

METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

RADIO TECHNICAL OPERATIONS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Board Room, Metro Counties Government Center

May 25, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS:

Ulrie Seal, Chair
MN Fire Chiefs Association

Ron Jansen, Vice Chair
Dakota County

Jake Thompson
Anoka County

Tim Walsh
Carver County

Rod Olson
City of Minneapolis

Jon Eckel
Chisago County

John Gundersen
Hennepin County

Bob Shogren
Isanti County

Jeff Bjorklund
Metropolitan Airports
Commission

Chad LeVasseur
Metropolitan Council

Iver Johnson
Metro Region EMS

Dave Pikal
Ramsey County

Adam Pirri
Scott County

Chuck Steier
U of M Police, at large
member

Nate Timm
Washington County

Open
MN Chiefs of Police
Association

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of March 30, 2016 Minutes
3. Agenda Items
 - a. State Standard 3.19.0 - Use of 800 MHz Statewide LTAC and SIU Interoperability Talkgroups– Jansen / Meyer
 - b. State Standard 1.8.1 – Change Management – Gunderson / Tretter
 - c. Appointment of Metro Representatives for SOAR workgroup – Tretter
 - d. Appointment of Metro Representatives for Roaming workgroup – Tretter
4. Moves, Additions & Changes to the System
 - a. Anoka County Water Tower Sites Repainting - Thompson
 - b. Update on Removal of Voting from Interoperability System – Jansen
5. Committee Reports
 - a. Metro Mobility System Usage Update—Chad LeVasseur/Dana Rude
 - b. System Manager's Group/Metro Owner's Group Update – Jansen
 - c. Reports from SECB Committees – Tretter
 - i. Steering
 - ii. OTC
 - d. State Change Management Standard Workgroup – Gundersen
6. Other Business
 - a. Regional Talkgroup Permissions Updates
 - i. Wright County: METAC's
 - b. METRO Change management solicitation – May 25th deadline
 - c. Next Meeting June 22nd, 2016
7. Adjourn

Ulrie Seal, Chair

**Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Radio Technical Operations Committee
Meeting Notes
March 30, 2016**

Members Present: Ulie Seal, Curt Meyer, Ron Jansen, Jake Thompson, Dana Rude, Nate Timm, Dave Pikal, Jon Eckel, Rod Olson, Chris Kummer, Tim Walsh, Bob Shogren, Chuck Steier

Guests Present: Troy Tretter; *Metropolitan Emergency Services Board*, Steve Ouradnik, Victor Wanchena; *DOC*, John Anderson, *MnDOT*, Rey Freeman; *RFCC*, Christopher Meyer; *Motorola*, Bill Schmidt; *DHS*, Victoria Peckman; *Allina EMS*, Peter Sauter; *Carver County*

Call to Order: Ulie Seal called the meeting to order at 1:02 P.M.

Minutes of the February 24, 2016 Meeting

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to approve February 2016 minutes. Rod Olson seconded. The motion carried

Agenda Items

State Change Management Submission – Curt Meyer

Curt Meyer briefed on the official state change proposal for (2) additional law enforcement only LTACE talk groups. LTAC9E and LTAC10E, noting they are following the same encryption and patching standards as LTAC5E-LTAC8E. Tretter noted the revised 3.19.0 standard in the meeting packet. There was discussion if the proposed channels would fit into the Law Enforcement zone? It was commented that there are currently 12 channels in the Law Enforcement zone and they would fit. It was asked if there would be a creation of ME-TAC encrypted law enforcement only talkgroups? Tretter stated there was a submission, but they would be reviewed at the TOC meeting after the metro solicitation period had ended.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to approve moving forward with change management submission for (2) additional statewide LTACE talk groups. Nate Timm seconded. The motion carried.

Maple Grove Fire- Waiver for State Standard 3.19.0 – Curt Meyer

Curt Meyer stated that Maple Grove fire has 10 radios carried by fire department command staff that are waiting to be programmed. The previous radios they had, were programmed with LTACs, this would be making sure they are allowed to do so. Tretter noted this would need approval by the OTC and the SECB.

M/S/C Motion made by Nate Timm to approve the waiver for movement forward to the OTC. Dave Pikal seconded. The motion carried.

Allina Health EMS participation plan change – Peckman

Victoria Peckman briefed the committee on addition of a Motorola AIS server to logging for the new Eventide logger that will be installed after the 7.15 is complete. Tretter noted this would also need OTC, SECB and full MESB board approval.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to approve Allina Health's change, Jake Thompson seconded. The motion carried.

MN DHS ARMER Plan – Rey Freeman

Rey Freeman with Bill Schmidt (DHS) presented to the board a proposal to add additional radios and talk groups to the system. He stated that DHS currently has a Joint Powers Agreement with the department of corrections at their Moose Lake site. They read from a summary document “DHS ARMER Participation Plan Technical Data” shared with members of the committee. The plan highlighted the effect on the Metro region and noted there would be an additional 142 radios and 5 talk groups added to the Anoka MSHS location. Also, the addition of 84 new radios and 42 new talk groups in the metro area. The radios and talk groups would be affiliated with the Hennepin West Simulcast system, estimating 24 hours of traffic per month.

Ron Jansen asked about the use of DHS statewide talkgroup in all of the radios pulling radio traffic all over the state. Rey Freeman stated the use of the statewide DHS talkgroup would be use minimally. Bill Schmidt stated the majority of DHS use would be localized only and would use the statewide channel only as needed. Ulie Seal has concerns on the training of group home staff and contractors on how people may use the radio. Also, how there would be challenges of turnover of keeping people trained, airtime and usage.

Curt Meyer expressed concern, as they were already in the process of moving users to the Hennepin West system to free up busies elsewhere. Curt stated they would need to do some engineering analysis to see what the impact would be and if there would room for expansion. Ron Jansen noted that Hennepin West is already taking busies. Ron added that some counties participation plans have come on ARMER with less radios and have added infrastructure.

