

Meeting Minutes  
Iowa State Interoperable Communications System Board  
July 14, 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

David Ness  
Municipal Police Department

Denise Pavlik  
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 10:40 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:** Bob Younie, Jason Leonard, Ted Kamatchus, Patrick Updike, Tom Lampe, John Benson, Linda Frederiksen, Jeff Swearngin, Denise Pavlik, Andy Buffington, Michael Kasper

Members via conference line: Brian Dreiling representing Bob von Wolfradt, David Ness, Kelly Groskurth

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

**Absent:** Ellen Hagen, Deb Krebill, Carole Lund-Smith, Bob von Wolfradt

**Guests:** Shweta Agrahari, Iowa Communications Network (ICN); Ric Lombard, Executive Director, ICN; Sandy Morris, Des Moines PD; Stephen Rodriguez, ICN; Melvin Mercado, Mindy Benson, Tama Co EMA; Rob Koppert, Cass Co 911; Brian Krumm, JVC Kenwood; Diana Richardson, RACOM; Marty Smith, IDPH; Blake DeRouchey, Homeland Security; Curtis Pion, Polk Co Sheriff Office; Curtis Walser, Cedar Rapids FD; Tracey Bearden, Polk Co EMA; Tim Malott, Cedar Co EMA; Ryan Mulhall, ICN; Dave Brittain, DPS; Scott Richardson, DPS; Nathan Rippey, DPS; Rhonda McKibben, DPS; Amanda Roush, Story Co 911, Doug McCausland, Warren Co 911, Shari Schmitz, Motorola; Nickie Whitaker, DPS (phone); Jim Lundsted, OEC (phone)

**Approval of Agenda:** Jeff Swearngin made a motion to approve agenda. Michael Kasper seconded this motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

**Approval of Minutes:** Andy Buffington made a motion to approve minutes from June 9, 2016 Board meeting. Ted Kamatchus seconded this motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

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

- SWIC Allen discussed ISICS system and a general overview of progress. The Board should know that Outreach Committee did two webinars providing general information and a couple on technical information. He recognized John Benson for doing an outstanding job of facilitating those webinars and his abilities to capture the questions and get us to the right contact of question is greatly appreciated.
- The User Group Committee application process has a meeting scheduled and invitations were extended to representatives from other statewide platforms including: Ohio, Illinois and Missouri. These other states can help us assess the process we have established and help ensure that we will be using best practices. The ISICS platform is being used today. Chair Lampe will talk about ISICS more particularly how it worked for the National Governor's Association conference. There is an ISICS Detail Design Review (DDR) scheduled for October that will bring us much closer to exactly what the system will look like, how it will work, and what we can expect from it.
- Activities from FirstNet, the RICs continue to identify representatives from various agencies across the state and get the information into the Communications Asset Survey and Mapping (CASM) tool. We are developing updated FirstNet presentations for deeper more robust outreach e.g., 201 and 301 to meet the interest that is emerging across Iowa. There are different levels of interest, some are trying to determine what FirstNet means to them operationally, and others say they want to be on FirstNet so they are looking for a path to get there. Presentation 201 and 301 will help public safety across Iowa get a better grasp of FirstNet capabilities and how to get involved. FirstNet continues to identify who their primary vendor will be with responsibility for construction and the rollout of FirstNet. In SWIC Allen's observations Iowa is very well positioned and prepared, as other SWICs have not brought anything up at meetings that Iowa did not already know about and was already actively involved in. In many ways, it is hard to recognize when you are out in front of the pack, which is where Iowa finds itself on the FirstNet initiatives.
- Board activities. We have had a couple of new Board members, Denise Pavlik from Scott County and Captain Dave Ness from Des Moines. Denise has agreed to chair the Training & Exercise Committee. We posted on our website a revised list of committee chairs and the times and dates they meet.
- SWIC Allen was asked to look at the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture (TFOPA) and provide some insight as to what there might be value of interoperability with regard to Iowa. Allen knows a number of the TFOPA members involved in drafting plans and these plans were silent in many areas that needed addressed, such as a strategic plan and requirements of public safety grade. He was told there would be another TFOPA report coming out that will address those topics more robustly later in 2016.

