

Central MN Executive Committee
Microsoft Teams Meeting
March 30, 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 (Guest)
5. Paul McIntyre – Users Chair
6. Sarah Booker – NG911 Chair
7. Stephanie Johnson – EMAC Chair

GUESTS PRESENT:

1. Steven Tait (DPS) ECN

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:

ESB (Vice Chair) made a motion to approve the agenda. O&O Committee (Vice Chair) seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

ESB (Vice Chair) made a motion to approve the minutes from January 26, 2022. RAC Committee seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. MN Public Safety Communications Conference
Tait reported registration is still open for the conference. Tait sent a reminder out to the regions. We continue to see people using the coupon codes for the complimentary registration. The conference schedule is finally finished and has been pushed out on our website. Hopefully, there is a little bit of something for everybody at the conference. Tait does encourage everybody even if you can only drive up for a day to come up and see what is going on and do a little bit of networking. Myers did ask some questions about the cost associated with sending people that are presenting. Tait knows Deputy Director Clark is going to follow-up on that. There is some great opportunities for feedback coming out of this process on what should that conference registration look like for next year to help streamline it. Shari does an awful lot of work trying to collect reimbursements and submit that to ECN or handle that on behalf of the region. Tait would like to find a better way of doing that and making it a little bit more cost effective for people to participate in that conference. Any ideas this group may have Tait thinks would be very well received by ECN on how we can do better and make sure the right people have a seat at the table during that conference.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Regional Concerns

A. Regional Strategic Plan Update

Myers knows our regional committees are settling in place. The O&O/Users went through and laid out a roadmap for their plans for updating their sections of the regional plan. Larson was working on some stuff under the COMU/COML sections. From the RAC side, we are looking at one of the questions that crossed is funding. We are looking at getting behind support is one of the things you will see in the agenda at the Board meeting here following up this afternoon is a letter of support looking at the bills that are currently going through legislation right now for replacement radios and ARMER equipment. We continue to work on it from each of the standing committees. At the O&O/Users they did lay out their roadmap, so they took action at their last meeting.

Larson added that Lahr at the last meeting did put together a document to help track our progress on our strategic plan goals and keep reminding us of what they are rather than having the all-encompassing plan in the packet every time. Larson is hopeful that her nicely formatted single pager will help keep conversation pertinent to the goals we have got and our progress. Jelinski agrees with that. To look at the big package or look at one page it is a big deal of a difference.

Tait is typing a very similar document for the SECB Legislative Committee. Lahr's format is very easy to read, easy to track progress. Tait appreciates Lahr sharing that with Tait and allowing Tait to share it with both the SECB and Tait's regions.

B. Training Roadmap (Update)

Myers explained if you look at the top of the list there is a \$4,500 that has already been approved. That is a training we have slated to go April 12-13th. That is for the ARMER Radio training. Based on the meeting at the O&O/Users, we put together a request and we sent out a survey which we got a pretty good response on. Looking at establishing priorities. What was asked and what will be presented to the board is looking for giving us the authority to seek multiple different flavors of funding either through grants, reserves, and looking at any assistance ECN can provide. Tait was participating in that discussion at our last O&O/Users. We have laid out the training requests from the folks. The challenge you have with that is in traditional standpoint where in the past we received funding through the SHSP and through SECB and we used those to cover. With the changes in the funding structure based on FCC requirements, the ARMER training we had to find a different funding source. Also, one of the things we come up with that was added after the O&O/Users, Myers reached out to an organization. Myers shared the 911 Training Institute website. Since the O&O/Users met, Myers reached out to the 911 Training Institute and looked at potential trainings they have. Myers reached out to the training coordinator and found out we could do our own hosted. We could do it in one of two ways. An actual classroom where they come onto a location and present, or we could do virtual trainings. If we get more than 18 people in the virtual for the number it would break-even then. If there is an in-person we needed to have right around 21-22 folks sign-up. The class sizes are restricted. They say the best effectiveness is between that 30-35 participants in a class depending on if it is an in-person verses that. We could basically go out and get our own. The cost for them to come on and do that is about \$4,500. This is going to be more along the lines depending on the NG911 participants, because they were the ones that made the ask for mental health training, etc. This is one we could seek additional funding, because it would fall underneath the SECB dollars, because this is a direct tie into PSAP.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

B. Training Roadmap (Update) (Continued)

Myers explained we have a multitude of different trainings we want and we are going to make the ask to the board this afternoon to give us the authority to go and seek these. We do not anticipate any trainings happening, we are coming up with the Interop Conference, and summer is typically a bad time to try and schedule. We are looking at implementing our trainings most likely starting in the fall into the winter for the calendar year.

