

**Central MN
Owners & Operators and User Committee Meeting
Microsoft Teams Meeting
May 19, 2022 – 10:00 AM**

OWNERS & OPERATORS MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:

1. Brandon Larson, Vice Chair & Micah Myers – City of St. Cloud
2. Kandiyohi County – Big Stone County
3. Tina Lindquist – Grant County
4. Ace Bonnema – Kandiyohi County
5. Andy Beckstrom – Mille Lacs County
6. Victoria MacKissock – Morrison County
7. Jason Karlgaard & Greg Seim – Otter Tail County
8. Nathan Brecht – Pope County
9. Kristen Lahr, Chair & Mary Lieser & Michele Burke – Stearns County
10. Dona Greiner & Brian Koehler – Stevens County
11. Bill McGeary – Swift County
12. Sarah Booker – Todd County
13. Tyler Wheeler – Wadena County
14. Haley Dubois – Wright County

USERS MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:

1. Tom Zabinski & Steve Williams – City of St. Cloud
2. Kandiyohi County – Big Stone County
3. Tina Lindquist – Grant County
4. Ace Bonnema – Kandiyohi County
5. Andy Beckstrom – Mille Lacs County
6. Victoria MacKissock – Morrison County
7. Jason Karlgaard & Marco Picchiarini & Greg Seim – Otter Tail County
8. Nathan Brecht – Pope County
9. Kristen Lahr, Chairperson pro tem & Michele Burke – Stearns County
10. Dona Greiner & Brian Koehler – Stevens County
11. Bill McGeary – Swift County
12. Sarah Booker – Todd County
13. Tyler Wheeler – Wadena County
14. Haley Dubois & Richard Ward – Wright County

GUESTS:

1. Commissioner Jeff Jelinski, ESB Chair – Morrison County
2. Stephanie Johnson, EMAC Chair – Meeker County

OWNERS & OPERATORS MEMBERS/ALTERNATES ABSENT:

1. Benton County
2. Douglas County
3. Meeker County
4. Traverse County
5. Wilkin County

USER MEMBERS/ALTERNATES ABSENT:

1. Benton County
2. Douglas County
3. Meeker County
4. Traverse County
5. Wilkin County

CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting called to order by O&O Chair Kristen Lahr at 10:00 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions were conducted. There was a quorum for both Committees.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Todd County made a motion to approve the O&O/Users Agenda. Grant County seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Morrison – Aye; Otter Tail – Aye; Pope – Aye; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Todd – Aye; Wadena – Aye; Wright – Aye.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Morrison County made a motion to approve the March 17, 2022 O&O/Users minutes. Todd County seconded, motion carried. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Morrison – Aye; Otter Tail – Aye; Pope – Aye; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Todd – Aye; Wadena – Aye; Wright – Aye.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. CMN800MHz list serve ended May 16th – Sign-up for Notifications
Lahr reported the Central MN 800MHz list serve has been disabled as of Monday, May 16th. In the packet you can sign-up for notifications via the MNECB website. That is how we will be sending out notifications of trainings, etc. from here on out. Shari has created lists specifically for membership rosters for meeting agenda packets and notifications that need to be sent out just to membership for all of the committees. Shari added on the trainings topic, we will not be sending out the trainings that ECN is sending out. We got the COMT one today and the AUXCOMM that we might want to bring up during the User business. Shari explained we will be sending out any trainings that the region does though on those lists. Lahr explained you should be able to sign-up on the ECN website for training notifications.
- b. MN Public Safety Communications Conference – Reimbursements
Shari explained we have not received too many reimbursement requests yet. We have until June to get those in. If you used your personal cash, make sure you are going to your counties to get reimbursement through your county. We will be reimbursing counties only. We did intend to reimburse everything for the conference besides the preconference, so what that means is the meals that were included on your hotel invoices. It looks like breakfasts were not listed, but lunches were. That lunch that you had on Wednesday would be included in your Tuesday night hotel costs, so that will be included as well.

O&O BUSINESS:

- a. CM Analyzer rotation schedule
Larson was just notified yesterday that the analyzer is currently in Swift County in route to Stevens County. McGeary had brought it from Todd County to here and his Sheriff decided he did not want it. Greiner reported we have it connected and we will be using it until the first part of June.

