

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION NETWORKS

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

May 20, 2014 1:00 P.M.
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
Ulrie 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
Scott Camps/**Kerry Swenson** /**Bruce Hegrenes**- 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
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
John Tonding, DPS, ECN
Carol-Linnea Salmon, DPS, ECN
James Schnoor, Federal Reserve
Jill Rohret, MESB
Rod Olson, City of Minneapolis

Call to Order:

Chair Thomson calls the meeting to order at 1:02.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Ron Jansen moves to approve agenda.

Monte Fronk seconds.

Motion carries.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's minutes. None stated.

Bruce Hegrenes moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

John Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

ACTION ITEM

1. Standard 1.11.4 Training ARMER End Users (Cathy Anderson)

Cathy Anderson reports that a work group looked at both of the standards presented today to make revisions and then sent them to the Steering Committee for review. The Steering Committee has asked that the standards and changes be reviewed by this committee.

Starting with Standard 1.11.4 Training ARMER End Users.

The parts in yellow are changes recommended by the work group and the parts in green are changes recommended by the Steering Committee. Everything that is in yellow was already approved by the Steering Committee and sent here for review.

Anderson reads from the standard.

Chair Thomson asks why the word *incumbent* is in it —do we want to say current or just drop the word completely?

Anderson says she thinks it could come out.

Anderson reviews *Technical Background* and says nothing was changed in that section. She reads from the paragraph “*Operational Context*”.

Chair Thomson says he is concerned about the word ‘*configure*’ as it pertains to end users. Dooley says he would drop “*configure and*”. End users are really not configuring anything.

Anderson says that on point number 4 quite a lot was deleted. She reads from page 2, “*Each agency operating on the ARMER System is responsible ... To meet this objective, each... For the purpose of this standard, there will be three tiers of users...*”

Anderson says the Steering Committee added, “*Just in-time training would be conducted at the scene of an incident or event; i.e., distributing radios to a volunteer or non-ARMER user, and is not considered acceptable training for any other user level.*”

Anderson adds that the work group wanted to get away from mandating that everyone would have to watch the four modules.

“If an organization creates their own training program, the modules listed below are not required, as long as the curriculum contains their content.”

Ron Jansen asks if we are making a standard that we are not putting any teeth behind? “*It is highly recommended...*” is not really teeth if it’s a standard. Maybe it’s just a best practice and not a standard. He is concerned that we are making a standard that is “*highly recommended*”. Should we make this a “shall” or a “best practices” because there is no teeth to it?

Bill Schmidt says he thought the whole reason for reviewing this standard was to put teeth behind it and agrees with Mr. Jensen that we should maybe reword this.

Chair Thomson says Radio 101 is 12 minutes long and he thinks a lot of it is not particularly applicable to end users.

Hegrenes says The History of ARMER might also be a moot point now.

Thomson agrees and points out that it is 24 minutes long.

Micah Myers says in the Central Region they use Radio 101 on an annual basis for elected officials because there is turnover. They are working on developing their own training standard. A challenge the committee is going to have is in enforcing this. Who is enforcing this? This is the same question we’ve had ongoing. He thinks this is more of a best practices guide and that it should be up to the regions to develop the training.

How do you deal with transient radios? People coming in on joint ventures?

Anderson reports that the work group had a lot of discussion about that. Later on in the standard--as to who would be tracking—every agency would be required to keep track of its own training. There is not a consequence but the standard does require every agency to track its own training but left it open as to how that might happen. If the system administrator wants to see proof of training it would have to be produced. We talked about consequences – do you want to take people off the system? We did require every agency to start tracking their training. This was a very diverse work group. —police, fire, everybody. There was a lot of good discussion.

Chair Thomson says for Radio 101 and History of ARMER—those are valid points for elected officials. I don't think we should get rid of that training but I also don't think that needs to be an every two year training for other users.

Jansen agrees.

Myers says the wording incumbent was in there to cover the spectrum of types of users.

Chair Thomson say he thinks the committee should go back and consider all of these suggestions as single motions. His first thought was *incumbent users* –do we want to keep this? *Incumbent* vs. just *ARMER users* (going back to section 1).

Dooley says he thinks the committee should take the word incumbent out.

Chair Thomson notes that it's in two places. It's under the *Purpose or Objective* heading and also in the third paragraph from bottom of page 2.

Dooley makes a motion to drop the word *incumbent* from the two areas.

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to change the language in the first paragraph under *Operational Context* to read, “System functionality and integrity would be realized only by ensuring the trained, competent personnel operate all end user components that make up the ARMER System.”

Dooley seconds it.

Chair repeats the wording then calls the question.

Motion carries

Schmidt says he would like to go back to the phrasing “*incident commander would...*” He says he knows a lot of incident commanders that are not capable of doing the training.

Chair Thomson says he thinks the second part takes care of that.

Jansen repeats his earlier concern about “highly recommending” but then the language is “if you choose to do this, you shall do that”.