Myers added the other items you see listed in that training roadmap were classes we had in the past. We have reached out to On Target. On Target guaranteed us they would honor the pricing they gave us before, so we have the pricing. It is going to be what we can come up with funding and have the board say do we take it out of reserves. Do we look at the offerings that Tait had put out there from ECN, or looking at other grant opportunities for covering the cost of these classes. That is what we are asking the Board and we will have to bring it back. Because the classes are going to be held later in the year, that we would have formalized, but what we are looking at is to go out and find out how much we can acquire and then you would have to sign off and that will be brought back at your budget meeting in June. One of the things we asked at the O&O/Users was to come up with a priority. In discussions last week as we were putting together the agenda Myers said just get the survey out. We need to know a priority, so when we present to the board we can show. Here are the classes that folks are saying they want. So, if we cannot fund them all, we have a list to say here is the cutoff based on what we have gotten feedback from our end user group as to what we are going to put on that we think we can fill a class and get the most benefit out of regional funds on that. Myers added the 911 Training Institute was a follow-up we did based on information Tait had given us. Myers did the follow-up with the 911 Institute, spoke to them and she sent Myers some follow-up information that we will bring back to the NG911 group. We can do one or two day trainings. There are different combination of classes. There is one class that the PSAP staff will appreciate. They have one for every one of your participants that sign-up, their significant other can also attend the training. It does not stop in the PSAP, you have to deal with your home life for the stress that job puts on and how do you manage those relationships with your significant other. They do not charge for the, they do not consider that a registrant. It is something Myers would like to discuss.

C. Grant Funding Letter – Follow-up (Update)

Myers reported the Board took action on this. The chair signed this and this was sent to Director Kelly from Homeland Security, it was also Cc'd to Commissioner Harrington and to Director Wahlberg. We have not heard anything from it. What we are asking for is a follow-up. Myers does not want this to die on the vine. This is a letter Myers is going to share with the other regions through the Grants Workgroup. Putting the pressure as to, we saw a reduction in the SHSP funding when it comes to emergency communications. It is key for us to get, Myers wants Director Kelly to weigh-in. Myers knows Johnson from the EMAC side with the turnback dollars they followed-up and got nothing, so from the region Myers wants to inundate HSEM from all the regions asking the same question as to what do we need to do to get more funding directed back to emergency communications. With some of the restrictions that have been put on from the use of the 911 fees for some of the trainings, we need to get this back. And we need them to respond to it. Being that it has been more than several weeks that this was sent and we have not heard anything, Myers would like to do a follow-up. Myers is asking the board to give you the ability, we can put together the content and the reply and have it come directly from you the Chair of the CMESB.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

D. RapidDeploy Radius Mapping Project (Update)

Myers reported the equipment from the last update Myers received from Wendy has been. There is a handful, Myers thinks everyone in our area now has completed. They had to provide an inventory, a list of their participants within their PSAP. Myers knows the equipment is starting to show up. They are going to be going out and deploying these soon.

Larson has been a part of a couple of those update meetings with Wendy. One of the questions Larson had asked during one of the live presentations and then followed-up in email, was in previous projects with the state our region has had questions regarding when hardware is involved. Who is responsible for the hardware? Who is responsible for the maintenance, upkeep or future replacement? Larson had asked if ECN planned on providing an MOU for all the regions and participants to identify the information. Wendy had noted in one of the project updates recently that it did not necessarily sound like an MOU would be provided, but they provided in their update notice ECN responsibilities, RapidDeploy responsibilities, and PSAP responsibilities detailed in this newsletter. Larson does not know if that meets the need for PSAPs in our region for historical aspect as people switch positions and their retirements, or if it needs to be more formalized.