O&O BUSINESS: (Continued)

a. CM Analyzer rotation schedule (Continued)

Larson requested if you could give him a head's up when you are almost done. It jumped a county or two out of sequence. We will need to check in with those counties in the middle when Stevens is done. Johnson reported Meeker County declined it which is why it went to Swift. Larson will have to check on Wadena.

b. Genesis PC replacement

Lahr added this to the agenda and we did touch on it a little bit last week at the RAC meeting in regards to budget requests. The laptop that is used for the Genesis reporting software that the region uses is the same laptop we began with in maybe 2014-2015. The laptop is about seven years old. We did have some network connectivity with it a few years ago. MnDOT took it down at the ROC. They reloaded the operating system and were able to get it back connected to the network. The operating system should likely be upgraded. It is currently running maybe Windows 7. The equipment is just aging out. We are looking to have a discussion whether, or not, we should add in the 2023 budget cycle the option to replace the hardware equipment that goes along with Genesis, or put into the budget cycle an annual amortized budget amount to get that on a more regular replacement cycle for the region.

Myers explained what we are looking at is either paying for it up front, or putting it on a lease replacement schedule which we can do it in a 3 or 4 year process. That way we get it on a cycle that it is regularly being replaced and we can budget for it. We can take the hit in one year or we can do the budget over the next 3-4 years.

Lahr asked Myers do you have a rough estimate as to how much a new laptop would cost or what the impact per year would be if we put it on a lease agreement?

Myers explained ballpark on a laptop is going to be a right around \$2,200 new. If we did it on a lease it will be between \$600-800. Your payment will be right around \$700, but depends on how we can figure it. That is the budgetary number Myers uses for his current city laptops and we just added to the lease. The other challenge you got is how quickly we want to get this replaced. If we move it forward, anticipate there is going to be some delay in getting it as with anything right now it is hard to get, supply chain.

Lahr explained if we do just a one-time purchase we are looking at for next year like a \$115.00 increase to each of our member agencies. Or, the \$700 about \$37 dollar increase to our contributions for the budget. Lahr asked for a motion to request the replacement be placed in the budget cycle. We could leave it up to the Board as to how they want to spread it out, whether it be over the course of several years or just a one-time purchase.

Booker thinks it would seem like good business to do the annual thing and just have it on a regular replacement schedule. Booker does not know that we are ever going to get to a time where technology is not becoming out-dated. If we have that planned and it is a fairly stable amount going through that to Booker seems like that would be the best option. *Todd County made a motion to do the lease agreement and put it on a regular replacement schedule. Otter Tail County seconded.* Otter Tail County explained as far as the payment schedule we would be fine with either way whatever works best for everyone. It is not that much either way. We definitely find value in the Genesis. We would sure like to keep that around. Stearns County does as well. Roll Call Vote: City of St. Cloud – Aye; Big Stone – Aye; Grant – Aye; Kandiyohi – Aye; Mille Lacs – Aye; Morrison – Aye; Otter Tail – Aye; Pope – Aye; Stearns – Aye; Stevens – Aye; Swift – Aye; Todd – Aye; Wadena – Aye; Wright – Aye. *Motion carried.*

USER BUSINESS:

a. Training:

- 2022 Training Roadmap Status

Lahr explained the items at the top in this table are the trainings that we are looking at for 2022. We do have funds to hold these trainings including three trainings in the NG911 track. Is that correct? We just need to determine what trainings those will be.

Myers replied those are just offerings. Like when you look at the NG911 mental health and then the NG911 caller management. There are two different entities that provide them. If you look down below, you will see the difference. There is the NG911 training institute and then the public safety consultants. We are looking at doing either a whole set or a hybrid where you can be in-person or not. The dollar amounts you see in there are for up to, it lists the class sizes right here where it says the limits. We are looking at a combination of those. The first one you can do two different classes for that price, and the other one is just an individual class.

Lahr stated we are looking for interest by the region as to of all of these three courses what we have the greatest interest in providing?

Booker explained after our meeting last week, we did send out a survey this week. If somebody has not taken a look at it, they can take a look at it and kind of rank in order of interest which ones they would prefer. And then we will consolidate those results and try and come up with a good solution. Lahr believes we are requesting responses back by June 1st? Booker replied yes, we wanted to try and get two weeks out of it and give us a little bit of time to go through it before our next meeting.