- DSWIC Troyanovich reported that on the Federal level she has been working on the communications research user interface working group. This started in June and they have weekly meetings every Wednesday. In 2016, PSCR decided they would develop a user interface roadmap for public safety and PSCR is seeking to solicit input from first responders, federal, state and local government, industry leaders and academia. By leveraging expertise from across a diverse stakeholder base, they can accurately identify where research and development resources will create the greatest impact to the public safety community. They have done other roadmaps that are similar to this so through the NCSWIC group she was assigned to the working group. The weekly meetings have accelerated capturing stakeholder information regarding user interface technology, including potential gaps, to create the UI roadmap. This week they discussed voice gesture and eye control technologies, wearable and smart user equipment, and interactive GPS. It is all about forward looking for LTE and FirstNet.
- On the FirstNet outreach, they have been working on the WISE Pilot, which is Wifi Internet for School Emergencies. This pilot has been a strong focus this past June and will be going into the summer months. She will be heading up the technical liaison duties while Shawn Wagner will be talking to mainly the stakeholders and the affiliates. We have introduced the WISE Pilot FAQ, some have already been sent out. FirstNet quality of service, priority and pre-emption, those documents that the FirstNet Broadband Committee sent out have been circulating in the regional RICs and we have had a few discussions on the RIC calls. We have some outreach planning to include QPP in the works of FirstNet and that is like a power point presentation Shawn and DSWIC are working on. In addition, the FirstNet Broadband committee is planning the FEMA Region 7 meeting in August.
- RIC Report. As far as the RICs go, we have an issue right now with chair vacancies in three RICs. In RICs 3, 5 and 6 the vice-chairs have yet to hold a vote to get new leaders in as of today. SWIC Allen and DSWIC Troyanovich made an effort to go to RIC 5 and could not as the leaders were too busy to meet with them. Therefore, they will continue the calls and the emails and online tools for RIC outreach education and include RIC outreach in the meetings as they travel for FirstNet outreach this summer. Regions 1, 2 and 4 meet regularly. One thing that is common in all the RIC meetings is that one of the requests that she has noticed for the next LMR/DDR meeting, they would appreciate more than a 2 week notice for these meetings, if they are a long-term meeting like more than 1 day. They also would like a CASM webinar. Therefore, DSWIC will be working with OEC Jeff Lee on a initial training webinar. Our webinar is more about the history of CASM and that is not what they want they want to know how to sign up. Also been working on a CASM NextGen presentation for Homeland Security 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Iowa Homeland Security Conference coming in October. There was a June 30 deadline for the conference presenter form to be completed, which was done. September 30 is the presentation deadline and it is already completed. RIC 1 meeting was yesterday and there was light attendance. One of the themes in RIC 2 was the point of contact map on the website had not been updated since April. Shawn provided her with some training, she was able to update that map, and she took over the duties of updating it. Region 4 meeting, Chair Doug Reed, they had discussed the points of contact in CASM and did discuss the QPP and are considering a survey in the Constant Contact database to use for the QPP feedback from the regional people. DSWIC explained what QPP was. Quality of service, Priority and Pre-emption, it is similar to if you know how radios are used, if you have a talk group, emergency talk group that is mainly used just by first responders, but then you have you have an

“all hands on deck” situation and you want to put other entities in there, you actually change to a different talk group, you escalate their priority. This can be done in the LTE world; you can do it by user and in so many different ways. You can pre-empt others trying to get to the same tower if there is limited access. Each state needs to meet with FirstNet and they are doing it by FEMA region to determine how we want to do that in our region. Chair Lampe stated that QPP is totally related to FirstNet at this point and nothing to do with LMR. We are not dealing with the QPP on the ISICS system right now. SWIC Allen stated that whatever we determine for the ISICS system has to overlay with the QPP for FirstNet when it comes so that the radio device when it works, that framework has to work the same way. The prioritization is the bottom line and the network becomes secondary. Chair Lampe asked if that is where LMR and FirstNet spectrum are working together on the same networks, which is some time away yet. We are not talking about an LMR as of today. SWIC Allen stated what we do today have an impact on how things work tomorrow. DSWIC Troyanovich stated there are USE cases we use to explain it that are helpful.

**E911 Council Report & E911 Program Manager**– Blake DeRouche reported that later today they would announce the vendor for 911 consolidations which Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM) was tasked with in HF2439. They are looking at a couple of different stakeholder engagement meetings throughout Iowa. The ISICS Board will be included in that so be sure to engage in those meetings and spread the word as they would like broad participation in these meetings. There are no pre-conceived notions as to how the reports on consolidation will shake out. There is a lot of interest in the legislature about consolidation and about shared services. One of the things discussed in council meeting today was consolidation grants. The changes to HF 2439, the old \$100,000 grants went away, in its place are \$200,000 consolidation grants. Both physical and virtual are to be considered. HSEM did a number of webinars to explain changes to the 911-grant program and in those webinars, we discussed what would be eligible as far as virtual consolidation for radio systems; Radio systems alongside Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) and CPEs in physical consolidation. They had two consolidation applications both on virtual radio side of things. Program manager DeRouche explained there is another part of this related to PSAPs. He can easily draw logical lines – it’s one county that wants to join a regional radio system. What does that mean for a county who wants to join a statewide system? How does that PSAP then connect directly to another consolidated PSAP? The team is trying to interpret what ISICS means and how it applies and if it is an eligible expense in consolidation grants. We have not approved administrative rules yet to update according to HF 2439 directives. Therefore, they decided to slow down a bit on approving the consolidation applications. They will gather August 10 prior to the next 911 council meeting to make decisions. I hope that they will be able to involve their consultant for the consolidation study at the same time so they can look strategically at what they want to consider as virtual consolidation. We can debate both sides of the radio consolidation. SWIC Allen stated that it seemed the council had adopted the P25 expenditure of funds for P25 upgrade equipment to align with the statewide platform, which is a recognition or acceptance by the council of ISICS platform. What would it take for the 911 council to consider ISICS for blanket acceptance? DeRouche stated that if the Board thinks it would be beneficial for their purposes, to write a letter of some sort. Maybe it makes sense to go ahead, adopt it, and then have language in the administrative rules. DeRouche stated that maybe we should go ahead and start approving consolidation applications for the state LMR project at some point before we pay that out and close that grant. We will want some sort of documentation in front of the Board