Booker personally would be more comfortable with something formal with a signature on it. Just to have a little bit of something to be able to go back on if somebody is not meeting their requirements from whichever end of the deal. Booker thinks that is why we had multiple conversations about this over the last several months and did make that formal request to do an actual signature MOU. It is going to look very similar to this document, but to formalize that Booker would be more comfortable with that.

Johnson is not integrated in the RapidDeploy project, but when it comes to MOUs, Johnson would agree with the comments that were said. Until it is more teeth, it can go either way. You can argue it at a table and it can be more difficult to put in those responsibilities on both sides. We are actually seeing that now again with some of the after-actions with Avian Influenza coming back up and information sharing. Johnson would agree having a little bit more structure than ambiguity is always beneficial.

Johnson asked who would be that authorizing signature that we would all hope to see on here that would give the teeth? Booker thinks since we moved ahead with this as a Regional Coordinator project, that would be an appropriate place for this request to come from.

Where Myers is looking at from the MOU part of it is defining what you want in the MOU would come from that. We would then move forward. Myers has already reached out to Tait right when we first started this request. Tait and Myers had some discussions on this; and we moved it forward. Myers would like to see it in writing and we can follow-up from the Regional Coordinator standpoint, but Myers still needs to know what it is you want in the MOU. And have that defined so it is clearly stated this is our expectation. Myers would say we could put it on for an official ask, but we are not writing the MOU. The MOU should come from ECN. We just tell them that these are the items that we need to have in the MOU.

Booker would anticipate the MOU is going to look pretty similar to what is on here. Booker thinks it does pretty clearly list who is responsible for which portion of the project. To transfer most of this information to a signatory document is probably more prudent.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

D. RapidDeploy Radius Mapping Project (Update) (Continued)

Tait wishes it was that easy. This will have to go through our contracting office. So, you can expect to add about 20 pages to this and about 6 months of time. The agreement will actually be with the individual PSAP, it will not be with the region. We can certainly do that, but the ask is going to have to come from each PSAP in order to start that process. And that will go through our contract officer. Just understand it will get very complicated and the Attorney General is going to get involved and it is going to take months to get this done. We have been waiting for contracts since last summer that have not been executed yet.

Myers agrees it is a lengthy process. Myers would say on behalf of the region we can extend the ask to the Attorney General saying here are the folks that are listed. We understand the contract will be individual, but here are the asks that we want to seek and that can come from the region. It does not have to be individual PSAPs. We can make that ask and let it go through the formal process. One of the things we want to make sure, because we are not always going to be here. Just making sure as you know with some of the other endeavors we are working on is the folks that originally wrote it, they are not around to express what they want. We want to make sure we have that. From that standpoint, we can take this and Myers can from the Regional Coordinator, we can go that route. But, to actually write the contract Tait is right it has to come through contracting, not us. Because Myers can write stuff and have our attorney go through and do what we have done with other contracts, but ultimately the state has got to agree to do it. That we can take the lead on and say here is what we are asking that they reach out and do a formalized MOU or contract setting what it listed in there and if there is anything that is not on that list it needs to be included and then we will send the letter on behalf of the participating members from the region.

Tait asked you want me to tell Wendy and Sandy not to ship any equipment, not to do any work for the Central Region PSAPs until this MOU is in place?

Myers replied that is not what I am saying. What I am saying is the expectation going forward. We have time constraints on the money, but what we are looking for is we would like something in writing stating what it is. Myers will send that to whoever he needs to send it to through Wendy to ECN and to contracting, whoever, just give Myers the points of contact and Myers will take the lead on that. Myers is not saying we stop and hold up the project. Myers is saying there needs to be an understanding at the end of life of this project. If that is the tactic they choose to deploy so be it. Understanding the timeliness of this project and that it needs to have some success, but Myers is not asking our folks to go into this blindly and then 3-4 years down the road says oh by the way you have this.

Booker stated Tait we had talked about that. ECN is going to sponsor this for the first year. We are going to do this pilot. We are going to see if it is beneficial. The question really comes in what happens after the first year? We have time to get this going without holding up the project. We just want to make sure for the future and going forward, that everybody is clear on what it is that they are going to be responsible for, or not.

