

**CENTRAL MINNESOTA REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Friday, July 11, 2008 10:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.  
Wheaton Hospital - Ambulance Garage and Training Center  
Wheaton, MN, Traverse County

**Members/Alternates Present:**

1. Micah Myers – Vice-Chair – Designee of St. Cloud
2. John Haukos – Designee Big Stone County
3. Tom Egan – Designee Douglas County  
Michael Henrion – Alternate Douglas County
4. Troy Langlie – Designee Grant County
5. Stacey “Ace” Bonnema – Alternate Kandiyohi County
6. Jeff Norlin – Alternate Meeker County
7. Judy Siggerud – Alternate Otter Tail County
8. Tom Larson – Delegate Pope County
9. Jay Sikkink – Alternate Stearns County
10. Judy Diehl – Designee Stevens County
11. Bob Cuchna – Alternate Todd County
12. Trevor Wright – Designee Traverse County  
Brenda Pederson – Alternate Traverse County
13. Scott McKellep – Delegate Wadena County
14. Rick Fiedler – Designee Wilkin County  
Dawn Mund – Alternate Wilkin County

**Members/Alternates Absent:**

15. Troy Heck – Alternate Benton County
16. Mille Lacs County
17. Morrison County
18. Sherburne County
19. Swift County
20. Wright County

**Guests Present:**

Tom Justin, Central MN Interop Coordinator  
Tom Hannon, ARMER

**Meeting was called to order by Micah Myers at 10:07 a.m.**

Chair Myers welcomes members and guests, introductions conducted. 14 out of the 20 members in attendance with a quorum present

**Approval of Minutes:**

Chair Myers asks for a motion to approve RAC minutes of June 20, 2008. *A motion by Troy Langlie, second Jay Sikkink to approve minutes, upon a vote motion carries.*

## **Reports:**

### ARMER Update:

Tom Hannon stated the assessment contract which started in April is expected to be finished in August so assessment process can begin for all other counties in the State who are not in phase two or three.

### OTC Update:

Did not meet last month.

### User:

User Committee Chair Paul McIntyre stated the group met in Long Prairie on Tuesday. They went through reports and have topics each month for discussion and it was suggested each month to look at a standard, this month decided to review and discuss 10 codes versus plain English. Had some discussion on bylaws in reference to membership and voting i.e. conducted a vote on PSIC grant, some members felt each county should only have one vote, bylaws state need to have minimum quorum of counties and based on majority rule. A couple of exceptions are financial impact or change in bylaws. Discussed some options to make it fair – perhaps a 30 day notice on any vote, bylaws were handed out and asked to return at next month's meeting to review them and see if there are any changes.

Talked about tower sites, grant funding, general discussion; another big topic is trying to increase the members in attendance at meetings and discussed if we go to a centralized meeting, come up with some type of videoconferencing and select approximately three sites or come up with a central location. This will be discussed at next meeting to see if we can get more individuals attending. At the last meeting we had approximately 27 out of 100 members present.

Andy Faith stated Long Prairie tower site was turned on and had strong in-building coverage, tested back to Stearns County and felt it sounded excellent.

Micah stated Tom Eagan replied to per diem in their county, Tom stated one of their local fire chiefs is on the User Committee, other employees are getting paid and Fire Department is volunteering plus need to drive their selves. County board decided to pay them a per diem in mileage, unsure where the funds will be coming from within the budget. Board is a little confused as to who should pay the money out and feel the Sheriff's Office should, Tom felt it is for the entire county and should be paid by the County's General Fund. It is a minimal detail although is wondering what other counties are doing. Meeker is paying per diem and mileage, although county is providing transportation and is coming out of their budget still discussing if it will come from dispatch, emergency management, etc.

### Regional RAC Committees:

Tom Hannon stated the activity around the state is picking up and only a single region does not have a joint powers agreement for a RRB. In southeast all agencies have approved agreement, southwest all except Renville County approved, next week will set date, northeast will be meeting in Brainerd in the next week and will approve joint powers and submit to partners for approval. Most aggressive is the northwest who are working with emergency managers and obtained financing to hire a contracted employee to manage the planning process, integration of plans, over see the administration affairs of the RRB. They are utilizing \$30,000 from Emergency Managers and Homeland Security plus \$15,000 additional to help defray RRB annual budget, plus \$5,000 additional for a total of \$50,000 in grant money to run organization in northwest Minnesota. Have advertisement on street for individuals interested in applying for contracted consulting position for managing activities. There will be a lot of travel involved for that region and one person would shorten their implementation of the plans and coordinate with Canada and North Dakota.