or from somebody that yes they are now on the system or made those steps to get onto the system.

Tim Malott Cedar, County Emergency Manager, approached the Board and stated that regarding the question on the effects of flooding and asking if you could move any ISICS equipment. Lesson learned from the 2008 flood was the first thing they do is take dispatching of all the emergency responders to the incident away from the PSAP because they are overwhelmed. They need to do their day-to-day issues, they move dispatching to the EOCs. How will that affect FirstNet and this ISICS platform when it is not sitting in the EOC? SWIC Allen stated that all you have to do is hit the ISICS network, think in terms of your phone; it does not matter where you go if you have wireless connectivity, you only have to hit the network. Tim stated that he has had three presidential disasters and they have lost all cellular. SWIC Allen stated that your radio acts like a cell phone except on a stand-alone network (ISICS) so in a statewide system you bring your radio; it does not matter where you go in the state, and it works. If you take your dispatch center and move it over to another location, as long as there is access to the network, you can do that. Tim stated that he does not move his PSAP unless necessary.

**User Group Committee** – Chair Andy Buffington reported that they have some openings right now for RIC chairs. The last meeting of the UGC was June 16, which was during the DDR, which led to decreased participation. On July 28 at 9:00 AM there is going to be a User Group Committee meeting at the DPS building for considering Dallas County's application to ISICS. This is the first step into this process so about the process, Dallas County has submitted a letter of intent. We need to do our best to make sure that gets out there to people that want to join or intend to join ISICS have that letter of intent stating their purposes. They are talking about some kind of technical consultation right now to determine levels of access. For the applicant, what technical information do they need to submit to us so we can make our best recommendation back to the ISICS Board so that as we make a recommendation it is not going to interfere, hamper or interrupt anything that the vendor is doing? From there it is then the Board vote. There will be a number of experts from other states here assisting with this meeting.

**Finance Report** – Chair Kelly Groskurth reported the Finance met on Tuesday. Regarding the budget report the State and Local Implementation Grant Program (SLIGP) request, total expenditures in June is \$37,923.94, of that the feds paid \$30,339.15. The committee did recognize that there was a charge for \$3,122 for phones on the report and questioned that. DPS stated that was charged to us in error and it will be removed from Interoperability accounts and show on the July statements. Of the total grants, \$2,070,323 grant, there is \$1,164,042.24 remaining in the grant. Of that dollar amount, the federal government has paid \$931,233.39 and that state has matched that at \$232,808.85. Need to note that the remaining amount of \$1,164,042 is slightly overstated in that the ICN has not billed the Board for services since October and they have done a significant amount of work for us. We are urging them to get that bill to the Board next month and a very conservative estimate of the bill is \$125,000. Nickie Whitaker is working on a documentation plan to develop for FY 2017 to ensure we get timely billing on that. Our annual appropriation we receive from the state and have received since 2013. Unused revenues rolled to the next year for our use. Our total revenues received through FY 2016 are \$360,138. Expenditures through June 30, 2016 is \$175,052, expenditures for FY end 2016, this last year we finished are \$92,338. We have remaining in our appropriations funds \$175,052. We also have been awarded a new

appropriation for fiscal year end 2017 in the amount of \$154,661. Therefore, the new balance is \$129,713. The Connect Nation contract that is on the agenda, the Finance committee recommended the Board enter into contract on an hourly basis pending legal review of contract last month to ensure that the contract is truly an hourly-based contract with no obligations to pay should we not use it for the full term. It has been confirmed that the contract is hourly based so the committee does recommend approval of the contract. The contract expires the end of July 2016.

Chair Groskurth made a motion to approve the contract with Connect Nation on an hourly basis with the Attorney General's approval. Michael Kasper seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passes.

Regarding the travel requests and the experts coming in from Ohio and Illinois, the committee has determined the Board and committee have both approved this in the past meeting. Good news that it will cost less than originally thought.