Tait thinks we will have to check with our contract office. Tait's inkling is the contract office is going to say until the agreement is there we are not doing any work. Tait will ask Wendy and Sandy what the next step is and if the contract office is okay with keeping the momentum while we work through the MOU process. Tait will make sure he loops Myers in on that.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

E. CMN800MHz List serve – End May 2nd or May 16th? **(Action Item)**

Myers reported to give a little history the board did approve this already. This gets down to the logistics. What Shari is looking for is when do we turn off the current list serve either the 2nd or 16th of May. Then item #2 on the list is the 11 private lists or the 9 lists, or do not create any new lists. What she is looking for on item #2 which one of the a-b-c are we going to take and then there is a process that is listed below that goes through. One of the things we currently do on the list serve is there is information that is provided to different folks within the region and then that is then reposted and sent out through the list serve. We are looking at a lot of the information the folks can self-serve like from the stuff that is coming from ECN. You can go and sign-up on their GovDelivery platform it lists there the items they have. Item #2 you will see that there is a list of items they can subscribe to on their own. It is just do we want to continue we will get it and then we will repost it. Where self-service is what we are looking at to be more efficient. Also, if you look at item #1 it talks about the sign-up process for our regional lists we are doing. There are two items there. There is the Alert Center, Bid Postings, and then there is the Board/Committee notifications that you can select which ones you want to receive. Then either through the Regional Coordinator or through the individual Chairs that are sending out communication through, they can do that, or we can do one of the other things which Myers does not want to do. Myers thinks that trying to manage an email group list is a little bit more antiquated. We can go through and have people sign-up, so people are not getting stuff they do not want. Put the ownness on them. Sign-up you get your list and then as we get a bounce back report on those. That if we see emails that are bouncing back, then we remove those from the list that is how we will maintain it. We are at a point now we are looking at which direction do we go. Decide on #1 when do we want to go live with this either the 2nd or 16th of May. Myers would lean towards the 16th, it gives a little bit more time to get everything in place. Then the second item is do we create the 11 new private lists that the Regional Coordinator will maintain, or create 9 public lists that the public can sign-up for, or we do not create lists and we do the email option which that to Myers is really not a real viable option, but it is an option we can go with. Myers would say that either A or B on that one and this group can throw it out for discussion as to how they want to do it. Being that right now we have several of the committee chairs sitting here. As you roll through the rolls, you are not always going to be a committee chair to infinity and beyond, so what makes sense from the region as to how we manage these lists?

Johnson asked if we create and open it up to the public, is there a way we could toggle to say we are sending this out, but we want to send it out to our private individuals and then those in the public realm will not receive the notification? Or is it more of an either or? It either has to be a public list, or it has to be a private list.

Myers replied that is the question, you could do both, but then it is like you are double-dipping the maintenance. Myers is looking at do we want to go with the private lists, the private lists gives us the ability to do the legwork if we want to send direct to members, but Myers looks at what is going out on those lists and Myers does not know that it has been used that often. Then we look at the public where it allows people to sign-up, then the ownness is on them where they get the bounce back. Myers does not get the bounce backs on the private lists that Myers does. The way the CivicPlus site works is they will send out based on your lists you have you will get it comes through when they get so many they will send you and say hey you should check on these emails, because we are getting returns from that that are not. The private lists we actually manage.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

E. CMN800MHz List serve – End May 2nd or May 16th? (**Action Item**)

Myers explained the public lists are lists that people go in and sign-up, so there is a little difference there in how we manage those. We could do both, but it comes down to then we are twice the list maintenance that we should have. With the public lists everybody gets it regardless of who you intend to send the message to. With the private lists by managing the list that way you pick who it is going to go to. We will not have the functionality like what we have with the current list serve which you can just send out an email. Either way we have it, you are not going to have the ability to have that functionality that we have right now where Myers can target and not send to the general public. The other thing you will not have is what started this discussion was where we had someone commandeer the list and started spamming out and sending to people using the list serve. The general public cannot send out messages on the list. You can subscribe to receive it, whereas with the private lists we can push, so that is another feature you have to take into consideration.

Johnson stated with that Johnson would be fine with doing a public list, Johnson is thinking of our committees, most of our meetings are public meetings. The information even when we are opening up grant information or financial information most of it is open to the public, because of the way we meet. It would just mean if we want things to go only to our members or have more of a private conversation before it is ready to be rolled out to the public, then we would more so be looking at handling that at a committee-level with an email to those individuals if it was a public forum. With public verses private most of our meetings are public, so it just saves us time of notification.