Tom stated there is a lot of activity as to how they include NGO's and tribal entities into the plan as it is a requirement of the grant; everyone is looking for this region to assist in them making decisions.

### Regional RAC Committees: (Continued)

Jay stated as he sees this grow in other regions, he feels there should be an annual meeting or biannual meeting to see who they as we are up to seven regions and they will need to represent us on the SRB. Tom stated they are looking at it this fall and would initially be a conference paid for by a grant and will provide training. An issue is providing efficient training to board members and Frank Karnauskas is providing some entry level type training today. Need to deal with organization issues and will come as regions work together.

Chair Myers stated at the AMC Convention they had discussions on training, etc. and felt it would be good to have training at all conferences, Tom stated a discussion was to include it with the Homeland Security Convention.

Tom Larson asked if the \$42,000 PSIC money can be used for the NGO radios, Tom Hannon stated they can be for the ARMER compatible and NGO's do qualify. Tom Hannon stated discussion in Northern region is the NGO's should be able to come up with their own 20% match, concern was where the match money would come from and was it reasonable to expect counties to match for private use or should they be able to match their own. Objective is to lessen the impact for the smaller agencies to provide an opportunity to participate. Several agencies when going narrow banding went VHF to communicate with North Dakota.

### Regional Radio Board:

#### Budget Review:

Chair Myers stated the last meeting was June 18<sup>th</sup>, they approved budget and there was an email sent out stating they need to authorize the budget. He stated there was a question raised as to how members were paying for their portion of the CMNRRB annual budget (General Fund or Sheriff's Communication Budget). The auditors for each county were receiving invoicing and questioned where members had funds allocated: Grant County - radio budget set up, Meeker – General Fund, Pope – General Fund, Stevens – unsure, Todd – Administrative Fund, Otter Tail - unsure, Stearns - 800 Fund, Pope – discussing, Sherburne - General, Kandiyohi - unsure, Traverse - General, St. Cloud – Radio budget. A question on member approval of the budget and does each county need to approve budget? The process according to the bylaws is if a response is not returned, it is assumed it is approved.

#### Regional CASM Representative:

Chair Myers presented a professional services agreement for Ace to become CASM rep. Discussed adding time to have this person work with a consultant and develop regional TIC plan. He asked if we want to put a cap on the time and unsure how much time Ace has to commit.

Tom Larson asked if the TIC plan is for the region, he stated his region has up to \$100,000 for grant funding towards the TIC plan and is not yet determined on the breakdown. Micah asked if we want to have a staff person on the region such as the NGO's coming onto the system, where do they get the unit ID's as someone needs to manage it within the region and do we need to staff an individual for that purpose.

Jay Sikkink stated FEMA just announced funds for an Interoperability Grant and it can not be used for subscriber units and if this grant would allow for funding the TIC plan, it would be a great idea. Chair Myers stated we have \$20,000 this year, \$14,000 next year, and \$7,000 the third year to offset operational cost of the RRB. Tom Hannon stated in the northern area they took their \$30,000 from the funding which Tom Larson was referring to (from the \$100,000). The big discussion was how much the other counties needed to supplement the person. Tom Larson stated they have another meeting next week and the \$100,000 was strictly set up for strategic planning to be passed through to the RRB to be used for that; if they do not want it for that purpose it could be utilized for other things.

**Regional Radio Board: (Continued)**

**Regional CASM Representative: (Continued)**

Tom Larson stated he didn't think the emergency managers would not want to write the TIC plan. He would like to recommend next week at the Emergency Management meeting to ask if they can utilize some of the funding to hire someone dedicated to do the TIC plan so they would get a quality plan.