Anderson reports that the work group wanted to have agencies come up with some kind of a training program but didn't think the standard should mandate that but did think it could mandate keeping records of training. She says, as we all know, training records are important for liability. The hope is that agencies would have stringent training programs and refresher training. The standard could mandate that refresher training happen, which again was left open to each agency's discretion. The intent was not to link the mandating of keeping training records with mandating the training content. The work group did have a lot more in the standard but took it out after discussion about cost and time. The group felt it couldn't mandate how the training happens or what it includes, but could mandate that training happens and that records are kept.

Giese says he feels there should be some required training. He listens to the ARMER radio quite often and is amazed how many times he hears officers say “I don't believe I have that talk group on my radio”. Users should at least know what talk groups they have on their radio. Giese says when he hears things like that he feels that we are failing to train people in basic radio operation. Our failure to make it required is our fault. We should have ongoing training every year.

Anderson says the work group decided we could mandate channels and zones—we looked at what everyone would need to know—on the next page where we mandate the minimum competencies. The previous standard was so nebulous that it didn't even talk about training.

Chair Thomson says it's recommended that they do these particular online courses or come up with something on their own. And do training every two years. I do like later where it says the locals will maintain records of who has gone through training.

Hegrenes says he would like to cut the four courses on page 2 to two course and remove Radio 101 and History of ARMER.

Chair Thomson clarifies those are only suggested, not required.

Hegrenes responds that the standard says the content still must be included in training.

Anderson asks what if we change the verbiage to say *"if an organization creates their own training program, the modules listed below are not required, as long as the curriculum contains content pertinent to the end user use"*?

Hegrenes says that would work.

Chair Thomson asks Hegrenes if he would agree to ARMER History and Radio 101 being listed as optional.

Hegrenes responds that he would agree to that. He adds that that is over a half hour of training that is not necessarily needed. He says the Northeast could use that extra time to talk about talk groups and radio basics. He says they do a lot of training – they have trained 184 agencies. He says by the time they got past all of this stuff, the eyes were already glazed over.

Hegrenes makes a motion to list *Radio 101-optional and History of ARMER- optional.*

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries

Anderson continues reading from the standard on the top of page 3. *"These courses, created on behalf of...."* She reads a list of topics that make up minimum required training competencies for 800 MHz daily or occasional users.

Jansen asks why duplex audio is on the list.

Anderson says that from her experience as a dispatcher, it is so police officers and fire fighters can talk while a dispatcher is talking. So an officer can talk over the dispatcher.

Jansen says he doesn't believe that is called duplex audio. He thinks that is called console or dispatch override. He says the ARMER system does not do duplex audio.

Roger Laurence says that at the console its duplex audio because it means you can transmit and receive at the same time.

Anderson says the thought was that dispatcher supervisors would know what that means.

Laurence says that whatever you call it, it's a legitimate training point.

Hegrenes moves to insert *Radio Talkgroup priority under 3E and the current 3E, Talkgroup busy, becoming 3F.*

Myers seconds.
Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading the list on page 3.

Jansen moves to change *Button configuration* to *Button / Switch configuration* under 2 C.
Myers seconds.
Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading from list.

Chair Thomson asks why "*if applicable*" was taken off of item #5 Emergency Button. He says we have a lot of groups using radios that will not be using the emergency button so why did you take off "*if applicable*"?

Anderson responds that the work group added "*if applicable*" at the top of the list to cover all items that might not be applicable.

Schmidt says he thinks it is prudent for management to do some training regardless on the emergency button because an end user may be trained to use their radio but at some point they may use someone else's radio and they really need to know not to push that button.

Myers makes a motion to add item F underneath #6: *Scanning multiple bands*
Jansen seconds.
Motion carries.

Olson says there isn't anything on announcement groups and their limitation and nothing on dynamic regroup.

Anderson responds that she thinks it was the work group's intent by listing it as Group Call. But we could add Announcement.

Jansen moves to change 3A from *Group Call* to *Group / Announcement Call* and to put #6. *Dynamic Regroup* after our current #5. *Emergency Button* and have *Scanning* become item #7.
Schmidt seconds.

Chair Thomson asks if the committee wants to say ARMER users at the top of the paragraph?
Jansen takes that as a friendly amendment to his motion.

Motion as amended:

Jansen moves to change 3A from *Group Call* to *Group / Announcement Call* and to put #6. *Dynamic Regroup* after our current #5. *Emergency Button* and have *Scanning* become item #7. And to change the paragraph at the top of this section to read, "*The following topics will be the minimum required training competencies for ARMER users.*"

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading from the standard.

Jansen moves to add "*national*" after "*state*" in item #2 a) on page 4.
Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues to read.

Committee discusses that there are no national talk groups. Should we include national? Or change the wording about talk groups.

Dooley moves to change #2 from *Interoperability talk groups* to *Interoperability talk groups / resources*.

Schmidt seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading on page 5 near the bottom. *"Each agency is responsible to communicate policy changes to their employees..."*

"Each agency is required to provide refresher training for their end users..."

Anderson says the workgroup went around and around about what refresher training should incorporate but decided not to make it specific but leave it up to the agencies to know where the deficiencies were and train for their own specific areas of need. We just put *"Refresher training shall ensure competencies of all skills taught in initial training..."*

"Each agency shall be responsible for maintaining adequate records..."

