STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

STEERING COMMITTEE

March 9, 2016 1 p.m.
Chair: Dan Hartog
Call-in number: 1-888-742-5095
Code: 2786437892#

North Memorial Ambulance Service
4501 68th Ave N,
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429

Meeting Agenda

Call to order

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Previous Meetings' Minutes

- February 2016

Action Items

- Strategic Plan (Jackie Mines)
- Subsystem Roaming (Joe Glaccum)

Discussion Items

Adjourn

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

STEERING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 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	Representing
Dan Hartog, CHAIR	Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.
Joe Glaccum, Vice Chair	Minnesota Ambulance Association
Mike Slavik/Tom Wolf/Troy Tretter	Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn	MnDOT OSRC
VACANT	MN State Patrol
VACANT	MN.IT
Tina Lindquist/Kristen Lahr	Central MN ESB

Guests:
Jim Stromberg, DPS ECN
Marcus Bruning, DPS ECN
Rick Juth, DPS ECN
Carol Salmon, DPS ECN
Scott Wosje, Northland Business Systems

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Joe Glaccum requests to add to the agenda a discussion about system loading.

Glaccum makes a motion to approve agenda as amended.
Mike Slavik seconds the motion.
Motion carries.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

DRAFT

Glaccum makes a motion to approve the November meeting minutes.
Slavik seconds the motion.
Motion carries.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

RED CROSS AND DROS ON THE ARMER SYSTEM (JIM STROMBERG)

Jim Stromberg introduces the topic and opens the discussion. He reports that the Northeast Region was approached by the Red Cross and the National Weather Service (NWS) about ARMER participation. Bruce Hegrenes, of the Northeast Region, raised the question at the Operations and Technical Committee of whether these entities should be regional or statewide participants. Stromberg researched and put together a small workgroup to discuss this. The workgroup included Todd Krause from the NWS in Chaska. The NWS is not a responder, dispatch, nor a PSAP so it is a unique situation. The offices generally have one radio and maybe a couple of talkgroups and are stationary. The office covering Minnesota is not necessarily even in Minnesota. Krause said that to sign onto a participation plan would involve considerable bureaucracy and encouraged regional sponsorship. Stromberg clarified that sponsored agencies require participation plans according to Standard 1.10.2.

Discussion about the best way to include the National Weather Service on the ARMER system. Committee agrees that the best way is to do it regionally. Stromberg will bring a revised standard to the OTC.

Stromberg introduces the topic of the Disaster Relief Organizations (DROs). There are four DRO talkgroups that have statewide access. There are state and metro standards covering the talkgroups. The MESB has a relationship with the Minnesota Volunteer Organizations Action in Disaster (MNVOAD). MnVOAD issued 4 radios for the Red Cross and 4 for the Salvation Army. The standard called out for 4 talkgroups—1 for Red Cross, 1 for Salvation Army and 2 open.

Stromberg thinks it makes the most sense for the DROs to have state sponsorship. Coincidently, Bill Schmidt of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) asked if DHSS could sponsor the Red Cross. Stromberg asked if the agency would also sponsor the Salvation Army. Schmidt responded that it was likely. Stromberg asked about the DHHS sponsoring MnVOAD. Schmidt said probably not.

Stromberg says if we can get sponsorship by the Department of Health and Human Services that would clean it up but it leaves all the other organizations in MNVOAD hanging. Stromberg thinks if there is another agency in MNVOAD that needs to have access that is what the cache radios are for. He thinks it would cover it.

Tretter says originally the DROs were only metro. At some point they went statewide. They should have regionalized but they had statewide access and just used it. He agrees it should be at a state sponsorship level. There are a lot of organizations listed under MNVOAD but from his understanding no one else besides Salvation Army and Red Cross has asked to come on the system. Stromberg reports that the two agencies have not used the system much so there is not a capacity issue.

Glaccum asks about sunsetting the standard and then having DHHS write a sponsorship letter.

Stromberg thinks we could update the standard to say we have these four talkgroups and we are calling out this talkgroup for the Red Cross for so long as they maintain their sponsorship, another for the Salvation Army, same requirement, and the other two for any DRO with a cache radio.

Glaccum suggests that it say only the Red Cross and Salvation Army and through change management drop the

DRAFT

other two. He asks if a state agency can sponsor an entity.

Tretter responds that in the metro region it has to be a system owner to sponsor.

Stromberg says we do have lots of incidences of local police departments being sponsors of entities. For example, Bloomington Fire is the sponsor of CP Rail. The metro standard is tighter than the state.

Glaccum's concern is are there other state agencies not qualified to sponsor and would this make them eligible? Maybe we could have MnDOT approving DHHS?