Chair Myers stated following discussion it seems Ace is to handle the CASM items mainly; another question is on background checks and who will manage that, do we separate and define the duties accordingly. Tom Hannon stated the funding of the \$100,000 was for planning and they already put out an RFP and advertised it. Chair Myers asked if we could get a copy of the RFP.

Chair Myers stated per the CASM agreement for Ace, do we want him to focus on the CASM piece, (will demo at the next meeting). Jay asked how much time would be needed for the background checks per month, Chair Myers stated he is unsure and we can amend accordingly. He would like to bring agreement to RRB at the end of the month to approve and Ace has training scheduled the end of June as well. Micah asked if we could add an additional five hours per month for background checks, Ace felt it was ok. *Tom Larson moved to add five hours to Ace's agreement per month. Bob Cuchna second. Upon a vote, motion approved.*

Andy Faith asked on the background checks – they have 13 technicians ready to submit their applications to get updated per the new Central MN RAC rules, who do they submit them to. Chair Myers stated they go to the system administrator for the system they are working on, however if working on Stearns and St. Cloud, they can submit to either himself or Jay.

**Official Mailing Address:**

Chair Myers stated for drafting the contract, we need an official address to list in agreements, contracts, etc. He asked if any mailings associated to the Central MN RRB do we list the City of St. Cloud as the Administrative agent. Tom Hannon stated per the Joint Powers Agreement it is listed as one of the standard duties of being the Administrative agent.

**Updates from Partners on Current Projects:**

Micah stated he met a couple of weeks ago on Geo-Comm's studies and had a list of items that needed to be addressed; Geo-Comm provided a presentation at meeting. Greg Ballantine thanked the group for the opportunity to address the RAC, he stated they had a constructive meeting last week with members and was very happy with the meeting as it gave them clear direction as to where they needed to be. One of the items is they needed to provide a presentation and plan today as to their commitment and timeline to deliver the product outlined.

Geo-Comm is committed to provide unparalleled, client-focused services designed to ensure long-term relationships and will do what they need to in order to achieve that. With the exception of some recent issues, Geo-Comm is well known for their customer service satisfaction. Greg introduced primary staff responsible for the contracts and stated they were present today to discuss any specific county questions after the meeting. They will reformat the way the final reports are being constructed for the county projects, the drafts have been very large and members requested to have the reports more detailed, smaller, accurate, and complete. They will have a very simple detailed administrative matrix on costs so it can be removed yet the document can stand alone. The Executive Summary will be portable and they are looking at overview and analysis of current system today, where counties would like to go, then putting four very specific recommendations with a full analysis of the advantages, disadvantages, and costs to them. All of projects they are engaged in have a narrow banded federal requirement that impacts the whole region; at a minimum, the region will have federal mandates and certain actions will be required according to federal law that they must adhere to.

### **Updates from Partners on Current Projects: (Continued)**

Next step is to address or recommend how to improve the coverage if there are deficiencies staying with a VHF/analog system. If there are no system enhancements, although they want to fill in areas of coverage deficiencies, Geo-Comm will include that information. Then if moving to digital VHF, will provide encryption, the pros cons, costs, and impact on paging for each of the options. Finally full ARMER presentation will be provided.

For ARMER option, Geo-Comm will provide analysis of recommended sites to include budgetary costs of all equipment needed for both fixed and subscriber units; include maintenance costs, list number of repeaters needed, channels, etc.

Entities that have seen draft reports so far from GeoComm have seen a lot of non-specific information, Geo-Comm is recommending to pull that info from the reports, create documents with the material that is not agency specific and they can use it for educational purposes if they chose as that is not what entities are paying for. Geo-Comm will attend a local meeting, whether they have a contract or not to provide training presentations like Rey's training 101 and is useful for officials who do not regularly utilize the system such as elected officials.

Micah stated one item needed is the steps of how they are going to get there. Greg stated, they had an extensive workshop and looked at each of the contracts and came to a plan they know they can meet. The last thing Greg would do is tell the group what they will do and then not provide it by the deadlines. They will meet the plan provided. Geo-Comm grouped some of the counties as they are in the same status.

#### **Kandiyohi, Meeker, Todd, Wright, Sherburne Counties:**

All counties provided their final reports and consider them complete, Wright and Sherburne moved into implementation status, and entered into some follow up contracts with some counties. These counties are considered complete and closed.