Jansen says --again *"agencies shall be responsible"* for something that is *"highly recommended"*? Also what are *"adequate records"*?

Anderson responds that the work group talked about that and thought that *"adequate records"* could be different for each agency. The group wrote the standard so that it was mandatory to keep adequate records documenting compliance. The standard highly recommends that agencies keep accurate and complete records because the work group did not want to dictate what agencies had to do for recordkeeping. It was left open in the hope that if they have to maintain records they will do it. If the committee wants something more specific we can change it.

Dooley says he thinks that a) at least a roster must be kept and b) at least attach a syllabus of what was trained on and C) if they took any of the online training and got a certificate, that should be attached. He thinks we should have at least those three things. At least then there is a reasonable assurance that if someone takes a look there is something to show that looks like someone's been trained on something.

Schmidt says that, consistent with what Dooley was speaking to, if a user was to come back and say "I was never trained on that" we would have records to show that they were.

Dooley moves to include language that says a minimum of training recording keeping would be to include a roster and a syllabus.

Anderson asks if Dooley wanted to add the addition of online training certificates. Dooley says that could be optional.

Anderson reads the proposed amended language, under the third paragraph: *Every agency shall be responsible for maintaining adequate records documenting compliance with the provisions of this standard. Those documents shall include a) roster of current employees; b) syllabus of what employees were trained on; and c) online certifications (optional).*

Suggestions to change “employees” to “users”. Suggestion to add the word “trained” before the word “users”.

Discussion of whether it should include the date of training. Some say that would be included on a roster. Others say that is not a given. Discussion of what level of detail of record keeping should be mandated.

Dooley amends his motion to change the language to read, “These records will include a) roster of end users; B) training syllabus; C) online certification (optional).”

Schmidt seconds.

Motion carries with one opposed.

Schmidt moves to amend the wording on page 5 from “Each agency is responsible to communicate policy changes to their employees...” to “Each agency is responsible to communicate policy changes as they occur to their radio end users.”

Hegrenes seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading in the middle of page 6, “It is highly recommended that agencies follow the guidelines established ...

If the non-compliant issue is not able to be resolved at the regional level it shall be brought before the Statewide Emergency Communications Board Operations and Technical Committee.”

Hegrenes moves to accept Standard 1.11.4 as amended.

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

2. Standard 1.11.3 Training Dispatchers (Cathy Anderson)

Anderson says the same work group worked on this standard. She reads from the standard. “The purpose of this standard is to establish the minimum training standards for dispatchers. This will ensure that ...”

Anderson reports that the workgroup felt it was easier to go into a specific job role and name what has to be done.

The work group didn’t change anything under *Technical Background* or *Operational Context*.

“System functionality and integrity must be maintained by ensuring properly trained personnel... The following topics will be the minimum required training for dispatchers in the State of Minnesota...”

Jansen moves to change “agency unit numbering convention” to “agency unit numbering convention / radio alias”.

Schmidt seconds.

Motion carries.

Jill Rohret suggests a change to the wording on page 2, bullet item number 12 that starts with “Fleetmaps of dependent agency...” She recommends that the last word be changed from *municipalities* to *jurisdiction*.

Jansen moves to change wording on the twelfth bullet, “Fleetmaps of dependent agency or agencies (as it affects interoperability within and outside agency’s municipality)”. The motion is to change “municipality” to “jurisdiction”.

Schmidt seconds.

Monte says that is a good change for the tribes too.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading on page 2.

Myers moves to change the wording on bullet number 18 “Minnesota Public Safety VHF Interoperability Frequency Plan, if applicable.” The motion is to drop the words “if applicable.” And under item 23, Status Board 2.0, to drop “2.0”.

Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading on page 2. *“All training will involve interactive scenarios.... Each agency is responsible to communicate policy changes to their employees as they occur.”*

Schmidt moves to change the first complete sentence on page 3 to read “Each agency is responsible to communicate policy changes to their dispatchers as they occur.”

Giese seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading, *“Dispatcher shall receive refresher training every 2 years... Each agency shall be responsible for maintaining adequate records documenting compliance...”*

Schmidt moves to add the wording “These records will include a) roster of dispatchers; b) training syllabus; and c) online certification (optional).”

Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading on page 3, *“5. Recommended Procedure”*.

“These courses, created on behalf of the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) and reviewed and approved by subject matter experts, are hosted through the Alexandria Technical & Community College online...”

Jansen asks if there are any true dispatcher training courses on Alexandria Tech specific either to Motorola consoles or Zetron consoles.

There are not specific dispatcher training courses on Alexandria Tech for every type of console.

Jansen wonders if we want to put this in the standard if the training is not available for all of the specific manufacturers.

Schmidt says would it make sense to change the wording to say *“if available”*?

Jansen says would we then be saying if it's not available then dispatcher does not have to do training?

Olson says the training would not always be online so we should strike the word *‘online’*. Then it leaves open to get the training for whatever system you have.

Anderson says that some of this came from people who are not yet on the system who wanted to make sure that

people were trained.

Micah Myers says that in the central region they do a communications personnel training workshop that is not console specific. It's a broad enough class. If you are not taking an online class you could have a curriculum that has been provided or approved by the SECB prior to training.

Chair Thomson says someone is always going to come up with another console so maybe just training within that agency. Everybody is required to cover all the specifics.

Anderson says we could add a sentence that says this requirement is waived if an online training module is not available for an agencies specific console.

Chair Thomson says I like the idea of dropping the word "online".

Jansen moves to drop the word 'online' from the paragraph beginning "For dispatchers in agencies migrating to ARMER, or implementing..."

Hegrenes seconds.

Myers says then you need to strike the next paragraph which is all about online training

Dooley says that paragraph could say "These courses, if available, created on behalf..." If they are not available then it would be up to the local agencies to come up with something.

Anderson adds that that follows the spirit of the work group's intention.

Chair Thomson suggests that the standard could say "specific console courses". That would not limit us to certain brands even later down the line.

Myers moves to change the language in the 2nd paragraph from the bottom from "These courses..." to "A recommended course created on behalf the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB)..."

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Olson suggests dropping "if applicable" from the third paragraph from the bottom.

Myers moves to drop the words "if applicable" from the third paragraph from the bottom. The new sentence would read, "For dispatchers in agencies migrating to ARMER or implementing interoperability measures with ARMER users from Legacy systems, training for agency-specific dispatch consoles is required prior to completing field training and operating independently."

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson continues reading, "Agency management will be responsible to ensure..."

Hegrenes moves to add "dispatch" in front of "agency".

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Dooley moves to drop the word "manual" from the last phrase.

Hegrenes seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to approve Standard 1.11.3 as amended.

Myers seconds.

Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS: none

ANNOUNCEMENTS: none

Meeting adjourns at 2:45 p.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION NETWORKS

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

July 15, 2014 1:00 P.M.

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
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer- MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulle 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** / **Randy Donahue** SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/VACANT- Central MN RAC
Scott Camps/**Kerry Swenson** /Bruce Hegrenes- 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
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Carol-Linnea Salmon, DPS, ECN
Rod Olson, City of Minneapolis
Jill Rohret, MESB

Call to Order:

Chair Thomson calls the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the agenda.

Tim Lee asks to add an item for discussion to the agenda pertaining to possible mis-use of ARMER system by a non-governmental agency.

Micah Myers moves to approve the agenda as amended.

Clif Giese seconds.

Motion carries.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's minutes. None stated.

Ron Jansen moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Giese seconds.

Motion carries.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Tim Lee states that MNDOT had been monitoring the S-TAC 12 during the MS 150 Bike Ride. He states his concern about how the statewide resource is being used and wonders if this was appropriate use based on what he heard on the S-TAC 12. He asks if anyone knows who approved their access to the system for this event. He relays that the usage of S-TAC 12 consisted of communicating route changes and rest stop closures as well as requests for SAG wagon and where to meet up after the race. The MNDOT personnel did not hear the agency communicating with law enforcement personnel throughout the time they monitored. Lee brings this incident forth as a good example of why the Standard regarding non-public safety / non-public service entities users of the system is important. He questions if use of the system includes these events. He also expresses concern that events must be monitored by the agency which is approving the event to ensure proper usage of the system.

Committee discusses the need to monitor use of the system by non-public safety/non-public service entities and to identify who is responsible for monitoring for appropriate usage and what enforcement might look like.

1. Standard 3.31.0 Status Board Review (Cathy Anderson)

Cathy Anderson reports that Brandon Abley recommended some changes to this standard before he left. One change is on page 3, stating that ECN provides self-paced training at the Alex Tech on-line training site and does not provide continued training sessions. Starting on page 4, information is added outlining the contingency plan for unplanned outages (also distributed on the listserv). These changes were passed by the OTC at its July meeting.

Myers asks how often the training courses that are referenced will be updated. If there are changes to the status board will the training be updated. For refresher training or ongoing training—will it be the responsibility of the entities when the changes come through? Will the training be updated and aligned with the software as it changes?

Anderson responds that it was initially set up so a new dispatcher could go in and take the training and learn how to use the status board. The assumption is that the training will be updated as changes are made.

Myers says one of the challenges experienced by dispatch is what action to take when it fails. The training should include what to do when it fails. Myers asks if the standard going to be left vague?

Anderson replies that could the standard could be modified to add that each agency is responsible to ensure that their dispatchers are kept updated on status board changes and training.

Ron Jensen recommends sending the standard to the Next Gen 911 Committee and the PSAP managers for their input. They may have good ideas..

Anderson will see if she can get it on the NextGen911 meeting agenda tomorrow.

Mines asks if the telephone number of the ROC should be added? She has received a lot of calls about that.

Lee says he thought it was in there. He thought if there was a system outage that everyone knew what the number was.

Chair asks if it is on the signature line of the ARMER mailing list.

Lee would rather not have it out in a public way.

Chair says the ROC could send out the information to the mailing list.

Myers says they have a secure portion of their website where the regions can look for quick reference.

Mines asks if the plan is to go back to OTC to get more information about what to do if the Status Board goes down.

Anderson says she believes that the plan was to come out with some kind of contingency plan.

Myers suggests that we might have some things that we require the regions to do as appendixes for the document but not change the document itself.

Chair says we will send it back to the OTC with these ideas.

ACTION ITEMS

1. CMNESB Request for Access to MotoBridge for Otter Tail County (Micah Myers)

Myers reports that the region utilized the MotoBridge plan and put in a centralized MotoBridge station at Otter Tail County. They entered into an MOU with Otter Tail County to manage those resources for the Central Region. They also put it into their plan a backup on the software side at Mille Lacs County. They are asking for access for all 109 sites.

The system is up and functioning. Still waiting for the VPN connection to MN.IT for Mille Lacs County so they have a backup component in place. All the hardware and links are up and functional in Otter Tail County. Dispatchers have been trained. CMNESB is asking for service.

Lee moves to approve the CMNESB request for access to Motobridge for Otter Tail County statewide.

John Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Lee cautions that if someone brings up a resource with MotoBridge and someone else comes on they can grab it and change the frequency and use it.

2. Chippewa USFS VHFI-OP Agreement (Pat Coughlin)

Pat Coughlin presents for Mike Mackie from the United Forest Service. This is an application for V-LAW 31 and V-LAW 23. Every five years they get all of their frequency agreements in line and this year they are up and basically they just need the okay to use them.

Mackie sent the frequency forms as part of the package. We can send the forms to whoever can sign it.

Chair suggests that we have a motion that MnDot does the paperwork necessary to allow the Forestry Service on V-LAW 31 and V-LAW 23.

Giese asks if it transmits statewide. Coughlin responds that is just local. Radio-to-radio channel.

Jansen moves to approve the MnDot agreement with the Forestry Service.

Ulle Seal seconds.

Motion carries.

3. Standard 1.10.2 –Requesting Participation by Non-Public Safety/Non-Public Service Organizations (Cathy Anderson)

Anderson reports that the Steering Committee has worked on this and is ready to pass it forward for review.

Lee suggests that there should be language added that Nonpublic service/nonpublic safety/events be reviewed and approved by Interop and OTC so they can approve those special events with a follow up review that ensures they used ARMER appropriately. A COML should be assigned and IC 201 filled out.

Giese offered it should be evaluated by regions if it's regional resources and at the state level if state resources.

Chair says that some regions wouldn't want to do that.

Olson adds that timing is an issue—there isn't always that kind of time.

Lee responds that it should only be for non-public safety / non-public service /events— not the public safety ones.

Rohret points out the difficulty in defining nonpublic safety events. For example, the TC Marathon, County Fairs— where they are using the ARMER system. Is it truly a public safety event? Given how long many of these events have been going on this will be a tough habit to break for some of these things. Many events could provide the argument that they are public safety related.

Chair says that he sees this just as S-TACs and L-TACs

Lee wonders who is sponsoring the situation outlined above.

Rohret states that they are loaning out radios and providing just-in-time training. She believes if you disallow this, it would be argued that is an appropriate use of ARMER system.

Mines expresses concern that stated parameters in the standard on inappropriate use is important for the future.

Rohret asks about getting approval for these events first.

Anderson suggests leaving this Standard as is and add another Standard for approval and monitoring of events for nonpublic safety/service. She adds that a lot of this falls back on the sponsor. The sponsor should know how the non-public safety/non-public service entity is approved for use on the ARMER system.

Mines asks about adding another criteria that it would be the responsibility of the sponsoring entity to monitor this.

Meyers points out the challenge of what happens when the system is upgraded. Is it the responsibility of the sponsoring agency to deal with costs of the upgrades? He adds that the sponsoring agencies should monitor the use of resources.

Meyers moves to add the following language in Section 6: “The sponsoring agency will be responsible for monitoring the use of those resources.”

Jansen seconds.

Rohret says that on page 2 the language in green was added because of the bike ride. They did have a need –there was a cardiac arrest. It sounds like in the future you would need to identify a public safety sponsor.

Lee asks who is the authorized user? Volunteers at an event are not authorized users.

Chair wonders if we are putting two things into one standard. Discussion about drafting a different Standard to cover non-participating user events.

Mines suggests adding to the item in green type the following: “Monitoring of these resources for appropriate use is the responsibility of COML.”

Jensen says that there may not be a COML available. Who would monitor it?

Mines suggests that under criteria three in the Standard and the sample plan—that we could say “Monitoring of those resources for appropriate usage.”

Mines moves to add under criteria three, “Monitoring of those resources for appropriate usage.”

Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Battig refers to the green highlighted paragraph and asks if we want to say, “you can do that but not for over 72 hours”. That seems like what we are trying to deal with in the next Standard.

Mines says she thinks this was intended to cover an emergency where there wasn’t time to get permission.

Rohret says yet it could be viewed as a tornado but it could also be viewed as something like the bike ride. And if you don’t allow it and then there is a cardiac arrest. This specific race is a three day race. It could be an event like this or it could be tornado clean up.