Jake Thomson stated Anoka County’s request onto ARMER was with less equipment and they added infrastructure. Jake would request that DHS add infrastructure. Ulie asked if this is was what Hennepin West was discussing. Curt Meyer said yes. Nate Timm addressed what profiling would they use, since they are a state agency, would they use county profiling or state profiling? John Anderson from MnDOT recommended they use county profiling.

Ulie asked since they don’t currently have funding on this project, they are in no rush getting this passed. Rey Freeman said they are in no rush, they have been working on this for a year and a half. Ulie asked going forward, to get feedback from Hennepin and Anoka to do assessments and address site profiling in the plan. Ron Jansen also wanted to see loading across the state because some traffic may get pulled to the Dakota Sub-system. Ulie Seal commented on do they so many radios and potential impact on loading. Nate Timm asked if they would still have a merged plan with the DOC. Bill Schmidt stated they would like to have their own participation plan.

Ulie said there won’t be a vote, but recommended that Anoka and Hennepin conduct assessments and if the state has any questions about state loading. Ulie requested they come back to address the committee and will at them to a future agenda. Rod Olson wanted to see the site affiliations with Minneapolis, because there are 3 sites in Minneapolis that are not listed. Rey stated they would look into it. Ron Jansen noted that the 100 radio ID’s for dispatch consoles are not needed as the new consoles do not require that many radio ID’s. Rey appreciated the catch.

There was no motion needed.

COMT Packet approval (Bob Beem, Hennepin County)

Troy Tretter said Bob Beems packet is included in the meeting materials. Chief Seal asked if they needed to have ICS300. Troy stated that it is not required at the state level. Chris Kummer and Ulie Seal feel it should be, but since the standard does not require it, he will approve it.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to approve Bob Beem's packet. Jake Thompson seconded. The motion carried.

Moves, Additions & Changes to the System

Anoka County Water Tower Sites Repainting – Thompson

Jake provided and update of the use of the STR tower temporarily, noted that at the lower height, it improved in building coverage.

Ron Jansen said the Sperry site will be dismantled, a temporary tower will be put in place and the cutover will be on March 31st. After the work is done, a stealth tower will be installed.

Update on Removal of Voting from Interoperability System – Jansen

Ron Jansen stated that it is still on the punch list after the 7.15 upgrade.

Committee Reports

Metro Mobility System Usage Update—Chad LeVasseur/Dana Rude

Dana Rude discussed that they are working to integrate the MCC's into their Trapeze system to see how workable of a solution it is. Ron Jansen stated they have seen a drop in the use in Dakota County with the radio's moved over to ANCOM's system and is pleased. Troy Tretter said he did not include Metro Mobility's use in the packet, and asked if the committee would like it included? Ulie Seal said there was no need for the chart in the packet, but to keep notes on their performance. Nate Timm asked why they just moved radio off Dakota ARMER system to ANCOM's UHF, and will they move others? Dana said there are no plans to move off ARMER, they will move more towards their CAD system.

System Manager's Group/Metro Owner's Group Update – Jansen

Ron Jansen discussed that at the System Managers Group met and had training on the 7.15 upgrade that was not as long as anticipated; they could have had the TOC meeting on the same day. He reminded everyone the system will go into lock down on April 1st and the scheduled outages are set for May 17th at 10am and 2pm.

Reports from SECB Committee – Tretter

Troy Tretter briefed on each of the activities from the SECB board meetings from the last month. OTC: Noting that there was an approved dispatcher's best practices guide and updated language on various state standards. Troy mentioned that standards working group is working hard on updating language and there is good representation from the Metro. IOC: There was a new standard on interoperability with Ontario, which is a cross border patch is controlled by the State Patrol and will be tested monthly.

2016 Interoperability Conference – Tretter

Troy Tretter informed the group that he has 16 people signed up so far and has an April 15th deadline for submissions to attend using grant money. He said he will send out an email to remind everyone.

Other Business

Regional Talkgroup Permission updates

None

Discussion on system capacity management

Ron Jansen said Hennepin West has had more busies on the monthly reports. Ulie stated it is important to pay attention to the busies each month.

Next Meeting April 27th

Tretter noted that this was the last day of the Interoperability Conference in Saint Cloud, any may be a challenge to have some members make it to the meeting.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to have the meeting moved up one week to April 20th. Nate Timm seconded. The motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 3pm.



**METROPOLITAN
EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD**

2099 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST
SUITE 201
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA
55104-3431

PHONE 651-643-8395
FAX 651-603-0101
WWW.MN-MESB.ORG

MEMO

To: Chief Ulie Seal, Metro RTOC Chair
Fr: Troy Tretter
Date: May 11th, 2016
RE: Review of State Standard 3.19.0 – Use of 800 MHz Statewide LTAC and SIU Interoperability Talkgroups

During the May 10th OTC meeting, the committee reviewed the request for Maple Grove Fire's waiver of Standard 3.19.0 to program LTAC 1-4 channels in 10 of their command radios.

The request resulted in a carried motion to be placed on hold and to have all regions review the 3.19.0 and discuss criteria for allowing waivers, if any variance at all to the current standard. The standard does not have any language for waivers or variances from the standard.

It was requested to have regional input ready for the next OTC meeting. The next meeting of the OTC is currently scheduled for June 14th, 2016 at 1pm.

Troy Tretter
Radio Services Coordinator
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board



City of Maple Grove

12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway, P.O. Box 1180, Maple Grove, MN 55311-6180

FIRE-RESCUE DEPARTMENT

Fire Department
763-494-6300

Fire Inspection
763-494-6090

23, March 2016

Curt Meyer
800 MHz Coordinator / Assistant Radio Systems Manager
Hennepin County Sheriffs' Office
1245 Shenandoah Ln
Plymouth, MN 55447

Mr. Meyer,

This letter is in regards to our conversation regarding reprogramming of Maple Grove fire department portable radios.

I understand there is an issue in the programming of LTAC 1, 2, 3 and 4 due to a rule change regarding their use.

