

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

STEERING COMMITTEE

August 10, 2016 1 p.m.

Chair: Dan Hartog

Call-in number: 1-888-742-5095

Code: 2786437892#

Meeting Agenda

Call to order

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Previous Meetings' Minutes

- May 2016

Action Items

- Subsystem Roaming

Discussion Items

Adjourn

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

STEERING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2016

1 P.M.

CHAIR: DAN HARTOG

NORTH MEMORIAL AMBULANCE SERVICE
4501 68TH AVE N
BROOKLYN CENTER, MN 55429

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance

Members:

Present

Member/Alternate

Dan Hartog, CHAIR
Joe Glaccum, Vice Chair
Mike Slavik/Tom Wolf/Troy Tretter
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn
VACANT
VACANT
Tina Lindquist/Kristen Lahr

Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.
Minnesota Ambulance Association
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
MnDOT OSRC
MN State Patrol
MN.IT
Central MN ESB

Guests:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN
Jim Stromberg, DPS ECN
Rick Juth, DPS ECN
Carol Salmon, DPS ECN
Jill Rohret, MESB
Marcus Bruning, ECN

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Joe Glaccum requests to add a discussion about data usage on the ARMER network.

Joe Glaccum makes a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Troy Tretter seconds the motion.

Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

Tretter makes a motion to approve the March meeting minutes.
Glaccum seconds the motion.
Motion carries.

ACTION ITEMS

ADDITION OF TRIBAL GOVERNMENT ON BOARD (JACKIE MINES)

Jackie Mines introduces the item and recommends tribal representation on the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB). She reports that ECN has met with tribal nations around the state and has had conversations with the Indian Affairs Council and the Council is very interested in having a seat on the SECB.

Marcus Bruning adds that it has become apparent with the work with FirstNet that we need to reach out to the tribes and invite more participation. He presented to the Interoperable Data Committee the tribes willingness and interest to be a part of the SECB. The IDC determined that the discussion should happen at the Steering Committee.

Jill Rohret asks if the recommendation is that it would be one seat or one seat from each tribe.

Mines responds that she recommends that it be one seat for the IAC and that the IAC rotate the member and alternate among its membership.

Troy Tretter asks if this would still keep to the one third and one third plus one ration on the board.

Mines responds that there may be a propensity for it to line up on the side of rural but there is a big metro tribe and she believes the IAC will keep in mind their representation. She thinks the tribes should be viewed as a sovereign nation. She adds that the SECB should encourage tribal participation at the committee level and in particular on the IDC. ECN will prepare a tribal newsletter to educate the tribes on what the board does and how to participate and to keep them updated.

Mines notes that the SECB is minus the one-third participation by the state because Minnesota Management and Budget took themselves off of the board. She suggests adding the Department of Health back to the board. She asks if Homeland Security should be added. They are big participants on interoperable communications and would be involved in any major incident with the EOC.

Glaccum adds that the Metropolitan Council displaced the Commissioner of Health years ago. He supports a seat for the IAC. He agrees with adding the Department of Health back because the Department of Health is embracing this form of communication for the coordination for disease and chemical warfare.

Rohret agrees.

Glaccum makes a motion to recommend that the Indian Affairs Council and the Commissioner of Health have a seat on the SECB.
Tretter seconds the motion.
Motion carries.

SUBSYSTEM ROAMING WORKGROUP MAKEUP (JOE GLACCUM)

Glaccum introduces the item and notes that in the meeting minutes it reflects that committee wanted two people from each region to form a workgroup. He and Rohret met with SECB Chair Mark Dunaski and thought it should be looked at again. Originally, they thought it would be easier to determine who was a subsystem owner. The list from MnDOT was very long. Glaccum supports the Metro Region having more representation than what was originally proposed because they have more subsystem owners and the issue of subsystem roaming is not as prevalent in Greater Minnesota.

