

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD
FINANCE COMMITTEE

March 13, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance

Members

Present

Member/Alternate

- X Chair, Cari Gerlicher – MN Police Chiefs Association
- X Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, Mn/DOT-OEC
- X Commissioner Blake Huffman/Jill Rohret, MESB
- X Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB
- X Commissioner Jack Swanson – NW RRB
- X Vice Chair, Micah Myers – Central MN ESB

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests reporting:

Name	Representing
Jackie Mines	DECN
Cathy Anderson	DECN
Mike Fink	Motorola

CALL TO ORDER

Chair calls the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Chair notes there is a quorum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Motion to approve Agenda: Ron Antony
Second: Blake Huffman
Agenda Approved.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Motion to approve previous meeting's minutes: Jack Swanson
Second: Blake Huffman
Minutes Approved.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Local cost of upgrade 7.15 and timeframe to occur (Rohret)**

Chair says there is a memo in the packet from Jill Rohret to Jackie Mines on March 3rd and gives Rohret the floor.

Rohret thanks Chair and says she had asked their local agencies that will have to upgrade consoles prior to the 7.15 upgrade whether or not they had secured funding in order to do so by May 2016. She says about 50 percent said yes and about 50 percent were less than positive that they would have the funding in time, so she asked the TOC if they should request a delay. The TOC did not want to ask for a formal delay, but they thought that it should be discussed at the SECB level about what happens if agencies are not able to do it and how it will be handled.

She says another person saw the packet and felt strongly the upgrades should go on as cited and if local entities can't do the upgrade in time, they should be dropped from the system. She did not agree and said that was the other person's thought, but she was bringing it up for discussion.

Rohret states she hasn't asked those outside the metro if they will be able to make the time frame and that just because they are saying they're less than confident it will happen, that doesn't mean it won't happen, they just don't have the funding secured yet.

Jack Swanson asks if the SECB has the power to delay the upgrade, as he thought the upgrade had already been delayed for a period of time.

Rohret replies it is completely up to us when we want to do the upgrade. Motorola wants us to do them at certain points in time, but that doesn't mean we have to do them when they want us to.

Swanson says he thought they said after a certain amount of time they will no longer support the older consoles.

Rohret says that is correct. The older consoles will not be supported in the 7.15 upgrade, so people would have to change out their consoles.

Swanson says that's not an issue of concern in the northwest, but he understands this is a real problem for local entities given funding or for smaller counties and entities because of the cost of the upgrade. He has no idea of how we respond to that, though.

Rohret says she is not necessarily asking for a specific answer today, but it's something the Board and Committees need to be thinking about and there needs to be a backup plan.

Ron Antony says when we originally talked about this 7.15 upgrade, there was talk about whether we should push it out further. He says the option should not be taken off the table to give these counties more time to procure some funding.

Mines agrees and says she thinks it's our call. She says when we made this decision, the upgrade was included in software upgrade package we committed to. She says we did talk about doing this in May 2016, but it's not unusual for us to delay those or for it to be delayed because Motorola isn't ready. She doesn't believe we actually

know all the software features in that upgrade, as it has not totally been communicated to members of OTC, the SMG group, or MnDOT. She feels if the SECB doesn't want to put an unfair burden on locals and locals need more time to address those costs, it's totally legitimate for locals to raise that concern and ask MnDOT to lay out pros and cons of delaying and how long we could possibly delay.

Chair directs the question to Rohret. She says she is not opposed to making the request for a delay but doesn't think it can be an indefinite delay. She is curious as to what agencies in the Metro have said yes and what agencies have said no. She inquires that for agencies who have said yes, if this gets moved to another fiscal year, will they lose the funding promise they received that put them in place prior to May of 2016?

Rohret says she can't answer the second question, because she doesn't know how the funding works within each individual agency. She says she has a list of PSAPs and asks if Chair wants a list of PSAPs who are not sure about funding and says Anoka County, Ramsey County, and the City of Minneapolis are the big three.

Chair says she thinks it's important to know who they are, especially if they are larger counties. She asks if they have already put it off, how do we know they will be committed to come up with funding in a year.

Rohret says that's the concern of the TOC and why they didn't ask for a formal delay.

Chair suggests before asking for a delay, we ask what their plan is to make sure they have secured funding for that year if we delay for six months or a year, and if they will still say they won't have the funds, we should move forward. She says it obviously can't be delayed indefinitely.

Commissioner Huffman asks if Ramsey County was included in that list.

Rohret states she was told Ramsey County doesn't have the funding secured for consoles in 2016 and that it was possible but not confident for 2016.

Commissioner Huffman asks if someone can get him names of who to talk to and says they should be a leader in this endeavor.

Rohret says she will provide him with names.

Commissioner Huffman says Ramsey County will not be an issue.

Rohret says she found the list, and those who are questionable for 2016 include Anoka County, Hennepin EMS, Minneapolis, and Ridgeview EMS. She says she didn't hear from a couple of them and some will say high confidence, but confidence doesn't necessarily mean it will or won't happen. Isanti is likely.

Swanson says to the Chair's point of whether funding is secured now or a year or two from now, if you don't have it now, you probably won't have it then. He questions what happens to the entities that truly cannot afford to replace consoles and asks if they are unable to communicate at that time. He inquires what the practical result will be for those who can't replace the Gold Elite.

Chair asks if there is a technical person on this call and looks to Thakur or Mines.

Mines says she can't answer that question and it needs to be presented to MnDOT.

Thakur says he is not able to answer the question but wants to clarify the question.

Swanson says he wants to know what happens if an entity cannot do the upgrade, what the practical result is, and whether or not they can only partially communicate.

Chair asks Mike Fink if he knows.

Fink says he can't answer the question and doesn't know what MnDOT has for spares and that it comes down to supportability. He says they won't be able to guarantee they can supply parts for the Gold Elite consoles and if the wrong part goes bad, they can't guarantee they can get a new one, either. He says it will all depend on how many and what spares each entity and MnDOT have.

Chair asks Fink if an agency makes the 2016 deadline and is six months away from funding for changing out the Gold Elite's, if Motorola does the upgrade, does the upgrade make the Gold Elite ineffective, or can it run on 7.15 and you just have no guarantee how long you will be able to use it.

Fink says his understanding is that it can't operate on 7.15 and that everyone has to be up to MCC7500's.

Chair acknowledges.

Ron Antony says they were led to believe when Motorola met with them in the southwest that once the upgrade is performed, Gold Elite's would not operate on the upgrade at all.

Fink says he doesn't know exactly what that means and that he's been told everyone has to be up to MCC7500's.

Chair says she understands funds are tight, but the other issue she is hearing is that if Motorola is no longer going to be able to get parts to fix Gold Elite's and we put this off a year, Gold Elite's could crash and we would be in just as much trouble as if we didn't do the upgrade. She says we have two years but feels a survey needs to be sent out in the next month asking counties and entities that need to do the upgrades if they've been able to find funding for May of 2016 and, if not, what they think their extended time frame will be. She says it can't be indefinite, and we wouldn't want to push it back farther than a year.

She says people have to have a plan as to how they'll get this funding. She cites the example of Minneapolis and how they should have some major salary savings by officers retiring and being replaced with new, younger officers and that they may need to shift their funding around. She says people need to figure it out, and if there is no funding, that's when we start looking for emergency grant dollars, but you don't want to just toss grant dollars out to anyone who puts in an application for one.

Fink says Motorola has plans they can structure so the first payment is due one year after the contract, which gives people another year. He says they do have some programs that could help.

Mines asks Fink when they first started communicating that the Gold Elite's would be obsolete and that they wouldn't be supporting them anymore.

Fink responds it was prior to 2012, probably 2011, or maybe even before. He says he doesn't know the exact date, but it has been in the works for some time.

Swanson asks Fink what the approximate cost of an MCC7500 is.

Fink says it really depends on how many CCGW's and how many positions there are. He says there are a lot of factors and that they can do budgetary quotes for a specific entity. He says they have had lots of entities who have switched over in the Metro and other areas, so they would have some data to get an idea of how much. He says it's not answering the question directly, but there are so many factors, it's hard to give an amount per position.

Swanson asks Fink if he could give a range.

Fink says that a couple they've recently sold in the Metro were somewhere around 50 thousand per position and that it really depends on what other things you're trying to do, like logging. He says there are all sorts of factors.

Swanson thanks Fink.

Chair asks if anyone else has any thoughts or ideas and what they think about sending a survey out, if people will respond or not. She says we can check our outstate resources that way.

Unidentified male speaker says the majority of outstate, or Greater Minnesota, was so far behind the Metro that most of them have 7500's. He says in the southwest, there were only two Gold Elite's in the entire region to replace, and he believes both counties have already done it.

Chair says that's the way they did theirs, as well.

Unidentified male speaker says in the central, they have three left and one is actually in the process of being replaced now and the budgeting is in place, so they will be on 7500's by the end of next year.

Chair asks Rohret what she would like to see happen.

Rohret says she has no idea but it concerns her that several PSAPs sound less than confident they'll be able to do it and agrees with people who think if we delay it, they'll delay getting the funding. She says she thinks the Board needs to figure out what to do if PSAPs are not ready at that point in time – do they move on and tell the PSAPs they're no longer part of the ARMER system?

Chair inquires if this should be delayed for six months without dialogue from counties or if a survey should be taken to see where we're really at.

Huffman says he feels we should do a quick survey, being specific, and have frank conversations with entities, because it sounds like delaying it for the sake of delaying might not accomplish anything.

Chair asks if that is a motion.

Huffman says he will make it a motion.

Huffman motions to send out a survey inquiring where PSAPs are at regarding funding for the 2016 upgrade.

Seconded by Swanson.

There is more discussion.

Swanson says he is only speaking for counties in his region but that the funding for these things at a county level is going to come through the County Board. He doubts that County Commissioners have any awareness of this issue and where it might be going in terms of their budget process. He says whether the funding source is the city or whoever it might be, it seems important that the people voting on the budgets are made aware of the situation.

Huffman says they need to bring the elected people into the conversation so they understand what they are doing by their actions or inactions.

Rohret says they have had this discussion at their RRB when there was the SUA2 issue. They had the discussion with people on their Executive Committee, who said if they can push it out to 2016, it can work, and there was not a nay vote on the Committee. She says they sent information out to County Administrators, but somewhere, information is being lost in the budgeting process and things are not being ranked as being as important as competing interests. She says at least in the Metro, they have tried to make them aware and doesn't know what more they can do.

Fink says Motorola has not been pushing this upgrade and that it's been out there since 2012.

Chair says it's already at March of 2016.

Mines states it's May 2016.

Chair asks Mines if we can come up with a survey and give people two weeks to get it back. She says the SECB needs to write a letter to the County Commissioners of those counties or cities that say they don't feel they can meet the deadline. She feels Commissioners will be making financial decisions for 2016 funding in next 4 to 6 months, so there is time, and she agrees the information needs to get to people who make decisions about the budget. She suggests moving the motion forward that's currently on the floor about doing the survey and says another motion with a letter of urgency to follow- up with municipalities that say they can't fund it could be done afterward.

Mines says ECN can conduct a survey but there is not a list of all the different commissioners from all the counties. She is concerned that there are counties who have budgeted, purchased, and upgraded, but a few haven't and may be holding out for grant dollars. She says it is difficult to support or conduct a grant program which we have had money for counties to purchase these items in the past when they've known these were their own cost to bear for quite some time when they joined the ARMER system, and they've known these items were not going to be supported in the long term. She says she is willing to conduct the survey but hopes it doesn't send the message that we are going to provide a grant program, because it would be difficult to be fair to those who have already taken the upgrade and budgeted for these items.

Mines says she doesn't want to be seen as negative or anti-grant but is concerned that the survey will send the message we are looking at doing that. She feels we can probably negotiate something with Motorola if we needed an extra six months but the date is their commitment to make.

Chair says she doesn't think a survey should say anything about grant dollars, and the survey should say we are taking a poll to see if they have positively secured funding for the 7.15 upgrade in May of 2016. If they haven't, what is their plan for securing the funding or if it is their concern they will not be able to find funding.

She says the SECB should write to Commissioners in the areas saying they cannot find funding, tell them they have had four years to plan, and if their plan is to contact Motorola and find a way to work with them, they have until May of 2016 to do that. Chair says nothing in the survey should have anything to do with grant funding.

Mines says she can do the survey, but she would need a list of Commissioners.

Chair says we don't have to worry about that until we get the surveys back and that the surveys don't go to the County Commissioners. She asks Rohret if it goes to the Radio Board people.

Rohret says she would send the survey to the PSAP manager but that it's up to this Committee who they want to send it to.

Unidentified male asks if it should go to the administrator of the radio system.

Chair says that's who she thinks the survey should go out to and asks Commissioner Huffman if this still fits the intent of his motion.

Huffman says one hundred percent.

Chair repeats that there is a motion that the SECB send a survey out to the PSAP managers to have them articulate if they have identified funding for May of 2016, and if they have not identified funding, what their intent was to try and do such or what their ideas are for solving the problem. She says once the surveys come back, we will figure out who letters need to be sent to.

Mines acknowledges and asks if we send surveys to PSAP managers only.

Chair says she thinks so and asks if there are any other comments and calls for a vote on the motion.

Motion carries to send out survey.

Chair asks if we want to follow up with a second motion articulating the follow up letter after the survey is done.

Myers makes the motion to send a follow-up letter to the Commissioners or the City Managers in the municipalities who answered back negatively.

Huffman seconds.

Swanson asks if the letter will say you have no choice, find the money?

Chair says it could or it could say you've known about this since 2011, here's the date, your PSAP managers are saying they're unsure that the money has been identified, so in the next 60 days, please come up with a plan or solution to include if you need an additional six-month extension or if you want to contact Motorola. She thinks we give them some options but doesn't think the extension should be longer than the calendar year of 2016.

Swanson says when a Commissioner outstate gets a letter from the State, you know what the reaction will be. He says there is turnover with elected officials, so there should be some explanation of the need stating here's what's going to happen if you don't commit the funding for this upgrade.

Chair agrees and says we can move the motion forward to send the letter. She says in the next 30 days, Jackie and she can work on that letter, and the next Finance meeting, the letter can be approved or changed.

Mines says she can help with that.

Chair asks if there are any other comments or discussions, but there are none.

Chair calls for a vote in favor of a follow-up letter after the results of the survey come back.

Motion carries.

Chair says hopefully in the next 90 days, we will have some different answers for Jill and she feels more secure about the Metro being able to handle their end of the bargain. She asks Rohret if she's OK with the response.

Rohret says sure, she is just raising the issue.

Chair states it obviously needed to be raised to figure out how bad an issue it will be, and then we can figure out how we want to solve it after that.

- **Funding Study (Mines)**

Mines says included in the package is a high-level overview of items that came out of the funding study. This is information that could be used for meetings with legislators, and she encourages the committee members to share it within their regions or, if requested, she can present it. Mines says the SECB should continue to work on the long-term funding strategy taking into consideration the length of time it really takes local governments to secure funding for items they're responsible for.

She says a very big concern brought out in the study was that these upgrades have to be thoroughly vetted with the big decision makers, and it is difficult to know where the breakdown in communication is. She says the SECB votes for these, they go through committee, and then they get sent to the Regional Board. She says we're hearing back is that there's not enough time to make decisions at the local level or that they're not understanding the full extent of the cost, so the SECB needs to work more closely with the regions on how to bridge the gap.

Mines says since we're not sure where the breakdown of communication is so Board members, regions, and Commissioners on committees are encouraged to help us understand where we can communicate better.

She says those were some of the highlights that came out in the report and asks for questions.

Swanson asks for further explanation about page 2, under the Future of 911 Funding Fee, the second bullet point. He says what he reads is that the state statute is suggesting 911 dollars would be reallocated away from locals.

Mines says that in the Statute, revenue bonds were used to build the ARMER backbone, and the 911 fee or 911 collection is what is used as collateral to pay off those bonds. She says it was determined at that time to make those bonds non-risky to the bond buyers, and the first priority we use the money for that's collected is to pay off the 23 million dollar obligation we have until 2026 for the bonds. She says the bond payment is the first payment our office is required to pay and then there are other obligations.

Mines states she has shown every line item in the budget and that it is easy to take the spreadsheet and identify exactly where those commitments are. She says as long as the revenue stream is very solid, that should be possible with the other obligations but it is important to note the 9-1-1 fee supports ARMER, the bond payment, 911, NG 911, and it supports PSAPS to support their 911 call centers. She says people should be aware the 911 fee is supporting multiple things and if there is a fall in the 911 fee or any issue with collection, our first obligation is the bond payment.

Swanson asks if any increase to the 911 fee would be legislatively acted on and wanted to know how the 911 fee could be increased to account for what appears to be greater costs in the future.

Mines says in the report she has tried to demonstrate that to make the existing commitments today plus things we know we have to do for NG911, we will have to increase the fee to 95 cents. She says that will have to be done at some point in time, but how quickly it is done depends on how strong the fee is. She says we are not up to 95 cents today, so there is room to grow, but we have to make the existing commitments to date and not any additional commitments. She cites an example of a payment for MnDOT to pay for maintenance of the system that hasn't been accommodated for and says if that goes up over the next few years, then the fee has to go up.

Mines says if we pursue the next steps of NG911, the fee has to raise and if you want to do anything over and above what's listed, the fee has to increase. The increase depends on how many subscribers we have at that time, what the project is, and how expensive that project is.

She says the goal of the budget is to demonstrate there are no hidden items and that these are the commitments that have been made as of today at the amounts they are today. She says she has put in some increase based on cost-of-living expenses, and she anticipates the fee has to go up to accommodate costs of some of the NG911 items, but says you will see that the fee structure has to go up to accommodate any new projects.

Mines states there won't be any more growth spurts in the 9-1-1 fees and we are tapped out in terms of how many subscribers we have in Minnesota for wireless. She says subscriber rates are falling about 5% a year because of wireline subscribers dropping off and that there are indications at the FCC they are encouraging carriers to move away from providing landline service and going to VIOP. She says it's much more difficult to collect 9-1-1 fees from VOIP providers, because we don't have access to their customer base, so it's purely based on them being honest with us.

She feels if there is not a way to double-check them, it's difficult to know if we're getting all the fees we can and says while the fee is strong and reliable now, the report indicates there are things we need to be aware of that could make that fee less strong in the future. She says we need to make sure we can fund the things we have committed to up to this point, and then we can move on to other things we want to fund over and above that.

Swanson compliments Mines on her explanation and asks who has the authority to raise the 911 fee.

Mines says that Statute allows us to raise it to 95-cents and that it has to be in the Statute. She says a case has to be made at the legislature, with the understanding that carriers have to collect the fees, and they are sensitive to price

increases. She has been told that we could go to \$2.00 or \$2.50, because surrounding states have done so, but she's also been at the legislature when it took the Minnesota Telephone Association (MTA) one minute to get changes we wanted to the 911 statute thrown out. She says nobody asked any questions and just went along with it, so it would take a strong lobbying effort on the part of the SECB, because ECN can't lobby that alone without a strong support network.

Swanson again thanks Mines.

Chair asks if there are other questions or comments for Mines. There are none.

Chair asks Mines if there was a request to approve her document as written or if it was just information she wanted to get out.

Mines states it was for information only and she desires the information gets out into the regions.

Chair says there is no other new business on the agenda and asks if there is any old business or anything else to be discussed.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

Chair asks for motion to adjourn.

Myers makes motion to adjourn.

Swanson seconds.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:56 a.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

FINANCE COMMITTEE

April 10, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance

Members

Present

Member/Alternate

- X Chair, Cari Gerlicher – MN Police Chiefs Association
- X Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, Mn/DOT-OEC
- X Commissioner Blake Huffman/Jill Rohret, MESB
- Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB
- X Commissioner Jack Swanson – NW RRB
- X Vice Chair, Micah Myers – Central MN ESB

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests reporting:

Name	Representing
Jackie Mines	DECN
Cathy Anderson	DECN

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair calls the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. with a quorum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Vice Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Jackie Mines mentions there was a letter requesting training sent out to everyone by Brandon Abley that is not on the agenda and would like it added.

Motion to approve Agenda with the amendment: Jack Swanson

Second: Jill Rohret

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Rohret says she has two changes to the minutes: page 2, paragraph 3 of the minutes where we were talking about dropping people from the system who haven't upgraded their consoles, it was that she thought it would be easier said than done, not that she thought it should happen.

The other change is on page 3 of the minutes, second full paragraph and that it is written in a way that makes it sound like she freely gave off the list of agencies, but she had been asked by the Chair for the list of agencies who said they weren't sure about making the deadline.

Myers says in a paragraph that lists an unidentified male talking about Central, that was him, and he believes the paragraph above that was not him. He thinks another paragraph with an unidentified male talking about the majority of the Greater Minnesota being so far behind in the Metro was Ron but states that he isn't on the phone to verify, so it should stay the same.

Motion to approve previous amended meeting's minutes: Micah Myers

Second: Jill Rohret

Minutes Approved.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Request to approve 2013 SHSP Grants to Local Units of Government (Jackie Mines)**

Mines says in 2013, the Homeland Security grant, which is actually provided to us in 2014, allocated \$890,211 to ECN for continuing investment in strengthening the interop system. Mines reads the breakdown of funds as indicated in her memo to the Committee and says people can apply in egrants and request their budget based on the criteria that was discussed in the grant workgroup. Mines encourages everyone to use the amount dedicated for training as such, because extra money from HSEM was provided with a commitment to do more training.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the grant as written and as Mines has articulated it.

Motion: Micah Myers

Second: Jill Rohret

Motion carries

- **Gold Elite Survey Results (Jackie Mines)**

Mines says the results of the survey she sent out for the Finance Committee is included in the packet. The survey was for different counties and PSAPs that have not yet upgraded from Gold Elite consoles to MCC 7500, and based on the 25 responses that came back, Anoka County expressed cautious optimism they're going to get their money through bonding. Their bond hasn't completed yet, so they can't say for sure but don't foresee any issues.

Mines says the second PSAP to express concern about not having secured funding was Edina, but they hope to use some of their 911 funds, which can be used for that purchase. She says they have not scheduled with Motorola yet but plan to do so in April. Discussions are underway, but the final securing through the city's capital improvement plan has not been committed to at this point.

She says Minneapolis is saying capital funding is requested but it's not yet funded and they won't know until January 2015 or January 2016.

White Bear Lake has not secured funding, and they want to make their current system last as long as possible. It is in their budgetary items, but they would be open to grants if there are any available.

Kanabec County is the only Greater Minnesota county that has expressed concern. They say they have no other plans, because they have upgraded their 911 equipment and don't have leftover money in their budget for this upgrade.

Mines says all the rest have a strong commitment. There are some counties in Greater Minnesota that decided to take advantage of PSIC grant money and purchase consolettes as opposed as to purchasing MCC 7500s or Gold Elites. A couple of those are considering upgrades in 2014 and have expressed requests for grant money, but they

were all eligible to receive grants when we had the ARMER Integration grant, and they chose not to take advantage of those at that time.

She says that's the summary of the situation for the Gold Elite's for the most part. It looks as if everyone has a plan, and everyone is open to grant money, but there might be some unintended consequences for grants based on the fact that many had already budgeted for this and made the investment.

Chair says she thinks the survey came back better than anticipated and it was enlightening. There was some discussion about pushing the upgrade back one year, and she wouldn't necessarily be opposed to that. She says the 7500s for some have been in place a couple years and like any item, they'll wear out, and these MCC 7500s will be upgraded down the road, so those who had them for 2-1/2 years, they will be old, and those who waited will have new ones.

Mines asks if there's any follow-up to the survey the Committee would like to have done.

Chair says last month during the discussion, if we had people saying they had no idea how to get funded and refused to discuss it, we would entertain going to the SECB to request a letter be written to funding authority in that county or city reminding people this needs to be done. She says in light of this survey, she not necessarily sure the letters need to be written.

Chair asks if there are any thoughts about trying to push the process back one year or if everyone is comfortable to make the designated change in 2016.

Myers asks if it was a full year and says he thought we were looking at pushing it back six months.

Chair says that could be and she can't remember off-hand the time frame that was talked about.

Mines says one point of clarification that Motorola followed up with her after last month's call was that Gold Elite consoles will not be supported either after the upgrade or 2018, so everyone has to upgrade by 2018, regardless.

Chair asks how the Committee is feeling – do we continue with the date we currently have and addresses Rohret's concerns she had about the Metro. Chair asks if we need to add six months to the process.

Rohret says she was pleasantly surprised that so many agencies in the Metro changed and gave Jackie different information than they gave her and given that fact, leave it as it is. She says it would be nice if Motorola would finish the 7.13 upgrade but says to leave things as scheduled for now, and if something changes in the interim, then something changes in the interim.

Chair asks for any other thoughts.

Jack Swanson and Myers both say they support what Jill said.

Chair says she doesn't think a motion is needed since no changes are being made. If new information comes up in the coming months and we need to revisit this, we will.

- **Review of 2Q2014 ARMER Maintenance Budget (Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee)**

Mines says this is a review of the second quarter ARMER maintenance budget and she has asked Tim Lee and Mukhtar Thakur to present it. She says we are getting on a quarterly schedule of getting an updated maintenance budget from MnDOT and will be happy to present each quarter to the Finance Committee.

Thakur says everyone should have the sheet that was sent out for the FY 2014 and FY 2015 budgets and asks for questions. He says what has been expended to date to March 14th is already written down in FY 2014 and all information is there regarding everything to include salaries, surplus, and deficits.

Chair asks if there are questions. There are none.

Chair asks Mines if that budget needs to be voted on or if it's informational.

Mines says it is informational and is not sure if Chair wants to present it to the SECB or just keep it in the Committee and if there are any questions going forward, we have the information and can answer them.

Chair says she thinks putting them in the packet might be good for appearances for the board to be able to take a look at. It's already set and is not a voteable thing, but it's good for people to see how things are being worked out and how hard MnDOT is working.

Mines says she will work with Lee and Thakur to make sure the packet reflects all the items they want to include. .

Chair thanks Thakur.

- **Discussion of Motorola Software Maintenance Budget notification timeline to local units of government (Cari Gerlicher)**

Chair says it seems we are still having a little bit of an issue with MnDOT getting a foreseeable future budget out to state agencies for their software upgrades in what some would consider a timely fashion. Last year, the bill came out after it was due, and state agencies scrambled for payment. This year, it came out with about a three-week deadline and tens of thousands of dollars needed to be paid by some organizations. She is asking where the time frame to deliver comes from and doesn't know when Motorola sends that information out and what MnDOT's turnaround time is, but from comments she's heard from other state agencies is that they would really love to have at least six months or a quarter time frame put into that budget processing so they can plan for these \$60k-\$80k purchases instead of getting a bill January 15 and being told it's due February 5th.

She says she wants to have some discussion with MnDOT and Motorola as to how the process works on their end so she can better explain it on her end.

Rohret asks if she is talking about an annual service contract bill or an upgrade bill.

Chair responds service contract bill and asks if Lee, Thakur, or Mike Fink have any educational information to share.

Lee says they don't send notices to every agency way ahead of time, but is the budget and costs are presented to the whole Board. He says the estimated budgets were presented to the SRB in April 2013 and that he doesn't mail it to every agency at that time. Right now, MnDOT doesn't charge on any overhead for processing all of this, they're just passing on what they get from Motorola and says if we have to go to that level, if you can't get it from the SECB, they can always tack on an overhead fee and start doing that.

Chair says she thinks that explaining to the SECB that bills will not be coming out prior to the due date would be helpful. She was not of the understanding that she, as a member of the SECB, needed to take that April information and the due date and give it to the agency, because sometime things change. She says she doesn't recall if the breakdown is by state agency, but if it is, she will make sure the state agencies know that what comes out during that month is what their bill for next January will be.

Lee says the estimates we have for next year would be out, but at the end of the year, Motorola totals up the final equipment. He says at the end of the year, they go through and look and if anyone has added anything, that's where it changes. The estimates are sent out in April or May the year before, but they don't mail them to anyone, they just present it through the Board.

Mines asks Lee if there were a lot of changes and if most bills were a lot higher after the estimate this year. She says it seems like there was more feedback when she went out the last couple months to different regions that it was

higher than expected. She wasn't sure if it was a timing issue with warranties lapsing or if it just took Motorola a while to get the data together and it was more accurate. She asks Lee to elaborate.

Lee says if you go back to the estimates that were put out in 2012, it is listed as 2013 as SMA, which was the agreement we had with Motorola. He says a lot of people saw theirs increase in 2014, because we are now under SUA, and those costs were in there and they did not change for a lot of agencies, but then there were a lot of agencies that came out of warranty or had no equipment before and it just got added in the last year it came off warranty. He says they did not see an overall change from what they actually presented in 2012 for SMA and 2013 and SUA in 2014.

Mines says we're kind of continually hearing this that we're distributing info to the regions through the committees, but she doesn't know if there's a concerted effort at each of the regions to distribute that to each county and each agency. She says we seem to have surprises, and it goes back to the communications through the people on committees getting back to the respective organizations.

Myers says in MnDOT's defense, what was sent out has a contact person listed. In his region, he emailed that spreadsheet from Tim to all the contacts, making sure they had it. If the contacts are not current, MnDOT can't do anything about that. He says if you go way back in the process, MnDOT even approached the regions saying they would bill the regions and have the regions do the individual billing on it. He says he doesn't know how we get this information out but knows MnDOT has provided it, and their numbers were pretty spot on, with the only ones who changed were those migrating onto the system or those whose equipment came out of warranty.

Rohret says in the Metro, she also emails the spreadsheet when she gets it and they have been on it the longest and dealing with the contract the longest. She says it's just been in the last couple years that someone doesn't call her and ask what the bill is for and they forgot to budget for it, and she thinks sometime it just takes a while.

She says the one thing she would like to see from a local perspective is if the estimates could be done earlier in year, because April and May is late in the local budgeting process, from what she hears. When she send estimates out for her agencies, she tells them to budget at least what they spent the prior year. They have the 2015 estimate that was prepared in 2012, not knowing how accurate it will be, but she included that, as well.

Chair says they're one of the agencies that came off warranty, but they were prepared and had discussed it. She feels it's important that they either send out an email or remind people at the big meeting in April that once MnDOT presents the budget, it is the responsibility of the Radio Board Chairs in the regions to make sure that information gets out. She says the state chair head is responsible for getting their information out to their state agencies and some regions have done it well and some have not. She says it would be helpful to remind the Regional Radio chairs that the information needs to be sent out to their counties.

Mines says we can do those reminders, and as soon as we get the information would be happy to do an additional email out of our office to the RICs and the Radio Board Chairs and remind them to get the information out to everyone.

Jack Swanson says speaking from a regional perspective, it seems that at least in outstate, the RICs are a lot more knowledgeable, and it would be nice if they could carry this info as opposed to a regional SECB Chair, which in most cases is a commissioner probably filling a role as Chair.

Chair says that sounds good and asks if there is suggestion for the best way to get that information to the RICs.

Mines says the RICs can get the information to the regions, but where she feels the breakdown occurs is the regional representative that comes to those meetings. She feels there should be some sort encouragement from the RRB, RACs, and Chairs to take that message back to the people who make the decision, like the respective Sheriff, etc. Mines says even with the excellent job Jill does communicating out to everyone she has listed as a contact, she hears from some Metro commissioners that they are still not getting the information.

She says we can only do so much, and then it's up to the various regions to pay attention and work with their respective agencies in those regions to get that message out. While the RICs can do a really good job of presenting it to the RACs, we need the support and encouragement of the RACs and RRBs to get the message out to the right people. She says we have communicated in previous years to the RICs and the RICs have taken that message to the regional RACs, etc., and we can always push to do a better job of that, but her concern is still that it is breaking down between that meeting and the individual counties.

Swanson says he agrees with Mines, and that's exactly correct about where the breakdown happens. He says we're looking at something so complex that commissioners and sheriffs, for the most part, have no idea what we're talking about. They will look at a piece of paper and have no clue. He doesn't have a solution for it, but he is not faulting Mines, the RICs, or any of those people and says the communication breakdown happens at a local level. He says he's not sure there's a good way to resolve that.

Myers says one of the other things they do in the Central is send it out annually to Board membership, and he doesn't send it to the Board members, he sends it to the County Administrator or Chief Financial Officer in the county. He also includes a cover memo that explains how they derive those numbers, and it gets sent out to them every year. He suggests that might be something to do on the Board level for working with the RIC to get that contact person for your county agencies to send the information to. He says he's not sure how else it can be done and that we can provide a lot of information but sometime it just doesn't get to the right person.

Swanson says in Outstate Minnesota, especially in the northwest, many of the counties don't have coordinators or administrators so you're expecting the Board clerk, which is often the auditor, so the reality is you're expecting the auditor to have a sense of this.

Mines asks Myers if he could send her an example of what he sends out, and she can send it to the RICs or talk about it at the next quarterly RIC meeting, asking them to provide suggestions as to how we might improve that communication. She feels outstate regions might benefit from it, as well.

Myers says he will send the spreadsheet to Mines with the budget process and the cover memo explaining each section item on the budget and how they derive the numbers. He says he also send the portion of the JPA that explains the whole budgeting process with the Central Minnesota Emergency Services Board. This portion talks about their pre-budget meeting and the window of time they have to reply by if they have objections. He says it goes out every year, and the clerical staff tries to stay on top of changes, but it took some time to get to this point.

Mines thanks Myers and asks Tim Lee if there is a way to move the notification up from MnDOT and says she thinks there's a standard that identifies when it needs to go out. She is wondering if we need to modify it to move it up a month or two and if that is possible from a practical standpoint.

Lee says right now, the contract they have with Motorola is through the end of 2015 and the pricing is known as far as SSA/SUA, so the numbers are not changing much from what they presented before, unless people have changed or added equipment. He says they just haven't sent anything official out for this year, but what happens next year is if the SECB wants to continue the contract in 2016, that has to be decide between now and sometime early in 2015.

He says at that time, they have to go out for bids on this contract again, and they wouldn't have those prices until the end of 2015 when the contract was put in place toward the end of 2015 for any 2016 costs. They aren't going to know the 2016 costs for a while, and that depends on what level of service everyone wants to buy from Motorola and what the Board tells us to go out and get.

Lee says they have 2015 costs right now and he could send them out, but it shouldn't change much from what they've already sent out unless you've added or changed equipment. The costs for 2016 will be a lot harder to get by May of 2015 if we're changing the contract service level and we still haven't gone out for bid for that contract.

Chair asks Lee when he would foresee starting the process for a new RFP for 2016.

Lee says they have to start in the middle of 2015 to give Admin time, but between now and when we can go out for RFP, the SECB has to decide what level of service we want, and that's a big decision for the Board.

Chair suggests she and Mines talk to the SECB Chair and look at starting a timeline for making the decision as to what type of service contract we want by November of this year so MnDOT can start the process of an RFP in January or February 2015 so things get done earlier.

Lee says he has to go to Admin to see when they can actually start working on it once a decision is made.

Chair asks if it's MnDOT that does that or if it is ECN that should have the discussion. She is wondering if someone can have that discussion by the May Finance Committee meeting.

Lee says the bigger level discussion has to be with the whole SECB to see what level of service we want to continue forward with.

Chair says she realizes that but is wondering if Lee can touch base with Admin to find out how early we can start the process so we can have the dialogue at the Board meeting, as well.

Lee says he'll check with Admin.

Mines says what she is hearing is that there should be a meeting between herself, Chair, Tim Lee, Mukhtar, and Commissioner Dunaski to understand all that needs to go into the process and also do some preliminary discussion before we put something to the Board. She asks if that is correct.

Chair says we need to get a timeline down so we can have some goal dates on the steps that need to take place so we can expedite the process so dollar amounts are gotten out to counties and regions earlier rather than later, if possible.

Mines asks Thakur and Lee if that sounds amenable to them.

Lee says yes.

Thakur says if there is anything they can do to help understand and clarify the picture so everyone understands the best they can about what the process will do and the timeline for it, it would be helpful. He says the issue is what Myers said that a lot of people don't understand it when they receive it, and that is a challenging endeavor to try and find a solution to. One idea that was mentioned is that the RICs should get it because they are better able to understand what it all means and can help the local agencies. He feels it's a good idea and is worth a try.

Chair says there are two things we need to continue to work on. One is finding ways to explain the billing system and the papers that come out and finding the best way to get it to people. There are a couple people who are willing to send information about the process they use to Jackie, and she (Chair) will talk about that a little bit on Monday. The second thing is to find a way to get the dollar figures expedited for the 2016 year. She sees these as being separate items but being very important processes, one that we need to start working on now as information and the other one is the process for the future RFP budget.

Mines says it sounds good and we'll pursue that.

- **Camp Ripley Request (Jackie Mines)**

Mines says we typically hold COMDEX exercises at the DOT State Patrol Training Facility in Arden Hills, but Camp Ripley is a prime place to do this major, full-scale exercise they would like to do. She says the facilities cost \$120.00, and is looking to fund it out of the SECB budget.

Motion made by Jack Swanson to approve the request.

Second: Micah Myers
Motion carries

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Swanson says that Mines has agreed to appear before the Board of Directors at the Association of Minnesota Counties tomorrow and thanks her in advance.

ADJOURN

Chair asks for motion to adjourn.

Motion: Micah Myers

Second: Jill Rohret

Meeting is adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE

June 12, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance

Members

Present

Member/Alternate

- X Chair, **Cari Gerlicher** – MN Police Chiefs Association
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, Mn/DOT-OEC
- X Commissioner **Blake Huffman**/Jill Rohret, MESB
Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB
- X Commissioner **Jack Swanson** – NW RRB
Vice Chair, **Micah Myers** – Central MN ESB

- X **Marcus Bruning**, Northern RIC

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests reporting:

Name	Representing
Brandon Abley	ECN

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gerlicher calls the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Jack Swanson moves to approve the agenda.

Blake Huffman seconds.

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Swanson mentions that Jackie Mines and Brandon Abley were at an Association of Minnesota Counties Board of Directors meeting and gave an excellent presentation. He says that as he looked around the room, filled with primarily Commissioners, it looked as though eyes had glazed over and he didn't think they gleaned very much of what was presented. These were probably among the brightest of the Commissioners in Minnesota so it is descriptive of the problem we have with disseminating information in such a complex area and the ability of people to understand it.

Brandon Abley agrees and says he thinks they did lose the group a little. They seemed interested but it wasn't their area of expertise so they couldn't keep up. They had asked for a lot of information and Abley thought it might have been a little overwhelming.

Cari Gerlicher asks if this is a group that would be good candidates for when we have the Radio conference for those Radio 101 classes on the beginning day of the conference.

Swanson does not think so for this group. He says that those folks that are directly involved in the regions are often Commissioners and he thinks it is too complex a topic for Commissioners or Sheriffs to understand and many counties don't have any in-house expertise – they are contracting with somebody—so a lot of what is presented is beyond their ability to understand.

Abley responds that these are the elected officials so there's staff that specializes and is hired to deal with the technical information and that may be part of the issue.

Huffman moves to approve previous meeting's minutes.

Micah Myers seconds.

Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Participation Plan Grant request by NWRRB (Mines)

Abley reports for Director Mines. He says that routinely throughout the years the SECB has allocated funds for grants for participation plans. This request is from counties in the Northwest—Lake of the Woods County and Roseau County –to secure participation plans. Both counties have already received bids and would be ready to go as soon as they have the cash in hand. Lake of the Woods County for \$19,500 for an ARMER participation plan and Roseau County for \$16,000 for a participation plan.

At the bottom of your letter in the meeting materials is a breakdown of the SECB's current budget. It shows that there is room within the SECB's budget right now. Currently the SECB has about \$197,000 available in its FY2014 budget and this request would bring SECB down to \$161,632 for FY2014. This is the State fiscal year which ends at the end of June.

Swanson moves to approve the request.

Myers seconds.

Gerlicher calls for discussion or questions. She says it appears that the money is there and obviously the goal is to get people to complete participation plans.

No further discussion.

Motion carries.

Gerlicher reports that there has been discussion about having a retreat in the fall to talk about financially planning for the future and looking at the continued upgrades that are suggested by Motorola as we move into the 2018s and the 2020s. It's her understanding that at the SECB meeting at the end of the month the dates for the retreat will be set and people will be asked to volunteer to participate. If you have an interest in participating, please let Jackie Mines know in the next week.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

Chair asks for motion to adjourn.

Myers moves to adjourn the meeting.

Swanson seconds.

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

DRAFT

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

FINANCE COMMITTEE

October 9, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Member/Alternate

Chair, Cari Gerlicher – MN Police Chiefs Association

Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, Mn/DOT-OEC

Commissioner Blake Huffman/Jill Rohret, MESB

Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB

Commissioner Jack Swanson – NW RRB

Vice Chair, Micah Myers – Central MN ESB

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests:

Name	Representing
Jackie Mines	ECN
Bruce Hegrenes	NE Region
Randy Donahue	Southern RIC
Mike Fink	Motorola
Carol Salmon	ECN
Marcus Bruning,	Northern RIC
Tim Lee	MnDot

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gerlicher calls the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended. She would like to add discussion items of the SEAs, region priority setting, and planning a Finance Committee meeting in December or January to go over the project budget.

Jack Swanson moves to approve the agenda as amended.

Blake Huffman seconds.

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Huffman moves to approve previous meeting's minutes.

Swanson seconds.

Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

- Request for Participation Plan Grant by Clay County (Mines)

Director Mines reports that Clay County dispatches out of the Red River Regional Dispatch Center in Fargo. She reports that it is positive to see that they are joining the system, even though on the North Dakota side the PSAP deals with VHS. Typically the cost of a participation plan costs anywhere from \$16 to 24k. Mines thinks this is a reasonable request and a very positive direction for the region.

Swanson moves to approve the request.

Huffman seconds.

Motion carries.

- Intersubsystem Interface (Nate Timm/Bruce Hegrenes)

Mr. Hegrenes reports that he and Mr. Timm have been working on an interface for interoperability between the new Wisconsin system and ARMER. There is a unique situation in St. Louis County and Douglas County with the common port shared with Wisconsin. Two years ago they had a large scale port operation and the exercise revealed some interoperable communications issues in the port. Some of them have been mitigated. But as the Superior, Douglas County, Wisconsin State Patrol and Wisconsin DNR transition to the new Wisconsin system, the interoperability will be more problematic.

Hegrenes explains the technical reasons why the Intersubsystem Interface would make operability seamless across the border between WI and MN. He says the system is not just for Duluth and St. Louis County but for the whole length of the Minnesota border.

Hegrenes says St. Louis County presents this request having secured partial funding. Through a grant the county has established a microwave link into the WI system. The county received a \$130k port security grant, broken down into a \$97,500 grant and a matching grant of \$32,500.

Hegrenes clarifies that the system costs \$306,000 and that includes the first ten talk groups. There would be about \$25-\$30,000 in annual maintenance fees. Hegrenes says the request is to purchase this system and include it as part of the ARMER system. St. Louis County would only need a few of the talkgroups; the rest would be available for other regions. He reiterates that St. Louis County paid for the microwave and is providing \$130,000 toward the project. The county has set aside funds to pay the \$32,000 portion for the matching grant but if the SECB could also fund that, it would be appreciated and the county would use those dollars on something else.

Chair Gerlicher clarifies that St. Louis County is asking for \$176,000 and possibly another \$32,000?

She asks if there has been any discussion with the other regions--on the North Dakota or South Dakota or Iowa side to see if they might be able to contribute financially.

Hegrenes says they have not pursued that.

Swanson asks if this would be functional for Clay County into North Dakota as well.

Hegrenes says there is a possibility. The ISSI gateway requires the other agency or the other state to provide an interface so it depends on whether North Dakota would be agreeable. Wisconsin has already agreed to do so and has purchased the gateway.

Swanson says that Commissioner Antony could not be on the call but asked that Swanson report that Antony supports this. Swanson says that he supports it as well. He thinks part of the reason the Northwest has been somewhat reluctant to convert to ARMER is because of the interoperability issue with North Dakota and Manitoba.

Gerlicher asks Swanson if Clay County would be willing to consider contributing funding for this.

Swanson says they do not meet again until December. He does not think that ISSI has been discussed at all in the NW region.

Gerlicher says conceptually she does not have an issue with it. She says there are some huge purchases coming up in the next couple of years so having to pay an additional \$20-30k a year in System Upgrade Agreement (SUA) costs could be a concern. She is curious what the regions that will be affected by this might be able to contribute. What is the timeline—could we table this for a month and reach out to those other regions?

Rohret asks who will be responsible for the \$30k added to the SUA. Would it be the state? Would it be everyone that is on the contract? Would it be only those who are using/benefiting from the system? She thinks there should be a plan for that and it should be communicated. When it comes to purchasing additional licenses as needed, she recommends there is a plan in place for that as well. For example, when the eleventh talk group is needed, does that agency have to pay the entire \$50k? She says the Metro Region has not discussed this so she can't speak to whether any of the border counties would want to add money to this.

Swanson asks if this committee made a recommendation to the SECB in November would that be soon enough. Hegrenes says yes. He would recommend that the state purchase it and St. Louis County could encumber the money and reimburse.

Swanson asks if we could bring this to the Regional Interoperability Coordinators (RICs) to bring out to the regions, to their Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) and hopefully their Emergency Communication Boards (ECBs) as well and then bring this back to our November meeting?

Mines says she believes the RICs could bring this out. She has a couple of questions. When Hegrenes is looking at the state is he looking the SECB funds or is he looking at the bond budget that MnDot has? She is not sure if the bond budget is possible. Also the maintenance--\$30k a year—would that get added into the states portion of the SUA cost going forward and if so, can MnDot's existing budget cover that going forward? How does that line up with other requests that might come through? Her concern is how this lines up with those other requests, for coverage gaps, etc. If you put out a grant and those requests come in later and they are denied—that has to be considered. How does it stack up with other needs in the other regions? She doesn't know if there are any other additional costs that MnDot has to support and implement this solution on an ongoing basis and if that is covered in the existing maintenance budget.

Tim Lee says MnDot does not have this in the budget. We could put it in there, but anything we put it in means something else doesn't get done. We would have to look at it. Who is using the talk groups? If there are ten talk groups for the box and there's a cost to keep this box up, maybe whoever is using the talkgroup plays a portion. If St. Louis County has two of the ten, maybe St. Louis County pays 20% of the operating costs of it, for example.

Swanson asks if the regions that would potentially have a use for this are the Northeast, Southeast and Metro.

Lee says in the initial use it would be tying to the E.F. Johnson system in Wisconsin. There would be additional things that would have to be looked at and planned out to tie it to the system in South Dakota. Lee says Iowa does not have a trunking system. They are planning it but they have been planning for ten years. Lee says it would not work for North Dakota because North Dakota does not have a trunk system. If you were going to add South Dakota you would have to look at the design because you would have to connect from South Dakota all the way back to Duluth or you would have to buy another one of these ISSI interfaces to put down near South Dakota. That hasn't been thought out. He doesn't know if the cost of the microwave is more than the cost of adding another box but as you look at future systems, yes you could add into this box but there might be a lot of cost to tie some of these other systems in.

Mr. Fink says that question is more of a MnDot connectivity question, checking the microwave to determine if there is a route into where the ISSI will reside.

Lee says he doesn't know what the bandwidth requirements are and would have to research to see if that bandwidth exists and if it doesn't exist, we'd have to purchase it.

Fink will get him information.

Rohret says the Metro region has not discussed it.

Gerlicher asks Hegrenes to put some information out to the RICS and we will table it to the November Finance meeting. She asks him to ask Motorola to answer the question if the system is based in Duluth and we want to add South Dakota—how would that work.

Mines says in order to have this question go out to the RICs, she will need to have the answers to those questions so that they have all the information available to them.

Hegrenes ask for clarification about the question of where the funds would come from. Gerlicher asks if this project could be funded through bonds. Lee says we could use bond funds.

Gerlicher says we need the budget shored up, we have connectivity questions, and we need to know if any of the other counties would use this and if they would be willing to contribute to the funding. She asks Hegrenes to clarify the budget and for Tim Lee to get the bandwidth information. Mines will draft questions and send them to Hegrenes.

Action on this item is tabled until November meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Gerlicher says that Tim Lee is going to need the SECB to make a decision very quickly so he can get a Request for Proposal (RFP) out for the new SUA Contracts. We would like to have the regions between now and mid-December put together their top six priorities for the ARMER project. There are a lot of individual requests coming and the concern is how to decide what to fund. She would like the regions to start putting together a

list of their priorities so we can make holistic decisions. Our goal would be that we meet face to face in December or January to take a look at the regional priorities and make a master list of priorities.

Swanson agrees that we should discuss this in person and that we should meet sooner rather than later.

Micah Myers says isn't this along the lines of what we did at the Strategic Planning Meeting. If we are going to have the sit down it would be nice to have the notes and summary from that meeting.

Gerlicher says yes we did some of this but some of it was at the 10,000 foot level. What she clearly heard from her group was that everybody thought it was very important that we get NextGen 911 and GIS completed but didn't look at the bells and whistles of ARMER. She thinks the meeting minutes are very important but doesn't think we got down to the minutia. She says there are regions that need capacity expansion, and other areas that are concerned about the 7.19 and future upgrades, etc. She needs to hear from the regions to see what their priorities are so we can see where there are similarities.

Swanson asks are you suggesting including region reps as well?

Gerlicher says yes, region reps should be there. They should talk to the commissioners and sheriffs in their region and bring a consistent package. She may have a conflict with the date of the Finance Committee in December.

Swanson says that the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) has its annual conference on the 8th and 9th of December in St. Cloud. He proposes the afternoon of Tuesday the 9th or the following morning as a possible meeting time as many of the commissioners would be in St. Cloud on those two days.

Gerlicher could not be there the on 8th – 12th. She thinks we need to have the bulk of the Finance Committee there.

Meyers will chair the meeting. He will look for a venue.

Swanson asks Gerlicher if regions can submit their priorities as soon as early December.

Mines is concerned because the SW/SC/SE regions only meet every other month. They would have to call a special meeting. It might be difficult to act on it that quickly—she doesn't know how possible that is.

Mines adds that the grant programs have had the focus of getting the regions on the system and that was a priority of the SECB. But now we are at a different juncture. Now there needs to be some thoughtful consideration about how we address regional needs. We have to get everyone's feedback. She thinks it's worth taking the time to get every region's list of priorities. Some of the things in front of us affect only some subsystem owners. Some of the things before us affect only Greater Minnesota. We need to be confident that we are being fair. If we know what everyone's needs are, we have a better opportunity to address them as fairly as possible with everyone's input.

Swanson asks Gerlicher if we need the priority list in order to have the discussion for the SUA.

Gerlicher says we can't wait. MnDot needs to have that RFP ready to go by the holidays. We heard that counties need to know by April for budgeting purposes what those costs are going to be. Gerlicher had discussions with Mines and Deputy Commissioner Dunaski about some options with SUA. One of the things they talked about was putting an additional six months on to the time that people have to get the 7.19 upgrade.

Mines clarifies that 7.15 is the next upgrade and that is the one that affects the Gold Elite upgrades. When is that due?

Lee says we are getting it under our 2015 SUA contracts but Motorola agreed not to install until 2016. May or June of 2016.

Fink says May of 2016.

Mines says 7.19 is the upgrade that affects the first subsystem owners. This will affect to a large degree the metropolitan area with some pretty big price tags—in the range of 10 -15 million dollars for some and 3-4 million dollars for others—so that's a total of over 25 million for locals—and that is just the hardware. The state has \$10 million to upgrade older infrastructure. Lee has been tackling some of this whenever there is room in the budget. The problem is that that has to be coordinated with the local timeframes. And these are capital improvement projects. The best case scenario is 2020 or 21 to get the upgrade coordinated for 7.19 and we would have to figure out a way to address these costs. If we want to keep the system upgraded, as we heard loud and clear at the meeting, how are we going to do that over the next four years?

Gerlicher says we talked about pushing 7.19 back to 2021 to buy some time. It also buys some time to finish the NextGen911 project. We talked about trying to take some of the budget dollars to offer counties some grants between now and 2021 to get the upgrades done that need to get done in order to get that piece put into place.

There needs to be a discussion and a vote by November to give Lee permission to move forward on that contract. What do people think about pushing back the 7.19 back to 2021?

Rohret says she thinks the Metro would be supportive of pushing it back.

Gerlicher says she heard from her group the desire to move forward on the SUA and the only way we can do that is to give Lee the opportunity to get the RFP moving so we can get that back into the budget.

Mines asks if we went with the SUA like we've gone in the past few years would the prices stay relatively the same to the regions or would they go up? Because, especially in rural MN, they need to have a consistent price point. That was a big price for them and they are just getting used to it. How can we keep the SUA costs similar or the same as what they are today?

Fink says the only thing that really causes that to go up is adding equipment. From this year to next year the increase might be in the 100 thousand dollar range. It is the number of pieces of equipment that causes it to increase.

Rohret asks if there are different prices from Gold Elites to MCC 7500. Is it higher after migration? Also with logging equipment, costs could change.

Mines ask to clarify—if the number of pieces of equipment is the same then the price would be the same unless a piece of equipment is added or changing out a Gold Elite to an MCC 7500.

Fink says that historically the pricing has been about the number of pieces of equipment. The only thing that would cause it to increase would be as more equipment is added.

Tim Lee says there is no cost difference on the positions. Where people get hit is they add a nice logger. Or they add CCGWs and there is a slight cost to those.

Gerlicher asks Mines if the goal for Finance in the November meeting is to pass a motion that the SUA Contract RFP proceed to the SECB November meeting.

Mines asks Lee if, when he enters into the RFP process, does he have to know at that time if we are going to do System Maintenance Agreement (SMA), SUA or the Super SUA? Or can he just go out to RFP so what we would do today is make a motion for MnDot to move forward with the RFP and then as you get the response back and have the pricing we decide. Typically in the past we have had to take the pricing out to the regions to make sure they knew what they were agreeing to.

Lee says we would have to look at the timing of the RFP. The contract would start on the first of January 2016. He doesn't know how far ahead they want to go out with the RFP. He doesn't know that we would go through the RFP process and have that completed by April of next year. He is assuming under the SUA II or the SMA they are very similar to past costs and the price differences are going to be based upon the amount of equipment we have. He thinks we just need to know which approach we are taking and then we could say this is what we estimate the costs to be. He doesn't know that we are going to have an RFP done and we certainly are not going to have a contract by next April.

Gerlicher thought the goal was to have the RFP written by the end of December in the hopes that there was some movement on it before April. To her it is more important that we make the decision between SUA and SMA. She thinks that decision will to give people a pretty good idea ahead of time what their costs are going to be.

Lee has a sheet that lists the difference in pricing between SUA and SMA, based on past pricing.

Fink adds that that was based on the quantity of equipment at that time.

Gerlicher asks how old it is.

Lee says it was based upon our last pricing. The adds are minimal.

Gerlicher asks if it's fair to say within 10%

Lee says definitely. But any new agencies that came on that did not get an SUA bill before will get one now.

Mines asks Rohret if the Finance Committee says if the SUA does not change more than 10% then we would prefer to go with SUA as opposed to SMA, would we need to go through change management process?

Rohret says she does not recall specifically talking about the SUA contract but they did talk about upgrades. The upgrades have technical changes; the upgrades also can have additional financial impact beyond the SUA / SMA but she thinks if we stay where we are or reduce the contract down to SMA she doesn't think we have to go through change management or send it out to the regions. But if you go to the MAB program, that has a huge financial impact, that would need to be discussed by the regions.

Mines clarifies that there would be a huge upgrade cost to certain subsystem owners for us to pursue 7.19. In the MAP program, everyone's prices would go up whether they had those pieces of equipment or not so over time we could pay for the hardware. In conversations she had with the Commissioner and the Finance Chair this week, they thought that probably wasn't fair. It would be fairer if we raised the rate and come up with a grant program to help with the cost.

Myers says he has had this in his CIB plan for some time and he has convinced his administration and will be getting funding for it. We are going to replace ahead of whatever the SECB decides. We are moving forward in

preparation for it. We understand the costs of coming on to the system. It's just a matter of getting this in front of your decision makers so they can fund it. He would be more in favor of the grant program than raising it across the board and having other regions feel like they are subsidizing our system. He thinks you would get some pushback on it.

Swanson agrees. Gerlicher agrees.

Gerlicher asks if anyone is opposed to a decision to move forward with SUA instead of SMA. No one disagrees.

Myers moves to recommend to the SECB that the RFP process begin to move forward to extend the SUA contract.

Rohret seconds.

Swanson asks Mines--when we had a lengthy SUA discussion about two years ago--at that time was it determined that the SUA was the most prudent way to go moving forward?

Mines says yes it was discussed as probably being the most prudent way to move forward. We see some overall cost benefit because there is some shared risk with Motorola. At the Strategic Planning Session --one of the recommended priorities of the board was to keep the system upgraded. The voice network is really going to be around for a while and it makes sense to upgrade but not on an aggressive schedule of every two years, more like three to four years, and we also don't want to upgrade just to buy new things. We want to keep it working and keeping it functional. She thinks that's the overall feedback from the Strategic Planning Session. She thinks the overall perception was *not* let's freeze the system.

Swanson points out, as a caveat, that there were not as many commissioners as users at the meeting. He asks since Metro is going to have a significant expenditure with the 7.15 upgrade, are we saying for the 7.19 upgrade then the rest of Minnesota will also see a significant cost increase?

Mines says no, with 7.15 the majority of users have it in their budgets to upgrade their Gold Elite consoles, and that's really the subject of 7.15. 7.19 is significant for St. Cloud, Rochester and the Metro area. It doesn't affect Greater MN because most of you, when you came on board, had the latest hardware components that will be upgraded to in this version. It's just that very early adopters had older equipment.

Motion carries.

ADJOURN

Myers moves to adjourn the meeting.

Rohret seconds.

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

FINANCE COMMITTEE

November 13, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Member/Alternate

Chair, **Cari Gerlicher** – MN Police Chiefs Association
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, MN/DOT-OEC
Commissioner **Blake Huffman/Jill Rohret**, MESB
Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB
Commissioner **Jack Swanson** – NW RRB
Vice Chair, **Micah Myers** – Central MN ESB

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests:

Name	Representing
Jackie Mines	ECN
Randy Donahue	Southern RIC
Mike Fink	Motorola
Carol Salmon	ECN
Marcus Bruning	Northern RIC
Nate Timm	Southeast Region

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gerlicher calls the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended.

Blake Huffman moves to approve the agenda as amended.

Jack Swanson seconds.

Chair Gerlicher would like to add a discussion of meeting date of December 9th.

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Jill Rohret says on page 7 the reference should be to MAP not MAB.

Huffman moves to approve previous meeting's minutes as amended.

Mukhtar Thakur seconds.
Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

- Request to the SECB to fund the ISSI (Timm)

Discussion about technical issues and about how universally it would be used and who would pay the ongoing costs. Discussion of whether the technical and integration questions had all been answered. Discussion of whether the request had followed the procedure in the standard for statewide enhancements. Discussion of which regions would use it. Discussion of whether or not this is a statewide asset and who makes that determination.

The proposal is being considered at the December Interoperability Committee meeting.

Swanson moves to defers action until the December meeting on the decision of the SECB funding the ISSI to give the IOC an opportunity to determine if it is a statewide asset and the regions time to discuss whether they would use it.
Huffman seconds.

Micah Myers asks if the regions are going to weigh in on it. Do we want to set a date that the regions need to weigh in on it?

Gerlicher recommends the regions discuss it by December 1st so we can use the feedback.

Friendly amendment to ask that regions have discussion and give feedback by December 1st.
Motion carries.

- **Limited matching grant for equipment for the 7.19 upgrade (Jackie Mines)**

Mines reports that outcomes from the Strategic Planning Session are still being reviewed but early indications are that the SECB should develop a matching grant for the hardware needed for the 7.19 upgrade. That grant program would be funded from raising the 911 fee, so it would not come out of the SECB budget. It would be a 50% match on specific hardware. Timing is an issue. The proposal is to ask for the Finance Committees approval to begin developing a grant program. The process would begin with meeting with the subsystem owners and with MnDot to go over the hardware components to make sure we all agree on exactly the components of the upgrade. We would work with the subsystem owners, and develop the grant program and then we would bring it back to the Finance Committee for approval.

Rohret says in the memo 2019 is listed as the deadline. Could we push this to 2020 or 2021?

Gerlicher says she thinks this was discussed at the Strategic Planning Session to move it back as well.

Mines would request that the money be raised over those four years and be available until the money was spent and the upgrade was completed. Tim Lee and Mines would vet the timeline during meetings with the subsystem owners. Part of the problem is that we can't raise in one year all the money that will be needed so we need to start raising it now and set it aside.

Myers moves to create a limited matching grant for equipment for the 7.19 upgrade.
Rohret seconds.

Discussion of whether this support will also be made available to Greater MN when the time comes for those

regions to upgrade. Mine responds that because the Metro came on the system first, it will be outdated before everyone else. Going forward, grant programs will consistently come out to benefit all at the same time. But in the recent past, we have tried very hard to fair across the state. The majority of the costs are in the metro area, but we have tried to be equal based upon need and cost overall. When we did a review two years ago of the approximate grant funding that was given to greater MN, we saw an average of 50% of locals cost was covered through various grants. She believes we have set a precedent of being fair and she would anticipate that we would try to attempt to do that going forward.

Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Regional funding priority discussion with RAC and RECB Chairs and Finance Committee on December 9th.**

Gerlicher says we are finding some competing classes and meetings and we are not getting the audience that we had hoped we would get. In addition, some of the regions have said that they need more time. She recommends that we push it back to January 8th which is the regular Finance Committee date and that we make it a 9-11 meeting. If St. Cloud is more regionally located it could be there. Gerlicher and Mines will get more information out to the regions about future grants and funding.

Swanson says he agrees. He would like if the RICs could bring this up at their regional meetings with some direction from Mines and Gerlicher as to what we are seeking. It needs to be discussed at the regions between now and January. Gerlicher agrees and says it is important that whatever way the conversation gets shared with the commissioners and chairs and others, that discussions take place before January.

Gerlicher says we want the regions and the RACs to have a 3-5 year plan for their system and what their costs will be and their ideas about how it will be funded. Those are the things we are looking at.

Agreement to change the meeting date to January 8th.

- **SECB Budget review (Gerlicher/Mines)**

Mines reviews financial documents as presented in the meeting materials. She reports that the SECB did not spend \$723,000 from last year so the total budget for FY15 is 1,723,000. Mines has identified what we have committed funds to as of today. Mines suggests that we create an ongoing grant program out of the SECB funds on a biennial basis. She recommends keeping about \$369,000 for things such as conferences, SLIGPY match for additional projects, additional costs for Status Board, additional counties that have not yet come on the system.

Mines suggests a creating a grant program of one million dollars. We could identify to the regions that that money would be available for regional priorities. She says that in other states 911 boards create an ongoing grant program. This might be a great opportunity for the board as it is creating the priorities out of the strategic planning session. If the board had a continual matching program, it could be geared around the priorities of the board. Regions could plan around it knowing it would be available at a regular set time and have the ability to plan around it as a funding option.

Mine adds that the board has not been spending the whole budget for operational needs. In 2012 and 2013, more than half of the two million went to local ARMER enhancement grants. In 2010, the board purchased all the control stations for the border. (Mines reviews how the money was spent in the past, as submitted in the

materials.) The board has consistently given out grants but if it did it up front and on an ongoing basis, it may help locals do long range planning. It would be a fund that Greater MN could count on.

Swanson moves that the SECB create an ongoing competitive grant program of \$1 million every biennium as long as the funding continues and that a grant program be created out of the FY14-15 funds of \$1 million.

Myers seconds.

Motion carries.

Adjourn

Myers moves to adjourn the meeting.

Swanson seconds.

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:08 a.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

FINANCE COMMITTEE

December 11, 2014

Conference Call; Dial-in: 1-888-742-5095; Code: 2786437892#

MEETING MINUTES

Member/Alternate

Chair, Cari Gerlicher – MN Police Chiefs Association

Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee – Director, Mn/DOT-OEC

Commissioner Blake Huffman/Jill Rohret, MESB

Commissioner Ron Antony – SW RRB

Commissioner Jack Swanson – NW RRB

Vice Chair, Micah Myers – Central MN ESB

*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

Guests:

Name	Representing
Jackie Mines	ECN
Mike Fink	Motorola
Carol Salmon	ECN

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Micah Myers calls the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended.

Jack Swanson moves to approve the agenda as amended.

Jill Rohret seconds.

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Swanson moves to approve previous meeting's minutes.

Rohret seconds.

Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- **ARMER Master Switching Office Contingency Plan**

Mr. Lee reviews the plan as presented in the meeting materials. The plan is to respond in the event that a Master Switching Office (MSO) is lost due to fire or weather or another catastrophe. MnDot proposes to buy one set of MSO equipment that could be used to replace any one of the six MSOs. A new site would be rebuilt at an off-site facility. The MSO would operate from site-trunking until the new zone was rebuilt. This plan is more economically feasible than other options and was approved by the Operations and Technical Committee.

Lee says it will be funded out of ARMER contingency funds. There are a number of sites that are being leased where the land owners are reluctant to sell at this time. The purchase of those sites has been taken out of the contingency fund and the MSO Contingency Plan was put in instead.

Rohret motion to approve MN Dot's proposal.

Swanson seconds.

Motion carries.

- **ARMER Maintenance Budget**

Mr. Lee presents the ARMER maintenance budget as presented in the meeting materials, for information only. There were no questions and no action was required.

- **Regional SECB Leadership Meeting in St. Cloud**

Vice Chair Meyers introduces the topic of the Regional SECB Leadership Meeting in St. Cloud. The target audience for the meeting is Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Chairs and Regional Radio Board (RRB) Chairs. The purpose is to discuss regional funding needs and grant requests. Participants are encouraged to attend the meeting in person. Where that is not possible, video conferencing will be provided. Myers will set up video conferencing software.

Swanson says the NW region has appointed a subcommittee to discuss funding needs because their board isn't scheduled to meet until after the January 8th meeting.

Myers asks if Mines will she plans to present the power point that she presented to the grant committee.

Mines says that will be updated based on the next meeting with the grants work group and she will present what they have so far. Some of the grants will be very specific and the grant work group will make some recommendations but some are very dependent upon the regional priorities. Mines will have present the power point slides so people can see each of the four different grants and what has been decided so far and what is open for discussion and where input is needed.

Mines will also give an overview of the Strategic Planning Session and what came out of it. The Steering

Committee is still working on the plan but Mines will share what they have so far so participants understand the long term objectives that came out of the Strategic Planning Session.

Swanson suggests that what the Radio Board Chairs are going to be most interested in is what will be the costs going forward, specifically with the ARMER system. Equipment upgrades, maintenance, etc. That will be their number one question and concern.

Mines says we can say what we know so far. We will have to go out to RFP and Motorola will respond and there will be a period of negotiation. For the hardware that is absolutely necessary to upgrade to 7.19, we have an indication from Motorola that those costs will hold steady through 2019.

What she doesn't know is how the SUA costs will change, if at all. She asks Lee to anticipate if SUA costs for equipment purchased will remain the consistent if we enter into the contract again with Motorola?

Lee says based on what has happened in the past, increases have come from added equipment. The baseline costs have stayed about the same, if there has been no added equipment.

Mines says she thinks we can be fairly confident that for the vast majority of users SUA costs will remain relatively the same as what they are now.

Myers says the timing of the purchase of equipment is also an issue. If you entered in the middle of the year and were prorated, the next year you will have the cost for the full year so could be a variable to plan for.

Rohret asks if the SUA cost for MCC 7500 comparable to Gold Elites. Lee says yes.

Mukhtar Thakur moves to adjourn the meeting.

Rohret seconds.

Motion carries.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:25 a.m.