

Central Minnesota  
Regional Logger Committee Meeting  
Microsoft Teams Meeting  
March 11, 2022 – 11:30 a.m. (After RAC)

**Members/Alternates Present:**

1. Micah Myers & Brandon Larson, Chair – City of St. Cloud
2. Sheriff Mark Brown – Big Stone County
3. Tom Egan & Kevin Smith – Douglas County
4. Jon Combs – Grant County
5. Jody Norstegard – Kandiyohi County
6. Sheriff Brian Cruze – Meeker County
7. Andy Beckstrom, Vice Chair – Mille Lacs County
8. Jason Karlgaard & Greg Seim – Otter Tail County
9. Mary Lieser & Kristen Lahr – Stearns County
10. Dona Greiner – Stevens County
11. Sheriff Fiedler & Amy Schultz – Wilkin County

**Members/Alternates Absent:**

12. Pope County
13. Sherburne County
14. Wright County

**Guests Present:**

1. Nathan Brecht – Pope County
2. Dar Pankonie – Washington County
3. Steve Tait – ECN
4. Dereck Leyde – Northland Business Systems
5. Heidi Schultz – Northland Business Systems
6. Lucas Heitkamp – Northland Business Systems

**Approval of the Agenda**

*Douglas County made a motion to approve the agenda. Otter Tail County seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Douglas – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Meeker – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Otter Tail – Aye; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Wilkin – Aye.*

**Approval of Minutes**

*Stevens County motioned to approve the minutes from January 14, 2022. Douglas County seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Douglas – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Meeker – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Otter Tail – Aye; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Wilkin – Aye.*

**Communications**

None.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion

Larson explained this is a continuation of a discussion from a previous meeting regarding the BCA encryption requirements. We had a good conversation about that previous meeting and included Northland Business Systems. Northland has included for us an idea of pricing for encryption.

Schultz explained we have got our encryption diagram showing the backup and the main site of the two VM 's we would have. So, the KMS 1, KMS 2, would work together on the main site and then KMS 3 and KMS 4 would be at the backup. We would ask to have the redundancy on both sides just in case your KMS 1 were to go down that the KMS 2 would kick in and you would still be encrypting all your recordings and also have access to all your encrypted recordings that are already on your data center.

Larson asked could you explain what is a KMS? Schultz explained the KMS would be your encryption server, a VM. The licenses that you would be buying or getting. The KMS 1 and KMS 2 would share a license, and then the KMS 3, KMS 4, would share the other license separately for your encryption so that way they could work together. Larson stated those are the servers that are going to actually do the encryption and decryption then? Schultz replied exactly.

Leyde explained we can do the encryption at the regional level and we have a primary and a secondary server to manage that encryption. Let us step into the pricing here.

Schultz explained on this page is where you are seeing the encryption of all the talkgroups at the region along with any labor, etc. The implementation of the new servers would be that \$22,000 you are seeing. The channels are your talkgroups. The licensing charges and then the installation and configuration by Northland engineers would be the \$33,000. There would be an additional annual maintenance charge, which you guys are already used to for your encryption licenses in servers and that is that \$14,400.

Leyde explained basically what we are looking at is we have a primary a secondary encryption server that would manage all the encryptions for your talkgroups and your local servers as well. We can encrypt locally and we can encrypt at the regional level. And also in addition, we can cache the encryptions locally, so we do not need an encryption server at the local server and the cache is up to 6 hours, so if there is a bandwidth outage, we have 6 hours to cache those recordings. What we are trying to do with Verint is to be able to do this with as little resources as possible. So, you do not need an encryption server at each local site. We manage that from the region.

Larson asked when you talk about caching and outage are you talking about if someone with a premise logger, so for example, Douglas County has some sort of an internet outage, or whatever backhaul they are using to get back to the regional logger, that would be the outage you are speaking of?

Leyde replied, yeah, so let's just say you are encrypting Douglas County Sheriff and there is a bandwidth outage, fiber line is cut. Those new recordings would not be encrypted, however you would have access to play back up to 6 hours. So, you would have a 6-hour grace period to restore the fiber. The idea is for incidents like this so you are not down and out as soon as that line gets cut and what we are trying to do working with Verint is to increase that cache to 12-24 hours, because sometimes it can take longer than the 6 hours. Up to this point, we were led to believe you would be down and out without, so if that line got cut you would not be able to play back the instant that line got cut. Now we have learned working with development at Verint we have up to 6 hours as a grace period.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Leyde explained that will allow just a primary and a secondary encryption server at the region to manage your P25 talkgroups and your local servers without the need of that encryption server at each premise site. Think of this concept very similar to what we are doing with P25 talk groups. You already have your consolidation from the P25 side, now we are taking it a step further to do encryption as well. We can encrypt 911 calls, we can encrypt talkgroups. It is up to you guys on what you want to encrypt. We are being told by the BCA that any CJi data whether it is on a phone call, or a talkgroup, needs to be encrypted. However, this is a very expensive solution as you have seen there briefly. We have shared that with the BCA to roll this out as quickly as they are trying to everyone is shocked by this, so we are just trying to do our best to get the information out to the end users. It is really the customer that makes the decision on which talkgroups need to be encrypted because we can go selective. You may have 10 talkgroups you encrypt, 20 you do not encrypt and it is licensed by talkgroup or by channel. Same thing with your 911 lines we have some agencies now coming to us looking for pricing to encrypt their 911 main lines. Other lines that do not have CJi data technically do not need to be encrypted. We have the resources to implement it. We are not telling customers they have to do one way or another. It is really up to the customer to decide.