Myers was just saying what we were looking at, we are making the recommendation to send this forward to the board to pull from reserves. What we were asking of this group is start identifying dates and locations where we can do these so we can reach out to the said vendors and start getting on their calendars. I know we talked about staying away from summer months because it is really hard to do training. But what we also suggested at the RAC last week was looking at potentially starting middle to end of August. Working through to try and give us a wide enough window that we can accomplish these. And go ahead and move these forward. The other thing to think about too is if we do not get in this calendar year we could roll it into the first quarter of 2023 as well. We just need to get dates from the group.

Lahr entertained a discussion or opened the floor for anyone on the call today, if they have any availability or willingness to host any of these courses. The ARMER Radio Trainer is a two-day course. Classroom style refresher is a single day course, classroom style. ARMER System Administrator in that case we would need to have an ARMER network connectivity for that class. And ARMER dispatch we are looking for some ARMER network connectivity for that as well. Does anyone today have any comments or willingness to offer up some space and we can look at dates and schedules offline, but maybe just to get the conversation started?

Otter Tail County would. Burke replied Stearns would be able to host something. Lahr responded we can start with Otter Tail and Stearns looking at potential for what classes those might be and some dates and bring that back to the next meeting. And send out some notifications if we are looking for space on some other trainings as well.

USER BUSINESS:

a. Training:

- 2022 Training Roadmap Status

Lahr asked Myers did you mention some of the NG911 training is potentially virtual options? Myers replied there is a virtual option. With the 911 Institute there is an option for a hybrid. Once we settle on the training, we get the location, we can sit down with the vendor and coordinate how we are going to deliver it. That option works well too where if they keep talking that we are going to see an uptick in COVID and that is where some of the issue why we held over something like the training we just had here back in April. That was a holdover because we could not really have it in-person. Myers would like to have the option. Myers would also reach out to the group do they have a preference of virtual or in-person for those trainings when they are responding as their priority. Myers thinks that would be helpful on those that are offered that way. Booker replied that was one of the options on our survey.

Myers stated as for the ARMER classes, some of those do not lend themselves to the virtual option, so those will be in-person, but if there is an option that we want to get the class in and it is conducive to being virtual we will look into that and Myers will work with that when Myers works with On Target on that as well.

Lahr knows we do did have CASM listed here and we were waiting for the CASM refresh on the website first. That has been done. Lahr is wondering if maybe we could check in with On Target. Steve Olson in 2016 provided that initial CASM level one and two training when we first started trying to promote CASM use. Should we check in with On Target to see if they would be willing to develop a course or offer that?

Myers will ask Rey Freeman on that one as well. The other thing Myers would suggest too since the refresh has happened. If you do not have a CASM login, Myers would say get one. You can go into the resource library there and pull up all of the refresher trainings. The other option and Myers wanted to get some feedback from the group, Myers has downloaded all of the videos that were on the refresher training. We could put that up on a resource library on the website as well for folks if there is enough interest. Myers wants to make sure there is enough interest before we go through recreating something that is already there.

Lahr stated we will just look into that. We will reach out to On Target. We do have CASM on topic in our regional goals discussion further in the agenda.

Myers knows we have in the budget a line item for 2023 for training. There is a lot of stuff to try and get into the one year. Myers will look at seeing if On Target if there is still a willingness to provide that training and probably suggesting looking at that for Q1 of 2023 if we are going to move forward with it.

Lahr reported there is a survey going around for the NG911 courses as far as level of interest on those. We will be working with Otter Tail and Stearns to potentially schedule and locate some of the ARMER trainings and reach out to On Target whether, or not, they have the ability to provide a CASM refresher for potentially Q1 of 2023. We can bring that information back to our next meeting.

USER BUSINESS: (Continued)

a. Training: (Continued)

- ARMER Radio Trainer After-action Report

Lahr reported the after action-report from the April course that was delivered is in the packet. We get course evaluations from On Target in regard to our training. The bulk of the summary on the April training is on the second page of that after-action report. Feedback that was provided, so this is provided to us for review. Feedback on how the course was delivered and the participant's opinions. The only thing Lahr wanted to bring up today are some recommendations for improving the delivery of future training events. There were some items noted here like utilization of the Alex Tech training program to reinforce concepts taught in the training. Modification of our course sign-up process. This would allow us to give members of the region adequate time to register and create a waitlist for those outside the region that wanted to attend the training. Provide the vendor questions for our after-action report to include with their class evaluations. Lahr asked are there specific questions we want answered in the after-action report? And also send participants the link to the Alex Tech training program and a link to the region's Acronym List prior to the training. Lahr explained these are some things we can discuss building into how we deliver our future training events. Prep participants with the information on how to get online training through Alex before they go to the in-person classes. And some key pieces of information like acronym lists, etc. if that is helpful for students as they are going through in-person courses. Lahr thinks it might be something that could be built into the registration process. Lahr could look at how we set-up our EventBrite registrations as far as prerequisites. We could potentially put links in there to the specific Alex Tech ARMER 101 courses in their registration process that they could get as they are signing up. We could talk about that and see if there is any of these suggestions we can incorporate maybe automatically rather than adding to anyone's workload.

Myers asked as you are talking about building that registration form, can we put some text or free form that people can either set expectations or what they hope to accomplish out of attending the training so the training providers can say I need to cover this subject, or this is something they are looking for. Kind of front load it. Then the other thing with this report here we did this when we were looking at a requirement for submitting for grants. We had to provide an after-action report. Myers does find value when you go through and look and see if we are hitting the mark on the course. Not only are we looking at to make it a better for things, but it helps us determine did we pick it right or what else do we need to look at when we are trying to plan for what other offerings we are going to have going forward.

Lahr can look at that on the EventBrite site, so we can pull automatic information for registrants, but if you have any ideas be sure to bring it up in discussion.

b. Request for comment: MN Fire Service Communications Best Practice Guide

Lahr reported this was updated as part of the SECB Standards Workgroup updating both standards and best practice guides. The group did go through and update the Fire Service Best Practice Guide. It is included in your packet. Cathy Anderson is asking for all the regions to distribute it to their relative individuals and have them review and go over any of the changes that were made and submit any comments back to Cathy Anderson on that. Looking for comments by June 1st. Any fire service individuals here or if you wish to forward this to anyone in your agency that can give it a once over, provide some feedback. It will be going to the LMR Committee at their June meeting.

JOINT BUSINESS:

a. Regional Strategic Plan – O&O / Users focused goals

- Priority 1 – Subscriber Inventory Form

Lahr explained priority 1 is important for all of us. Securing funding for emergency communications equipment and technology. The first bullet point on the packet is the subscriber inventory form that we started in our region and ECN is using and pushing out to all the regions to gather an inventory of what we have out there for subscribers currently. What capabilities those subscribers have, how old they are, what models they are, etc. There is a quick link here to download that form if you have not done so. Our region has been pretty good. We are close to 70% submission. If your agency has not submitted that inventory it is very helpful for multiple efforts to try and secure funding for subscriber replacements moving through the future. It is hard to ask the legislature for funding when we do not exactly know how much we are asking for, or what needs to be replaced or funded.

Myers reported the Finance Committee, this is one cog. We are also looking at something that Myers thinks we will be asking for more to the point of if we are going to the legislators and we are asking for funding to help support these systems, not only ARMER, but the other NG911, Wireless Broadband, and IPAWS underneath the SECB, we need to know what our exposure is. We are going to be asking for costing as part of a detailed cost study we are looking to embark on. And this is just one of the cogs in there. It is to your benefit if you do provide the information. Myers knows that some areas around the state they have not, because there may be a cost, because they use radio shops to support that. If that is the case let us know, because from the Finance Committee standpoint of trying to figure out how we can work with those radio shops to get that information, because it is imperative we get it for our ongoing initiatives.

- Priority 2 – Advocate and support FirstNet and wireless broadband initiatives

Lahr explained at our March meeting, we have here that there was a brief update from RIC Tait regarding Stevens County meeting with AT&T to discuss coverage in the western part of the state. Koehler from Stevens County reported we initially met with AT&T/FirstNet to discuss it. They are aware of the issues out here. We have not heard anything since that meeting. They are well aware of it. They even showed us the mapping of their coverage and it does show there is a big hole in this area including up north of us. As far as what their plans are in the near future it has not been opened up yet, but they said they are aware of it and will be working on it.

- Priority 3 – Provide training and exercise opportunities to regional stakeholders

Lahr reported we just got out of a discussion on where we are going with that. Lahr will update this tracking sheet with what we discussed here today.