Battig says that he heard “in an emergency”. Not for a planned event. This temporary issue that would be allowed by a sponsoring agency—he would feel more comfortable if it said “as necessary in emergency to protect life or property”.

Battig moves to change the green paragraph to read “as necessary in an emergency to protect life and property.”

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to remove “certified Communications Unit Leader” from green paragraph and anywhere else it is in the document and add COML/ COML(T).

Myers seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to add the word “types ” after “certain” of these entities at the top of page 2.

Myers seconds

Motion carries.

Myers moves to approve 1.10.2 as amended.

Battig seconds.

Mines says that this makes sense going forward. What about those who have already been operating this way. Do we need to go back and have them write a plan? Or do they get grandfathered in?

Jansen thinks we should get those squared up to prevent trouble.

Meyers suggests adding language under #6 that says that it’s the sponsoring agency’s responsibility to go back and get a plan.

Jansen moves to add “Sponsoring agencies for any existing non-public safety / non-public service entities on the ARMER system as of the date of this standard must get approval by the end of December 2015.”

Myers seconds.

Motion carries.

Dooley moves to add “unless covered by another state standard.”

Ulie seconds.

Motion carries.

Motion to approve the 1.10.2 as amended carries.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION NETWORKS

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

September 16, 2014 1:00 P.M.

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
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulrie 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 / Randy Donahue SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/Darrin Haeder – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/Kristen Lahr– Central MN RAC
Scott Camps/Kerry Swenson /Bruce Hegrenes– 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
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Randy Donahue, DPS-ECN
Carol-Linnea Salmon, DPS, ECN

Call to Order:

Chair Thomson calls the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Rick Juth moves to approve the agenda.

John Dooley seconds.

Motion carries.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's minutes. None stated.

Victor Wanchena moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Clif Giese seconds.

Motion carries.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Standard 3.31.0 Status Board Review (Cathy Anderson)

Anderson presents the Status Board Standard and reviews its progression. It was passed at the Operations and Technical Committee and then came back to the Interoperability Committee. The Interoperability Committee then asked that it be reviewed by PSAPS. It was reviewed by a subcommittee of the N911 Committee and now is back before this committee today.

Anderson reviews the changes suggested by the NG911 Committee work group as presented.

Ron Jansen moves Under Item 4. Recommended Protocol/Standard, after the words "read" or "write" access, drop the words "to that zone".

Wanchena seconds

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to change the wording under Section 4, page 3, from, "at least once a month, the PSAP managers shall review" to "at least once a month, the Status Board Administrator shall review..." And in the following sentence, to change the wording to, "By December 31 of every year, a Status Board Administrator will provide..."

Juth seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to change the word “view” training to “complete” the online training under the heading Training on page 3.

Tretter seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to insert “training” after “The StatusBoard” and before “module was created...” on page 4.

Tretter seconds.

Motion carries.

Anderson reviews that the NG911 workgroup wanted to remove the password instructions on page 4.

Anderson moves on to page 5 and the section on unplanned outages.

Discussion about what to include in the standard regarding who to contact if there is a status board outage.

Discussion about sending out a memo to all administrators with contact information.

Jansen moves to add the words “reference ECN contact memo” in the paragraph beginning “after verifying the outage...” on page 5.

Tretter seconds.

Motion carries.

Jansen moves to delete the words “and share accordingly” from the end of the sentence on page 5 that says, “If an agency requires a mutual aid resources during an outage, it shall monitor for existing traffic...”

Giese seconds.

Motion carries.

On page six, at the first bullet where it reads, “Only qualified personnel access the StatusBoard,” Chair Thomson suggest it be changed to say, “Only qualified personnel are granted status board accounts.”

Jansen moves that on page six, “Only qualified personnel access the StatusBoard,” be changed to read, “Only qualified personnel are granted status board accounts” and also to add “status” between local and administrators on the first line above the bullet point.

Monte Fronk seconds.

Motion carries.

Mr. Thomson notes typos on page 1. The Internet should be capitalized.

Giese moves to accept Standard 3.31.0 as amended.

Jansen seconds.

Motion carries.

Mines thanks everyone for their work on this.

Chair thanks everyone for their work on this.

No new business.

No announcements

Meeting adjourns at 1:49 p.m.

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION NETWORKS

INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

November 18, 2014 1:00 P.M.

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
Vice Chair: **Rick Juth**– Minnesota State Patrol
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
Ron Jansen/Chris Kummer– MESB
John Sanner/Rich Stanek – MN Sheriffs Association
Ulrie 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/Vacant – 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/**Kimberly Hall** / SW MN RAC
Brett Miller/**Darrin Haeder** – SC MN RAC
Micah Myers/**Kristen Lahr**– Central MN RAC
Scott Camps/Kerry Swenson /Bruce Hegrenes– NE MN RAC
Pat Novacek / **Brian Zastoupil** – NW MN RAC
Monte Fronk – Tribal Government
Jim Halstrom – Association of MN Emergency Managers (AMEM)
Vice Chair: **Rick Juth** – Minnesota State Patrol

Members attending marked with **highlight.*

Guests:

Jackie Mines, DPS-ECN
Cathy Anderson, DPS-ECN
Carol-Linnea Salmon, DPS, ECN
Mary Borst, Mayo Clinic
Jim Jarvis, Emergency Communications
Nate Timm, SE Region
Rod Olson, City of Minneapolis
Mike Fink, Motorola
Marcus Bruning, ECN
Randy Donahue, ECN

Call to Order:

Chair Thomson calls the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Rick Juth moves to approve the agenda.