#### **Swift, Big Stone Counties:**

Have received final draft reports and are in the process of reviewing, final reports will be delivered by July 18<sup>th</sup> in the current format they have agreed to. Once they are accept, Geo-Comm will provide a presentation to their official groups within the next 60 days and will be a part of the contract, then this contract will be closed.

#### **Otter Tail, Pope, Douglas, Grant Counties:**

These counties are very close to completion, these counties desire the final reports to elected officials during this current budget process for potential 2009 funding. Need some additional data to complete final reports, have a plan in place internally to gather this data and get information back to them in two weeks, they are asking to schedule conference calls on August 4<sup>th</sup>, meet and get draft reports which will be extremely accurate and there should be minimal errors; the review from draft to final plan should be minimal. Conference calls will be in one week following draft and one week later meeting to review final plan. Again Geo-Comm will be available within 60 days to make presentation to stakeholder group, elected official, etc.

The above are the counties determined to be the highest priority depending on 2009 funding.

#### **Stevens County:**

All data has been collected and in house at GeoComm, customer reviewed initial draft, plan on having final report draft by August 29<sup>th</sup> with conference call the following week, in person meeting on September 15<sup>th</sup> and need to be worked out.

## Updates from Partners on Current Projects: (Continued)

### Morrison, Wadena, Wilkin Counties:

Have all raw data in house and they need to complete additional analysis, and budget work needs to be completed. Final draft to customer by September 26<sup>th</sup>, draft conference call the following Friday, and deliver in person final report on October 6<sup>th</sup>.

### Traverse County:

They signed their contract much later than other counties in region, asking to be held to the original date, draft by August 29<sup>th</sup>, in person conference call September 1<sup>st</sup> and in person meeting of final report on September 15<sup>th</sup>.

Geo-Comm would like to meet these dates prior to those listed if at all possible. They plan on meeting these dates unless customers have provided some reason other way.

Regional plan must be completed after county studies; they know there are a number of meetings needing to be held with MnDOT, schools, hospitals, etc. Today they are not prepared to put forth a timeline detail, although are willing to state it will be on an aggressive timeline with a report back in 90 days.

Greg stated where do we go from here? If given the ok, Geo-Comm will contact each customer next week to discuss if additional data is needed, if not will provide specifics on dates to move forward. Geo-Comm will not push these dates, although there are communications which is needed with each entity, if they are not available to meet on dates listed, Geo-Comm can not be responsible to stay on the timeline presented. We can not skip a step in this plan to meet presented dates.

Greg stated when asked to coordinate with Geo-Comm for the person to person meeting be reasonable to schedule the meetings as necessary. He also asked to provide Geo-Comm an opportunity on the agenda at the next meeting in Morris to provide an update of status. They are prepared to come back next month and be held accountable to the plan.

Chair Myers asked the group for their input – he asked Troy Langlie if the timeframe will provide him sufficient time for the 2009 timeline of budget, he stated yes. Tom Larson stated their budgets are due July 31<sup>st</sup>, and is ok with it. Scott McKellep stated he is fine with it, would rather have time to review before making budgetary decisions. Judy stated he is ok with it, Bob stated he received changes today from Mike, will need to review and make arrangements to present to commissioners and ask Mike to be in attendance to present to the commissioners and move forward. Jeff stated Mike is still making revisions on final plan and should be completed later this month and will set up meeting form there. Judy Siggerud is ok, Tom Larson stated they are cutting it close but they are ok, John Haukos stated they are at point where they need to meet with commissioners and are ok with plan. Ace stated Kandiyohi is looking at October to start purchasing equipment and stated they just have some questions on radios and scope of original plan. Brenda Pederson stated it will work for them, Dawn and Rick stated they are ok. Mike stated for Benton County, they are meeting on Monday with them, Troy Heck asked Tom Justin and Tom Hannon to meet with them on Tuesday and the board, will be having a pre-meeting on Monday. If anyone is interested in having Tom Justin and Tom Hannon meet with them to review the Geo-Comm plans, let them know and they will help them put that together.