I am requesting permission on behalf of Maple Grove Fire, Police and Emergency Management to retain these talk groups in the police fleet map in our 10 command encrypted radios. These talk groups had been in our fleet map previously and had not encountered any issues

The 10 Command radios currently have the complete fleet map for each discipline (police, fire, public works, and emergency management) and are used to provide extra command encrypted capable radios for police or fire command staff.

There is no need for fire personnel to have access to these talk groups however it gives the Maple Grove public safety command staff additional interoperability.

I appreciate your assistance with this request.

Sincerely,

Kurt Kramer
Deputy Fire Chief
Emergency Management Coordinator
City of Maple Grove

"Serving Today, Shaping Tomorrow"

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response System (ARMER)

Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section 3	Interoperability Standards	Status: Complete
State Standard Number	3.19.0	
Standard Title	Use of 800 MHz Statewide LTAC and SIU Interoperability Talkgroups	
Date Established		SECB Approval: 3/28/2013
Replaces Document Dated	02/26/2009	
Date Revised	03/19/2013	

1. Purpose or Objective

The purpose of this standard is to establish policy and procedures for use of the 800 MHz statewide law enforcement interoperability talkgroups. The LTAC and SIU talkgroups are a system wide resource to facilitate communications between law enforcement agencies including, but not limited to, Special Investigative Units that typically do not communicate with each other on a regular basis.

2. Technical Background

▪ Capabilities

It is possible to have access to one or more common pool of clear and encrypted talkgroups in radios used by agencies that share the statewide 800 MHz radio system. These clear and encrypted talkgroups can be used for a wide range of intercommunication when coordination of activities between personnel of different agencies is needed on an event.

▪ Constraints

LTAC5E through LTAC8E can be used by all law enforcement agencies with encrypted radios and can be programmed in law enforcement dispatch consoles.

The LTAC5E through LTAC8E and SIU1E through SIU4E talkgroups are always encrypted.

SIU1E through SIU4E are only to be use by Special Investigation Units; for example, Gang and Drug task forces, SWAT, etc. SIU1E through SIU4E may not be programmed in dispatch consoles.

When using SIU1E through SIU4E, if non-Special Investigation Unit officers and dispatchers need to participate in an activity, it is up to the local incident command to supply those persons with radios that have SIU1E through SIU4E.

SIU1E through SIU4E are not to be patched with any other talkgroup.

3. Operational Context

The LTAC and SIU talkgroups are a system wide resource to facilitate communications between law branch agencies including, but not limited to, Special Investigative Units that typically do not communicate with each other on a regular basis.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard

LTAC1 through LTAC4 TALKGROUPS

<u>TG Requirements</u>	<u>For Whom?</u>
<u>Required</u>	<u>All Law Enforcement Users & PSAP</u>
<u>Recommended</u>	
<u>Optional</u>	
<u>Not Allowed</u>	<u>Non-law Enforcement</u>
<u>Site Access</u>	<u>System Wide – All Sites</u>

<u>Cross Patch Standard</u>	<u>YES / NO</u>	<u>To TalkGroups</u>
<u>Soft Patch</u>	<u>Optional</u>	<u>As Needed</u>
<u>Hard Patch</u>	<u>No</u>	

LTAC5E through LTAC8E TALKGROUPS

<u>TG Requirements</u>	<u>For Whom?</u>
<u>Required</u>	<u>All Law Enforcement users with Encrypted Radios</u>
<u>Recommended</u>	<u>All Law Enforcement PSAPs</u>
<u>Optional</u>	
<u>Not Allowed</u>	<u>All others</u>

<u>Cross Patch Standard</u>	<u>YES / NO</u>	<u>To TalkGroups</u>
<u>Soft Patch</u>	<u>Optional</u>	<u>Encrypted TGs only</u>
<u>Hard Patch</u>	<u>No</u>	

SIU1E through SIU4E TALKGROUPS

<u>TG Requirements</u>	<u>For Whom?</u>
<u>Required</u>	
<u>Recommended</u>	<u>SIU communications, i.e. Gang, Drug, Swat task forces</u>
<u>Optional</u>	
<u>Not Allowed</u>	<u>All others</u>

<u>Cross Patch Standard</u>	<u>YES / NO</u>	<u>To TalkGroups</u>
<u>Soft Patch</u>	<u>No</u>	
<u>Hard Patch</u>	<u>No</u>	

The StatusBoard application will be used to manage the law enforcement pool talkgroup resources.

Console Resource Requirements and Patching

Integrated law enforcement ARMER dispatch consoles (Gold Elite, MCC7500, etc.) shall have LTAC1 through LTAC4 in their configuration, available for patching. If the patched talkgroups have different "home zones," multiple repeaters will be assigned, impacting system loading. Therefore, extended duration patching of statewide interoperability talkgroups to other talkgroups should be avoided. Users should transition to the statewide talkgroup as soon as it can be done safely, and the patch should be terminated. LTACs should not be patched to other statewide interoperability talkgroups. In order to meet the communications needs for an event, the LTAC talkgroups may be patched to:

- Conventional RF resources, such as VHF, UHF, etc.
- Private agency talkgroups, such as dispatch mains, tactical talkgroups, pools, etc.
- Patches between the LTAC talkgroups and regional TACs, although this would not be preferred as a method of resolving communications needs, because it reduces the number of talkgroups available for an incident.

LTAC5E through LTAC8E can optionally be programmed in law enforcement dispatch consoles but may not be patched to unencrypted ARMER talkgroups.

SIU talkgroups may not be programmed in dispatch consoles or any ARMER resource. When using SIU1E through SIU4E, incident command will provide radios for other non-SIU entities assisting, such as patrol officers, dispatchers, etc.

None of the SIU and LTAC-E talkgroups shall be part of any multi-group.

All radios using LTAC5E through LTAC8E and SIU1E through SIU4E must use the state assigned Data Encryption Standard (DES) encryption keys. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) System Administrator will be responsible for managing and periodically updating the statewide encryption keys.

