

Note: These minutes are a draft and are not to be considered official until approved at the next meeting.

**Iowa E911 Communications Council Meeting
September 16, 2009
Joint Forces Headquarters – Camp Dodge
Dining Hall – 1st Floor of JFHQ
Johnston, IA**

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steven Ray at 10:00 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)	Doug Slagle	Absent
Secretary	Sally Hall	Present
Iowa Chapter of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA)	Jill Randolph	Present
alternate	Kirk Hundertmark	
Iowa State Sheriff's & Deputies Association (ISSDA)	Tom Heater	Present
alternate	Dean Kruger	
Iowa Chiefs of Police & Peace Officers Association (ICPPO)	Jack O'Donnell	Excused
alternate	Sandy Morris	Present
Iowa Professional Firefighters (IAPFF)	Mike S. Bryant	Present
alternate	Justin Adams	
Iowa Fireman's Association (IFA)	Mark Murphy	Excused
alternate	Tom Berger	Present
Iowa Emergency Managers Association (IEMA)		
Vice-Chairperson	Bob Seivert	Present
alternate	Jo Duckworth	Present
Iowa Department of Public Safety (IDPS)		
Chairperson	Steven Ray	Present
alternate	Todd Misel	Present
Iowa Emergency Medical Services Association (IEMSA)	Paul Andorf	Present
alternate	Rob Dehnert	
Iowa Telephone Association <15,000	Bill Hotchkiss	Present
alternate	Pat Snyder	
Iowa Telephone Association >15,000	Natalie Stallman	Absent
alternate	Dan Halterman	Absent
Cellular Providers	Bill Tortoriello	Absent
alternate	Jason Fenton	
PCS Providers	David Kaus	Excused
alternate	Joe Sargent	
Auditor of the State, Ex-Officio member	Warren Jenkins	Absent

Staff:

Barbara Vos, E-911 Program Manager	Present
Kathy Karn, E-911 Program Planner	Present

Guests:

Norman Wellman, Delaware County E911	Diana Richardson, RACOM
Brenda Vande Voorde, Fayette County E911	Cherese Sexe, Humboldt County E911
Dina McKenna, Story County Sheriff's Office	Connie Hambly, Story County E911
Rob Koppert, Cass County E911	Joni Walston, SCI Regional E911
Lorrie Lacina, Muscom	Cara Sorrells, Washington County E911
Michele Bott, Clinton County E911	Tom Ling, Mills County E911

David Murray, Keokuk PD
Dan Taylor, Greene County E911 & Jefferson PD
Chris Moore, Pottawattamie County E911

Lora Phillips, Johnson County Sheriff's Office
Jim Giglierano, Iowa DNR
Jon Paoli, HLSEM

Introductions

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

Minutes

Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Bill Hotchkiss to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2009 meeting. All ayes. Passed.

Agenda

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Jill Randolph to approve the agenda for the September 16, 2009 meeting with the following addition: New Business a.) Jim Giglierano, IDNR and Jon Paoli, HLSEM – GIS Mapping Initiatives. All ayes. Passed.

State of Iowa Administrator Reports – Mrs. Barb Vos

911 Program Financial Report

Mrs. Vos distributed copies of the financial report. Current carryover fund balance is \$2,795,824.16. Total Carryover PSAP Projects balance is \$1,369,806.02.

Mrs. Vos noted the amount of \$6,205.32 to State Appeal Board that was listed in the upper left hand portion of the report was a one time payment. Two carriers paid surcharge twice. To refund the amount due, the carriers must follow the appeal process through the State Appeal Board.

Administrative Rule Changes

Mrs. Vos distributed a copy of the Notice of Intended Action that was filed on September 4, 2009. This will be published in the Administrative Rules Code bulletin on September 23, 2009. A public hearing will be held on October 15, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. at Iowa Homeland Security & Emergency Management Division, 7105 NW 70th Ave, Camp Dodge, Bldg W-4, Johnston, IA 50131. Comments will be accepted on the proposed changes until October 15, 2009.

