

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014

1 P.M.

CHAIR: DAN HARTOG

MNDOT ARDEN HILLS TRAINING CENTER  
1900 WEST COUNTY ROAD I, SHOREVIEW MN

### MEETING MINUTES

---

January 8, 2014

#### Attendance

##### Members:

##### Present

##### Member/Alternate

**Dan Hartog**, CHAIR  
**Joe Glaccum**, Vice Chair  
**Carol LeDoux** / **Jill Rohret**  
Mukhtar Thakur / **Tim Lee** / Jim Mohn  
Kevin Daly / Bob Meyerson  
Tarek Tomes / **Dave Van Thiel**  
Rich Stanek / **Jim Bayer**  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.  
Minnesota Ambulance Association  
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board  
MnDOT  
MN State Patrol  
MnIT  
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office  
Central MN ESB

\*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

#### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Wendy Surprise, DPS ECN  
Brandon Abley, DPS ECN

#### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:08. Chair notes there is a quorum.

#### Approval of Agenda

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**Motion to approve Agenda: Jill Rohret**

**Motion Seconded: Jim Bayer**

**Agenda Approved.**

#### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

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

**Motion to approve previous meeting's minutes: Jim Bayer**

**Motion seconded: Jill Rohret  
Minutes Approved.**

**Discussion Items:**

- Review ARMER User ID report

**Who is on ARMER** Tim Lee goes over the report and reviews some of the numbers for the committee.

He states that the report people have was created to try to line up radio counts and IDs. He says the report shows what the counts on the system are. He states that he thinks the last total was about 95,000 IDs programmed into the system. Motorola has said that the top limit is 128,000. The report also gives the number of radio users *over* the approved, but this may not be quite current. Joe Glaccum asks if the counts include the 3-year growth counts.

Lee states that it includes what has been approved by the OTC. The numbers are close and his best guess. He has been keeping a spreadsheet with 2009 as a starting date. OTC has approved about 112,000 IDs. He adds there about 12,000 IDs in the system that are Gold Elite IDs. As Gold Elite's go away, those IDs will be freed up and available for radio use again.

Chair asks how soon the Gold Elites will be gone.

Lee says 2016.

Glaccum says that to his knowledge, he doesn't know of anyone coming to the OTC and turning back IDs after they have upgraded their Gold Elites. For example, he doesn't recall State Patrol coming back and giving IDs.

Lee states that those were just rolled up higher and not part of the original approved count.

Chair asks if there will be more IDs available if Motorola does an upgrade.

Lee says that right now it's not in the plans to increase it, but there is talk from other states that they want Motorola to start looking at it. The system is certified for 128,000. There is nothing to stop us from adding more, but the system may not handle it.

Mines asks if all regions purchased cache radios..

Glaccum says yes.

Bayer says he thinks Hennepin has at least 500.

Jill says most caches are very small except Hennepin's.

Mines asks if auxiliary organizations need their own if the other locals/regions have a cache.

Glaccum states that exercising caution when approving ancillary groups is prudent in his opinion. He asks if as a group if we feel at risk of running out of IDs. Also asks about just automatically

taking the IDs off their count when participation plans are approved when replacing Gold Elites with MCC7500s. We could retrospectively deal with that and also do it going forward.

Chair asks how many counties have yet to join ARMER.

Lee says that we have not seen plans from Clay, Lake of the Woods, Mahanomen, Marshall and Norman Counties.

Mines says that IDs don't seem to be in issue. She asks if training is an issue. Is everyone getting properly trained.

Glaccum says we have not always been consistent with the participation plans that have come forward.

Rohret states that a lot of the participation plans include language that training will meet ARMER standards. Is anyone checking on that or following up? Is there a lot of ongoing training going on?

Rohret adds that the training standards are very vague. They were written that way so as to not become outdated.

Bayer asks if the training is still available on the Alex Tech website.

Mines says yes.

Chair asks if Alex Tech reports *who* takes the training.

Mines says they can but do not today

Abley agrees and says we should probably do that annually.

Chair asks if we need to tighten up the standard and also asks how we will enforce it.

Lee states that a lot of the training language used the phrase "highly recommended".

Mines asks about tying grant money to training. It's there for training but she says she sees a lot of it come back in ways other than training. Can we ask for documentation that ties it to training.

Glaccum says training needs to stand the test of time.

Rohret says that it's the system administrator's responsibility to make sure on-going training occurs.

Mines asks if this is a bigger issue with ARMER than it was with VHF.

Bayer says it's a larger issue with ARMER. The zones make it more complicated and intimidating for users.

Lee says he thinks that the patching has made it too easy and users don't have to switch zones. He adds that if you aren't doing it consistently, the training will be lost.

Bayer says they have talked about having their users put the fleet map on the MDC in the car.

Chair asks how you determine who is certified to give the training and how do you determine that.

Mines says we can really only do so much. We could make the Alex Tech training certification a little more difficult such as require a test question be answered before moving to the next question. Maybe there could be annual training requirement through Alex Tech.

Chair suggests a printed receipt from Alex be submitted to *someone*.

Glaccum states he thinks it should be managed locally.

Mines asks how we can do anything about it at the state level.

Lee suggests doing a lot of routine, small-scale exercises.

Glaccum wonders if we could make a commitment to provide a training module with Alex Tech for every flavor radio with the exception of a radio with extremely limited use.

Chair asks if the group thinks we should look into the funding for Alex Tech training.

Mines says we can look at what it would cost.

Abley says we have some room left in that contract.

Mines asks if we should look at putting together a training best practices guide. We could ask for ideas about how user training is happening.

Rohret says if we had something like that she could send it out. Giving people some ideas might be helpful.

Mines says that it would give the regional radio boards a chance to make recommendations to their users.

### **Usage of IDs on ARMER**

Lee says the plan defines who is eligible to be on the system.

Mines says she thinks people know that the criteria is there, but if there is a concern about resources and costs, we should remember who the system was built for and who the primary users are. The language is pretty broad and almost anyone can make a case for being on it. That's not a bad thing but we have to be able to afford it.

Lee says that up until now we hadn't really been looking at the "busies". This is part of the monthly report. There are a number of sites that have been busy every month this past year. Lee thinks it's time to start pulling that information and putting together some sort of report. If there were some number of busies that was reached in a month, we could bring to the OTC. Plenty of counties have said, or been told, that they would never have enough traffic to cause busies. The list of the sites that have regular busies every month is pretty long.

Mines says that one of the things that concerns her about capacity issues that are caused by using all the IDs is how do you prioritize that. We don't have the grant money that we used to have. When we had a lot of grant money it was easier to say, "That's a priority, bring it forward to the group or workgroup". But, without a lot of grant money, we are dependent upon the SECB \$1 Million dollar allocation each year and a biennium budget cycle with shifting/competing priorities. We really have to be thinking about how we prioritize projects. The SECB money should be used for necessary projects outside the building of the backbone. We've used it in the past to put microwave in, and things that would help multiple agencies, etc. This year we are using it for StatusBoard, SLGP match, etc.

Glaccum asks about the priority list we came up with for the allocation of grant dollars.

Mines says we could use that.

Lee says that with regard to adding channel capacity and who is responsible for paying for that, isn't sure it's only the responsibility of the SECB to pay.

Rohret says that could get interesting because there are some busies in the metro that are really caused by roaming from other subsystems.

Abley says if you had to make that call (who is responsible) couldn't you refer to the FCC's standards for allocating frequencies based on certain numbers of users when you apply for trunk frequencies?

Glaccum says he thinks we would have trouble enforcing that. He adds that once we are built, he wonders if it is worth the fight to figure out who is responsible. Says that perhaps we should just find the funding and add a channel.

Mines says we could make that a SECB responsibility and include in our budget planning.

Rohret says there can be technical issues to blame, like profiles need to be changed so that users aren't roaming over to busy sites as much.

Glaccum agrees with Rohret.

Mines says she likes the idea of planning ahead and identifying priorities of how to use the allocation each year.

Glaccum suggests bringing the busy reports to the OTC and that would launch an investigation into who it is causing busies and why. If it comes back that the busies are no one's fault, the SECB could look at funding more capacity.

Committee likes that idea.

Lee says he will try to figure out the best way to display the data (busies). It's in the report but you have to go through and filter it. It's one thing to look at the traffic but it doesn't tell you what happened and who is actually talking at that time.

Rohret agrees that sometimes it's just anecdotal.

Glaccum agrees that it's not simple, but adds that it's not insurmountable to take a twelve-month snapshot of busies.

Lee says that there are 30 or 40 sites that have ten or more busies per month.

Chair asks if it's more complicated in the metro to do the forensics.

Lee says while there are some busies on metro sites, it's a smaller number of busies. Number the IDs, talkgroups, training, capacity are all interrelated.

- Identify User Tiers

Mines says it sounds like rather than putting users into a "user tier" that we implement the aforementioned steps first. It sounds like IDs really aren't an issue for the foreseeable future and that capacity issues might have multiple causes and we need to figure out the root cause, address that if it is caused by user error and if it is not anyone's fault, determine if SECB funds should be used to address the capacity issue. Once we have monitored this for a time, we could then identify tiers of users as a next step.

Lee states that if we start to approach the limit, we should go back and make sure we have a reserve for the counties that haven't come on the system and also consider the additional user IDs needed by counties that have only brought on law enforcement and will need more for other public safety such as fire, EMS, public works). There are five counties that have not yet submitted plans so we should reserve for them.

Mines says she isn't hearing that schools/buses, power companies are a problem at this point. She thinks perhaps the Steering Committee should consider putting some boundaries around ancillary users. The report and the root causes of those busies would help us determine if locals need to figure out their priorities.

Chair says if there are problems, it should be addressed at an upper level.

Glaccum says that is if they are already on the system. Question is how do we deal with the requests that are coming now.

Rohret says there are shifting needs. Interop with schools wasn't talked about much when the system first started. But, because of events that have occurred, more and more places want the schools on. There are officers IN schools. Things are shifting and how do we say the schools aren't important, because they are. They aren't public safety, but they can be. Tiering would be difficult. It's going to be hard to tell anyone no.

Mines asks if there is any issue with sponsorship of some of the ancillary groups. If we don't have regions or a particular organization sponsoring them, then there is nobody to really take responsibility for them. She says she has concerns about that. We have orphan organizations out there that really need some strong sponsorship. If it's not done at a regional level, how do we address it.

Carol LeDoux asks why we couldn't have a boilerplate contract that stipulates costs, etc. and is very clear about capacity.

Mines says there isn't a user fee.

Rohret says there used to be and it was problematic and when we got legislative funding for the backbone costs, the user fee went away.

LeDoux says that as users expand and capacity needs increase, there are costs associated with that as the landscape changes. She asks if that is a legislative issue.

Rohret says not necessarily. The Board would have to look at it. It's something that a lot of politicians haven't wanted to touch in the past.

LeDoux says she understands that, but funding it as a covering-costs kind of measure, as the system grows, will have to happen.

Mines says the Funding Study being done goes out about 15 years and will identify what's been done in other states, including user fees. The comments she has heard from states that have users fees state that they are difficult to collect and cost money just to collect. And, how do you kick someone off the public safety system if they don't pay. The Funding Study will outline some of the pros and cons of different ways states that states have gone about funding maintenance costs.

Abley agrees that even with the user fee, you can be left with the same problem you started with.

LeDoux asks if anyone has looked at airtime fees. Could we collect up front and not have an ongoing collection.

Glaccum states that the user fee was a huge disincentive and there was a lot of distrust of the State. We aren't really talking about funding right now, but who is eligible to be on the system and who is not. Also, should we talk about putting some parameters on who is eligible or at least tier them. He adds that he thinks if we had stayed with the user fee system, we wouldn't have the kind of participation we have now.

The Chair agrees. The committee agrees.

Bayer asks if the majority of the busies are in outstate Minnesota or the Metro.

Lee says there are some in the Metro.

Mines says funding isn't a big issue at this time.

Glaccum suggests that looking at requests for ancillary groups on a case by case basis might be the best we can do and maybe that is good enough. It was easy to build the system and put everyone on, but now that we've got some expertise and look at things differently, it's getting harder to say yes to everyone. The question is how do we say yes and how do we say no.

Chair asks if we have a standard or a policy.

Glaccum states he doesn't think we could capture every scenario or possibility in a standard.

Mines says we have been struggling with that.

Chair asks about the process. Asks if it goes to the OTC first and then comes to Steering and then to the SECB?

Glaccum says that that would work. If there is a standard at all, we could take the hardcore definitions we have of public safety and public service and if its falling outside of those parameters are far as the users, then we would need to get approval from the OTC and Steering and we could “hard coat” that so it always happens.

Rohret asks if the Board could have an internal policy for an ancillary group that is non-governmental, non-public safety and non-first responder agency. The OTC could look at the technical and then to the Steering as part of process.

Glaccum wonders if we would have pushback from the OTC.

Chair likes the definition “non-first responder” and also agrees with the process of also having non-first responder ID requests looked at by Steering Committee.

Mines says if Steering looks at all non-first responder requests we would be treating everyone the same.

Van Thiel suggests having some designated criteria we could bounce each request against. It would make it easier later to explain why a group was or wasn’t approved. Groups could then make sure their requests are thorough and meet criteria.

Mines agrees but thinks that we don’t have that defined well-enough ourselves *yet*.

Van Thiel suggests taking the last half dozen that were approved and recreate the requests and ask what the key points were that were looked at. This would help to define the criteria. It could also help down the road if funding is an issue. If the Legislature asks “why did you let this huge power company on” you could better answer the question.

Mines says that is a perfect point.

Glaccum agrees but asks about groups who are willing to pay to have the opportunity to interface with public safety.

Van Thiel agrees and says it’s hard to make a group of volunteers *pay* to do so.

Glaccum says it would face some criticism there. He suggests immediacy (how quickly do you need to have a radio in your hand) as criteria.

Van Thiel agrees with that as important criteria.

Chair says we have pretty much covered the following:

- Determine Future Needs for Public Safety Responder entities.
- When does ARMER reach capacity for Public Safety Responders?  
How many more Public Safety Users will be coming on ARMER?  
How many more Counties will be coming on ARMER?  
How many more IDs will be coming on ARMER?



Chair says that next time we should sit down and talk about breaking down our criteria of approving User ID requests when looking at requests from non-first responders.

Group agrees that meeting in person is best for working on these issues.

Wendy Surprise tells the group the next meeting is the second Wednesday of the month.

Rohret and Glaccum offer space for a meeting.

Next meeting will be February 12th at 1:00 at a location to be determined.

Chair thanks committee for their work.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**Meeting adjourned at 2:56**

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2014

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

Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret

Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn

Kevin Daly/Bob Meyerson

Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel

Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer

Michael Henrion

##### Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.

Minnesota Ambulance Association

Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

MnDOT

MN State Patrol

MnIT

Hennepin County Sheriff's Office

Central MN ESB

\*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

##### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN

Wendy Surprise, DPS ECN

##### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:00. Chair notes there is a quorum. Chair asks committee members to introduce themselves.

##### Approval of Agenda

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**Motion to approve Agenda: Joe Glaccum**

**Motion Seconded: Tom Wolf**

**Agenda Approved.**

##### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

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

**Motion to approve previous meeting's minutes: James Bayer**

**Motion seconded: Dave Van Thiel**

**Wolf abstains as he was not in attendance at previous meeting.**

**Minutes Approved.**

## Discussion Items:

### **Usage of IDs on ARMER - User ID requests from non-first responders.**

Chair states that we have discussed this at two previous meetings. One of the criteria needed is how to discern between first responder and non-first responder. He asks if there is anything in standard that defines what those are.

Glaccum states that we defined what is public safety and what is public service. Some of the language came from FCC language. Even though we have those definitions, this is still a problem.

Chair states the issue is the IDs out there and how do we want to vet out the requests from non-first responders and how do we want to move forward. Create guidelines. Asks committee for thoughts.

Glaccum states that the intake process could be whatever is most appropriate (which committee the request would originate at). If it falls outside of the criteria we have right now, i.e. not a county, not a fire department, etc. Our process should automatically generate a steering discussion. We have to try to define who gets to use the ARMER system and who does not no matter the circumstance. We've not been able to accomplish this. It may have to be up to the wisdom of the committee and we would be at risk for being inconsistent.

Chair says that we might have to look at the requests on a case by case basis.

Carol LeDoux asks if there is a framework as to the criteria. While it might be loose, some sort of framework could be written so that we weed out requests that don't meet standard.

Bayer asks if we are talking about volunteer organizations or all public service.

Mines says both. The two situations that brought this to a head were Civil Air Patrol and Minnesota Department of Health and Human Services. One issue is that there isn't necessarily a supporting agency for some of these groups. What criteria are we going to use to approve or not or modify requests.

Bayer asks how many ids will be freed up when the system is upgraded to 7.15.

Glaccum states that he heard Tim Lee from MnDOT says 12,000.

Mines states that IDs may not be the issue but perhaps training, costs, and taking up space on the system MnDOT could partner with OTC to monitor busies on the system.

Glaccum states we have criteria from grant funding and we can plagiarize those criteria. How quickly a requesting group need radios in an emergency would be criteria.

Chair says he is not familiar with the grant funding criteria.

Glaccum says they worked on that long ago and will find the standard. It was for the greatest number of people to benefit from spending the money down to the least number of people.

LeDoux asks about rights and responsibilities that were delineated in receiving grant funding.

Glaccum says that is typically handled at the contract level. Whether it's with MnDOT or a local agency, things like training, programming is spelled out. Not all contracts are created equal. The interoperability contract would have some criteria.

Chair asks about criteria the committee would like to see, such as a regional sponsor.

Glaccum says that the Civil Air Patrol had regional support (sponsor).

LeDoux says we can spell out that we reserve the right to review and deny an application.

Glaccum says at a minimum they need a sponsor but that doesn't mean they are automatically in.

Mines asks about the history of State sponsorship. What is the responsibility of the sponsoring agency? Is MnDOT the state? For state agencies like DOC and DHS, who would be the state sponsor?

Mukhtar Thakur asks what would be the reason for saying no. He asks who is responsible for future costs.

Bayer asks if agencies realize that its more than just buying radios and having them programmed. That there are other costs associated with joining the system.

LeDoux suggests that should be part of the framework. Requestors should know they are going to pay to play. They have to know there will be long term costs for the affiliation.

Mines says that a full participation plan should lay out their long term maintenance costs.

Chair says sponsorship should also deal with training and the responsibility for the radios.

Jill Rohret says that was the idea behind sponsorship. The Sponsor is responsible for maintaining the radios and the providing training as well. Most that are sponsored in the Metro, the radios are responsibility of Sponsor.

LeDoux asks who is paying for the system. Where is the money coming from?

Mines says that the cost of building the backbone was paid out of a 911 revenue bond which will we still pay and will be paid off in 2026. The maintenance comes out of the 911 fee. We transfer budget item to MnDOT every year (per statute). When a local agency decides to come on, like a county, they are responsible for any enhancements and local equipment. That usually comes from their local levy. If DOC, for example, comes on and they have a lot of local infrastructure, they are responsible for all of the upgrade as well on the pieces they use to enhance the system. That comes out of their general fund budget. We just recently completed the Long Term Funding Study of all the public safety systems. The local cost to get on these systems (NG911, ARMER, 911 – all funded by the 911 service fee) is usually borne by the locals. Keeping the system updated and keeping everyone on the same page is challenging because we all have different budget cycles. All of us have to partner on the decision making process. If a school wants to come on the system, the school has to be able to pay for that. If there is an upgrade that causes those radios to go out of date, those schools will be affected.

Mines says that some of the "one offs" are challenging. A county might need a power company on, but how do we decide that no other power companies need to be on.

Glaccum says that when plans come forward, we approve if they have everything in place, including training.

LeDoux says agencies should be held accountable and responsible for the use of radios.

Chair says he thinks that does happen. Internally there is education, retraining, and discipline when necessary.

LeDoux asks if we need a protocol. Are there fines? What happens if there is misuse.

Glaccum says it hasn't happened yet.

Bayer says there were issues with Metro Mobility.

Glaccum says that during the bridge collapse there were users who inappropriately tuned in. We were not well positioned to do anything about that. We have not formalized. Retrospectively sorting out who is on resources isn't realistic.

Mines suggests putting together a loose outline of criteria.

Glaccum says all the standards are written this way (shows group a standard) with a purpose, objective, technical background, operational context, etc. We could ask:

- Do they need to be on the system?
- Why do they need to be on the system?

If yes we can determine what priority.

- Is there capacity?

Bayer agrees it is important to ask whether new users might cause busies.

Mines asks what if there is capacity at the time of the request, but in the future it is an issue. Would you then go back and look at where there is an issue.

Bayer suggests asking the question about whether they will be prepared to pay for changes in the future.

LeDoux asks if we can go back to users that don't have value and aren't using the system when we need capacity.

Glaccum says that radios that sit on the shelf don't take away resources from the system.

LeDoux asks if there should be a contract that spells out firmware updates. Agencies and entities need to have a financial awareness about participating long term.

Chair asks if the onus should be on the sponsor making certain users know who is responsible.

Glaccum suggests putting in some boiler plate language we could insist be included in the contract with sponsoring agencies.

Mines asks who should sponsor groups like National Guard, Red Cross, Civil Air Patrol (statewide groups).

Glaccum says he thinks that right now anyone who is a state user contracts with MnDOT.

Thakur says there is a cost to everything.

Chair asks aside from the money, who would be responsible for those groups. Who is the go to person? Also should the requests go to OTC or Steering?

Glaccum states it's been pretty easy to date to approve users because they have been public safety.

Bayer asks if OTC knows the channel capacity of each region before approving or denying participation requests.

Glaccum says no, but there is criteria regarding training, number of IDs, Radios, Ports, etc. As chair of the OTC he also makes sure that MnDOT has reviewed and approved the Plan. Regions are also asked for input. At times, we have delayed rollout because there hasn't been buildout in certain areas. OTC does not rubber stamp the plans.

Mines suggests that if state sponsorship is required, those requests should come through the Steering Committee.

Glaccum suggests that if a user falls outside the definition of an eligible user, it must go through Steering.

Thakur agrees.

Glaccum suggests putting that in framework. If Steering doesn't send forward, it wouldn't go to another committee. Steering could just look at it from an eligibility standpoint.

Bayer agrees.

Thakur asks about looking at other states and their users.

Glaccum thinks that is a great idea but believes most states look at Minnesota as a model.

Mines says she could go and look at some other states and see how many other organizations could potentially be interested and what the states have done. When we look at sponsorship we should make sure sponsors can support long term costs of supporting agency.

Chair asks for other suggestions.

Mines says that the funding study pointed out that we need to do a better job as a board to determine the impacts of upgrades on the entire system. Would we start that discussion in the Steering Committee or Finance? Should the Chair of the SECB task a committee to continue looking at funding? Should we talk about an asset management account at the Legislature? Does the SECB put together a legislative agenda for the Legislative Committee?

Thakur asks who decides whether we would skip an upgrade.

Chair answers Steering Committee.

Glaccum states he thinks it was made by the Statewide Radio Board last time.

Thakur says that the Steering Committee needs to be aware of all of the pros and cons of the upgrade and input from all of the users.

Mines says we have typically done every other upgrade.

Glaccum says that not everyone cares about every feature of every upgrade.

Glaccum suggests that with regard to funding, Finance takes that on.

Chair asks about costs down the road with FirstNet.

Mines asks how the committee would like ECN to report out on FirstNet. She asks if there is some formal request the Steering Committee has of ECN that we can provide. At this point in time, we've done informational meetings and collected data. There has not been a lot of direction from FirstNet. We could bring FirstNet decisions forwarded to the Steering Committee.

Chair likes that idea.

Mines says that will be formalized at ECN.

Chair thanks Mines. He asks if we are ready to move it forward.

Mines says that we should discuss internally how we want to deal with any agency that the State is sponsoring. We need to make sure we are in synch to meet the needs at least two years in advance. Could we bring this to our next internal ARMER meeting?

Glaccum asks if we should put the framework into standard and vet through the language of the standard. Asks Mines if ECN could take a crack at it.

Mines says yes. She will work with Anderson.

Van Thiel asks if this framework is gated (you don't make it through the first gate then you don't get considered for the second part) or is it more like looking at a lot of criteria and coming up with a composite score.

Glaccum says the standard he brought up was gated. Some subjective scoring needs to be looked at, too.

Van Thiel says criteria could have different weighting.

Mines says we will look at the proposed standard at the next meeting. She adds that ARMER and MnDOT get together at least once a month and she will bring up the sponsorship idea.

Bayer asks if anyone has ever decided not to be part of the system (after participating) and if so, what was done with their radios.

No one thinks that has happened.

Next meeting 1:00 on March 12 at Joe Glaccum's office.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

Next meeting 1:00 on March 12 at Joe Glaccum's office.

**Meeting adjourned at 2:38**

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth  
Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.  
Minnesota Ambulance Association  
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board  
MnDOT  
MN State Patrol  
MnIT  
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office  
Central MN ESB

\*Members attending are marked with yellow highlight.

##### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Brandon Abley, DPS ECN

##### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:00 with a quorum.

##### Approval of Agenda

Joe Glaccum added a discussion item regarding non-government agencies using the ARMER System.  
Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended.

**Motion to approve Agenda: Joe Glaccum**

**Motion Seconded: Tarek Tomes**

**Agenda Approved.**

##### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

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

**Motion to approve previous meeting's minutes: Joe Glaccum**

**Motion seconded: Tarek Tomes**

**Minutes Approved.**

##### Discussion Items:



- **Standard 1.11.4 – Training ARMER End Users (Brandon Abley)**

Abley states he did not have a particularly active role in authoring this standard and that he is filling in for Cathy Anderson, who could not make it. He says he did participate in some of the workgroup calls and can speak about the standard.

Abley says he believes this committee asked for this standard to be looked at. A workgroup was commissioned, and there were several conference calls that came up with various versions of the standard. There isn't a tremendous amount of new text, but a good amount of work went into where it is at now.

This standard says that everyone is required to receive training of some kind, but it does not go into specific competencies about what those requirements are.

Abley says a significant addition can be found under Section 4, number 2, stating, "Every agency shall be responsible for maintaining adequate records documenting compliance with the provisions of this standard. These records will be produced at the request of the RRB or the local System Administrator of the agency's county."

Above that in the previous section, it says that, "Local System Administrators shall identify training needs and implement training programs to meet those needs."

He states what is significant about this is that the standard introduces the requirement that every agency would need to have records of their training and that agencies would have to produce those records upon request. The standard doesn't state what needs to be in those records, just that they are kept. The idea is that regions will police this.

Abley says he thinks there was some conversation about how this might introduce some significant administrative burdens to agencies but that all agencies should be keeping these records anyway. Agencies should be able to prove that everyone has been trained when asked to do so.

He says that under section 5, there is a recommendation for everyone to complete our online training program through Alexandria Technical & Community College. In an earlier draft of this standard, it was stated as a requirement but was changed into a recommendation. He stated he didn't have the background on that and there had been some consensus that every new ARMER user should be required to watch the training modules. In this final version it was changed into a recommendation

Rick Juth adds that at one point it was discussed as to whether or not users had to take the actual online modules or if the content of the modules could be presented in a classroom-style training.

Abley states in the final version that ended up getting removed. He says if you specify exactly what kind of training everyone has to go through, you introduce a significant cost factor for everyone that has to do the training.

Abley summarizes the main change in this standard is that agencies will be required to keep training records and be able to produce them. He asks for questions.

Jill Rohret says she understands the spirit of the changes in the standard and thinks keeping training records are great. However, she says the significant change is that instructors are now approved by the Regional Radio Boards (RRBs). She says this could create a liability for RRBs, in addition to creating a whole new work load that hasn't been considered. It could also lead to inconsistent training across the state because what Metro approved could be different than what Central has approved, which could be different than what Southwest has approved, etc. She says unless the State is going to say what the approval requirements are and what the training is, you will have training problems across the state.

Chair says one of the reasons they're looking at this is if there will be non-government units on the system, we need to make sure they're going to have training. Nothing was mentioned about whether or not it should be done yearly or as refresher training.

Abley says that this standard is a product of the workgroup and it doesn't represent ECN's exclusive contribution. In earlier drafts of the standard, there were a lot more requirements, but as the group went on, they ended up backing down from a lot of those.

Jackie Mines says she watched email chains and noticed there are some people who feel strongly that we should require training to be done, listing specific modules, and there are others who are very opposed to that. From an observer standpoint, she doesn't think the State or ECN can say you have to be trained or monitor who has been trained.

She states we could put a document together that says these are the things that need to be trained on, but there's no way for us to police that, and it would have to be policed at the local level. If you require that everyone has to go through the four online training modules, what do you do with nurses and others who use radios periodically when you have to pay them overtime.

She feels that's the significant reason the work group back off occurred and if we make some specific changes to what we offer on the online modules, we can address that issue again. Some of what she took away from the conversation is how can you force people to do this and how are they supposed to do this when it requires additional resources and commitments.

Carol LeDoux says that without consistency, expectation, and implementation, she doesn't know how it could really be effective. She continues that nobody likes state mandates, but we are dealing with life and death here, so if people are doing it differently in their own counties, it could be a disaster waiting to happen. LeDoux feels if they are getting into this program, to be effective, it has to work the way we want it to work and be a consistent program.

Abley says that by having regions certify trainers and training programs, that is how the group is punting the issue. If the regions set their own requirements and develop those requirements being required to certify trainers introduces a liability issue. The region will certify a trainer and now they have some legal responsibility for that training because they've said it meets their requirements.

Rohret states it also has a potential for inconsistent programs across the state that would defeat the purpose. She says the reason we have this training and approved training curriculum is to have consistent training and if you leave that to regions to determine the contents, that's a big problem. One region could say 15 minutes on portables is enough.

Glaccum talks about the ICS model. He says we, at the state level, do kind of control the minimum content people have, but we still have to deal with the operational aspect, because people can learn how to push a radio button in 15 minutes. Training always has a local flavor and we'll never get it consistent across the state, but we can address it in the standard and say on top of your training, you have to show this – people could print out the certificates. Or if an agency or county wants to bring in an instructor who addresses all of that stuff, then the discussion turns into what is the equivalent of the modules. If we offer the modules, people can make a decision if they want to go more. Glaccum states he is opposed to RRBs certifying instructors.

He states you can make it as large or small as we wish and that if people have their training records, they can show why they didn't do an online module and looking at the number of users around state, maybe that's where we start. He is hesitant to say we would approve every equivalent and that if we were staffed to do that, we could do the training ourselves and asks if there's an appetite for the ICS model to throw that out there.

Juth states he was on most of the conference calls. He says the whole process of revising the standard went through quite a metamorphosis. It started out with a document he offered that generated a lot of discussion. He says people are getting hung up on the "state" thing and that this is a Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) standard – state government is not creating the standard, SECB is creating it, and that membership is made up of the users. He states some people don't view it like that and are very resistant. He feels this issue needs to be

addressed. This is an SECB-level standard that provides guidance and direction of how individual users are going to be trained on the system.

He says that's the way it started out and there was strong lobbying in the group among users who said it should be the RRBs controlling this whole thing. He feels the standard should be defined at the SECB level and should apply across the board. People need to understand it's not the state, ECN, MnDOT, or DPS that is driving these standards. He says we only have representatives on these committees and that we don't make up majority of them.

Juth says regarding the standard, at one point, ECN was going to be gatekeeper of all training records, but that was found not to be possible and there is not the ability to support that.

He says that none of the standards have any repercussions and that we should have the ability to have some level of repercussion for not complying with state standards. As it stands in this draft, it has gone back to the RRB level, and they will be responsible for oversight in their regions. It would lead to what exists today – a wide range of application of all standards and operational use of the system among the regions. Regions are in different places in terms of involvement and application to the standard. The guidance in some of these has to be high, but some people are hung up that DPS or MnDOT are driving them. They're not, and it isn't possible because this is a committee approach.

