



## STATE OF IOWA

**TERRY E. BRANSTAD**  
GOVERNOR

**KIM REYNOLDS**  
LT. GOVERNOR

IOWA HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT  
MARK J. SCHOUTEN, HOMELAND SECURITY ADVISOR  
AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR

July 28, 2015

David G. Simpson  
Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington D.C. 20554

**VIA EMAIL**

RE: Iowa Submission of the 2015 NET 911 Fee Report

Dear Mr. Simpson:

The State of Iowa received the data request from the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) on June 2, 2015. The information requested is to assist the FCC in meeting its reporting requirements set forth in the New and Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008 Section 6(f).

Attached, you will find Iowa's submission of the 2015 NET 911 Fee Report. We welcome any questions regarding this important program within the State.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark J. Schouten", written over a horizontal line.

Mark J. Schouten  
Director

Enclosure



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Approved by OMB  
3060-1122  
Expires: March 31, 2018  
Estimated time per response: 10-55  
hours

Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122 , the FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission's obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

**A. Filing Information**

**1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

State or Jurisdiction
Iowa

**2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

Name	Title	Organization
Blake DeRouchey	E911 Program Manager	Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

1. Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2014:

PSAP Type <sup>1</sup>	Total
Primary	115
Secondary	0
<b>Total</b>	115

2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>2</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2014:

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total
Full-Time	0
Part-time	0

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

<b>Amount</b> (\$)	144,628,785
-----------------------	-------------

<sup>1</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), July 29, 2014, at 118, 126, available at [https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014\\_2014072.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See *Master Glossary* at 137.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.

4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014.

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	Unknown
Wireless	795,125
VoIP	Nomadic VoIP is counted but not separated with wireless counts. Static VoIP is counted with wireline counts
Other	
<b>Total</b>	795,125

**C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**

1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? *Check one.*

- Yes .....
- No .....

1a. If yes, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The State of Iowa E911 Program has an established funding mechanism for the purpose of E911 support and implementation under Code of Iowa, Chapter 34A.7. The corresponding implementing rule is found in Iowa Administrative Code Section 605, Chapter 10.

**1b. If yes, during the annual period January 1 - December 31, 2014, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

Iowa did not change or amend the funding mechanism during this time frame.

**2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? Check one.**

- The State collects the fees .....
- A Local Authority collects the fees .....
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies  
(e.g., state and local authority) collect the fees .....

**3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

Per Iowa Code 34A. 7A, Wireless and Prepaid surcharge is remitted to the State and distributed to the County 911 Service Boards on a quarterly basis. Wireline Surcharge is remitted directly from the local telecoms to the County Service Boards.

**D. Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

<b>1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.</b>		
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds</b> <i>(Check one)</i>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local <i>(e.g., county, city, municipality)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)</b>		
<p>Local Service Boards are able to approve the expenditure of funds that have been remitted to them (wireline and wireless) as part of the quarterly surcharge collection process, within the confines of Code of Iowa 34A. 7A. Iowa code details a “carryover operating surplus” that is the repository for excess wireless surcharge not distributed to the local service boards or used to administer the program. This fund can be accessed by local service boards for PSAP Improvements. The State has a grant application, approval, and reimbursement process to govern the use of those funds</p>		

**2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one.***

- Yes .....
- No .....

**2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.**

Wireline usage is detailed in Code of Iowa: 34A.7 and Iowa Administrative Code Section 605, Chapter 10. 8-13



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Wireless usage is detailed in 34A.7A and Iowa Administrative Code Section 605, Chapter 10.9-13

**2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.**

[Empty rectangular box for response]



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

- 1. Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

The State collects wireless and prepaid surcharge remittance on a quarterly basis. The State passes 46% of the collected surcharge to the local service boards based on a formula of square mileage the service board is responsible for, and call counts. Wireless surcharge is also used to fund the administration of the E911 Program by Homeland Security and Emergency Management.

The State also pays recurring costs for transport costs between selective router and PSAPs. The State pays for ALI database information on a quarterly basis. The state reimburses Wireless Carriers for up to 13% of surcharge generated to recover their actual costs associated with Phase 1 delivery. Once recurring costs are paid for, remaining surcharge goes into an Operating Surplus fund, that local service boards can access through a state managed grant program to fund PSAP improvements.

The State has entered into a contract with TeleCommunications System for development, construction, management, and monitoring of the Statewide Wireless Network and to provide NextGen upgrades to the PSAPs. TCS operates two Call Logic Centers within the state to maintain the network.

The State has also entered into a GeoComm to provide end to end GIS services as part of Next Gen upgrades. During this reporting period, County Service Boards provided GeoComm with an initial, baseline layer of county GIS data for analysis.





Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

<b>2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply.</b>			
<b>Type of Cost</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Operating Costs</b>	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Administrative Costs</b>	Program Administration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Dispatch Costs</b>	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Grant Programs</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If Yes, see 2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.</b>			



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The State did not have any external grants available during this time frame. The state operated an E911 Carryover Grant as detailed in Code of Iowa 34A. 7A. From January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, \$50,000 per PSAP was available to local service boards through the grant. An equal amount of local match was required. Starting July 1, 2014-December 31, 2014, \$100,000 was available per PSAP to local county service boards and no match was required. For the entire year, approval of the grant money was made by the E911 Program Manager and the E911 Communications Council for PSAP improvements.