- Priority 4 – Increase stakeholder awareness and usage of regional COMU resources

Lahr reported at our last meeting, we discussed that our regional COMU group was going to bring up a topic with the Executive Committee the potential of formalizing the COMU group as a workgroup in the governance structure with the regional committees. Lahr asked if there was an update on that. Larson replied the topic was brought up, but there was no discussion. Lahr stated the regional COMU group is still meeting, correct? Larson reported we met in-person in St. Cloud. We had hands on training with gateways and cellular devices configuration. We were able to collaborate a couple folks from National Guard participated with us as well.

JOINT BUSINESS: (Continued)

a. Regional Strategic Plan – O&O / Users focused goals (Continued)

- Priority 4 – Increase stakeholder awareness & usage of regional COMU resources
Lahr reported we did from our last meeting discuss that we would be providing a regional COMU report that we generally submit annually to the state SWIC. Both our STR report as far as funds that were spent out of our STR, and any COMU activity that we have had reported in the Central Region is included in your packet.
- Priority 6 – Increase stakeholder awareness and usage of CASM resources
Lahr noted some updates for May. The CASM upgrade/refresh has been completed. There are training materials that are available via the CASM dashboard. There is a CASM link that has been added to our regional training page. You will see that there is a CASM link on how to request or access the CASM website. Request a login from there. Once you login to the dashboard there are training materials available right on that first screen that allow you to go through training updates on the refresh of the website. Lahr added a link in our packet.
- CASM Refresh Fact Sheet
Lahr reported in our packet is a CASM fact sheet that was provided as part of the refresh. There were some training dates some Webexs initially right after the refresh they were the first part of May. Those training sessions have been completed. We will be looking at potential for a CASM training the first quarter of next year.

b. Encryption Summit – report and discussion

Lahr reported there were maybe about 30 to 40 people across the state both operational and technical that participated, several ECN folks, people from fire service, the State Fire Marshal's Office, the Fire Chiefs Association, law enforcement. The group met to discuss a wide variety of topics that are coming at us pretty quick stirred up from the requirement bulletin that was put out by the BCA in regard to an FBI rule about transmitting CJI data over AES encryption needs to be encrypted at AES-256 or 256 bit encryption for CJI data on land mobile radio. A variety of topics were discussed and some ideas were presented. Out of the two-day summit the group produced a number of recommendations or potential action items related to the development and implementation of a statewide LMR encryption plan. Those include incorporating AES-256 as the new state standard for encrypted interoperable communications on ARMER. We are looking at moving to AES interoperable talkgroups for statewide encryption interoperable talkgroups, so for statewide encrypted talk groups, so incorporating that into the plan. We also made a recommendation that is imperative to maintain interoperability for and with those agencies and disciplines as they consider encryption of their local talkgroups, or maybe consider encryption on a day-to-day basis for encrypting their mains. There are several agencies across the state that have already switched to encrypting their day-to-day traffic and we want to put a high importance on maintaining interoperability as more of that might start to occur across the state. The group anticipated the migration from our current DES encryption to AES would take several years, maybe about 8 to 10 years. And change management that process would probably determine the pace and sunset of DES encryption on statewide talkgroups. DES is not going away anytime soon, but there is a willingness. We do feel there is an importance to move to that federal standard of AES-256 for statewide encryption. There is also a recommendation by the group that is that all public safety subscriber purchases or new radio purchases where hardware encryption is desired should include or shall include AES and multi key. If agencies are looking to purchase new radios, they should include AES and multi key with part of that purchase and that is packaged together in the state contract anyway.

JOINT BUSINESS: (Continued)

a. Encryption Summit – report and discussion (Continued)

Lahr stated it should not be a huge impact or a detriment or an additional cost for agencies, but just to have a recommendation out there that makes sure you are doing that when you are purchasing new radios. We are recommending that a purchasing guide or a buyer's guide be developed in educating those decision makers or people as they are looking at new radio purchases, like what should I consider when I am buying a new radio? What's my discipline? Who do I need to talk to? Should I consider getting encryption when I am buying a new radio? Kind of like an educational buyers guide so it makes purchases a bit easier. The LMR Committee recommended that SECB regions develop a procedure for those agencies that are migrating to day-to-day encryption for their mains, maybe bringing that to the either O&O, RAC, or to a regional committee just so they are vetting those plans, not so much approving or denying it like we do with participation plans. Let's use Stearns County for instance. We want to go day-to-day encryption on our law main. We would bring that to the Owners and Operators so we can look at what is your plan for talking to your neighbors that are not encrypted when you need to talk to them, or what are you going to do when you have a pursuit? Are you going to patch to a clear mode LTAC? Do you understand once you patch to a clear mode talkgroup with your encrypted main, that you are essentially broadcasting all of your traffic over that clear mode talkgroup? Walk through that so as agencies move to encryption on a more day-to-day basis they have those interoperability pieces hammered out in their plan before they go there.