The Old Business item she will give report on. The Governance committee has assisted with this significantly. This is regarding Federal Engineering contract services. In December 2015, a motion was made for the procurement of Federal Engineering not to exceed \$50,000 for the project timeline for the LMR system. That was passed and approved by us. We have since learned that we made too narrow of a motion for what we need to use those services for. The Governance committee has reviewed the motion and has made the following recommendation. This is old business item "Revised Finance Resolution from Dec 2015 Expanded Use of Funds". The Governance committee has suggested modify the motion as follows: Kelly Groskurth made a motion for procurement of Federal Engineering contracted not to exceed \$50,000 for the project timeline for the LMR system. We are going to add to this motion *"and assist the Board and its committees in developing processes for and establishing technical criteria necessary to bring new users into ISICS and also provide advice can counsel to ISICS project team including but not limited to design reviews, research and identifying LMF best practices of any kind necessary to drive effective and efficient governance and oversight with a goal of ISICS being recognized as a national model of interoperability"* Chair Lampe asked if they were expanding the motion from the last time allowing the use of federal engineering to be used for purposes besides just the timeline which the motion was pretty narrow. She stated that was correct. The dollar amount is still not to exceed \$50,000. Kelly will have Bob Younie make the motion during old business.

**Governance Committee** – Chair Younie reported that he had passed out document (3 of them). First, one is the list of Governance committee members. Currently there are four Board members on the Governance committee. Denise Pavlik has accepted the leadership of the Training and Exercise committee so it may determine on her workload if she stay on Governance committee. Document 2 is the 6-page background for the Governance committee discussion to what Chair Groskurth just spoke about. The subject is the problem statement. Talking about additional resources to assist the Board through the User Group committee and other committees as the Chair deems necessary to do the work we need to do in assisting people coming on to the new radio system. On page, four there are some conclusions starting on line 156. Conclusion 1 states the Board does not have sufficient or appropriate staff resources assigned to all interoperable projects. We are short resources to do what we need to do. There are recommendations on page 5. We need to do something to help the Board and User Group committee fulfill our commitment to the User community as they come on. He sees it as having an external consultant review applications, make a recommendation to the User Group committee and they would act upon those

recommendations. The review of the application process that takes the time. Document 3 is a summary of the governance committee recommendation on this matter. Ted Kamatchus stated that as the system grows and there is a need for local jurisdictions to tie into it, there is going to be a need to answer questions and share protocols so that another body can tie into it, so is this particular authorization going to authorize us marketing out to jurisdictions the use of this program on an operational stance because if it is, then we are wrong as that is not our charge as a Board. Are we paying people to be sales people of this system or just sharing information about the system making them aware it is available. Younie stated that he supports the latter as being what our responsibilities are, the sharing of information and how to do it. Kamatchus thinks that it is important that we make that statement clear and up front, we need to make it clear that we are not out to market the system. SWIC Allen called attention to the assumptions on page 1, we “have a duty” based on statute to come up with a process if somebody wants to join any interoperability platform that we have. Do we just establish the forms and the process to be used and let locals figure it out how to complete the applications for them or do we have an obligation as a Board through our funding to assist them in completing the application forms to determine whether they want to come on the system. Allen stated he is specifically talking interoperability. What we don’t have right now is a team of consultants so that we don’t end up with a 150 consultants representing the 300 plus law enforcement and fire agencies around the state coming to the Board with different perspectives of how the systems works or what it does. So, do we have a duty to help locals come on the system for interoperability? Kamatchus stated that we must walk a fine line. Kamatchus stated, “If DAS or some other body outside this Board desires to ask how you can put your operation onto the state system to do daily operation that is fine for them to do.” Kamatchus said he feels it is outside the realm of what this Board’s responsibility is when we get to operability. His point is that he would not want to have a document that begins to meld over those two particular things (interoperability and operability). Kamatchus said it is not our charge as a Board that deals with interoperability. SWIC Allen stated that if this Board ends up with 150 consultants approaching the User Group Committee saying here is the best plan for county X and then later another consultant with a different view of what is best for another county Y, then that group would be ground to a halt. There are people who are going to want to use this for operations and people who will not want to use if for operations and the question is how do we deal with that as a Board do we still have an obligation as to how we open the door to them? If they build their own system, they still want to have interoperability on ISICS so when a user travels to another part of the state and needs to use ISICS and we need to have standardized methodology to accomplish that user need. Allen stated, of the 99 Iowa counties, 75 counties have 25,000 or less people, we will have to outsource the services to help those counties determine what is in their best interest. Therefore, if the Board says “No” we are not going to touch that area, we need to be ready for a whole back end that gets very expensive in addressing these various creative solutions that may show up because we are not following a standard model. Kamatchus commented that if the state who owns the system feels they want to have narrow protocols then the state should do that. He says it is the state’s responsibility and should be done for the exact reason SWIC Allen stated. He stated the Board should not take any action that the state should be taking. The Board’s job is to make sure there is smooth interoperability and that is where it ends. If the state wants to put money forth to find people who tell them how they should connect clean then the state should do that. Younie states that may be an area of disagreement. Will continue this discussion with Old Business.