Glaccum says the spirit of the state standards has been to set a minimum competency or minimum threshold and that's how we have to look at this. We do have to drive it at the statewide committee level and say here's the minimum. He suggests having language allowing regions to strengthen their own standards and says the operational aspect works the same everywhere – turning on the radio, site affiliation, etc., so we can set minimum training for that. He says we have to make sure the Alex Tech modules are what we need them to be.

Rohret says there is no training for some radios and if people are going to be encouraged to do the online training, it needs to be kept up-to-date. Training for all the equipment has to be on there and has to be a big push to do that when these changes take effect.

Glaccum says the only problem he sees with the online training modules is that a lot of the button configurations are different. Saying something is an option button doesn't do anybody a lot of good.

Rohret agrees.

Glaccum says maybe training is something like what does a bonk mean, what are the risks, what does a statewide resource mean, a regional resource? For your agency, whatever type of radio you're using and how it is set up is what you have documentation for that someone has been trained on those things.

Abley says he would add for the committee's benefit that our mission for training in first place was never to have it be comprehensive but foundational. It would be a change in scope if we have it be comprehensive, and he wouldn't want anyone to watch the videos from Alex Tech and think they're good to go.

Juth says as far as the section about approved or authorized trainers, he feels it should be at the state level and that any training provider in the state should have to come before the Technical Operations Committee (TOC) and provide their presentation. It would almost be like the same thing with a participation plan in that there would be certain criteria the presentation would have to include. Once approved by the TOC, it would move forward to the SECB for approval. Then they would be on an approved list for trainers anywhere in the state. We have people training in the state that we have no idea what they're doing.

Mines inquires besides On Target, what other training companies or trainers are there?

Rohret states local agencies have actual users as their subject matter experts and do training internally. There are various users who do the training, and while she agreed with what Juth was saying, she says that when they tried to approve radio shops, there were problems.

Glaccum says they tried to approve radio shops and the technicians for what they could work on.

Rohret says the way the standard is worded that Joe would have to be approved for his training.

Juth states it would unmanageable.

Glaccum says everyone on the system has agreed to train, and it is a requirement in their participation plan. Everyone knows it's an obligation expectation.

Rohret says some of the cooperative agreements in other regions and cooperative agreement with users also make system managers responsible, and it doesn't work. She states when she sends out new operational changes to system managers, they're supposed to let their people know, but she doesn't have everyone's email address.

Juth says there could be a requirement they be limited to those companies or individuals that provide training for hire that training outside their own agency for a company. A training company could provide their curriculum for review to the TOC prior to conducting training on ARMER in the state of Minnesota. If an individual agency has a trainer, that would not fall under this.

Mines asks how you would know the agency is following the requirements.

Glaccum says it's the same as all the standards. You can't say everyone is following them, but they have an obligation to follow them. Like many of these things, it's going to be a retrospective discovery, but it's usually discovered when something is disrupted.

Chair brings up the Incident Command System (ICS). He says he was thinking it could be some kind of system like that, at least for a general knowledge of the radio. For example, if you have to go to an STAC talkgroup, they have a general idea of what to do with their radios in certain situations and what they can't do with them. It could be a good basic understanding of what you can and can't do. He agrees with the point that if someone's for hire, they should be certified by the SECB to go around the state and make sure they're teaching the same thing.

Juth says or make sure they're teaching the correct thing. He says for those who have taken on the role of training within their own agency, maybe there could be some sort of trainer's conference on an annual basis, providing an opportunity for refresher training or for questions and answers. He states that nobody is even sure of how many trainers there are.

Chair asks if that is something the RICs could do as far as who's doing the training out there to get a baseline.

Juth says it would be interesting to at least find out the primary trainers.

Glaccum says it would be hard to ask people already doing training for years, like On Target, to come back and certify their curriculum. A few more counties will get training, but the group we should be focusing on is what we want for recurrence and for those coming on the system. He states he kind of likes the model of the minimum ICS stuff and maybe we should drill into that. As for maintaining training records, if the region or county wants to do that at higher level, they can. They would understand they're supposed to get radio training, what they need to know and who they have to go to for that info, and if we want to stay consistent, we can have a checklist of operational aspect programming features of the system and an overall view of the system.

Juth says one thing that got deleted on his draft version is that each agency would be responsible for maintaining a training plan that would be based upon their participation level on the ARMER System. It would address things like the training of occasional users, the ER nurse, volunteers that are called in, just-in-time training. He says one draft had that if a region decided they would create a training plan for the region, it would apply to all users in that region, but it would have to coincide with their participation plan. They could address what limited participation agency users need to know about the system, and training would be focused on different things. That got wiped out in latest version, and group members of the committee were going back to the region to be the responsible party.

Glaccum says it has to all the regions or none at all.

Abley states we can get the workgroup back together to come up with a standard that better meets expectations of the committee.

He says he doesn't like regions certifying trainers and training programs and doesn't want regions to bear the responsibility. There should be minimum specific competencies in the standard, like what each user needs to know - radio buttons, basic knowledge of standards, and governance.

He likes the idea of agencies having to keep records and being able to produce them, as well as the requirement for basic foundation of operational knowledge on how the communication program works for that agency.

The workgroup can work on what specific competencies should be required.

Juth says everybody is a participant at some level in the state, but those who have not migrated over don't consider they need to have ARMER training because they're not on ARMER. He says that's why he came up with the approach to training based on participant level. He says his version created a fourth level for a disaster or search, any time a radio could be given to a person who is not a member of public safety (i.e. the occasional user, pollution control, agriculture, citizen), and it would provide them with some sort of just-in-time training - how to turn the radio on, press this button if you need to talk, etc. He says you have to identify these people, or they may be forgotten about for training.

Chair says that's where the recurrent training comes in. Fire departments that only go out six times a year don't remember how to use their radios, so they may not recall how to get to a mutual aid zone. Recurrent training would keep them up on that.

Mines says that's the whole idea of the Alex Tech training. ECN is willing to support the ongoing relationship with them to update, refresh, or create courses for the occasional user. Whatever we don't have, we will explore doing if people will use it and we can gain some consensus around this issue. She says at least having an online training forum gives us a little control over what's being created. We don't have control over places like On Target or what message they may or may not provide out there. With Alex Tech, we can even explore training being done there as opposed to being done in the field.

Juth says the SECB could say training and that refresher training is critical, investing in the people doing training at each agency. The state could provide annual training at a conference because people come, leave, retire, change jobs or agencies, and we really don't know what's out there.

Chair adds that is true, especially with volunteer organizations, and suggests we put something together as far as continuing ed hours like POST certification.

Juth says part of the conversation during the standard workgroup meetings included the idea of a curriculum to be developed and submitted for POST certification, because that would entice people to do the training.

Mines says On Target did training in the Central Region recently and that Randy Willis from MSA went to get information to try and get dispatchers more consistently trained across the state. He says dispatchers had been trained but many didn't know how to do things that were being talked about in the training.

MSA would like to encourage POST training, so Mines and Willis visited Alex Tech. Linda Muchow said she could add test questions to enable the online training to be POST certified.

Juth states another conversation within this discussion is the Best Practice approach and looking at the Dispatcher Best Practice Guide. He says the challenge is if we are going to put language into this saying it's a recommendation and strongly urged but isn't must or shall, within each agency's training plan, they must include how they will address remedial training. This has to be within dispatch centers, because the PSAP manager or operations supervisor has to have a mechanism in their center to say what they're going to do. For example, today we're going

to review the pursuit standard. If you know they haven't done a pursuit before, that is where issues come up and said if someone hasn't done something for six months, how are they going to remember if someone isn't drilling them on these things.

Chair states they were just talking about active shooter with the dispatchers.

Rohret says they did training like Rick was talking about. It was dispatcher scenario training, and it always got really good questions. Some of the things they need refreshers for could be made easier instead of getting a class together and finding instructors. It is a lot easier if the classes can be online.

Juth says on the law enforcement side, most are familiar with the radio. They are trained annually on things like driving, first aid, weapons, but unless someone is proactive, radio training occurred when the radio was issued or when some new system is installed.

Glaccum states people trying to keep local records isn't a big deal. He says online modules should be redone to make them more generic and include language for local operational stuff to help keep it fresh and pertinent. Just-in-time training should be done to recognize the volunteers and other modules should be discipline specific with stuff pertinent to each job.

Chair says it would be good to get POST certification since personnel would be investing time on it.

Juth says for police officers, it would be another tool – like a Taser or gun, they should be able to receive POST credit for this training, as well.

Rohret asks if we need something like POST training for technical folks. Radio shops need to know what they're doing, and there are other certain classes as well, like system administrators. Everyone needs to know the information regarding the system.

Juth says if they have a system administrator or someone in doing things on the system, they can create havoc or really create issues if they do something wrong.

Glaccum says he doesn't disagree and that this is quite a chunk we're taking on. The name could be operational users of 800, steering away from technical folks. If we can get this taken care of, we've made a huge step. This is where our issues are, as we haven't seen a lot of failures with respect to deleting MnDOT ID's, microwaves failing, etc.

Chair says it would cover non-government users down the road, too.

Abley says he has it all documented so the workgroup can put it together. He says most of the information requested has already been written and proposed in some draft already and that either he or Anderson will be back with the new version.

- **1.10.2 – Radio User ID Requests (Mines)**

Mines says this one actually got lot of input from different people and discussed it as laid out. We tried to take the model Joe talked about last time and use criteria we would use to evaluate a non-government user. Overall, without reading the whole thing, this is what we came up with. She asked for feedback and said this is a preliminary draft based on the first conversation.

Rohret says when she read it, she saw that it could apply to any group that are considered government but are not first responders, like MnDOT, hospitals, or any other users that are already on the system, not just Red Cross, National Guard, etc.

Glaccum states they could be defined as public safety and public service eligible. For people outside the definition of whatever is considered outside public safety or public service, it includes everyone unless considered VOAD. The spirit of it is right, but you can't just say non-first responder.

Mines says after the discussion in OTC, we need to define what we're talking about, because it's getting confusing.

Glaccum says we may look at where it says public safety, public service, who is eligible and the language that belongs there and that we could come up with a third group name and decide what to call it.

Mukhtar Thakur asks how you would classify Metro Transit.

Rohret responds public service and public safety, as they have a large police force.

Thakur states he just wanted to clarify that and isn't worried about them.

Mines asks if almost anybody can be considered public service when it relates to a role assisting public safety.

Glaccum says that's a good point.

Abley responds the entities that are not traditionally eligible, like agencies that don't use ARMER for their primary communications and who have a limited participation plan. He says Red Cross would never be eligible to always use ARMER for their day-to-day communications, only for special applications.

Mines asks if he's saying that's a definition.

Abley states he's trying to articulate what the target group is. He says we know what it is but it's hard to describe.

Mines asks about evaluation criteria.

Rohret says the standard in the Metro requires a partnership where you have these odd agencies that need to talk to public safety. She says contractors on the field at the airport have an FCC requirement that they have to be able to talk back to public safety, so the airport sponsors them so they can talk. Minneapolis has crime in the skyway, so they are sponsored with one talkgroup so security can reach Minneapolis PD in the event of an incident. She says you have to have specific sponsorship requirements at times and likes the evaluation criteria but thinks number 3 might need more definition.

Mines agrees it needs more thought and input. She said a sponsor would take care of a lot of issues and concerns since they're the ones who ultimately have to deal with things. If there is abuse or overuse, that area needs more work, as well.

Chair asks if there is any background done on the types of individuals, like security in the skyway, using the radios.

Glaccum responds it is a reasonable question and that a quick pass at BCA technically doesn't get at our issues. There has been agonizing discussion about criminal background checks, especially on the technical side, and we won't be able to standardize this across the state. He says right now, your county may have its own criteria as to who can use the system, be in your building, etc., and it would be expensive to get the background details you want for people who would be a threat on system.

Chair says he was on a committee in the Central region when there was discussion about criminal history for people going into the radio shop or where equipment was and that if we talk about sponsorship, that will go back to the sponsor.

Rohret says they're at least looking with some sort of review.

Glaccum says we're not sure how to do it, but it will take some high-level language.

Mines asks if we want to include subscriber background.

Chair replies yes.

Mines says under evaluation criteria number 1, after reading the Metro standard, she wonders if we should add that the fleetmap must be reviewed or made available.

Glaccum states he thinks criteria 1 becomes high-level, because what you are asking for is subjective and what we're after is the technical number of users and the ID's.

Mines asks if that would be under technical.

Glaccum states it can go in either and that he would drop the number of users radios proposed from criteria 1 since it would be in criteria evaluation number 4. The reason for the request is a big one, and you need more language in criteria 1 – the purpose and the things in number 2.

Juth suggests creating a 4<sup>th</sup> sponsored level participation plan which would indicate who's sponsoring them and address all the criteria within the plan like anyone else has to do.

Mines asks what everyone thinks of that idea.

Glaccum says sponsored participant sounds great.

Juth says they would have to come before the TOC with their plan, along with any criteria requested in this standard. Then you would have a record of who came before you and who's sponsored. They would have to go through the whole process, and the sponsor could be there to address questions.

Rohret says she would like to have more of it on the sponsor and that there is nothing she wants to change in their standard. For the ones in the Metro, there's a subscriber agreement between the subscriber and sponsor, but it should be an option. She says if someone's going to step up, it should be the sponsor of the entity.

Glaccum asks if we need to see the agreement.

Rohret says that's up to the committee. MESB doesn't, but she thinks most of them have plagiarized the subscriber agreement and maybe there should be some sort of checklist. She says in the Metro, most have taken their subscriber agreement, altered, and used it. There needs to be some kind of checklist indicating they have executed a subscriber agreement with the sponsoring agency and whether or not you want to see the agreement.

Glaccum says they don't need to see it now but he's just throwing it out there. He says capturing the conversation at the committee level should be good – asking who the sponsor is and telling them they're committing to being responsible, etc.

Chair states it goes back to training and that we should hold their feet to the fire about doing the training, backgrounds, and other things.

Juth says in lieu of creating a 4<sup>th</sup> participant level, anybody already a participant on the system with a participation plan would be required to modify their plan to list all the users they're sponsoring. They would be responsible for all those agencies and have to come before the TOC with a modified plan indicating all agencies they are sponsoring. Any time they add an agency they are sponsoring, they would have to come back again with another modification. If there is a problem, you could pull out the plan and would know who the sponsor was to talk to them.

Glaccum says he likes the first idea better. The sponsored user, regardless of where they are, if not fitting the definition of where we let people do what they want in regions, the sponsor should come through this group, OTC, and the SECB. What we want to do is figure out how we stay consistent in the NW and SE.

Mines says she likes it, because going through this makes people think about those things they didn't think about when first talked about it. You have to write something down and commit, but when they have to put it in writing, it means they have to think about everything that could result from it, like if the SECB decides it's time to upgrade.



Chair says that way there would be a track record ten years from now when everyone here now is gone.

Mines asks if more input is needed on 2, 3, 4, and 5, or if there are thoughts about adding other things.

Glaccum says he knows she wanted to work number 3, but he circled long-term support. He doesn't think it is appropriate and that it needs to be made clear what sponsorship means.

Rohret says they have language on page 2 of their standard that talks about how they would be authorized for emergency coordination with authorized users during an emergency and that it might be some good language to plagiarize.

Mines says she actually had that highlighted and asks Rohret if she thinks the committee needs to add Metro's language under number 5.

Rohret says she does and that if someone's going to be a sponsor, there should be documentation of that assigned letter – what they have, whether or not they show the subscriber agreement or not, the number of radios they already have. It probably would include a fleetmap. She says it should be very targeted and limited. She says the Metro requires some sort of contract showing what actions are relating to that and referred to bulleted items.

Mines says we can add those and that she likes those, too.

Chair asks if there's a future cost of hardware or anything like that and asks if they're responsible for that if they're a sponsor. He says it might be talked about more in the next item of the agenda.

Rohret says they don't list that in their standard, but that's because they are signing subscriber agreement with that agency. The agency will determine if they want them to buy more radios or if they get them from the subscriber and says MESB doesn't address that.

Glaccum asks if they would be in a position to tell the agency to decrease their radio use.

