Chair Seivert – We have the chair of APCO and NENA present in the room. I would like to see someone step up and be responsible for organizing it.

Mr. McCarville – It is already being done. Our lobbyist is working on finding available dates at this time. As soon as the dates are presented it will go at to the APCO/NENA membership.

Mr. Bryant – The Governor’s speech included a recommendation to use \$4.1 million from the Rebuild Iowa Infrastructure Fund (RIIF) for the next payment of LMR system – but I guess I would add stay tuned. With budget cuts and shortfalls and increased budgets planned for the next few years. If you read all the way through the report, it has some obvious problems balancing a budget. I look for that to be discussed.

Vice Chair Seivert – I believe this will be a very active year for 911 on the Hill. The initiatives the state has outlined. Those will certainly generate a lot of discussion. The comment Mike made about the funding for the LMR is certainly going to continue as we move forward. I would encourage everyone to stay in close contact with their lobbyists so that we can respond appropriately to what comes forward.

Items for Discussion

Iowa APCO/Iowa NENA Request for Funding – Sally Hall

Mrs. Hall – I have been contacted by the Iowa APCO leadership and would like to ask the Council for funding from the \$100,000 that is set aside for the Council. The section of the Iowa Code is included on the summary sheet of what the \$100,000 is designated for. We would like to ask for up to \$20,000 per year for Iowa APCO and Iowa NENA. This would help to offset the training that is provided by APCO and NENA at the spring and fall conferences. This would be for four days of conferences. For the last three years APCO has lost money because it is the goal of the associations to bring in quality people to do presentations to do training for everyone in the state of Iowa. This would affect all 99 counties, every 911 center and every 911 personnel in the state of Iowa. This training is open to everyone. For example Gordon Graham, he is a magnificent speaker. The costs to bring him to Iowa are over \$5,000. The upcoming spring conference is on March 13 and 14. This is an up to amount. If the amount is not spent we don’t expect any more than that. We realize the Council runs on a fiscal year and we would also like you to consider granting \$3,500 per association to help offset the cost for the spring conference that is coming up. Again the benefits are this is training is provided across the state, for everybody, all 911 personnel, all 99 counties.

Mr. McCarville – One thing to clarify is the intent in asking for that money is just to cover speaker costs. We are not asking the 911 Council to assist in paying for the venue, to pay for food, to pay for anything our associations will continue to pay for that. When we ask for up to \$10,000, don’t think the goal was to come to the 911 Council, “Well we want all of it, because we spent more than \$10,000.” If a motion were to be made, it would be to help offset just the costs of the speakers or trainers at the conferences and educating all of the attendees throughout the state of Iowa.

Mrs. Hall – It will also help defray the associations of raising registration fees to bring quality speakers because the more you increase the registration fees the less participation that you have. We feel if we can maintain the level of registration fees, participation will increase and we feel that the membership in the associations will increase.

Vice Chair Seivert – I believe that is a very good proposal and if I understand it right the Council would be making a recommendation to the E911 program manager for the expenditure \$3500 this year for the March conferences and that would be per association and future years not to exceed \$20,000 from that particular fund to support those conferences for speaker fees only. Blake, do you feel that is within the scope of the use of the funds?

Mr. DeRouchey – Yes, I think it is within the scope. Thank you for this, for bringing it up. It helps to make this decision. We may need a little bit more policy behind it. I don’t think we want to get into where a single PSAP manager/supervisor starts coming to the Council on a regular basis to use this money for their own training. When you read it, that’s fair game. I think there needs to be some policy behind it. It needs to be group training or benefit multiple entities/people/supervisors. Keep in mind we are using this

for GIS training that's upcoming. That will benefit the entire community. We are using it for Text-to-911 public education. That will benefit the entire 911 community and the public. Neither of those is going to approach the \$100,000. By all means let's spend the money. It probably didn't look very good last year when we didn't spend very much of the money. We just have to be cognizant of what is going out the door and I know we're all fiscally responsible so that's not an issue but that is something to keep in the back of our minds.

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded Rob Rotter that we ask the program manager to take back to the director the recommendation of granting up to \$3,500 to each association (Iowa APCO and Iowa NENA) for a total up to \$7,000 from the \$100,000 fund that is set aside for the E911 Council to be used for offsetting the costs of speakers for the 2017 Spring Conferences on March 13 and March 14. All ayes. Motion passed.

