

CENTRAL MINNESOTA REGIONAL RADIO BOARD (RRB)
Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 30, 2008 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

City of St. Cloud City Hall, St. Cloud, MN

Members/Alternates Present:

1. Don Otte, Designee Stearns County - Chair
2. Jim McMahon – Designee Benton County
3. Doug Tomschin – Designee Big Stone County
4. Paul Anderson – Designee Douglas County – Vice Chair
Jerry Johnson – Alternate Douglas County
5. Ron Woltjer – Designee Grant County
Tom Amundson – Alternate Grant County
6. Dean Shuck – Designee Kandiyohi County
7. Wally Strand– Designee Meeker County
Dave Gabrielson – Alternate Meeker County
8. Robert Block – Designee Otter Tail County
9. Paul Anderson – Designee Pope County
10. Rachel Leonard – Alternate Sherburne County
11. Jeff Georger – Designee City of St. Cloud
12. Larry Sayre – Stevens County
13. Gary Kneisl – Designee Todd County
14. Dr. David Naatz – Designee Traverse County
15. Lane Waldahl – Designee Wadena County
16. Dan Hartog – Designee Regional Advisory Committee
17. Tom Justin – Designee User Committee
Paul McIntyre – Alternate User Committee

Members/Alternates Absent:

18. Morrison County
19. Swift County
20. Wilkin County
21. Wright County

Guests Present:

Tom Hannon - SRB

Call to Order:

Meeting called to order by Chair Otte at 2:05 p.m.

Introductions:

Introductions were conducted. Chair Otte welcomed everyone and reminded them to sign-in.

Approval of June 18, 2008 Minutes: *Paul Anderson, Douglas County moved, second Dr. David Naatz, to approve minutes of June 18, 2008, upon a vote, motion carried.*

Correction via Tom Justin Page 3

Communications:

None at this time.

Reports:**SRB:**

Chair Otte stated the June SRB meeting they approved the split for the monies that were to be distributed Outstate and Metro – 2/3 Outstate and 1/3 Metro, July meeting cancelled.

RAC – Micah Myers:

RAC Chair Myers state they met on July 11th and went though through CASM representative agreement, Kandiyohi County put a representative forward for position and will be reimbursed 15 hours per month for Ace's time as the Central MN CASM representative. Additional time is allotted for other responsibilities as needed. Professional Services Agreement is in packet, RAC discussed agreement which is a standard agreement the City has utilized in the past. The RAC made changes referencing TIC Plan and in the interim Ace will work with consultant for up to 15 hours per month for consulting services. RAC recommended approval of agreement by the RRB, Micah stated the Central MN RRB budget has a line item for professional services of \$5,000 in 2008 and \$10,500 in 2009. We can use the professional service money for the 20% match for M&A money (\$20,000 in 2008, \$14,000 in 2009 and \$7,000 in 2010), budget would not change. *Jim McMahan moved, Jeff Goerger second to approve agreement, upon a vote motion carried.*

Dan Hartog stated in the private language instead of contract it should be listed as an agreement and corrected county board to state board. Jim McMahan questioned if the address listed as county versus state and should it list City of St. Cloud as the fiscal agent, Micah stated yes.

Doug Tomschin asked for an explanation of a TIC plan – Micah explained it is a technical operations plan i.e. if a tornado came through and several counties responded for assistance, it would list how they would communicate and what equipment they had available, frequencies, etc.

Micah stated RAC had discussion on background checks and standard 4.10 regarding residency. Original indicated going back to age 18, a vendor had an older employee and going to 18 would be cumbersome, therefore upon much discussion the language was changed to state, "Last 10 years of residency and any other addresses outside of the state of Minnesota and must include City and State and dates"). *Dean Shuck moved, second Dr. Naatz to approve revised 4.10 standard, approved upon a vote.*

Micah discussed project Jay Sikkink is heading up - Central MN RCC Transport. Jay met with a couple of emergency transports. Bill Becker of St Cloud Hospital is in support of it and is looking at housing it at the St. Cloud Hospital and is in the process of developing a roadmap as to how we will set up a RCC.

Each of the RAC members discussed the status with GeoComm and their plans. There was a resolution proposal that each member would complete their assessment studies and there was a lengthy discussion, approved to accept GeoComm's proposal on the assessment studies and due dates.

SRB Interoperability Committee – Micah Myers and Jay Sikkink:

Micah stated there currently is a grant they are working on for operational and planning expenses in the amount of \$648,000, committee had a lot of discussion as to qualified expenses. Had discussion as to how to cover costs for non-city or county employees for attending meetings such as volunteer fire, looking at way to kick back to counties who are reimbursing their members for attending subcommittee meetings. Also looking at additional money going into training, are developing a plan and hope to have something concrete in the next 60 days.

