Central MN Executive Committee
Microsoft Teams Meeting
January 26, 2022 – 11:00 AM

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:
1. Jeff Jelinski – ESB Chair
2. Steve Schmitt – ESB Vice Chair
3. Micah Myers – RAC Chair
4. Brandon Larson – O&O Vice Chair and Logger Chair
5. Paul McIntyre – Users Chair
6. Stephanie Johnson – EMAC Chair
7. Sarah Booker – NG911 Chair

GUESTS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER:
The meeting was called to order by ESB Chair Jeff Jelinski at 11:00 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS:
Introductions were conducted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Myers reported for clarification under the Regional Coordinator Report, we discussed this at the last Executive Committee and ESB, but we did not take an action on it, so this is more of a follow-up questioning whether, or not, we continue to produce that or look at putting that time in some other needs for the region. *RAC Committee made a motion to approve the agenda. ESB (Vice Chair) seconded, motion carried.* Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
RAC Committee made a motion to approve the minutes from December 15, 2021. NG911 Committee seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye.

COMMUNICATIONS:
   a. ECN Webinar Series
      View online.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:
Regional Concerns
   A. Regional Strategic Plan Update
      Myers stated from our last meeting, we had some modifications that were made by Tait. What we would like to do is go ahead and get that published and have the board take up action to adopt it, with the caveat that it is not a finished product. It is going to be something we are going to continue to work on. What you see here is what we did at the state level on the Finance Committee. Myers would call it a transfer sheet. The items we discussed at that meeting as they pertain to the SCIP will be noted on this.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

   A. Regional Strategic Plan Update (Continued)

Myers explained on the back half of the SCIP it has a section that shows revisions or notes. We would take from our standing committees as they go through they will make their updates and they would publish that as footnote to the document. Then the actual changes would be on this document, so we are not keying them in or reformatting it. You can hyperlink in the areas of the SCIP plan you can click there and it will take you down to the footnote which would be this transfer sheet with the notes from the committees. So, we have a way to track the changes and keep the thing going, because if we try to wait until we get a finished product we will never publish it.

Myers explained the other thing we included in here you can see for information looking at what the other regions are doing. Why is this important? Because if we can get those collaboratives of cross-region initiatives going or looking at what they are doing we can use that to feed into ours. You will see each of the region's priorities listed here. Then you get down into where Shari went through and put the common themes. Where the items we have aligned where we have those same initiatives we want to do in our region, we can put there and then we can make this available to the other regions as well. Myers wants to see if that is the direction we should move in from the group. This is something Myers thinks so we can keep this thing moving and make this a usable document, and also accomplish some of the objectives we have listed going back to when we had our planning sessions and when we were creating this document.

Jelinski noted this document is a complete waste of time if nobody is ever going to take a look at it. Jelinski was on the Regional Leadership call on Monday; CASM was tossed around again. It gets tossed around in many different committees. Dealing with the conversation of everybody needs a new radio, and many people believing the State of MN has a ton of extra money that could be where everybody's new radio comes from. Also, conversation dealing with the FBI and NCIC saying you cannot transmit certain things over the radio anymore. Anyone that was on that call also heard it is okay to transmit that information via a cellphone. As a former telecommunicator, Jelinski can tell you if somebody is going to tell Jelinski that in an emergency situation, Jelinski now needs to call that police officer via telephone, that is not going to happen. Part of the conversation then continued onto encryption and what radios need to get encrypted. CASM is that tool that is available to us. Nobody seems to know how many radios an agency has, what radios can be utilized, which ones are encrypted, or which ones have encryption available. Jelinski's question is this a place where CASM is a conversation? Myers replied yes.

Myers added we had a pretty good discussion at the O&O last week on this as well. CASM is only as good as like you said this plan. If we spend this effort and do not do anything with it, it is worthless. We also had a discussion that there is a refresh coming to CASM. We want to wait until that comes in, but on the efforts of collecting the radio information we are seeking for the Finance Committee at the SECB-level, it is a not a vain effort for collecting this information, because we look at putting it into the CASM tool. Then there is also training, and that is one of the things when we get down to the training roadmap that we will suggest looking at coming back to from the O&O/Users group. Get the tool, get it updated, and get the training so people know it and start working towards utilizing it. It will feed in that is one of our goals we have in the region is to revisit and get back to the CASM.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

<u>Regional Concerns (Continued)</u>

A. Regional Strategic Plan Update (Continued)

Myers explained Larson and Myers had some discussion yesterday and he talked about another item that bolts on. It starts with let's get the basement blocks put in and then we start building the rest of the structure and that is a work management tool that would bolt on and interface to CASM for tracking radios and some other things. There is a lot of stuff.

Myers explained we have to start somewhere with this report and this is why Myers likes the format of this. We put this front and center on all the committee agendas every month and if you do not have anything you just move on, but we do not lose sight of it. We have these discussions as things evolve and change.

Myers sat on that meeting as well. Myers was a little bit disappointed with the BCA, because it was more that's a good question we will have to look into it, or if you do this, or take the information you put into your system now it is not considered CJIS information. They were trying to devise workarounds that once again convolutes the process. If encryption is what we need that is one of the things we can use to leverage to say we need to, because that is another reason we can make the case for saying we need to look at encryption. We have been talking encryption for 4+ years. Now we have got some items that are driving that ship, so Myers is like let's take advantage of it, because the inventory is not a wasted effort. We take that and put it into the CASM. If it helps us get a funding to help people replace or get radios that don't get radios, that's the thing. Myers has got a couple opinions on that. We have not used grant process to pay for radios, but some jurisdictions don't have the resources to draw from and they will need that, so we have to be mindful of that. The interoperability component goes with it. Everything on that discussion was law enforcement centric, but the problem is is that encryption is going to impact all disciplines, all first responders. Myers wants to broaden that discussion.

Larson added another thing that meeting muddied the waters on if you are watching the chat side, people are having a side conversation about what level of encryption meets the FBI requirement. One person said our existing level of encryption of DES-OFB, which is not an industry standard anymore, is sufficient to meet the standard. That was not really spelled out by the BCA or addressed as to what it is. The important thing to realize is the LMR Committee has had the Change Management Workgroup enacted and operating before this BCA stuff was brought to light. They were already having the conversation about encryption and migrating to the industry standard of AES. The important thing to not lose site of is that Change Management, no matter what happens with the BCA stuff, Change Management Workgroup may have recommendations and marching orders to make a change. Whether, or not, it is instep with this BCA stuff.

Jelinski added there was also a lot of conversation about the BCA audits and the FBI audits. As someone who has been through more than one BCA audit, and more than one FBI audit, if you don't think as the end user, which would have been Jelinski at the time, that you don't lose any sleep over that FBI audit, Jelinski lost way too much sleep over it. Part of the thing is today, just going to talk about radios, in Jelinski's personal opinion, our MN BCA does not know, based on our conversation on Monday, what the FBI is talking about, or what NCIC is talking about. She did not have an answer.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
Regional Concerns (Continued)
    A. Regional Strategic Plan Update (Continued)
        Jelinski cannot remember where CASM was originally thought, was that an emergency management tool at one time? Larson's understanding is CASM comes from the federal government. It is maintained by the federal government. It is utilized for interoperability for communications assets. At one point, in the Central Region the emergency managers were looking to see if it was a tool they could leverage for some of their inventory purposes. Larson does not think that moved forward. The whole idea is you input your agency's, let's say your county, you have your sheriff's office, and each PD, etc. Within there you put in the number of radios of what model you have got. You may have multiple entries. Then you also include what interoperable resources are in those radios. The COML when they come into an incident, or the Feds when they come to help with a major event, if you say you your CASM data is up-to-date they will take a look and you can see what is the lowest common denominator so we can build our communications plan. That is what it was designed for and locating additional mobile towers, etc. As Kandiyohi County has said over the years, if we do not have a real hard fast commitment to using it, the data is stale in the database right now for the most part, and it's not usable. We have had agencies where they specifically have said they made a decision not to include that level of detail with their agencies radios and resources and that defeats the purpose of CASM.

