

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
Thursday, April 13, 2017
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	
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Present
alternate	Doug Neys	
Iowa Firefighters Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Present-phone
alternate	Tom Berger	Present-phone
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	James Chambers	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	Bernardo Granwehr	Absent

Staff:

Blake DeRouchey, E-911 Program Manager	Present
Samantha Brear, E911 Program Planner	Present

Guests:

Tim Malott, Cedar County EMA	Nicole Wethington, Cedar County
Brian Magdwell, Westcom	Doug Houghton, City of Ames
Jason Study, Pottawattamie County 911	Rob Bowers, Iowa State University
Amanda Rousch, Story County 911	Mike Kasper, Linn County Sheriff's Office
Brent Long, Polk County Sheriff's Office	Jim Lundstead, DHS OEC
Andy Buffington, Hancock County 911	Curtis Pion, Polk County Sheriff's Office
Jeff Andersen, Marion County EMA/911	Craig Allen SWIC
Diane Sefrit, SCI	Joni Nicoll, IUB
Caitlin Jarzen, Iowa Communications Alliance	Tracey Bearden, Polk County EMA
Shari Schmitz, Motorola	

Guest present by teleconference:
Brad Brooks, Synergen Technologies

Stacen Gross, GeoComm

Introductions

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

Approve the Minutes

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2017, meeting. All ayes. Motion passed.

Approve the Agenda

Motion by Sally Hall, seconded by Rob Koppert to approve the agenda with the correction to the spelling of Mr. Dehnert name under item VII. A. All ayes. Motion passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports (Blake DeRouchey)

911 Program Financial Reports

No financial report since this is not at the end of the quarter.

Program Update/NexGen 911 Update

Mr. DeRouchey – There are 28 counties that have tested Text-to-911. EmergiTech has their first county turned up for text. That was Emmett County yesterday. CallWorks has started to schedule their upgrades as well – one on Friday and one next week. We were going to have our first Viper turned up today but that fell through. They have another one scheduled for next week. There are about two or three counties converting on a weekly basis. I am fairly confident where we are now but we are going to send a letters to a couple of vendors that we have contracts with to stress the importance of this project and the timeline involved.

Text-to-911 – As we do get closer to statewide capability we are going to roll out our public education materials. I hoped to have some of that for you today but it wasn't quite what I was looking for. As soon as I get those done, we will get them printed or sent electronically to all of the PSAPs in all of the jurisdictions so you can either print them off or use the ones we have printed for you. Once counties do Text-to-911, if you want to do local media outlets that is fine. We will probably begin a statewide campaign sometime in May. We have a standing contract with our department and I believe Learfield to do radio spots. I have a meeting with them next week to discuss what we want to do for the public education campaign for Text-to-911. We are able to guarantee how many times those ads air in every county. They put together the script. So it is a good contract. I'm asking for about a \$40,000 budget to do that. That will leave about \$25,000 out of the \$100,000 for the council travel, public education and training budget. We have less than a quarter to go and we will have a quarter of that budget remaining. Motion by Rob Koppert, seconded by Rob Rotter to allocated \$40,000 out of the travel expense/education fund to support radio spots, PSAs for the Text-to-911 public education campaign. All ayes. Motion carried.

911 Bill – The 911 bill has been renumbered. It is now SF500. Initially it was to be on the agenda to be discussed on the Senate floor today. It is not so it is now going to be on Monday. The Legislature is looking to wrap up next Friday. That means it gives us about five days to get this bill done.

AT&T Outage – Right after the 911 Council meeting last month there was a lot in the media about an AT&T outage. The FCC is looking into that outage. All the PSAPs got some automated alerts that there was a 911 outage by AT&T that could be affecting your PSAP. And like a lot of those automated alerts that we receive they are not timely, not actionable at all and not very specific. Every PSAP in the state was getting this alert along with the state 911 program office. We had no impacts in Iowa. If we would have done any mass state notifications it would have been incorrect and it would have not been timely at all. The alert went out across the nation and there were definitely some states that were impacted. Because of the scope and size of the outage, the FCC is looking into it. We weren't impacted in Iowa because the outage was on Voice Over LTE. We don't have that service in Iowa for AT&T but other states do. So that is why they were impacted. AT&T has recommended for local PSAPs to improve their mass notification to alert the public when something like this happens. My immediate thoughts were your alerts are not actionable. We couldn't have done anything and which by the way it would have been wrong if we would have alerted the public to this outage. I'm not sure where this is going to go.