After suggestions from the locals, being reviewed by the Iowa Attorney General's Office and Iowa Homeland Security & Emergency Management Division the only changes that were made are as follows:

- Definitions 10.2 – Added to the “*Recurring costs*” definition “and personnel directly associated with addressing
- Membership 10.3(1)a., b. c. & d. – Added “county” before E911 service area and “one” or “one voting” before voting membership or membership.
- Membership 10.3(1)e. & 10.4(2)d. & 10.11(1)c. – Changed co-chairperson to vice-chairperson.
- Membership 10.3(1)f. – Added “The joint E911 service board will annually submit a listing of members, to include the political subdivision they represent and, if applicable, associated 28E agreement, to the E911 program manager. A copy of the list will be submitted within 30 days of adoption of the operating budget for the ensuing fiscal year on the prescribed form provided by the E911 program manager.”
- Enhanced wireless 911 service plan 10.7(2) & 10.8(6) address correction for the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division.
- E911 service fund 10.11(2) – Rearranged the wording for better clarification. Added “does not have a valid board membership, or if the division determines that a joint E911 service board or the department of public safety”. Also added “board membership” to the last sentence.

After the public hearing, the proposed changes will go to the administrative rules committee. If approved, it is undetermined when the changes will be made official.

A question was asked why administrative rules do not match Chapter 34A. Mrs. Vos stated the administrative rules explain more clearly what the intent of Chapter 34A is.

Mrs. Vos attended the Washington County E911 Service Board meeting to clarify service board membership. Cara Sorrells, Washington County E911, stated their voting membership changed from 9 voting members to 4 voting members. There was further discussion about the revision to Chapter 10 concerning townships that operate a volunteer fire department. At the time that Mrs. Vos attended the Washington County meeting this revision had not been published in the bulletin. Mrs. Vos advised Mrs. Sorrells that this recent addition could change the membership on their board.

There was discussion about county service board membership contact information. It will be the individual county's responsibility to obtain the necessary contact information of their members. If the proposed changes to Chapter 10 are approved, this information will be submitted annually to the State 911 Program Manager on a prescribed form made available to the county service boards by the State 911 Program Manager.

US Dept of Commerce/USDOT Grant

As of today, Mrs. Vos has not received notice if Iowa will be a recipient of this grant. The funds have to be expended to the states by September 30, 2009 so there should be notification shortly.

The original amount Iowa was eligible to apply for was \$668,545.47. Mrs. Vos applied for that amount and submitted a supplemental application in the amount of \$4,000,000. The match funds would come from a portion of the wireless carryover fund over the next three years. That is the timeframe in which the state would have to expend the grant funds.

Re-opening the wireless carryover grant applications process at the local level will depend on the amount of grant award.

Bob Seivert expressed concern about the amount of money being obligated from the wireless carryover fund and after 3 years not having a completed project.

Mrs. Vos stated that this project would start the process of moving the wireless network to an IP based next generation network. This is going to be a very large project and will have to be done in phases. There has been much discussion what we currently have and what would need to be done to move to an IP wireless network. We do not want a network that is not complete. The amount of grant awarded will determine what phases of the project can be completed and still be a working network.

Discussion was held about using the ICN. ICN was approached when the wireless project was first started and they did not respond to the RFI that was recently sent out. Concerns include 24/7 support, charges for usage and time to resolve issues. ICN is currently used for long distance calls. The IP network being looked at would be private.

In addition to telephone service, it is anticipated that data, texting, video stream, photos and radio will be incorporated into the IP based network. 911 needs to be part of the big picture. Mrs. Vos has been attending all of the Iowa Statewide Interoperable Communications System Board (ISICSB) meetings. If Iowa is awarded the USDOT grant, Mrs. Vos will write the RFP for the IP based wireless network so that it integrates with the ISICSB plan. What makes the most sense is to work together with ISICSB to make a true statewide interoperable system that includes 911.

Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

Technical Advisory

None

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

Dina McKenna – The board received a draft plan in early September and it is being reviewed now. They hope to present the plan at their next meeting in September but it may be October. ISICSB has been asked to come to the NENA/APCO conference to give an update. A copy of the draft is on the website. When the draft is updated it will be put on the website.