Victor Wanchena seconds.

Motion carries.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Chair asks if there are any changes to the previous meeting's minutes. None stated.

Clif Giese moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.

Terry Stoltzman seconds.

Motion carries.

ACTION ITEMS

STATE STANDARD AIRCOM (CLIF GIESE)

Clif Giese introduces the Standard. The purpose is to improve communications between helicopter communications centers. For example, if two helicopters are going to the same hospital, this would help the helicopters advise each other. Another example would be if there is a call for a helicopter in Goodhue County but the closest helicopter is busy it could be used to put out a call to Mayo for a helicopter. This would decrease the time on phones to find an available helicopter. Each communications center would only use the tower closest to their site and it would not be used in any portable radios. It would only be on consoles.

Tim Lee says it is a radio, it uses control stations. We need to know which areas around these sites they want; it would probably need a special profile.

Chair Thomson asks for clarification on who would use it. North, Mayo, Sanford, Aircare, Lifelink.

Juth moves to approve the AIRCOM Standard.

Stoltzman seconds.

Motion carries.

STATUS BOARD STANDARD 3.31.0 (CATHY ANDERSON)

Cathy Anderson says this Standard was approved by the committee two months ago but there have been some minor changes. A StatusBoard Hotline number has been added to call if the StatusBoard goes down during non-business hours. Anderson refers to the amended language reflecting this change. On page 4, the third paragraph from the bottom now reads, "After verifying the outage, if it is during non-business hours, affected agencies shall report the outage on the StatusBoard Hotline number."

In the next paragraph, it originally said "If no response is received by the reporting agency within five minutes..." Anderson recommends changing that to say "within 10 minutes."

Ron Jansen moves to approve the proposed change to Standard 3.31.0.

Monte Fronk seconds.

Giese asked why it doesn't just say 24 hours rather than after normal business hours.

Giese moves to amend the motion to change the language to read, "After verifying the outage, agencies shall report the outage to the StatusBoard Hotline number..."

Jansen seconds.

The amendment to the motion passes.

Anderson recommends a change to the fourth paragraph on page 5, under the heading "Planned Outages." Where it says, "When work is completed, ECN shall provide notice that the service is back online," Anderson recommends changing "shall" to "may." The edited sentence would read, "When work is completed, ECN *may* provide notice that the service is back online." This change is meant for times when there is a planned outage for a five or ten minute maintenance between 7 and 11 p.m. Then a notice would not be sent at 11:00 p.m. when it is back up. Otherwise notices would be sent.

Jansen moves to approve the proposed changes to the StatusBoard Standard 3.31.0.

Wanchena seconds.

Motion carries.

ISSI (NATE TIMM /BRUCE HEGRENES)

Nate Timm presents the ISSI proposal.

Timm says ISSI is a solution from Motorola to connect different vendors' radio systems. Timm says in his case, they are looking at immediately connecting with Wisconsin's system, which is called Wiscon. Other bordering counties around the state will not see an immediate benefit from it because Iowa has no trunking system, North Dakota has nothing, and South Dakota has one but we have not been approached by any South Dakota counties that are interested. Goodhue County is interested in ISSI because of the nuclear plant at Red Wing. There are frequent nuclear drills and because of that location the drills involve Madison for Wisconsin and St. Paul EOC for Minnesota. Currently they patch with control stations and it can be messy. ISSI marries the two systems. It is digital-to-digital; there is no degradation of audio quality.

Timm reports that Mr. Hegrenes, in St. Louis County, has a more immediate need for ISSI because Duluth and

Superior, WI, have a close working relationship. When Duluth went to ARMER, the communication between those two entities became more difficult.

When we started the discussion, we thought this would be a state asset because it immediately affects two agencies in different regions. In the future, other regions might use it to connect with Iowa or North or South Dakota. It would not benefit Central Minnesota except for potentially Monticello and Prairie Island with their power plants. It could benefit federal partners such as the ATF or FBI that have operational needs in different states. It would also have a benefit to private EMS partners like North and Mayo who have partners in Wisconsin.

Timm says ISSI was determined to be technically feasible by the OTC. It was reviewed by the Finance Committee which determined it was unclear that it would be a statewide resource. It has gone out to regions to see where it would be useful. It is here before this committee to determine if it is a statewide asset or should be pursued as a local enhancement.

Brian Zastoupil asks if the vision is that this be funded locally and then becoming part of the Motorola software support agreement for long term maintenance.

Timm says he believes the model being considered now is that the entities that use it would share the cost of implementation equipment and ongoing maintenance.

Giese asks what Wisconsin has to do to make this work.