        Myers explained at one time when we used to do the St. Cloud TICP, the CASM was part of that. It was a radio initiative that started it. We hired On Target. It was one of the first contracts we did with On Target to manage and go through. Tom Justin went through and did interviews. It was more than just your radio resources. It was designed that if I have got volunteer fire agencies I can see what apparatus' you guys have got. When you are requesting information I can request resources coming in. It is a very powerful tool, but it requires maintenance otherwise it is not worth the paper it is written on. At one time we did contract to manage it through On Target. And then Emergency Management started looking at it, because there is a wealth of tools or things you can get out of using CASM. We did have some level of training we did early on, but it died on the vine. As we go through and start looking at these other initiatives we have in our regional plan, it makes sense to put that information in there and start using this tool again, but it is getting people up-to-speed and getting people to actually take the time and manage it. Without forcing their hand, Myers does not know how you get people to continue to maintain the information that is put in it so the data does not become stale.

        Johnson noted CASM is going to be discussed at EMAC this afternoon. There is an EMAC meeting and Dona Greiner is going to be the one mentioning that to see what the input would be on utilization and training of CASM. Jelinski responded if this thing would be something this region would actually be interested in taking a bite out of, Jelinski would absolutely support funding this thing. Jelinski thinks it is that important. We do not have a list of our basic needs and our basic needs right now for this conversation is what we utilize in radios. Jelinski is not talking about fire forces where they are talking about fire and rescue and their picks and their shovels, but at one time that is what Jelinski remembers is they wanted to have a list of absolutely every resource that was available. Sometimes you have to take small bites, perhaps if we could just start by having the Central Region as the leader in CASM with a radio period. And then let us start building on that, but in order to do that, Jelinski realizes there is training and stuff.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
Regional Concerns (Continued)
- B. Training Roadmap (Update)
  Myers reported in the training roadmap for 2022 this is a holdover from 2021. It is ARMER radio training which will take place on April 12-13ᵗʰ. Discussion at the O&O/User Committee is looking at what is on the training roadmap for 2022? That group is going to look at. You can see here some of the trainings we have done in the past and when we have held those classes. They are going to try and come up with an ask looking at what they would like to see for training for 2022 and bring that back for action to the board on the March meeting.

- C. Grant Funding Letter **(Action Item)**
  Myers made the noted changes. Myers wanted to make sure he has captured what we are asking for at the last meeting. Myers cleaned up the table. Took some columns out of the table. Then Myers put the closing paragraph in defining what our ask was. These are projects we have. We are looking at taking the response from Johnson that she had when she sent it. Talked about where the funds came from and what are we asking. Not only are we looking for the turnback monies, but anything that was turnback to be made available to the Central Region for application. Myers would ask that the board allow you to sign-off on this letter and we get it sent. *O&O Committed motioned. ESB (Vice Chair) seconded.* Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. *Motion passes.*

- D. RapidDeploy Radius Mapping Project (Update) **(Action Item)**
  Myers has been working with Wendy Chretien at ECN to get information on this. Shari has done an amazing job in putting together and collecting that information for the folks that are there. The last update we had they wanted to look at for the EDG device. What we are looking at doing, we have had some discussions with Motorola and the RapidDeploy folks, where the hosted CPE is. They have come to the determination it looks like those EDG devices will go at the Woodbury and Willmar sites. And the only two would be Benton and Stearns that we would have physical devices on, because they are not part of CPE. They collected information on their CAD vendors and contact information, so we provided that. Wendy really likes having the process that we reached out to the Board and got approval for using the Regional Coordinator to coordinate this. Instead of having them try and go through each individual entity, because it would be challenging for them. We want this project to be successful. It is the springboard for the rest of the region. We have had exactly 1/3 of the PSAPs in our region have signed on. There are some concerns that the other sheriffs or PSAPs are waiting for to see how this works through. At the last regional NG911 meeting, they requested an MOU. Which will clearly define and set the stage for what are we getting, where the costs are going, what are the recurring costs and who is going to pick those costs up. We asked ECN to put it in writing. In discussions Myers had with Steve Tait when Myers suggested that to him he was very receptive to that. The way Myers looks at it is it will help within our region, because when you put it in writing and ECN signs off and commits to it, it will help with some of the concerns that has been voiced by the sheriffs or the PSAP managers within the region as to we are going to put effort into a project and then ECN is going to pull the rug from underneath us. If we got it in writing we can move this forward, because this is a really cool tool, and it will provide some benefit to the PSAPs, so we want to keep this thing moving. Booker added we have taken the next steps and we had the discussion about formalizing this MOU so that it is very clear on what we are getting and who is paying for it.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
Regional Concerns (Continued)