**Operations Committee** – Chair Ted Kamatchus reported that during Operations committee meeting the members did unanimously vote to recommend that we move forward with the

purchase of the truck. The Board should take a moment to determine if a truck/trailer combination is feasible for all three Strategic Technology Reserve (STR) units and if that does happen that we look at the possibility of making sure that we have not just a maintenance process but a monitor process so that someone goes out on a daily basis to make sure things are in good order. He also stated that Cindi Fox is no longer an employee with DPS so they are in process right now of finding someone who will take over the sub-committee to monitor and coordinate the STR trailers. If anyone is interested in this, please let him know. SWIC Allen commented on the topic of monitoring, he thinks that is a wonderful idea. He asked if that was something that is envisioned as being volunteers to do that or is it something we should consider a more formal outsourcing of that responsibility. The trailers now have some age on them. Is it something that is workable for the volunteers? Kamatchus stated it depends on where the trailer is. If it is some place like a post where there are troopers in and out all the time, then we will need to find someone who can do it. Will need to be done on a case-by-case basis so will need to come up with a checklist of things that need done. The committee would also discuss how to get these trailers out to jurisdictions. Maybe we should have a flowing meeting where we are going to contact the jurisdictions to look at the trailers. Maybe utilizing the E911 people would be one way. Kamatchus announced that he is retiring January 2. Effective this meeting he is going to step down as Chair of the Operations committee. Ellen Hagen is the Vice-chair and she is able to take the reins for now but will need to look at a permanent replacement whether it is Ellen or someone else. He asks that the Board work with her on this. He would like to stay on the committee if possible. His last meeting with the Board will be in September. He stated the Sheriff's and Deputy's Assn. will research who will be the best candidate to replace him on the Board. He stated there is a bias for the Office of Sheriff. They will make an appointment based on someone who understands the Office of Sheriff. They want to make sure that anyone who comes in here that reminds the Board of the importance of the local person. He reminded the Board the state does not control the county and never will. He stated a sheriff recently reached out to all the other sheriffs, this Board supposedly went around the sheriff and went to the Board of Supervisors, did not tell the sheriff but wanted to go ahead and market it "the statewide system for operations". He stated that is not our job and we do not want to pick a fight with those elected officials. We have a charge so we should build it from there. We do not want to market ourselves. Chair Lampe had one question on the trailer; does committee have a plan to come up with standardization? Kamatchus stated the committee is working on the checklist for standardization. Chair Lampe suggested getting Dave Wilson (Johnson County Emergency Manager) involved in helping with this. Wilson does a fantastic job with the East STR Trailer. Ultimately would like to have the trailers as similar to each other as possible with equipment, etc. Linda Frederiksen asked about the truck/trailer combo is that something you are going to look at the cost to strategically replace the trailers. Kamatchus stated the truck was one the DOT was getting rid of so will bring that on board. Then the thought arose about getting a certain type of truck rather than hooking something up to trailer that is inadequate and trying to travel long distance with it.

**Outreach Committee** – Chair John Benson reported regarding the ISICS Land Mobile Radio (LMR) outreach webinars they did conduct the technical ones on 29 June with about 70 attending. There are two more scheduled for July 20<sup>th</sup>, which will complete the initial group of 4 webinars. Decided after these are completed to do monthly updates and will develop those as we see what is happening with UGC progress, etc.

Outreach Specialist (ORS) Shawn Wagner reported that DSWIC Troyanovich gave a good overview of what he has been working on but he will give a quick recap. We are working on continued FirstNet outreach. We are working on addressing the website. We have had

some issues that we are working through with the office of the CIO concerning billing for the website and support and maintenance and developing and understanding of how we will work together on the website as well as moving to the new fully supported state platform. There is a great deal of contractual items and things going on with OCIO's office right now with websites and where the state as a whole is going so there will be another update next month. We are working on the new power point update for outreach and he will cover that later in the meeting.

**Training and Exercise Committee** – No report.

**Technical Committee** – Vice-chair Patrick Updike reported they had three agenda items in June. The first item was Minnesota Field Operations Guide update that was sent by SWIC Allen. He wanted the Technology committee to look at these documents to see if Iowa had any updates that needed to be submitted to Minnesota for their Field Operations Guide. This documentation was sent out to all the members. There was not much input from members other than Eric Nevins did remind them that one change was the point to point channel here in Iowa added the DSST 71 tone and Rob Dehnert has a webpage that has all this information with regards to mutual aid channels, interoperability channels, fire channels, EMS. So he would like to see in the future Rob's website used as a central location to refer to off the ISICS webpage so if anyone has any questions about what some of these agencies are using, they can go to that as it's accurate and kept updated. This whole issue with the Minnesota Guide gels with the Iowa Field Operations Guide we are working on. Still trying to gather some of Fire and EMS input. The ISICS P25 platform fleet mapping, there has been no movement as of right now because of the NGA taking place. Westcom is now connected to the ISICS system with two simulcast sites up and running and fleet mapped with 16 talk groups and cored through a new central location. It is the hope that with upcoming DDR optimization meetings that we can move forward with fleet mapping discussion. For DOC, Updike will start pulling in DOC technicians statewide to strategize fleet mapping the DOC. They are set up and ready to go, they just need to program their mobiles and control stations.