Jim Stromberg responds that the committee had decided to have one member from each region with a subsystem, one member from each region, and one from MnDOT. There are 39 subsystem owners and seven regions plus one from MnDOT so it would be a big group. He thinks it's important to include at least one from each region even if they have no subsystem owner. He lists a few scenarios for representation on the committee based on the number of subsystem owners in a region. The number of subsystem owners by region:

Metro has 9 subsystem owners

NE 6

Central 8

SW 5

SC 4

SE 7

NW 0

Glaccum suggests a representative from each region, a subsystem owner from each region and two subsystem owners from the Metro because it has more owners. Glaccum notes that this is a workgroup that will make recommendations which will be vetted through the committees and board. He does not feel qualified to set the thresholds and nobody on the board would be qualified to set the thresholds. He recommends a group of 15 people. One subsystem owner from every region except 0 from the Northwest and two from the Metro, plus one representative from every region, plus one from MnDOT.

Discussion about who should lead the group. Stromberg will offer guidance as to the mission and keep the group on task.

Discussion about timeline. No later than November.

Glaccum makes a motion to modify the original recommendation to say that the workgroup should consist of one representative from each region, one subsystem owner from each region, with Metro having two, plus a representative from MnDot and ECN support staff, with a recommendation back to the Steering Committee by November.

Tretter seconds the motion.

ECN will send a notice out to the regions asking for appointments to the workgroup.

Kristen Lahr says it seems reasonable for the Metro Region to have two representatives due to the concentration and geographic area and not having the option to add additional capacity. She is fine with it and hopes her region will support that as well. Tina Lindquist agrees and recommends framing it as a state interoperable concern.

Motion carries.

Stromberg reports that the workgroup met by phone on May 3 and discussed the promotion of Text-to-9-1-1. Stromberg talked with Dana Wahlberg and she reported that it is premature and when we are ready to promote Text-to-9-1-1 we can use materials produced by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA). There have not been any other requests for the services of this workgroup. The workgroup talked about branding and a logo for the SECB. The workgroup feels that the SECB needs to have some branding that can be used beyond the letterhead and PowerPoint templates. Stromberg gives the example of the strategic technology reserve equipment and notes that all of the portable towers have manufacturer's logos on the side. He suggests the equipment as a place where the SECB could promote what it does for the state. He also recommends that the standards could be printed on material with SECB branding. The workgroup would like the Steering Committee to further consider the topic of branding.

Rohret raises the question of a re-education campaign about when it's appropriate to call 9-1-1 in light of recent events with the accidental tornado siren in Hennepin County and the smoky haze coming from Canadian wildfires. PSAPs received an influx of calls because of the smoke, for example. The Metro Region will be considering this.

Mines responds that in some counties there are different perspectives on when it is appropriate to call 9-1-1. In the Metro there is a 4-1-1- and a 3-1-1 center and greater number of calls. In other areas, sheriffs would prefer to have people call 9-1-1. She thinks we need to start reminding people when and how to use it. She will bring it to the communications department for advice on how to get the message out.

Discussion about using IPAWS for alerts such as a message to the public saying this was an inadvertent activation of the siren. Mines says the IPAWS Committee created a high level brochure for sheriffs saying here is how you can use IPAWS for more than just traditional emergencies. More training may be needed at the dispatch level or refresher training about what it is and how to use it. John Dooly is going to regional meetings to get the word out.

DATA USAGE ON THE ARMER NETWORK.

Discussion about data usage on the ARMER network. Data usage takes bandwidth from the voice side. Should it be allowed on the voice network and, if so, how much. Voice traffic will always supersede data traffic. Integrated voice and data is pretty good with a small number of people. The airport and others would likely be willing to test it. It is limited at this point to 1000 people per site. It requires licensures at the sites and at the subscriber level. Suggestion to talk with other larger systems that have it. Discussion about asking Motorola to give a presentation on it. Decision to ask for two presentations. One general overview presentation with information about the cost given to the board and one more detailed presentation given to the committee.

Mines will invite Chris Meier from Motorola to give a presentation at the SECB meeting.

Glaccum makes a motion to adjourn to meeting.

Tretter seconds the motion.

Motion carries.