Reports: (Continued)

SRB Interoperability Committee – Micah Myers and Jay Sikkink: (Continued)

Jay stated the Interoperability Committee is working on law enforcement and how they interoperate when people are on their VHF and 800 systems. Hardest issue is a chase as it goes across several jurisdictions and counties where as fire is not a moving target. Talking to State Patrol who owns the chase as it goes across jurisdictions and who is the backup person for control. At this time, they are gathering information and resources available.

User Committee:

Had a lot of discussion at User Committee and RAC on use of 10 codes and going to plain English. A similar code could mean different things for different regions, there are a few 10 codes that need to be left in tact but need to determine which ones.

OTC:

Nothing to report – did not meet since list RRB meeting.

General Discussion and New Business:

Review Bylaws:

Micah stated there were questions regarding bylaws such as when is the budget due, when are officers elected, etc. Budget was approved in June; question was raised on process and responsibility of each member once it is approved and what each member's commitment is. At the beginning of each year we are to elect a chair and the term is for one year. Elections were not done last month and the RRB must decide if we need to change, etc. The RRB should see if they want to amend bylaws to change what is not working as anticipated.

Chair Otte asked if the 1st meeting of each year is June or July – Micah stated Chair Otte was elected at June for one year – this group needs to decide on voting. Chair Otte stated motion at June meeting was to go to a calendar year and the first meeting would be in January. Micah read verbage from bylaws. Doug Tomschin asked if it would be easier on the chair to have elections in January; Paul Anderson, Pope County stated he likes the annual meeting to be held in June. Tom Justin stated the 2nd line of the 1st paragraph of the bylaws stated annual meeting is the 3rd Wednesday of June; the issue is when a board and committee chair is elected and can it be amended to state 1st calendar meeting.

Micah stated they can be amended at today's meeting and they won't take affect until 30 days. Tom Justin stated article VII stated members need to have a ten day notice of any proposed changes. Chair Otte stated he would like to amend bylaws so elections take place the 1st meeting of the calendar year, we need a ten day notice for changes to bylaws and asked to be put on the next agenda. *Ron Woltjer moved, Dr. Naatz second to have agenda items posted ten days prior to meeting via email. Motion carried.*

Budget:

Micah stated budget was approved, but there was a question as to what happens then. Once budget is approved and if the RRB does not hear back by August, it is the agreement that the county automatically agrees with the budget and are ok with it. Micah stated we did send out notifications to each of the entities fiscal agent on file stating it needs to be in their county budget. Chair Otte stated if a county does not want to pay the bill, how when do they need to let us know. Micah stated by August and according to the Joint Powers Agreement, Article IV talks about termination of the agreement if they decide to pull out of the agreement.

General Discussion and New Business: (Continued)

Grant Money (PSIC):

Micah stated Central MN will receive just under \$843,000 and it was moved forward from the User Committee following a lengthy discussion to the RAC that it be split equally for approximately \$42,100 to each member to purchase radios and put in a timeline as an entity has to have the matching funds of January 1, 2010 and have until September 1, 2010 to spend the money. This is the RAC's recommendation that entities need to have the matching portion by May of 2009 or the entity's funds will be returned.

He did receive an email today asking if the money has to be labeled in the budget. Tom Hannon stated one of the rules of the PSIC grant requires that these funds not be supplanted i.e. an agency not have dollars budgeted in their current budget and not be replaced with grant dollars. It needs to be labeled for funds for radios and not for communication so in your budget documents it should actually say, "it is match for PSIC grant dollars", the language has been provided to Micah and he can provide to all administrative staff. Tom stated he just received the language this morning and any other questions such as dollars from fund balance were not dollars allocated for a project and may be allowed although Ron Whitehead could verify. He stated it could be out of the bond dollars but would need to be a separate line.

Micah stated the funding mechanism the RAC is recommending is to have the PSIC funding divided equally. The match would be about \$8,500 and an entity could get about \$50,000 in radios. He stated May of 2009 commitment needs to be made because money must be encumbered and to the state level by January 1, 2010. If you have the match in your budget by January 1, 2010, you have to have it spent by September 1, 2010. Date is May so the RAC can meet one additional time for reallocation.

Tom Justin stated one of the concerns initially is if you allocated the funding this year for the 2009 budget, it indicates you are interested and if you wait until 2009 for 2010 budget, counties would not have time to plan for the additional funding from entities not utilizing the funds. Paul Anderson, Pope County stated it would need to be in the budget they are working on now. Micah stated it does not need to be in the 2009 budget, just would need a commitment. Chair Otte asked if it needs to be via resolution, Micah stated that is up to them.