E. Regional Coordinator Contract Renewal

Myers reported this is part of an annual process. It is whether the region wants to continue to leverage our service from the Regional Coordinator, or not. This contract can go on in perpetuity, but it does require action each year whether the Board wants to, or if the city wants to, continue to do it. From the city's standpoint, we will continue to do it as long as the board wants us to do it. We just need to have the formalized action, so present this to the ESB. Jelinski looked for a motion to continue the City of St. Cloud as being our Regional Coordinator. *NG911 Committee motioned. ESB (Vice Chair) seconded.* Jelinski does not see any other paperwork for us to look at. Is it 'x' amount of dollars? Is that all staying the same? Myers replied everything stays the same. Myers stated we should have a cover memo just stating there are no changes to the contract. This is the renewal at the same terms. Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. *Motion passes.*

F. Regional Coordinator Report

Myers reported this is looking for feedback. When we discussed it at the last ESB, the question was asked are they using it, does it get pared down, or get rid of it. What we are looking for follow-up with the Board is to say do we want us to continue to use our efforts, or do we want to put those energies into some of the other upcoming projects we have. It does not bold for us to continue to produce it if no one is reading it. Jelinski has never looked at it. Jelinski's anticipation is that no one else has looked at it either. Jelinski does not know that though. In Jelinski's opinion, Jelinski would get rid of it.

Myers noted we just did not take a formal action. What Myers is looking for from the Board is saying that we discontinue the coordinator report. We did not receive any feedback from the group as to yay/nay they wanted to keep it. We are just asking to say we want official action saying that we will remove that. Because that is part of one of the things we talk about in the Regional Coordinator's services we provide is the report. No one is using it. We picked up additional items like what we are working on the RapidDeploy. We went to the Board, we approved that and as long as we have those action items in the minutes at a meeting and we agree to those terms and nothing is changing on the Regional Coordinator contract, so that is why Myers would just look for official action from the Board to say we can discontinue the report. Jelinski added it is pretty common knowledge there had not been anything added to that Regional Coordinator Report for a long time, but the item has always been on our agenda and nobody has obviously looked at it. It also does not specifically say we are going to do action on this one today. Are we just talking about it today? Myers replied this is the follow-up. That is where Myers was going when we did the agenda is the reason why this is on there is we did not take action at the last ESB, so that is what Myers is asking the ESB to take action today on.

G. CMN800MHz List serve **(Action Item)**

Myers reported when we presented the pricing when we had the discussion last time, the thought was looking at going from upgrading and paying for the list serve to leveraging the list serve capabilities we have on the website. We have the ability on our website to send out communications to the group. We just have to get our members to subscribe. There is a set-up process to go through. We can achieve everything we are doing with the website lists verses paying additional fees to continue to do the process.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
<u>Regional Concerns (Continued)</u>

    G. CMN800MHz List serve (Continued) **(Action Item)**

Myers explained doing the list serve off the website, it prevents one of the things that got us to this discussion what broke the list serve is because someone's mailbox got compromised and they were able to spam out on the list serve as a result of it. This limits who can send out messages to the list. That is where we want to go with this. Officially close the door on the current list serve model and look to going through the website list we have available to the committee chairs that they can send out their communication to their membership via the website.

Jelinski asked when he is looking at the dollar signs here, Jelinski is looking at a $500 one-time set-up charge, then a $250 and another $250. On the second $250 a flat rate of $2,500 a year. And on our third one it is $2.50 per 1,000 emails. Jelinski asked is this a new dollar and cent we are talking about, or have we been paying this all along? Myers said the question is we can pay this, upgrade our current list serve (not the website) and that is what it is going to cost you to do it. Whereas, we can leverage the list serve capability on our current website and we do not incur these costs.