Larson explained Shari has sent out some good examples lately to us Chairs of messages that people should self-service from ECN's GovDelivery, or messages that would be good for either a public or private list. One of the more recent ones that Larson forwarded out was from CISA for a cybersecurity concern. Shari's comment was it would be better suited for a private list. But, our options it looks like are either to go all public or all private.

Myers replied you could do both, but you are double-managing it. You can go with a private list and that. It is who is going to manage those lists. That is what it comes down to, being with the public lists CivicPlus sends us out the bounce. With the private list we have to manage those. That is where Shari has to find out is this person still here when people leave organizations and that is even with the current list serve we have that issue. We could do both of those. The other thing looking at it from the management standpoint when we start looking at for example for the stuff you are sending out for CISA, you could put the content out on the website and it would go out to the list for those. You could create a public list that you want to get that information out. That is how it works. When the content changes on the sites that you are looking for put it there. It is how we do it. It does not have to go out in email. It can do it from updating content on the page. Larson was just referring to the options listed on the packet information here option 1, 2, and 3.

Myers would say there are two items we need to look at. One is looking at what date do we want to sunset the existing list serve, so we can tell Stearns County we do not need to do the list serve anymore. Second, is deciding do we want to go with the private lists or the public, or even a hybrid as we were discussing. We just need some direction.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

E. CMN800MHz List serve – End May 2nd or May 16th? **(Action Item)**

Jelinski thinks we should have two motions and one should be the May 2nd or 16th. And then the other one is the three different options for part two. Jelinski reported Myers had said that May 16th would be the better date to end the list serve. If that is so then we need a motion. *EMAC Committee made that motion. O&O Committee (Vice Chair) seconded.* Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. Motion carried.

Jelinski stated our second piece to this. *RAC Committee made a motion that we go with option B with the ability to look at private lists to address the concerns that Larson brought up in items that are not tied to one of the regional committees. ESB (Vice Chair) seconded.* Jelinski asked is this like a hybrid then the way you explained the motion? Myers replied that is correct we will put together the 9 public lists and we would explore the option of creating a private list for the items that do not fit underneath the public lists. Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. *Motion carried.*

F. Annual STR-COMU Reporting by Brandon Larson

Larson reported annually the statewide interoperability coordinator which is Deputy Director Cathy Clark with ECN requests a report for activities financially for the STR, and activities for the COMU unit personnel in that region. You will see in your packet we have expenditures for the STR fund which were monies that were provided to each of the regions when the STR was first handed over from the state to the region. We had an expenditure of just over \$24 this past year. We have our fund balance at over \$5,300. And then some further information regarding our communications unit personnel that are state recognized. It is actually not a certification, so that will probably have to get updated in the SWIC's report. The state recognition for those positions and you can see the number of COMLs, COMTs, we have that are state-recognized. We do have a number of personnel in our region that have let their state recognition lapse. Whether it is a personal reason, or they feel their agency does not support it, or they just do not have time to keep up their recognition. We do have additional personnel beyond just these numbers. It is just they do not have state recognition. They are trainees as well. A number of our personnel have been very active with different types of exercises in 2021. For training activities in 2021, Larson helped bring together an informal group along with a couple of others in our region to start providing some training opportunities, some continuing education. You can see some of that information listed in this report here along with anything else that they had involvement with in their agencies. The report asks for any significant events in which COMU was involved or should have been deployed in retrospect and we have responses there. Some significant trends of the COMU program, you can see the responses from our COMU personnel, an overarching. Larson's observation is we do have some personnel that when they initially become recognized and go through their task book, their agencies signoff on support to support that employee to fulfill this position. Unfortunately, for one reason or another we do have a number of personnel that are active in our region, but they are not supported by their agency. It could be a reason that they do not ask their agency for support to attend trainings and exercises, or their agency does not support it. We do have a number of our personnel that Larson has found that are taking vacation time from their fulltime job to be active in communications unit activities. Newly recognized COMU personnel, Larson had his COML position recognized in 2021. Larson noted this was sent to SWIC Clark last week before the deadline.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