Lane Waldahl stated counties could put in a line item in 2009 of \$4,250 and 2010 could do another \$4,250 and would have the \$8,000 Match, Tom Justin stated they could do it in a two-year plan. That would show the county has made a commitment to move forward. Jeff Georger stated he does not understand this; if it is included in the 2010 budget, that is a commitment yet Tom Justin is stating by 2009 to allow for commitment. Chair Otte asked Tom Hannon for clarification, he stated the User Committee and RAC as well as other RRB's across the state – this is only one component of a very complex issue; the current thinking is the state is requiring a commitment by December 31, 2009 which it could be the 2010 budget adopted prior to December 31, 2009. Problem is if an entity does not make that commitment, it does not allow enough time for other entities to utilize the funds for those who are not committed.

The RAC would like to get a commitment from everyone in the region if they will or will not be utilizing the funding. The board needs to decide when they want the partners to come up with their match and indicate if the unused funds go back to the state, but if they want to have an opportunity to have the funds stay in the region, then the board needs to set the date prior to December 31, 2009 to allow other partners to come up with the match. These dollars are also limited as to what they can be spent for – can not be used for infrastructure - can only be used for mobiles and portables.

General Discussion and New Business: (Continued)

Grant Money (PSIC): (Continued)

Other issues around the state is many counties have opted to go with narrow band VHF to meet their requirements and will not have a need to go 700 or 800 although they still need to interoperate and will need public safety equipment to interop with their neighbors who are going 800. Therefore counties are rethinking their plan if they want to utilize the funds if not going 800. Tom stated if the region goes with a date of December 31, 2009, we will lose money back to the state. Jeff stated he understands it needs to be in the budget in 2009 or 2010 but commitment by May 2009 – Micah stated yes. Jeff Goerger asked if the City has a provision for these funds in the 2009 budget and Micah stated yes.

Paul Anderson, Douglas County asked on commitment – Micah stated the RAC suggests the PSIC grant gets divided equally by all members and would be \$42,100 – the match of 20% would be \$8,500. He stated it either needs to be in the 2009 budget or a commitment by then.

Tom Hannon stated other regions stated is requirement in grant that NGO's be included in the funding and could go to City's, EMS agencies, ambulances, etc. that are within the county but not a county government and could ask them to provide the match. Chair Otte stated so in St. Cloud they could ask Gold Cross to come up with the match money, although other counties who are volunteer ambulance, it would fall on the counties for the match.

Dr. Naatz asked how this plays in with the legislature in levy limits. Micah stated at the last meeting information was provided and this is outside of the levy limit as legislation provided an exemption for matching grants outside of the levy limit. Paul Anderson, Pope County stated if it is in the 2009 budget could they carry it forward to 2010 by a resolution in 2009 or would it be tough to bind the resolution in 2010. Rachel Leonard stated from what she understands they would go to respective counties and get the commitment. *Rachel Leonard moved that the commitment be by May 2009 and if a county does not want to participate, it would allow enough time to redistribute, Jeff Georger second motion. Following much discussion, the motion carried.* (See additional discussion below.)

Chair Otte stated if the motion passes as stated, it could be in the 2009 or 2010 budget, he would like to see it in the 2009 budget and Paul Anderson, Pope County stated he also would like to see it that way. Chair Otte asked if we want to keep the original motion as some counties may be more strapped for funding and not able to put it into their 2009 budget. Lane Waldahl stated he can not make a motion to spend money on behalf of the county without their input. Jeff Georger stated the reason why he asked Micah about the City's budget is it will be presented to the council next week. He knows some entities' budget process is well underway; it would be tough to add it now and expects next year's budget to be more stringent. He does not feel anyone here has the authority to authorize their county to put funds into their 2009 budget. Chair Otte stated he would like a letter sending something to their administrator making reference to this and would like a letter sent out if motion passes.

Wally Strand stated the letter sent out should recommend to counties to approve in 2009 and not spend the money. Tom Justin stated there are two issues: first is a funding formula, the board needs to decide if they want to split the funding equally. The second concern is there are entities who will use the money in 2009 and others not until 2010, yet those that want to make use of the funds that may come back will need to put the additional funding into their budget. Rachel Leonard stated she is in the same boat as the City they are instructed to not bring any additional costs forwarding in 2009. Doug Tomschin stated the funding could be split into two years - \$4,250 each.

Jeff Georger moved that funding be split equally by each entity, Lane Waldahl second and motion carried. Micah will send out letter to administrator making reference to this.

General Discussion and New Business: (Continued)

Staff for the CMNRB:

Micah asked if the board should have a staff member put together agendas, etc. and there is a big time commitment involved, there are other things they need to look at as a region also. Grant funding is available to offset funding, in the NW region they already authorized to hire a staff member. Tom Hannon stated the NW RRB directed its staff to secure grant funding to assist them in funding for a whole group of activities such as assessments, making sure they are done consistently, put into regional plan, TIC plan, working with the board for implementation, seeking grant opportunities, etc. They were successful in obtaining Homeland Security funding and budgeted first year at \$30,000 for consulting services. Homeland Security management staff voted to approve funding for that obligation and have a strong working relationship between Emergency Management staff; also secured a few matching grants for other operational issues.

