

Meeting Minutes
Iowa State Interoperable Communications System Board
May 12, 2016
West Des Moines City Hall
4200 Mills Civic Parkway
West Des Moines, Iowa

John R. Benson
HSEMD

VACANT
Iowa DPH

Carole Lund-Smith
ILEA

Andy Buffington
Communications Center

VACANT
Municipal Police Department

VACANT
Communications Center

Linda Frederiksen
EMS

Kelly Groskurth
Member At-Large

Ellen Hagen
Fire Department (Volunteer)

Ted Kamatchus
Sheriff's Office

Michael Kasper
Sheriff's Office

Deb Krebill
Fire Department

Tom Lampe
Iowa DPS

Jason Leonard
Municipal Police Department

Jeffery Swearngin
Iowa DNR

Patrick Updike
Iowa DOC

Bob von Wolfradt
Office of the CIO

Robert A. Younie
Iowa DOT

Legislative Members
Senator Chris Brase
Senator Randy Fenestra
Representative Bob Kressig
Representative Steven Holt

Meeting called to order by Chair Lampe at 10:30 am

Conference telephone line was opened for public listening and comment, and for Board members who found it impractical to attend in person.

Voting Members in Attendance: Ellen Hagen, Bob Younie, Jason Leonard, Ted Kamatchus, Patrick Updike, Tom Lampe, John Benson, Linda Frederiksen

Members via conference line: Bob von Wolfradt, Andy Buffington, Nicki Whitaker (DPS) representing Finance committee

Non-Voting: SWIC Craig Allen, Helen Troyanovich, Outreach Specialist Shawn Wagner

Absent: Jeff Swearngin, Deb Krebill, Michael Kasper, Carole Lund-Smith, Kelly Groskurth

Guests: Shweta Agrahari, ICN; Jontell Harris, ICN; Captain Curtis Walser, Cedar Rapids FD; Sandy Morris, DMPD; Stephen Rodriguez, ICN; Melvin Mercado, Motorola; Shari Schmitz, Motorola; Rob Dehnert, Westcom; Rob Koppert, Cass Co 911; Brian Krumm, JVC Westwood; Duane Vos, RACOM; Marty Smith, IDPH; Kevin Condon, IA Communications Alliance; Cindi Fox, DPS Communications; Tom Reis, State RACES Officer; Bill McCall, Story Co ARES; Clint Miller, Story Co ARES; Mike Harvey, Iowa DOT; Steven Ray, DPS; Brian Noble, ICN; Doug McCausland, Warren Co 911; Jerry Green, DOT;

Approval of Agenda: Ellen Hagen made a motion to approve today's agenda. Ted Kamatchus seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

Approval of Minutes: John Benson made a motion to approve minutes from April 14, 2016 Board meeting. Bob Younie seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

SWIC Report – SWIC Craig Allen reported on the following items:

- He attended the National Council of SWICs meeting in Jacksonville FL. He chairs the Technology & Policy committee and one of the areas that will be important to the National Council of SWICs and SAFECOM is defining public safety grade in a broader scope. Their interest along with some of the standards making bodies is to begin defining standards for those areas of communications lacking specific standards like "coverage." Project 25 recently adopted a definition of public safety grade that says if you have P25 equipment, that equipment by default meets the defining of public safety grade. So a good question is what is the difference between "public safety grade and mission critical"? The difference is demonstrable mission critical can be any piece of equipment that is used to carry out a mission. The challenge is that that mission critical equipment does not meet mill specs and therefore has places that it cannot go, e.g., one would not take mission critical equipment into a scene with flammable gas vapors or those cheaper radios are unprotected and could set off a blast. As NCSWIC looked at how to drive interoperability one of the best things to do is to get people into equipment that is interoperable and will integrate together on a standards based network, system, or platform. Standard have yet to be established for many system components. Discussions at the NCSWICs and joint SAFECOM committee agreed it made sense, at the national level, to collaborate to drive standards based solutions. When this group looked at existing definitions of PSG, the Iowa definition of PSG appears to be the driving force and aligns well with the NCSWIC vision.
- SWIC Allen summarized the ISSI/CSSI system interface meeting him and Chair Lampe attended in Denver, Co. May 2016. The Department of Homeland Security Office of Emergency Communications (DHS/OEC) hosted this ISSI/CSSI meeting. It was an invitation only event where they invited 16 system users who currently use ISSI or CSSI. He explained that ISSI/CSSI is a wired system interface between two trunked systems. The CSSI is the interface of dispatch consoles and between systems. The interest that Iowa has is that our ISICS platform has one just one ISSI switch. We have seven trunked radio systems in Iowa. How does it make the most sense to utilize that one switch with regard to interoperability. The interest we had in going out there was what are best practices, how to best use it. There is a whole range of possibilities for using an ISSI connection from interfacing a system to be able to take your radio system and get radio transmissions on your smart phone application. We learned that these interfaces are largely software driven. This becomes a cost driver as platforms have to be at the same level of software upgrade or the ISSI switch will not integrate as it should and may not pass all information from one system to the platform. So as we begin to look at how Iowa operates we can look at the latest platform 700 MHz TDMA, so how might we interface with some other legacy equipment or in fact should we? These questions and many more was what this meeting was about. From SWIC Allen's perspective, we came back better prepared to answer questions at upcoming Detail Design Review (DDR) meetings. Although we did not come back with as many answers as

we thought when we went out there. The conversations from ISSI/CSSI meeting were the attendees agreed there needs to be more of these user/vendor meetings, and these meetings probably need to be held quarterly. The first day was all Users; the second day was a blend of users and manufacturers of ISSI/CSSI equipment. In the middle of the discussion were the P25 standards and the value of having standards. What came out was there are some gaps in the standards between manufactures interpretations, how these manufactures implement each standard. Chair Lampe then displayed an article and stated there were three things about an ISSI we need to know. 1) It is important to know what an ISSI is and what it means to ISICS interoperability. 2) It is important for us to use the one ISSI we have as a system solution not for just one additional system interface. 3) We have only one ISSI solution as part of this contract and we need to make sure that we use it the most effective way for interoperability. Looking at the total interoperability statewide is our goal. We are building out a statewide platform and we have to be cognizant of other currently existing county systems that are in place and make sure we think through how those systems might connect to the platform in order to interoperate during events. One of the ways to interconnect for interoperability is through ISSI, but we only have one ISSI port in the platform. Chair Lampe pointed out from the recent Mission Critical article, that one way to create systems of systems approach is to use ISSI as a network interface with other systems. Chair Lampe stated there is discussion of a plan to fulfill our obligation of interoperability meeting Code of Iowa requirements. That includes studying ISSI technology and how it might work for Iowa, he will share additional information later in the meeting. There were people at the Denver meeting that had deployed ISSI and CSSI from different vendors. The Denver meeting was very informative with presentations of advantages and disadvantages by system administrators who have actually deployed multi-vendor ISSI solutions. SWIC Allen stated that ISSI is the Interface Systems and that interface is between the core of one system and the core of another. The CSSI is the dispatch or console wired connection. The cost of an ISSI can be significant as telephone lines are typical connections between the two systems cores. In ISICS platform has three cores, so any ISSI from another system must connect to all three ISICS cores and if the other system has redundant cores all three ISICS must connect to all of theirs, which is lots of backhaul whether microwave or dedicated telephone lines. Unfortunately there must a way to get that wire connection from one core to the other core and when connecting multiple cores you can imagine all the different connectivity that must occur. It is not a solution without significant backend costs. Chair Lampe stated that when we first formed our budget, it is set up as a special state find so that end of the year remaining balance rolls over in the fund each year so in years when we underspend we can keep the funds for future use. In most state funded budgets the end of the year funds cannot be spent in the next fiscal year, ISICSB is retained by ISICSB Fund which may be helpful particularly if cost of ISSI connects occur each year. There is money budgeted for a study to assess how to best deploy ISICS and this can be used to get consulting help on the best practices and best way for ISICSB to deploy the ISSI port. Kamatchus asked if the \$50,000 in this year's budget was just for the study itself. Chair Lampe said it could be used for study. Some of this year's funds have already been used for consultant in developing a labor needs time line and after contract signing project management. Kamatchus stated that the state annual appropriation to ISICSB of \$150,000 does not go far in platform transitional costs. These funds would be used for such things as a committee to study how we are going to deploy and use ISSI.

SWIC Allen stated that he had a schedule conflict with travel in June 2016 and needs to decide how to address Board representative attending the TIA meeting in Kansas City next month. SWIC is scheduled to be at the PSCR annual meeting that same week as the TIA meeting. He is recommending that we send two members because of the close proximity and therefore reduced travel costs to go to Kansas City, Mo. He would like permission from the Board to use the travel that was approved for TIA membership travel and in this instance; we send two people as the cost should not be more as there are no flights involved. He asked the Board to approved sending two people to observe and vote if there is a vote on the P25 at the meeting in Kansas City the week of June 6th. If there is interest, by any Board member to attend the TIA meeting they can send SWIC Allen an email. This would be the second of our two required meetings to gain TIA voting status.

Bob Younie asked a question relative to the ISSI study discussed by Chair Lampe, specifically what are the expected outcomes of that study? Would they be fiscal outcomes or something that we would have to spend money on? Chair Lampe stated the intended outcome is a recommendation as to how best to use our ISSI asset Chair Lampe suggested the final decision would probably be User Group Committee under Chair Andy Buffington along with Technology under Vice Chair Patrick Updike that will figure this out. SWIC Allen has established good contacts through the meeting they just attended in Denver and Chair Lampe would like to engage other current ISSI users across the country to have those people available to answer questions. It is imperative to be able to talk to the people who have already used it. Bob Younie stated the outcome is optimization of the system. Chair Lampe stated that out of that there would probably need to be some policy statements or directions, which will require Governance committee involvement.

- DSWIC Troyanovich reported that she participated with the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council (NPSTC). She is on the NPSTC Broadband committee, which takes several hours a months for the P 25 LMR to LTE migration workshop and working group. She has reviewed the first draft of the public safety requirements use case report for P25 to LTE transition. This is the LMR/LTE operation working group which is similar to what SWIC Allen is talking about that is connecting two disparate systems together using different technologies. This NPSTC working group is working on the FirstNet or LTE side. If we have an LTE FirstNet system then how do we connect that to our existing ISICS LMR system because they will be working side by side in the future. So we are looking at public safety mission critical voice specifically in the LMR/LTE working group and they include FDMA/TDMA, full duplex voice, emergency alerting and voice quality. Those are some of the things they are focusing on in the use cases. These groups have all the public safety disciplines represented, different industry represented, government and different telco carriers and private industry in the working group. This is one of the largest working groups in the standards development of LTE and all of the working groups feed up into the NPSTC broadband committee. Mission critical voice communication requirements for public safety including all mission critical items, mission support, business critical, and consistency of user experience, management user expectations, security, and existing LMR systems return on investment. Much of this is not anything new to what people have been discussing in Iowa regarding FirstNet.

E911 Council Report & E911 Program Manager – Blake DeRouche reported there was a legislative bill, HF 2439; it changes the pass through amount of wireless surcharge managed by HSEM and provided to the local 911 service boards. The increase was from 46% to 60% of wireless surcharge funds held by HSEM, which go back to the PSAPs. This legislation also puts a \$4.4 million cap on expenditures from the carryover fund to PSAPs. In the current year (FY 2016), we had anticipated to pass through \$12 to \$13 million dollars and in FY 2017 with the new legislation that will be capped at \$4.4 million. HSEM plan to provide lump sum payment to the county service boards to make sure to utilize the entire \$4.4 million. The other thing this new legislation does is puts a priority on consolidation effort whether physical and virtual consolidation. In the Next Gen world of E911, you can do many things that you might not have to have some of those very expensive pieces of equipment in every PSAP. It looks like the intent of this legislation is to encourage some cost savings with virtual consolidation and not actually closing PSAP doors finding cost savings while sharing some services. Therefore, that \$4.4 million is consolidation that has to be considered first and that everything else can be passed through to the county service boards. He reminded everyone that there is a list of FAQs on their HSEM website. Regarding Text 911, we have talked about our pilot program where they have been like a web browser, an instant message screen. What was recently accomplished is it is integrated now with the call taker screen so a text will come in just like a call and the telecommunicator can respond just as if it is a call. Cedar County so will be looking to do that statewide hopefully sooner rather than later. Cedar is the first county to received text messaging that way. We are also looking at doing a beta product, a map of all the contacts with 911. It does get into CASM a little bit. There are about three different contacts for every PSAP and are putting that on a map so you can hover over it and see the contacts for each particular PSAP. This will be put on their website for the public. Chair Lampe asked about how is the physical vs. virtual consolidation defined, and how does an agency qualify for consolidation, does it mean that virtually you can do it, you don't have to shut a center down? Blake stated that was correct. Some PSAPs already share some equipment. They are writing the rules as to what will be eligible so when we have the public hearings for the PSAP community and the 911 council he will report to the Board on it. Kamatchus stated that talking about consolidation and to clarify he asked if DeRouche was talking about potential to literally reduce PSAPs so maybe the counties sharing multiple dispatch centers per county. DeRouche stated that was correct. DeRouche stated right now there are 113 state recognized PSAPs and the legislature is interested in reducing that number of PSAPs. He has read the legislation to say we can also virtually consolidate to keep all 113 doors open and save money just by sharing equipment. Kamatchus stated that the new LMR platform the state is putting in; he wondered how many dispatch centers the State Patrol had, which is five and asked, "Are they reducing that number as well?" Chair Lampe stated that yes DPS are reducing their number of dispatch centers, although he does not know for sure by how much yet. Kamatchus was concerned about local control being taken from the local dispatch centerboards. DeRouche stated the other thing HF 2439 asks to do is the study consolidation, he is considering it more as a statewide PSAP strategic plan which they are trying to do full consensus involving local PSAP supervisors, sheriffs, Telecommunicators, wireless providers, landline providers and trying to figure out a master plan to do business. DeRouche stated, You don't have to close doors, instead of having a technology like a "controller" in every PSAP, just have 6 controllers throughout the state which are shared That virtual consolidations seems more palatable to local boards, but would still be giving up a little control. Kamatchus stated a concern for losing jobs locally. Chair Lampe stated there is a difference from NG911 side consolidation and physically dispatching a caller from that PSAP or from another PSAP.

User Group Committee – Chair Andy Buffington reported the Regional Interposable Committees (RICs) continue their good work and it has been encouraging seeing them grow with their action items. They are continuing to work on the process for the 18 local UGC voting memberships, which includes the letter of intent to join ISICS that will be received by the Chair and will forward to the User Group committee. Hopefully next month we will start seeing some recommendations from the UGC to the Board for inclusion on ISICS and then Chair Lampe will be in charge of propagating our UGC with those individuals. There were some recommendations from some outlying groups on the UGC. The UGC has been working closely within the Technology committee and working with the Governance committee. UGC Vice-chair Rob Dehnert (WESTCOM) was asked to step forward to take over the UGC report as Chair Buffington was reporting telephonically and Chair Buffington had to return to his other obligation. Chair Lampe asked Buffington before he left about the “letter of intent” that was mentioned, are you looking for this Board to come up with a “sample letter of intent” for a county or a city to join ISICS? Chair Buffington stated he would like to see something along that line so that each organization that is joins ISICS does not have to make it up on their own. Maybe the Board could provide some sort of template letter of intent. He stated that if Dallas County could provide the first input and it is acceptable to the Board then we could use that as the template to provide the other agencies. SWIC Allen stated that the ISICSB website should provide a packet of information with examples of what documents should look like in making submissions to join ISICS. Chair Buffington agreed and believes the Board needs to set up some foundational documents, like the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Again, how each agency is going to complete their application will be up to them. Any of those covered municipalities would sign the MOA that says “yes” they want to join ISICS and then they would go to each municipality that they dispatch for and have their governing body sign a resolution in support of the MOA. That package needs to be forwarded to the locals, the locals need to do the work and send that back to UGC. UGC will consider each application and make a recommendation to the full Board.

Chair Lampe stated the process outlined by Chair Buffington falls in line with Outreach Chair John Benson’s four-step outreach plan. SWIC Allen asked if Chair Buffington was envisioning that each city would get their packet and as it comes in UGC will have this stack of requests bundled together? Chair Buffington thinks that it is going to be jurisdictionally decided. What works well for a small county may not be exactly how they do it in larger or combined communities or counties. Cities that have full-time fire departments, etc., those entities are covered by their city. We could have an MOA from a county but a certain city may want to do their own and not collaborate with a county. Buffington posited he thought the application ISICSB receives would be on a case-by-case basis so we will organizationally need to keep open lines of communications between Outreach Chair John Benson and through the UGC so that we are able to communicate those things and help the agencies seeking to join ISICS. Chair Lampe stated the importance of getting the process itself on the website so people know how to apply and do we NOT need a policy statement as to how that process works. SWIC Allen states that under 2013-01 we have a model procedure. Therefore, the current policy statement, which developed a protocol as to how to carry out the intent of this policy statement. Younie stated that is the conversation they have had in the past. He says we may be looking at a series of protocols that define how Policy Statement 2015-01 is carried out. We will discuss later some of the complexities involved in this process.

Finance Report – Chair Kelly Groskurth had a schedule conflict so Vice-chair Nicki Whitaker reported the Finance committee met May 3, 2016 and explained the financial statements. The current balance remaining of the grant is approximately \$1.2 million of that \$986,000 is

from the grant and the remaining \$246,000 is the match. The other account, the general fund account the remaining funds that are available is \$199,000. Additional funds were appropriated during the for FY 2017 during the legislation. The appropriation in 2017 was for an additional \$154,661 and those funds will become available beginning July 1, 2017. There were no other specific items discussed.

Governance Committee – Chair Younie discussed his handout seeking to discuss the first three pages of policy 2015-01. The next four pages of his attached documents are that same document laid out in a little different style; the lines of this document are numbered to discuss specific areas of interest. The last two pages are diagrams of the User Group committee. The top page is the one that was discussed in November 2015. It shows the layout of the UGC based on a Governance statement that we adopted in 2015, and 2nd page is new with the most current names on it he had access too. Andy Buffington is the Chair and the Chair of any standing committee according to Iowa administrative rule has to be an ISICSB Board member. He will get changes made and update the names of committee members. Younie stated he would like this document put up on the website. He then directed attention to page 6 of the document, specifically line 84, 85 and 86 “the ISICSB shall establish a standing User Group Committee UGC of no more than 18 voting members from county and local, and no more than one additional vote per state or federal agency operationally using the platform”. Compare those three lines with the User Group committee diagram on page 9 of his hand out. On the diagram there are 18 blue blocks, those blocks correspond to that statement about 18 members. The additional vote per state or federal agency is the black box on the diagram. Kamatchus brought up whether the Chair could vote. Younie stated perhaps there needs to be a protocol to define that.

Line 86, 87 and 88 “One voting member from each region shall be the Regional Interoperability chair for that region whether or not the RIC chair is a user of the platform”. This distinction is that we have RIC members and they must be users of the ISICS Platform but the RIC chair themselves do not have to be users of ISICS. These RIC committees and their chairs are on the top row of the blue blocks.

Line 88-100. This is the ex-officio non-voting members group. People who represent certain constituencies and have certain expertise. This list of ex-officio members is very inclusive. The point is that we want to be inclusive. If we think we have missed someone, we will correct it. These ex-officio members represent the yellow blocks at the bottom of the diagram. Younie stated that Chair Buffington is concerned that so many people will show up that it will be hard to accommodate them all in a meeting.

Lines 100-105. To be a voting member and RIC chair from that region users must be from and represent a user agency actually using these interoperable platform daily operational/interoperable User agencies must demonstrate full time daily operational/interoperable use on interoperable platform as determined by the Governance committee. The actual specifics of this full time user have not been discussed in detail amongst the Board. Younie states this may take some time to develop depending on levels of users. There were questions about line 103 and 104. An audience question arose asking “Does this mean that people that have converted and using the new state system for all of their daily use, is that what is required for them to be eligible to be a voting member or a user agency or if someone is maintaining what they currently have as a legacy of the structure but interfacing or connecting to the platform say with an ISSI connection, are these non-direct users going to be eligible to be on the user group committees?” SWIC Allen stated the experience from talking with other states is that this definition is a complex topic. One

concept used by other states is that you limit the voting members to those members who actually use every day operational use of the platform as well as interoperability. These fulltime users become the voting members or overseers of the system since they rely completely on the platform for all their radio use every day. There can be implications for having an interoperable user who uses the system, maybe once every two months, setting the policy for those who use it every day. The role of users and voting rights was considered and discussed when the policy was developed. The way all of this is crafted gives ISICSB the ability to write procedures without having to go back and re-write policy.

Younie continued, Line 105-108. Chair shall appoint no more than three users from each of the six regional areas. In addition, one of those three regional representatives shall be the RIC chair of the region. This is an application process to become a voting member of a RIC. Once the RIC chairs are democratically elected, then the other two votes from county or local for each region.

Line 108-121. We start to talk about the Board Chair and how the Chair goes about doing the appointed duties. When this was written, the line was solid enough to give some criteria and give some elements for consideration for the Chair to give toward the remaining 12 voting members representing county and local regional committee representatives. Chair Lampe asked if there was intent to review it because it was written at a time when we did not have a system and now to see if it still works with the system. Governance Committee Chair Younie stated the intention of going through this now in this meeting is in preparation of administrative needs of having a rotation of members and we need to be more aware of what this language is and how we apply it. When we developed this and voted on it we did not really have a platform or knowledge of what level of participation this platform would get. Today, the User Group Committee has six voting members and it is time for us to re-acquaint ourselves with the language of the policy and be aware that we have some decisions that are facing the Chair on filling out this committee. So yesterday Governor Branstad signed bill in Dallas County as Dallas county plans on being the first joiner of the system, there is going to be more over time. We are making a start and we owe it to the Governance to make sure we understand what are responsibilities are as a Board and what the Chair's responsibilities are.

Operations Committee – Chair Ted Kamatchus reported the committee had a phone meeting on April 20 with 11 members present. The majority of the discussion revolved around the STR trailers and the development of that sub-committee under Cindi Fox DPS as subcommittee chair. During the discussion some of the other individuals who would serve as maybe regional chairs keeping up the STR trailers for that committee, Curtis Walser, Tom Reis and Rob Koppert. That is going to give us someone who will help coordinate the efforts on the East, Central and West trailers. There has been much communication since the last meeting.

Cindi Fox then gave a brief update as the where they are in this process with the trailers. She reported that Curtis Walser, Tom Reis and Rob Koppert are the regional vice-chairs and Marty Smith is on the sub-committee. Currently the West trailer is actually located here in Des Moines with the Central trailer. Due to some construction issues at DPS 2nd Avenue Radio shop we have to remove the STR trailers from there, so she has made arrangements for them to be housed JFHQ in the secured gated area. With the West trailer, being here Rob Koppert and Cindi will start the initial process for inventory on the West trailer.

Cindi was asking for Board permission to move STR Trailers out to JFHQ today. Chair Lampe asked how we could access the trailers at JFHQ. The process to access the trailer

will probably be through Cindi. Their hope is to get the one DPS truck that is hooked to the West trailer also stored at JFHQ so if we do need to take either trailer somewhere that there is the capability to do so. Chair Lampe stated that it has been a challenge to get some vehicle to tow the trailer and so that will be something that needs addressed. Cindi stated that right now we have to borrow a vehicle from DPS Radio. There is an old Ford F250 that is there that can pull the trailer as well as a dually truck. Marty Smith has also mentioned that if we can into a crunch, he does have access to truck that would be available to tow the trailers. The sub-committee will be working through these issues. Chair Kamatchus stated the biggest issue we have right now is that two trailers are located right here in the middle of the state. There is a lot of catching up to do on the West trailer with maintenance and such. We have to find someone who really wants the responsibility of taking care of that West trailer. In addition, the coordination of getting someone to haul it around properly. It will be a benefit to find someone local and do that. He is looking forward to seeing how this sub-committee evolves in the weeks and months ahead. Chair Kamatchus also had the opportunity to speak with Steven Ray (DPS) Steven stated that they would be getting together with Jason Hoffman and Rob Dehnert as to the private/public partnership aspect to all of this. We will encourage others to want to get involved. This will have many implications. Kamatchus stated that Steven Ray is sitting in a good position as the Chair of E911 Council. Kamatchus stated he is looking for someone who can go down through the ranks and find the people who know this stuff and that group will formulate this into a nice structure and then will be looking for other people to take over because we do not want anyone to be burnt out. Steven Ray stated we have to make sure the private factor is included. Kamatchus stated we need to have the private organizations involved and then will see massive leaps in things like emergency response and those type of things. Kamatchus discussed having a face-to-face meet and greet for the Operations committee. Would like the Operations committee to meet after the June 9, 2016 Board meeting. Plan about 1 ½ hours for this meeting. The sub-committee is going to work with the DSWIC to get the program to do the inventory. Those inventories need to be consistent. This will be the sub-committee's "baby". There will be a group for East, West and Central and Cindi will coordinate those groups. It will be a bar code system. There is a good generic inventory although he does not know if it shows all right now. Chair Lampe asked if the radios inside the trailers are functional. All three trailers are equipped with UHF, VHF, digital d star and they have completed installing those. West and Central are identical and very close to what is in the East trailer. They are all identically programmed.

Outreach Committee – Chair John Benson reported that with regard to the outreach on the ISICS network, we did have to adjust the dates so instead of starting May 18 we start May 25 and then June 1, June 2, June 15. Will just be doing two a day. They will start at 11:00 with the second one at 12:30. Will be about an hour of formal presentation through the webinar and about a half hour for questions and answers. The 25th and 1st will focus on the policy and the 2nd and 15th will be about technology. The notifications will be going out soon. Shawn Wagner has been working on those. Anyone who is on a mailing list that we have will be getting an invitation to this. It will be electronic registration. You will be able to watch it live on the webinar. It will be recorded as well and put onto the Board's YouTube page. If you are not able to make any of the four dates listed, you will also have an opportunity to watch them online. We will be adjusting those as we go forward based on feedback that we receive. Also on the website, you will see the first piece of quick information. If you go to the website and click on the ISICS platform icon, it will take you to that webpage and on that webpage; you will find the first piece of information that is referred to as the ISICS brochure. It is two pages with regard to what this will accomplish. It has information about how we go through that process of registering to access the network. More of these elements will start

to show up. The webinars are a joint effort between the deployment team, from the State's side as well as Motorola. Chair Lampe asked what style of presentation this would be. Chair Benson stated there had been discussions about doing both. It will have to be live from the aspect that there will be a Q & A at the end of it. It appears to be about a 3-hour time commitment on those respective dates. However, are also considering doing a nicely recorded formalized one on YouTube. He personally prefers to have the webinars done live.

Shawn Wagner gave an update. He has been testing the ISICS presentation registration via website, there have been some issues. We did not want double registration so have been cleaning that up as well as clean the content that was provided by Motorola. Currently we are working on with the ICN for FirstNet outreach, will be going out and working with the schools to turn about the WI FI and we are going to see how we can talk about that and how that will look once FirstNet is implemented. There are three schools (Marshalltown, Norwalk and Martensdale) currently that have this WI FI system enabled for public safety people. When they come on site or near the site, they should be able to use it so we want to visit with the schools and see how it is working for them and talk with local officers and other public's safety people who are using it. We are working to complete the website going on to the next state's standard, which is a constant work in progress. Right now, we are taking all the content from the current site and moving it into the new site as well as making sure that all the modules work. Will be developing a social media strategy as well as further refining what this FirstNet Broadband Summit will look like in 2017. He provided Chair Lampe with a list of what a breakdown would look like for this 2-day conference and whom would we want to present. Still working on the videos of the COML COMT as well as recording the CASM training. Looking at potentially putting together a FirstNet Iowa that would be a summary of everything we have accomplished and the process we have gone through. We are working on scheduling to do presentations as well as finalizing the CASM point of contact report. WI schools is a program for us test what it would look like if we turn up the WI FI at the school and allow public safety personnel use it rather than using their air card. This would be a much stronger signal and allow them to do much more. ICN is a big part of this and they are helping us as well as when we go to the schools we are going to be looking for the ICN personnel to tell us how this is going from their end as well as the school's end and public safety's end. Chair Lampe stated the purpose of this testing is to simulate what FirstNet will do for public safety personnel. Shawn stated we are waiting to get the feedback from the schools. This is a great way to demonstrate FirstNet and interoperability for public safety to be present around schools. Random law enforcement presence at the schools can be a great deterrent.

Training and Exercise Committee – Vice Chair Captain Curtis Walser -gave a report for the training committee. The training committee is in a bit of transition right now with the retirement of Chair Boeckmann. They did have a conference call this last month the 3 topics of concern right now are the 3 upcoming training classes from OEC, the COMT Train the Trainer that was awarded as a regional award, the state's in FEMA region 7, each state is given 2 positions in the class and the class will be hosted here in Iowa in West Des Moines at Westcom. It is possible that we will get more than two seats if the other states do not have personnel to send. Still in the process of identifying who is going to attend, these are Board appointed slots at this point. This is slated to start September 12, 2016 and runs for 5 days. The other two we have been awarded but not scheduled is the Incident Dispatcher Training along with the NG911 Workshop. Discussed finding the right time and right place to hold these trainings. This summer is busy with the National Governor's Association Conference (NGA) and immediately following that is RAGBRAI and then the State Fair. We need to look at the September through November timeline to schedule those trainings. There are two

COML candidates here in the meeting today. Chair Lampe and SWIC Allen presented Bill McCall and Clint Miller with credential certificates.

Technical Committee – Vice-chair Patrick Updike reported that on May 1, 2016 procedure 2015-04A went into effect. He has not heard any comments at all. This is the DCS tone on point to point. SWIC Allen stated that he has received four phone calls asking what does this mean and once he explained what we were doing, everyone was fine with it. The committee met on April 28 and one of the topics of discussion was the interoperability channels. It was hung up in the process because Rob Dehnert had submitted some documentation from the FCC. In this document, the FCC wants to keep the interoperability mutual aid channels narrow band analog but they also want to include some of the 100 MHz channels to be included in this. This gives a little concern about should we really proceed until we find out if the FCC really means what they say about narrow banding the 800 MHz channels. The information was forward to DHS/OEC Regional Representative Jim Lundsted. He brought back some information that leads us to believe the FCC is going to amend that document not narrow band the channels. Out of all of that, we did not achieve anything with interoperability channels. LMR – fleet mapping, there was much input on this. Rob Dehnert is working on his matrix that will be coming out soon. That document has mathematical calculations that helps outline how many users based on population, how much equipment can be put into that area. This is all just a work in progress. Rob Dehnert stated there have been a number of suggestions and comments, alternatives to it. He stated there is a reserve in the allocation much like the 700 MHz frequencies were laid out. It is at least a plan to start with.

Broadband Subcommittee – Jontell Harris representing Co-Chair Ric Lumbard reported the last Broadband committee meeting they voted on two action items. The item was for the FirstNet workgroup to engage in outreach with the tribal entities in Iowa to be sure they are informed on all the FirstNet progress and process. They met with several individuals from the Sac and Fox tribe also including the FirstNet tribal regional representative, answered their questions, and determined that quarterly updates would be scheduled in the future to keep them updated. The second item was in relation to quality of service, priority and pre-emption. The committee established a consultation task force comprised of five committee members to interface with FirstNet on any TPP actions in the future. FirstNet was present for this last meeting. They had the regional lead as well as the government affairs representative there for our region and they reviewed the process leading up to today for FirstNet. They discussed next steps and answered questions from the committee. Regarding the Opt In/Opt Out task force the Broadband committee established, they have the responsibility of researching all aspects of opting in or opting out of FirstNet. Their research has concluded and it has been determined that if FirstNet's state plan does meet the expectations of the state that the committee is recommending that we go for the Opt In motion right now. Governor Branstad has been updated on the research findings of that task force and preparation for the National Governor's Association meeting this summer. The June Broadband committee meeting has been canceled due to summer vacation so the next meeting will be on July 5th at the Oran Pape building. Chair Lampe asked that the RIC chairs be involved with the task force. In addition, he stated that FirstNet would be at this Board meeting in July.

Other Reports – Chair Lampe discussed information sharing. At the next Board meeting in June 2016 you will see on the agenda, he will form an ISSI subcommittee on this Board to research the best practices and to research how best to use our ISICS, ISSI solution and interface with other systems in the state because our main goal is interoperability. Chair would like that LMR ISSI subcommittee to be formed in June. He reminded Board members

that in 2009 and 2010 this Board issued federal pass through PSIC grants. Those PSIC grants were funds because the county or local users would connect to the statewide platform when it became available. Those funds were distributed based on that fact. The platform is now being designed so the grantees need to be given options to meet their obligations. He sees this LMR ISSI sub committee working along with the vendors in Iowa to find the best solution. If there are any ideas of whom you want on that committee, please let Chair Lampe know by June 2016.

Chair Lampe also mentioned that the Governor to the Board has appointed four new members although he does not have names yet.

Motorola ISICS Project Director Melvin Mercado gave a power point presentation on the Motorola update. Much of the project file is huge and is difficult to gain intelligence from it and put it on the small screen. He presented a make shift critical path, and timeline trying to depict how the difference project aspects affect each other. First, is the end of last year we staged ISICS platform and that triggered the rest of the project process. In January 2016 we started coordination with the Core team of ISICS, the primary focus has been site development and continues to be a big piece of that. In February 2016, we started having explanation meetings on requirements for developing an engineering Detail Design Review (DDR), February 26, 2016 was the first one and there have been 4 ever since. Plan on a long session by the end of June or first of July, they will be done with DDRs. Looking after the NGA to start the formal meetings with the optimization of Detail Design Review. Mr. Mercado wants to focus on the site development DDR. One thing to consider is that we are talking about the completion by the end of 2017 but it does not mean that none of this stuff is done until 2017. There are different elements going on all the time. Pre-construction of the site development has different elements also. Right now, our primary efforts are in identifying the sites, walking the sites, confirming the viability of the site and having folks review what has been found. Preliminary drawings have been put together for review and to get some feedback. A lot of time has been spent identifying the points of contact. Started the process in January and finished about the middle of February getting the points of contact. After that, the site walks and then started reviewing the construction drawings. Specifically we are looking at all the A & E work. There are a total of 21 DPS tower sites and 42 DOT tower sites, we have identified the points of contact for each site, done the site walks and produced preliminary construction drawings, which were completed by the middle of March. Review process for DOT has been completed. By March 14, we had all the DPS sites reviewed and are currently at 62% with the DOT sites. Aiming to have DOT completed by the 20th of this month. They are starting to move forward with the zoning approval process. They have coordinated with the State; this has gone through the Attorney General's office to issue a letter that was issued about a week ago. Once they received the letter, their partners started on the ninth to make phone calls calling the jurisdictions where these sites reside. This has helped them to move forward with this project. Based on the timing, they are talking about getting this completed by the 27th of this month. They are going to look at any zoning variances that they may need identified and work with those entities to resolve that. For the DOT sites, they need some extra time because not all the pieces are in place. The date of June 10 is based on completing the review by the 20th of this month. Once they get the zoning approval, they make any modifications necessary to the construction drawing that was reviewed here. In this case, the drawing they generated was reviewed and goes to zoning based on the reviewed document and if zoning says there must be changes, then they do some modifications. Then they go to a civil DDR, which is a formal Detail Design Review. While that is happening there is a regulatory process going on. That process takes the longest. After these processes are complete, then construction will begin. February of 2017,

what that means is that is the worst case that means that there is at least one site out there that is going to start in February 2017. In reality there is a lot of work that will start this year. Many sites are already in existence so these sites we can be done quickly. The sites where you have to build a tower or a shelter are much more complicated. The overall project in terms of construction, we are talking towards the end of 2017. In reality, much of this work is happening right now. Major actions by the end of this month, a simulcast cell that they are in the process of installing in the capitol area in downtown Des Moines. By the end of this month, that cell will be installed. That is critical for supporting the NGA as well. Also looking at completing integration of Westcom into the ISICS core as well by the end of this month. Looking at dispatch in Des Moines at JFHQ, we will be able to integrate that into the ISICS as well. By the end of this month will have the simulcast cell in the capitol area and Westcom interconnected so that there will be interoperability and operability as a small regional system, a starting point for ISICS. That means by the end of this month ISICS will be up and operational even though it is a smaller starting point, it is a significant milestone. SWIC Allen asked what is the biggest concern based on where the project is right now. Mr. Mercado stated the concern continues to be site availability. Updike asked if any of those sites include the DOC and Melvin stated that yes, there were a few. Melvin stated there had been some issues with some bigger towers they wanted to use which were IPTV towers. They are working on resolving some of those issues.

Old Business – Chair Younie stated there were requests to take the administrative rules to your group or committee and email him about what you have done. At the last Governance committee meeting, they discussed term limits or rotational processes on committees, the UGC and RICs. He would be interested in everyone talking to his or her groups about what they think about that and comment back. The Governance committee is of the opinion that it is probably healthy to have a rotational process for the UGC, so it would be to have a third of the committee rotate off each year. It would be 18 people but six of them would be RIC chairs. Therefore, they think it would be useful to have the 3-year rotational process to maintain stability but still provide turnovers on the UGC. They think the same things would also be healthy at the RIC level. It does not mean that you are on once and then cannot be on again, as Board members on ISICSB 1 can re-apply. At some point in time, they think it would be appropriate to have a protocol statement to discuss these things. SWIC Allen asked the Board if there was any concern with the 3-year cycle. Kamatchus stated that there should be some rotation but suggested that we make sure before you start to rotate the RICs to look at the people who are in those positions and finding that type of leadership is not as easy as finding participation in a group. He is just speaking of the leadership position. Younie stated we must have something that we can sustain and that will work. The Governance committee needs to think through this, they are not ready to make a recommendation yet. They see advantages to this but question how to sustain it. He would appreciate discussion among everyone's groups. Will bring this topic back next month. Chair Lampe asked if there was, anything to keep the UGC from moving forward based on this. Younie stated that "Yes" there may be something that might prevent that. The Governance committee is recommending to the Board continuing discussion to let the concept mature. The Governance committee is recommending we are not ready to start yet. Chair Lampe stated that two counties that submitted intent by email to him but not a formal letter to join the system. If he cannot pass it to the UGC to allow them to come on, we will have to decide as this Board to approve them. Is the UGC established enough now to approve these counties? Younie stated that yes it is.

New Business – Chair Lampe reported that he has an email from Dallas county requesting to join the system. Will probably get them a sample letter of some type to use and then will

push that back through quickly to start that process. Woodbury County is also in the wings waiting for the same thing. Those two counties will be coming on soon. The UGC will have their first two applicants very shortly.

Public Comments – None

Motion to Adjourn: Motion made by John Benson, seconded by Ellen Hagen. Meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM