STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

January 15, 2013
Mn/DOT Arden Hills Training Facility
1900 West County Road I
Shoreview, MN 55126

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present	**Members/alternates present:**
X	Chair: Cari Gerlicher/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
	Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
X	Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
X	Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
	Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
X	Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Jim Mohn – Mn/DOT
X	Bob Norlen/Kim Thon – MN EMSRB
	John Priem – Prairie Island Tribal Police
X	Brandon Abley/Tom Johnson – 700 MHz RPC
X	Chris Kummer/Chris Breitbach – MESB
	John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
X	Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
X	Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
	Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
X	Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
	B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
	Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
X	John Dooley/– HSEM
X	Matt Haas/Kevin Torgerson HSEM Region 1
X	Scott Camps/Vacant – HSEM Region 2
	Brian Halbasch/Bryan Green – HSEM Region 3
	Randy Willis / Michael Wisniewski / HSEM Region 4
X	Mike Hennen/John Maatz – HSEM Region 5
X	Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
X	Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
X	John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
	Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
X	Micah Myers/Jay Sikkink– Central MN RAC
	Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /– NE MN RAC
	Pat Novacek / Brian Zastoupil – NW MN RAC
X	Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
	Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
John Tonding, DPS-ECN
Mike Fink, Motorola
Jill Rohret, MESB
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Jackie Mines, DPS-ECN
Bill Bernhjelm, DPS-ECN
Steve Borchardt, DPS-ECN

Call to Order:

Chair notes that there is a quorum

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve Agenda.

Motion to approve agenda: Chris Kummer
Second: Terry Stoltzman
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the November meeting minutes.

No changes.

Motions to Approve November Minutes: Chris Kummer
Second: Terry Stoltzman
Motion Carries

ACTION ITEMS

1. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ADDENDUM TO STANDARD 3.16.4 AND SUNSET 1.1.2 AS OF JANUARY 1, 2013 (TOM JOHNSON)

Tom Johnson explains that this addendum plus standard now replaces the Standard 1.1.2 which will be sunset as of January 1, 2013. This standard was left in place until narrow-banding went into effect. A sub group of the Interoperability workgroup reviewed standard 1.1.2 and 3.16.4 and added this addendum. They are moving this forward for final approval.

Motion to Approve: Monte Fronk
Second: Micah Myers
Motion Carries.

2. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ADDENDUM TO STANDARD 3.16.5 AND SUNSET 1.1.1 AND 3.5.0 AS OF JANUARY 1, 2013(TOM JOHNSON)

Johnson explains that this addendum along with standard 3.16.5 replaces standard 1.1.1 and 3.5.0 which will sunset as of January 1, 2013 when narrow-banding went into effect.

Discussion:

Seal would like to know why it isn't mandatory. Johnson identifies that it will become mandatory when Status Board is available statewide.

Motion to Approve: Ulie Seal
Second: Chris Kummer
Motion Carries.

3. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO PROPOSED CHANGES TO 2.8.0 TALKGROUP AND RADIO USER PRIORITY (CATHY ANDERSON)

Anderson explains that most of the changes are grammatical in nature but it is before the committee because there were some definitions in the standard that were not complete. Definitions added under Priority 4 and 6, smaller changes under Priorities 8 and 9.

Motion to Approve: Micah Myers
Second: Monte Fronk
Motion Carries.

4. SHERBURNE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE REQUESTS PERMISSION TO USE VLAW 31 MNSEF (TOM JOHNSON)

Johnson explains that this is a request to allow Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge access to the ARMER system for joint operations or mutual aid.

Motion to approve: Ulie Seal
Second: John Dooley
Motion Carries.

5. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR PROPOSED STANDARD 3.44.0 STATEWIDE PURSUIT COMMUNICATIONS (TOM JOHNSON)

Johnson explains that there was a need to change the procedures for pursuit policy due to a change in software upgrade 7.9. The Interoperability workgroup reviewed the existing standard and has proposed changes based upon input from all radio regions.

Motion to Approve: Ulie Seal
Second: Terry Stoltzman
Motion Carries.

6. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR STANDARD 3.35.0 NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE ARMER RADIO OPERATIONS (TOM JOHNSON)

Johnson explains that the purpose of the standard is to define the ARMER talkgroups and procedures to be used by the National Weather Service (NWS) offices that serve the various ARMER regions of the state for NWS to county and local agency communications during severe weather events. He further goes on to state that Steve Borchardt worked on this standard with the various regions and the Interoperability Workgroup for the better part of a year. The goal was to standardize operations across the state but found it was just not possible given the different circumstances across the state. The proposed standard is the next best thing. Johnson asks Borchardt to explain.

Borchardt started with metro standard but as they moved across state there were constraints identified.

Standard defines two different methods of operation. Central and Metro will use the Metro protocol to date. Chanhassen will notify MSP by NAWAS and MSP will notify counties via regional call talk-groups and will have to identify which cluster of counties are affected within each NWS regions. They will assign a regional or state resource as necessary to reach the counties in that watch area and patch to a dedicated Chanhassen talk-group.

SW and SC regions want to operate on dedicated talk-groups and MSP will manage to that difference.
If multiple events across both regions there will be one talk-group assigned because Chanhassen does not have the personnel to navigate multiple talk-groups for multiple events on one radio or multiple radios.

Borchardt states this is the one murky area. Weakness is that there could be a warning in two different regions they will have to be managed on same talk-group.

Only exception is Aberdeen SD NWS. They are not within radio coverage on ARMER. They will continue to do business on SD state talk-group monitored by Big Stone and Traverse Counties and they will patch to ARMER talkgroup.

Protocol on recommended procedures is written in a generic way. Essentially each county that is served by Chanhassen will let Chanhassen know how they want to operate. MSP will assign a resource and those counties that want to use that resource will do so and those that want to operate on dedicated Chanhassen talkgroup will operate that way.

Quite a few Gold Elite consoles in Metro are maxed out and cannot handle a dedicated Chanhassen talk group so until Gold Elites go away they don't have that capacity.

It was also debated removing MSP's role and work county by county. That would require more responsibilities at the counties but afraid there could be notification gaps and would like to see how it works for this year. They are the warning point coordinator for NAWAS and distribute warning downstream and have an additional role of creating this patch.

Borchardt thanks Rick Juth for committing MSP for this complex role.

Questions:

Chair asks are we to assume that operationally, MSP and Chanhassen understand the regions and how they differ.

Borchardt states that is correct. He also points out that this talk-group is not intended for local spotter traffic unless the NWS specifically requests direct communication with a spotter. There are occasions where they may want to verify what they are seeing with an individual spotter and want to facilitate. Normally field communications should take place on a local talk-group.

Chair asks if we are assuming that spotters are employees .

Borchardt replies that yes they are usually volunteer firefighters or local emergency managers.

Stoltzman asks when these talk-groups will be created.

Borchardt: Yes some of the talk-groups already created such as in the SW.

Dooley: (Inaudible)

Stoltzman expresses some concern about MSP insertion.

Borchardt states that MSP is already part of process via NAWAS but most local counties will watch the weather and call into NWS and establish direct communication with NWS before the warning is distributed via the formal channels. There was concern that reducing the role of the MSP would exclude the formal channel and might inadvertently create a gap in warning.

Freshwater: (inaudible) **Micah Myers states at the March 2013 that Freshwater's motion included making the priority level2. This change was approved at March 2013 meeting.**

Motion to Approve: Rick Freshwater
Second: Micah Myers
Motion Carries.