Rohret states yes.

Abley says that is accounted for in this draft, too.

Mines says we'll make some changes and bring it back.

Glaccum says the spirit of the standard title kind of turned into something different.

Mines asks like sponsored participant?

Abley suggests we don't even introduce a new standard and just put this all in the participation standard.

There is agreement within the group.

Glaccum says it may very well fit there modifying it.

Chair asks if there is anything more on that standard.

- **Non-Government Agencies Using the ARMER System. (Glaccum)**

Glaccum says there was conversation at the OTC yesterday that was close to this but it needs to be treated separately.

He says there was a formal request to allow a tow truck on the system. After very good discussion where a lot of regions weighed in, law enforcement overwhelmingly supported the idea and thought that talking to the tow truck driver was more important to them than people who fix sewers, and they are allowed to use the system. Tow truck

drivers are part of a coordinated effort on the scene of something, and there was support for that. The action was to forward it to this committee.

He states subsequent action was that OTC wanted to at least allow them to move forward with something. St Cloud was willing to move forward and keep it just on the St. Cloud Subsystem with St. Cloud tactical talkgroups only in the radios until the Steering Committee had a chance to review it further.

He continues that the request is for tow truck to tow truck while law enforcement is involved at the scene. As for the tow truck or private tow, the ARMER resources are not to be used. The difference is that a tow truck should be able to coordinate with the officers. Glaccum asks Abley if he can fill in anything else.

Abley says it is important to note that no internal, regular business will be conducted. One of the use situations provided was like a snow emergency, and the only resources St. Cloud proposed putting in were the city's mutual aid channels.

He says that MnDOT offered an interesting precedent, where they hire bridge contractors and will give them a radio with one talkgroup. The contractor can only talk to necessary government staff. He says that additionally, whether or not it was approved in first place, there is precedent, as they are doing this in Big Stone County already.

Chair asks if they gave the tow agency one of their radios.

Abley says Tom (Justin) didn't go into detail but suggested the county had issued radios to the tow trucks and that there is only one tow company in Big Stone county. He says the Committee and Board should follow up on that issue if they don't like it.

Rohret says when she read the packet, she thought it was to use internally, which would not go with the rules of use of public safety frequencies. This does follow the use, and Roger (Laurence) had email conversation with Justin about it. She says what they're asking for is under official actions of helping the police department. She is OK with the limited use and doesn't care if tow trucks are talking to each other if it is for the same incident but not to ask where they're going to lunch.

She says if St. Cloud takes responsibility for the radios and that they are only staying on whatever system they need to stay on, it should be OK and that the concern was whether it would be used for day-to-day internal communications.

Chair says that was his concern.

Rohret says you don't have to sponsor any of that but everything needs to be clear under these situations.

Juth says language should be something like tow operators operating under the authority or direction of a law enforcement officer are authorized to use ARMER radios.

Rohret states she wouldn't want anything specific like tow trucks spelled out in a standard but like a generalized standard that can cover any source of random sponsored entities or individuals. She says we may start getting more requests because of that.

Chair asks what State Patrol uses on the interstate, as an example.

Juth says they don't have contracted services, but they have approved towing companies with specific geographical areas they operate in.

Chair asks Juth what talkgroups they would use.

Juth responds they would probably have them use one of the district's tactical channels unless it was a bigger event, where they would use a regional talkgroup.

Chair brings up the point about fleetmaps.

Juth says if this became something broader and was approved, maybe the Central Region would just say that one of their CM talkgroups would be a tow interop talkgroup across region.

Glaccum wants to clarify. He says it's easy to look at a situation like blizzard conditions and that two cars piled up on 94 is why they would be there already, but they could be on ARMER if they were interacting with law enforcement. He says he likes the language and suggests we can say that if law enforcement is coordinating, you're authorized to use the radio system.

He says he finds himself supporting this more and more, but there were standards we thought were good until this. Now maybe the sponsor tells us which talkgroup will be used and they are responsible. It stops there, and the region is exempted.

Rohret says these radios should be exempted from the standard.

Mines states this standard should have a requirement for that.

Glaccum says they're exempt from ICS zones and any of the mandated zones we've said must be in your radio.

Abley asks if that is exempted voluntarily. He says there are cases where a sponsored organization should have mutual aid resources and some that shouldn't.

Glaccum says if we have to revisit the decision, Bruce (Hegrenes) brought up at yesterday's meeting that if there is a major event and we have to coordinate, you patch and watch your home zone patching.

He says if there is a situation where a regional TAC needs to be used and the sponsoring agency takes a local resource and patches it to the regional resource, it works. There are technical limitations we had as far as law enforcement being left out in the field if they patched to LTAC or something, but he doesn't think it applies to this group. If the tow can't talk for a while if they break down the patch, it is no big deal.

Thakur asks if anyone knows the actual number of tow trucks, looking at the Metro area.

Rohret says she doesn't think it will apply to Metro.

Thakur says there will be more that turn out.

Rohret mentions others who would be included and asks how far we are going to go. She mentions Excel, Center Point and says gas lines break all the time.

Thakur says the issue we are trying to avoid is that you can't distinguish between the Metro and St. Cloud. He says the legitimacy of the need is clear, but you can't distinguish between them.

Rohret says if it is a sponsored request, it has to have the approval of someone else and a Metro tow truck will be different.

Thakur says if they have radios, there will be more people going to the legislature saying they need money for upgrading their radios, too.

Rohret says that's part of the whole sponsorship thing. If St. Cloud is sponsoring them, they use St. Cloud radios. However the tow truck has it in their agreement, it's either St. Cloud or their own responsibility.

Thakur asks if there is a way to make sure they will not use it for non-transportation use and wonders who is going to police that, St. Cloud or MnDOT.

Rohret says by limiting what's in their radios.

Mines says it should be St. Cloud, as the sponsoring agency.

Abley states it's like any other user group using radios inappropriately. The city is responsible for them, and the city might have to shut their radios off if there is something inappropriate.

Rohret says if MnDOT hears something inappropriate, they can tell the city they need to do that.

Thakur says it would be very difficult to do that because anything MnDOT does or says about any entity using system becomes a political issue.

Glaccum says having a sponsoring agency lets us hold them accountable. He says he doesn't think it's unreasonable to be overprotective because of the overall impact on the system. He says people will know that it's actually being watched but that overall usage doesn't seem out of line, but it usually occurs when someone notices a problem and says something.

Chair asks if grant money could be used for sponsoring tow truck radios.

Mines says she has a problem with that. There are counties in certain regions that don't have things they need, but grant money has been used to purchase regional loggers. Now there's no more grant money. If they want to go to the legislature and can convince them to give money out of the general fund, that's one thing, but she thinks the line needs to be drawn at grant money for a private company regardless of how much they're helping out. She says if the county has extra money and wants to give them radios, that's up to them.

Rohret says there should be some sort of rule and guidance somewhere.

Abley says even with state dollars there has to be an administrative rule or law somewhere about state dollar money going to private companies for a grant program.

Mines says 911 fees can't be used for radios.

Chair says there are specific rules about that.

Glaccum says he would like to see all language about NGO's taken out of public safety and define them as a public safety agency. North Memorial is private and not for profit, and as soon as they say grant dollars for government, they are excluded. A lot of counties say they need money for this, and they do something different with it, so they're in violation.

Mines says to run them through the grant workgroup.

Chair says it could be an issue.

Jim Bayer asks how many radios/id numbers we are looking at.

Rohret asks if he is talking about the St. Cloud request.

Bayer says yes, if it starts with St. Cloud, there will be others in the Metro.

Rohret says she doesn't think there's any way to come up with number of radios or what that would mean.

Glaccum says the precedent has been set and they would have to find a sponsor.

Chair asks if you limit the number of portables and mobiles they can have.

Juth mentions that cities contract with a tow company to provide towing within their city for whatever the needs are. He says it could be an interesting issue to see what Plymouth would do and what the response back would be from the Hennepin County radio system manager, for example.

Rohret says because they're all subscribers to Hennepin County, Hennepin County has to say yes, and they would have to say number of radios they would be adding or at least the way it's written, that should be included.

Juth says Minneapolis does it for a number of tow trucks. He doesn't know how many contracts they have, but it could be 30-40 when they do a tow emergency.

Abley says that's a City of Minneapolis user, though. Hennepin County could say they don't like it and won't do it, like other Minneapolis user groups.

Mines says there are other options for ways to interface with the radio system if they don't have VHF radios any more.

Chair says he was thinking of the number of ID's and asks if you give them 40 IDs if they want 40 mobiles and what happens if they want portables after that.

Rohret says that would be in the sponsorship and participation plan.

Mines says this particular request doesn't have any number listed.

Glaccum says these are issues we have to take on but that the larger issue has to be addressed.

Thakur states he is very concerned that during a major issue, there could be a lot of people on the system, and he is not too sure what it would take for the system to get filled up before radios wouldn't work.

Rohret asks how this was done when everyone was on VHF and if they were able to communicate then.

Abley states it was no problem because everyone was on the same frequency.

Rohret asks if this is something that came up because of someone thinking they need ARMER, because they suddenly couldn't talk with someone the way they used to, or was it that they were told they should do this, too?

Glaccum says he's aware of some counties in Greater MN that allow tow trucks to talk on their system, whether it's right or wrong. He says the cost of radios become cost prohibitive and that this is interesting, because the tow company wants to purchase the radios. He likes that it is completely up to St. Cloud to make the decision and says with Big Stone, they don't have a subsystem. They're sponsors, but they're committing state resources to the tow truck. Maybe this becomes a consideration, especially when we start having capacity issues. He says he would look at Big Stone's usage independently whether sponsored or not.

Chair says they dispatch for Big Stone, and he's never heard anything. He wonders if they gave them one of their radios and the ID would just be one of Big Stone County's ID.

Thakur says he reiterates the legitimacy of the request as being appropriate for interaction between tow truck drivers and officers and says he sees a tremendous amount of benefit.

Chair says they have six tow companies in their county and they use a rotation for them. All the agencies would need to have radios.

Juth asks what happens when big rig tow operators go all over the state, wanting state access.

Abley says whoever sponsors that would be responsible.

Mines says we don't have a vote on any committee level.

Juth mentions a statewide towing talkgroup.

Glaccum says to take what has been put together and talk about sponsorship. We can take the language back to St. Cloud and have an interim solution so we're not tying them up. If we clean up language to get that done, we can tell

them some of the parameters we're looking to put around this, and they can come through the approval process once we have those standards. That seems like an appropriate pathway. The language we'll have them use is that language that we can vet out in the standard.

Abley says another action item will be to follow up with Big Stone County and report back to this committee in case someone's mistaken or they really did do something they shouldn't have.

Chair asked if anyone else had anything about this. There was nothing else mentioned.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no Old Business.

Next meeting 1:00 on April 9 at North Memorial.

**Meeting adjourned at 2:54**

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux / Tom Wolf / Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur / Tim Lee / Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson / Rick Juth  
Tarek Tomes / Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek / Jim Bayer  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.  
Minnesota Ambulance Association  
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board  
MnDOT  
MN State Patrol  
MnIT  
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office  
Central MN ESB

#### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Brandon Abley, DPS ECN  
Cathy Anderson, DPS ECN

#### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:00 with a quorum.

#### Approval of Agenda

Chair asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**Motion to approve Agenda: Tom Wolf**

**Motion Seconded: Jim Bayer**

**Motion carries.**

#### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

Chair asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. It is noted Cathy Anderson should be removed from attendance and Rick Juth should be added. There was a question as to whether Mike Henrion had attended the meeting, but upon review of the conference recording, he was found to be in attendance via phone.

**Motion to approve previous meeting's minutes with changes noted: Tom Wolf**

**Motion seconded: Dave Van Thiel**

**Minutes Approved.**

## Discussion Items:

- **Standard 1.11.4 – Training ARMER End Users (Cathy Anderson)**

Anderson explains they had incorporated a Standards workgroup to go over this and the next standard. She says the workgroup tried to make changes based on feedback from the Steering Committee to give people something to go by and make it a little more stringent. She says the group worked hard and was multi-faceted but would certainly be open to some feedback.

Anderson went through the standard, pointing out the additions, starting with section 1. Sections 1, 2, and 3 were determined to be OK as written.

The group came up with three tiers of users based on an agency's use and added the note about failing to properly train does not put an agency into the just-in-time user category.

Juth says we felt there might be agencies and users across the state that might circumvent the standard and consider all training to be just-in-time.

Tom Wolf asks if every agency would have to do their own training, based on this standard.

Anderson says this standard is encouraging them to develop their own training plan so everyone in their agency is trained consistently for their job, whether they are police officers, public works, dispatchers, etc., and that each group should be trained at the same level.

Juth says the agency will have a training plan for the new or incumbent officer, and there will be some sort of new or annual training for the incumbent and new officer, along with a training manual. Somewhere in that training manual, there should be a module that says ARMER or radio system training. That training plan is based off the recommendations in this standard, so it's really just one more tool, like if you train the officer on emergency driving or use of a Taser, the radio is just one more module in that training plan.

Rohret says that's not to say as a region, they wouldn't put regional training materials out to help with some of that, but there would be local things. She cites the example of when Scott County came on the system, they (MESB) trained all the trainers and gave them the curriculum.

Wolf says so they have it and now they can train with it. He says he didn't know how intense it was or how much redundancy there would be.

Mines says when the project got rolled out, people got initially trained, but now there's the issue of ongoing and refresher training we want to address.

Rohret says regarding the just-in-time training, she understands what the standard is trying to say, but she would like to see more definition with it. She says at the bottom of page 1 where it says, "The Incident Commander or his/her designee will be responsible for providing "just-in-time training appropriate for the role of each user," and that could be read as though the Incident Commander is going to be doing just-in-time training for users for all the earlier categories and thinks it needs a little more clarification. She points out the just-in-time user is really like the volunteer at a search being handed a radio.

Anderson continues on with the standard as written and explains that the workgroup used the terms "highly recommended" as opposed to "mandatory", because there was a lot of controversy with mandating something that might cause an agency to have to pay overtime for employees.

She points out as long as employees are getting trained to the level of the (Alex Tech) modules, the content could be given in a classroom setting as opposed to watching the modules. It is hoped that agencies will make sure their employees understand all the necessary and appropriate information.



The workgroup came up with these four modules because it felt those were the major ones and had the most important information.

Anderson talked about the portion in the standard about the Alexandria Technical & Community College where the modules are housed and where they can be accessed from.

Rohret asks if every individual person needs a password or if an agency can get a generic agency password.

She says a county gave her comments that they didn't like Alex Tech being called out specifically and they think a link should just be provided on the ARMER web page.

Anderson says the reason they went with that is because that's what the training was provided for, in conjunction with ECN and the training is for everyone coming on the ARMER system as a way for everyone to learn about the system. It's consistent training so we know what's in there, and we had many subject matter experts look at it before it was posted.

Rohret says it wasn't her comment.

Anderson asks what the desire of the group is – does that get changed or get left the way it is.

Abley says he understands the comment that Jill is relaying and says that Alex Tech is our provider in a sense, but it is our training website. It is the Department's and the SECB's training objectives that are being met and Alex Tech is providing them, but to say the Alex Tech training website kind of sells the sponsors short and it's just a twist of language.

Anderson asks how it should be written, if it is through ECN or something on that order.

Rohret suggests something like we (the State) created the training, but it's hosted on the Alex Tech site.

Mines makes a suggestion for verbiage consisting of, "These courses are SECB sanctioned or created, hosted through Alex Tech."

Rohret says she would go with created on behalf of SECB.

Mines suggests, "These courses, created on behalf of SECB, are hosted through the Alexandria Technical & Community College online website."

Anderson asks if that sounds better.

Juth says it does and also to add instructions to gain access to these courses is available here or something to that effect.

Anderson answers an earlier question from Rohret regarding user name and password information for the online training modules and says that departments can decide whether they want each user to have their own password, which would be if they wanted to track an individual's progress. She says she typically gives out the generic information for the region, as most agencies have said they don't need to track individual progress, and people can print out certificates for their files. If an agency wants to track individual use, they can get an individual log on from Linda Muchow.