An agenda item for ISICSB is to provide continuing education throughout the state. If there are meetings that you wish to have an ISICSB member attend, contact a board member to schedule a presentation.

ISICSB is in the process of hiring a statewide interoperability communications coordinator. That should help the board do more outreach education.

Ms. McKenna encouraged everyone to watch the website and to keep educated on the latest happenings, meetings, etc.

Mr. Seivert stated there is a negative undercurrent of apprehension about this plan. There have been comments that “they are going to take the 911 surcharge away”, “they are creating a monster that no one is going to be able to afford”. Mr. Seivert is not hearing positive comments from the different revues that he is a part of. The process of putting information on websites is good but it requires somebody to do something. Versus ISICSB going more directly out into the regions – Emergency Management, Sheriff’s and Deputies Association and have a representative seat there directly. Mr. Seivert felt that would alleviate a lot of the apprehension if there was more of a visible presence of the board members at these different places. It is time consuming and costly but it would be in the board’s best interest. Ms. McKenna agreed and stated that hopefully a statewide coordinator could help by being a part of these meetings and reaching out across the state.

Mrs. Vos – There are two opportunities coming up that ISICSB will be at. The Governor’s Homeland Security Conference Oct. 6-7 and the APCO/NENA/911 Council Conference Oct. 27-28.

Sandy Morris encouraged those entities to invite ICICSB to come to their meetings. The board may not be aware of when and where a meeting is and they do not want to force themselves on anyone. If ISICSB is put on the agenda and invited to come, we will make sure someone is there.

Items for Discussion

None.

Unfinished Business

None.

New Business

Jim Giglierano from Iowa DNR – Mapping initiatives.

Mr. Giglierano has been working with mapping and GIS for 25 years. IDNR is trying to coordinate their projects in more of a statewide fashion. Currently IDNR is doing a two foot color orthophotography project for the entire state. This project was started in 2007 and will be finished in the spring of 2010. Once completed, the data will be available at no charge.

Statewide LiDAR Project – This project will provide new elevation data of the entire state and is about 80% complete. It was to be a three year project but is now in the fifth year. This is a \$4.5 million project with the IDOT, IDNR and Iowa Homeland Security. It will provide new topographic information providing location and elevation information within 6 inches.

Statewide Geocoding Project – The objectives of this project are to 1) Create two geospatial datasets consisting of a standardized state-wide layer of address points (including both building and E911 address points) and a polygon layer representing building footprints and structures. 2) Create web tools for geocoding online by all government agencies and the public. 3) Create a process to maintain the

geocoding databases. IDNR wants to make this a cooperative project. If the data already exists locally it could be incorporated into this project. If it does not exist, they would contract to have the data produced.

Mr. Giglierano will be giving a presentation at the APCO/NENA Conference on Tuesday, October 27th.

Mrs. Vos – They need to understand how it is going to benefit 911. Some counties maintain their own database.

Mr. Giglierano – From other projects that have been done he understands that some dispatch centers have address point files and some have centerline files. If you already have the address point files for the driveways, IDNR will be creating a building footprint and an address point file on the actual houses, commercial buildings, etc.

Chris Moore – Do you have liaison in every county (example: when a building is removed) to be able to obtain current information?

Mr. Giglierano – We are talking to the local GIS person and will be talking to the 911 coordinators.

Will there be a statewide GIS website? Mr. Giglierano – We are getting there. The plan is to collect the data, standardize it and then hand it back for all to use. It is going to be a long process. Everyone has their way of doing it. IDNR's approach is to reach out, make contacts and discover how we can benefit each other.

Question was asked if IDNR had contacted Pictometry. Pictometry was contacted when they started doing the orthos for the entire state. It would have cost \$2.5 million to do the entire state. That cost was more than was available. There were also some issues with the software licensing. Pictometry has a proprietary software for viewing the oblique imagery. But they may look at that again in a couple of years

LiDAR compare to Pictometry. LiDAR is laser based. Sensing the same thing but doing it in a different way.