Meeting adjourns at 2:50 p.m.

To: SECB Steering Committee
From: Jim Stromberg, ARMER Program Manager
Date: July 20, 2016
Subject: Subsystem Roaming Workgroup

Per the decisions of the SECB Steering Committee at its March 9, 2016 and May 11, 2016 meetings, I convened a workgroup to consider issues associated with Subsystem Roaming. The workgroup met on July 11, 2016 in St. Cloud for an all-day meeting. This memo details our work and outcomes.

The Steering Committee guided that the workgroup invite the following representatives:

- One person from each Emergency Communication region of the state
- One person from each Emergency Communication region of the state with subsystem ownership (this is each region except the Northwest)
- One additional person from the metro region
- One person from MnDOT

Actual participants at the meeting:

- Central Region: Kristen Lahr (Stearns County) & Brandon Larson (St. Cloud)
- Metro Region: Troy Tretter (MESB) & Ron Jansen (Dakota County)
- Northeast Region : John Hyde (Duluth) & Ken Yurrick (Itasca County)
- Southeast Region: Jennifer Hauer-Schmitz (Rice County) and Dave Thomson (Rochester)

I moderated the discussion. The workgroup understood that its charge was to explore issues and questions related to subsystem roaming and not to make decisions.

The following questions/topics drove the discussions:

- Is subsystem roaming a public safety issue or a fairness issue?
- Under which circumstances should an authorized ARMER user be allowed to roam onto a neighboring subsystem?
- How should subsystem capacity and usage be measured?
- Should a subsystem have reserve, surge capacity? If so, how much is acceptable?
- What is the best resolution process for a situation where a subsystem owner believes their capacity is being unfairly consumed?

The workgroup concluded three main points:

1. Quantifying subsystem roaming is an inadequate method to evaluate and resolve a subsystem roaming concern. *The approach must be qualitative.*
2. Subsystem roaming concerns need to be addressed through an *established process* emphasizing communication between involved parties.
3. *A Radio Programming Best Practices Guide should be created* to guide programmers in standardized and uniform ways.

Point One – Use a Qualitative Method Rather Than Quantitative

Every subsystem roaming scenario will be different and no one set of guidelines could adequately address the many complexities involved. Data from ARMER reports provide some illumination but the raw data alone, no matter how measured, is an inadequate way to evaluate and resolve a subsystem roaming concern. Subsystem roaming matters are complicated by the fact that public safety service areas often overlap MNDOT and local subsystem coverage areas. In matters of site loading, ownership is not just who built the towers, it is conveyed to those who purchased channels for the site. Resolution to a loading concern in greater Minnesota may be to purchase a channel while in the Metro other solutions must be considered because an additional channel may not be available.

Point Two – Concerns Should be Addressed via a Defined Process

The workgroup agreed with the existing Standards that dictate that roaming issues be addressed locally. The actual process should be more clearly defined so that the responsibilities of subsystem owners and suspect offenders is clear. Suggested process steps:

1. Subsystem System Administrator formally contacts System Administrator of suspected offending entity to resolve.
2. Regional Emergency Communications/Services Board notified.
3. Statewide Interoperability Coordinator notified to assign a Regional Interoperability Coordinator to mediate the issue.
4. Unresolved issues brought by the aggrieved subsystem owner are brought to the OTC.

Point Three – Best Practices

A Radio Programming Best Practices Guide would be very beneficial education tool to ARMER programmers statewide. Implementing a Guide may mitigate many subsystem roaming concerns before they become a problem. In addition to detailed technical advice, the Guide should encourage relationships and a mentorship process. It should elaborate on the steps in Point Two to resolve concerns.

Other Comments From the Workgroup

- There was consensus that subsystem roaming could be both a public safety and a fairness issue, depending on unique circumstances.
- The workgroup believed that monitoring subsystem roaming was the responsibility of the subsystem owner. The reports provided by MNDOT were a valuable tools to that end.
- The workgroup examined Standards 2.9.0 and 2.11.0 and forwarded recommendations to the Standards Workgroup for review.