It is highly recommended that SIU radio users program a sufficient quantity of SIU and LTAC-E talkgroups into their subscriber radios to meet interagency communications needs, starting with LTAC5E.

Dual Naming

Existing LETAC-1 through LETAC-4 talkgroups are renamed LTAC5E through LTAC8E. Existing LESIU-1 through LESIU-4 are renamed SIU1E through SIU4E. Dual names will be added to PSAP consoles and used for the renamed talkgroups and will remain in place until June 26, 2015, or until all affected ARMER radios have been reprogrammed. The old name will be primary until June 26, 2014, then secondary until June 26, 2015. Dual naming will be removed from PSAP consoles on June 26, 2015.

5. Recommended Procedure

The usage of LTAC1 through LTAC4 for **PREPLANNED NON-EMERGENCY** interoperability events should be LTAC4 through LTAC1, in that order.

The usage of LTAC1 through LTAC4 for **UNPLANNED EMERGENCY** incidents should be LTAC1 through LTAC4, in that order.

LTAC5E through LTAC8E may be patched **ONLY TO OTHER ENCRYPTED TALKGROUPS** during PREPLANNED NON-EMERGENCY interoperability events and UNPLANNED EMERGENCY incidents.

SIU1E through SIU4E may only be used directly and not be patched to other resources to meet the communications needs of an event or incident.

The dispatch center will use the StatusBoard application to identify use of the LTAC and SIU resources.

When an SIU resource is needed, any SIU agency may contact an appropriate 800 MHz dispatch center, capable of assigning SIU resources, to have the next preferred available SIU assigned and recorded on the Status Board. There must be an agreement between the SIU agency and the dispatch center to provide this service.

At the end of the event, the 800MHz assigning dispatch center must clear the status, so the other dispatchers will know this resource is available for use.

6. Management

The PSAP managers for agencies on the statewide 800 MHz radio system shall ensure that there is a procedure for assigning LTAC and SIU talkgroups.

The MnDOT System Administrator shall be responsible for the StatusBoard application.

Dispatch center operators shall receive initial and continuing training on the use of this procedure.

Responsibility for monitoring performance and for modifying this procedure shall be a function of the agencies using this resource.

Troy Tretter

From: Stromberg, James (DPS) <James.Stromberg@state.mn.us>
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 11:41 AM
To: Troy Tretter
Cc: akruger@mankatomn.gov; al.fjerstad@co.mille-lacs.mn.us; Anderson, Cathy (DPS); Bruce Hegrenes (hegrenesb@StLouisCountyMN.gov); hlandsman@co.murray.mn.us; John Maatz; john.gundersen@hennepin.us; Keith Ruffing (keithr@saintpetermn.gov); Micah Myers (micah.myers@ci.stcloud.mn.us); Mike Peterson (Mpeterson@co.winona.mn.us); Mohn, James R (DOT); Neil Dolan; Rick Freshwater (freshwater.rick@CO.OLMSTED.MN.US); Stromberg, James (DPS); Mines, Jackie (DPS); Joe Glaccum (joe.glaccum@northmemorial.com)
Subject: Change Management Standard

Hi Troy. I had a nice visit yesterday with John Gunderson about the Change Management Standard. I didn't know he had been out of the office when I called him but he was kind enough to find time for me.

I updated him on the OTC and SECB votes on the Change Management standard and advised that the ECN would like to see this standard get to a point where everyone is happy with it. To that end, I suggested that the Metro put something together that it thinks will be acceptable to the rest of the regions. I don't see it going back to the workgroup quite yet because what passed at the OTC was the workgroup's final product. John supported me and recommended that I forward this on to you to engage the Metro region. Once the Metro's suggestions are defined and drafted into the standard, I think it should go back to the workgroup for further review.

Let me know how I can help or if you had another plan in mind. Keep me posted.

Jim Stromberg
ARMER Program Manager / Statewide Interoperability Coordinator
State of Minnesota, Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Communication Networks
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 137, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
651-201-7557
651-296-2665 (fax)
James.Stromberg@state.mn.us
<http://ecn.dps.mn.gov>



METROPOLITAN
EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

2099 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST
SUITE 201
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA
55104-3431

PHONE 651-643-8395
FAX 651-603-0101
WWW.MN-MESB.ORG

MEMO

To: Chief Ulie Seal, Metro RTOC Chair
Fr: Troy Tretter
Date: May 16th, 2016
RE: Metro Region input to Draft State Standard 1.8.1 – Change Management

The draft state standard for change management 1.8.1, was tabled at the April 25th SECB meeting. The draft standard was solicited for additional metro input on April 28th, 2016. Input that was received from Metro TOC membership, was incorporated into the draft standard. Included in the May TOC packet is a copy of the original draft presented to the SECB, the redlined Metro changes and the final clean version of the Metro draft.

Based upon guidance from the change management workgroup chair, Jim Stromberg and Metro region representative, John Gundersen; it is requested the Metro TOC vote on the proposed changes before it returns to the workgroup. I respectfully request the Metro TOC votes on any changes to the standard.

Troy Tretter
Radio Services Coordinator
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER)

Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section 1	Management of System	Status: DRAFT
State Standard Number	1.08.1	
Standard Title	Change Management	
Date Established		SRB Approval:
Replaces Document Dated	1.08.0 (04/28/2011) and 1.05.2 (04/28/2011)	
Date Revised		

1. Purpose or Objective

This standard sets forth the process for considering operational and technical changes to the ARMER backbone. This process should ensure that change requests are managed, vetted, timed to correspond with budgets, and efficiently implemented.

2. Technical Background

Capabilities

This standard relates to future changes to the ARMER backbone but, in and of itself, is not a technical standard.

Constraints

The ARMER backbone is defined by Minnesota State Statue 403.21, subd. 9 and its definition limits the scope of this standard. The statute reads:

"System backbone" or "backbone" means a public safety radio communication system that consists of a shared, trunked, communication, and interoperability infrastructure network, including, but not limited to, radio towers and associated structures and equipment, the elements of which are identified in the region wide public safety radio communication system plan and the statewide radio communication plan under section 403.36.