Question was asked if locally we went out and did all of the 911 addresses, would the state like to have that information. Mr. Giglierano replied they would. IDNR would compile and standardize the information then give the information back for all to use with any additional data they have.

Travel Request

No travel request.

Business from the Floor / 911 Issues at the PSAPs

E9-1-1 Rural Addressing Signage, Standards and Costs Associated with their placement

Brenda Vande Voorde, Fayette County E911 expressed a concern in reference to the upcoming federal mandate requiring replacement of road and street signs with those of higher visibility. Her local service board was told this had to be accomplished by the year 2010 and they had a discussion about the ownership of the signs.

Mrs. Vos stated that this is a federal issue and not state or local. She has made some contacts requesting a copy of the federal regulations and has not received any response. This issue was originally brought to her attention by O'Brien County.

Chris Moore, Pottawattamie County E911 asked if anyone present had their local board of supervisors come to their 911 service board and ask for money. Their service board voted not to do this. If they did this for the county, they would have to do this for each city. This could end up being thousands of street name signs.

There is discussion within the counties of what these signs are called – street names signs or 911 signs. The street name signs are used for more than just 911. They are used by the postal service to deliver mail, delivery service vendors such as UPS, FedEx, etc. and travelers in their course of travel.

This continues to be an individual service board/county issue.

Bob Seivert – Intrado/ATX letter. Since the last meeting, an updated letter was sent out by Intrado/ATX. Hughes has dropped out of the picture.

Mrs. Vos has contact ATX about collecting and remitting surcharge. There was another meeting the first of this week with Bob Currier, APCO, NENA and NASDA. Mrs. Vos felt it was not progressing well. ATX is saying they do not operate like OnStar. OnStar has two different choices. They have a wireless phone as part of the system and/or the emergency button that goes into the call center. ATX is basically the emergency button that goes into the call center. It does not work as a wireless phone. Therefore they don't need to collect the surcharge. Mrs. Vos approached them about keeping track of how many 911 calls they send to a PSAP and collect surcharge on that. They are considering that, but as yet have not responded.

Mr. Seivert volunteered Shelby County to accept all of the ATX calls in Iowa for the minimal cost of \$.50 per call. Shelby County would then transfer the call to any county across the state.

Cherese Sexe stated that the test calls with OnStar in her county came in on their administrative lines. Mrs. Vos advised that she has made numerous contacts with OnStar and they have been instructed to send their calls over the wireless network. Anytime something like this happens, the PSAP should get as much information and forward it to Mrs. Vos. Story County and State Patrol stated they are receiving OnStar calls and everything has been working properly.

Mr. Seivert expressed his concerns about allowing them to use our 911 trunks. These service providers are riding the backbone of the wireless network and not paying anything for it. If they are allowed to do that then that means that everyone should get the same service for nothing. The wireless surcharge collected from cellular phone company customers is paying for the network. If we allow companies like this to deteriorate the level of our surcharges, we eventually will not be able to provide the services that we provide today. It will erode our capabilities and we will not have enough money to replace our equipment. If we allow this open-ended access to Iowa's 911 system without a fee or charge or expectation, we have undermined our entire funding system.

Ms. Vande Voorde – Should this be taken one step further and say that this should not be on the backs of the wireline carriers either. If 60% of my calls are wireless, shouldn't wireless be paying the same as wireline? It shouldn't always be run on the back of the wireline carriers to fund the entire network.

Mr. Seivert – There is a whole philosophical arena you open up in this discussion. Every year we face challenges on the surcharge. There are counties that put in individual requests to increase the surcharge; change the way funds are distributed across the state and from what I am hearing there is a ground swell of counties out there that want more than \$.65. They want more than the 21% we are getting. They just as soon see us do away with the excess surcharge and have it come directly to the counties. I think this council and the next legislative session are going to see a lot of challenges to the 911 system. I feel the state is remiss in allowing calls to be delivered over our system for no fees. Some of us have tested with them. When they tested with me, it did not locate. We got the call, the ring and the voice. We didn't get the proof that it would locate to our maps. We need that proof of location, callback number, etc. If they can't deliver that, it is not a 911 call.