Stromberg says MnDot has to enter into a contract with the agency because MnDot holds the license but that is different from sponsorship and who is responsible for training and oversight.

Thakur will check with MnDot to determine if MnDOT can issue permission for DROs to use ARMER radio channels under the condition that they are sponsored by a state agency such as the Department of Health. He will research how state agencies get their rights to be on the system.

Tretter will ask the MESB if it wants to adopt the state standard.

Stromberg says we will wait to get a report back from Thakur and Tretter and he will revise the standard and bring it back to the Steering Committee.

MnVOAD—Stromberg will defer that to MESB and from a state perspective we do not have a relationship with them. If they want one, they can apply and if we need them in the meantime we can use them as a just-in-time user.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE (JIM STROMBERG)

Stromberg reports that he chairs the Education and Outreach Workgroup which he inherited from Julie Anderson. The priority is branding of the SECB and preparing for future needs of the SECB. The DPS Communications Office put together a logo and letterhead. The workgroup updated power points for each of the committees and those are on the website. The last area is the standards template. Stromberg would like to add the SECB swoosh to the standard template and would like to revise the template to clarify the dates of adoption.

Clarification that the 'swoosh' on the letterhead and other materials has not been adopted as an SECB logo. It was created to be a temporary solution. The workgroup should continue working on a logo. Agreement that Minnesota should be added to the logo, either graphically or in text.

Members of the Education and Outreach workgroup are:
Mary Borst
Tina Lindquist
Cathy Anderson
Shari Geski
Jill Rohret

The next meeting will be held on March 1.

RED RIVER REGIONAL DISPATCH (MARCUS BRUNING)

Marcus Bruning reports that the Red River Regional Dispatch Center (RRRDC), by way of a Joint Powers Agreement, serves as the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) for the Fargo-Moorhead regional area of Minnesota

DRAFT

and North Dakota. The Fargo-located PSAP answers 9-1-1 calls from Cass County, North Dakota and Clay County, Minnesota and dispatches police, fire, and EMS in both states. The RRRDC's consoles are nearing "end-of-life" and, when replaced in 2017, will be newly integrated with the ARMER system. This creates an opportunity for the RRRDC to upgrade the aging radio system serving the North Dakota side of the Red River. An option under consideration is to build an ARMER-compatible network on the North Dakota side of the RRRDC service area and tie it to Minnesota's ARMER network. This solution would benefit to public safety in both states but it generates political and financial questions.

The budget is made up of both Minnesota and North Dakota tax dollars. On the North Dakota side, the system is aging and North Dakota is trying to figure out what they are going to do. The North Dakota legislature only meets every two years. The last time it met money was allocated to do a study to find a solution to emergency communications in North Dakota.

When RRRDC started to look at migrating over to Clay County, MN, they contacted Jim Stromberg and Marcus Bruning about the potential of building sites similar to local enhancement sites and locating them in North Dakota and requesting to connect them to the ARMER backbone at least on a temporary basis until North Dakota decides what it is going to do. The idea is to build three site simulcasts in Fargo /West Fargo and three other towers across Cass County, North Dakota, and tie that into the zone controller in Detroit Lakes. Stromberg and Bruning talked to Tim Lee and asked about the capacity of the zone controller in Detroit Lakes and there is a lot of capacity there right now.

Stromberg and Bruning told the RRRDC that technologically it is feasible but there are lot of concerns about governance and contracting.

Clay County and the RRRDC are very active in the Northwest regional board, in fact the OTC representative is from North Dakota (Brian Zastoupil). This idea was presented at the NW RAC and ECB last month and received overwhelming support this. The interest is interoperability. The immediate response plans include fire coming across the river every day. Historically there is a lot of flooding that occurs in that region.

The North Dakota resources would be programmed to prefer North Dakota sites and Minnesota resources would continue to be programmed to prefer Minnesota resources.

Stromberg and Bruning looked at coverage maps and in Norman County on the western edge of the Red River Valley coverage is pretty weak. One of the sites North Dakota is proposing to build in Cass County, ND, would benefit Minnesota users.

Stromberg and Bruning recommend preparing some talking points for discussions with legislators in the area to clarify that Minnesota tax dollars will not be used to benefit North Dakota.

The NW region is pretty excited about this. It is quite likely that the RRRDC will be coming forward with a request. The RRRDC has consulted with a company to develop a participation plan. They are looking at a plan that would involve their own zone controller or using ours temporarily and either way it would involve an ISSI across the border. The six consoles that have been approved already can only be connected to one zone controller.

Bruning reads from the following talking points:

DRAFT

Unique Situation and Relationship
The cooperative environment between Minnesota and North Dakota public safety in the Fargo-Moorhead area is quite remarkable and is a tremendous example of a consolidated dispatch center and communications system that has been advantageous for local citizens and governmental budgets for many years. No other Minnesota PSAP is engaged in a Joint Powers agreement with another state. The RRRDC is the only multi-state dispatch center currently involved with in Minnesota's SECB governance.