3. Operational Context

The Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) is responsible for:

- Ensuring that ARMER maximizes interoperability
- Establishing and enforcing performance and technical standards for ARMER
- Establishing and enforcing priorities or protocols that facilitate uniformity

The SECB adopts ARMER Standards, Protocols, and Procedures to achieve these goals. Changes to the ARMER system are sometimes necessary and those changes must receive due consideration for economic impacts, operational impacts, and other issues that may compromise the integrity and use of the system.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard

Changes that have one or more of the following impacts on the ARMER backbone or impacting more than one emergency communication regions are subject to the procedures prescribed in this Standard:

- Changes impacting the majority of users
- Changes mandating the placement of resources in communications equipment
- Changes requiring updated user training
- Changes requiring reprogramming of console and/or subscriber equipment
- Changes resulting in costs beyond routine maintenance costs

5. Recommended Procedure

Individuals or entities with a change suggestion that they believe may be subject to this standard should present their suggestion to the Operations and Technical Committee (OTC) of the SECB. Items brought directly to the SECB or to other committees of the SECB that appear subject to this standard should be directed to the OTC. Items may be brought to the OTC at any regular meeting.

After receiving a request to change the ARMER system, the OTC should make a determination if the suggestion is subject to this standard. If the OTC determines that the suggestion is subject to the terms of this standard, the OTC will ask the requestor to bring their request to specific entities for feedback and/or formal approval. The reviews shall scrutinize the change proposal by identifying pitfalls, considering variables, and identify alternatives. The OTC may establish a Workgroup to facilitate this process.

The OTC shall first assign the requestor to consult the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) for technical review and the Emergency Communication Networks (ECN) for an operational and financial review of the request. The requestor may consult with MnDOT and the ECN prior bringing the request to the OTC and the input of MnDOT and the ECN may be provided when the request is first introduced.

Upon receipt of input from MnDOT and the ECN, the OTC will assign the requestor to consult the Finance and Steering Committees of the SECB and the Emergency Communication Boards of each potentially impacted region. The OTC may also require the requestor to consult other committees or workgroups of the SECB or any other entity the OTC deems necessary.

The OTC *may* consider and grant provisional authority (subject to SECB ratification) for portions or the entire change request to be enacted. Temporary authority will allow for prompt implementation and may provide data about the proposal to assist with a permanent decision.

The requesting entity should consult each of the entities identified by the OTC about their change request and follow through with those entities as directed. The requesting entity may modify their original request based on new information or suggestions received. The requesting entity should provide a status update to the OTC within six months and every three months afterward.

Upon return to the OTC, the requesting entity should provide a report detailing their follow up. Modifications to the original request may be offered. Supporting materials such as meeting minutes or letters of approval should be submitted at this time. Relevant parties should be present for testimony. The OTC may then commence deliberations about the request. Approved requests should be forwarded to the SECB for consideration.

Requesting entities may appeal decisions by the means provided in standard 7.3.0.

Suggestions approved by the SECB should be jointly managed by MnDOT and the ECN. Generally, MnDOT will manage technical items and the ECN will manage operational items. Concerns raised but not fully satisfied during the process should be considered as the change is implemented.

The ECN will be responsible for tracking requests subject to this standard.

The following points related to timing should be followed during the implementation of this standard:

- Change suggestions may be submitted to the OTC at any time and this standard may be applied at any time.
- The process established in this standard should be expected to take at least six months so change suggestions subject to this standard should be submitted at least six months prior to consideration.
- Approved changes involving reprogramming of consoles or user equipment may be held up to two years so that multiple changes may be consolidated into one reprogramming.

A timeline should be followed to ensure adequate timing to prepare and request funding. In the below table, Change Management matters follow a four-year timing cycle and letters represent years:

- Year AAAA: 2016, 2020, 2024, ...
- Year BBBB: 2017, 2021, 2025, ...
- Year CCCC: 2018, 2022, 2026, ...
- Year DDDD: 2019, 2023, 2027, ...

January 1, AAAA	<u>If allowing six months for this process</u> , this is the last day to <u>submit</u> changes subject to the Change Management standard to the OTC for consideration in the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota budget.
July 1, AAAA	Deadline for the SECB to approve requests subject and for the ECN to know financial needs to be considered for the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota Budget.
July 1, AAAA to January 1, BBBB	ECN to obtain Governor's approval of ECN budget and to prepare budget request for state legislature.
January 1, BBBB to May 1, BBBB	ECN to present budget request to legislature.
June 1, BBBB	State legislature approves budgets.
July 1, BBBB to June 30, CCCC	Fiscal Year CCCC of CCCC/DDDD budget.
July 1, CCCC to June 30, DDDD	Fiscal Year DDDD of CCCC/DDDD budget.

When the requirements of this standard cannot be met by an entity, the entity must apply for a waiver and that waiver must be considered by the OTC.

6. Management

The OTC with administrative support from the ECN is responsible for supervising and managing this process.

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER) Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section 1	Management of System	Status: DRAFT METRO
State Standard Number	1.8.1	
Standard Title	Change Management	
Date Established		SRB Approval:
Replaces Document Dated	1.8.0 (04/28/2011) and 1.5.2 (04/28/2011)	
Date Revised		

1. Purpose or Objective

This standard sets forth the process for considering major operational and technical changes to the ARMER backbone. This process will ensure that change requests are managed, evaluated, timed to correspond with state and local budgeting processes, and efficiently implemented.

2. Technical Background

Capabilities

This standard relates to future changes to the ARMER backbone but, in and of itself, is not a technical standard.

Constraints

The ARMER backbone is defined by Minnesota State Statute 403.21, subd. 9 and its definition limits the scope of this standard. The statute reads:

"System backbone" or "backbone" means a public safety radio communication system that consists of a shared, trunked, communication, and interoperability infrastructure network, including, but not limited to, radio towers and associated structures and equipment, the elements of which are identified in the region wide public safety radio communication system plan and the statewide radio communication plan under section 403.36.