Mrs. Vos – It is my understanding after talking to Intrado and ATX when the testing is done you should be getting the location. If you did not, their testing is not working. The other issue we have to look at as a state is that this is a public safety issue. The one call that doesn't get delivered somewhere and something happens.

Mr. Seivert – There is no safe way to answer the letter from ATX. By answering yes, you are saying that you are willing to accept substandard calls that do not provide all of the information that is required. And if you say no and the calls are routed to State Patrol, I am creating a liability there by delaying the delivery of that call to the fire and ambulance personnel. Our service board is not answering the letter. The state

needs to step up. We as a PSAP community need to draw a line in the sand and say deliver the call in the proper way or don't deliver it at all. If these calls go bad, who is suffering?

When a test call was placed a very specific set of questions was asked of what was being viewed on their screen and those things matched, but the call didn't locate on the map. I tried to call them back using the number that came up on the screen. It took three days for them to get back to me. The number on the screen was not the number where the call was placed from. They didn't have any idea. They would have to do some research and get back to me.

Chris Moore – Is it my understanding that Intrado and these other carriers charge their customers a fee to provide this service.

Mrs. Vos – Intrado is a third party provider that is doing this for ATX. OnStar charges so much per year for their services. I assume that ATX is going to do the same. I have had conversations with them such as “you charge for this service but you can't remit \$.65 surcharge per month for each customer”. If you look at our legislation, other state's legislation and the FCC, they are not seen as a wireless carrier. They are a telematics provider.

Several concerns were expressed about collecting and remitting of the surcharge.

Chris Moore – Can the 911 Council take a stance and say this is the way we are going to do this in Iowa. You will delivery your call according to this set of guidelines. If not, we will not do this.

Mrs. Vos – That is one of the reasons why Bob Currier attended the last meeting. The issues being discussed now have come up since then. The understanding was that if they were going to provide the service they were going to provide the location and do the testing. They were still discussing the surcharge. As State E911 Program Manager I take the advice of the council and we try to work through issues. The council can take a stance but it ultimately falls back on our agency (HLSEM) to determine how we are going to handle this.

Ms. Vande Voorde – It is my understanding if you sign off on the letter to accept the calls – these are the steps I will do 1) call you to setup of the testing 2) do the testing 3) make sure the testing works. My opinion is that once we say yes – we do the testing and the testing didn't work – we are going to send you the calls anyway. At what point can we say it's not working right. We don't want you to send the calls.

Mrs. Vos – You can say no at anytime. If you are not comfortable with the way it tested and they are not providing you what you think they should, tell them not to send you the calls.

They are tracking what counties have replied to the letter with a yes or no answer. If they say no, they are going to come back to me and discuss what will be done. There is no timeline. That was removed from the second letter. We need to get surcharge out of these companies, but if they are not considered a wireless carrier they are not required to remit surcharge. Chapter 34A refers to wireline and wireless surcharge.

Rob Koppert – The legislation also says wireless communications service means commercial mobile radio service as defined under sections 3 (27) and 332 (d) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, FCC and Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Mrs. Vos – They are not defined as a mobile radio service. Administrator David Miller is looking at this as a public safety issue. He understands the issue of the surcharge and wants the surcharge as much as any of you do.

Motion by Mike Bryant, seconded by Tom Heater to form a legislative committee to explore changing language in Chapter 34A to alleviate this problem. All ayes. Passed. Chair Ray appointed Mike Bryant, Barb Vos, Bob Seivert, Tom Heater and Chris Moore to the committee. The problem will have to be defined and the Attorney General's Office will be consulted to determine what is legal and will solve the problem. We will need the support at the local level by contacting your legislators, etc.

There was discussion about reaching out across the state. There are individuals that are unable to attend meetings like this due to time or financial constraints. The use of email will be used to forward information to all of the organizations represented on the 911 Council, PSAP contacts, etc. across the state.