Anderson continues on with the standard about the topics that will be considered the minimum training competencies.

Rohret says looking at the next standard, there is language, "...if applicable" which should be added to this standard since not all topics may be needed by all users. She says if it's mandated, how much do you have to go through on

this with something they may not understand or something that doesn't necessarily affect their daily use of the system and knowing how to use it.

Anderson says that is why the workgroup didn't state exactly what needed to be brought up. At a minimum, the group decided it was important for everyone to have some sense of things like affiliation and what the ramifications are, even though they didn't train all of that in Hennepin, but this came from a very diverse group of users.

Mines says she can see that they should have some information about all the topics, but depending on the user being trained, they might not need as much information and suggests adding a comment at the top in parenthesis, "How detailed the information presented pertaining to each of the items below depends on the audience receiving the training."

Rohret says that makes sense and is similar to, "if applicable," citing an example that even if you don't use encryption, you should know what it sounds like if you are on a scene using a shared talkgroup and someone is using encryption but is not supposed to be using it.

Bayer asks if we even track how many times just-in-time users are on the system.

Rohret says no and for all the special events and times people are given radios and told not to turn the knob, there are many more times than we know about.

Mines asks if we should add this behind just-in-time users, "The level of detail of each topic should be tailored to class audience."

Chair says that makes sense.

Rohret says that can be added to the next standard, as well.

Anderson asks if anyone has an issue with the things that are listed, after adding the verbiage suggested, and says she doesn't believe it hurts to have these items in the list. She says even though training may not go in-depth for some of the items, people should still be familiar with them.

Mines says her thought on adding, "if applicable," rather than the sentence she said is that it becomes more subjective as to whether or not they add it, and she feels everyone should at least be told about what these terms are, because at some time, they will run into the terms, unless they're just-in-time users, where it wouldn't count. She says it would be her recommendation that we don't say, "if applicable" after each or at the top, and she would just leave it the level of detail of each topic should be tailored to the class audience. That way, they understand who needs to have more detail and who doesn't on each of these topics.

Chair says that makes sense.

Rohret mentions that scanning should probably have scanning SOA's added to the list.

Anderson says that is a good thing to add and asks if there are any other thoughts, deletions, additions. She says the workgroup really tried to incorporate the most critical aspects of everything, listing what everyone using the system has to know at a minimum.

She continues with the standard after the list and says the workgroup hopes every agency is already communicating policy changes, but we all know there might be some who are less diligent about it.

Regarding the paragraph talking about refresher training, Rohret says she likes the concept but asks for clarification about refresher training and wonders if it's going through everything again or if it could be focused on one or two items that someone may be having a hard time with. She says that was a question that people had and would like feedback on.

Anderson says the group did not go into specifics about refresher training but in essence, how we have it written is so you could count going over something a user was having difficulty with, like changing zones or scanning, as refresher training. She says the committee left it up in the air intentionally so we didn't have to dictate exactly what would have to be done.

Juth says it could be a challenge with what they address in the training and it would be different for every agency doing refresher training. They need to determine what, if any, the issues are. It is hoped that whoever is doing the training, whether annual or quarterly, they could go back and say we had this occur, so let's review the standard on pursuits or the use of interop talkgroups – regional, statewide, or if they're talking about training dispatchers, let's review patching or things like that. They could go back retroactively from their last training and be aware of things that came up that were red flags and then touch on those, not go back to the beginning.

Anderson says that's why they wrote it the way they did about the refresher training ensuring competency of all skills taught in initial training, which should incorporate these things. She says this is common sense, but we know from experience that this stuff isn't being trained consistently and cites an example of when she attended the dispatch training in Central Minnesota. There were some dispatchers in the class who weren't familiar with the pursuit standard or best practice guides and said we know the information isn't being disseminated and people aren't being checked. She says they listed these items as a minimum guideline for agencies that might not always think of each topic and asks what the thought of the group is.

Juth says he's guessing in some places, depending on the role, they do a lot of training on a regular basis, but some, like law enforcement agencies, may only have an annual training to keep post requirements up. On the dispatcher side, we don't really have a sense of what dispatcher training encompasses for refresher – annual, quarterly, etc. He says the biggest challenge for a lot of them, especially the farther out you get from the Metro, is the high-risk, low-frequency incident where there's not any time to think about what you're supposed to be doing with the radio to establish interoperability.

Juth says that's where agencies have to have something in place to train people on a regular basis. He mentions ideas of doing scenarios like if this happened now, what would you do but doesn't think there's a lot of that going on. It becomes an issue when something significant occurs, and then communications created a liability, exposure, or officer safety issue because people in the role of dispatcher weren't aware of what they were supposed to do or didn't remember because the only time they ever heard about it was when they went through initial ARMER training.

He says another aspect of this is the shift in significance of role for the dispatcher on the ARMER system. It's a more critical role, and the dispatcher has to have knowledge at a level higher than the field user, because they should be in a position to direct personnel to talkgroups. In some agencies across the state, this role hasn't been embraced by all who need to embrace it, and it's still being field driven.

He used an example of a recent situation in International Falls where the trooper decided on his own to do a mock scenario on LTAC1. State Patrol dispatch shut that down as soon as they heard traffic, and they didn't even know about it. Dispatchers have to be empowered by their agency heads to recognize inappropriate use and tell the users they cannot conduct that activity on a certain talkgroup.

Chair says that's a good point and maybe it should be put in the basic training or training we talked about earlier to field units, every day users, what dispatch role is when you have a big event or that type of thing.

Juth says in any of these training standards, a role of clarity for the different disciplines should be established and also each role within the discipline. It's different now than it was in the VHF world.

Rohret says in the Dispatcher standard, there is a bullet point for Management of Talkgroups, Dispatcher's role in selection of talkgroups and Dispatcher's role in directing responders to talkgroups - maybe that could be carried over but not go as in depth as you would for dispatchers.

Chair says a reminder for the field users.

Anderson says that would be consistent with what Mines said about the training being on the level of the users and says it can be added.

Rohret says she likes that these are guidelines and that there is flexibility. She believes people will be more at ease with knowing there is flexibility and says there was a question as to what maintaining adequate records consists of, whether it is a note in an employee's file, is there a checklist or a form, etc., or if it is open and up to each agency.

Anderson says the group thought it could be left open and up to the agency, with the hope that agencies are at least making a note of some kind in their file when someone has had training. The point was brought up about officers who go to other agencies being able to bring all the information showing what they had been trained on.

Regarding this standard, it is up in the air, hoping agencies would track when someone was trained on something, or the refresher training someone has, at least make a note in the file like an annual review. If an agency decides they'll make a spreadsheet or something more above or beyond, they can certainly do that. Maybe when the standard is finalized, it can be explained this is open to handle how you want with your record keeping but it's highly recommended you keep good records.

She cites an example of many years ago when she was dispatching at Hennepin County and went to a conference where she found out if the pre-arrival instructions dispatchers were giving out were not uniform and consistent, there was a liability involved. She hopes agencies keep good records and can show someone was trained the way they should have been in case anything happens.

Juth says he hopes every unit of government, sheriff's office, local police department, etc., has a personnel file on every employee and probably even has a sub-file within it for training. It may be that the training record is a separate form saying they attended this, but there's a training file on that person. He says this isn't creating any undue amount of work for any agency, and it could be something saying they conducted training, and ARMER training could be part of that. It could take place quarterly or annually, but it would just be part of the record.

He says if there's a challenge or someone questions it, the agency can say the last time a person was trained on something. He says if supervisors do some kind of informal review of a procedure like at a console or in a squad car, they should make notes in the person's file saying they counseled or did refresher with them on this date and this time. It isn't anything they shouldn't already be doing.

Bayer says at a minimum, the agency should keep the curriculum they went over so if someone says you went to this training on this day, this is what we went over, there shouldn't be any issues.

Chair says when they hire new people, they have a check off list – they see a radio guy and a person in charge of dispatch to go through how to work the radio and then get checked off. He says a lot of that is already in place but thinks there are agencies who might not be on top of that, and says you should have what you did for training for the year, since some of it is reimbursed by POST.

Juth asks if we had an SECB curriculum that could be POST certified for points, is that better or can an individual agency develop and submit their curriculum for POST certification.

Bayer says an individual agency can submit their curriculum for POST certification.

Juth says that should be part of it, then, as it makes it more formal.

Bayer says it's easier for the police side and he's not sure if fire has something like that.

Anderson says the group did leave that to each agency to decide what they want to do.

Chair asks if we have a list of local system administrators.

Mines asks Tim Lee if they have a list.

Lee says not necessarily and that everybody who signed a contract to be part of the system listed someone who was in charge or who we would contact to deal with the contract, but he's not sure they all know who their administrators are.

Mines asks if there was a recommendation Juth wanted Steering to make, based on all his discussion.

Juth asks if she means about the curriculum and says no, each individual agency can build their own curriculum and submit it for POST board credits if they choose.

Mines asks Chair if each region keeps a file on who the system administrators are so if there are changes and there's no notification to MnDOT, the region knows who the system administrator is.

Chair says he doesn't know for sure and that someone should check into it to see if there is a current list so we know who we're supposed to go to.

Mines says the reason she asked the question is there was something brought up at OTC yesterday about the list of system ID's and talkgroups and the overages people had, they had gone to OTC and asked for so many, but now there are more than what was on record as being approved. She says many of those counties listed had question marks by the system administrator, so she doesn't believe we have a very accurate list at MnDOT. She says maybe we need something in a standard or somewhere else that regions should keep an active list of system administrators.

Chair asks if that list should be brought up to the Board.

Mines says the real issue is making sure MnDOT has an accurate list, because if there's an issue, they need to know who to go to so they can address the issue.

Lee says John (Anderson) can run a list of who had accounts on the system, but whoever is entering radios into the system might not be the person who's responsible within the county or city. If you look at the contracts signed with counties, they are usually signed by the county board, so we don't know who's responsible for making sure they follow the standards. He says the person they have down is the name of the person who has access to enter ID's within their account and may not be the person who's actually in charge in the county.

Chair says who's doing training and keeping up on that.

Juth says at one time we had agency head versus...

Anderson says in the Dispatch standard under Management, the committee put that agency management should be responsible for all that stuff, because sometime the supervisors at an agency don't know who their local system administrator is and they either go to the Communications Center Manager or make their own decisions. Anderson asks if the Committee wants it to show agency management.

Rohret says she thinks the request should be made through the subsystem owner and says that if the problem is in Hennepin County, Hennepin County should be able to go to that agency and ask for their training records. She says some will be within that subsystem and there will be independent agencies but believes that anyone who asks for training records should be able to access them.

Chair says he's wondering about who is actually responsible for what's going on in smaller counties or agencies and asks if it's the Sheriff.

Juth says he thinks it is.

Chair says most of the time, Sheriffs are running the PSAP, so he feels it would go to that person as the administrator of the system.

Anderson asks how the Committee wants it worded, if it should read these records will be produced the request of the subsystem owner.

Mines asks if we could say, "These records will be provided at the request of the local administrator/subsystem owner/agency management."

Rohrert says she thinks it's fine as it is written, because a local system administrator could be the subsystem.

Chair asks if we want to define local system admin or if it's the Sheriff.

Juth says there are two different positions and one local system administrator is really the technical administrator, the real administrator of the system is the Sheriff. He feels the person we've been referring to as the local system administrator is a system technical administrator - the person doing all configuring and technical aspects of administrating the system. He says the real administrative manager of the system is the Sheriff as the agency head.

Chair agrees with that and says if something goes wrong, it is going to go to the agency head.

Rohret says at some point, possibly years ago, we were talking about defining more clearly a system manager versus a system administrator. She says she doesn't remember if it ever really got resolved but assumes it would have gone into a standard if it did get resolved.

Juth says what we've been defining as system administrator is the technical administrator, and he or she is acting at the direction of the Sheriff as the administrative manager of that system. The Sheriff will define what that person will be doing and not doing, and how the system will be set up will come from recommendations of technical people, but the ultimate decision is made by the agency head. .

Chair says who they have doing what, like if IT is going to take care of running the system more or if they have a designated person to take care of it.

Juth says they will go to the Sheriff with the recommendation of how to configure the system, but the final decision is made by the Sheriff, whether he or she feels operationally that this is the way we want the system or not.

Mines says one of her concerns is that this gives the give the local system administrator enough authority to ask for it. She says she heard something at some kind of training that local system administrators wanted more strength behind the ability to ask for something like that. She says she doesn't know what the circumstances are with that particular agency, but it is concerning that some local administrators feel they're not empowered enough to ask for those things.

Juth says in the role assignment with this whole thing, there are people doing things within the ARMER system that are more IT now than ever before, and they may not even be under the chain of command of the Sheriff or within the Sheriff's Department. He says it becomes challenging for the Sheriff or Chief of Police to maneuver through this to get anything done.

Bayer says Juth is right, because more and more of the Metro area has more non-sworn people running these and mentions Anoka County, saying the PSAP Manager reports to the county board and not the Sheriff.

Rohret says the standard requires that agencies shall be responsible for maintaining adequate training records and that is more than they had before, even though it doesn't define adequate.

Mines says it helps give them a little more.

Bayer says it doesn't address timing, either, like how long they have to produce the records.

Anderson asks if we want to put two weeks or an amount of time in the standard, and the decision is made to add, "within a reasonable amount of time."

Anderson continues on with the standard as written.

Rohret says we should check the non-compliance standard to make sure this standard matches the verbiage that is in the non-compliance standard.

Chair asks if there is any other discussion on that standard.

Mines asks if we make changes to the standard and bring it back to this committee or move it on to the Interop Committee. The decision is made to move it on to the Interop Committee after the changes are made to the standard.

Anderson says she will send it to the workgroup and ask for thoughts after the changes are made, as well.

**Bayer makes a motion to move 1.11.4 on to the Interop Committee.**

**Wolf seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

- **Standard 1.11.3 – Training Dispatchers (Cathy Anderson)**

Anderson goes through the standard, starting with Section 1. She notes that there were a few words added through Section 3, but the changes weren't major.

For Section 4, Rohret suggests adding in the same language Mines suggested for 1.11.4, "How detailed the information presented pertaining to each of the items below depends on the audience receiving the training."

Anderson asks if anyone has more topics to add to the list and says the workgroup thought it was pretty inclusive.

She continues on with the standard and indicates the training portion was important to include working with local people, regional, statewide and did not list how often.

Chair says some will do it maybe once a year that is a critical incident.

Juth says the other thing that goes with this is there should be in the mind of those creating exercises or drills, no matter how small they are, they need to consider the dispatcher role in that. Sometime Emergency Managers create the drills, whether they are simulated or full-blown drills, and they often consider the first responders and may not consider the fact that if something were to occur, the first person to become aware of it is the dispatcher. Most of the time, you could consider a dispatcher the incident commander until someone else arrives and takes that job over, because the dispatcher is making all the decisions and notifications until someone is on site and takes it over.

Rohret says in the previous standard, the first sentence under Section 4 should be added in the same place to this standard, as well.

Anderson continues on with the standard and says she will add the same verbiage in the paragraph right before Section 5 that is added to the previous standard, "within a reasonable amount of time."

She continues on with Section 5, indicating they added the paragraph mandating dispatchers in agencies migrating to ARMER or implementing interoperability measures with ARMER users from Legacy systems to view the online training module for their agency-specific dispatch console prior to operating independently, if applicable.

Mines suggests using the same verbiage under paragraph 3 that was added to the previous standard for the training part. She asks if an agency can track a specific person with a generic user name and password.

Anderson says we could put something in the standard about if an agency wants to track individual use they need to get individual log on information, but if they aren't concerned about that, they can all use the generic log on and password.

Rohret says if we add that, we need to make it clear that an individual log on is not required for each user.

Anderson asks if we want to add that or leave it the way it is. She says she explains when to people who call for log on information that they can track individual use if they want, but so far nobody has chosen to do that and just take the generic log on information.

Juth says it's also easier for an agency to do it that way with people coming and going.

**Motion made by Tom Wolf to move Standard 1.11.3 to the Interop Committee.**

**Second by Dave Van Thiel.**

**Motion carries.**

## **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no Old Business.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.