Mike Kahl and Mike Mazzitello are working on a plan for equipment on how to configure their system and move towards those options, are gathering numbers and some are hard to get as they are waiting for Motorola. Tom Justin asked if their assessment plan will be 80-90 pages, Mike Mazzitello stated no about nine. He stated Benton County so covered by other areas and they do not need a lot of equipment. Will provide an outright purchase of system to a lease option and thanked Granite Electronics for helping get the numbers needed.

### Updates from Partners on Current Projects: (Continued)

John Haukos stated in reference to the cooperation agreement, at the time they do the presentation to their county regarding the radio study, will they also get a presentation from GeoComm in regards to their consolidation efforts. He also asked if Rey could get briefed on the plan and be able to provide both presentations at the same time. Todd Pieper stated that will be possible.

Tom Justin asked what the original scope put out will be provided with plans or will it be provided later in a different report. Greg stated there are some items in the original scope they will not be able to provide in the new format, although what is being provided in the new format includes the substance they were hired to do. There are some things in the original scope they will not be able to provide by deadline and will provide later. They are committed to meet all items in the scope and they will let the entities know which items were in the original scope and which will come later. For instance there is no projected time for the follow up of the product which will not be provided. Greg stated they do not have built into the timeline to conduct interviews except what is absolutely necessary to meet the timeline and will not go back after delivery to interview as it would not be relevant.

Chair Myers stated he is of the understanding the group is ok with the proposal and are ok to move forward. *Bob Cuchna moved to accept the presented plan by Geo-Com, Scott McKellep 2<sup>nd</sup>. Upon a vote, motion carried.* Rick Fiedler asked for a copy of the hand out, Greg will provide to Debbie to send out via email.

Jay stated he lives in Mille Lacs and asked if we are still looking at working with them as they already missed some grant funding. Chair Myers stated it will be addressed later in the meeting and he has been in contact with them.

Greg stated Geo-Comm does not believe they are to produce a participation plan that can be handed to the state; the scope of each individual case is to outline the pros, cons, cost, and impact on community for them to make a local business decision operationally and fiscally. They should and will outline what the state plans are in our community, what the guidelines are and what they need to do if they pursue to join according to the steps outlined by the state. It is not their belief they were hired to conduct the study, provide options and not carry out the steps from there once a decision is made, want to be sure the understanding is clear leaving today. Chair Myers stated this process is changing all the way through; some did receive participation plans with approval to the state as the process we already started and that is the understanding. Greg stated the participation plan he is unsure if it is well designed, what Geo-Comm calls a participation plan is an eight-ten page document and was conducted outside of this process, if it is the understanding otherwise, they want to know.

Tom Larson stated he talked to Mike Mazzitello about that, Rey stated this is a discussion they had over the past couple of weeks, the ARMER participation plan is a very specific document that has been created by the operational level, anyone who wants to join the system, they have to prepare and submit, prior to the RRB being performed, the plans went directly to the state. Rey stated an ARMER implementation plan would not go forward unless an entity knew they were going to participate in ARMER. Mike Mazzitello confirmed in St. Cloud it was provided, Rey stated with the studies they are conducting they are not under the impression they are suppose to provide it. As in reference to Kandiyohi they knew they were moving forward and stated they would provide such document. Rey stated they are putting together a template for ARMER and it is outside of the scope.

### **Updates from Partners on Current Projects: (Continued)**

Tom Larson asked how it got into the conversation with the rest of us of providing the plan to the ARMER participation plan. He stated he questioned why they have a participation plan if they are unsure they are going to ARMER, yet they were included. Mike Mazzitello stated there is a term called scope creep. He stated St. Cloud and Stearns sort of put together a participation plan after they were going onto the system as it was something they were doing, yet it is not in the language of the original scope. Tom Hannon stated he asked the same question in June as they are premature as a plan can not happen until entities have made that decision. He stated they were suppose to give the decision makers the information so they could make a decision, then if they were going to ARMER, they needed to make alternate means to provide the participation plan, it was not a standard to the assessment.

