I. Call to order
   Lt. Governor Flanagan called the meeting to order at 10:23 a.m. She noted the Committee would vote to approve the Annual Report which is important as it includes funding and bonding recommendations to complete the initial security improvements described in the Miller Dunwoodie report as discussed in previous meetings.

II. Approval of meeting minutes: February 2, 2021
   Lt. Governor Flanagan stated Paul Mandell had attended the February 2, 2021 meeting and the minutes will be amended to reflect his attendance. Majority Leader Winkler made a motion to approve the amended minutes. By a motion of 5-0, the motion passed.

   The Lt. Governor noted that at the last meeting Representatives Nash and Winkler were conducting a survey of all House members and staff on their thoughts, concerns and ideas on Capitol area security. Today they are presenting their findings.

III. Review of legislative survey results
   a. Representative Winkler and Rep. Nash reviewed a PowerPoint production put together by Legislative Assistant Joshua Solano and Committee Administrator Will Blauvelt. Majority Leader Winkler noted they did a great job preparing the presentation. The entire PowerPoint presentation will be listed in the Meeting Video section of the Advisory Committee on Capitol Area Security website located at dps.mn.gov/accas. Listed below is a summary of some of the information presented on the slides.
The first slide showed that out of just over 400 employees of the Minnesota House, 315 responded to the survey. Responses include 60% from staff and 40% members.

Second slide showed 94% worked at the State Office Building.

Third slide showed 68% worked in private office and 31% worked in an open area.

Fourth slide showed roughly 74% agree or generally agree they feel safe in the State Office Building. Much fewer stated they don’t feel safe and a small percentage disagreed.

Fifth slide showed when more specific questions are asked regarding security presence in the State Office Building, there is a misalignment of perception and reality. Rep. Winkler reviewed some of the quotes from House staff including: “Locked doors, badges needed, security walking around browsing offices, offer State Patrol at important entrances, yes it is adequate as long as there are no active protests on either side.” That is a big caveat.

Sixth slide showed roughly the same numbers regarding the House controlled spaces in the State Capitol as compared to the State Office Building.

Seventh slide asked a critical question regarding public access. Before the pandemic public access in the State Office Building was open to the public with almost no restrictions and should the State Office Building have the same level of public access in the future. Slightly more believed they should not have the same access, 1/3 said they should and 1/3 is in the middle ground. If you add it up, roughly 2/3 of respondents say there should be a change from where we were before.

Eighth slide Highlighting Data: Out of 315 responses, there were 34 individual responses and 16 of those responses mentioned implementation of more/new security checkpoints including sign in and restricted access. There were 13 responses that mentioned installing metal detectors, weapons screening, or banning firearms, and 3 asked for a middle ground on restrictions. Rep. Nash noted that while 13 responses is not statistically significant, the detailed commentary is from a low level of respondents. He stated he is not minimizing the input but it is not overwhelming input. Rep. Winkler noted there are strong opinions of fire arms on both sides and we will see more of that. People are concerned about access in some way or another.

Ninth slide asks what places in the State Office Building do you feel least secure and what should be done to improve it? Some responses included: I don’t find any of it is particularly secure. Public should be required to sign it . . . the 2nd-5th floor, especially LA desk . . . they are completely exposed without any security measures. Security checkpoint with metal detector.

Tenth slide asks about their understanding of security presence in the Capitol Complex and what they believe to be in place and is it adequate. Responses include a general feeling that the State Patrol, Capitol Security and Sergeant’s office are around. Comforting to know that extra security could be added. Relatively little officer presence, but occasional State Patrol backup for large events. Security cameras, locked doors but unclear who’s watching or what the response time might be if an incident would occur. Does not feel adequate presence or that it would deter people seeking to do harm in the building. Rep. Nash stated that detail should be discussed and it matches what has been discussed in this Committee that we do need to increase sworn officer presence.

Other slides were discussed including improving safety, adequate safety training, safety issues being openly discussed between staff, training and drills, and evacuation drills are set in place and annually practiced. The House needs to do a better job in training and preparing for things out of the ordinary, e.g., tornado, active shooter, and just go through the drills on a regular, periodic basis.

A slide asked about security or safety ideas to improve on not discussed in the survey. Responses included the public should not be able to access the entire building, funnel the public to desks outside each elevator for meetings, metal detectors, card access, unsafe building and take us seriously when we bring these concerns. Out of the 128 staff responses, 16 mentioned installing metal detectors, banning weapons, or having physical screening. Cover
active shooter training, notification of large events including protests requiring extra security which staff would like to be notified of. Rep. Nash discussed fire arms and noted that there have been fire arm hearings, rallies and bill hearings and nothing has happened. It is a contentious subject but there has not been a negative incident as Commissioner Harrington stated and the Sergeants would also attest to. He appreciates the 16 staff members who said that and he takes the comment seriously when they say take us seriously, but he wants to make sure that we are not belaboring the point. We have a second amendment right and it is important to maintain the conversation.