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Dave Kaus that we ask the program manager to take back to the director the recommendation of granting up to \$10,000 to each association (Iowa APCO and Iowa NENA) for a total up to \$20,000 from the \$100,000 fund that is set aside for the E911 Council to be used for offsetting the costs of speakers on a fiscal year basis. This is contingent on the \$100,000 being there after this legislative session. All ayes. Motion passed.

Vice Chair Seivert – As far as the individual PSAPs making those requests, Blake is there something that could be drafted through administrative rules that would clarify the use of funds? Even if those requests come through the Council....as they're presented maybe we can discuss it at that point since our role is to make a recommendation.

Mr. DeRouchey – Yes, that makes sense.

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

Mr. Brennan – This is question about some of the funding and the grants available. Last year there was roughly \$4 million that went to the state's LMR. There was \$4.4 million available for consolidation grants. I think there was about \$8 million that the state put aside as a rainy day fund for the radio. Can you elaborate between the physical consolidation grants? Is that going to be roughly \$4 million? Is the \$8 million going to get disbursed back to the PSAPs?

Mr. DeRouchey – Thank you for bringing that up. Last year \$4.3 million was allotted for the LMR and \$4.4 million was allotted for the consolidation grants (virtual and physical). All the money went out the door for virtual consolidation. One has since cancelled and we had some on standby. That money is going to get disbursed at the end of fiscal year to all of the PSAPs. We have talked about it in our office and what we are leaning toward, as well, is almost a similar concept as this year but the difference is if the Governor's budget holds. Instead of that \$4.4 million cap it would be like an \$8.7 million cap on back end money that could either be used for physical consolidation grants or disbursed equally to the PSAPs. That's still protecting that original \$8 or \$9 million of operating surplus that we can use as a nest egg to do the rest of the virtual consolidation statewide – the wireline and wireless together. That's kind of the concept that we floated around that we think would work conceptually this year as well. If you remember last year, if nobody claimed any of the grants, you divide \$4.4 million by 113 PSAPs. Each PSAP would have gotten around \$32,000. If the Governor's budget holds true, double on the backend. Hypothetically \$64,000. Again we are not talking about the front-end 60 percent pass through.

Vice Chair Seivert – That is if there are no physical consolidations then?

Mr. DeRouchey – We were into the discussion trying to define virtual consolidation. Physical consolidation is someone closing their doors. That is cut and dry. Those that would take us up on that type of grant are probably leaning toward doing that any way but I don't think it is going to be a windfall for the folks closing for \$200,000.

Vice Chair Seivert – Would anybody disagree with that plan?

Mr. Humphrey – Do you actually think that is going to survive the legislative session? All this is speculative right now. Is there a push to–

Mr. DeRouchey – Are you talking about taking the LMR payment out of the RIIF fund?

Mr. Humphrey – Yes.

Mr. DeRouchey – Last year it started out there as well. The two sides of the Capitol were split. It was the Senate Democratic side that moved that back under the 911 fund and ultimately approved by the House as well.

Mr. Koppert thanked the Council and ISICSB for the get well card and the thoughts and well wishes that he has received.

Vice Chair Seivert – We wish you well and we are behind you 110 percent.

Mr. Bryant – Blake, the money for the merger of the wireline/wireless network is that what we call the old carryover fund money which was about \$8 million?

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct.

Mr. Bryant – About where are we or what would you anticipate...?

Mr. DeRouchey – Just as a reminder, the idea for the current fiscal year was to spend only what we brought in as revenue for the current fiscal year. We haven't paid out any of that grant money that has been approved. So it is going to look a little bit higher than reality. As far as what is or isn't obligated. We are right on track for the quarterly receipts and spending. Also what is still in that old operating surplus that \$8 or \$9 million, again I use the term nest egg, is to do this with in two years.

Announcements

The next meeting will be on Thursday, Feb. 9, 2017, at 9 a.m. in the West Des Moines City Hall.

Motion by Dave Kaus, seconded by Rob Rotter to adjourn. All ayes. Motion passed. 9:54 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Hall, Secretary