STANDING REPORTS:

Interoperability Work Group:

Johnson states that all the Best Practices Guides are now on the website and that there are currently 69 counties migrated to ARMER with 74 resolutions passed to explore a move to ARMER.

Johnson relates that the VHF Interoperability Plan is awaiting the technical portion and equipment to be installed and waiting for MNDOT to propose standards and finalize installation.

Interoperability between Manitoba and MN is waiting for completion of International Falls tower.

Motobridge training is almost complete and almost ready for voice overlay. Brad Barber will take a look at the final outline. Subject matter experts are not readily available within the state so looking for some input from states that use Motobridge.

Interop Conference planning continues. Tom asks everyone to hold open the May 6-8th dates of Conference.

Johnson thanks Interoperability Workgroup and RICs for their hard work on the standards put forth today.

Biennial report is complete and to the legislature and on the website. Hard copies available upon request.

Reminds everyone that COMT training is scheduled for June 10-14 in Arden Hills and will need a minimum of six for class.

COML exercise is week of July 8th in St. Cloud which will certify COMTs.

SCIP planning workshop is scheduled for May 29th and 30th in Arden Hills and will include broadband for public safety.

May 22nd there will be a NG911 workshop put on by DHS.

Chair asks if COML training has been added to HSEM NIMS training course.

Johnson not sure if that has been included. HSEM has reviewed the training and adding requirements to be pre-qualified.

Strategic Technology Reserve:

Abley states nothing new to report.

Old Business:

Change Management:

Chris Kummer asks if the OTC had conducted a technical review of the change management items from last meetings discussion as requested by IOC? Kummer understands that OTC did not do a technical review and moved them forward and he is wondering if they are coming back to IOC?

Abley states that these items were discussed and that MNDOT had prepared reports for committee review. He also states that the OTC did not deem the items necessitated further detailed technical review and had recommended moving items forth to SRB.

Chair asks for clarification if it was decided that MNDOT should perform further technical review.

Kummer asks for clarification that the OTC was satisfied with what they saw from the MNDOT reports and asks if these items are not coming back to IOC.

Abley states that is correct.

Membership:

Johnson points out that IOC membership was changed in By-Laws passed in September and he was not aware of that and outstate five HSEM region seats has been changed from 5 seats each to one primary seat and one alternate for the Metro and for Greater MN.

Chair states that with lack of attendance it was difficult to have all these seats for HSEM and that it was decided that membership for HSEM would be similar to the Chiefs and Sheriffs—one primary and one alternate for Metro and one primary and one alternate for Greater MN. Chair asks HSEM to decide who will represent their group. Suggest that by March meeting HSEM regions make a decision and let Jackie Mines at ECN know who it will be.

Stolzman states that HSEM region 5 was represented at most meeting by himself.

Chair states that is true but a member cannot represent two organizations on the committee. As such her representation has always been as representing Chiefs of Police and not DOC and so Victor will represent them on this committee so there is not a conflict of interest.

Mines asks that each member organization check to make sure that they have a primary and alternate identified and alert ECN if there are any changes for the March meeting.

Chair adjourns meeting at 1:50 pm.

STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

March 19, 2013
Mn/DOT Arden Hills Training Facility
1900 West County Road I
Shoreview, MN 55126

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present	**Members/alternates present:**
	Chair: Cari Gerlicher/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
X	Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
X	Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
X	Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
	Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
X	Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Brad Peters – Mn/DOT
X	Pam Biladeau/Bob Norlen – MN EMSRB
X	Brandon Abley/Tom Johnson – 700 MHz RPC
X	Chris Kummer/Chris Breitbach – MESB
	John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
X	Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
X	Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
X	Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
	Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
X	B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
	Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
X	John Dooley/– HSEM
X	Scott McKellep/ Michael Wisniewski / HSEM Greater MN
X	Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
	Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
X	John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
	Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
X	Micah Myers/VACANT– Central MN RAC
	Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /– NE MN RAC
X	Pat Novacek / Brian Zastoupil – NW MN RAC
X	Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
X	Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
John Tonding, DPS-ECN
Jill Rohret, MESB

Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Bill Bernhjelm, DPS-ECN
Steve Borchardt, DPS-ECN
Dave Thomson, Rochester PD
Nate Timm, Goodhue County
Jeff Nelson, PSC Alliance
Dave Deal, Washington County
Ron Olson, City of Minneapolis
John Gundersen, Hennepin County
Mike Hennen, HSEM Region V

Call to Order:

Chair notes that there is a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Vice Chair states that Action Item Number 1 is not actionable and will be heard after Action Item Number 2.

Vice Chair states that Agenda reads "November" minutes and should read "January" minutes.

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

Motion to approve agenda: Jansen
Second: Clif Giese
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the January meeting minutes.

Micah Myers states that the Minutes should reflect that the National Weather Standard was given a priority 2 for the talkgroups. He says this is missing from the Minutes, though Rick Freshwater made the motion.

Motions to Approve Minutes as amended: Micah Myers
Second: John Dooley
Motion Carries

ACTION ITEMS

1. Change Management (Brandon Abley)

Brandon Abley gives an overview of status of Change Management Process as written. He states that there are two versions of the same standard in the packet provided. One marked Hennepin County version and one marked OTC version Standard 3.16.0. Abley states that the majority of these items came from Hennepin County. There is a one-page summary from Hennepin County describing some of the changes made to their proposal.

Abley goes over the updates to the Hennepin County change proposal (as written).

Abley asks for questions from committee and for comments from Hennepin County.

Laurence asks for time to speak about the Hennepin County submission.

Laurence: while it has been referred to as *the* Hennepin County proposal, this was intended to be an omnibus proposal after gathering suggestions from a variety of venues. Hennepin County was pretty happy with the way the system was. There were three or four challenges he will try to identify here. After ten years' experience, this is a great operable radio system, not yet optimally configured to provide interoperability in all cases. Every major incident where metro resources have been sent have encountered a gap. Either cache radios have had to be deployed or we had to reprogram them. They just weren't aligned.

Laurence: A second challenge was the constant moving target. Every couple of months there was a major operational change that made it through the OTC and SRB. Every few months there were changes, some good ideas, but incremental adjustments that really became unmanageable to roll into a configuration in a set of radios and to train people. This led to the change management standard creating a process where rather than have these dribbling standards always changing, we said let's gather this thing up one time and not have to do it again ever or at least not for a long time. That's kind of the omnibus approach.

Laurence: Another thing that was core to this was a couple of years ago Central Minnesota (and largely embraced by the regional leadership committee) really identified a potential for an insufficient number of STACs to support multiple simultaneous incidents and events occurring around the state. This doubled the number of STACs and became the core substantive part of this omnibus group of proposals we assembled. We looked at breaking down some of the silos; FTACs, LTACs, ETACs, STACs, ASOAs, PSOAs, FSOAs…all of these different flavors of talkgroups which led to a tremendously wide variety of how people's fleetmaps are configured. Everything is different. We gathered all of those things up and put them into this package. This has been tweaked some to accommodate many, but not all, of the objections that have come back. If you read the report from the MESB, we are far from having unanimous agreement on any or all of these. This has been one of the reasons why this has been a laborious process to get through change management procedure with the lack of unanimous consent and how do we deal with the objections that come up. At the last meeting here, there was a vote to kick the can downstream for another year. Personally, I don't know if that's a good solution. We've gone through a process and have received a lot of good feedback on a lot of these proposals. The key assessment is the operational assessment. When a whole series of table top exercises are performed and measured against the existing configuration and determining whether it leads to improved interoperability.

Laurence: I will quickly go through ICS 217. When you look at it from a wide view there isn't a whole lot that is changing. It creates three standardized zones that everybody with a radio that can do it, is supposed to have. If you don't have a radio that can do it, you don't have to do it. If you don't do it, you file a spreadsheet with the interoperability coordinator saying what you *do* have in your radio. That is in current standard now, but Tom (Johnson) I don't know how big your binder is on exception and variance reports or people documenting how they have actually implemented statewide resources in their radios.

Johnson: Not at this time.

Laurence: I will tell you from experience there are a lot of people that have not even adopted the current recommended IC zone lineup. But, 3 zones, if you can fit them in your radio. One that has the STACs in it, which includes the existing STACs relabeled FTACs and ATACs. One of the things that are primarily in play for objections and how are these objections going to be considered. Do we add more STACs or not. The OTC did not recommend any more STACs. If we do, how many and how do we deal with the proposal for encrypted STACs. Secondly is how do we deal with pooling the SOAs. There was an objection from the State Fire Chiefs and the MESB to including the existing FTACs into that pool.

Seal corrects him and states FSOAs.

Laurence: Yes, FSOAs. The standardized zones for regionals. In other words, telling the regions that everyone now – as a standard – has to have the same lineup for their regional interoperability resources. The Statewide Radio Board came real close to adopting that within the last couple of years, which really embraced the Central Minnesota lineup that most new regions went with and I think they backed away from that and said that we recommend this but we also will grandfather the existing ATAC and PTAC configurations. What this does is it takes these configurations from "you ought to do this" and says that this is the standard now. We are to the point now where we are going to require uniformity in everybody's radios, with an extended period of time to get implemented, to the next time you buy new radios and the provision for variances and waivers. The way that the current revised proposal has it, is there are still four new STACs but rather than those being in section five through eight, they are in slots thirteen through sixteen. There is a lot of concern about having mixed mode encrypted clear STACs and the consensus of the recommendations that came in was that if you are going to have encrypted STACs make them slave encrypted. So, those landed in slots fifteen and sixteen.

Laurence: One derivative of the OTC action would be to retain those in seven and eight which would have taken existing FTAC three and four and made them mixed mode encryption. We didn't think that was a good approach. Then the renaming and pooling of the existing SOAs using the national NPSTAC naming conventions for the where the 8 goes in the front, then the usage and then the sequence number which I believe has already been adopted on the second page. Slot fifteen and sixteen is something that the committee is going to have to decide about how to forward, recommending this lineup eliminating fifteen and sixteen so the standardized zone that everybody has to have will only have ASOA 1,2,3,4 and the existing FSOAs would stay separate with fire only.

Laurence: The regional interop zone there was some question from some of the regions about the twelfth one, the statewide one. Do they really need a roamer or not. That was the original configuration that I think is still in the SRB actions as being a recommended way to do it. You've got Call, you've got ten regions TACs and another that works statewide.

Laurence: The second page is the renaming LETACs. The standards are just the narratives that embraces all this. There was concern that came out of the MESB that they did not recommend moving forward with increasing the number of STACs without an additional technical analysis primarily concerning the impact on loading when you patch talkgroups that have different home zones. The statewide resources have different home zones. If you patch two talkgroups together, local, regional or statewide, if they are in the same zone it only assigns it to one repeater. If the talkgroups you are patching are in different home zones it will assign to two repeaters. So, the concern was by creating more STACs and doing a lot of patching and we have a lot in use in one location AND it's a location that doesn't have a lot of channel capacity, are we in danger of overloading the system. That certainly is a concern and we've added suggested language for that that basically says extended duration of patching of statewide interop talkgroups to local talkgroups should be avoided. If they have different home zones, multiple repeaters will be assigned and users should transition as soon as safely done to statewide talkgroup and patch terminated. It also says that STACs should not be patched to other statewide talkgroups.

Laurence: During this transitional period, some people don't have all of the resources and there is probably going to be some patching involved. Once you get to a situation where everybody has got these three zones rolled out in their public safety radios, you probably shouldn't have to be doing a lot of patching. The idea is putting this language in so you are minimizing the patching on statewide tacticals should mitigate the concern. Anytime that you have a lot of stuff going on at an incident scene and are assigning a lot of talkgroups and doing patching, you've got potential to get a lot of busies on the system – we saw that at the bridge collapse – it got really busy for the first hour and a half and was back to normal in about six hours. The whole purpose was to be able to support multiple simultaneous incidents or events in different parts of the state.

Laurence: The way I see it, the outstanding issues open for debate, and there certainly could be more, go with the OTC approach and don't add any more STACs, or do we go ahead and add the four, two clear and two encrypted. And, what about the FSOAs and what about actually adopting a regional configuration so all of the regional

interoperable talkgroups all line up. I don't particularly advocate for one or the other and I think this has merit. What I would urge is actually taking action on this and get it resolved and move it to the Statewide Radio Board, get the standards updated so that everybody that is planning what their radios are going to look like for the next ten years can get on with it. Then we're done with these types of changes. The only concern I have about going forward and not doing the additional STACs is if it turns out the Central Minnesota was right, and we don't have enough, I don't want to have to come back and add them.

Vice Chair thanks Laurence. Asks for other comments or discussion.

Pat Novacek says that he is concerned that counties that are using consolettes and not connected to their system with their PSAPs and mandating additional STACs 15 and 16 E, would force them to add a couple, if not more, consolettes or control stations in order to meet the requirements of the standard. This would be an issue for smaller counties that do not have MCC7500 consoles.

Abley states that there is a provision for a variance if there is a reason that an entity cannot participate in the change. This is included in the proposed schedule.

Ulie Seal states that he has a fundamental problem passing rules that he cannot comply with.

Seal: I am driven by Laurence's continued use of the word *omnibus* to think about most omnibus bills that go through the legislature always carry bad stuff for me. There have been some things here that have been, not mischaracterized, but I certainly want to reiterate some very strong feelings the fire service has. One is the FSOAs. Particularly in the case of tactical operations when you get into a spot away from the system getting a very techy defined number of FSOAs that the fire service can rely on and use. They cannot (they meaning whoever tracks the system resources) tell me that we don't use the FSOAs like they can the FTACs so I challenge him to tell me we aren't using them enough and that's the reason they want to reallocate them and take them away.

Seal: The Fire Service was in favor of maintaining the FTACs, maintain and keeping the FSOAs and have a fundamental issue with passing rules that can't be complied with right from the outset. I hope the new variance process works exactly the same as the old one that way it will make it easy to comply with the new rules.

Vice Chair thanks Seal. Asks for further comments.

John Maatz states that after the discussion at their last radio board meeting, it would be the Southwest's position that they are for the creation of the additional four STACs as he believes was the original intent from Central.

Nate Timm states that as a member of the OTC, the committee discussed this matter and decided that the four STACs would be a problem because some of the metro member counties were saying some of their Gold Elite consoles would not be able to support the addition of those four talkgroups. He says the committee did not really touch on the encryption issue because we renamed the FTACs as STAC 5,6,7,8 and the consoles couldn't even support the ETACs. The committee thought that the metro counties would have at least the first eight STACs. The ETACs wouldn't even fit, according to some members of the OTC. Timm says that he agrees that if we are going to do it, it's better to do it all at once and not come back in a couple of years. He says he sees both sides.

Seal: The regional mandated listing of talkgroups is an issue for the metro region. Not convinced they need 16 regional interop talkgroups. We haven't agreed upon whether we are going to rename them. So, with regard to the variance, it could be a long time before we change what we want to do in the metro region with that regional piece.

Vice Chair asks for further comments.

Dave Thomson states that on behalf of the OTC, along with Mr. Timm, he wants to make comments about what OTC looked at, particularly regarding system loading. It was sent to the OTC to do a technical review about whether adding these talkgroups or pooling them would cause problems at particular sites. As Roger already stated, when you get to a scene on a smaller site, with a 5-channel ASR or smaller simulcast group, it's really going to be up the COMT or the COML to minimize those busies and the system impact. He states that we were not able to look at it and definitively say if we have one additional STAC, it's going to cause a problem. It really is a site by site and a situation by situation issue that the COMLs and COMTs are going to have to handle. The OTC was not able to look at it and come up with anything.

Timm: Frankly it's an issue as we speak. Right now. today. The majority of the members from outside the metro had the all branch IC zone. So as we speak today, outstate, most everybody's got the 16 TACs in one zone. If it hits the fan in a 5-channel site today, if there is not someone managing the communications, it's an issue right now.

Laurence: I would say that the first draft of this before it was officially submitted by the MESB, the statewide zone would be like the current all branch zone. STAC, FTAC, LTAC, ETAC. There was considerable pushback from the Law branch to carve those out and make them law only. Just to let you know, that was in there early but didn't service. What I might suggest, Mr. Chair, is we move this to get it before us, and then follow Robert's Rules of Order consider amendments to it. Ultimately at the end of the day, we'll have something we can vote on and move forward.

Jill Rohret states that committee could take a motion first and then discuss.

Vice Chair asks if there is a motion to approve the change management plan.

Laurence states he would move what is known as the Hennepin County version.

Motion to Approve: Laurence
Second: Giese

Rohret: Mr. Chair, in regards to the mandated regional interop zone, the metro has been going through a regional version of this process. Once again, looking at regional talkgroups, whether we should rename them so it's a common one like the other regions have adopted and whether or not we should add additional resources. We are not complete with the process but we are receiving a great deal of pushback from all branches of users in regards to the name change and adding anything and opening them up to all users. Since I work for a regional board, I have a little bit of heartburn when the state comes in tells me as a region, what I should or should not name my own talkgroups and how many I should or should not have. The MESB has not taken any formal position on that. That is my personal statement. I would feel a little more comfortable with a regional interop zone if it's up to the region to determine how many regional interop zones and how they are named. If it is passed as written today, I think I would have to submit a variance on behalf of the entire metro for that regional interop zone. We are voting on it next week but right now I don't see it passing at our region.

Laurence: I am sort in between a rock and hard place here because I usually advocate for local control on this type of stuff. In this particular case, I have to take off my Hennepin County hat and my metro hat and put on my statewide Minnesota hat. In know that when the chief of the State Patrol was before us about 2 years ago, he was perplexed and beside himself because the regions weren't getting their act together in terms of what they were going to have for regional lineups. So every time there was a change, the State Patrol had to reprogram their entire fleet of radios. We have the same situation because the metro borders all but one of the regions. What you end up with if you are going to try to stay caught up with what the bordering regions are using, if you're running a big cache or for statewide deployments, it gets to be pretty challenging because you can pretty much guarantee

yourself that you're not going to have the right talkgroups to work with them. For the first ten years of the system, regions got to do whatever they wanted to. However, the Statewide Radio Board has said there are going to be two standard lineups we are endorsing. This is one and then there is the existing ATAC and PTAC. It has not been required.

Laurence: In the state of Michigan, you will have three standardized zones. No exceptions. They have achieved interoperability. We didn't do that and we have not achieved interoperability. This is not my first choice and I fought against this from a local perspective. But, if the Statewide Radio Board says this is what everybody has to have over the course of the next two or three years, Hennepin will comply with it. We aren't going to like it but we'll do it.

Seal: Mr. Chair, at the risk of alienating people that don't like me anyway, the rush to kneel at the altar of interoperability, forgets the fact that 99% of what I do has nothing to do with interoperability and has to do with day to day operations. Besides that I will say there are some things in this package, this omnibus package, that the interoperability committee already acted on and are in a previous set of minutes. I brought them along if you need to look. Specifically, what pops into my head is the FSOAs. If this is presented as a package, the way that it has been and moved and seconded, I am going to vote NO against the whole package and carry that irritation with me to the SRB meeting. I am not of the mind that Michigan, unless we jointly split the state of Wisconsin in between the two of us, really has a great deal of concern for me and how they operate. I am concerned about how we operate in this state and specifically with fire operations. Yes, that may be a silo mentality and no I don't have to put on the state hat, and I am not interested in putting on a state hat and I've got my fire hat on.

Vice Chair asks if there are further comments.

Ron Jansen states that if we create more STACs that are statewide, why do we have to define the regional which are regionally located. If you are going to do an interoperability outside of your zone, outside of your region, you'd go to the state TAC. I am a little bit lost. Why do we have to mandate a regional zone so that we can have that in our radios to go to someone else's zone when we have statewide zones to talk on.

Laurence: I think that the motion would be strike the entire regional interoperability standardized zone from the proposal. That would be the motion that would be in order. See if there is a consensus to adopt. I am not going to make the motion.

Vice Chair states that there has been a tremendous amount of work that has gone into this package. He says that he doesn't feel we need to make any change. Asks what is driving the need to make change at this time. Not everyone is on the system yet and we are not addressing any real need. He says if he saw any real need at all it might be the new National Weather Service standard impact. He says from where he sits, across the state, the regional interop talk groups that are present today, and the statewide interoperability talkgroups that are out there, aren't being utilized at all anyway. From a consistency perspective, he would love to have the metro region rename their talkgroups MECALL 2-12 like everyone else in the state. That would be nice and consistency would be nice. But, he cen't justify more talkgroups.

Laurence agrees and said he gave the same speech at the leadership committee a year and a half earlier when this first came up.

Timm: In the Lake City Event when Officer Shawn Schneider was shot, we requested an immediate patch to LTAC and new dispatch staff made the mistake and chose LETAC 1s to the LTAC1s. While I agree that talkgroups are rarely used, the renaming of those encrypted talkgroups would be of immediate benefit. And if we are going to have to touch all the radios to rename, maybe it's a good time to look at consistency issues, too.

Jansen states that he would make a motion to amend the current motion to remove the the regional aspect of that proposal.

Second: Terry Stoltzman

A vote is taken on the amendment to strike all of the regional interoperability part of proposal.

Roger Laurence votes No
Clif Giese votes No
Ulie Seal votes No

Laurence states that a yes vote deletes the interoperability zone. A no vote keeps it in the proposal.

Vice Chair says correct.

Seal: Say that again. That's not what you just said, Rick. Before when you said the motion going forward.

Jansen: The motion is to remove any regional standard's interoperability standard.

Seal: So we aren't moving the whole package.

Vice Chair: No, just the amendment.

Laurence: Just deleting the standardized interoperability zone.

Seal: Let's clarify.

Vice Chair: We are voting on the amendment.

Seal: To remove the regional interop zone from this package.

Vice Chair calls for a vote.

Clif Giese Votes No.
Roger Laurence Votes No.
Motion to remove standardized interoperability zone carries.

Rohret: I want to clarify something Chief Seal said. At the November meeting of this committee they did take a vote on whether or not to rename for the 800 MHz SOAs and it was not approved. The renaming was not approved so to see them in the package, I think has caused some…not to speak for Chief Seal…some irritation. I think that the committee either needs to take a new vote and the package voted forward….*inaudible*

Laurence: Chair, I think the Committee has the ability to take an action now that would replace a prior action. The intent was that major changes would not be pulled out and acted upon in different places in the schedule. They would all stay together until we get to the end and today we are at the end. So, my own opinion is the best way to proceed would be to have another amendment offered that would delete the FSOA 5-6 from the standardized conventional interoperability zone. So those would become blanks. And the FSOAs 1-2 would stay the same as they are.

Brandon Abley states that he would personally recommend something like 8FSOA 5-6.

Abley: Going back to Nate's example of LTAC 1 and LETAC1, that spirit is consistent through the whole proposal and seemed to be a popular characteristic of the proposal as I went through the region.

Vice Chair asks if anyone is prepared to make a motion on just the FSOA portion of this proposal.

Seal states that he would make a motion to maintain the FSOA1 and FSOA2. It's the way it's currently operationalized in the fire service and that's the way we'd like to see it stay.

Laurence: By default it would not be part of the standardized convention interoperability zone.

Seal: I actually think it is standardized in the fire service which are the people who are using it. So I would quibble with your characterization of this interop still be standardized since you are going to pass something that I cant comply with anyway. And, I can file a variance for which flies in the face of standardization. Everyone keeps throwing about mandating standardized zones. So I am very strongly asking to keep the FSOA1 and FSOA2 characterizations that is the way they are in the radios now and that is the way the fire service is using them now. As far as the other four FSOAs I am ok with whatever you want to name them.

Vice Chair: So Ulie you would be opposed to putting an 8 before that F.

Seal: Some of this detail requirement and supposed consistency mystifies me. It would change what they are looking for, it would change what they are doing and I don't know if functionally it would change and I could probably get them to see past the 8s and just to look at what follows behind them. But, certainly, I want to keep the FSOAs Fire Service and EMS specific, which is the way they are in the standard now. I can make less of an argument for that and I am going to have to file variances anyway.

Laurence: If I understand correctly, the amendment would be to maintain the FSOAs just as they are. Not adding an 8 or anything else. By default, they can't be in the conventional interoperability zone for all users because all users aren't eligible to have them. Mr. Chair, I did offer to do all of the word smithing do bring the documents into alignment with what ends up being ultimately passed by the Statewide Radio Board.

Seal: Mr. Chair, in response to Mr. Laurence's query about being in that interop zone, one of the ways the Fire Service currently uses those FSOAs is in one of their main zones so we have a quick turn of the knob to get to it in case we get away from the system and get bonked in the basement during a fire we can call up to the IC. Most ICs have been taught how to monitor their talkgroup while they are working on the fire zone scene as well as those SOAs so they can catch that coming in or out. So most of the fire service out there uses FSOAs in their tactical talkgroups. So, I am not sure that I can disagree with Roger's characterization that it shouldn't be in the interop zone. I just want to maintain two FSOAs. So if you want to find two other SOAs or 800 conventional channels that you want to plug in for 5 and 6 in the interop zone that would be find with me. I just want to maintain two FSOAs for the Fire Service to use in their tactical operations.

Mike Wisniewski: the standard does not state specifically that they can't use the LSOAs or the ASOAs. It just creates a starting point for fire service to use and puts an organizational structure to it. So, they aren't limited to just the FSOAs. They can use any of the SOAs. Rural Fire Departments may make a fire call every two months at the most. Considering all of the confusion they would have using all of these interops could be an issue. Even though you do training and try to keep it as standard and as easy for them to identify where they're going to go in their radio to start with .

Vice Chair asks if there is a motion .

Seal: My amendment is to at least for the 3.15.0 to maintain two fire SOAs 1 and 2.

Laurence: Chair, my understanding on that is the remaining proposed change then will only take the existing ASOAs and PSOAs, rename them and make them available to everyone. The FSOAs will stay the way they are, for Fire only.

Seal: That would be fine with me.

Timm: To Brandon's point, the similarities between SOA1 and FSOA1 and the potential confusion should be discussed. Unless we start naming the new SOAs as 3.

Abley: Chair, the national channel naming standards that we have that the Radio Board has endorsed, don't necessarily fall into that line exactly because those are national shared channels. The closest thing to that would be to increment the sequence number to have an 8 in front of it because you might have different bands in your radio and to describe the use of the channel.

Stoltzman seconds.

Seal: My point to Brandon is that they aren't in the interop band. I am trying to maintain a tactical option for fire departments when they get away from the system. I don't know why we have to get wrapped around the axel and I'm not quite sure the confusion in a talkgroup is the same as on a conventional radio channel.

Vice Chair: But Brandon, what you are suggesting is renaming to 8FSOA1 and 8FSOA2.

Abley: Chair, I think that I was mentioning it, I don't have a strong feeling about it. I certainly defer to Ulie's experience actually fighting fires.

Laurence: There are two issues, one is the naming and the other is the eligibility. This retains the original name and original eligibility therefore, it doesn't fit in to this standardized group of 6.

Seal: I would agree with that.

Jansen: Point of clarification, we are going with FSOAs to be only in Fire Service radios whereas now all six FSOAs are allowed in all radios although two fires are designated for basically *inaudible.*

Laurence: If this prevails, the only eligibility change is that PSOAs become available to all users. Currently they are restricted to public safety only. Basically, you end up with four ASOAs. What would remain is the combining and pooling of the ASOAs and PSOAs to a group of four that everybody would have.

Jansen: FSOAs in fire radios only.

Seal: And EMS.

Vice Chair: But for consistency of naming, the federal naming conventions, shouldn't we have the 8 in front of them

Seal: These aren't federal interops. If Roger pulls them out of the interop there is no reason to put an 8 in front of it. Just fire and EMS folks will have it.

Laurence: There aren't any more 8s and that's why we came up with these 12 7 SOAs.

Abley: Chair these aren't national channels. They are licensed to DOT actually.

Vice Chair: we have a motion and a second for the amendment. Specific to the FSOAs.

Vote is taken.

Laurence votes No.

Motion Carries.

Vice Chair asks what is next.

Laurence: Now the original proposal is moved and seconded with two changes to it. Removing the Regional Interoperability Zone and the FSOAs.

Abley: Chair, I believe that STACs are an unsettled issue.

Vice Chair: Do we have a motion to do anything with the STACs?

Rohret: I have a question about the transition plan. Does the transition plan detail how we are supposed to interop for those people who are going to file variances. Will the transition plan be detailed enough so that we can still maintain interoperability even though a lot of agencies won't have all twelve.

Laurence: I would recommend proceeding with the new IC zone. There are five flavors. Very convoluted, very confusing and what this does is replaces them all with one. Either with or without the two encrypted on the end. I think it really simplifies the statewide trunked interop zone. It gets rid of a lot of the confusion and inconsistency that we have now. It does address what Central Minnesota put on the table which I think was validated in the operational assessments; if we do get more than two substantial incidents or events occurring simultaneously throughout the state and we need to start assigning these, we need more. Four is not enough. It gives you the ability to have encrypted interoperability cross branch. You end up with a fourteen-slot zone, STAC1-14. We don't have the regional interoperability zone any more. I will be voting in favor of what remains on the table.

Jansen states that he leans toward the 12 STACs. All the resource data we looked at doesn't show any busies or any significant need for more. There is still room for 4 LTACs.

Vice Chair asks if Jansen is making a motion.

Jansen says yes.

Seal seconds

Rohret states that in the Hennepin version, in regards to the LTACs, the LTACs are law enforcement only to be used however they see fit.

Abley states they are for emergent and planned events.

Timm asks about encryption.

Jansen says 12 clear STACs

Vice Chair calls for vote.

Laurence votes No.
Micah Myers votes No.
Giese votes No.

Laurence: because this is such a substantial change package should be re-referred for a redo of operational assessment omitting encryption, interoperability and reducing the number of STACs from 16 down to 12.

Vice Chair: are you suggesting this go back to the OTC?

Laurence: No, the operational assessment is the responsibility of this committee. It's just a request and the committee certainly doesn't need to do that.

Recall the vote including a show of hands.

Same as above:

Laurence votes No.
Micah Myers votes No.
Giese votes No.

Motion carries.

John Gundersen states that if we don't have a way to encrypt and have a private conversation, are we giving up a portion of this resource (security) in the interest of interoperability.

Laurence: I can turn that into a motion to amend that would add back only the two new encrypted talkgroups in positions 13 and 14. So, we would have twelve clear STACs and adding STACE13 and E14 encrypted.

Vice Chair: we have a motion before us. Do we have a second?

Lance Lehman seconds.

Jansen asks how they would be labeled. He has an issue with them being labeled E at the end.

Laurence says that embedding it inside the name is confusing. Continuing the number sequence and adding a suffix seems less confusing.

Dave Thomsen states that they are using E at the end as a standard in the city and it seems more clear to users.

Jansen thinks they should have a different designator to leave room for expansion.

Laurence: if that's your concern, with all due respect , I think you voted wrong on the last amendment.

Vice Chair: We have a motion and second to add two encrypted talkgroups.

John Tonding: So these two talkgroups would be programmed completed at the user's discretion?

Laurence: If you are public safety and you have encrypted radios and you implement this statewide zone, you would be required to put them in slots 13 and 14. You can unbundle them and put them anyplace you want. You won't have to go on a treasure hunt to find some obscure talkgroup deep in your fleet map.

Timm asks about consoles.

Laurence: the way the standard is drafted, public safety PSAPs with consoles would be required if they'll go in.

Rohret: *inaudible.*

Laurence: All consoles are capable of encryption.

Wiszniewski: you do have to understand that some of us don't have consoles and have already maxed out how many radios we can hook up to consolettes. We would be forced to buy new equipment.

Laurence: Not required on consolettes.

Novacek states that looking at the standard it is required by the PSAPs.

Laurence: I think there is another technical standard. If it's a hardship, you apply for a variance.

Jansen: Does the state have resources to be able to log those?

Tim Lee: We aren't logging.

Vice Chair calls for vote.

Jansen votes No.
Novacek votes No.
Wiszniewski votes No.

Motion carries.

Laurence: Now we are back to the original package as amended. It has been moved and seconded with three revisions.

Abley: My understanding, to summarize, the amendments include renaming the FTACs and ETACs so we have 12 STACs, assigning two encrypted STAC talkgroups, numbered 13 and 14, the SOA proposal is modified to have 4 SOAs, removing regional talkgroups from the statewide standard.

Timm asks what the proposed naming is for the Law Enforcement Encrypted.

LTAC5E through LTAC8E.

Laurence: Under old names had embedded hyphens. New names will not have hyphens. People can add them. I still need to do a cleanup on the STR radio cache and get rid of hyphens.

Giese asks about Hyphens for medical and will they be removed.

Laurence: do you want them removed.

Giese: we don't want hyphens removed.

Laurence: we will be changing LESIU-1 to SIU1.

Timm: For consistency should there be an E.

Laurence: I will consider that a friendly amendment unless there are objections. Add the E suffix to be consistent. Hyphen stays with EMS.

Abley states that a schedule is included basically it is about a half year from when these are passed operationally the changes are in effect and we are in a state of transition. Prior to that, any work that needs to get done in the system gets done, variances are submitted within the first couple of months and then do a variance report to IOC and OTC. The whole transition would take about two years.

Laurence thanks everyone for their work. He particularly thanks Brandon Abley and the ECN staff and Jill Rohret.

A vote is called.

Novacek votes No.

Laurence: I would like to withdraw my request for an operational reassessment. I think it would be unproductive at this point.

Vice Chair thanks Abley for all of his work.

1. Steele County Request to ADD ASR Site

Jeff Nelson introduces the discussion of the use of 700MHz spectrum in ARMER sites for long term use.

He states that Steele County went on the ARMER system in the middle of last year. A few months later they discovered that they had some unsatisfactory coverage inside buildings in Blooming Prairie (SE Part of County). The matter was brought before the OTC last fall to remedy with an ASR site with 700 MHz channels. They felt that available 800 MHz spectrum was unsatisfactory for purposes of constructing the site and getting the most bang for the buck.

Nelson says that when the idea was brought before the OTC in December, it was apparent this would be an uphill climb to get the site built with an ASR configuration with 700 channels. It was then referred to this committee and in a parallel path, Steele County applied for some 800 spectrum in the Nextel vacated spectrum. That application is currently before the FCC. This looked like it would be a long process and County looked to other methods. They believe they will be successful in getting the license.

Nelson states that he was asked by the chair of the OTC to bring the item to the IOC though there is no active request being made. The principle concerns were that certain legacy radios would not be able to operate in the community.

Nelson states that there findings were that a majority of radios were found to be 700 capable. There were some radios in secondary use that were not 700 capable. This is not a topic that will be resolved in a few minutes. The day may come where the ARMER system to avoid traffic…will need to look at 700 spectrum. He says the OTC chair asked him to come to the IOC is to get ahead of that discussion rather reacting to it under the gun. Steele County has withdrawn its request for 700 spectrum but there may be a need in the future. They have reached an

agreement with MnDOT to change not only this site design, but also several others in the area to a simulcast configuration to bring some spectrum relief in the 800 band.

Nelson asks for questions.

No further discussion.

STANDING REPORTS:

Interoperability Work Group:

Tom Johnson states that system is still standing at 69 counties. 80 of 87 counties have passed resolutions.

The Regions have been putting in a lot of work on the National Weather Service Standard. The radios have been programmed and some testing has taken place and is going very well.

The communications pursuit policy is out again.

Standards 3.16.4 and 3.16.5 addendums put out to all regions.

Minnesota and Manitoba are working on MOUs and Standards. The equipment is in place.

The equipment for Ontario has been purchased and now waiting for tower in International Falls.

Motobridge web-based training has been put together. Divided it up into two 20-minute segments. It has been reviewed and some narrator errors were found and are being fixed. Should be ready in the very near future. Found some extra grant money that had to be spent by the end of March and are buying a Motobridge work station for Alex Tech to install and have there for training purposes.

Conference planning is coming along. Seven vendors are signed up. Televate will sponsor a breakfast. First time we have had a sponsor. Breakouts and work sessions are coming together well and conference should he beneficial to new users and more experienced. Key note speaker from Firstnet.

Working on training for the coming year. After April 1st, people can contact Brandon Abley if they are interested in the COMT Train the Trainer. Spots are available. National Guard will be helping with the equipment.

COML Exercise in St. Cloud July 9 – 12.

Vice Chair thanks Tom Johnson for his years of work.

No further business.

Vice Chair adjourns meeting at 2:47 pm.

STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

May 21, 2013
Conference Call

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present **Members/alternates present:**

Chair: Cari Gerlicher/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Brad Peters – Mn/DOT
Pam Biladeau/Bob Norlen – MN EMSRB
Brandon Abley/vacant – 700 MHz RPC
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
John Dooley/– HSEM
Scott McKellep/ Michael Wisniewski - HSEM Greater MN
Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/VACANT– Central MN RAC
Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /– NE MN RAC
Pat Novacek / Brian Zastoupil – NW MN RAC
Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
Jackie Mines, DPS-ECN
Bill Bernhjelm, DPS-ECN
Steve Borchardt, DPS-ECN
John Tonding, DPS-ECN

Wendy Surprise, DPS-ECN

Call to Order:

Chair notes that there is a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Motion to approve agenda: Ulie Seal
Second: Ron Jansen
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's Minutes.

Motions to Approve Minutes: Rick Juth
Second: Ulie Seal
Minutes Approved

ACTION ITEM

1. Amendment to Standard 3.16.6 (Brandon Abley)

Brandon Abley gives an overview of proposed changes to 3.16.6. He states that the zone labels are identical to certain channel prefixes. This may cause confusion in the field and interfere with interoperability. Abley Proposes replacing zone labels "SW" with "MN" and "CV" with "8C".

Motion to approve: Terry Stoltzman
Second: Ulie Seal

Wanchena asks if there will be any issue with MN running together with other names on the display.

Abley states that this is acknowledged in the standard.

Motion to Amend Standard 3.16.6 Approved.

Chair adjourns meeting at 1:13

STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

July 16, 2013
Conference Call

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present **Members/alternates present:**

Chair: Cari Gerlicher/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Brad Peters – Mn/DOT
Pam Biladeau/Bob Norlen – MN EMSRB
Brandon Abley/vacant – 700 MHz RPC
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
John Dooley/– HSEM
Scott McKellep/ Michael Wisniewski - HSEM Greater MN
Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/VACANT– Central MN RAC
Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /– NE MN RAC
Pat Novacek / Brian Zastoupil – NW MN RAC
Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
Jackie Mines, DPS-ECN
Wendy Surprise, DPS-ECN
John Tonding, DPS-ECN
Steve Borchardt, DPS, ECN

Bill Bernhjelm, DPS, ECN

Call to Order:

Chair calls the meeting to order at 1:02.

Chair takes the roll and notes that there is a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair states there is a request to hear the 2nd Agenda item before the first. No objections.

Motion to approve agenda as amended: Troy Tretter
Second: Ron Jansen
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's Minutes.

Motions to Approve Minutes: Monte Fronk
Second: Lance Lehman
Minutes Approved

ACTION ITEM

1. Anoka County Variance to Standards (Jake Thompson)

Thompson states that Anoka County is requesting a variance to the standards part of Change Management. They are asking for an additional 6 months to reprogram radios. Anoka's plan is to start programming radios in January of 2015 to be completed by December 31, 2015.

Motion to approve: Jansen
Second: Ulie Seal
Motion carries.

2. Standard 3.31.0 Proposed Changes (Brandon Abley)

Abley states that the standard is the standard for Status Board. It is a complete re-write. Most of the existing Standard has been changed. Abley goes through each section of the standard as written and submitted to committee .

Steve Borchardt states that the Training portion looks pretty loose.

Abley states that onus is on the Administrators to train.

Borchardt says that the Southwest region may request something more specific.

Chair asks committee if they are comfortable leaving it "loose" or would they like it more specific.

Jansen states he is in favor of leaving it loose.

Clif Giese agrees with Jansen.

Chair would like a mandate to have at least one Administrator and one User to go through training.

Giese and Jansen agree with Chair.

Motion to approve: Fronk
Second: Giese
Motion carries.

Chair adjourns meeting at 1:40

STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

September 17, 2013
Chair: Dave Thomson
Mn/DOT Arden Hills Training Facility
1900 West County Road I
Shoreview, MN 55126

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present **Members/alternates present:**

Chair: Dave Thomson/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Brad Peters – Mn/DOT
Pam Biladeau/Bob Norlen – MN EMSRB
Brandon Abley/vacant – 700 MHz RPC
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
John Dooley/– HSEM
Scott McKellep/ Michael Wisniewski - HSEM Greater MN
Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/VACANT– Central MN RAC
Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /– NE MN RAC
Pat Novacek / Brian Zastoupil – NW MN RAC
Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
Jackie Mines, DPS-ECN
Wendy Surprise, DPS-ECN

John Tonding, DPS, ECN
Mike Fink, Motorola
Jill Rohret, MESB
Rod Olson, City of Minneapolis
Steve Borchardt, DPS-ECN
Scott Blackwell, Border Patrol

Call to Order:

Chair calls the meeting to order at 1:02.

Chair takes the roll and notes that there is a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Motion to approve agenda: Bill Schmidt
Second: Pat Coughlin
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's Minutes.

Lance Lehman states that he was in attendance but not reflected as such.

Bill Schmidt says he was also in attendance but not marked as such.

Motions to Approve Amended Minutes: Ulie Seal
Second: Bruce Hegrenes
Minutes Approved

ACTION ITEM

1. Proposed 2013 Minnesota State Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) (Brandon Abley)

Brandon Abley introduces the 2013 proposed SCIP. He states that a final version will be presented to the SECB. A two-day workshop was held and group brainstormed and went back and forth for editing. The workshop was well attended. This document is a product of that workshop.

He goes over some of the highlights and states that he will stand for feedback after each section.

Under Section 2, Goals & Initiatives, Juth asks about GIS as it relates to NG911.

Abley asks if Juth would like to propose something.

Juth says there is a desire to have a single statewide database or map to be used by all PSAPs across the state.

Abley agrees that is important.

Mines states that the GIS project/initiative is underway at ECN and are planning to go out to RFP early next year. Mines adds we are being lobbied pretty heavily by MnIT to explore their solution set. What we need to do is have all of our requirements more specifically identified.

Abley states he could put under Goal 6.

Juth asks if we should have an item under "Initiatives" that would identify the required completion of the Motobridge network and its use. He adds that it seems to have dropped off the radar.

Abley says completing the construction might be a worth technology goal and as far as training and usage should also be part of.

Abley asks committee how they would like this to be articulated.

Juth says first would be the Initiative to complete the Motobridge network statewide. Then the establishment of standards for use.

Chair suggests adding to section 5.4 for training.

Abley says he will include.

Coughlin asks if State Patrol is the only one that have Motobridge. He has been approached by some at MICF that are interested in obtaining for dispatch station at MIFC and they could do the actual patching.

Chair suggests they talk offline. He asks Lee who would be the first point of contact.

Lee states that it sounds like MIFC has already been in touch with MnDOT.

Chair suggests that MIFC put a proposal together for the Operations & Technical Committee.

Abley suggests adding under "Usage" encourage usage of the cross spectrum interop overlay. He could include that as an addition Initiative under 15.

Seal states that under number 8, it should not read NO STANDARDIZED PROTOCOL. He states there are protocols with AMBER and Weather Alerts.

Chair states that he would like to move the SCIP forward with the amendments for adding GIS, adding Motobridge under SOP & Usage, and the edit for IPAWS under Goal 8.

Motion to approve: Ulie Seal
Second: Rick Juth
Motion carries.

Seal asks where it will go after this committee.

Abley states that IOC will recommend to the SECB. He will be submitting for approval in November.