Larson stated I think at the last meeting when we had our initial conversations about encryption one thing we talked about was like you talked about with caching. Just encrypting the data also means if some hardware failure occurs our agencies may have difficulty or lose the ability to play back their own audio, is that correct?

Leyde replied that would be correct, so if you were to lose the encryption server 1 and encryption server 2 we would have some challenges. We do have a plan to install the licensing. There would be a down time to get everything up and running on a new server and that is why we strongly recommend doing a primary and a secondary for the encryption server. And to go a step further, I would go primary on one VM host, secondary on a totally separate VM host, so that way if that hardware fails it is only affecting one of the virtual machines and not both of them.

Larson asked so then this diagram showing four servers that is what your recommendation is?

Leyde replied based on how we have laid this out, yes, because you have the primary and secondary for your P25, so we would have a primary and secondary encryption server for each P25 or for each data center to take it a step further. Because if you had just one encryption server, say for the first data center, and that encryption server were to fail there could be a potential outage that could be significant more than just a few hours. Where if you have the redundancy built in we would not have that outage. It is just taking that redundancy one step further on following the redundancy through. As they say redundancies are not good unless you follow it through start to finish, so if you have all your power for 2 servers going into one power source and that power source fails your redundancy is pointless. You would want to have your power into a say a source A and then secondary into a source B and we follow that through every step of the way from your internet connections, your power, your backups, your servers and essentially that is what we are doing here.

Karlgaard asked when you are talking about these outages and caching are you talking about just the P25 radio talkgroups and/or the 9-1-1 phone recordings? And then my second question, are you talking just outages for playing things back or actually things will be not recorded.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Leyde explained in this diagram we are demonstrating here is just the P25. But we can do both. We can do P25 and your premise. The pricing as well is only for your P25. If you guys want to encrypt locally we would work with each agency to provide and hand off that pricing. But yeah, it could be done either way, and the region could house all of that encryption for the P25 and for the premise servers. The focus has been the P25 up to this point, because of what the BCA has come out and said that there is CJI data information in the talkgroups being recorded, however, we have agencies, saying well no there is also CJI in a 911 call and the BCA has in fact, told us that as well. And they have told us you guys as a vendor should be encouraging your customers to also encrypt the premise, the 911 calls as well. It is anywhere where there is CJI information they want that encrypted as soon as possible. That can be followed through with this concept it is just the pricing we would work with you specifically for that.

Karlgaard asked then my second part was when you are talking about the outages and caching of 6 hours are you talking only to playback those recordings or you talking if we have an internet outage of longer than 6 hours where our stuff would be no longer recorded then.

Leyde replied this would only affect playback, so new recordings would still occur even if there is an outage to the data center, so meaning the connectivity from Otter Tail County to the City of St. Cloud if that fiber line were to be cut you guys would still be recording. You just would not be able to play back if we go beyond that 6 hour cached time frame and let's hope we can get more time as Verint continues to develop this, because this is something they have used quite a bit on the bank side for many years and what we are doing is we are taking that code from the banking side and applying it now to the public safety side. We have that 6-hour grace period to go in and play back so if we go beyond whatever that cached time frame is, then you just would not be able to playback you would still be recording though.

Lahr just had one point of clarification as far as the pricing and the licensing under the cost where you list the channels and that cost would be like \$96,000 is that taking into consideration encrypting all of the current talkgroup channels that we are recording now? Is that of a fluctuating cost and you are just going with the entire 322 channels that were recording currently? Leyde replied, yes, that is correct, we are taking into account every talkgroup on the system today. Primary and secondary so this is looking at it as worst case scenario.

Egan is a little bit confused about the encrypting the 911 stuff. Can anybody help me out with was that part of this BCA/FBI thing? Leyde replied what we have been told from the BCA, and we have heard it from customers as well, is CJI information does carry through a 911 call from time to time, so some agencies are taking the approach of well, then I'm just going to encrypt all of my main 911 lines so we do not have any concerns with the BCA. If there's no CJI data that is in those recordings you do not need to worry about encryption. But if there is CJI, then yes, you do want to add that at some time. One thing the BCA shared with us last week is they understand that everyone is not going to do this tomorrow or even in 3 months it is just the goal is everyone is working towards this and budgeting for it in the future.

Pankonie does not want to convolute this issue, but it kind of segues off of what Lahr just mentioned. Pankonie was wondering about the channels. The number of channels and the pricing there and Pankonie knows we are going to come to this, where Washington County is going to be joining the Central Region if everything works out here in the final stages of paperwork. We are bringing in 130 licenses, we are not recording on all of them right now.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Pankonie thinks Larson said like 80, but where does that fit? Is that 130 on there or is that going to be a cost to Washington County, because Pankonie knows in our service agreement Washington County pays for those talkgroup licenses.

Leyde replied we can certainly work with you on that and it is really up to the region to decide how they want to incorporate this long term or even short term. Do we add that into this and price it out, or is that something they want Washington County to pay for and then we could decide which talkgroups are encrypted, because maybe all of them do not need to be encrypted. Maybe it is only 40 of those. It is really up to the region to decide on how the pricing is structured for not only you, but anyone else that decides to join.