Current Funding Process
Both Clay County and the City of Moorhead participate in the governance, operation, and funding of the Fargo, North Dakota-located RRRDC. 911 fees collected from Minnesota residents help to support the Minnesota portion of 911 emergency communications at the RRRDC.

Daily Mutual Aid
The spirit of RRRDC's cooperation is present on a day-to-day basis, meeting the public safety needs of the entire area. Police, Fire, and EMS providers regularly cross the Red River, which divides the one metropolitan area into two states. Emergency response plans include the sharing of resources to meet the needs of the area.

Large Scale Mutual Aid
The Red River Valley area of Fargo-Moorhead has had numerous, significant flooding events throughout history. Public safety resources from all across Minnesota and North Dakota, as well as federal emergency responders, have historically assisted the local resources with all communications coordinated by the RRRDC.

Radio Coverage Benefits
Should this model be adopted, six radio tower sites would be built using North Dakota funds in Clay County, North Dakota. The proposed architecture would include programming North Dakota user radios to "prefer" North Dakota towers and Minnesota radios to "prefer" Minnesota towers. However, in times when the preferred tower was out of range or somehow compromised, radios could roam across state lines to affiliate with a non-preferred site, greatly improving coverage and, consequently, public safety.

Interoperability Benefits
If this model is adopted, radio interoperability between Minnesota and North Dakota users would be seamless. In the case of interoperable, emergency radio channels, radios would "prefer" the closest radio tower and emergency responders, regardless of jurisdiction or discipline, could be assigned the same radio channel.

Regional Support
In January 2016, the idea of a potential shared resource solution was overwhelmingly supported by the Northwest Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) and Northwest Emergency Communications Board (NWRECB).

North Dakota Governance
The North Dakota Emergency Services Board is supportive of this project. The RRRDC is currently negotiating with a vendor to develop what Minnesota refers to as a Full Participation Plan. This Plan includes a detailed engineering and system loading study. The RRRDC desires to be prepared with technical aspects prior to approaching Minnesota.

Fairness and Contractual Matters
Contractual language would need to be developed to ensure fairness, define responsibilities, and to assign potential future responsibilities for any future impacts by North Dakota. Contractual language and a flexible formula would need to be developed to assign today's costs and future costs.

DRAFT

Precedent Setting?
The RRRDC is in a unique situation in that it is a shared, consolidated PSAP engaged in a Joint Powers Agreement and funded through the tax dollars of two states. Other metropolitan areas that encompass two states (e.g. East Grand Forks/Grand Forks and Duluth/Superior) have their own independent PSAPs. Further, the Fargo, North Dakota-based RRRDC is already approved to connect directly to the ARMER backbone through the Clay County/Moorhead Full Participation Plan.

Technical Impact
Preliminary research suggests that the infrastructure and capacity of the ARMER radio system in the northwest region of the state is more than capable of handling the estimated additional load by adding Cass County and Fargo to the system. While today's impact is negligible, future impact is unknown and must be considered part of a contractual agreement.

Bruning asks the committee for direction on when sample letters should go out with talking points for sheriffs and others in the region. Should this go to the OTC and SECB first?

Chair Hartog says that in his area they dispatch for Big Stone County and Big Stone City, South Dakota. They started talking to everybody before they got to the level of the participation plan.

Discussion about the need for a technical and financial plan. Could the contractor draft a financial plan as well as a technical plan just for a starting point?

Agreement to not present to the SECB until there is a proposal. At the OTC next month it should be brought up that this was discussed at the Steering Committee and the committee is identifying issues.

Committee agrees that Director Mines may send a bullet list and sample letter to the sheriffs and others in the region to explain what is being researched and considered and to provide talking points.

Attendance and Roster

Carol Salmon calls attention to the attendance report and roster, which were included in the meeting materials. An attendance report is provided annually for the committee's information to show where there may be vacancies or lack of participation.

Loading Discussion

Joe Glaccum requests that in the interest of time the loading discussion be moved to next month's meeting. He briefly reports that there was a discussion at the Operations and Technical Committee on the topic and the consensus was that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution. The Metro Region and Greater Minnesota have different issues and needs.

Thakur says the ARMER system is a testament to Minnesotans working together and cooperation in spite all of the challenges. He acknowledges the work of so many who have worked on this for so long.

Meeting adjourns at 3:35 p.m.

DRAFT

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER)
Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section 2	**Configuration and Allocation**	**Status:** Complete
State Standard Number	**2.11.0**	
Standard Title	**Radio Site Access Permission – Subsystem Roaming**	
Date Established	**1/19/2001**	**SECB Approval**: 6/27/2013
Replaces Document Dated	**9/01/2005**	
Date Revised	**6/27/2013**	

1. Purpose or Objective

The network infrastructure and subscriber units are configured to permit managed access to sites throughout various parts of the system. This managed site access provides the ability for users to achieve wide area coverage where necessary for mission-critical operations, enhanced in-building portable coverage, and a degree of system level backup in the event of certain types of major network failures. Roaming for non-essential operations is subject to being restricted, in order to maintain an acceptable grade of service for mission-critical operations.

2. Technical Background

Infrastructure programming settings that control site access for talkgroups/multigroups

There are settings in the system infrastructure to control the "Site Access Denial Type" parameter, which controls how site access is handled for radio users of the system. Radio users and talkgroups have independent access lists programmed into the system infrastructure. These lists control which sites the radio and/or the talkgroup can access. The level of access depends on the "Site Access Denial Type" setting. Options for this setting are:

Individual Only: The radio is rejected if the individual radio user ID does not have access to the site, regardless of talkgroup site access settings.

Talkgroup Only: The radio is rejected if the current, selected talkgroup ID does not have access to the site, regardless of radio user site access settings.

Both: The radio is rejected only if BOTH the talkgroup ID AND the Radio User ID do not have access to the site.

Either: The radio is rejected if EITHER the talkgroup ID OR the Radio User ID do not have access to the site.

Infrastructure programming settings that control site access for Interconnect/Private Call

The site access privileges for private and interconnect calls are based on the site access settings for the radio user and not based on the system "Site Access Denial Type" settings. They are independent of talkgroup site access settings.

Radio programming settings that control site access

The subscriber radios contain "Site Preference" selections for radio programming. Radios can be programmed with multiple unique personalities, which will allow unique Site Preference Selections for each talkgroup in the radio.

Least Preferred: The site will be avoided unless it is the only usable site for operation.

No Preference: The site is given no preference. If the site is not listed here, the radio automatically assigns it no preference.

*Preferred: The site will be used over all non-preferred sites with similar signal strength.

*Always Preferred: The site will be used over all non-preferred sites with similar signal strength, even if the site loses communication with the Zone Controller and enters site trunking.

*Note: Always Preferred and Preferred are operationally identical if the radio sites have communication with the system and are operating in wide area mode.

- **Constraints**

Using the "Both" site access denial setting to facilitate unique, individual needs will allow those individuals full access to all their talkgroups at sites they have "Radio User" permission for.

Using the "Either" site access denial setting to facilitate unique individual needs may block those individuals from site access, even in emergency conditions.

3. Operational Context

Normally, only those talkgroups in Priority 3 (Mutual Aid) or above will be permitted access at ALL sites.

Talkgroups would generally be permitted access at all those sites necessary to support the "normal day-to-day" business operations of the users of that talkgroup.

If it is necessary that a talkgroup have redundancy protection in the event of a site failure, the attempt shall be made to use one adjacent or overlapping non-owned site for the

talkgroup's protection. Factors determining the best protection site include coverage of the site or function of the talkgroups per site.

Custom talkgroup site access configuration profiles can be created for consistency with this standard.

Dispatchers would be able to use the wide area, "roaming," "common," or "pool" talkgroups as described in Infrastructure Configuration (below) for patching to their local area talkgroup to facilitate temporary wide area access.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard

Subscriber Unit Configuration

In subscriber radio programming, the radio would normally be enabled for all sites of the system, and the operational site access would be managed at the system level.

The local System Administrator will program the radio's site preference tables to maintain roaming at an acceptable level, while minimizing impact to other sites.

Radios with no site preference tables, or with all sites set to the default "No Preference," will generally not be allowed on the system, because they will indiscriminately roam among all sites where the selected talkgroup is allowed.

Infrastructure Configuration

Radio user profiles would generally not have special site access permissions granted. Site access for wide area operations will primarily be managed at the talkgroup level. System Managers may accomplish this by designating site access throughout the system to a limited number of special wide area talkgroups. These special talkgroups would not be main dispatch or tactical talkgroups with high volumes of radio traffic but may be special Wide Area, "roaming," "common" or "pool" talkgroups. The "Site Access Denial Type" for the system is set to "Talkgroup," meaning that a radio will receive an out of range indicator on a selected talkgroup at a site if both the talkgroup privileges are denied at the site. The use of "Critical User" and "Critical Site" in the system is generally discouraged and must be authorized by the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB).

5. Recommended Procedure

The defined standard would be implemented and maintained by the appropriate System Administrator(s).

6. Management

The System Managers Group (SMG) is responsible for oversight and ensuring that the standard is followed.