3. Operational Context

The Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) is responsible for:

- Ensuring that ARMER maximizes interoperability
- Establishing and enforcing performance and technical standards for ARMER
- Establishing and enforcing priorities or protocols that facilitate uniformity

The SECB adopts ARMER standards, protocols, and procedures to achieve these goals. Changes to the ARMER system are sometimes necessary but they must receive due consideration for economic and operational impacts, and other issues that may compromise the integrity and use of the system.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard

Changes which have one or more of the following effects on the ARMER backbone or impacting more than one emergency communication regions are considered major changes and are thus subject to the procedures prescribed in this Standard:

- Changes effecting the majority of users
- Changes mandating the placement of resources in communications equipment
- Changes requiring updated user training
- Changes requiring reprogramming of console and/or subscriber equipment
- Changes resulting in costs beyond routine maintenance costs for state and local users

5. Recommended Procedure

Individuals or entities with a change suggestion that they believe may be subject to this standard should submit their suggestion to the Operations and Technical Committee (OTC) of the SECB using the Change Management Request form. Items brought directly to the SECB or to other SECB committees which are subject to this standard will be directed to the OTC. Items may be brought to the OTC at any regular meeting.

After receiving a change request to change the ARMER system, the OTC will determine if the request is a major change and is subject to this standard. If the OTC determines that the suggestion is subject to the terms of this standard, it will ask the requestor to bring their request to specific entities for feedback and/or formal approval. The reviews shall scrutinize the change proposal by identifying pitfalls, considering variables, and identify alternatives. The OTC may establish a workgroup of operational and technical regional representation to facilitate this process, before making a final recommendation to the SECB.

The OTC shall first assign the requestor to consult the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Office of Statewide Radio Communications for technical review and the Emergency Communication Networks (ECN) for an operational and financial review of the request. The requestor may consult with MnDOT and the ECN prior bringing the request to the OTC and the input of MnDOT and the ECN may be provided when the request is first introduced.

Upon receipt of comment from MnDOT and the ECN, the OTC may assign the requestor to consult the SECB's Finance and Steering Committees, if applicable, and the effected Regional Emergency Communication Boards. The OTC may also require the requestor to consult other committees or workgroups of the SECB or any other entity the OTC deems necessary.

The OTC *may* consider and grant provisional authority, with SECB approval, for portions or the entire change request to be enacted. Temporary authority will allow for prompt implementation and may provide data about the proposal to assist with a permanent decision.

The requesting entity will consult each of the entities identified by the OTC about their change request and follow through with those entities as directed. The requesting entity may modify their original request based on new information or suggestions received. The requesting entity should provide a status update to the OTC within six months and every three months afterward.

Upon return to the OTC, the requesting entity should provide a report detailing their follow up. Modifications to the original request may be offered. Supporting materials such as meeting minutes or letters of approval should be submitted at this time. Relevant parties should be present for testimony. The OTC may then commence deliberations about the request, resulting in a recommendation to the SECB. Approved requests will be forwarded to the SECB for final review and consideration.

Appeals of SECB decisions are governed by State Standard 7.3.0 'Appeal Process'.

Approved change requests will be jointly managed by MnDOT and the ECN. Generally, MnDOT will manage technical items and the ECN will manage operational items. Concerns raised but not fully satisfied during the process should be considered as the change is implemented.

The ECN will be responsible for tracking requests subject to this standard.

The following points related to timing should be followed during the implementation of this standard:

- Change suggestions may be submitted to the OTC at any time and this standard may be applied at any time.

- The process established in this standard should be expected to take at least six months so change suggestions subject to this standard should be submitted at least six months prior to consideration.
- Approved changes involving reprogramming of consoles or user equipment may be held up to 18 months so that multiple changes may be consolidated into one reprogramming to allow for funding for the proposed changes.
- ECN will notify all system users of SECB approval and implementation timeline of all major ARMER changes.

A timeline should be followed to ensure adequate timing for the state and regions to prepare and request funding. In the below table, Change Management matters follow a four-year timing cycle and letters represent years:

- Year AAAA: 2016, 2020, 2024, ...
- Year BBBB: 2017, 2021, 2025, ...
- Year CCCC: 2018, 2022, 2026, ...
- Year DDDD: 2019, 2023, 2027, ...

January 1, AAAA	<u>If allowing six months for this process</u> , this is the last day to <u>submit</u> changes subject to the Change Management standard to the OTC for consideration in the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota budget.
July 1, AAAA	Deadline for the SECB to approve requests subject and for the ECN to know financial needs to be considered for the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota Budget.
July 1, AAAA to January 1, BBBB	ECN to obtain Governor's approval of ECN budget and to prepare budget request for state legislature.
January 1, BBBB to May 1, BBBB	ECN to present budget request to legislature.
June 1, BBBB	State legislature approves budgets.
July 1, BBBB to June 30, CCCC	Fiscal Year CCCC of CCCC/DDDD budget.
July 1, CCCC to June 30, DDDD	Fiscal Year DDDD of CCCC/DDDD budget.

When the requirements of this standard cannot be met by an entity, the entity must apply for a waiver and that waiver must be considered by the OTC.

6. Management

The OTC with administrative support from the ECN is responsible for supervising and managing this process.

METRO DRAFT

**Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER)
Standards, Protocols, Procedures**

Document Section 1	Management of System	Status: DRAFT <u>METRO</u>
State Standard Number	1.8.1	
Standard Title	Change Management	
Date Established		SRB Approval:
Replaces Document Dated	1.8.0 (04/28/2011) and 1.5.2 (04/28/2011)	
Date Revised		

1. Purpose or Objective

This standard sets forth the process for considering major operational and technical changes to the ARMER backbone. This process will ensure that change requests are managed, evaluated, timed to correspond with state and local budgeting processes, and efficiently implemented.