Other safety ideas include hiring more State Patrol, installing more cameras, panic buttons, mandatory active shooter training, fire and severe weather drills, have an app to access information and post questions. It is a tough balance as you want the buildings to be open and accessible to the public, but that is also what makes it unsafe. Think proactively about how to deter people who want to cause harm. I would also encourage providing some security training of exit routes, numbers to call, and timely communication about events that have the potential to spiral so people have more information about making various safety decisions.

Rep. Winkler noted items discussed in this Committee are reflected in the security comments and concerns of House members and staff. Issues related to training, officer presence and inherent danger of the State Office Building in the sense of public access and the public can be everywhere and there is discomfort with that. Firearms issue is raised on both sides. Rep. Nash also thanked the staff who helped with this and he thanked Rep. Winkler who helped write the questions. Perhaps other tenants of the Capitol area can conduct a similar exercise. This does match up some recommendations made in this Committee and we really need to listen to staff as rudimentary as fire drill and active shooter training and various other events are, they are improvements to staff and members. Rep. Nash thanked Rep. Winkler as this truly was a bipartisan effort.

The Lt. Governor thanked Representatives Nash and Winkler, and Will and Josh for their work.

Sen. Dibble noted they have just started to copycat the House’s survey work this week. They have engaged the Sgt. in Arms and Sen. Limmer. Sen. Dibble and Sen. Limmer will have a report soon.

IV. Approval of annual report

Captain Roeske gave a brief overview of the DPS portion of the report from pages 2-6 which includes statutory requirements and dates, table of contents, an introduction section, current members, reporting schedule and meeting requirements, reference to the Capitol Complex layout, highlights and main responsibility of Capitol Security, installation of the May 2020 fence, and puts in place the decision process for the future of the fence.

Director Chris Guevin reviewed the Department of Administration’s portion starting on Page 7.

• Page 7: States the project is over 90% complete.
• Page 8: Recommended future improvements which is the thrust of the request for this year. We would like to continue with Phase 2 of security enhancements. We have only received about 35% of the request from the 2015-2016 timeframe. Over half of the complex square footage and population did not receive the program security enhancements through Phase 1. We are asking $31 million in general obligation bonds for security enhancements that did not take place. Additional enhancements will likely be discovered in the upcoming security assessment. We are asking for $12M out of the general fund for buildings not eligible for general obligation bonds.
• Page 9: Mission Statement.
• Page 10: Outlines who the members are and the departments they are affiliated with.
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- Page 11: Draft legislation that pushes forward the recommended enhancements bonding and general fund to move forward with. Mirrors the bonding language that we are putting together in Administration to carry the bill. In the past we have put forth language in the Report from the Committee that reinforces the languages that Administration has put together.

Sen. Dibble had a stylistic observation on page 6. He suggested the first sentences in the final paragraph be moved up above the recommendations elements at the end. They are more of the same in terms of making the case. He stated we can do that or not do that. For the final sentence: They will recommend to the Advisory Committee on Capitol Area Security that the fence will be removed. He noted the Committee is advisory only. There needs to be another sentence on what we will do in response to the recommendation or who makes the decision on the removal of the fence. On the recommended future improvements, Sen. Dibble asked if there will be another report with more recommendations based on conversations we are having now and with the results of the survey.

The Lt. Governor stated we will have an interim report that will address those issues and the issues we have heard from the colleagues who are constitutional officers who office off-site and off campus and the additional concerns brought up over the last weeks and months.

Rep. Winkler had the same question as Sen. Dibble. He is comfortable with the recommended future improvements and understands the need to move forward for budgeting, but stated there needs to be a deeper consideration for the State Office Building. Based on the results of the survey, he would like to move an oral amendment to Page 8 (Recommended Future Improvements), the third paragraph, after the words related to: insert: State Office building security. The Lt. Governor noted that made sense.

Rep. Nash stated that on Page 4 it notes that the Committee only met three times. He understands that it is difficult to get everyone together but we have met a number of times in the last number of weeks and he wants to make sure we put in the effort to meet. Meetings should be available to the public and testimony should be taken. The work is important and we have the ability to meet with Zoom.

The Lt. Governor noted she takes that seriously and hears Rep. Nash. She wants everyone to know they have encouraged people to submit online comments, and they have provided people an opportunity for testimony and for people to sign up over the last several meetings. That will be her expectation as Chair going forward.

Sen. Limmer stated he has had members of the public inquiring about how they can track efforts and get more information. Contact information or a website that would tell of upcoming meetings and a Zoom address would be helpful. John Eastham noted in Appendix B his rank should be Commander.

The Lt. Governor stated that adding the State Office Building to the future recommendations and how to get in touch with the Advisory Committee will be added. The stylistic change will be left for now. We will signal to our colleagues that we will issue an interim report so their concerns are reflected.


V. Adjourn
Motion to adjourn made by Sen. Limmer, seconded by Sen. Dibble. By a vote of 5-0, the motion passes and the meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.