Timm says Wisconsin has purchased the equipment for the connection and is already integrating into Outagamie County. The Wisconsin/E.F. Johnson/Motorola connection has been demonstrated and proven.

Lance Lehman asks Rick Juth if this would be significant for the state patrol. Juth says he does not envision immediate enhancement for the state patrol though they have had instances where helicopters have called for an assist on the border.

Timm says of the Wisconsin bordering counties, so far only Douglas County has committed to Wisconsin. Most of the bordering counties are still using the conventional system, so for example it may not be seen as helpful in the Metro Region.

Timm says the Finance Committee is looking for action by this committee to determine whether this is a statewide asset or a regional enhancement.

Mines clarifies that there is a Standard for requests to the Finance Committee for full funding by the SECB for something that is to be considered a statewide asset. The Standard says the request must go through OTC, IOC and then Finance. This request skipped IOC last month (the committee did not meet) so it is coming here today. There is concern about the fact that all these other states have to commit to the same price point so there is no guarantee or certainty that it would be used by the other regions. The question is should it be considered a statewide resource or a local enhancement. If another region joined, the maintenance portion of the local enhancement would be spread between the two entities. If it were a statewide enhancement, MnDot would need to fund the ongoing maintenance and that would take away from something else.

Discussion about which regions will use this. So far only Northeast and Southeast have a need for it. The other regions have not yet reported on whether or not they would benefit from this.

Jansen makes a motion to table it until all the regions have had the opportunity to report back.

Stoltzman seconds.

Motion carries.

KEYBOXES FOR STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY RESERVE TOWERS (JACKIE MINES)

Mines reports that at the quarterly regional meeting the request came up that regions have consistent lock boxes or keys and tool kits for the STRs. Mines says at the Central Region meeting it was stated that every region could work together to identify a consistent product and they would purchase that with the funding they have to maintain the system.

Randy Donahue says it was brought up at the leadership meeting that with the advent of the COMLs and COMTs it would be nice if there was a standardized keypad or lockbox that would give access to a key. That way if a COMT or COML came into an area and had to set up an STR, it would be consistent for that individual to access the lockboxes. It was also mentioned that there should be a standardized toolkit at each of the lock boxes. Steve Olson, who is heavily involved with COMLs, brought it up at the leadership meeting and it was a well-received idea. Every region was given a maintenance fund for their STR.

Thomson asks if there is an STR committee or maintenance group. Mines responds that there used to be but it disbanded after the STRs were distributed. Thomson says this idea makes sense and asks if this would need to go to Finance Committee.

Mines says when we turned the trailers over to the regions, we also provided funds for maintenance over the next five years. Mines thinks this could come out of the maintenance funds. She thinks the regional STRs should determine whether or not this is reasonable and if they think it is not then they could make a proposal to the Finance Committee.

Thomson asks if we want to recommend the STRs come together for a meeting to see what they need and then come back with a list.

Donahue agrees that would be a good idea.

Micah Myers says each region signed an MOU and the MOU listed the name of an administrator of an STR. He suggests contacting the administrators and having the administrators coordinate this and using maintenance money.

Thomson asks if we need a standard to mandate the admins to be able to self-fund?

Myers thinks a lot of what we need to do is already in place.

Thomson says we could pass an informal request down to the STR admins to come up with a standard, if needed.

Micah Myers moves to table this as an action item.

Lance Lehman seconds.

Motion carries.

STANDARDS 3.17.0 AND 3.17.3 --VOLUNTEER COML/COMTS SPONSORED BY AN AGENCY (CATHY ANDERSON)

Anderson reviews the recommended changes to existing standards. She will bring the Standard back to the OTC in December. In the meantime, a question has been raised about the role of a volunteer COML/COMT. On page 2, the fourth bullet point, Anderson proposes adding the phrase "currently employing or sponsoring the candidate." She also

proposes adding the sentence, "For other than full-time, paid employees, candidates may only act in the role of a COML/COMT when deployed by the sponsoring agency."

Discussion about accountability and liability and concerns about vetting someone during a situation.

Anderson says that's why they have to be sponsored by the agency and the agency would need to take responsibility. The Standard reads, "Obtain agency certification from the designated agency head." That's why they have to have a signature. Someone is going to take responsibility for signing off on their training. That's why we have consistent training for COMLs and COMTS.

Chair Thomson clarifies that the Standard says they are only certified to work for that sponsoring agency.

Stoltzman says in Anoka County they cover volunteers as employees under workers' comp. He says it comes down to relationships and known entities.

Mr. Wanchena says he understands the concern about people who self-deploy. He doesn't think that anything that we put in the Standard will help with people who self-deploy. That really comes down to management. What we put in the Standard will help us but it will not stop someone who is trying to work their way into a situation.

Suggestion to add "and authorized" after "deployed."

Anderson says the Standard says we will maintain a list of COMLs and COMTs on the ECN website. She is working on that.

Jansen expresses concern about background checks. Would that be done for a volunteer? He would like to have this vetted through CRF and the Metro.

Wanchena moves to accept the standards as presented.

Monte Fronk seconds.

Motion passes with two opposed.

Meeting adjourns at 2:10 p.m.