2. Technical Background

Capabilities

This standard relates to future changes to the ARMER backbone but, in and of itself, is not a technical standard.

Constraints

The ARMER backbone is defined by Minnesota State Statute 403.21, subd. 9 and its definition limits the scope of this standard. The statute reads:

"System backbone" or "backbone" means a public safety radio communication system that consists of a shared, trunked, communication, and interoperability infrastructure network, including, but not limited to, radio towers and associated structures and equipment, the elements of which are identified in the region wide public safety radio communication system plan and the statewide radio communication plan under section 403.36.

3. Operational Context

The Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB) is responsible for:

- Ensuring that ARMER maximizes interoperability
- Establishing and enforcing performance and technical standards for ARMER
- Establishing and enforcing priorities or protocols that facilitate uniformity

The SECB adopts ARMER standards, protocols, and procedures to achieve these goals. Changes to the ARMER system are sometimes necessary but they must receive due consideration for economic and operational impacts, and other issues that may compromise the integrity and use of the system.

4. Recommended Protocol/ Standard

Changes which have one or more of the following effects on the ARMER backbone or impacting more than one emergency communication regions are considered major changes and are thus subject to the procedures prescribed in this Standard:

- Changes effecting the majority of users
- Changes mandating the placement of resources in communications equipment
- Changes requiring updated user training
- Changes requiring reprogramming of console and/or subscriber equipment
- Changes resulting in costs beyond routine maintenance costs for state and local users

5. Recommended Procedure

Formatted: Centered

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 0

Commented [TT1]: Removed the 0 leading the second number, as these were not in the previous standards.

Deleted: 0

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: should

Deleted: vetted,

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

Deleted: P

Deleted: P

Deleted: and those changes

Deleted: impacts,

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: that

Deleted: impacts

Deleted:

Deleted: impacting

Individuals or entities with a change suggestion that they believe may be subject to this standard should submit their suggestion to the Operations and Technical Committee (OTC) of the SECB using the Change Management Request form. Items brought directly to the SECB or to other SECB committees which are subject to this standard will be directed to the OTC. Items may be brought to the OTC at any regular meeting.

After receiving a change request to change the ARMER system, the OTC will determine if the request is a major change and is subject to this standard. If the OTC determines that the suggestion is subject to the terms of this standard, it will ask the requestor to bring their request to specific entities for feedback and/or formal approval. The reviews shall scrutinize the change proposal by identifying pitfalls, considering variables, and identify alternatives. The OTC may establish a workgroup of operational and technical regional representation to facilitate this process, before making a final recommendation to the SECB.

The OTC shall first assign the requestor to consult the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Office of Statewide Radio Communications for technical review and the Emergency Communication Networks (ECN) for an operational and financial review of the request. The requestor may consult with MnDOT and the ECN prior bringing the request to the OTC and the input of MnDOT and the ECN may be provided when the request is first introduced.

Upon receipt of comment from MnDOT and the ECN, the OTC may assign the requestor to consult the SECB's Finance and Steering Committees, if applicable, and the effected Regional Emergency Communication Boards. The OTC may also require the requestor to consult other committees or workgroups of the SECB or any other entity the OTC deems necessary.

The OTC may consider and grant provisional authority with SECB approval for portions or the entire change request to be enacted. Temporary authority will allow for prompt implementation and may provide data about the proposal to assist with a permanent decision.

The requesting entity will consult each of the entities identified by the OTC about their change request and follow through with those entities as directed. The requesting entity may modify their original request based on new information or suggestions received. The requesting entity should provide a status update to the OTC within six months and every three months afterward.

Upon return to the OTC, the requesting entity should provide a report detailing their follow up. Modifications to the original request may be offered. Supporting materials such as meeting minutes or letters of approval should be submitted at this time. Relevant parties should be present for testimony. The OTC may then commence deliberations about the request, resulting in a recommendation to the SECB. Approved requests will be forwarded to the SECB for final review and consideration.

Appeals of SECB decisions are governed by State Standard 7.3.0 'Appeal Process'.

Approved change requests will be jointly managed by MnDOT and the ECN. Generally, MnDOT will manage technical items and the ECN will manage operational items. Concerns raised but not fully satisfied during the process should be considered as the change is implemented.

The ECN will be responsible for tracking requests subject to this standard.

The following points related to timing should be followed during the implementation of this standard:

- Change suggestions may be submitted to the OTC at any time and this standard may be applied at any time.

Deleted: present

Deleted: of the SECB that appear

Deleted: should be

Deleted: should make a determination

Deleted: suggestion

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: the OTC

Deleted: identifying

Deleted: W

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: .

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: (MnDOT)

Deleted: input

Deleted: will

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: of th

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: e SECB and the

Deleted: of each potentially impacted region.

Deleted: entity

Deleted: (subject

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: to

Deleted: ratification)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: should

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: should

Deleted: consideration

Deleted: Requesting entities may appeal decisions by the means provided in standard 7.3.0.

Deleted: Suggestions approved

Deleted: by the SECB should be

- The process established in this standard should be expected to take at least six months so change suggestions subject to this standard should be submitted at least six months prior to consideration.
- Approved changes involving reprogramming of consoles or user equipment may be held up to 18 months so that multiple changes may be consolidated into one reprogramming to allow for funding for the proposed changes.
- ECN will notify all system users of SECB approval and implementation timeline of all major ARMER changes.

A timeline should be followed to ensure adequate timing for the state and regions to prepare and request funding. In the below table, Change Management matters follow a four-year timing cycle and letters represent years:

- Year AAAA: 2016, 2020, 2024, ...
- Year BBBB: 2017, 2021, 2025, ...
- Year CCCC: 2018, 2022, 2026, ...
- Year DDDD: 2019, 2023, 2027, ...