Lahr explained the last recommendation is just a recommendation to regions that they should at least address or look at the consideration of developing AES talkgroups at some point in the future. Is it something that your region wants to start digging into now? Do you want to plan for that? That is the general report of what came out of the encryption summit.

Jelinski understands where the encryption thing is coming from the FBI, NCICC, etc. What would happen hypothetically, if county X said we are happy with the way things are, I get that I cannot communicate over these other encrypted channels with other counties, but we are not going to do anything. Other than a bad mark when we have our FBI audit, a red mark, a flag, is somebody going to shut that agency or that county down? Or is it just that we would not be able to talk to the FBI if some drastic thing happened? Jelinski understands if county X converts everything to an encrypted mode that county wide does not have. Is there going to be some kind of a shame on you from the FBI? And they are going to give you a bad mark on an audit or what really happens there?

Lahr thinks you are not the only one with that question. That was debated quite a bit in the session. A point was brought up that if this is a hard and fast rule and no CJI information can be transmitted without that AES encryption. A point was made that even if Lahr would encrypt her talk path to that federal level and transmit that CJI data there is also still a rule for CJI data stating that data is supposed to be transmitted on a one-to-one basis. I am supposed to be giving that information to the one person that needs it, or the smallest amount of individuals that need that. I am still broadcasting that over a talk path that all of our law enforcement listens to. Currently, Stearns County shares our law main with our fire and EMS agencies, so if we still continue to practice it that way, that data is also being shared with fire and EMS agencies who do not need that data. So, we would still be in violation technically there from on a different rule. There is a lot of debate surrounding that. There is still really no hard and true answers. It is just still very much a topic of discussion. But, the fact that rule was distributed did kind of urge a lot of other encryption consideration topics that we as a state feel we do need to address and get ahead of to maintain interoperability that we all benefit from today.

JOINT BUSINESS: (Continued)

- a. Encryption Summit – report and discussion (Continued)
 - Change Management Workgroup – seeking participation
Lahr explained those recommendations were brought up at the May LMR Committee and LMR did vote to request from SECB starting the Change Management process to look at the development of AES or incorporating AES or look at the whole process of moving to AES as the statewide encryption standard, so that will be brought to the SECB. If that is approved by the SECB we will be opening up or forming a Change Management workgroup as part of that process. Make sure your interest is known that you would like to participate in that Change Management process. We would like to get input from both, not just technical users, but operational users, so that all of the impacts as we move forward towards that higher level of encryption are considered and incorporated into a plan so no one is left behind.
 - Encryption Education Workgroup – requesting participation
Lahr explained out of the summit there was an educational workgroup developed. Just a small handful of people that said we would be interested in participating in the encryption education workgroup to come up with materials, cheat sheets to educate stakeholders like decision makers, Commissioners, Administrators, operational people on some of the encryption topics we are considering to make plain sense of everything. And then also to develop that purchasing guide, or buyer’s guide, to distribute to decision makers as they look at new subscriber purchases. We did have one workgroup session on that already. We are looking for anybody that is interested in participating in that. It is a very concise start and stop date, not like an extended period of time that you have to commit to. We are looking at getting a few things crossed off the list right away in the next couple of months. And then disbanding that group unless it needs to come up again. Larson added that workgroup has already set meeting dates and a perspective end date for accomplishing tasks. Lahr stated the next meeting date is June 2nd. We are looking at Thursday afternoons. The first and third Thursday of each month for maybe just 2-3 months to knock some of these educational materials out. If anyone is interested in that let Larson or Lahr know.

REPORTS:

RIC Report

No report.

CMESB:

Emergency Services Board (ESB)

Myers reported this upcoming meeting here on June 8th will be our budget meeting. We will be providing the board with a draft budget for recommendations as to proceed for their final approval at their July meeting. We are also making the recommendation coming forward for the paying for the trainings we talked about earlier on the training road map. If there are any items that the groups need to get to the meeting we need to have those by June 1st.