Larson stated this is all very early conversations and one thing we requested from Northland was the worst case scenario. Larson would not anticipate this would necessarily cover limited participants. Larson thinks that would be a discussion point for our committee and for Pankonie and the others to have of what is equitable and what makes the most sense. And maybe Leyde you can help clarify, but if Larson recalls correctly Washing County has 130 licenses. And they were purchasing 30 additional to make it 80 redundant licenses for their region, right?

Leyde replied yes, that is what I recall, but it was I believe 80 and 80 is what we are looking at doing 80 for the primary, 80 for the backup.

Pankonie still shows 130 and 130 on my paperwork, so there is some clarification that does need to be done there. Leyde replied the difference between those numbers Leyde believes is those channels are talkgroups are already being recorded today, because they are shared talkgroups. We can certainly go through that with you and just make sure we have everything finalized properly with pricing and such.

Karlgaard wanted to touch on Egan's comment again. Karlgaard does not know about any other agencies, but we have only heard from the BCA talking about the radio requirement for encryption. We have not heard anything from the BCA directly about needing to encrypt 911 calls or things like. Karlgaard is kind of frustrated with how the BCA decided and FBI decided to roll out this change with an email to everyone and no definitions of what they are considering or defining what criminal justice information is, etc. If it is a requirement that we need to encrypt 9-1-1 recordings, the BCA should be telling us that and what the requirements are.

Pankonie agrees with all that, because it does bring in a whole confusion to the mix. Pankonie would say there is not a whole lot of Criminal Justice Information being communicated over a 911 call. You could have things that are under investigation and criminal acts and stuff like that, and people 's names being said that who the person was that is there doing something. There is more criminal justice information being said over our non-911 lines that are recorded and that are completely public information. That makes a whole lot not a sense really because we can release data today that comes in on a non-911 line to anybody who requests it and there is stuff on there with officers calling in and saying hey can you run this party for me? Here is his name here is their date of birth. All of that is being recorded, and has been ever since these 911 centers have been stood up. That is a whole different mix, but it is a good discussion to bring in as long as we are talking about it, because Pankonie thinks there is a whole lot of data practice in Minnesota State statute that needs to either be revised or at least given guidance too.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Karlgaard would agree with that, because again going off the information that Karlgaard has seen they are classifying criminal justice information as basically, the way Karlgaard takes it is anything from NCIC. Any type of NCIC response is what they are considering criminal justice information. Well, we are not typically relaying any of that over a 911 call. Way more frequently on our admin lines with officers calling in or something like that.

Leyde added one thing we have brought up to the BCA is we think it would be beneficial for them to be on these types of calls to message this clearly. Versus this seems like game of telephone we are playing a little bit because we are hearing things, you guys are hearing things a bit differently, we are hearing it from other customers differently. Leyde would ask Larson to see if you want to reach out to Diane at the BCA and see if she could join our next call, so we do have a clear directive moving forward. Because our standpoint is we can provide the encryption and it is really up to the agency to decide which channels which talkgroups they wish to encrypt. We are not going to tell any agency what they have to do that you need to encrypt all channels because it is a pricing thing for us and that is by all means, not the case. It is we clearly just want to get you guys the information, so you have it and you guys make the call as far as which channels to encrypt.

Lahr just wanted to make a comment in regard to this with the information that is coming off from the BCA, there is an intention for some sort of a presentation, round table discussion or a breakout session on this topic at the conference in April, is that correct? At the last regional leadership group when the BCA was participating in that breakout session with the webinar there Lahr thinks there was a lot of clarification the BCA was going to try to clear up based on questions that were asked that they did not really have solid answers to on that webinar. Karlgaard thinks you are correct, Karlgaard has heard that there was going to be discussion on it at the Public Safety Communications Conference, but again, you know they have not released an agenda so Karlgaard has not seen anything for sure. Smith had seen an agenda and there is a time slot slated for BCA encryption there and Smith does want to mention some of you were probably on the regional stakeholders called. Diane did join us there and she was somewhat blindsided by a lot of it did not realize the impact that it would have and was planning on doing some research with FBI. Smith thinks there is more to come and we just have to sit back and wait for good answers. Larson noted Pankonie put in the Chat window that Dianne will be at the MN 911 APCO-NENA PSAP Conference on March 22<sup>nd</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss this topic.

Sheriff Cruze wanted to echo what was just said. Sheriff Cruze does not think that anybody has had a conversation with the FBI asking what this really means for them, or for us, or had hard discussions with BCA and there is a lot of confusion. Through the Sheriffs' Association, we have asked to meet with Drew at the BCA to get some clarification. Sheriff Cruze knows there is a lot of discussions about the impact of this and what it means and the timeline and things like that. The costs of this are going to be out of reach for some agencies, so the state is going to have to step in. We started monitoring some of our radio traffic. When it came to like EMS, fire and ambulance services, etc. we are not finding any criminal justice information that is going that way. And now the 911 calls that is new to Sheriff Cruze as well, and it is a little confusing on my part because the people who call us are not calling on encrypted equipment. But now the state is going to require we encrypt this conversation we are having with people in the public.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Sheriff Cruze does not think there is a lot of criminal justice information going across a 9-1-1 call. There is way more going across an admin call when a deputy calls in and says hey, I need this, or please run this. But Sheriff Cruze thinks sometimes what gets lost in this is we have ways to communicate with our deputies out on the street that we can maybe cut down on some of these costs. But big picture there needs to be some conversations with BCI and FBI and Sheriff Cruze does not know who does that. They need to be told what the real impact of this is as far as the costs and the timeline to get it all done and where are we really at and Sheriff Cruze does not think those have happened yet and hopefully those conferences coming up, some of those round tables will do that, but just know there are other conversations going on behind the scenes trying to get these conversations started to figure out exactly where we need to be with them.