Question was asked about reimbursement for committee meetings. If you are conducting council business, it is reimbursable. The committee will meet after the 911 council meeting to setup dates and time to meet.

Mr. Seivert – Legislatively he is aware there is an effort to change Chapter 34A to include services such as Code Red, Reverse 911, etc. as an allowable 911 surcharge expenditure.

Mr. Seivert brought before the council that the APCO primary representative, Doug Slagle has missed more than three consecutive meetings. According to the council's bylaws – Members that are absent (unexcused) from three consecutive meetings shall be considered to have resigned their position. The appointing body shall be notified to fill the vacancy as soon as possible. Motion by Bob Seivert, seconded by Mike Bryant to send a letter to the Iowa APCO President asking for an appointment to fill the vacancy of the primary representative on the 911 Council. All ayes. Passed.

Capt. Todd Misel asked the question whether there are any other 911 calls coming into the PSAPs now that are not being compensated for. He felt that this should also be addressed specifically redistributed cell phone.

Mrs. Vos distributed information on the SafeLink Wireless & the Lifeline Program. This program will provide free cell phones with free minutes to low-income families. TracFone Wireless, Inc. has been approved by the FCC to offer Lifeline – a federal public assistance program that ensures telephone service is available for low-income families. TracFone is required by the FCC to confirm that it has provided evidence it will offer basic or enhanced E9-1-1 service to its SafeLink customers and the carriers have supplied letters certifying they route 9-1-1 calls from TracFone customers in the same manner that they route 9-1-1 calls from their own retail customers. The FCC 9-1-1 certification can be filled in two ways: 1) A state 9-1-1 administrator or board can certify that TracFone has provided evidence it will provide 9-1-1 service or 2) Each Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) can certify individually. Once a request is received to certify, there must be a response within 90 days. If the certification is not provided, they can self certify. This is according to FCC Docket # 96-45.

Mrs. Vos stated they will not be paying surcharge because they are not charging for this service so they can't collect a surcharge.

Mrs. Vos had a discussion with Administrator Dave Miller about this issue last week and they are not going to certify TracFone. TracFone will end up doing it anyway because the FCC says they can self-certify if the state or the local PSAP does not certify. A letter will be sent with the section of code stating the requirement to pay surcharge and the state is not going to certify and does not endorse this program. Mr. Miller has spoken with the Governor's office and they are on board with the decision of not certifying but it doesn't mean the calls are not going to show up. These phones will be distributed with 59 minutes a month. Once the 59 minutes has been used, the person receiving the phone can purchase an air card with additional minutes therefore allowing it to be used with no remittance of surcharge. TracFone is a reseller and companies they resell for are already a part of 911 wireless network. There is no way to track when one of these calls come in.

Mr. Seivert – If it is a wireline issue, it is the local PSAP's decision to accept or reject. But if it is something that is coming through the state wireless network, it should be a statewide policy. It should not be either/or. We need to draw the line on how those calls are handled. We need consistency.

Mrs. Vos – I do not have a problem with that. Basically why we have always done it this way is to allow the locals to determine what you do or do not want – just like you do on your wireline side. If you prefer that we make the decision that is fine. When the wireless network was initiated, the decisions were made

at the state level. It seemed the better way to do it so the locals have input on what is going on in the wireless system.

Bob Seivert – Input is fine but input should be used to develop a statewide policy that is uniform across the PSAP community. Not if you want to you can and if you don't, you don't have to.

Back to ATX – Sandy Morris, Des Moines PD stated that they did sign the letter and further remarked that their feeling was they did not want the citizens to get caught in the fight as the calls will be routed somewhere, eventually coming back to them and her feeling was the delay in service was not advisable. Ms. Morris commented that she felt PSAPs could accept these calls and still work to make changes that are necessary.

Announcements

Meetings are held every other month January, March, May, July, September and November.

The next meeting of the council will be on Wednesday, November 18, 2009 at the Iowa State Patrol District 1 Office, Des Moines at 10:00 a.m.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sally Hall