---

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2014

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

Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret

Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn

Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth

Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel

Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer

Michael Henrion

##### Representing

Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.

Minnesota Ambulance Association

Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

MnDOT

MN State Patrol

MnIT

Hennepin County Sheriff's Office

Central MN ESB

#### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN

Cathy Anderson, DPS ECN

Carol-Linnea Salmon, DPS ECN

#### Call to Order

Vice Chair Glaccum called meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

#### Approval of Agenda

Jackie Mines asked to add to the agenda a discussion of priorities of funding.

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

**Jim Bayer moves to approve the agenda.**

**Rick Juth seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

#### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

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

**Juth moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.**

**Jill Rohret seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## Discussion Items:

- **Standard 1.10.2 – Radio User ID Requests (Jackie Mines)**

Mines begins a review of the recommended changes to the standard from Steering's last meeting. Mines reports that Ms. Rohret had suggested that the committee take a look at the metro region's standard to see if there is language in it that might be useful. Mines requests discussion with committee regarding what wording from metro standard is pertinent for the state standard. Mines asked for a reminder of what the committee decided to call the entities. She remembered a discussion of not using the term non-governmental entities but could not remember what was decided.

Glaccum suggests that it might have been (or that it could be) the wording non-public safety/non-public service.

Mines reads the second sentence: "this would include but not be limited to the Red Cross, National Guard, transportation companies, power companies, MnDOT, and hospitals..." and asks if that should be kept or changed.

Committee discusses what might be considered a public safety or public service and looks for an example. It is agreed that National Guard and MnDOT are not good examples. Red Cross is a good example. The discussion raises the question of whether non-public safety / non-public service is the best title for the standard. Could be too broadly interpreted (snowplows, etc.) The committee looks at the language in the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) standard.

Mines likes the examples listed in the MESB standard: "Examples include but are not limited to railroads, utilities, pipelines, refineries, haz-mat response contractors, vehicle recovery contractors, commercial aviation, educational institutions, large manufacturing plants, large retail & entertainment facilities, private security contractors, etc."

Glaccum likes the MESB language "non-government entities and individuals not specifically addressed in other ARMER" elsewhere. He likes the title "System Access by Non-Governmental Organizations" but suggests adding "and Individuals".

Rohret responds that the standard title is actually "Non-governmental Use for Emergency Coordination." She says that the MESB made the language very specific so the entities may not use the system for their day-to-day operations. This is where the sponsoring comes in so, for example, Burlington Northern Railroad is sponsored by Anoka County and the Minneapolis Skyway Retail Association is sponsored by Minneapolis. The standard is to clarify that the uses are very limited and specific and not for day-to-day operations.

Mines notes that the MESB standard states the FCC rules and she likes that the FCC wording very clearly states that it is supposed to be for emergency use and not day-to-day use. "The licensee is responsible for taking necessary precautions to prevent unauthorized operation of units not under its control."

Glaccum asks if the committee wants to restrict the standard to I.D. requests or make the title broader to be about using the system. How about "use of the ARMER system by non-governmental entities or organizations not elsewhere defined?" Really long for a title – can we shorten it up?

Rohre responds that the 1.10.0 standard is entitled "Requesting Participation and Participation Plan Changes". If this is a subversion of that standard it could be titled "Requesting Participation by Non-governmental Entities or Organizations". Suggests to put "not elsewhere defined" in the standard itself but not in the title..

Glaccum changed his thoughts on using the term individual and prefers “entities or organizations”. Asks if the committee wants to return to the language “non-public safety / non-public service. Suggests the title “Requesting Participation by Non-governmental Entities or Non-public Safety/Service Organizations”. Start with this and fine tune-it later.

Mines asks about including the policy background so the FCC rules are stated.

Rohret suggests looking up the FCC language in case there have been changes since the MESB standard was written.

Glaccum says he dislikes quoting another document that might be updated without our control. We can direct to the FCC section but not quote it so our standard does not include language from another source that may be changed in the future.

Rohret suggests: “A government entity holding an FCC license for the ARMER system may allow radios to be used by certain non-governmental entities with whom the licensee requires cooperation and coordination during an emergency. Such things may be allowed per Section 90.421 of the FCC Rules.”

Mines: Do we want to keep Capabilities and Constraints as listed on our proposed standard?

Glaccum: Do we want to change the wording to say “Non-governmental Entities or Non-public Safety/Service Organizations” instead of “non-first responders”?

Mines: We will make sure we use that same verbiage throughout the standard.

Glaccum: Is the third bullet point under Constraints worthy of being in here? (Non-first responder agencies introduce unique management and funding challenges.)

Mines: I think so because we want to reinforce the idea to the region that is sponsoring the entity that they have to manage it and have to be willing to support the funding of it as it pertains to whatever else they fund.

Rohret suggests adding “training”.

Under *Operational Context* it was discussed to change the wording to say “*determining priorities for participation requests of ...*” It was decided to borrow language from the MSEB standard’s list of examples and to basically take all of paragraph 3 from the MSEB. Discussion of who should be a sponsoring agency. Counties do not hold licenses. Eligible participant raises the question of first tier users verses second tier users. The intent would not be for second tier users to be sponsoring agencies. Should it all be on public safety—fire, law, emergency medical services? If it is for emergency coordination that makes sense. Discussion about including language about emergency coordination early in the standard. Under *Purpose or Objective*.

Mines reads a proposed rewrite: *The purpose of this standard is to establish a policy that will provide criteria for non-public safety/non-public service entities or organizations not specifically addressed in another ARMER standard which in an emergency or under contract require cooperation and coordination with public safety users to be included as “Authorized Users” of the regional 800MHz trunked digital public safety radio system.*

Mines reads from the MESB standard: *These entities must be sponsored and authorized by a governmental entity that holds an FCC license for the ARMER system. This sponsoring agency must be either, a county or a first class city that has a licensed subsystem.*

Discussion of what are the “entities”. Public safety entities. Should they be spelled out-- law, fire, EMS?

Do we want to add a fiscal responsibility? Add “training” to bullet number three under constraints. Under number five, under sponsorship support, list budget, training and enforcement.

Discussion of defining participants.

Juth: Should sponsoring agencies be called “full participants”? Should we consider formalizing levels of participation in the system? Should we think about having everyone on the system be categorized by their participation level? Is there a value in doing that? For example, with this standard we would say to the sponsoring agency that your entity must come forth with an X-level participation plan, just like the full participant has to come through with a plan, and these are the items that must be address in a plan seeking X-level participation and it will be reviewed by the TOC. If we formalize different levels of participation then enforcement could be telling an entity that they are participating at a level for which they have not been approved.

Glacuum: I like the idea of sponsoring participants. We could tighten it up to say sponsoring entities need to be full participants. To be a full participant you meet all that other criteria. Trying to think of an exception. We would want to say public safety (because of Metro Mobility). For example, we wouldn't want an ambulance service with one ambulance sponsoring the Red Cross. It should have to be an entity at some level.

Juth: What about public safety agencies that themselves are sponsored by other agencies—could they be sponsoring agencies when they themselves are sponsored? For example, fire departments in Hennepin County are sponsored by Hennepin County.

Consensus that sponsoring agencies must be full participants. That helps with understanding the fiscal responsibility as well. It should be a public safety entity that holds full participation plan.

Rohret: Technically in most cases the participation plan is owned by the county and administered by the sheriff's office. So would the wording of “public safety entity that holds a full participation plan” really work?

Mines reads this wording: *These entities must be sponsored and authorized by a public safety entity that holds a full participation plan that is on ARMER.*

Discussion that the sheriff's office would need to get approval from the county and that would add another layer of bureaucracy and approval but also gives more attention to the fiscal implications. If it's a legitimate request it should go through. In practice, in many smaller counties, it would be a rubber stamp.

How to swing the pendulum. Either restrict it to full participation or leave it more inclusive and then the risk of smaller entities being able to sponsor. Could phrase it system administrator with public safety approval. Not every county has a system administrator. A lot of counties hire radio companies to be the administrator. System administrator means something different now from when we first started and were smaller.

Consensus to use the language “public safety full participant” for now and revisit it later to consider where there might be holes that would require different language.

Mines: Recommended protocol and standards section. We had rewritten that and included many of the things that MESB has. Ours says: *This entity may be authorized to use the ARMER System for the following types of communications:*

1. *Emergency coordination with other authorized users during an emergency event which is under incident command of a governmental entity*
2. *Coordination among other authorized users in the performance of official governmental activities of the sponsoring licensee.*

*Prohibited use includes internal day-to-day administrative, and non-emergency communications, except where otherwise approved by the SECB.*

Agreement to change the wording under the first bullet to say “public safety entities”. Under the second bullet it should read “sponsoring agency” instead of “sponsoring licensee”.

Mines continues reading the draft state standard: *All requests shall be reviewed by the OTC. However, any requests for new groups or individuals as described in #1 will also be reviewed by the Steering Committee before submission for approval by the SECB.*

Change “as described in #1” to “as defined in the standard”.

Should we add “other committees as deemed appropriate”? Does this need to be spelled out or is it understood? There is agreement that while it seems understood it should be listed in the standard.

Mines: We did not include this sentence from the MESB’s but I like it: *Nothing in the Standard should be construed so as to prohibit a licensee from temporarily issuing radios to non-governmental agencies as necessary to protect life or property.* Do we want to say that for those unusual, once in a lifetime situations?

Rohret: We might add “at an incident”. I think that was the intent.

Glaccum: I think this would create a loophole.

Mines: I see your point. If there was an abuse of the system it would come to the radio board’s attention. No one is ever going to deny someone issuing radios under undue stress.

Decision to leave the sentence out.

Mines: Under *Recommended Procedure*—we made this a little more complicated. We had five evaluation criteria. This was an outline of what needed to be in the sponsored participation plan. The first was *Background Information*. Agency requesting access; reason for request; number of users and radios; deployment time requirements; training plan; fleet map.

The Metro Standard has sponsorship letter; subscriber agreements; copies of contracts.

Agreement that Background section can stay as is.

*Evaluation #2 – Value of Participant Being on ARMER*

Change where it says “first responder” to “public safety agency”.

*Evaluation #3 – Sponsorship (long-term support)*

*Modified participation plan (to include sponsored entity).*

Glacuum: Hamel and Hennepin. Would you change your participation plan to bring someone else in?

We have been inconsistent with modifying plans to add users. Some come before the OTC and we have approved a plan modifications but other, for example Hennepin County, have added users without adding it to their participation plan.

Rohret: That was prior to the OTC.

Agreement that something should be in writing but should it be a modified plan or could it be a letter? Or either one?

When the entity comes before the OTC, the sponsor's letter is part of the participation plan. Then the sponsoring agency does not modify their full participation plan but they have the plan for the sponsored entity on file somewhere. Then the sponsoring agency can also pull the sponsorship at some point in the future with a letter and without needing to modify their participation plan.

We could make a participant template that has a lot of this in it.

Could we use the InterOp participation plan template?

Juth: Instead of listing everything in *Recommended Procedures* you could have a hyperlink to the sponsoring participant's plan. Then it would not necessarily need to be listed in the standard. The standard could just say the recommended entity must present a completed plan and letter from the sponsoring agency. Then if it comes before the committee and the fleet-map has regional talk-groups it would be directed back to the appropriate region.

Consensus of group was to create "Sponsored Participation Plan". Then the SECB has a participant plan template for each level of participation on the website.

Mines: What I have captured is: *Any proposed non-public safety/non-public service entity must provide a completed Sponsored Participation Plan and sponsored letter presented to the OTC.* And then we would provide a link to that Sponsored Participation Plan template on the web site.

Agreement to create a template for a Sponsored Participation Plan.

Technical Considerations, Cost/Feasibility and Management are all good as presented.

Agreement to have the edited standard brought back to the group both as a red-lined and a clean copy.

### **Discussion of Financial Priorities (Jackie Mines)**

Mines: I want to make sure that the Steering Committee understands that future funding priorities have to be considered very soon if there is an increase in funding required or an increase in the fee required to cover it.

I would like the regions to bring forth their needs and requests through the regional radio groups to the OTC so we can discuss whether it is a local responsibility or of the statewide system. What's concerning is that I am not seeing that happen in all cases. I'm wondering if we should be calling out for what needs to be considered from the statewide perspective so that everyone has an equal opportunity to put forth their argument that a need is a statewide responsibility and here's why and so we can talk about how to use the SECB one million dollar allocation each year.

I'm getting pressure from MMB to put the budget together for FY16 and 17 so if we do not discuss our funding priorities soon then it will be pushed out to FY 18 and 19.

I'm concerned that some regions don't understand how the budgeting process works and how long it takes the state to make its funding decisions. We've always had a great deal of flexibility in our budget but our revenue stream is declining and we now have a number of very important Next Generation 911 initiatives that will require additional funding both at the PSAP level and the state level. PSAPs are starting to ask for additional money for technology refresh for all of these items.

My immediate concern is that I need to know what to put in the SECB and regular budgets for the upcoming year *soon*.

We have been mostly reactive and but I would like to be proactive going forward.

Rohret: Contingency fund is for finishing the system but not for ISSI or OTAR or add-ons.

We could have an annual process to look at the greater good.

If we start discussing it now that will help. We've identified what is the backbone—that is very specific. We need to address concerns about holes in the system.

Rohret: Holes in coverage were supposed to be addressed locally. I think we need to be careful with the coverage holes. Is it part of the 95% coverage (5% not covered)?

Mines: I've been trying to get regions to bring their issues to the OTC so we can work it out. I don't want to put grant programs out there that cover the local responsibility.

Rohret: Do you see the OTC having as an agenda item "Future Needs"?

Glaccum: We have an obligation to build the system to what we agreed to but not otherwise. Treat it not unlike change management. I'm seeing a very similar process involving all of the committees. We are going to have to vet the 911 needs with the radio needs. But if we don't have a process we are going to always have the trickle-in that locks us up.

Can we figure out when we need to start the process. Remind people that capital requests are due at this time. Let's choose a month during the year when all capital requests are due.

The governor's budget is required by September. We would need requests by July 1<sup>st</sup> to prepare the budget to submit in September.

Glaccum suggests an evaluation process for grant dollars in January and then goes to all committee levels for approval.

Mines: I think it's an education process. The SECB million dollars is automatic every year in our budget.

The million dollars was for the ARMER system but now will there be 911 expenses coming out of it. I think that's something we will need to know. I think that needs to be asked and answered at the SECB board.

911 fees from contracts.

Up to this point we've handled Next Gen 911 expenses by saving money on things that were no longer necessary. My concern going forward is the GIS project coming up is going to cost 5 or 6 million dollars and that is not something we can just find in savings from other areas. We are going to need to allocate funds out

of the unallocated funding. Text messaging is probably not going to be that big but I am concerned about the request from PSAPS for dollars.

Question before the board we should ask and answer.

We should have Counsel look at the statute to determine if the \$1 Million SECB budget item can be used for anything other than ARMER

This 2015 FY SECB fund is really the only thing we have this year. But we have six months. If there is something on the radar that will go beyond the SECB funding, we should know that now.

Consensus of the group is to set January 1 of each year for all capital project requests out of the budget going forward.

Committee determines that SECB publish that schedule -that we need all capital project requests by January 1, 2015 for the FY2018-19.

Mines will get an answer on the statute question for next time.

Discussion regarding the need for a standard to address process. Everything goes to Jackie's office first then to committees.

June board meeting is the cutoff for budget requests.

We want to have a memo from the steering committee for the SECB next week about long term funding of capital projects to my office by January 1<sup>st</sup> annual with a six month decision making cycle meaning we have to have our priorities approved through the media board by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mines will do that memo.

Ask the board to take formal action to say that is our process.

**Meeting adjourns at 2:50 p.m.**



---

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth  
Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

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

#### Guests reporting:

Brandon Abley, DPS ECN

#### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:15 p.m.

#### Approval of Agenda

Chair Hartog asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.  
Joe Glaccum would like to add a discussion item regarding the Status Board.

**Jim Bayer moves to approve agenda as amended.**

**Carol LeDoux seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

#### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

Chair Hartog asks for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes.  
It is noted that there were some typos and misspelled names.