Siri 108 – This is something that is built into a lot of smart phones. When you are traveling in another country it is built in to know and recognize other country's emergency numbers. Whatever they may be. It is kind of a prank right now on social media asking Siri to say 108 which I would recommend that you not do that because that will make an emergency call. It gives you five seconds and then it makes a 911 call. There's probably other numbers that work but it's programmed that way for a reason. If you're traveling and you don't know the other country's code, the phone recognizes that and will make the appropriate emergency call whatever nation you are in. KCCI picked that story up a couple weeks ago so we decided to not do anything on our social media to not make it worse than it needs to be.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

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

Mr. DeAngelo – I attended a couple of conference calls last week. It looks like the FCC and FAA are moving forward with the requirement that rural wireless towers between 50 and 200 feet are going to require marking. Currently you don't have to mark a tower under 200 feet. That means either paint bands - white and orange. Possible lighting and/or orange marker balls on the guy wires if they are a guyed tower. It appears they are moving forward with that. The FCC is going to roll it out and the FAA with the requirements July 1. The tower operators that fall within that footage would have to complete that by July 1, 2018. So that's a major expense that will be coming up. I don't know if that impacts towers for 911. This is going to impact existing towers. I don't believe there is going to be any "grandfathering." There's probably going to be some exceptions. Basically this is coming from crop duster industry complaining about towers out in the rural area causing them problems with their aviation. We are waiting for the FAA and the FCC to clarify the rules.

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

Mr. Allen – The primary effort for the board right now is the SCIP update that will be done June 28. There will be a calendar invite coming out. The intent of this SCIP is that it will drive the agenda of the board. There are four basic parts. The LMR, FirstNet, administrative obligations and everything else that's communications related. (i.e. Reverse 911, Amber Alerts, etc.) We will be tying money to it this time because we have two elements of funds. One is state and the other is grants. If we do it right our money should be following the things that are the most important. As we look forward to the next two items the LMR roll out and the FirstNet. This is a very busy time for the state to have both of these projects going on at the same time and I leave July 7.

ISSI Switch – The switch will be used to connect the LMR core with one other core. There are many systems that want to connect. The monthly fees to keep that ISSI up are very significant. We have put a workgroup together to explore what the best practices would be. There are not very many people using it that like it or are comfortable with its outcome. It is a dilemma and does Iowa want to take that on. You don't buy ISSI people cheap. There are other ways to skim that interoperability without having to do it at the switch level.

There are a lot of questions coming out from the LMR outreach. (i.e. people wanting to buy equipment, testing, talk groups, encryption, etc.) What we are doing now is revitalizing the RICs. Everyone knows it is coming but few understand the ramification of the change. Moving from current analog or digital to a trunked system. There's a lot of training that goes into this. More importantly how do we get that local involvement?

The FirstNet award took place. AT&T is going to be the vendor. Through this process of reviewing the plan and the governor I believe we have 90 days to make our decision. What if it is a bad plan and we opt out? Then the cost is all on us. It may not be the plan we want but do we have the money to do it on our own. There will be a lot of training and coordination on the FirstNet effort. When it happens there are firm timelines that the state has to meet.

I have two meetings left May and June. My contract ends July 7. If there is anything that I should or could do for the Council please let me know soon.

The new SWIC selection process is moving along.

I believe now is the time for the Board to look at having multiple deputy SWICs and get a little more diversified because we are getting more specialized. There are people that bring unique skills and abilities, probably not as paid but as volunteers. When you look at things going on in TIA and talking about encryption there are few people in the state of Iowa that can have a valid discussion about encryption. If you stay in this business, in the next five years, we're one mess. The Boston bombing brought that out. A lot of operations are encrypting everything. That creates a planning factor with your neighbors.