Chair Myers stated some of the confusion is the participation plan lays out the steps necessary to come onto the ARMER. Tom Hannon stated he likes the term of an implementation versus participation plan, as they are actually making an implemented plan. Chair Myers stated in standard 1.9A in the packet, it refers to items included in the plan, yet some items will not be included in studies. Tom Hannon stated the standard did not exist when the first plans were being conducted. Tom Larson stated he did not feel the participation plan was in Pope's contract originally and is ok if it is not included in the plan. Chair Myers wants to make sure everyone has a clear understanding of what we are getting as a deliverable. Tom Larson does not feel an implementation plan is necessary until the county makes a decision. Jay stated it is difficult until they see the original plan and make decisions as some entities are two years out and does not feel it needs to be in the plan. Troy Langlie stated the implementation plan is a part of Grant's scope. Judy Siggerud asked once GeoComm provides a plan, are they required to follow an outline of implementation process if they chose to go to option four – ARMER, there. If not, Judy asked where they need to go to get the plan. Greg stated the steps will tell them what they need to do to get the implementation and this is their options, pros, cons, etc. they feel they have complied with the contract.

If an entity makes a decision as to what they want to do, they may or may not need to hire a consultant and a vendor may be all they need. Again he stated GeoComm is not approaching this as an ARMER study, they are providing the tools necessary for an entity to make a business decision. Greg stated they will have the information needed to provide the plan to the state; the plan is not a final document to just submit to the state as submittal ready. He wants to be sure everyone in the group is of a clear understanding and does not want to leave anyone hanging.

Jay stated a point of reference, he knows St. Cloud had a plan, and then had to do a participation to the State of MN and had Geo-Comm help, he stated he provided the plan himself. An entity can use what other agencies have submitted as a guide, the plans change depending what decisions they made. John Haukos asked if the standard lists clearly as to what is needed when submitting the plan, Tom Hannon stated yes and depending on the integration an entity wants will determine how much time a consultant may need to spend on the plan, it did not exist when Stearns and St. Cloud did it, it may be minimal time and may be more complex. Jay stated entities need talk groups, fleet maps, etc. John Haukos stated it may cost just as much for a consultant as the cost of the radios as they are a small county. Tom Hannon asked if this region had any participation in the standard, Chair Myers stated they had none. Tom Hannon stated if there is disagreement of what the SRB is requiring, this group can discuss it with the SRB and OTC. Bring it to the RRB and ask the SRB to make changes to what may not work for us.



### **Updates from Partners on Current Projects: (Continued)**

Chair Myers stated if entities take their assessment study it states this is the number they can take to the bank, and if there are other things missing, they need to know what their costs are going forward. Tom Hannon stated the state has been really responsive to the needs of outstate as their rules and process previously have been designed for the Metro, as the buildout is taking place, things are changing as the needs are changing. He stated when something like the standard is posing a cost, it needs to be addressed, perhaps MnDOT helps entities develop a plan as it helps them, perhaps the SRB hires someone to help with the plans state-wide so they are consistent, perhaps the state provides funding to the regions to provide that. There are options; we just need to identify what we want to solve and how to do it. Jay stated he thinks this is a standard metro took and made one standard for full and one for limited, he would like to get a copy for the next meeting and look at the state and metro standard. Rey stated he understands the implementation report may not contain everything needed for an ARMER implementation, he stated they do such as in Big Stone, the cost for them to implement ARMER, the system cost was 0, they had radios, etc. in Kandiyohi, it was millions as they had to add additional tower sites, microwave, etc. The bottom line is the ARMER implementation cost page should be everything they need as a dollar amount to move forward and can be taken to the County board.

Chair Myers stated it is loosely defined of what the implementation plan is, it is worded they will get an implementation plan, although if you do not go to ARMER, will you get an implementation plan. Tom Justin read statements from Grant's agreement, following what he read, Greg stated he believes, Grant will get most of what was proposed, then they would like to have a meeting to address what else was missing per the agreement and individually go through the contracts to determine: 1. Yes you received product. 2. You will get it on a timeline agreed to. 3. It is no longer necessary.