**Broadband Subcommittee** – Co Chair Ric Lumbard reported we are in a very interesting period with FirstNet right now as the RFP process is mid-stream, they are in the process of going through evaluations to choose a prime vendor and there is no information coming out right now. The committee looked at some of the scenarios for timelines, best case is a prime vendor shows up in the federal procurement process, above the other vendors and it is a clear-cut decision. The prime vendor is awarded and immediately that prime vendor goes to work in developing state plans where all states and territories would have their plan developed; a draft state plan would be dropped in the state for review and if that is good, then great! If not, then there could be some discussion, but then shortly thereafter the final state plan would be dropped on the state by FirstNet and then that starts a 90 day period in which the Governor can choose to opt in or opt out. If he adopts it immediately, it goes into build out immediately. We do not anticipate seeing the draft state plan this calendar year. However, in the procurement process, if the vendors appeal that could make that initial procurement process more drawn out. So right now, we are in that waiting period waiting to see whom the prime vendor will be. In the meantime, the committee has been getting two task forces underway, one is tribal outreach. We are required as a state to reach out and provide collaboration with various tribes within the state of Iowa. The committee has had their first meeting the Sac and Fox tribes and we have an existing relationship with them so we are building on that relationship. We are asking them to help us go in to other areas of the state that have not been recognized but are still able to be part of the FirstNet process. The other group is the QPP. The QPP is Quality of Service, Priority and Pre-emption, which begins to

discuss within the construct of the FirstNet cellular network, which inside that already private space has quality of service, has priority and pre-emption abilities inside that. Therefore, it allows everyone to be shoved off, moved over, and prioritized. FirstNet has requested that each FEMA region provide input as to how they would like to have this QPP treatment designed for the LTE network. Therefore, Iowa is hosting our FEMA region and we have a meeting in Osceola on August 16 for the entire FEMA region. This will be a think tank discussion to help develop that QPP strategy for our FEMA region. We have appointed a task force of five individuals from the Broadband committee to serve on that. We thought we had closed off the task force on Opt-In/Opt-out but we have kept the task force open, some consultants across the nation have been sort of throwing their wares at the state of Iowa. We are listening and making certain. The reason why we are keeping the door open to that, should FirstNet provide through their prime vendor, provide a plan that does not do Iowa law enforcement and First Responders well, is partial or incomplete, or does not augment well or collaborate well with other systems, then we would need another way to go and open another conversation. We would grab very close to the private sector, put our heads together, and re-evaluate this process. Until we see what FirstNet's primary vendor has defined for this state, we cannot really say that all options are off the table. We are keeping that task force to continue to look at all the information that keeps coming in to us. The ICN will be hosting an inter connect forum on August 2. This will be a technology forum. They are set up for their Public/Private Partnership Summit on August 25. Hoping to provide new information to all the vendors who come and those asking about FirstNet. It will be held in the Grimes Building at 1:00 PM.

**Other Reports** – Melvin Mercado gave the Motorola Project PowerPoint update. There has been much activity this past month, some repetitive. The first of three cores is up and operational. Westcom is operating on the ISICS platform. Des Moines simulcast cell is operational. Des Moines dispatch is operational. NGA command dispatch is operational, the NGA optimization is completed and the NGA training is completed. The Engineering DDR has also been completed and completed policy and technical webinars. There are roughly 2300 radios on the system right now. The system detailed design review was held over 3 days. Our eyes are set on the site development detailed design review, which is about the site development effort, (towers, shelters, equipment and install). There is also focus on the optimization detailed design review (how we want to program the devices and system to meet the needs of the ISICS platform). The Detailed Design Review was held in the middle of June. Looking at the doing Optimization DDR on October 11 & 12. On the A & E DDR, they would like to close the book on this in the next 30 to 60 days. On the overall Region Site Pre-Construction, the NEPAs are the things that hold us back. They are time consuming and we cannot proceed until done. All the focus has been on the pre-construction. They would like to, by end of September, move into construction phase. They have been working with DOT and DPS, meeting on a weekly basis and conference calls, with much action happening. They have sites which have been rejected by the FAA, and other sites they have determined cannot be used. It is important to keep track of the microwave path verification. Even though paper studies look good, site visits are necessary to get the right coordinates. There is a lot of labor involved and so can be a slow process. He reviewed the site pre-construction progress for each region. This is an ongoing process and is the most frustrating for everyone involved. The goal is to get 20 to 30 sites built by the end of this year. Will continue coordination with Dallas county project to interface into ISICS core and do the same thing with Woodbury County. The great asset we have is that the state has fiber assets statewide that are helpful in trying to get some things completed. SWIC Allen asked about presenting the Board with a critical path chart and has still not seen one. He asked when the Board would see that. Melvin stated one of the issues they have is our critical path is the site

development. SWIC Allen stated that the way things are explained to the Board is too opaque on where to put the energy and the Board really needs the PERT critical path chart. Motorola had agreed during contract negotiations to provide the PERT chart each month to the Board and had not yet completed that agreement. Melvin stated they do have this in a Microsoft office file.