Regional Advisory Committee (RAC)

RAC met last week. Myers reported as we also talked about in the training road map, we covered the recommendation from the RAC. We are also adopting a format for our SCIP updates. We have not officially adopted our SCIP, so that is something the Board will have to do as well. That is the recommendation coming from the RAC.

REPORTS: (Continued)

CMESB: (Continued)

Next Generation 911 Committee (NG911)

We met last week. Booker reported the majority of our meeting was just updates on our current projects. As noted, we did have a little bit of discussion on the training and sent out that survey after the meeting. We also did take a brief look at the mental health best practices policy making guide, so that is out there for review and comment. We will bring that back to statewide.

Emergency Management Advisory Committee (EMAC)

EMAC last met on April 27th in Stevens County. Johnson reported it was our first meeting where everyone was back in-person. We did look at and continue the discussion of what blended meetings might look like further, but everyone did have representation there at that in-person meeting. At the meeting, we also discussed continuing work through a subcommittee to look into National Weather Service doppler radar coverage. We do have some counties and some areas very similar to FirstNet that do not get the greatest coverage for radar and the National Weather Service is fully aware of those areas, as those counties are. We have opened up the discussion with them on starting the process of looking at regionally what we may be able to do to enhance that coverage and also looking into if it is not just our region, if there is multiple areas in the state, how can we potentially partner together and look at enhancing that for the betterment of the state. We also discussed the Salamander live badging system. The badging system right now is the state supported system for that Salamander live product. But there are additional products you can get which many counties in our region have coordinated and utilized that on individual county basis. At the discussion of EMAC, we were looking at do we want to move with that project regionally or do we want to leave it more on the county focus and after discussion on that we decided to leave it as individual county focus for now. Back in our January meeting, we decided to update the process for the election of our officers to allow for more time for potential interested individuals to shadow learn more about the position before they actually are elected in and taking office to allow some time between the nomination process and election. In order for us to do so we would need to change our bylaws. At the April meeting, we approved to change our bylaws for the election of officers so we can go ahead and elongate that so when they are elected, they will still take office that following January, but we will have more time with the officers in in the meantime. EMAC has approved we will be bringing that to the ESB next. We also continued the discussion of the COMU workgroup. Some of the members of the COMU workgroup for our region are emergency managers as well and kind of what that discussion of formalizing the COMU workgroup to see if there is a better home for that workgroup within our region. We discussed that at our EMAC region. Learned more about what COMU's focuses are, how we can collaborate, but still left it as unfortunately we do not know the perfect spot for COMU to be more formalized committee either, but we definitely see a lot of the work and benefit that COMU does. We are fully in support of that formalization. Our next EMAC meeting is going to be July 27th?

Regional Logger Committee:

No report.

Grant Updates/Current Regional Requests

Myers reported you can see we updated this list. We took off the Douglas County Alomere Health as they have found funding. One thing to note that the board approved and Commissioner Jelinski did follow-up on that. The board approved him to send out a follow-up email to Director Kelly. We had sent a letter on behalf of the region to Director Kelly and CC'd the Commissioner of Public Safety Harrington and Director Wahlberg asking for consideration of the SHSP dollars. As of today, we have not heard back on that. Can you confirm that Commissioner Jelinski since your last email? Jelinski has not heard anything.

REPORTS: (Continued)

CMESB: (Continued)

Grant Updates/Current Regional Requests (Continued)

Myers added as we go through the process of soliciting dollars for grants it goes back to the top we talked about with getting inventories on the subscribers. We cannot ask for what we do not know. If you have needs and you are not on this list, please give us those so as we go through the recurring grant process or seeking new grants that we have the information or the needs out there so we can try to acquire those so. It is ongoing, so this is something we put on all the ESB Committees agendas so we can make sure we are hitting all the membership.