I want to say thanks to Tracey (Bearden). She has taken a lead effort in developing the policies for the LMR system. She has done a fantastic job.

Mr. Seivert – AT&T got the FirstNet contract. We don't have the AT&T tower presence in our county. Are they going to build out towers?

Mr. Allen – In 2014 we did a survey. There is a plan now. It is out on CASM now. AT&T will have access to developing relationships with those local, county, state and private users to increase the coverage. There is nothing that I know of that prevents them from having sidebar agreements with another vendor to provide that coverage should they be interested. They have a significant presence in each of the states. If you look at their national map in Iowa there are places that have a big need for improvement but there are other places where their coverage is very good. They are giving priority access which has not happened before. So now your personal cell phone and the public safety's MDT got the same priority. It will now be MDT first and everybody else's cell phone second. Ruthless preemption. When a public safety call hits the FirstNet, someone's call is going to get dropped. How they manage that on the AT&T side, I don't know. Whether it's 4G, 5G, what technology upgrades they have to do to make that happen, I can't speak to that either. First you're going to priority access if you're a FirstNet user the second is ruthless preemption. And that will happen in December of this year.

Mr. Kaus – The bumping of calls has that been cleared through the FCC yet?

Mr. Chambers – Regarding the coverage – AT&T they are aware of that. The State of Iowa is requesting border-to-border coverage and they have maps on locations. There are gaps in the rural communities and that was addressed pretty quickly through the AT&T representative.

Mr. Allen – Iowa has had a unique public/private partner for two years. I think they have had five meetings now and the local telecos have been involved as to how to help drive that.

Legislative Issues

Mr. Seivert – SF500 up to now has been moving very smoothly through the Senate side. We had a commitment from Rep. Worthan to take the Senate version bring it through the House and put it on the governor's desk. Last week there were some amendments proposed to that. There's basically three amendments. One would require a plan and an increase in the consolidation grant to \$500,000. Language added to allow use of surcharge for accessing networks other than the LMR and RACOM's networks, and the 911 Council being involved in decisions regarding network access. Most of the amendments are non-substitutive – they don't deal with any money. The lobbyist has been working on these issues. There's some concern at this point if there is enough time left within the session to get these amendments placed and then moved through both houses and put on the governor's desk. The other concern that the lobbyist has expressed is that when you open a bill this late in the game there's always that fear that the money for the LMR could potential get stuck back in there where currently it has all been struck out. The session will probably end on Friday. I would encourage everyone to pay close attention to their lobbyist and be prepared to contact your local legislators to ask them to push this bill through. Whether it goes through in its current version as is, it is very good for the local PSAPs – whether these amendments get added to it. Like I said, they don't deal anything with money. Their amendments that are technical in nature. If they go through, fine. If they don't it just gives another initiative or strength for next year. I'm very concern right now whether the bill is going to go through at all.

Mr. Koppert – There was a conference call with the APCO and NENA leadership. There was discussion about the amendments and some of the language that was in this bill specifically. The wording that says it

can be used for local costs related to access the state's interoperable communications system which I don't have a problem with but the perception that some people have was that it was limiting it to only the state interoperable communications system and not local systems like SARA or the Pottawattamie County system or even if a border county up north wanted to get on the Minnesota ARMOR system that those funds would not be available for that. My argument on that was the very first part of that sentence – cost related to the receipt and disposition of the 911 calls. I have been asked for clarification and verification that the wording receipt and disposition of the 911 calls would include any regional or statewide system whether or not it is specifically name elsewhere in the document.

Mr. DeRouchey – That is something we have talked about since the initial Senate bill was drafted. In the early versions of this bill, that was struck out – assessing any system. The reason why is that language is redundant. Going back to the line right before that – the disposition of the 911 call: You are absolutely right. You can use local 911 funds, once it's in your account, to access the statewide radio system, a local system, or a regional system of your county's choice.

Mr. Koppert – If the PSAP grant comes back like the \$100,000 that we had a couple of years ago, and we were to get wireless 911 funds back to the PSAPs, once that hits our bank accounts we are free to use that for accessing any system that we deem necessary to operate or interoperate with either local or on a statewide basis?