**Glaccum moves to approve minutes.**

**Dave Van Thiel seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## Action Items:

- **Standard 1.10.2 Requesting Participation by Non-Public Safety/Non-Public Service Organizations (Brandon Abley)**

Glaccum points out the paragraph on page 2 highlighted in green was suggested by Hennepin County. (“Nothing in this Standard shall be construed so as to prohibit a licensee from temporarily....”) Glaccum recommends changing the last sentence where it says “*shall be reported to the Chair of the Operations and Technical Committee*” to read “*shall be reported to an Executive Member of the SECB.*” The Committee agrees with this recommendation.

Glaccum asks for an opinion from MnDot. Tim Lee says that he looked it over and doesn’t have anything to add. Jim Bayer says he talked it over with Roger and he thought it worked well with the Metro Standard.

Dave Van Thiel says the document handed out at the meeting is missing the examples under item number 3. The emailed copy did have those items.

Committee agrees that the examples should be listed in the standard and that the emailed version was the correct one.

Brandon Abley reports that at the OTC meeting Vice Chair Thomson indicated his understanding that the revisions to this Standard would be approved by the Steering Committee and then would go back to the OTC and IOC. Abley says that was ECN’s intention and he believes it would fit with the Steering Committee’s intention as well.

**Glaccum moves to approve the revised Standard 1.10.2 as amended and to send it to OTC and IOC for review.**

**Jim Bayer seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## **Sponsored Participation Plan draft (Brandon Abley)**

Abley presents the Sponsored Participation Plan template. He reminds the committee that this standard was intended to deal with agencies that are infrequent users. They are valued interoperability partners but they don’t fit into a traditional public safety definition. The intention is to facilitate their use of the ARMER System but what happens is that maintenance and management of their fleet and their resources do not fit into any of the traditional molds. The intent is for those organizations that are not public safety or public service organizations to be able to use the network with sponsorship from a qualified public service organization.

The first page of the standard covers some background and the purpose of the standard and some of the constraints of the ARMER System. Entities that would be seeking sponsorship should have a valid FCC license of some kind and file a participation plan identifying their sponsoring agency.

There are a number of criteria that start at the bottom of page 2 and continue on page 3. These criteria look a lot like a participation plan and most of the bulleted items were taken from participation plans. A new requirement for the sponsored participants would be a justification for their use of ARMER. They would have to show proof of sponsorship and sponsorship details.

Chair Hartog says he thinks this would be a good document to have and asks for other comments.

LeDoux notes that there are not five criteria headings.

Abley says this may have been language from previous drafts that was not made consistent. The headings could be changed to be consistent.

Committee agrees to change the wording to say “*Required information includes the following criteria*” and to take out the number 5 and then list the sections as Criteria 1; Criteria 2, etc.

Glaccum asks if the interoperability participation plan that Ron Whitehead drafted a long time ago was an addendum to an existing standard or a stand-alone document.

Abley responds that he has been handing it out as a stand-alone document. He says he doesn’t believe that the participation plan standard includes any templates.

Glaccum asks if, to be consistent with our other standards, this should be a stand-alone document that is referred to in the standard but not part of the standard.

Abley says what we have in this standard are just the things that go into a participation plan. He says ECN has a couple of different templates that it sends out for limited participation or interoperability participation but those are just guides. What we are really getting at here is the need to have the required information that’s in the standard in any plan. With this document the entirety of it except for some introductory text is just copied and pasted from the standard. Abley says he don’t know that it would be a useful addendum. It’s a template ECN could put on the website. It would be inconsistent with the other standards to include this as an appendix to the standard.

Committee discusses how best to link the two documents. Agreement to add the standard title under the template title: *Sponsored Participation Plan as referenced by Standard 1.10.2* and have a link back to the standard.

Abley says that with a full participation plan we don’t have any templates; we just list the information that we want in the standard. For a document like this that is shorter without lots of engineering in it he thinks a template will help people. With other sample participation plans, ECN may have a few different versions and might tweak a few fields before sending it out. He says for other types of participation plans the Board has not endorsed a particular sample document—ECN has prepared them independently.

Glaccum asks if that includes the Interoperability Committee.

Abley says yes, as far as he recalls. He doesn’t recall the Board ever saying this is the exact format or this is an endorsed sample document. Either way ECN is happy to produce and provide one.

Glaccum says he dislikes it when things are written identically in two locations because when you modify one you have to remember to modify the other. Maybe a compromise would be language referring to the standard. Maybe we say *sample participation plan as defined in the standard*.

Chair Hartog sums up the discussion as agreeing to change the title to “*Sample Sponsored Participation Plan*” with the subtitle “*Refer to Standard 1.10.02 for Full Requirements*” and have it attached to the standard.

**LeDoux moves to approve the Sample Sponsored Participation Plan with the subtitle *Refer to Standard 1.10.02 for Full Requirements as an attachment to Standard 1.10.02.***

**Bayer seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## Discussion item: Status Board

Glaccum opens the discussion expressing concern about the Status Board going down again. He says that from a discussion held at the OTC two months ago it seems like the feeling was we might have set the criteria a little too loose. If we added up the up time right now it's fantastic but with storm season coming there is concern about additional power outages. Glaccum would like some guidance before he goes back to his other committees where this will come up.

Abley requested at the OTC meeting yesterday that it add an action item to consider a resolution that the Status Board be made a mission critical service. The OTC declined to consider a resolution because it was put before the committee just that day.

Abley reports that with the last outage, if we look at our aggregate up time, we are barely making two 9s at this point. Currently the Status Board is hosted on the same server as the DVS which is not mission critical so there are no backup servers. It was thought that as a best efforts service that would meet the needs but there have been some serious outages and our stakeholders are not satisfied with that. To make the case to DVS and to our CIO we would like to have a SECB resolution that it be made a mission critical service. The SECB did fund the development and it really is an SECB initiative and not a DPS initiative. We need support to work within our own structure to make that case. Right now on the IT side with the state the Status Board is viewed as a best efforts service and our stakeholders have found that that is not acceptable for them.

Chair Hartog asks Abley where would something like this go that would have the power and backup.

Abley says there are a couple of options that he personally likes. The BCA provides high ability services for public safety. Another option is to take it out of the state's infrastructure altogether. There are competitive rates for hosting with commercial providers. We could get 99.5% availability with competitive rates. We'd also like to investigate funding some basic maintenance of the application because right now when we have updates or changes it takes a very long time to get them published because it isn't viewed as a high priority service --again it's a best efforts service --so it gets minimal support unless we are willing to commit funding to either outsource maintenance or for priority service.

ECN can prepare a proposal to present to the SECB without a motion to move toward mission critical service but we were hoping to build our case with a resolution from the OTC and SECB.

Bayer asks when was the last time the Status Board went down.

Abley says the last time was on June 1. There was a power outage in middle of night. We have battery backup but Xcel was working on it all day and the battery backup only lasts a few hours. It was down an entire day. It wasn't until the next morning that the service was back up.

LeDoux asks why do we not have a generator backup.

Abley responds that for a high availability service we would have it at two data centers and those data centers would have batteries and generators. But you have to pay for that. When the project was commissioned it was set up as a best efforts service which is less reliable but cheap. Currently we are incurring no cost for maintenance and hosting.

Glaccum says that it was assumed that the state had backups and generators but of course that is scaled, which is appropriate in the world of IT.

Chair Hartog asks Abley to clarify some of the options.

Abley responds that we could get hosting for very little cost with a private vendor such as Intertech. The other option would be to move it to BCA which does have high ability hosting. Abley has not talked to them yet. He doesn't know who would be assigned to maintain it. The team we currently have at MN.IT is not giving us the service we need because they don't have the resources available. MN.IT is building a world class data center for the consolidation of IT but we don't know when that would be up and running.

Dave Van Thiel says the same CIO that does Public Safety does BCA and State Patrol. He knows the CIO and will talk with him about options. He suspects that to move it outside the state we would have to meet the SEGES security requirements which can be fairly significant.

Abley says before we do any hosting there is an analysis to see whether the application contains any sensitive information and how sensitive the information is. In the case of Status Board it was determined that it really is not security information. It is not highly sensitive. You would not really hear anything you wouldn't hear over a clear radio channel. There might be additional requirements if we go to outside hosting but Abley doesn't think that the Status Board would need to have a high level of security.

Glaccum asks how quickly we could put it into a higher level service at MN.IT. There is urgency because of storm season coming up. If it couldn't happen quickly then he would suggest that it be moved outside and when the world class data center is available we could move it back.

Van Thiel says we probably need to clarify which part of the problem is the support resources doing the maintenance and which is the physical facility and the environment. It sounds like it might be a two-pronged discussion. He says he will talk with the CIO a week from Thursday. Whether it goes to BCA or the Anderson Data Center where DHS is and MN.IT has other data centers that have full generator backups—there are some options—it's a question of who's supporting it and how it gets there and some of those logistics.

Abley says the actual migration from one site to another is not difficult. Everyone would have to login again. We would set a specific window and instruct everyone to login at a certain time. The actual migration is neither difficult nor time consuming nor prone to error.

Van Thiel says the Tier 3 data facility that MN.IT was originally looking at building did not meet all the bonding funding so MN.IT is leasing a space. He doesn't know when that will be up and running but can get more information on that to know when that might become another option.

Glaccum says we have some good ideas but how do we fast track this? If the CIO says we can move it to a better spot—that could happen without bureaucracy. If there is no funding or bureaucracy we could do it without committee approval.

Committee agrees that Dave Van Thiel should report back to Abley and that it should be on the agenda to discuss at the SECB meeting.

**LeDoux moves to adjourn.**

**Van Thiel seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

**Meeting adjourns at 2:10 p.m.**

---

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth  
Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

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

#### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Cathy Anderson, DPS ECN  
Carol Salmon, DPS ECN

#### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:00 p.m.

#### Approval of Agenda

Chair Hartog asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**Jim Bayer moves to approve agenda.**

**Rick Juth seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

#### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

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

**Juth moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.**

**Dave Van Thiel seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## Action Items:

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

Anderson reviews the edits that have been suggested by the Interoperability Committee and the Operations and Technical Committee as presented in the meeting materials.

Discussion about compliance and how it would be monitored.

Discussion about having a roster of users.

Discussion about how to get contact information. Agreement to handle that administratively and not include that in the standard. A letter will go out to all agencies asking who they are sponsoring.

Anderson suggests adding “in compliance” to the letter of support. Agreement to do so.

Agreement to add specific entities, “towing companies, commercial aviation...”

**Carol LeDoux moves to approve Standard 1.10.2 as amended.  
Tom Wolf seconds.**

Discussion:

Dave Van Thiel says the word “storage” should be “restoration” in the Sample Participation Plan.

**Friendly amendment accepted to include that edit.  
Motion carries as amended.**

- **Standard 1.11.3 Training Dispatchers (Cathy Anderson)**

Cathy Anderson reviews the recommended edits as submitted in the meeting materials.

Anderson says there was good and broad representation on the committee and agreement about what would be the crucial topics for training but the committee did not want to make the modules mandatory.

Discussion about whether to include a specific number of hours required for the certification process. Since the standard is not specific to what must be done to retrain, it was agreed to leave out a specific required number of hours.

**Juth moves to approve Standard 1.11.3 as presented.  
Carol LeDoux seconds.  
Motion carries.**

- **Standard 1.11.4 Training ARMER End Users (Cathy Anderson)**

Anderson reviews the changes as presented in the meeting materials.

**Juth moves to approve Standard 1.11.3 as presented.**

**Carol LeDoux seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

**Wolf moves to adjourn.**

**Juth seconds.**

Juth extends his appreciate to Cathy Anderson for he work and tracking all of the changes on these standards. He says that she has done an excellent job.

Anderson says a lot of people contributed to the work including Juth and she thanks him as well.

**Motion carries.**

**Meeting adjourns at 1:40 p.m.**



# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth  
Tarek Tomes/Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

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

### Guests reporting:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Carol Salmon, DPS ECN

## CALL TO ORDER

---

Meeting is called to order at 1:05 p.m.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

---

Chair Hartog asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**Bayer moves to approve agenda.**

**Juth seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

## APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING'S MINUTES

---

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

**Juth moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.**

**Bayer seconds**

**Motion carries.**

---

## ACTION ITEMS

---

None.

---

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

---

- Review Strategic Planning Outcomes (Jackie Mines)

Director Mines opened the discussion by asking committee members to relay what they took away from the Strategic Planning Session as recommended directions for the SECB. The Steering Committee will need to decide what the important outcomes of the strategic planning session were and what to recommend to the SECB for its strategic plan. There was much discussion about the need for maintaining the ARMER system but not upgrading every other year; that GIS and Text-to-911 are critical initiatives to the continued success of the 911 program; the importance of effective education and outreach to elected officials—sheriffs, county commissioners and legislators; and training of personnel. The decision for the SECB is define priorities for the board; guide the board and committees on how to make this happen; and identify the cost and the funding mechanism to support the initiatives.

The Committee identified the key outcomes of the strategic planning session fall under three categories:

- 1) Education and Outreach
- 2) Technology
- 3) Funding

---

## EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

---

Education, outreach and training are a top priority. The educational components of the Strategic Planning Session were valuable and should be shared with board members and other constituents. How do we create effective communication? Discussion of the difficulty and also the importance of educating people who turn over frequently, such as commissioners or the new round of sheriffs. Agreement that education needs to happen at the legislative level and also at the local level because one reinforces the other. The more we educate people on the criticality of the systems, the more support we will get. Education should champion the importance of the wireless broadband for public safety initiative along with ARMER and 911 because all of the systems are critical and interdependent. Lay the groundwork for FirstNet now with educational focus

Discussion of the important of the SECB and committee members engaging in the education and outreach effort and the need for them to advocate within their regions and constituencies. The board and committee members may need more education first. We need to invigorate committee members to go out and help their regions and the various public safety stakeholders to understand the importance of the technology and the criticality of these systems. Regional boards should educate at the regional level. It's more effective to have public safety officials explain how they use the technology and how they impact the effectiveness of responding to emergencies. . There is a need to educate the board and then the regional representatives and then they assist in the education of their

regions. How do we condense the message and fit the message to the various audiences.

To make sure the message is consistent, we could post FAQs on the website and use the Alex Tech power point presentations as resources for people to educate constituents.

The Legislative and Governmental Affairs Committee could have work groups underneath it with outreach programs. Communication is out there but effective education is not. How do we make it dynamic? We need to reach out to the grassroots people and it needs to be continual and refreshed regularly. If we need a funding source to keep it going, let's do it. We should not expect three RICs to do it. We have been at this for 14 years so if this takes a year to create effective and sustainable communication, that doesn't seem like too long.

How effective would it be at the legislature if a letter from the Sheriff's Association, Fire Association, and Ambulance Association to a legislator all said the same thing when it comes to the importance of emergency communications, so that the legislature is not deciding to fund one system over another? Perhaps a retreat is necessary to brainstorm creative ways to get the message out. It may make sense to chunk down the presentations heard at the strategic planning session—to abbreviate them. Maybe we try to get these modules before every region and then we start again.

Figure out an effective way to reach the county commissioner level. Maybe we have an annual open house, after the election, and have the board meet with them. Every January we educate each new commissioner. Come up with some strategies to address the constant flow of people moving in and out and how to get the information in front of them.

Discussion about how some don't know the makeup of the SECB and the history behind the governance structure. Educate about this from the ground up so there is more ownership and buy-in. Misconceptions or not enough understanding about how the ARMER system and all the other emergency communications programs are funded. Where do we begin to educate on this? At the Finance Committee?

One idea suggested was to have a retreat or planning session to bring together the SECB board, the state level committee chairs and co-chairs and the regional advisory and board chairs into one room for the same type of overall education and discussion. Have that led by board members and chairs saying here are some things we have to tackle and we have to put some effort behind them. At the Strategic Planning Session, some regions asked for stronger guidance and direction from the board.