REPORTS:

SECB:

Land Mobile Radio Committee

LMR met in May. Lahr already updated you on any encryption discussion that was held at LMR. In addition to that Wisconsin had an interoperability participation plan requesting radio ID's to create a unified code plug across all over their Wisconsin State Patrol radios. They have approximately 1275 radio across their State Patrol fleet that they are looking to have an interoperability zone for ARMER interop talkgroups in, so that no matter what unit or portable or mobile would potentially be responding into Minnesota or needing to interoperate with Minnesota, they would have the capabilities to do so. That was approved. The change management process was requested to the SECB. The committee did approve that general request. We did a review of the LMR SCIP goals updates on the where all of our goals are at. Much of that was covered with encryption discussion. John Dooley also included a working draft of the updated MNFOG to receive comment on from the committee members and is requesting any feedback from any other regions or interested members that worked on the MNFOG across the state. If you are looking to take a look at the updated MNFOG it is in the LMR packet for May. Submit any comments or questions to John Dooley on that. They are looking to get that approved and updated moving forward.

Interoperability Committee

Met on Tuesday. Myers reported we had one action item that is a standard. We approved the standard to be moved forward to the SECB for approval. Went over our SCIP goals.

- **Workgroup Reports (COMU – STR – EMS/Hosp)**
Lahr stated McIntyre had mentioned that EMS/Hospital workgroup is starting up meetings again. They have a meeting set for the first part of June. If you have not received an invite for that and are interested contact McIntyre to get meeting information.

Larson reported COMU workgroup the most significant thing to mention. Larson brought it up at the latest NG911 meeting for our region, the state put out a request to CISA for a technical assistance. Meaning they are requesting classes from CISA to be hosted in Minnesota. Two of the classes you mentioned earlier today is a COMT class and an AUXCOMM, which are the amateur radio operator class. But then the other one we are waiting posting and advertising is an Incident Tactical Dispatcher class. That class we are coming back to our regions and asking for a recommendation of that class should be held virtual or in person. It is Larson's responsibility to take that back to ECN and deliver that recommendation which way we would prefer to have that class. Larson thinks it would also be good if we do have agencies that are interested in sending personnel there, so if it is an in-person class, we can best locate the class and host it in the most appropriate physical location. Lahr added if there are people on the call today or if you want to reach out to your PSAP staff or management at your agency with that ask can they send that interest to Larson?

REPORTS: (Continued)

SECB: (Continued)

Interoperability Committee

- Workgroup Reports (COMU – STR – EMS/Hosp)
Larson does not have an exact deadline from ECN. They were hoping to make a decision fairly quickly and get the class scheduled out with CISA. If ECN does not hear from us they will end up having to make a decision in the absence of our recommendation. Booker added we did also include that question on our training survey for the NG911 group.

Wireless Broadband and Applications Committee

What Larson is aware of is they did take action on a letter of support for a FirstNet tower site construction on Marine on St. Croix which is in Washington County. The committee previously gave a recommendation for a letter of support back in 2020 for construction at that location. AT&T requested an additional letter for the planning and zoning meeting. That letter will be going before the SECB for board action at their next meeting.

Steering Committee

Met on the May 11th. Lahr reported we had an update on where the updated governance language for Statute 403 was at in regards to the governance language. That group completed their work and that work was submitted to the legislative liaison for review. Currently, the legislative sessions are in progress and he will not be able to review that until the legislative session concludes. So, workgroup sessions on that are paused until a review and perspective from the Commissioner's Office has been offered to the group. There was some GIS discussion. Last year in May, the NG911 GIS workgroup crafted a report with recommendations and it was presented at the SECB meeting. Out of that report it was determined some of those recommendations should go to the Steering group for presentation. We have had this topic on our agenda for the last number of months. There are some discussions surrounding what is being asked of Steering as it pertains to GIS. Steering is asking for some clarification from the SECB as to whether the GIS workgroup report and the recommendations in it were adopted by the SECB, or if that document was just received by the SECB and if the board is asking Steering for some actionable steps on those recommendations. We would like to get some clarification on that and then move forward on whatever task it is that the SECB is asking of us. We reviewed our SCIP goals and had a discussion on any progress made in there. In July, our meeting will take action on a charter for a Steering workgroup to address our goal number one. Which is to develop some education materials or fact sheets regarding the four core emergency communication systems and the role the SECB plays in supporting those systems to give some clarity and garner participation in the whole governance process for the SECB. We will be looking at creating a workgroup to address that information for future activities.

NEXT MEETING:

The next O&O/Users meeting will be June 16, 2022 at 10:00 AM via Microsoft Teams.

ADJORNMENT:

Chair Lahr made the executive motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was carried unanimously at 11:35 a.m.

Minutes recorded by Shari Gieseke.