Mr. DeRouchey – Correct. That's a little different than the current fiscal year we are in. The current fiscal year grant process there was the virtual language that was in there and that required the collaboration and coordination of two separate PSAPs. That was specific for that grant for this fiscal year. The virtual language is gone in the purposed bill for next year. So literally any 911 funding can be used for any radio system that the local jurisdiction wants to use it for as long as it is for the disposition of the 911 call.

Items for Discussion

NENA i3 Architecture Standards and APCO Response

Mr. Dehnert – In March APCO sent a statement to their membership titled “The Vision for Next Generation 911 and the Role of Standards” essentially blasting NENA's i3 Standard which then instituted a volley from NENA back to APCO that it was its standard. I just wondered if the Council was aware of that and had any thoughts on this bickering between to very large associations of ours?

Mr. DeRouchey – In Iowa I'm very glad that APCO/NENA get along perfectly. NASNA polled its membership and like Iowa, the vast majority of states do use i3 as the basis for their statewide systems or what they are trying to build to. I think as we found in Iowa either within the i3 Standards there's a piece that hasn't been developed yet and again it's more of a concept we are working towards. The vast majority use i3 to work towards. Can they be improved? Absolutely. Our fear was that you get multiple standards out there or competing standards you're already introducing more confusion and chaos to state's local jurisdictions as to how you go about interoperating and communicating and doing 911 in the future. My perspective has always been, and maybe it's changing a little bit, APCO generally focuses more on the telecommunicator and NENA more on the technology and the network stuff. I don't know if National APCO is making a change in their business model but from the NASNA perspective we came out strongly supporting the i3 Standard.

Mr. Dehnert – I think we need to be aware and continue to monitor this situation.

Mr. Allen – The standards are so important to you and your teams. Standards are supposed to eliminate confusion and vendor mischief. Because cheap does not necessarily mean workable. It means cheap. A reminder of the project management rule. You can have it good or you can have it fast or you can have it cheap. If you pick cheap you can see the quality curve fall. So standards set the baseline for how far that quality curve can fall. What you are talking about now is a national debate because of things like P25. We're seeing it in encryption. There are particular companies that will offer an inferior encryption product at far less money. We're seeing now the discussion between public safety grade and mission critical. The design that we are looking for, yes, they get more expensive but they're driven by standards. So as were are looking at standards what I would encourage the Council to do is perhaps partner with the Board to put out a standard statement to help drive alignment so at least in Iowa we have an agreement as to what makes the most sense. We did that with P25. Another one was the AES 256. With the SCIP anything that

is passed by resolution that is passed by this Council and posted to your website or passed by the Board and put to our website, it's in the SCIP by reference. So when they go to get grant money they have to be compliant with the rules you've laid down here. Now if any federal or other dollars become available their required to be tied to the SCIP. So now we're are requiring people to buy equipment that won't let people get off on their own and bring something in here that we can't work with. The systems now have to align more than they did five years ago. We don't want our users to make bad choices.

Mr. Seivert – I would think that the Council should take a position and let National APCO and NENA know in no uncertain terms that it is not acceptable for both of those organizations to go in two different directions at this time, for the very reasons Craig talked about. With all the technology that is coming, it is not time for two disparate opinions coming from our national leaders in this arena. They need to get together and come up with a common platform that we can all adopt and move forward with. Otherwise, we are never going to get an end result.

Mr. Koppert – I think the Council needs to look at drafting and passing a resolution supporting the NENA i3 Standards. I think the APCO board needs to meet on this and send a letter or recommendation to National APCO from the Iowa Chapter stating that we support the NENA i3 Standards for the exact same reasons. We need to be on one standard and one voice. This isn't VHS and Beta anymore.

Chair Ray – Rob (Dehnert) would that be something that you and Blake would be willing to work on and bring back to the next meeting?

Mr. Dehnert – Yes.

Unfinished Business

None

Travel Requests

None

Business from the Floor/911 Issues at the PSAPs

None

Announcements

The next meeting will be Thursday, May 11, 2017, 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