Larson asked if we were to upgrade does this offer us any security protection from a compromised mailbox account? Does the list serve offer some new features we do not have currently? Myers replied yes it does. It will take away. It gives you so we do not get that spam effect, but it comes with a cost. Looking at the current website as a list you will not get that where someone gets into your mailbox. You have to have the credentials to be able to send out on the website list serve.

Larson stated the one thing that has been beneficial over the years being part of the region is that anyone can send out a message on the list serve. Which we have had people accidentally send them out to the whole list group on accident many times. We would have to talk about for Chairs, or people who want to send something out on the list serve, who would have access to that if we were to use the website verses upgrading?

Jelinski's further question would be what is the suggestion here from someone in the know. Is the suggestion that we start to pay more here? Myers replied the suggestion is, to Larson's point, Myers looks at over the years of sending out on the list serve, how many people other than the Chairs were actually using it or sending stuff out, other than when their mailbox got compromised? It is a nice feature to have, but it comes with a cost. If we can accomplish the mission of the list serve via the website. There is some bringing people up-to-speed and setting up who is going to have access that is going to have to occur, but Myers would rather go down that path than to pay. That is a significant amount when you start looking at it. You look at per 1,000 emails that are sent, those numbers can add up quite rapidly, whereas looking at it we already have the functionality built into the website that you can send out this information. It is just a matter of getting the committee chairs, or putting together the process on how we are going to send stuff out on the list serve. That is just Myers thought. It is up to the group, if you guys want to upgrade and pay for the functionality, yes the list serve does have that functionality, but are we getting the bang for our buck is the question Myers would ask the group. Jelinski stated if we can do this job without spending anything on what we have right now, why would we spend any more money?

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
<u>Regional Concerns (Continued)</u>
    G. CMN800MHz List serve (Continued) **(Action Item)**

Larson asked currently when we get emails from ECN, or someone else, that we send out to the list serve, we can just hit 'forward.' How would we do that with the website? Shari responded in some of those emails, at the top of them on the GovDelivery, there is a link that says view this in a web browser, so you could copy that link. Otherwise, you are just going to have to copy the body of that email and put it into the News Flash, or turn it into a document that you would upload.

Johnson thinks once our groups get past the learning curve of the transition from list serve to using the website, Johnson definitely agrees if it is a cost savings and if it prevents inaccurate emails, or replies that are not necessarily meant for the entire group, but accidents that happen, it is worth a try. Worst case scenario we realize it is not working, and we look at a different solution. It is worth a try.

Myers added one of the other things, and this has always been a source of frustration, because depending on what ECN sends out communications by either their GovDelivery, or from their RICs, if they do not include everyone that is on it, sometimes the message could get missed. Couldn't we set them up or link them that if they have to put communication they can send it out. We had some discussions on it, but if ECN needs to get a communication out to folks that were not even signed-up on their lists, then we create a list that catches all that they can work with and give them the ability to send out? It is one of those things you want to be cautious of who you give access to, but it just seems like we are duplicating efforts. The duplication of effort when the person that is originating that message, because it is not coming from our region, it is going to be the information is coming from ECN, give them the ability that we are not. It is up to them, put the ownership back to them to send it out. Or have people sign-up to their new state all-encompassing website they have and get that information there. It just seems like we do a lot of reposting, and Myers knows we need to get messages out, but Myers just wanted to throw that out for discussion as we are having discussion on how this is going to work going forward.

Jelinski stated for someone who has never used the tool are there only certain individuals that are actually going to use this, correct? There is only a certain number of individuals that would be involved that would actually be the start of the thing to begin with, right? Myers replied it is getting people to sign-up for what they want and managing those. And then show people how to send out. You can select when you put content out that is relevant to that list it should automatically go out. There is an amount of fork-lift lifting to do it. There is going to be some work to make it work and get it set-up. Reaching out to folks saying if you want this information this is where you can get it. If you do not want me to send it to you in a spam effect, then you have to take some ownership to say I want to get information from these lists. Then it is taking and linking those lists to the content that is put out for each of the committees, so when they put new content out it automatically pushes it out. Shari can get down into the details as to how it works that is one of the things she is very good at doing on these, but to Myers if your inbox is anything like Myers, we get a lot of stuff, but it is the vehicle we are choosing to deliver those messages we need to figure out how we engage the most amount of our membership as possible.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)
Regional Concerns (Continued)

G. CMN800MHz List serve (Continued) **(Action Item)**
Jelinski stated due to the fact this is an action item, it sounds like we have a choice of let's do it via our website or let's stay with the list serve. If we stay with the list serve we are talking about additional dollars and cents. *RAC Committee made a motion we go away from the current list serve and not spend the dollars you have on the screen and work to developing our lists through the website's list serve functionality. ESB (Vice Chair) seconded.* Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. *Motion passes.*

H. Audit Engagement Letter
Myers reported this is part of an annual process. This is the letter that commits us to working with Bergan KDV who has done the audit for us for several years. It lays out what they are going to do. It defines the timeline and what our deliverables are going to be. It needs to be signed. Myers can sign it, or he can have the chair. It is one of the things that being Myers has it, Myers can reassign the signature, or Myers can sign it. It is not something we want to take administratively, because if we change audit firms we would have to bring it back anyways. It is easy enough to say we will present it to the Board annually at our January meeting and then give Myers or Jelinski ability to sign the engagement letter. In Jelinski's personal opinion, the Regional Coordinator for this organization is the City of St. Cloud, Jelinski would have zero of an issue with Myers signing this thing. Myers replied it is a financial matter, so that is why we want to make sure when the board takes action, Myers would ask the board to approve it when we meet this afternoon.

I. 2022 Budget
Myers reported one of the things we talked about when we approved the budget way back in July, we did put in the caveat that we were waiting for the Census numbers to come out and we would update the table with the Census numbers. You will see that St. Cloud does have more than 6,505 people, but when Sherburne County left the region, the population of St. Cloud that was assigned to the counties, this one came back to us, because Sherburne County this population base is not being taken up by any of the other counties. Benton and Stearns County that population is included in their numbers. This is the number of the St. Cloud residents that are not assigned to a county that go to the city, so that is how it comes back to us for the population portion of it. We did update the numbers, these are the current Census numbers, and it changed the numbers a couple dollars here or there, but the overall budget does not change, it just changes each of the member's allocations by a few dollars. This is just an update, there is no action, because the Board already took action on this back in July.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Committee Attendance
View online.

B. Website (Update)
Myers reported we have taken the other regions down. Based on the recommendations that were discussed at our December meeting, we have now removed that content, so it is back to being a Central MN Region's website.

OLD BUSINESS: (Continued)
    C. Fee Diversion Strike Force Report
        View online.

<u>NEXT MEETING:</u>
    a) March 2, 2022 – 11:00 a.m.
    b) March 30, 2022 – 11:00 a.m. (ESB Meeting)

McIntyre had a question about the meeting agenda, the conflict with the System Managers Group (SMG). One of the things that came up, they are talking about merging the Change Management process into the SMG. A lot of us also attend that. Just pointing out the conflict that might become more of a conflict with that group if they merge those two together. Just something to think about as we look at our meeting schedules.

Myers brought up an appointee for the CAG representative. That is the Conference Advisory Group. We had talked about getting someone from our region. That was discussed at the regional quarterly meeting and looking at getting someone appointed to be our official representative on that committee. Jelinski has been on that committee for years and Jelinski will sit on it, but Jelinski believes there should be someone from the region that can say I am representing the Central Region. Jelinski would like to see somebody from the Central Region be on that planning committee. This is what it is about, it is the boots on the ground. Jelinski noted the end of April is the actual conference dates, so there is a pretty short window of actual meetings that are going to take place. Larson noted Cathy Clark mentioned because the short window of planning with it being the last week in April, it is probably going to be every other week meetings for a time commitment. Larson has been a part of that conference planning group as well. Larson does not mind being a part of it, but Larson does not know he will be able to attend every single meeting. It would be good to have someone else part of the region that can speak on behalf of the whole region.

Booker asked on the topic of committee and workgroup appointments, on the SECB appointment, does Booker just move from the alternate to the delegate. Or, does there need to be some formal action on it? Jelinski thinks what happens with that is it just happens.

<u>ADJORNMENT:</u>
Chair Jelinski made the executive motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was carried unanimously at 12:01 p.m.

Minutes by Shari Gieseke.