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

<b>1. Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.</b>		
<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Fee/Charge Imposed</b>	<b>Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination)</b>
Wireline	\$1.00	Local E911 Service Board
Wireless	\$1.00	State
Prepaid Wireless	\$.51	State
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	\$1.00	Static VoIP: Local Nomadic VoIP: State
Other		

**2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Total Amount Collected (\$)</b>
Wireline	Unknown



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Wireless	\$25,903,929.36
Prepaid Wireless	\$1,916,622.38
Voice Over Internet Protocol	Nomadic VoIP included but not separated from Wireless surcharge. Static VoIP collected at the local level
Other	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$27,820,551.74</b>

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

**3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

In addition to surcharge funding, local PSAPs are often also provided funds through county general fund appropriations, support from Sheriff Office funds, city general funds, and emergency management grants. These costs are broken down in the answer to question 5 of this section.

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? <i>Check one.</i></b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4a. If Yes, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.</b></p>		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

See the answer to question 3 and 5 for more the answer to this question

5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.	Percent
State 911 Fees (Includes both wireline and wireless surcharge as reported by the PSAPs)	22%
Local 911 Fees	0%
General Fund - State	0%
General Fund - County	37%
Other Local Contributions: (Sheriff's Office, City Contributions, Emergency Management Funding)	41%

**G. Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

Question	Yes	No
1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2014, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for purposes designated by the funding mechanism identified in Question 5? <i>Check one.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1a. If No, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.**

<b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>	<b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (Add lines as necessary)</b>

**H. Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

Question	Yes	No
<b>1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? Check one.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If yes, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2014. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b>		
<p>E911 Funds are audited by the Iowa State Auditor's Office in three distinct ways for this reporting period.</p> <p>The Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management Department is subject to an annual audit. As such, because the E911 program falls under HSEMD, E911 funds are audited along with other Department financial programs.: No findings</p> <p>The E911 Program is subject to an annual standalone audit by the State Auditor's Office: No findings</p> <p>PSAPs are required to submit annual expense reports per Code of Iowa 34A. 7A. These reports are also subject to audit from the State Auditor's Office: Audit has not been completed at this time</p>		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Question	Yes	No
<b>2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check one.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. If yes, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2014. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b>		

**I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

Question	Yes	No
<b>1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes? Check one.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:</b>		
Code of Iowa 34A. 7A and Iowa Administrative Rules 605 Chapter 10 10.9		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Question		Yes	No
<b>2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2014, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? Check one.</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. If yes, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.</b>			
<b>Amount</b> (\$)	Unknown, we do not track our costs this way		



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.					
Type of ESInet	Yes	No	If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet	If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?	
				Yes	No
a. A single, state-wide ESInet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	115	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Regional ESInets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	[If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>





Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2014.**

During this reporting period PSAPs began to upgrade to the NENA i3 standard Next Gen. PSAPs upgraded their CPE's and Recorders to SIP capable/enabled

During this reporting period, PSAPs worked with GeoComm to begin an initial data assessment of GIS data that will ultimately be used for NextGen upgrades.

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
<b>5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?</b>	1
Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
<b>6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?</b>	12

**J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
<b>1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Question	Total PSAPs
<p>2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>

Question	Yes	No	Unknown
<p>3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

1. Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.

The Iowa E911 Program made great strides during this reporting period while achieving cost savings through technological advances. While planning and development had been going on for a number of years, NG911 upgrades began in earnest during this time period. All PSAPs are on the ESInet utilizing the Iowa Communications Network. PSAPs began to plan and execute their upgrades to Next Gen through the procurement and installment of SIP enabled call taking equipment and logging recorders.

Also during this timeframe a build out of a secondary ESInet, a totally separate and diverse network consisting of 13 key PSAPs that could work as a standalone and redundant network, was imagined and designed. Soon that build out secondary ESInet will be complete.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

GIS work began during this time period where 95% of County Service Boards submitted required documentation to begin a baseline data analysis.

Funding continues to be a critical need into the future. Once all of Iowa's PSAPs have been upgraded to the NENA i3 SIP enabled standard, PSAPs will need to begin to evaluate and plan for the replacement of their CPE, which has a 3-5 year lifespan. CPE's will have to be continuously replaced at a significant cost to the state and local jurisdiction.

The state of Iowa submits an annual report to the State Legislature. That report can be found at:  
[http://www.homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/documents/e911/E911\\_AnnualReport\\_2014.pdf](http://www.homelandsecurity.iowa.gov/documents/e911/E911_AnnualReport_2014.pdf)

During the 2013 legislative session, the E911 program was tasked with measuring the adequacy of the \$1.00 surcharge. The program was to look at two years' worth of data submitted by the PSAPs on the costs associated with operating their PSAPs. The final year of data was submitted March, 2015 and will be analyzed and reported on January, 2016. That report will help provide an assessment on the appropriate levels and usage of E911 funds into the future, approximately midway through the state's NG911 upgrades.