Agreement that education and outreach are critical. How to fund it? What if a percentage of the SECB budget was dedicated to education and outreach? It affects everyone, it can benefit everyone, and it meets all of our funding criteria needs. It's important to have the educational piece so that we can maintain everything else.

Discussion of tasking the Legislative Committee with creating work groups to develop plans to educate on the local level and on the legislative level.

---

## TRAINING

---

Discussion of the importance of training the user base as another component of education and to put more emphasis on training exercises such as low incident but high risk situations. If the board has in its strategic plan a priority for training exercises, a certain portion of the SECB budget could go to a grant program for training. We might want the Interoperability Committee to identify some objectives for the regions.

Discussion about tying equipment funding to training or requiring regions to do one training every year as a requirement to get grant money. Discussion about how to define the exercises because of the length of time they can take to plan and the need to spend grant money in a shorter period of time. The board could say we are going

to expect this going forward, as of a certain date, so if you will be applying for grant money you will need to have a training exercise as part of your annual plan allowing the regions to plan ahead. We could create a template. There could be larger scale, regional exercises which would provide educational opportunities for commissioners and local officials, as well. Smaller exercises would count too.

---

## TECHNOLOGY

---

At the Strategic Planning Session people talked about the importance of the ARMER system and keeping it maintained and robust. It should be identified as a priority of the SECB to encourage remaining counties to migrate to the system for the sake of interoperability. The system should be kept maintained and upgraded because that will be cheaper in the long run, but upgrades should not happen every year or every other year. The current schedule has been too robust and does not allow agencies enough time to recover and to budget. Two to five years seems about the right amount of time between upgrades but we could form a group to advise on upgrade schedules.

Agreement to task the Finance Committee to develop an incentive grant for the last counties to get on the ARMER System; tying funding requests to training; develop a competitive grant program for regional priorities.

NG911 and GIS for 911 were also highlighted as priorities at the Strategic Planning Session. Recommendation that GIS, ARMER refresh to 7.15 and 7.19 and Text to 911 should be strategic initiatives of the board for the next four to five years until those projects are completed.

---

## Funding

---

Discussion about the SECB budget. In the past, the SECB funding has been used to pay for the local share of one of the early software upgrades so users were at the same software level; to fund federal grant matches for interoperability equipment for local agencies; to fund grants for Participation Plans and to pay for Status Board which was necessary to move off of MNDOT system for those dispatching on control stations. The focus was to improve the ARMER backbone and increase interoperability as well as migrate users to the system. Now as the SECB identifies the priorities for the next five years, it should define a specific budget with a certain amount for education and outreach; an amount for general operating expenses of the board and committees; an amount for one-time costs that benefit all users and an amount dedicated to an ongoing grant program for regional priorities. This grant program would be formed around the board initiatives for that fiscal year. The goal would be to allow regions enough time to create strategic priorities for the region and off set some of the costs with a matching grant. It also allows the board to make grants based around well thought through goals and objectives and help regions think along those lines.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

Mines will capture the discussion of the committee as well as the outcomes of the Strategic Planning Summary and prepare a draft SECB Strategic Plan for this committee to review in November.

Meeting Adjourns at 3:10 p.m.

---

# STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

## STEERING COMMITTEE

---

---

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
**Mukhtar Thakur**/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/**Rick Juth**  
**Dave Van Thiel**  
Rich Stanek/**Jim Bayer**  
Michael Henrion

##### Representing

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

##### Guests:

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Carol-Linnea Salmon DPS ECN

##### Call to Order

Meeting is called to order at 1:04 p.m.

##### Approval of Agenda

**Bayer moves to approve agenda.**

**Van Thiel seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

##### Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

**Bayer moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.**

**Van Thiel seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

##### Discussion Items:

- **Review Strategic Planning Meeting Outcomes (Jackie Mines)**

Director Mines presents a mock-up Strategic Plan draft for the committee to review. She distributes copies of sample strategic plans from other divisions of the Department of Public Safety as examples. She says the DPS Communications Department can help create a similar document for the SECB with photos and graphics.

Mines reviews the example from the Bureau of Criminal Investigation. The first part of the document says who the agency is, history, values, budget. The SECBs would be shorter but she likes this model.

Discussion of process. Agreement that after this committee has finished its draft, it be sent to each committee for review and then to the regions.

Discussion of an SECB logo. Since we do not have an SECB logo, Mines included the IPAWS, ARMER, and 911 logos on this document. She suggests that the board may want one. We have been putting ECN and DPS's logos on materials but that may be causing some confusion. For a Strategic Plan to be communicated effectively and adopted by the regions, we want to send the message that this is coming from the Statewide Emergency Communications Board (and not from ECN or the State). Having a logo is one way to give the message that this information comes from the SECB. Mines will bring examples of a previous mock-up of an SECB logo to the next meeting.

Discussion of board branding as a goal under outreach.

Discussion of what length of time should our plan cover. Agreement that five years is a good length.

Mines walks through the strategic plan mockup.

Dave Van Thiel suggests removing from the first sentence "The State of MN" to not create the impression that this is from the state.

Mines reads the Executive Summary. This section sets the stage that these are very sophisticated and technical systems but are built on products developed for public safety and are used across the country.

Next paragraph is to send the message that these need to be updated. Following paragraph points out that these refreshes are required more frequently now than in the past.

Jim Bayer suggests that in the first paragraph "occasionally" be changed to "more frequently".

Van Thiel suggests taking "State of Minnesota" off the heading on each page.

Mines reads the first paragraph About Statewide Emergency Communications Board.

After that, there will be paragraphs about each of the committees. Here she will insert graphics of SECB and RECBs and Committees.

Agreement that developing a vision or mission statement should be one of our goals but it will take time and not to try to get it done for this document.

Mines reviews the Key Points section of the document.

### **Changes in Public Safety Over 25 Years**

Mines asks if there are any other changes in public safety over the past 25 years? Is anything missing?

Chair Hartog says the cost for equipment has substantially increased.

Mines will add, "Change from hardware system driven systems to software driven systems that require constant upgrades."

### **Gaps and Challenges**

Van Thiel asks who will be the primary audience for this document.

Mines thinks there are two main audiences:

- 1) as a level-setting document so that all the stakeholders/user community are on the same page
- 2) elected officials who approve the funding.

Van Thiel asks if the gaps are self-explanatory or should we give examples for elected officials. Suggestion to give examples of Text-to-911, videos, mapping (GIS). The specifics will help make it more clear for those who are new or newer to this subject.

Add in training for public safety responders and those that take care of the equipment (staff—IT people).

Hartog says interoperability.

Bayer says community expectations.

Mines will add, "Increased need to communicate across state, county and city boundaries and across public safety disciplines."

Hartog asks about the technical skills required to work on the system.

Mines suggests, "Increased training needs for public safety responders and increased technical skills for system administrators of the equipment."

Also add, "For example, Text-to-911, and sending pictures and video of the incident."

### **Anticipate Trends and Challenges for Public Safety**

#### ***Demands and expectations of the public upon public safety are increasing.***

Discussion of changes in demands and expectations of the public upon public safety are increasing because there is a CSI mentality of what is possible versus what is reality. There is also a demand from the public that public safety has the same capabilities as the public does with its user devices but this is not always the case.

#### ***Reliability is a must.***

Hartog says the more technical we get the more reliable the systems have to be. We need to have more back-ups or staff to ensure the reliability is there. Mines suggests adding "users must be trained on how to improvise when the technology fails." Mines asks about adding "increased reliability on the electricity....?"

We need training to accommodate, for example, if there is a power grid failure. Also some agencies are reluctant to use data that is dependent on a system that may or may not be reliable so the more we rely on systems like this the more we have to have better training for contingency planning. High risk, low frequency events.

***A robust system requires stable and sustainable funding.***

Mines wants to add something about the speed of change and cost management across various public agencies and various sized agencies. The size of the agency may affect how quickly the agency can manage change.

Hartog suggests “size or structure of agency”.

Mines says another example is an agency that has a lot of volunteers takes longer to change than an agency with a full time staff because of training and daily use. Local governments have different funding approval processes. Lack of uniformity in the flexibility of systems to change.

***As existing staff are retiring from service....***

Technology can assist in bridging the gap but this creates its own challenges.

Discussion of the lack of training courses for these positions and that on-the-job training lengthens the amount of time before it staff become effective. The specificity of the technology and the number of people using it is so small that the training is very specific and mostly on the job.

Mines suggests adding, “technology is very specific to a very small industry.”

***Law enforcement will face increasing challenges***

Discussion topics: Mental health, drugs, social disparity. Emotional training. More training on data practices. More training oversight.

***System interoperability will be critical to providing the information needed by first responders.***

Mines will work on adding some from the list from the Strategic Planning Session.

**Criteria or Values for SECB to Consider in Planning Priorities**

Discussion about the important of having a set of criteria to make decisions about funding.

***A balance between local control and consolidation or statewide control with an emphasis on collaboration***

Discussion about whether this meant PSAP consolidation (no). Mines will use a different word than consolidation. Mines asks what about when we go for an upgrade but it is really expensive for some of the counties. She was thinking it might be about a balance between a local’s ability to have control over what they want to do and yet there’s a state need, too. It’s the push-pull – where you get the benefit of a statewide system and also the disadvantage of not always having the control.

“When you have a statewide system with local users and local infrastructure, both entities must work together to achieve a balance on when to pursue a priority or wait.”

Van Thiel says using an example here can make it more easily understood. The example of upgrades.

***Prioritization so that emphasis is given to necessity.***



Investments should be made wisely. Addressing basic needs first and then nice-to-haves second. Chasing technology for the sake of buying new is not recommended.

***Affordability across the state.***

Bayer says cost effective and efficient, achieve fiscal sustainability, cost equity, focus on value, sustainability, assure funding prioritization criteria is global. Mines will elaborate on these under affordability.

***Equity of service across communicates and across the state.***

Means everybody has access to the same technologies and also coverage.

***Invest in people who operating the systems.***

Discussion about the concern that the technology is getting so sophisticated that people don't know how to use it. Training is key. Ongoing as well as scenario based training. Training and education not just for elected officials but also ongoing training for users. PSAP training, not just ARMER training.

Mines asks the committee to read through all of the "call out" sections and send her an email saying what they think are the key messages that should be highlighted in the report that are not already highlighted elsewhere in the report.

Next Mines reads from the section labeled Funding Options. She suggests that the Steering Committee ask the Finance Committee to go over that.

**Recommendations to the SECB.**

This is where we would have the overarching goals and strategies based on the above.

Mines asks for help from the committee on thinking about:

**1) Training and Outreach**

Insert here users of the system need to be trained often.

We should probably add branding for the board so anyone reading documents created by committees under the board understand that this is a board approved and sanctioned project.

Creation of a mission statement.

**2) Technology Refresh**

Importance of keeping up with technology because the public expects it. Van Thiel points out it more cost-effective to not fall too far behind in software upgrades.

Mines will make the suggested edits and rework the document for the next meeting.

**Van Theil moves to adjourns.  
Thakur seconds.  
Meeting adjourns at 3:00 p.m.**

---

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

---

STEERING COMMITTEE

---

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2014

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  
Carol LeDoux /Tom Wolf/Jill Rohret  
Mukhtar Thakur/Tim Lee/Jim Mohn  
Bob Meyerson/Rick Juth  
Dave Van Thiel  
Rich Stanek/Jim Bayer  
Al Fjerstad/Kristen Lahr

**Representing**

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

**Guests:**

Jackie Mines, DPS ECN  
Carol-Linnea Salmon DPS ECN

**Call to Order**

Meeting is called to order at 1:02 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda**

**Jim Bayer moves to approve agenda.**

**Dave Van Theil seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

**Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes**

**Van Theil moves to approve the previous meeting's minutes.**

**Bayer seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

**Discussion Item**

- **Review Strategic Planning Meeting Outcomes (Jackie Mines)**

Director Mines introduces the revised report, as presented in the meeting materials. In the interest of time, she suggests that the committee focus on the section about overarching goals and strategies. She is open to feedback on the entire document.

Mines suggests that the report should include a summary of what took place at the Strategic Planning Session. This is not what she has seen in other reports but in our case, because the session was mostly stakeholders, it would be important to bring forth the ideas of the session. She used the outline from Judy Plant, the Strategic Planning Session facilitator. She would like committee member's feedback on whether the document as presented covers the key points from the Strategic Planning Session.

Discussion about the different viewpoints captured by the meeting facilitator. The different viewpoints could be included with language such as "these were comments by participants at the Strategic Planning Session and do not necessarily reflect the position of the SECB". Other ideas discussed were to include some general comments making sure all of the themes are covered and include that comments are in no particular order or priority and then a link to the full list of comments.

Discussion about the section on about funding options (page 5).

Rohret suggests another introductory paragraph that these are notes and brainstorming suggestions from the Strategic Planning Session and have not been approved or vetted by the SECB.

Discussion about incentivizing commercial carriers.

Discussion about what service providers are not paying fees and would it be cost-effective to collect. Mines says she thinks the revenue stream is healthy and the gaps are in some of the more atypical things. Committee agrees not to try to fix something that isn't broken and to watch and think about these things for now.

Discussion about matching grants for regions not on the system and matching grants for equipment. Discussion of importance of regions making a financial commitment as well and the benefits of not having everything funded by the state (skin in the game). Maintenance and enhancement are the regions' responsibilities, as was agreed upon from the beginning of the system. Mines suggests adding to the document the history of how the system was started and the expectations. Rohret suggests putting it in the history section and then referring to it in the technology refresh section.

Discussion about having two documents: a longer one with background and more explanation and a very short one with key points. Discussion about having the SECB Overarching Goals and Strategies at the front of the document in the Executive Summary. The Executive Summary should be more concise. Use bullet points. Whatever goes in front of the decision makers should say what we are going to do. What is the call to action? Why should a decision maker be interested? What support do we need from them? Mines says "the ask" is that technology needs to be kept up, we need training, we need education and outreach, we need money to do it.

Mines summarizes that the recommendation is to have a very brief first paragraph and then list the strategic initiatives. Mines lists the four strategic initiatives the committee came up with after the Strategic Planning Session. Training and Outreach; Technology Refresh; Importance of Ongoing Grant Programs; Funding.

Discussion about the need for a strategic plan to present to the legislature with the budget request. Rohret stresses the importance for the regions and commissioners and legislature to know that the SECB has a plan and guiding document now that the ARMER system is at almost built out. A strategic plan will provide a common understanding of where we are headed. The strategic plan will be updated on a regular/ annual basis. Feedback from the regions can be taken into consideration to revise the strategic plan. Glaccum suggests under history we

say that there has been a reach to the regions to get opinions and feedback.

Discussion about the pros and cons of paying off the bonds early. Agreement that we can say we are investigating the pros and cons of this. We need to have a process—educate the finance committee, then go forward to the board with a recommendation.

Discussion of which of the overarching goals is most important. Consensus that *Technology Refresh* is the most important. Second is *Outreach and Training*.

Additional suggestions / wordsmithing:

- take out the numbers on the upgrades (7.19, etc)
- include language about the gap between what the system can do and what the expectations and beliefs of the public are (CSI effect)
- biggest gap may have to do with the ability to locate callers
- keep NG911 and ARMER as separate bullet points
- avoid analogy of smart phones or computers because it may sound like wanting latest bells and whistles
- *Technology refresh to ensure ongoing support and viability.*
- Take out the number of counties from “*encourage full participation by remaining nine counties...*”
- *Create ongoing grant program to support SECB’s initiatives.*
- Under NG911- add the FCC mandate. Give examples.
- IPAWS—encourage participation and training to understand what it is
- “the protection and alerting of our system in the state of a disaster—an initiative to refresh how we notify citizens”
- *Continue to develop MN’s requirements for a dedicated wireless network for public safety.*
- take branding for board and mission statement out of the strategic plan.
- under education of users – “compliance with standards”
- the use, compliance and interoperability are the three biggies
- *Investigate early bond payoff to prepare for future technology needs.*

Mines will make the recommended changes and will try to get the document back to the committee with the goal of having a two page document to the SECB in January.

**Bayer moves to adjourn**

**Van Theil seconds.**

**Motion carries.**

Meeting adjourns at 3:02 p.m.