Judy Siggerud was understanding that whatever option they chose, Geo-comm will assist them all the way through the process. According to what was read, she feels that is what is said. Greg stated he agrees the contract is not clear, it is not and was not their intent to take the plans all the way through to the final option, if they are contractually obligated to do that, they will do it, whatever the contract states is what they will provide. It is an aggressive timeline they provided and do not want to have this issue interfere with it. He stated within the next eight to ten weeks, all plans will be provided to counties, individually Greg would sit down with whoever is responsible for the contracts and document items in a change order at no cost to change order as to what is necessary yet if any.

Tom Larson stated all contracts may be the same as they came from the same template and should treat each entity the same as they are from the same contract. He states nothing should change moving forward in the proposed plan. Micah stated there are a lot of unresolved items in the contract that need clarification, and there is still some cleanup items needed after they provide what was proposed today. Greg stated he wants to provide what we need to have and make the group satisfied customers.

Chair Myers stated there are some things that needed to be clarified at the OTC level, perhaps we take what Geo-Comm proposed, and we ask for clarification from OTC. Tom Hannon stated the expectations from the state have changed as to what is required and they have raised the bar without our input. Micah thinks we should ask the OTC if they will take what GeoComm has presented as discussed today and can take the whole plan and move forward.

## **General Discussion and New Business:**

### Tax Exemption Letter/Levy Limit Information:

Chair Myers asked if there were any changes to the letter, several members here are in the process of purchasing equipment, suggested putting the date of 2008 and asking for it to be retro but not going too far back as it has less of a chance of being approved. Hopefully with enough support it will be passed. Bob Cuchna as if the intention is to send to all of our reps in the region, Chair Myers stated yes and as well as it will be sent to the other regions. *Bob Cuchna moved to submit to our legislators in our Central MN region and submit to other regions as well. Tom Egan second, upon a vote motion carried.*

Tom Larson asked when it will be submitted as several legislators are up for reelection. He suggested seeing if the AMC will support it and have the county boards submit it as well. Bob Cuchna stated even though some will not be reelected to still send it because looking back at the meeting in Albany some representatives didn't get reelected and it still made a difference. Chair Myers states this template will be sent to each of the RRB's for their consideration.

### PSAP Contact Information Update:

Getting close to having the PSAP document completed and only missing Wadena County at this time.

### BCA Background Checks:

Chair Myers stated this was brought up, Andy was going through a round of background checks and there is a piece of residency asking to go back to age 18. One person was in the military and is 50 years old – that would be 34 years of residency and asked if something else could be determined versus back to the age of 18. Mark Englund had some concerns as how they are conducting the checks with the City and State, Bob Cuchna stated it provides them to contact agencies in the area if they had any concerns with them being a technician. As far as going back to 18, their juvenile record can not be accessed. Andy Faith asked if they could at least indicate what state they are in would be helpful. Bob stated if they could provide city and state would be good, Tom Justin stated the timeframe is necessary as where the law enforcements past records are kept is different. John Haukos asked if 34 years back is reasonable, Tom Larson stated ten years is pretty standard. He stated a criminal history will be on the record no matter how far back, Tom Justin stated not with the code that are being asked. He stated the history of a vendor that came up was found because they ran it as a criminal, if ran under the J code it would not have come up. If you wanted an in-depth check need to run in the J code in all 50 states or run as a "C". Chair Myers stated he thought per a few meetings ago, Mark Englund stated they could run it as an employee. Tom Larson stated they are only required to keep their records ten years unless it is a homicide or sex offense. John Haukos suggested adding extra line such as ten years back plus any additional states and timeframe you resided in that particular state. Bob Cuchna stated it was reasonable to run for the last ten years and list any other states they resided in. He asked if we could ask if they were in the military could we ask if they had an honorable discharge. Tom Justin stated getting the military information today is much easier than it was. He cautioned - one employee who was not allowed to program on the system the offence was greater than ten years ago and would not have been found if an address was not asked for. Tom Larson asked what the state requires, it was unknown. Tom Larson thought they could be run as a "C" status.

Tom Justin stated they are time consuming and he is inclined to conduct a thorough investigation; that is why there is a committee set up to make determination on the questionable checks. He stated it should include addresses out of state and include the last ten years within Minnesota would be sufficient. Discussed amending background standard to include last ten years within Minnesota and timeframes back to age of 18 and include city and state outside of Minnesota.