2. Standard 3.43.0 (Cathy Anderson)

Cathy Anderson gives a background on this Standard. OTC tabled it last week (it was originally tabled in 2009). It was originally brought forth by Roger Laurence. There was a suggestion at OTC to add language to current Interop Standard making sure there is a COML involved. She says depending upon what happens at this Committee; maybe a new standard could be created for preplanned events and exercises using language from the Central and Metro Regional Standards already in place.

Anderson asks John Gundersen to give history of the proposed standard.

Gundersen states that this standard has had a metamorphosis. The original recommendation was to use the operational talkgroups when practicing. There was some opposition to that. Language went to the opposite extreme "don't ever use them…use local talkgroups" or have training talkgroups in your fleetmap. This standard is a compromise of those issues. It was vetted out in most of the regions. Gundersen states he thinks it's a valuable standard to consider. As a COML he sees a need for guidance and oversight for exercise planning.

Seal asks why the OTC tabled it.

Chair states that they looked at the current standard that deals with interoperability, 3.16 and saw that it covered the majority of it, with the exception of utilizing COMLs. The OTC felt that there was a lot of redundancy. There also were issues with identifying full scale exercises versus a planned event and users still being able to find STAC 10 versus STAC1.

Seal asks if committee is expected to vote on it if the OTC already tabled it. Asks what our role is.

Chair says that we certainly can vote on it.

Seal says he knows that we can, but is not sure what the utility is.

Chair says he thinks this is a good discussion area and we can decide to make amendments and it could go back to OTC. Or, we could decide to do what they did and table it with no further discussion.

Seal says he is a little skeptical about the need for the State to tell the regions what to do.

Bill Schmidt states that he has some thoughts about it, having been present at the OTC. He sees pros and cons but would suggest modifying some verbiage in 3.16.0.

Abley states that by the time the Standard was amended to something agreeable, the only recommendation left in it was to add language to include COMLs.

Juth states that this standard was proposed in 2009. A lot has changed since then. He recommends standard being rescinded as it is no longer necessary. We could look at 3.16 and make language changes to that, as Bill Schmidt just said.

Jill Rohret says the concern was not whether STACs should be used in events, they probably should depending upon the exercise. She adds that COMLs should be involved in any exercise from the beginning so that communications plans can be developed in an appropriate time, and not the day before the event.

Hegrenes states that this is not currently a standard and just a proposal. He suggests voting it down and look at the other standard 3.16 at the next meeting.

Motion: Bruce Hegrenes
Second: Clif Giese

Motion Carries. VOTED DOWN

Anderson will look at standard 3.16.0 and make some changes to it and bring back to the committee.

Chair thanks Cari Gerlicher for chairing the Interoperability Committee and tells committee that he is the new Chair.

Chair adjourns meeting at 1:40

STATEWIDE RADIO BOARD

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

November 19, 2013
Chair: Dave Thomson
Conference Call

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Present	**Members/alternates present:**
X	Chair: Dave Thomson/Jim Crace—MN Chiefs of Police Association
X	Victor Wanchena/Vacant – MN Dept of Corrections
X	Clif Giese/Dan DeSmet– MN Ambulance Association
X	Bill Schmidt/Vacant – MN Department of Health
	Brian Askin/Dan Kuntz – MN DNR
X	Tim Lee/Mukhtar Thakur/Brad Peters – Mn/DOT
	Pam Biladeau/Bob Norlen – MN EMSRB
X	Brandon Abley/vacant – 700 MHz RPC
X	Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
X	John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
X	Ulie Seal/Vacant – MN Fire Chief's Association
X	Lance Lehman /Bill O'Donnell –MN Bureau of Crime Apprehension
	Pat Coughlin/Vacant – MIFC
	Mike Martin/Brian Smith – Federal Seat
X	B.J. Battig/Roger Laurence – UASI
	Troy Tretter/Tom Simota – MN National Guard
	John Dooley/– HSEM
X	Scott McKellep/ Michael Wisniewski - HSEM Greater MN
	Terry Stoltzman/Vacant – HSEM Region 6
	Rick Freshwater/Mark Darnell – SE MN RAC
X	John Maatz/Jeanna Sommers SW MN RAC
X	Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
X	Micah Myers/VACANT– Central MN RAC
	Bruce Hegrenes /Kerry Swenson /Scott Camps– NE MN RAC
X	Brian Zastoupil/Neil Dolan – NW MN RAC
X	Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
	Vice Chair: Rick Juth– Minnesota State Patrol

**Members attending marked with highlight.*

Guests:
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Wendy Surprise, DPS-ECN
John Tonding, DPS-ECN

Steve Borchardt, DPS-ECN
Jim Jarvis, Dept. of Homeland Security
Rod Olson, City of Minneapolis

Call to Order:

Chair calls the meeting to order at 1:03.

Chair takes the roll and notes that there is a quorum.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Motion to approve agenda: Ron Jansen
Second: Ulie Seal
Agenda Approved

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Motions to Approve Minutes: Clif Giese
Second: Lance Lehman
Minutes Approved

ACTION ITEM

1. Proposed 2014-2015 Minnesota State Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) (Brandon Abley)

Brandon Abley introduces the 2013 proposed SCIP. He goes through the changes that were made. He says the version he is showing is the abridged version with the tasks and tables. The full version contains an explanation of what the SCIP is and it is for a more general audience.

The first change was changing the name to the "2014-2015 Minnesota State Communications Interoperability Plan as suggested by the Chair of the SECB.

Abley goes through several changes suggested by committee members. This Plan has been sent out to committees and regions and no substantial changes were recommended. Abley also received concurrence of the Plan in writing from RAC chairs.

Chair thanks Abley and asks for comments from the committee.

Motion to approve: John Sanner
Second: Mike Wisniewski
Motion carries.

Discussion Item/Presentation

- MN COMM FOG

Abley goes over the Minnesota Communications Field Operations Guide. He adds that it is not an Action Item but he would certainly entertain any comments.

Micah Myers states that he has a list of changes that he can email to Abley.

Abley states that he did receive a number of emails with changes. He will go through all of those emails.

Abley gives a summary of changes.

- Changed the name of guide to MN FOG
- Changes related to Change Management
- Upgraded regional talk group references
- Added a cheat sheet for Change Management (left in VHF cheat sheet)
- Added sections on ARMER Training Site on Status Board
- Added information on Tribal Interoperability
- Updated some of the maps
- Added a State Patrol District Map

An electronic version will be published on ECN's website on November 22nd, in time for Change Management. Printed copies will be ordered by January. They will be distributed in the spring.

Chair asks if they older version is online now.

Abley says it is. The most current version is always on our website.

Abley goes through the document and shows where the changes have been made.

Committee gives some feedback for some further changes.

Steve Borchardt informs committee that the SE RRB has voted to become an ECB. This is not complete at this point, but will be by the time this is published. The SC RAC has voted to recommend the change to the SC RRB.

Chair asks Abley if he is looking for the committee to take action on the guide.

Abley says that he doesn't require any action; this is a state document that ECN authors and publishes. He wanted to update the committee on changes. He will make the recommended changes and bring back to the committee at the next meeting. If the committee would like to vote to endorse it at that time, it would be the committee's call.

Chair says that he thinks he would like to see it brought back and to endorse it. He thanks Abley for all of his work.

Abley also give an update on StatusBoard2. He says the OTC recommends a cut over occur a week from the date is ready which should be the first week of December. Further fixes will occur in December and January.

Chair thanks Abley.

Chair adjourns meeting at 2:11