G. Formalizing the COMU in the region under the CMESB

Larson recognizes there are a lot of COMU personnel in our region that are active at different levels of being active. A little personal story about Larson, when Larson first got involved with the City and all this communications stuff, Myers urged that Larson get involved with COMU operations. Larson attended his first class, Larson was really excited, Larson came out of class knowing he had to complete his task book. In order to do that your agency has to support you to do that. And then you have to find an exercise or an event and someone who already is in that position to oversee you and sign-off on your different tasks. These tasks do not always get signed-off in one event. You may not fulfill those different roles. Larson got to a point where he recognized there was no formal mentorship opportunities for COMU personnel when they come out of class. There was no roadmap or guiding point to help you get involved with exercises. Every once in a while a region, or ECN would in the past few years, has hosted a communications exercise to help people become recognized by the state, but then when you want to move on and still be active, it is really hard there is a big educational curve to educate different agencies about what COMU is and how it can benefit them. Looking at our strategic planning for the region, we have got COMU included in there as an important aspect. Last year, understanding Larson's own personal travel with his COMU stuff, Larson tried to provide an opportunity for some continuing education and some networking opportunities for the people in our region. Larson cannot recall how many times we met last year, but we were able to host a number of virtual continuing education/business meetings to talk about where we all want to be as COMU personnel and offer some opportunity for people to gain some additional knowledge. With huge help from Wisniewski and Todd County Sheriff's Office we were able to host a full-scale exercise last year in Long Prairie where we had communications personnel from the region come and participate. We had evaluators from other regions come and help evaluate. What Larson is trying to say is we have a lot of people that are hungry for experience and knowledge and want to help educate the first response administrators as to what we can do and how we can offer assistance. An important next step is to become some sort of formalization whether it is a committee, or a workgroup under a committee, or whatever that looks like that is where Larson is looking for conversation here at this Executive Committee to provide some guidance. At some point, we are going to need additional support for education and exercising for mentorship opportunities and perhaps even some structure for deployments within the region to help support other events. Last year, we were able to support City of Paynesville and Stearns County for an airshow at the Paynesville airport. It was very successful. Larson thinks there are a lot of events like that that can benefit from the communications unit, but our next step is to provide some structure and be within our existing Joint Powers governance.

Jelinski became a COML many years ago and that was in the early days of COML. Jelinski went through all the motions, drove down to the SECB and they were having their meetings at that time in Anoka somewhere. Jelinski found the place and he was handed this fancy certificate by the Assistant Commissioner of Public Safety. That was the first time Jelinski had ever been in the SECB meeting and it was pretty formalized at that point in time. Jelinski did not know what he was getting himself into other than this what he had to do. After that you had to continue on. You had to get your book signed as everyone knows. Which Jelinski did jump through all those hurdles and now Jelinski had that piece of paper and there was no where else to go with it. Locally and you had to dream up some kind of an exercise once a year to stay on top of things. And nobody really knew what that was. Jelinski thinks the education piece where does COMU tie into your COML/COMT, etc.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

G. Formalizing the COMU in the region under the CMESB (Continued)

Jelinski thinks is so important, because there is a lot of us out there that when you say COMU, and Jelinski says COMT, and Myers says COM this and COM that, nobody really necessarily knows what that language even is. If we took a poll today at ESB tell me what a COMU is, Jelinski would guarantee you we are going to get 35 different answers, because nobody is going to know. It is an education piece. Jelinski absolutely supports this, but Jelinski does not know where to go about supporting this and backing you on this. There is much more to the COMU then COMU. It is COM all of that stuff coming together as one, but what kind of a direction do we have. Jelinski participated in an extent in the Long Prairie exercise which was brand new. It was very well thought out, room to do much more on other days. Where it all goes, Jelinski does not know without a clear understanding so everyone is on that same page. Jelinski thinks its important, but we are going to have a COMU exercise, what does it mean and what are the participants? Is COML, COMT, COM this and COM that underneath that same umbrella? Jelinski knows they are, but how do you go about selling that?

Larson explained to give a little idea for you all at our last COMU meeting, we have been meeting monthly this year, our last meeting we had a lot of conversation about where might we best suited to sit. Larson does not know that we have any strong feelings one way or another. Currently the O&O review and take action on any COMU task books before they move up to the SECB level, but also you could consider us all Users as well, so maybe we sit within the User Committee. We also have a number of Emergency Managers that are in our COMU group and discussion centered around there that Emergency Managers really have their finger on the pulse with their communities and their local response agencies and disaster recovery, so maybe it would be valuable that we being support personnel and provide support services would be underneath EMAC. Larson does not know where the right answer is, but Larson looks for guidance on where we would be best suited. Larson does not know that we necessarily need a full committee. We can live underneath another committee, provide recommendations and conduct our training. The core areas where we need to operate is training and education, mentorship which could be pared with that, and then becoming actionable. Larson does not know what that necessarily looks like, Larson thinks that is future discussion, but being able to deploy within the region for different events both emergent and non-emergent.

H. CASM Training

Larson explained CASM is a web-based tool provided by the Federal government for tracking communications assets survey and mapping. CASM just underwent a significant upgrade and the federal agency that oversees CASM has provided training opportunities and training materials to get that update. This is the information that was sent out from the Feds.

Johnson asked since it says refresher, in the EM world many of our Emergency Managers have never been trained on CASM, so Johnson has been asked if the refresher training would be beneficial for them to attend, or if it would be more confusing if they attended a refresher verses a full-fledged CASM training. Larson responded that he has not had an opportunity to attend one of these yet. Larson knows the region contracted with On Target some many years ago for initial CASM training. Larson is going to anticipate that this as it is titled refresh is just going to be that to help people navigate the new user interface.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

I. SMG/Change Management Report

a. Executive Committee 2022 Meeting Schedule – SMG (**Action Item**)

Myers reported Shari put this in and she highlighted where we have conflicts. The Change Management process got moved from a standalone group into the System Managers group and we do have some time scheduling conflicts. And that is where you look at the July 27 & September 28 meetings. Do we want to change our meeting schedule that we have to accommodate for the folks? This is one of the challenges that both Larson, Lahr and McIntyre have because they all attend that Systems Manager group. So sometimes they will not be able to attend both. This will allow some level of flexibility to be able to do it. Myers looks at the meetings that are slated for the 27th and the 28th, those are going to be the ones in conflict simply changing our meeting schedule to move it to the time Shari has highlighted would accommodate that. Then they would still be able to attend their System Managers meeting. We are not changing the date we are just changing the time. Jelinski looked for the July 27th changing the time from 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. for the Executive Committee. September 28th changing the time from 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. *RAC Committee made that motion. User Committee seconded.* Roll Call Vote: ESB – Aye; RAC – Aye; O&O – Aye; Users – Aye; NG911 – Aye; EMAC – Aye. *Motion carried.*

J. Statewide NG911 Committee – Recruitment/Retention Tools

Booker reported at the last NG911 meeting, it was brought up by Director Wahlberg that there has been discussion about recruitment and retention in our PSAPs. There has been a suggestion to generate some marketing materials to try and help with that. The first part of her ask for feedback is that the suggestion was made to do a recruitment and retention video that will be professionally created and then able to be posted for potential hires to be able to look at. The second part of the feedback request is the addition of this \$683,000 appropriation that is being sunsetted and what to do with that. The two options that are suggested are there. It can be divided up between the eligible PSAPs, or we can continue to retain it into a fund that can fund the video mentioned above plus some other costs including the potential for the upcoming training and certification if that passes legislation and some of the ongoing costs to do that. The ask from the Director was to bring this back to our groups and provide any feedback to her, so we can make some decisions moving forward on this.

Jelinski would hope when this video is produced this is not done in a center that has 10, 12, 15, or 20 stations that we absolutely be able to see the few that are a one-horse operation where you might have one seat or one position dispatch center or a two-seat dispatch center that it is not just the honor and glory of having 20 positions in a dispatch center and say look how glorified this is. One person gets to relax, because they are a call-taker and the other one does this. Jelinski would hope we would be able to see a video that encompasses what we are actually talking about and we are not just talking about those big centers.

Booker reported Larson and her had a little email conversation after this request went out and he had a really good suggestion. Booker is going to include that in our feedback from our Central Region NG911 Committee. In addition to the video, to look at doing some other marketing type things. Some templates, some mailers, some types of what else can agencies use when they are doing this recruitment on their own. The video is great, but what happens after that? Having some supplemental materials or a toolbox of materials that agencies can use when they are trying to do their own internal recruitment would be helpful.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

J. Statewide NG911 Committee – Recruitment/Retention Tools (Continued)

Myers stated just one of the questions, and Myers does not know if it has been discussed from another state committee, we are looking at some initiatives so you create this video and you have this information where is your target audience? How are you delivering it to them? Is there any thought given to putting together a group that either works with whoever is going to be taking it on if we do get this certification process done and then also looking at reaching out and grabbing that high school job fairs that are going. Looking at how do you get your promotional material to your target audience. Has there been any thought on how that is going to be delivered?

Booker does not have the answer to that. This came up at our meeting a couple of weeks ago, so this is the first we as the regional membership has seen this ask. All of those things are worth taking note of and then bringing it back along with our feedback to try and get some of the supplemental answers to that.

Myers stated on that note, is there a process who is developing the content? Are you going to have input as to how that content like why choosing that? Myers does not know the answer, Myers is just throwing it out there for when this is going back and looking for feedback from our regional NG911 and at state level looking at why people should choose that content that is going to get developed. Is it some outside agency going to develop that content, or are you guys going to develop the content that you want to project in your video? Why choose this group, what makes it so attractive and looking at some of the incentives until you actually have those you cannot put them in there. What we are looking at is what are the changes that are coming in the industry what's the future hold. Some of the initiatives we are looking at from 9-1-1. How it is changing, here is today's 9-1-1 looking at where we see this going and trying to peek interest that way. Having the boots on the ground help drive some of the content as to why they are in the field and what they can bring to the table to help attract more folks to the career field. Myers does not know what that process is going to look like, but it is a question to get asked.

Tait added a little more context to help answer some of the questions. This request came from the MN Sheriffs Association. They operate 80 of our 96 primary PSAPs in the state. They see the collective need to do a better job of recruiting and retention statewide, so they asked ECN. We have the great idea, how are we going to pay for it, and that is where you are seeing the email here today. Tait envisions that yes, there will be a very strong focus on PSAPs that are 3 seats or smaller. Nationwide, the vast majority of our PSAPs are small centers, so that is going to be the focus. Sheriff Caulk in Isanti County has already offered up his PSAP as an opportunity to interview and shoot some video. Tait is sure the other members of the MSA PSAP Committee will open up their doors as well. As far as developing content, Tait envisions it as a collaboration between ECN, SECB NG911 Committee and the MN Sheriff's Association to decide exactly what that looks like. The 911 Committee does have an Operations Workgroup that will be standing up and meeting monthly. Tait sees that group having a very strong role in helping to identify those needs. Each region has representation on that workgroup and can report up to the 911 Committee and that committee can report up to the board. Very preliminary now, but certainly the Sheriffs and the SECB and ECN will have seats at that table and drive the bus on what that looks like and to Larson's comment what's next.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Regional Concerns (Continued)

J. Statewide NG911 Committee – Recruitment/Retention Tools (Continued)

Tait explained doing the video is just step #1 and that is where Director Wahlberg is asking for this \$683,000 to be dedicated to ongoing needs that all of our PSAPs share verses giving you an extra couple hundred dollars on your monthly check. There is a lot of collective need and it makes more sense to look at that from a global perspective instead of having everybody going out and inventing their own process. The Sheriffs are really starting to understand that it is not just Corrections, it's not just Deputies, it's also the PSAP that needs this kind of support.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Committee Attendance

Viewed online.

B. Website (Update)

No update.

C. Fee Diversion Strike Force Report

Myers would ask the question that has been on there for some time is that something we can sunset off the agenda? There is nothing really that has happened for several months on that since the final report came out. Do we want to keep it on there? Jelinski thinks it can go away, when something comes to light we can always bring it back. Myers will make note to remove that so we will take it off for the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING:

a) May 4, 2022 – 11:00 a.m.

b) June 8, 2022 – 11:00 a.m. (ESB Meeting)

ADJORNMENT:

Chair Jelinski made the executive motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was carried unanimously at 12:27 p.m.

Minutes by Shari Gieseke.