Larson asked is the best course of action then to wait for these next two conferences to kind of swing around, or wait to see what MSA hears from BCA and FBI, or what is the will of the committee?

Lahr is glad that we are kind of getting these numbers because it is good to have the information up front as to worst case scenarios like this what kind of an impact would this make on our region or local agencies, etc. But I think us doing our due diligence in gathering this information, but still holding a wait and see attitude toward what actually are the facts and what actually needs to be done?

Karlgaard replied absolutely agreed, we need to know what the actual requirements are of what needs to be encrypted before we would take any steps moving forward.

Tait wanted to echo Lahr's comments. This is exactly the conversation that will happen on May 4th and 5<sup>th</sup> at our encryption planning summit. These are all questions you guys have asked that need to get answered. Our goal on May 4th and 5th is to start you know okay we need to have this figured out and then that plays into this other discussion and get all that up on the white board, so we can capture that and then plug that into a master plan. This problem will not get solved overnight. It will probably take the better part of a year, maybe a year and a half just to get a plan developed because there are so many moving parts. Tait would not hit the panic button yet. This is a pretty big price tag and Tait thinks as Lahr said you need to take that wait and see approach. And as the sheriff mentioned it is getting very expensive very fast and Tait does not think this can be put on the backs of local agencies or a region to absorb these costs. There is obviously going to have to be some sort of state funding involved. A lot of discussion needs to happen. We are going to hit the tip of the iceberg at the PSAP conference in Alexandria. We are going to talk about the LMR side of encryption during the conference in April up at Breezy Point, but those will be very high-level discussions with no decisions made. Tait encourages you to keep your finger on the pulse and participate in those conferences. Make sure you are well represented at our encryption summit that is coming up. Hopefully by the middle to end of the year we will start having an outline of all those tasks that need to be accomplished to get us over the finish line.

Larson asked talking about the encryption summit do you anticipate BCA or FBI is going to be there to give some further detail on this?

Tait does not. Instead of all of us calling the BCA and asking the same question we need to have a process through the LMR Committee of these are the questions the LMR Committee needs to get answered on behalf of all the stakeholders so we are getting consistent information.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### BCA Requirements – Encryption – Discussion (Continued)

Tait added and not eight different answers because we had eight different people call Diane to ask. It is to capture what information needs to be asked at the BCA and the FBI and then have that formal process for how we want to get that information pushed up and then pushed back to all our stakeholders. Because there is no clarity. You talk to eight different people and they have heard eight different things and we need to clean that process up so we are all on the same sheet of music.

Larson stated in my higher education days this sounds a lot like what I experienced back then trying to navigate FERPA. And the difference between if it was information that our officers gathered through interview or we gathered it from a particular database whether or not it was protected. That is where it is sounding that this conversation is going down that rabbit hole and Larson will tell you that is a very tricky place to be if that is what is decided by the BCA and FBI. Larson thinks this conversation, as we see it is impacting logging which impacts PSAPs and 911 and LMR, is actually even a SECB level discussion and perhaps even a letter from the SECB itself to the BCA for clarification.

Tait explained that is already occurring behind the scenes. Director Wahlberg has engaged BCA leadership. They are very well aware this is a hot topic. Deputy Commissioner O'Hearn is very well aware this is a hot topic. So those conversations are occurring. BCA knows the email they sent out created a firestorm and did not appease really anybody on what the proper course of action is so they are playing catch up. They are trying to get their ducks in a row. Unfortunately, it just is not happening very fast, but you know the wheels of state government are turning behind the scenes and we should be seeing something from BCA and we have asked BCA. You know the Sheriff asked who is talking to the FBI, so we have asked BCA to do that. Go back get a 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> opinion, because we just do not think that is an inappropriate or an accurate interpretation of what that requirement means in our current operating environment. There is just nobody across the country that can comply with that today and they need to acknowledge that. We are chipping away. We will get there, but it is going to be several months before we actually get those questions answered.

Larson will leave this on our agenda as an old business item, so if we have any updates we can discuss it. But, we will not take any further action on the pricing right now that was for information from Northland for our benefit.

### Limited Member Fee Structure

Larson explained this goes hand in hand with our previous conversation and our old business item that is actually next pertaining to our logger capacity. As a historical note, we as a committee first started having the conversation probably three or more years ago about offering an opportunity for other entities to join our logger as we did not have any more from our Joint Powers that wished to join the logger. And we had excess capacity we were willing to offer and allow others to enjoy the benefit of a shared resources. Larson adjusted the graph from our previous conversation that we had to give you an idea of our current logger capacity. What is being used, anticipated. Other limited users that are working on finalizing various stages of the process. So, Washington County, Sanford EMS, are both in the contracting side. CentraCare we have had discussions with them and they are internally discussing whether, or not, they want to come forward with a request to participate. But, Larson put them in there with their anticipated talkgroup just to give an idea of where our capacity is. We have talked in the past that our capacity is finite.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Larson explained we have a hard and fast Motorola upper limit of how many talkgroups total we can have on our logger before we have to expand. When we initially came up with a limited member contribution rate, the goal was not to make it a revenue source for our committee or the region. It was just as all the other JPA members are putting in, to help pay down the shared cost for the logger. Larson wants to make note that when we have different users and many of our users in the region come in and we have anywhere from our lowest member is recording 14 talkgroups and our highest member is in the mid-30s. When you look at Washington County, they are a very large agency in the Metro area. As Pankonie mentioned earlier, they do have a number of talkgroups they are logging themselves. Larson's understanding is it is 80 talkgroups. That is a significant amount of our excess capacity that we have. At the same time, for those who may not have heard there is a statewide, it used to be Change Management Workgroup, but that has morphed a couple of different times here, that is discussing a lot of different things, encryption being one of the big topics. But, also any need to increase the number of interop talkgroups, whether encrypted, or unencrypted, for statewide which could mean creation of additional talkgroups that we inevitably would have to be responsible to record and log for our membership. We need to be thoughtful for future growth for our members and for those interop situations as well.

Myers explained we sat down with Pankonie. One of the things we are looking at is coming out with an equitable distribution of those costs as Larson was going through. Because at some point we will exceed our capacity and we are going to have to look at it is not that we cannot expand beyond that. There is a cost to doing that and looking at who bears that cost? We are trying to come up with a methodology. One of the things we discussed with Washington County this week was looking at their start the building blocks. In order to expand on the capacity, because the capacity constraint we are hitting on is a Motorola at this time. The Verint solution can scale up. It requires us to set-up another console site. We have looked at getting pricing for what a console site will cost. In the discussion with Washington County is they have a portion of the components we will need and that is an AIS. There is a value to that equipment. There is a component we could take on that we could do an in-kind. As long as we have that and we can keep the maintenance on it, it would count towards a console site. Then we would have to deploy that we would need two AIS for a minimum, but if we are going to keep with the same design we have right now where we do full replication it would be in a group of four. What we are looking at is establishing a value to the AIS, because in the discussions with Washington County they would turn that ownership of that over to the region and we could come up with a market value for that and that becomes part of an in-kind contribution and then they would have their base contribution what we charge the non-JPA members to participate in the logger. You could do it all at once so then depending on what that value is established they would not actually have anything that as Larson was talking about with the revenue reduction. They would come onto the logger. Their in-kind contribution once that would be used up, then they would start paying at a set rate. That rate would be subject to the annual increases we have seen from both the support from Motorola and Verint because the cost does not stay flat it does go up on an annual basis. There is a willingness to do that, but the group has to say okay. Is that a concern to the group that we are going to exceed capacity? Or do we just say Washington County comes on as a member paying the base rate that we charge for the non-JPA membership, but looking at it when you see it with the graphic that Larson has up here you will see they are a large entity. Myers explained they are larger than anything we have and that is when we start looking at discussion. Is it reasonable to say they would pay the same price that everyone else has?

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Myers thinks they are utilizing more of the resources and once we establish that baseline that will be for anything as you were talking about earlier for encryption or any cost you can strike that model across if you exceed a certain amount of capacity on the system then you are in a different tier. Myers does not see us trying to get down to a onesie, twosie threesie. Myers just thinks if you exceed a certain amount or capacity then you go there and move forward from there. The thought process we came up with is right now for non-JPA it is \$6,300 is what we charge for calendar year 2022. What we would look at for like Washing County double that, so that is \$12,600. The example of the way Myers explained it to Pankonie is if you say we established that your AIS that you would contribute to the region as an in-kind contribution when you joined. For easy math if you said it had a value of \$60,000 at about \$12,000 a year that would give you five years of no costs other than you would still assume your licensing costs. But, as to the annualized contribution to participate in the logger it would be covered under that window. In year 6 they would start paying that rate, whatever it is with the inflationary numbered figured in. To Myers it seems simple enough to do and Washington County did not think that was an issue. With this group, however, being this is not just a single entity deciding it, if the group would say if that is important to them.

Lahr stated the role of Devil Devil's advocate will be played by Kristen Lahr today. Lahr thinks if we are facing a situation where we are running out of space and this is an eventuality that we are looking at Lahr can wrap her head around this conversation. The other side of Lahr says are we planning for something we may, or may not, need? As Larson discussed, we opened up our membership to non-JPA members, because we had excess capacity that was not being used by the region, so that gives both the regional members and the non-JPA members that may join some cost savings. It pays down the initial cost and the maintenance costs kind of makes this more affordable solution for all involved. But once we are looking at reaching a capacity of our existing equipment in our existing platform still having a buffer for future expansion. Whether, or not, we need to start recording additional statewide talkgroups, interoperability talkgroups, or what may come. Is this a necessity? If we implement a cost structure for non-JPA members to start planning for excess capacity what happens to those funds if that excess capacity is not needed? What if we never need to expand? What if we do not have anyone else that wants to join the logger and we do not need to record anything? Lahr tries to balance it out with is this a necessary eventuality that we have to plan for? Or can we just state we are at capacity right now. We can add talkgroups if necessary, but let us just call it quits and maintain our membership as is. It is really food for thought and just a differing point of view not to throw a stick in the spokes.

Larson asked when you say to close the doors on letting others in with the understanding that Sanford and Washington County have been approved by this committee to join the logger is that correct? Lahr replied that is correct that we would be looking at potentially the agencies that have already received approval by the committee and depending on what CentraCare may, or may not, present to the committee that decision can be made.

Myers knows we are looking at capacity, but there are other costs we are going to incur that the group has. When you ask what do you do with those funds you could use those to offset those costs. Stearns County waited to join as the region upgraded and all the membership had built a little bit of a reserve. Then they paid, each member, I believe it was just short of \$4,000 they had to pony up to make the upgrade when we went to V15. There are costs we were having and that was one we had to do the implement of that one a few years ahead of schedule because Microsoft.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Myers would it is not for loss and we are not looking at a huge number and then with the membership comes on it reduces. If you look at the cost it reduces it. You are not going to see a huge reduction when you add another member on. Myers just looks at it from the standpoint of equitable distribution of it and even if we cap it and we say we do not add anymore. Does it make sense for you if you look at the number as it's on this information graph where most people are around that 3 to 4% of capacity where you have membership coming on at a higher rate. If you look at an industry for like licensing you pay by your licensing what you have. So, the more you use the more it goes up. It is a linear curve. If we do not want to do it, we do not have to. Your question to the funding there is a cost that we will expect. We have a 7-year replacement cycle on the infrastructure. We banked that on hardware going up at a set rate. So, even if we did cap it we are still going to have ongoing expenses that we have to do cost sharing as we go forward. Not saying anyway just saying that Myers does not think we are losing anything, or have to worry about what we do with those funds, we will have expenses in the future for these.

Pankonie thinks there is value in purchasing Washington County's AIS, because it is already purchased. You are not going to have to purchase another one, from Motorola if some time you do choose to get another one, you are going to have to pay that brand new price tag pricing. Whereas, this one has been around. It is on the replacement cycle already. It will just be something that does not have that higher price tag. It is as good as the other ones. Pankonie can totally understand if it does not want to be brought on board. That's fine, too. We will figure out a use for it or do something with it eventually, because we have kept it just because of that fact that we do not want to start over someday when we are looking for another one.

One thing Larson would note is within the last few years just before COVID we did have a situation where we did lose a VPM, a voice processing module, which stopped the logging of one of our AIS's. We did not lose logging because of our redundancy that we have set, but we did not have any spare equipment, the logger does not have spare VPM 's. Something that would be of benefit with Washington County's AIS and VPM and whatever other equipment that would be with it would allow us for some spare equipment to make sure that even though we do have redundancy and we have built that in that we do not have to test out that redundancy if something fails, and we have to send it in with our warranty contract.

Myers added getting back to Lahr's point, I would say if we never have to expand the capacity, yeah, you have that equipment. But if we assume it, we will assume some operational costs, because there is the initial purchase price for that equipment, but you have to keep it on a maintenance schedule in order for when Motorola comes out and does their equipment upgrades that it gets that. As long as we got the other hardware to Lahr's point do we need this? Myers would say that we keep. What we really need to get to today is are we asking Washington County to join at the one rate? Are we looking at do they pay an elevated cost because of their increased capacity constraints that they place when they come on? It comes down to the group do you let them in at what everyone else is doing or do they pay a higher annualized rate? Then you can start having discussion with the in-kind contribution they would bring to the table. You could do that for if we if we do not cap the door and we keep growing. First and foremost the point you have to do they join at the same rate that everyone else is joining that is a non-JPA member? That is point one, because Washington County is at a point to move forward. Part of what they need is Appendix A which is the pricing they are going to pay. We have to make that determination.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Lahr asked if we go this route, Lahr is assuming that this conversation has already been had with Washington County and there is some level of agreement or negotiation there and if so how does that affect say for instance, Sanford EMS who is also already on the system? Do we need to go back and re-discuss their agreement with the region? How does this get implemented?

Larson explained this conversation with Washington County occurred after the realization of the sheer number of talkgroups they are going to be utilizing. They own the talkgroup licenses, but it is like a marina, a boat slip. They are bringing in 80 boats into the marina and our marina can hold maximum of 512. Like Myers said earlier, it is a discussion of equity and what is fair and equitable for everyone. Sanford EMS they had an estimate of 20 or fewer talkgroups compared to the 80 talkgroups with Washington County and that is where this conversation came from. Larson does not think that any changes in contracts need to be had. This goes along with an Appendix document with a pricing schedule and that pricing schedule is determined annually at the budget meeting. Our first year that we did this we started off at \$6,000. It increased a couple percent due to our costs with our maintenance contract with Motorola and others.

Lahr asked are we looking for a potential decision or a motion to be made here today? Larson replied I think that is what Myers was referring to. Larson explained we have an opportunity if the committee chooses to take action on something today. It could be taken to the board meeting at the end of March. If the committee chooses not to take action, and wants further discussion this will prolong the finalizing of Washington County's joining since this is part of the contract that has to go before their county board. Whichever way the action is, if the action is to go ahead with the existing base rate that MHealth is paying then we just need to know that so we can finalize this agreement with Washington County.

Myers responded you did a great job summarizing it so looking at so we do not continue to have delayed. Washington County is ready to go. It comes down to what goes on Appendix A and we end to the point that Lahr had made earlier, we did have discussion as to if we were to increase the base rate as Myers gave an example and Washington County was okay with that. It just comes down to what does this group want to do? Do we move forward with the base rate we have already established for the other participants that are not part of the JPA and move that forward because I believe the contract was already reviewed and approved. It just comes down to when it was signed and when it was executed so we have already brought a lot of this to the board. If we changed the pricing model, it would have to go before the board for approval. The board will meet at the end of the month. Otherwise, the next board meeting is slated for June. Whatever we decide today, we need to make a decision is Myers question.

Pankonie agrees that Washington County coming in here throws a wrinkle on the pattern. We are coming in from the Metro. Even though you already had one agency from the Metro there, an EMS agency, they do not have all those Metro-wide law enforcement shared talkgroups that they were worried about being recorded. Washington County brings all those and that is why the number is fairly high. But not to mention we do dispatch for like 26 agencies so with that we have our county-wide event channels. Every Fire Department, which are 14 has an event channel. We do have a lot of talkgroups we are bringing to the table. Pankonie is absolutely willing to pay an equitable share of this logging group. Pankonie believes in what this thing was. Larson, Myers, like you said we have been talking about this for years and we believe in this shared value of doing it this way.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Whatever we workout and Pankonie is sure we might take a different lens at it later and it might move. Pankonie is very open to those discussion. What is the best thing for the greater good? What are we doing with the value of the public safety dollar we are on board with all of that. So, however it looks today, however it looks in the future we are very open to having those honest and value discussions. But we really do need to move. We have a V5 recorder that is recording our logging today at Washington County, so it is past end of life. Northland is graciously keeping it alive. But if something were to happen Pankonie does not have radio recording. As much as Pankonie knows that you might want to table this and further discuss it Pankonie just wanted to say we really do need to move forward Washington County, so Pankonie is hoping we can come to a decision today and like Pankonie said if the decision or the value changes in the future, Pankonie is open to that.

Larson explained we are asking for an action item for either Washington County to pay the base rate of \$6,300 which is the 2022 amount similar to MHealth, or pay \$12,600 which would be a double payment due to the number of talkgroups.

Lahr did have some reservations just because we did make the decision as a committee to allow Washington County to come onto the system and move forward with an agreement on that. That has not been finalized, but in regard to making the most out of public safety funds and making things equitable for all the users of the logger Lahr thinks that in addition to the fact that having potential spare equipment in the interim whether we expand, or not. Utilizing the spare equipment that Washington County may be able to bring to the region and have that as an insurance policy if something does break we do have spares in place that is an asset to the region. If there is a potential or a desire by somebody on the committee to make a motion to have Washington County join and be given credit for potentially the regional purchase of their existing AIS equipment and VPM at the standard base rate, and amortize that over however many years to adjust their additional capacity payment. Lahr thinks that would behoove the region and the members as a whole.

Egan thinks what Lahr said would benefit Washington County and the region. *Egan would work off of Lahr's comments and Douglas County would make that motion. Stevens County seconded.*

Pankonie does not think the motion was clear. Pankonie thinks she knows what it is, but Pankonie wants to make sure that everybody understands this and this is not surprised. Pankonie is just going to say that what she heard is that you were going to try to take on the AIS and put it in-kind thing and that Washington County would pay double your rate right and a tiered type pricing. We use double the average talkgroup, so we are going to pay double the annual cost. Is that what Pankonie heard?

Egan's understanding was they were going to pay the base rate, but have the extra equipment available to us.

Pankonie explained when you guys take on the AIS you are going to pay about \$3,000 a year to take it on to keep it on the maintenance cycle. That is what Pankonie has been paying. Pankonie does not want to do harm to this logging group, so maybe it is one and a half then so we offset you guys taking over that annual cost. Because that annual cost is above the base price, but again, Pankonie is also willing to pay double and if we put a different lens on it later that we think that is too much fine, but Pankonie does not want to do harm to your guy's budget, so Pankonie would look for anything in in there.

## **NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Fee Structure (Continued)

Egan retracted his motion. Egan stated if Pankonie is saying she is willing to pay the amount in double is that something that is fair for our region and fair for Washington County?

Pankonie can say Washington County is still getting value by joining you in making this move and paying this price. We did not have to go out and buy all the other pieces that the Central bring to the table, so we just had to buy our voice recorder and we have that, but we also did not have redundancy in our current form so we get that by joining the Central Region. Pankonie does feel Washington County is still getting value. And that is why Pankonie wants to make sure we are not doing any harm to your folks value, all the other counties and agencies.

Greiner understood that it was double and then that would help cover those additional costs, but maybe we need to clarify that.

Larson explained like Pankonie mentioned one thing we have talked about ever since Larson was a part of this Logger Committee is there are a lot of agencies out there that do have their own loggers. They have different types of loggers, they have loggers that are connecting radios at their location to a computer. They have loggers, or similar to ours, where they can record at the system level. One of the things this group accomplished that is so beneficial is that you all came together, agreed which is very tough for a lot of people to do, but you agreed on a retention schedule. You agreed on a piece of hardware and software and a vendor to work with. And on top of it, you made this a fully redundant logger, which means if half of it goes down, the other half that is a redundant side keeps going. We have only had in Larson's tenure one true outage and that was due to a Motorola firewall that we thought was working and froze up over a weekend. Any other outages were due to planned maintenance. So, like Pankonie mentioned she does have an existing logger, she has not gone through with the forklift upgrade that our committee did go through a few years ago. And she does not have redundancy. That is one of the reasons why she has come to us and we have had conversations with her off and on over the last few years. Because of those reasons provided value for her. Pankonie has mentioned like you have heard her say today that she is willing and Washington County still sees value paying double our base rate which would be \$12,600/year. And she is willing to transfer ownership of her AIS and VPM equipment that is currently connected to her existing logger to the region which can be amortized over a number of years to pay off that value through the rate that is set for Washington County.

*Egan stated with all that being said, Douglas County will make that motion for Washington County to pay double the initial rate, and then with the understanding that the AIS would be owned and amortized for the region. Larson stated, your motion to clarify is that Washington County would pay \$12,600 this year and their AIS and VPM would be ownership transferred and the value amortized. Egan replied that is his motion. Stevens County seconded. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Douglas – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Otter Tail – Abstain; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Wilkin – Aye. Motion carried. Larson stated that item will be carried forward to our ESB meeting here at the end of March.*

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Logger Capacity

See above.

## **OLD BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Limited Member Update

a. Washington County

Larson explained we are well aware of Washington County's update as that has been our topic here.

b. Sanford Health EMS

Larson explained their legal has the contracts and are reviewing them.

### Logger Update

Schultz reported we continue to monitor the CDR call tagging issue. Overall things have been stable. The Motorola zone controller work has been done this past week and we have checked on the systems to ensure there were no recording outages. No outages have been detected thus far. The NENA i3 tagging for Solacom customers only, Verint is still doing testing, but due to a lack of testing environment at Solacom Verint has been testing on a customer system, which has considerably slowed down this process. We will continue to keep Washington County apprised of variance progress. We are also in talks with Verint to see if we could do testing at Washington County. Pankonie gave us the go ahead on this yesterday.

Myers explained in the call with Pankonie earlier in the week, she had a question about recording of a different phone systems and we were going to bring it up with the group here and more to Verint for issues or how are they capturing those recordings.

Leyde replied we have been a little reluctant on wanting to share some of these issues with Solacom, because we do not want to just come out and pass blame on another vendor. The issues with Solacom it has been we do not have a lab like we do with VESTA and Intrado. Because of that we are really at a customer's mercy to get exactly what it is we are looking for this development. And we have been pressing Verint hard for many months on this. It actually goes back over a year, because NENA i3 in itself there has been many delays as we all know, but we did pose the question to Verint about doing the testing with Washington County and they are open to it, we would just need Pankonie and her team there to sign agreements as far as what it is we are doing, and that there could be potential outages because of this. Typically, with any of these you want to have a sandbox environment. You want to have a lab to do all that testing and unfortunately we do not have that we are led to believe a month ago after the first customer went live with their testing. We were going to have an update within a few weeks and we were really at that customers mercy in Ohio. And there has been some delays as far as with what it is they are doing with their IT Department and so on, and so forth. But it really comes down to all parties at the table whether it is the phone vendor or customer's local IT department.

Larson believes there are other Solacom customers in the state. When you say we do not have a lab environment do you mean Northland or Verint? Leyde means Solacom. Leyde explained Verint and Northland both have lab environments. So, with any phone provider you want them to have their own internal lab because they have all the Solacom equipment. Northland or Verint they do not have all the phone equipment for each phone manufacturer. They rely on that specific manufacturer to have the lab in place just like with Motorola with the P25. To be certified like Verint is there is a full blown lab and there is a process they go through with testing everything start to finish. But as far as are there other Solacom customers in the state, yes Met Council, Meeker County, Crow Wing County just to name a few.

## **OLD BUSINESS (Continued)**

### Logger Update (Continued)

Leyde explained the difference just so everyone understands is Washington County is the second customer in the country rolling out the NENA i3 side of it. So, we are already recording IP with Solacom. We can do that. But this is to bring in additional metadata that we have not had up until this point so that is really the difference is the Nena i3. The additional metadata. We can record like I said it's just additional functionality.

Larson knows in the past when we have had some hurdles with other systems we have explored the idea of inviting those manufacturers or vendors to our meeting to discuss it or to draft a letter. Do you feel that would be a necessary point with Solacom?

Leyde would say if we do not see much more. We are expecting a lot of traction in the next week to two weeks, but if things slow down, then I would encourage for the next meeting that we have all those players at the table, so we can have that round table discussion to go through and discuss any challenges we are having at that time just to keep things moving as really as quickly as possible.

Larson asks because also at some point Larson would imagine Meeker County is going to be going i3 as well, so this is going to impact multiple of our membership. So, Pankonie and Leyde, please let us know how things progress with Solacom if we need to take action as a group.

Leyde replied we will definitely do that we will keep you posted Larson on the emails here through the next week and a half and Leyde thinks it is a great idea. You know, maybe a letter first and then invite them to the next meeting.

### Logger User Concerns

None.

### Open Discussion

None.

**Next Meeting:** April 8, 2022 – Microsoft Teams

## **Adjournment**

*Chair Larson made the executive motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was carried unanimously at 12:43 p.m.*

Minutes recorded by Shari Gieseke.