There was \$130,000 allocated for each of the Homeland Security areas in the state and those funds are available to be used for this type of activity and need to work with Homeland Security staff to do this. Great relationship between Homeland Security individuals and RRB, usually county and city employees making those decisions and shouldn't be difficult to get approval. Doug Tomschin asked who writes the job description, etc. Tom Hannon stated the job description was drafted by the Administrative staff of the NW region working with two of the committees of the RRB. They drafted proposal, distributed and advertised it, had committee do the interviewing, and will be making decision next month.

Tom Justin stated last week he was at the Homeland Security quarterly meeting and it includes everyone here except Sherburne and they had consensus that they have two funds of a little over \$100,000 for planning and another grant funding of \$300,000 and has been tagged for working with the RRB. They made a commitment last week they would come to the RRB and ask if we would have anything they could do with those funds. If the RRB stated they don't want the money, they can then spend it in other areas they chose. One thing they talked about is this position, whether it is called Executive Director or a Staff person. Tom Hannon stated the reason the NW chose to go for a contract employee is there is no guarantee the funds will be available for over a period of time and do not need to deal with workers comp, etc. The contract would be for the term the funding would allow in the NW region. Tom Justin stated the Homeland Security funding needed to have a commitment where the dollars will be spend by sometime next year and the Feds need to know where the funding will be made.

Paul Anderson, Douglas County asked why the professional services agreement could not be used for the funding. Micah stated because we need to have a CASM rep in place and could be used for such. Chair Otte asked if we could get a motion to move forward. *Doug Tomschin moved that we put it together and seek funding, Paul Anderson, Douglas County second.* Tom Justin asked if the motion would require the RAC to make the agreement and it was clarified it did. Jeff Goerger asked if it was contingent upon the grant funding being approved and if \$30,000 is right for the NW is it right for us, he does not know if their needs are more complicated and how many members they have. Tom Hannon stated they are larger region but have 14 members and we have 20, they have more travel distance involved, are smaller counties with less staff, and it will be less than \$16/hour, and should be enough to get them a part-time person for the first year. He does not feel this would be enough for this region because of the size and complexity and would take more time. The RRB could perhaps charge the RAC with this responsibility and come back with a recommendation and work with Homeland Security to see what is available.

Tom Hannon stated the structure in the NW is much more aggressive than the structure across the state. The RAC is meeting every two weeks, committees meet one time and full group the next meeting. The Chair of the RAC has been chosen as the supervisor for this person. Lane Waldahl asked if the motion can be made to have it turned over to the RAC and ask them to come back with the recommendation for job description and dollar amount.

General Discussion and New Business: (Continued)

Staff for the CMNRB: (Continued)

Micah asked if the board should have a staff member put together agendas, etc. as there is a big time commitment involved with it. Chair Otte stated the first motion is that we want to do this and a second motion is required on how to do it. *Doug Tomschin stated his motion is for us to do this and not duplicate the CASM rep. Upon a vote Doug's motion above to put together job description and seek funding is carried.*

Lane Waldahl moved to assign the RAC with the responsibility to come back with a recommendation at the next meeting on the position, second Doug Tomschin, upon a vote motion carried.

Tom Justin stated he believes this is very forward and Micah's time to do these tasks is half of his work week is committed to this and feels the RAC is a very good place for it.

Legislative Letter:

Micah stated the legislative letter was discussed at last meeting, RAC is recommending each representative send it to their appropriate legislators. With elections coming up discussed when is a good time to send it out. Dean Shuck stated Kandiyohi could have saved around \$120,000 in sales tax if it is passed. Members of this region met in Albany and realized we can have an impact and suggested sending this to other regions and any savings will be helpful; should send the letter out now and again after elections.

Wally Strand moved, second Jeff Goerger to accept letter and send out now and again after in session. Upon a vote, motion carried.

Upcoming Meetings:

Next meetings are scheduled for Wednesday, October 29th and December 31st, 2 p.m. at St. Cloud City Hall Chambers, St. Cloud, MN.

Chair Otte asked if we would like to make an alternate date for December 31st – questioned if we need to meet in January. *Jeff Goerger moved to change December meeting to January 28th which is the 4th Wednesday, second by Paul Anderson, Pope County. Upon a vote, motion carried.*

Adjournment:

Dr. Naatz moved, second Wally Strand to adjourn at 3:33 p.m. Motion carried.

Minutes recorded by Debbie Backes, Recording Secretary.