January 1, AAAA	If allowing six months for this process, this is the last day to <u>submit</u> changes subject to the Change Management standard to the OTC for consideration in the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota budget.
July 1, AAAA	Deadline for the SECB to approve requests subject and for the ECN to know financial needs to be considered for the CCCC/DDDD Minnesota Budget.
July 1, AAAA to January 1, BBBB	ECN to obtain Governor's approval of ECN budget and to prepare budget request for state legislature.
January 1, BBBB to May 1, BBBB	ECN to present budget request to legislature.
June 1, BBBB	State legislature approves budgets.
July 1, BBBB to June 30, CCCC	Fiscal Year CCCC of CCCC/DDDD budget.
July 1, CCCC to June 30, DDDD	Fiscal Year DDDD of CCCC/DDDD budget.

When the requirements of this standard cannot be met by an entity, the entity must apply for a waiver and that waiver must be considered by the OTC.

6. Management

The OTC with administrative support from the ECN is responsible for supervising and managing this process.

Deleted: two years

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Deleted: cannot

Commented [TT2]: What requirements? The outcome of the change management or the timeline, the budgeting cycle? What is the spirit of this comment?

Formatted: Font: +Headings (Cambria)

Troy Tretter

From: Al Fjerstad <al.fjerstad@co.mille-lacs.mn.us>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Rick Juth ; Bruning, Marcus (DPS); Donahue, Randy (DPS); Lee, Tim (DOT) (tim.lee@state.mn.us); daves@wccwireless.com
Cc: Jim Stromberg (james.stromberg@state.mn.us); Joe Glacum ; Kristen Lahr; Micah Myers; Troy Tretter
Subject: OTC Statewide SOAR Workgroup

RICS's, at the last OTC meeting, I was elected as the Chair of the Statewide SOAR workgroup under the OTC. I am requesting your help in finding two members (one Technical & One Operational) from each of your RIC regions to sit on this workgroup. It is my intention that the meetings will be Conference Calls. If possible, can I have names and emails from you before the next OTC meeting.

Tim Lee, it will probably be OK to have just one person from your office on this work group, unless you feel an MSP Dispatcher would be good also

Rick Juth, Troy Tretter is already working on two names from the Metro Region.

Dave S, I would like you to be on this workgroup also.

Any questions, feel free to contact me.



Al Fjerstad
Mille Lacs County Sheriff's Office
640 3rd St. SE
Milaca, MN. 56353
Office 320-983-8288
Cell 612-916-5378
PSAP Manager / EM Director / Radio Sys Admin
MN Certified COML – COMT
DNR Wildland Fire Technical Specialist

Troy Tretter

From: Stromberg, James (DPS) <James.Stromberg@state.mn.us>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 4:23 PM
To: Lee, Timothy (DOT); Bill Flaten; Dave Pike (dpik@co.mower.mn.us); Dewey Johnson (johnsond@stlouiscountymn.gov); Micah Myers; Neil Dolan; Tim Mohr; Ulie Seal (useal@BloomingtonMN.gov)
Cc: Thakur, Mukhtar (DOT); Mines, Jackie (DPS); 3301@co.kandiyohi.mn.us; Joe Glaccum (joe.glaccum@northmemorial.com); Jill Rohret; Troy Tretter; Salmon, Carol (DPS); Bruning, Marcus (DPS); Donahue, Randy (DPS); Juth, Rick (DPS)
Subject: ARMER Subsystem Roaming Workgroup

Hello RAC Chairs. The SECB Steering Committee has created a workgroup to explore issues related to ARMER Subsystem Roaming. I will be moderating the Workgroup and we will be expected to provide recommendations to the Steering Committee by November. Our meetings will be held by conference call.

Workgroup members will be expected to represent their region and to regularly report back on the progress of the Workgroup to their regions. The Workgroup will serve only in an information gathering and advisory role to the Steering Committee. It will have no decision making authority.

The Workgroup is to have the following makeup and we are asking that you work with your regions to identify representatives. Discussions will be technical and operational. Please forward names to me.

- One representative from each Emergency Communication region of the state
- One representative from each Emergency Communication region of the state with subsystem ownership (this is each region except the Northwest)
- One additional representative from the metro region
- One representative from MnDOT

Please call if you have any questions. Thank you!

Jim Stromberg

ARMER Program Manager / Statewide Interoperability Coordinator

State of Minnesota, Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Communication Networks

445 Minnesota Street, Suite 137, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

651-201-7557

651-296-2665 (fax)

James.Stromberg@state.mn.us

<http://ecn.dps.mn.gov>

State of Minnesota – Statewide Radio Board – ARMER System

AUTHORIZATION TO USE TALK GROUPS
NOT OWNED BY THE REQUESTING AGENCY

Date: 04/22/2016

Requesting Agency: Wright County

Authorizing Agency: Metro Region Interop

Reason for Request x Add Talk Group(s) to Radios
 x Scan Talk Group(s)
 ☐ Other _____

I. Request permission to ADD the following talk groups

Talk Group	To Be Installed in: (i.e., Portable, Mobile, Command Post)	For the following Work Units:
ME-TAC 1		
ME-TAC 2		
ME-TAC 3		
ME-TAC 4		
ME-TAC 5		
ME-TAC 6		
ME-TAC 7		
ME-TAC 8		

II. Request permission to SCAN/ MONITOR the following talk groups

Talk Group	To Be Installed in: (i.e., Portable, Mobile, Command Post)	To be monitored by the following positions:	Request for Receive Only

III. Other Request/ Requirements (Explain):

***please advise which channels you would like us to have**

IV. Reason for Request:

***Wright County is in the process of reprogramming our user radios with Granite Electronics.**

Name of individual completing application: Communications Sgt Jason Kramber

Address: 3800 Braddock Ave NE, Buffalo, MN 55313

Phone: 763-682-7605

E-mail address: jason.kramber@co.wright.mn.us

For further information, please see Standard 2.7.0

This Side for Authorizing Agency use Only

AUTHORIZATION TO USE TALK GROUPS
NOT OWNED BY THE REQUESTING AGENCY

Request Approved_____ Approved with Conditions_____ Denied_____

Conditions:

Authorized Signature: _____

Name of Authorizing Individual _____

Address _____

Phone_____ E-mail address_____