**Old Business** – Chair Kamatchus stated the Operations committee recommendation is to purchase the truck from DOT. Bob Younie stated it was still available. Chair Kamatchus made the motion to purchase for truck from DOT for \$5,000. Patrick Updike seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passes.

ISSI committee with SWIC Allen and Bob von Wolfradt. SWIC Allen stated they had already met and identified those needing to be involved with the ISSI Committee. They have some of them already and the goal is to have a power point presentation next month.

Bob Younie discussed expanded use of funds under 20c. Going back to document 2, page 4, item 11 talks about the 4 different levels of user that we will have on the system. The point of this discussion is we recognize the fact there is interoperability and operability. Item 11 is an estimate he made. SWIC Allen discussed the four different types of levels. There is a cost to the Board on this end to evaluate those levels of users. That was the reason for back in the assumptions if we are not in this business we do not have to worry about it. If we are in the business of this system then we have some oversight and need to make sure that we stay in compliance with the contract. Kamatchus stated the cost per user is \$300 X 50 users, for instance, is that money billed back to us or back to the end user. Younie stated there were different ways to approach this and his recommendation is that this is a Board cost because we need to make the system where we can understand how the system is going to work to the extent that those costs fit this model, there are costs. This Board and not the end user will cover them. That is Younie's recommendation and why he prepared the estimate to get an idea of the cost would be because it is possible that we will have to seek additional funding from the legislature to do this. Document 3 is an outcome of the Governance committee discussion on document 2 with the recognition that we had some business in December 2015 that we could leverage by changing the language slightly and utilize what was approved then has not been utilized to date. That would be a way we could move this ahead. Specifically we had a motion that we passed in 2015 and had we known then what we know now, the motion would have been different. What our business is about here today is to deal with the business of the Board, what the Board has to do relative to bringing new users on to the system. We have worked long and hard and do not want there to be a roadblock this late in the game. We want to be able to address bringing the users on to the system in an expeditious way. The Governance committee recommends discussion by this Board relative to page 2 of document 3 to modify the last Board action from December 2015. Chair Lampe stated the \$50,000 already approved but you want to expand the use of it is different from you are saying document, with the \$300,000 estimate that we would probably try to should to help locals understand. Younie stated there are two elements to this plan, a short-term plan and long-term plan. We have to work within DAS rules and there is only so much we can spend on our own authority without going through an RFP process so this lets us leverage the \$50,000 that we approved in December for immediate needs and the second element is we will potentially develop an RFP for a larger amount of money to do this on a long term basis. This is go get us moving ahead for the users who want to come on right now without going through an RFP process. Will leverage the existing contractor we have on Board, which is Federal Engineering. If his estimate is correct, we cannot leverage it to that extent for all the users that are going to come on. We have to go through the RFP process

and select a new vendor to do that. Chair Lampe asked if we just wanted to address the short term with this motion. Younie stated yes but also have a discussion regarding to what degree do we want to take on this finance for helping users come on the short term and long-term basis. Is that what we want to do? The committee recommends we do that. Buffington stated from a User Group committer perspective this comes as a need for them because it is apparent the workload that is being put on them with the exception of Rob Dehnert the rest of them do not have the technical expertise to be able to give educated answers and what they do to grant access has a big impact on ISICS. They are in need of this type of guidance.

Chair Lampe entertained a motion to modify 20c. Younie stated he spotted an error he made on line 59. Either an “a” has to go away or the “s” in users.

Bob Younie made a motion to expand the use of the \$50,000 using current vendor Federal Engineering by modifying the December 2015 motion, take this language, and broaden the scope under which we could use Federal Engineering services to support the Board and user group near term/short term duties. Mike Kasper seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passes.

**New Business** – Shawn Wager discussed FirstNet 101 being described as the 99 county outreach that we have already performed. FirstNet 201 is where we are now in making sure we understand county demand and their understanding of FirstNet, making sure they are receiving whatever new FirstNet information we have including information such as QPP. FirstNet 301 is the government opt-in/opt-out, so what our state chooses and how we discuss that across the state and what decision comes from that. 301 and 401 have a hybrid portion of what our state plan is and what we receive from FirstNet as far as our state plan and how we work through that plan with the First Net deployment.