Last ten years of residency and any other addresses outside the state of Minnesota and include City, State, and dates. *Tom Larson moved, Bob Cuchna seconded, upon a vote, motion carried.*

Other Items of Interest:

Chair Myers stated the \$100,000 of Homeland Security and other grant monies are available that could be reallocated. In retrospect to Geo-Comm if the state requires us to put together additional information or resources, we could reallocate. Tom Larson stated there are two sets of money from Homeland Security. In our region there is \$306,000 or \$308,000 to fund communications studies for interoperability, he questions if we do not need the money can they be reallocated for subscriber units. The other is the \$100,000 to be utilized for the TIC plan and even for the communication study. The Emergency Managers would like to know how much money we would need to complete the studies, then how much of the \$100,000 would be needed to complete the TIC plan and if funds are available, we could use some of the money to write the implementation plans and could be the same person so there is consistency. He stated they have a meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and it would be nice to know how much of the \$108,000 is needed whether for Mille Lacs County, write the TIC plan, and the balance for subscriber units. They have until June of 2010 to spend the money for both amounts of money.

Chair Myers stated another item is the CMRCC idea, Jay put together a meeting a few weeks ago, there are a lot of decisions to be made yet, Jay stated they are finding out what is needed for a RCC from the Metro. St. Cloud has been designated as a possible RCC and it is funded through legislature so they are trying to get the amount allowed increased so it will cover St. Cloud in addition to the Metro. There is someone in the Central MN region that is well aware of the legislative process and working with a RCC. Chair Myers stated it is a RCC for Central MN and he thinks we can get additional support if we include other outstate regions as well. Tom Hannon suggested contacting Legislature Haws who sits on an Emergency Finance Committee and it might be helpful. He stated NW and SE are additional possible areas to be defined in the future.

Mike Mazzitello stated progress on Sherburne and Wright – Sherburne has received their console and radio equipment, Granite Electronics is taking equipment and placing in Enfield, Zimmerman, and EOC at this time, EOC is the staging area. Target date of having console in place, operating, and install the zone controller in time for the Republican National Convention. Sites are moving along, the German Hill tower site (formerly Palmer) is coming up as being overstressed as failing. Nothing has changed and is not old, although it will need either upgrades or replacement. State has selected a different site in Elk River on a tower site versus utilizing the power plant.

Wright County is a couple of months from them receiving their equipment into their new jail and LEC, looking at equipment being installed in fall and being plugged into the zone controller the first quarter in 2009. Jay stated Stearns County has a building in the Kimball site although he is not sure if it is movable.

Tom Larson stated the Emergency Managers meet quarterly, asked if we could get the dollar amounts for them in September, Chair Myers stated he will try and get someone from the OTC at the next RAC meeting for clarification.

Jay stated he wasn't sure if anyone was requesting the RNC radios we discussed at last meeting. Chair Myers stated we sent out a request for commitments, Waite Park and the City of St. Cloud are interested in some. Jay stated they are approximately a \$600 savings. Kandiyohi is requesting 138, Waite Park 15, St. Cloud 20, Mike Fink stated the deadline is July 18<sup>th</sup> and half of the radios are already committed for. Jay stated it is a full warranty with radios with an extra battery.

Jay stated next Wednesday is the SMB meeting with Motorola bringing the product team up as there were some issues with consoles, anyone who is interested in ordering consoles is strongly suggested to attend as it would be very beneficial for them to have input on features. He stated Motorola will be providing a product roadmap as well so it will be a lengthy meeting.

**Upcoming Meeting, Set Date, and Location:**

August:

Next meeting will be August 15<sup>th</sup> WCROC in Morris, Stevens County. Judy stated if you have time before the meeting to stop, the gardens are across the street and it really beautiful.

September:

In September we will be starting the alphabetical rotation with Benton County and will be held September 12<sup>th</sup>.

*Moved to have September 12 for meeting, Judy Diehl moved, and Judy Siggerud second, upon a vote, motion carried*

*Bob Chucna moved, Tom Larson second to adjourn meeting at 1:55 p.m., upon a vote motion carried.*

Minutes recorded by Debbie Backes, Recording Secretary.