Formerly it was Wi-Schools as in Wifi Schools but now it is called WISE and we typically use the term WISE Pilot. WISE stands for Wifi Internet for School Emergency. It is a pilot program with three schools, Norwalk, Marshalltown and Martensdale. There will be a press conference on 25 July. We are currently coordinating this with all three communities. We have been reaching out to Fire, EMAs, Police and the Sheriffs in both Marshal and Warren counties and all three cities to make sure they have an opportunity to be a part of this. Iowa is one of the only states looking at a pilot program like this. WISE Pilot is, during an emergency event, or any time day or night, public safety vehicles can come up to the schools and use their Wifi. It is a dedicated private secure Wifi connection for public safety. We have an FAQ available which describes the WISE Pilot which has been circulated to the participants first, and is now available on our website.

Chair Lampe stated under 21c the Board responsibilities for local use of ISICS falls into Operations. He thinks this should be discussed more at next month’s Board meeting.

**Public Comments** – Rob Koppert, the 911 Director for Cass County, addressed the Board regarding the point Sheriff Ted Kamatchus brought, which was also brought up by a PSAP manager. He had a sheriff contact him. Rob wanted to caution the Board, from what he understands there may be perhaps a team of individuals going out and speaking with Boards of Supervisors, city councils, other elected officials that oversee police departments, fire departments, sheriff offices, etc. bringing them up to date on what the ISICS is. ISICS is a good thing but the ISICS is not here. You have what he refers to as snake oil salesmen that are not telling the entire picture. You want 95% mobile coverage from the ISICS but some

counties are being told it is going to be their end all, be all. This what he has heard from one PSAP manager. It might work for many counties but for some counties it might not work well. He has looked at his county and if he wants indoor coverage, I might have to put up seven towers in my county to get indoor coverage for my deputies, we have talked and looked at two vendors, and we are in the neighborhood of 9 to 10 million dollars. He cannot go to his Board of Supervisors and say that that is something we can afford because we cannot, we are a small county. 75% of the counties in Iowa are under 25,000 in population, they are small counties. There seem to be some people out there who are saying this is and will do everything you want it to do and that is not the case. He cautions because he does not want to see the ISICS fail in any way. Get it running before going out to sell it and do not sell it to the elected officials who do not really understand what the radio systems can and cannot do. Bring it to the sheriffs, police chiefs, 911 directors, PSAP managers and let them bring it to the elected officials. Because they are the people in their counties who the elected officials look at for communications advice and information. He really cautions to listen to what Kamatchus and he is telling you. This is some of the things that they are hearing out in the field. He is here to relay that information to the Board. Be very cautious about pre-selling the system before it is up and running. John Benson stated that when those types of conversations are happening, in the instance Rob is talking about, is that meeting convened at the request of the Board of Supervisors or whoever it was. Rob stated he did not know as a PSAP manager they had found out from one of their Board of Supervisors that someone had contacted them who was promoting the ISICS told him. John asked if it was someone on this Board. Rob stated he did not think so. Rob did not know who it was. He will find out and let the Board know. John stated the problem we get into with this type of thing is that whoever this individual was, it becomes vexing for us because it's not necessarily something the Board or an agent of the Board undertook and did, but as it makes its way through, it becomes attributed to the Board as something the Board is doing and that becomes a dangerous position for the Board to be in so as you counsel the Board and say please be cautious about that, John agrees however he would counter and say that as a local Rob needs to be cautious about who he is talking to as well. Rob stated that he has had adjoining county to him that has said they will end up having to go on the system because that is the only way they can talk to the state. He asked if LEA is every going to go away, if the point to points is ever going to leave the state centers. That is how they talk to the state now. Chair Lampe stated that point to point would stay. Rob stated that information has to be put out there before it does the Board harm. John stated part of that has to come from the Board as regards to the outreach and FAQs that needs done now so they will have that information. There is not an FAQ out there right now so in lieu of information the vacuum fills itself. Kamatchus stated he was told by a sheriff who sent a broadcast out to all sheriffs that his Chairman of his Board who is a former deputy sheriff, was approached by a member of this Board to go ahead and talk about ISICS, this is the end all, be all for operations. That they will have to hook up to us anyway in order to talk interoperable, it just makes sense that you get on board operationally too. That is the way the sheriff sent that out. That is his point. He thinks this is a great thing and that operationally it makes sense for some. The problem is he does not want to end up with that type of problem. So why would someone from this Board go to a Board of Supervisors, not talk to the sheriff in the first place, the Board of Supervisors did not solicit this so he has no reason to not believe either one of these people and the next thing you know a letter goes out to all the sheriffs and says the state is going over us and behind our back as sheriffs trying to take over what we are supposed to do. He called and asked what they were talking about; there has never been that discussion on this Board. Perception is reality and that is his concern. Bob Younie does not think it is helpful to report 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> hand information. Rob agrees to an extent. He wants to bring to Board's attention whether it is firsthand information or 2<sup>nd</sup> hand information. If he hears a rumor that is out

there, he will bring it to this Board's attention so they can stop it or do something about it. Bob Younie states 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> hand information is not actionable and does not know what they would do with it.

Motion to Adjourn: Motion made by Andy Buffington, seconded by Michael Kasper. Meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM