

METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

RADIO TECHNICAL OPERATIONS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Board Room, Metro Counties Government Center

June 22, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS:

Ulie 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

Scott Haas
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 May 25, 2016 Minutes
3. Agenda Items
 - a. State Standard 1.8.1 – Change Management – Gunderson / Jansen
 - b. MN DHS ARMER Plan Follow up – Rey Freeman
 - c. Change Management Submission – Encrypted ME TAC's – Meyer
 - d. Change Management Submission – ME Zone Updates – Timm
 - e. Washington County Regional Talk Group Request – Timm
 - f. Incident Dispatcher Certification – Kummer (Discussion Only)
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
 - c. Removal of dual naming from consoles - 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 / Jansen
 - e. Scene of Action Repeater (SOAR) Workgroup – Olson / Kummer
6. Other Business
 - a. Regional Talkgroup Permissions Updates
 - i. Wright County: METAC's
 - b. Next Meeting July 27th
7. Adjourn

Ulie Seal, Chair

**Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Radio Technical Operations Committee
Meeting Notes
May 25, 2016**

Members Present: Dave Pikal, *Ramsey County*; Peter Sauter, *Carver County*; Chris Kummer, *Metropolitan Airports Commission*; Jake Thompson, *Anoka County*; Rod Olson, *City of Minneapolis*; Chad LeVasseur, *Metropolitan Council*; Jon Eckel, *Chisago County*; John Gundersen, *Hennepin County*; Nate Timm, *Washington County*; Chuck Steier, *University of Minnesota Police*; Ron Jansen, *Dakota County*.

Guests Present: Rick Juth, *ECN*; Scott Hass, *Scott County*; Curt Meyer, *Hennepin County*; Carrie Oster, Chris Meier, *Motorola*.

Call to Order: Ulie Seal called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

Minutes of the March 30, 2016 Meeting

M/S/C Motion made by Jansen to approve corrected March 2016 minutes. Peter Sauter seconded. The motion carried.

Agenda Items

State Standard 3.19.0 - Use of 800 MHz Statewide LTAC and SIU Interoperability Talkgroups- Ron Jansen

Ron Jansen said this request came about from the May OTC with the Maple Grove Fire wanting LTACs in their radios, since the May OTC, Maple Grove have rescinded their request to have LTAC's in their radio. The OTC requested each region should review 3.19 and determine if waivers should be allowed.

Chief Seal asked if do; do we just allow waivers or do we need to change the standard? Ron Jansen said he feels there should be a change to the standard, as there is no language in the standard that allows for waivers.

Nate Timm said there are some situations where the SWAT Medics on their SWAT team would use them, and that there is a time and place for them to be exempted.

Ron Jansen said his understanding was the OTC was asking if the regions should vote on waiver requests and be reviewed on individual basis, or modify the standard so the variances would not be necessary.

Ulie Seal asked members if there should be a workgroup formed to change the standard or continue with the waiver process. Ron Jansen said there was no waiver process now.

Ron Jansen said this standard is also under review because there has been some discussion in our standards workgroup on this one. At one point the LTAC5E – 8 E could not be patched in one section of the standard, and in another it says it can only be patched to an encrypted talkgroup and thinks there should be more discussion.

Nate Timm said there was suggestion that authorization for LTAC'S could simply be put on with the authorization of the Chief Law Enforcement Officer.

Ulie Seal asked members if there should be change.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to have the standard go to the OTC State Standard Workgroup. Nate Timm seconded. The motion carried.

John Gunderson asked if Scott Haas had any input on this discussion. Scott said that they went through a great process of change as the LTACs were on every radio and then restricted back to law enforcement about 3-4 years ago. All the radios have been programmed. He would disagree with the suggestion that the Chief Law Enforcement Officers be given the ability to make the decision to render a waiver. There may be appropriate uses of non-law enforcement like a squad medic to use the LTAC, but that should be done through the existing channels like we have with other standard waivers, going through the OTC, etc.

Troy Tretter informed members that the MESB members were very interested in this topic at the last board meeting. They brought up a scenario of a volunteer fire fighter carrying a radio which could give them the ability to access to law enforcement channels. They prefer more lock down than less restriction. They requested to be kept informed.

Ulie Seal asked if all four talkgroups can be scanned? The answer was yes- not the encrypted ones. Curt added that for board's information they would be used by full time staff, not volunteer.

The question was asked if it was admissible if during an event the radio be given to an Emergency Manager to monitor? It is not known if it is allowable per the standard.

State Standard 1.8.1 – Change Management – Gunderson / Tretter

At the April 25th SECB meeting the State Standard 1.8.1 Change management standard was voted down (tabled). Since then Troy has had a conversation with John Gunderson and Jim Stromberg about what the next steps are. It is their recommendation that the Metro TOC vote on the proposed changes before it goes back to the workgroup. The 2 representatives at the SECB that voted to table the Change Management standard were members from the greater metro area. It will be voted on again today.

Troy directed members to the packet containing the memo, email and draft of Standard. John Gunderson suggested some action be taken on this standard change today. He also suggested an additional person volunteer to be on the workgroup.

Ron Jansen commented that the proposed standard change suggests the SECB and MnDOT now control the purse strings of individual counties budgetary numbers. His other concern is if we take a step back as a potential change there could be a hold up of up to 18 months.

John Gunderson said he thinks the state is worried that major changes that would require state money.

Troy added that he put in a change based on suggestion to the standard for 18 months for reprogramming changes and also that change management submissions would take 6 months to be approved. This would be the 2 year cycle that is referenced in the standard. He add that the SOAR repeater and 2 encrypted law enforcement statewide channels have been assigned workgroups to address them, even though it was not addressed in the standard.

M/S/C John Gunderson made a motion to pass the strike through version of State Standard 1.8.1 Change Management standard. Nate Timm seconded. The motion carried.

Ron Jansen volunteered to join John Gunderson on Friday phone call.

Appointment of Metro Representatives for SOAR workgroup – Tretter

Troy Tretter told the committee that Al Fjerstad is requesting two members (one Technical & One Operational) from the metro region to sit on this workgroup. The meetings will be Conference Calls. Rod Olson and Chris Kummer volunteered.

M/S/C Motion made by Ron Jansen to appoint Rod Olson and Chris Kummer to the SOAR workgroup. Chris Kummer seconded. The motion carried.

Appointment of Metro Representatives for Roaming workgroup – Tretter

Troy Tretter told members this workgroup which was generated at the Steering Committee. This workgroup will determine how to address ARMER Roaming from one county to other subsystems. It is a sub group of the Steering Committee. They are looking for: 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. Troy said that he would like to volunteer, also that Jake Thompson and Ron Jansen have expressed interest in being appointed.

M/S/C Motion made by Jon Eckel to appoint Jake Thompson, Ron Jansen and Troy Tretter to the Roaming workgroup. Rod Olson seconded. The motion carried.

Moves, Additions & Changes to the System

Anoka County Water Tower Sites Repainting – Thompson

Jake Thompson said the STR tower was working great. Project will be done in September.

Update on Removal of Voting from Interoperability System – Jansen

Ron Jansen met this morning at the SMG meeting with Tim Lee and John Anderson and discussed the project. Anyone else is welcome to meet with them to finalize what they will do with timing and MnDOT and put that in a white paper. Should have that together by July meeting.

Committee Reports

Metro Mobility System Usage Update—Chad LeVasseur/Dana Rude

Dana said there was not much to report. Troy added he is tracking their usage. It has dropped approximately 550 hours per month since implementing its change December 2015.

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

Ron Jansen reiterated they had met this morning, 7.15 is up and running.

Reports from SECB Committee - Tretter

Troy Tretter stated he was going to focus on the steering committee and OTC. At the steering meeting they discussed at length adding a seat for Tribal to the SECB, this would mean a Legislative change next year. There was a discussion about removing Met Council from the SECB, this was challenged by Jill and Troy. At the OTC both the IOC and OTC voted to have the SOAR change management form a workgroup. The OTC approved the Hennepin County L-TACE request for (2) channels. They thought there may be a need for more channels, and wanted input to come back from the regions. They were happy that Metro was proposing on adding (2) Encrypted channels in the Metro.

Regional Talkgroup Permissions Updates, Wright County: METAC's

Wright County was looking to program ME TAC's in their radios since they share a borders with the Metro. Troy received the request from Jason Kramber, the PSAP manager for Wright County. They are in the process of reprogramming all of their radios with Granite Electronics. Troy noted that Wright County is a heavy roamer onto the Metro system. Hennepin West, over 90 hours last month and over 30 hours on the Norwood site. Troy said he has addressed this with Jason to have them change their preferred site priority to the Metro sites.

Ulie Seal asked what do they want to do with the talk groups? Troy said that Jason was not sure at the time where they wanted to put them. Rick Juth said that he also talked to Sgt. Jason Kramber and that he

is new to the system and standards, so he wants to follow the best practices for what is the right thing to do.

Ulie Seal asked to have a list of what authorizations have been approved or denied, also if Wright was in a hurry to have this done. Troy said he would have it ready for the next TOC meeting, and that Wright is not ready for programming and waiting will be no problem.

METRO Change management solicitation – May 25th deadline

Troy reminded the members that the deadline for change management submissions for the Metro is today, per the change management standard the 3 month solicitation period ends today and the request will be looked at during the June TOC meeting.

Next Meeting June 22nd, 2016

Ron Jansen said that he would like to discuss the removal of dual naming from consoles during the June TOC.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:14pm.

Troy Tretter

From: Stromberg, James (DPS) <James.Stromberg@state.mn.us>
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 4:15 PM
To: Bill Flaten; Dave Pike (dpike@co.mower.mn.us); Dewey Johnson (johnsond@stlouiscountymn.gov); Micah Myers; Neil Dolan; Tim Mohr; Ulie Seal (useal@BloomingtonMN.gov)
Cc: Bruning, Marcus (DPS); Donahue, Randy (DPS); Juth, Rick (DPS); Troy Tretter; Mines, Jackie (DPS); Joe Glaccum (joe.glaccum@northmemorial.com)
Subject: Change Management Standard Rewrite
Attachments: Change Management Standard Rewrite -- DRAFT v-7 -- 2016-05-27.docx; Change Management Standard Rewrite -- DRAFT v-7 -- 2016-05-27.pdf; Change Management Standard Rewrite -- DRAFT v-6 -- 2016-03-28.pdf

Hello RAC Chairs:

In December 2015 the SECB's Operations and Technical Committee created a workgroup to revise the two existing Change Management standards. The workgroup met over the winter and in April 2016 presented a new draft standard (one standard replacing two) to the OTC. The draft was approved by the OTC and sent to the SECB where it was tabled to allow the metro region additional time for additional review and comment. Suggestions for change were received and were considered by the workgroup during a May 27th conference call. The workgroup accepted some and rejected some of the metro's proposals. Attached you will find three attachments:

- v-6 is the version of the standard originally approved by the OTC and sent to the SECB
- v-7 (PDF) is the product of the May 27th conference call
- v-7 (Word) shows markup of changes between v-6 and v-7

The current standards (1.5.2 & 1.8.0) can be found on the [ECN website](#).

The OTC would like each region to formally weigh in on the last draft (v-7) of the change management standard and to provide the region's feedback to the OTC. Will you please add this item to your next meeting agendas and then provide your feedback to the OTC? Please let me know if you have any questions.

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>

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 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 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
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 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 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 effects on the ARMER backbone or impacting more than one emergency communication regions are subject to the procedures prescribed in this Standard:

- Changes affecting 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 submit 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 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 request to change the ARMER system, the OTC will determine if the request 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 before making a final recommendation to the SECB.

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 ECN prior bringing the request to the OTC and the input of MnDOT and ECN may be provided when the request is first introduced.

Upon receipt of comment from MnDOT and ECN, the OTC will assign the requestor to consult the SECB's 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 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.

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

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

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 and to allow for funding of the proposed changes.
- The monthly ECN report to the OTC will include a timeline detailing the approval and implementation of changes subject to this standard.

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 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 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
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		

Formatted Table

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 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 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-effects on the ARMER backbone or impacting more than one emergency communication regions are subject to the procedures prescribed in this Standard:

- Changes impacting-affecting 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-submit~~ 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 that are~~ subject to this standard ~~should-will~~ 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 will~~ ~~determine~~ if the ~~suggestion-request~~ 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~~ ~~identifying~~ pitfalls, considering variables, and identify alternatives. The OTC may establish a ~~W~~workgroup 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 (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-comment~~ from MnDOT and ~~the~~ ECN, the OTC will assign the requestor to consult the ~~SECB's~~ 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 ~~by~~ the OTC deems necessary.

The OTC *may* consider and grant provisional authority, ~~(subject to SECB approval 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-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 ~~should-will~~ be forwarded to the SECB for ~~final review and~~ consideration.

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

~~Suggestions-Change requests~~ approved by the SECB ~~should-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 two years so that multiple changes may be consolidated into one reprogramming and to allow for funding of the proposed changes.
- The monthly ECN report to the OTC will include a timeline detailing the approval and implementation of changes subject to this standard.

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)

Change Proposal

1. Administrative Information:

Type of Change (Technical or Operational)

Technical and Operational

Date Submitted:

March 10, 2016

Submitter (agency):

Hennepin County Sheriff's Office

Change Sponsor (Individual) Contact Information:

John Gundersen, Curt Meyer

2. Summary of proposed change(s):

Add four (4) encrypted regional tactical talk-groups for law enforcement use.

3. Existing MESB standards impacted:

3.14.0

4. Scope of Change:

Impact on users (e.g., majority of users, minority of users, number of counties):

All law enforcement radios that are equipped with DES-OFB encryption.

Impact on the placement of resources in communications equipment (e.g., upgrades):

4 encrypted talk groups to be added to encrypted law enforcement radios.

Impact on operational procedures (e.g., changes to operational standards):

Language for encrypted regional law enforcement radio resources must be added to the existing radio standard.

Impact on user training (e.g., training required for compliance):

Some training would be required as currently there are no regional encrypted radio resources.

Impact on reprogramming or configuration of end-user equipment:

Subscribers: All encrypted law enforcement radios.

Consoles: All law enforcement PSAP radio consoles would add the resources.

Other equipment: These new resources should be recorded.

5. Existing deficiencies, problems, needs addressed by the proposed changes:

Currently there are no regional encrypted law enforcement resources so users in this region have relied on statewide encrypted talk groups for interoperability when statewide coverage was not operationally necessary.

There are now more encrypted law enforcement users in the region and this region has monopolized the current encrypted statewide talk groups making them unavailable for users outstate.

6. Expected improvements & benefits resulting from the change

Regional encrypted interoperable law enforcement solution that was not previously available.

7. Proposed implementation & transition plan including timeline, milestones and training:

Start and End Date:

Beginning of the next Change Management radio programming cycle. No end date.

Description of Implementation Plan:

Add to dispatch consoles, then to subscriber radios.

8. Preliminary assessments which have been completed (documentation attached):

See attached talk group study.

9. List of Attached proposed new or revised Standards, Plans or Best Practices Guides:

Amend Metro ARMER Standard 3.14.0

10. Other Attachments:

11.Tracking and Approvals:

Submitter Approval:

Signature _____ Date _____

MESB Receipt:

Signature _____ Date _____

Radio TOC Determination of Need:

Signature _____ Date _____

MnDOT Approval (if needed):

Signature _____ Date _____

TOC Approval of Assessments:

Signature _____ Date _____

Finance Committee Approval:
(if required)

Signature _____ Date _____

Final MESB Approval:

Signature _____ Date _____

Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER)

Change Proposal ~~DRAFT~~

1. Administrative Information:

Type of Change (Technical or Operational)

Both technical and operational. This will be a major category change.

Date Submitted:

3/31/2016 ~~draft only~~

Submitter (agency):

Washington County Sheriff's Office

Change Sponsor (Individual) Contact Information:

Nathan Timm, 651-430-7863. Nate.timm@co.washington.mn.us

2. Summary of proposed change(s):

Add ME CALL

Add ME TAC 9 (all users)

Add ME TAC10 (all users)

~~Add ME TAC11E (law only)~~

~~Add ME TAC12E (law only)~~

Incorporate a recommended public safety ME zone:

1) < local choice >

2) ME CALL (new)

3) ME TAC1

4) ME TAC2

5) ME TAC3

6) ME TAC4

7) ME TAC5

8) ME TAC6

9) ME TAC7

10) ME TAC8

11) ME TAC9 (new)

12) ME TAC10 (new)

13) ME TAC11E ~~(new)~~ LE only

14) ME TAC12E ~~(new)~~ LE only

15) < local choice >

16) < local choice >

3. Existing MESB standards impacted:

| Regional talkgroup standards, [3.14.0 – Metro ME TACs](#).

4. Scope of Change:

Impact on users (e.g., majority of users, minority of users, number of counties):

All metro users and consoles. Also metro interop partners.

Impact on the placement of resources in communications equipment (e.g., upgrades):

All equipment will need to be updated.

Impact on operational procedures (e.g., changes to operational standards):

Procedures will need to be updated; 3 zone radios must be taken into account.

Impact on user training (e.g., training required for compliance):

All users will need to be briefed on the changes

Impact on reprogramming or configuration of end-user equipment:

Subscribers: All

Consoles: All

Other equipment: May be applicable

5. Existing deficiencies, problems, needs addressed by the proposed changes:

Using MSP call in an emergent situation will induce delay as State Patrol Dispatch contacts the local PSAP for a backup request. There is a benefit in having the field unit speak directly with the responsible PSAP. MSP Call can be confusing for a radio user in stress with the need to hail a regional PSAP; ME CALL stands out with a clear purpose.

Metro regional clear ~~tacs~~ [TAC's](#) have been nearly consumed, especially during holiday events.

~~Statewide encrypted tacs are more frequently all in use. Many of these events are metro only. Two metro encrypted tacs will relieve loading in the state resources.~~

Having a standard metro zone will make assigning units to the appropriate talkgroup much simpler on interoperable events. However, it should be noted that a truly standard zone would not be possible for ~~non~~ [public/non-public](#) safety (restricted from ME TAC1-4) and ~~non-law~~ [non-law](#) enforcement (ME TAC11E and 12E).

6. Expected improvements & benefits resulting from the change:

Increased efficiency, officer safety, and increased regional capacity

7. Proposed implementation & transition plan including timeline, milestones and training:

Start and End Date: Start date to be determined. A multiyear implementation plan will be necessary.

Description of Implementation Plan: Similar to the last round of IC zone updates.

8. Preliminary assessments which have been completed (documentation attached):

Visual observations of LTAC5E-LTAC8E and metro regional ~~taes~~ TAC's on statusboard.

9. List of Attached proposed new or revised Standards, Plans or Best Practices Guides:

Pending approval of moving forward by Metro TOC.

10. Other Attachments:

11.Tracking and Approvals:

Submitter Approval:

Signature _____ Date _____

MESB Receipt:

Signature _____ Date _____

Radio TOC Determination of Need:

Signature _____ Date _____

MnDOT Approval (if needed):

Signature _____ Date _____

TOC Approval of Assessments:

Signature _____ Date _____

Finance Committee Approval:
(if required)

Signature _____ Date _____

Final MESB Approval:

Signature _____ Date _____



Excelsior Fire District

Proudly Serving the Communities of:

Deephaven – Excelsior – Greenwood – Shorewood – Tonka Bay

24100 Smithtown Road

Shorewood, MN. 55331

952-401-8801 Phone

952-960-1690 Fax

Wednesday, June 01, 2016

Curt Meyer
Assistant Radio Systems Manager
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office
1245 Shenandoah Ln
Plymouth, MN 55447

Dear Curt,

This letter is in regards to a request of adding additional TAC Talkgroups on the ARMER system for the metro area. There are times during the year when it is difficult to obtain an available ME TAC to use for a multiagency incident because they are either reserved or currently in use by other agencies for appropriate purposes. At the Excelsior Fire District, we notice this mostly based on the number of special events in our area and for emergencies on Lake Minnetonka with multiple public safety agencies.

My suggestion is to add an additional six Talkgroups to the metro region TAC Talkgroups for the purposes of Public Safety only. The use of encryption onto a number of public safety radios may also impact this consideration.

I would be more than happy to discuss this further if you have any additional questions or comments.

Respectfully,

Scott Gerber
Fire Chief

sgerber@excelsiorfire.org

952-960-1650



Wednesday, June 01, 2016

Curt Meyer
Assistant Radio Systems Manager
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office
1245 Shenandoah Ln
Plymouth, MN 55447

Curt Meyer,

This letter is in regards to a request of adding additional TAC Talkgroups on the ARMER system for the metro area. There are times during the year when it is difficult to obtain an available ME TAC to use for a multiagency incident because they are either reserved or currently in use by other agencies for appropriate purposes.

My suggestion is to add an additional six Talkgroups to the metro region TAC Talkgroups, two clear Talkgroups and four encrypted Talkgroups for the purposes of Public Safety only. I feel with more and more agencies starting to add encryption onto their radios, we are going to see an increase in demand of encrypted regional Talkgroups. Currently there is a limited number of encrypted Talkgroups and the majority, are on the statewide level. I believe that if we add the four encrypted regional Talkgroups, this will help alleviate the demand for the statewide encrypted Talkgroups.

My recommendation is the following:

- ME TAC 1-6 Public Safety Only (Police, Fire, EMS)
- ME TAC 7-10 Public Service (Anyone)
- ME TAC 11E-14E Public Safety Only Encrypted

I would be more than happy to discuss this further if you have any additional questions or comments.

Thank you,

Tony Martin

Tony Martin
PSAP Manager / Edina Communications Center
TMartin@EdinaMN.gov
952-833-9523

EDINA POLICE DEPARTMENT

4801 West 50th Street • Edina, Minnesota 55424
www.EdinaMN.gov • 952-826-1610 • Fax 952-826-1607

From: [Dan Anderson](#)
To: [John D Gundersen](#)
Cc: [Curtis J Meyer](#)
Subject: RE: ARMER Change Management
Date: Thursday, January 07, 2016 1:20:00 PM

Curt asked me the same question and I'll copy and paste my reply...

More is always better and in my gut I think if it really hit the fan we'd really need some for a short period of time. I haven't been here long enough to know, but has the current amount of talkgroup capacity ever been tested in a real or training setting where all or most are being used at the same time? Not so much an infrastructure capacity issue as an issue of talkgroup management during an incident. In practice we currently use regional talkgroups really for non-regional uses, so the addition of more Hennepin County Mutual Aid tactical talkgroups would actually free the regional talkgroups up more for their intended use, which is multijurisdictional and multidiscipline response from multiple counties.

Dan Anderson MN CEM, COML, AUXCOMM
Senior Coordinator – Data Collaboration and Communications

1600 Prairie Drive,
Medina, MN 55340
USNG: 15T VK5531 8851
(612) 596-0253 (office)
(612) 578-1372 (cell)
daniel.anderson@hennepin.us
Illegitimus non carborundum est

-----Original Message-----

From: John D Gundersen
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 1:19 PM
To: Dan Anderson <Dan.Anderson@hennepin.us>
Cc: Curtis J Meyer <Curtis.Meyer@hennepin.us>
Subject: Re: ARMER Change Management

Another question... Do you see a need for more regional tacs?

John Gundersen
Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 7, 2016, at 12:20 PM, Dan Anderson <Dan.Anderson@hennepin.us> wrote:
>
> Good afternoon John...
>
> Previously Curt and I had talked about the possibility of adding additional Hennepin County talkgroups. He had suggested that I send you an official request for such, and this morning urged me to expedite my request.
>
> Much like the STACs and the METACs, Hennepin County could use several Hennepin County Mutual Aid Tactical talkgroups. I could immediately utilize 4 such talkgroups every time we activate our SMS for summer weather activities. I envision each of the 4 emergency planning groups using a talkgroup, with a possible fifth as a "Command" talkgroup (though that could be the existing HCEOC talkgroup if we needed to).
>
> As events grow and cascade, there could be a need for more mutual aid talkgroups beyond the 4 (for damage assessment, response, disaster recovery, staging, etc.), if for instance the 4 were already being utilized for

emergency management planning group storm spotting. I could easily see 4 additional talkgroups, bringing the total to 8 county mutual aid tactical talkgroups.

>

> My guess is that not all of these would be new. Perhaps there are ways to rededicate existing, barely-used talkgroups and reconfigure/rename them for this purpose. But having them in a block or zone in one convenient grouping would go a very long way in creating ICS-205 radio communications plans for SMS activations, which I intend to do this summer.

>

> So in summary, I feel that we need 8 countywide mutual aid tactical talkgroups, available to any Hennepin County Public Safety agency, reservable through our dispatch or the Status Board.

>

> If you have any questions please let me know. Thanks in advance...

>

>

> _____
> Dan Anderson MN CEM, COML, AUXCOMM

> Senior Coordinator - Data Collaboration and Communications

>

> 1600 Prairie Drive,

> Medina, MN 55340

> USNG: 15T VK5531 8851

> (612) 596-0253 (office)

> (612) 578-1372 (cell)

> daniel.anderson@hennepin.us

> Illegitimus non carborundum est

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Curtis J Meyer

> Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 10:41 AM

> To: Dan Anderson <Dan.Anderson@hennepin.us>

> Subject: ARMER Change Management

>

> Dan, it's starting.

> Submit you additional talk group requests clear and encrypted to John Gundersen as soon as you can.

>

> Thanks, Curt

> Sent from my iPhone



Office of the Sheriff

Commitment to Excellence



William M. Hutton
Sheriff

Dan Starry
Chief Deputy

6/2/2016

Ulie Seal, Chair Metro TOC
1800 West Old Shakopee Rd
Bloomington, MN 55431

Chair Seal,

Washington County respectfully requests TOC authorization to move two county talkgroups to the Metro Regional site access profile.

Our narcotics taskforce has two strapped encrypted tactical talkgroups. These taskforce officers and deputies primarily use portable radios. Recent operations have taken the team to the west metro, where their radios go out of range. The talkgroups are currently set to the Washington plus border profile, so when these radios roam one ring away from our site the talkgroups will fail.

Operations to the west metro are infrequent, but are mission critical.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nathan Timm".

Nathan Timm
Radio System Manager
Washington County Sheriff's Office

METRO REGION
800 MHz Trunked Regional Public Safety Radio System
Standards, Protocols, Procedures

Document Section:	3-Interoperability Guidelines	Radio TOC Approval – Signature:
Sub-Section:	METRO 3.17.5	Date: xx/xx/16
Procedure Title:	Criteria for Certification as an Incident Dispatcher	
Date Established:	xx/xx/16	
Replaces Document Dated:		MESB Approval - Signature:
Date Revised:		

1. Purpose or Objective

The intent of this standard is to establish protocols and procedures to be used for certification and re-certification of Incident Dispatcher in the Metro Region of Minnesota.

2. Background:

During all-hazards emergency response operations, communications among multiple jurisdictions and disciplines, including emergency medical, fire, and law enforcement services, is essential. Unfortunately, the absence of on-scene communications coordination has often compromised critical operations. To close this capability gap, the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) in partnership with the Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Integration Center (NIC), and practitioners from across the country developed performance and training standards for the all-hazards Incident Dispatcher as well as formulated a curriculum and comprehensive All-Hazards TRG-IDT course.

An Incident Dispatcher is a specially trained individual qualified to operate away from the dispatch center in a command post, Emergency Operations Center (EOC), base camp or at the incident scene. Incident dispatchers leverage the multi-tasking, communication, accountability and documentation skills of successful telecommunicators to provide public safety communications expertise and support at planned events, exercises and extended incidents. Incident Dispatchers may support the communication unit as a single resource or as part of an incident dispatch team.

As representatives of the Minnesota public safety community complete Incident Dispatcher training, the federal government has left it up to each state as to determine how the

Incident will be certified. This standard will lay out the certification process for Minnesota. An Incident Dispatcher will by default meet all criteria to be considered a Radio Operator (RADO) for the purpose of the Communications Unit (COMU). No further training will be required to be certified as a RADO.

3. Recommended Procedure:

The following procedure shall be followed in order to be initially certified as an Incident Dispatcher and in order to be recertified:

Prerequisite Experience/Training:

- A public safety background with three years of experience in dispatch operations, or ICTAP RADO training and 1 year experience in dispatch operations.
- Completion of the ICTAP Communications Unit Awareness web-based course.
- Completion of IS-100.b, IS-144, IS-200.b, IS-700.a, and IS-800.b.

Certification Process:

1. Attend and successfully complete a three day DHS-OEC all-hazards IDT (TRG-IDT) training session taught by a DHS-OEC certified IDT instructor. Experienced Incident Dispatchers who have received formal training from outside sources, and can provide certificates of training, shall be recognized and considered as having fulfilled this requirement.
2. Complete the IDT Task Book by demonstrating satisfactory performance of each of the tasks as witnessed by qualified evaluator(s) within three years of IDT training. It is acceptable to use an incident that occurred up to three years prior to the IDT training. (See attachment "A" Evaluation Form). Experienced Incident Dispatchers, previously trained before the formal DHS-OEC TRG-IDT was available can use tasks completed since recognized IDT training was completed.
3. Participate as an Incident Dispatcher in at least one NIMS Type III training drill, functional exercise, full scale exercise, incident or preplanned event. Provide a copy of one of the following: (1) Incident Action Plan; (2) Incident Communications Plan; or (3) After Action Report.
4. Obtain the "Final Evaluator's Verification" from one of the following: (1) A NIMS trained COML; (2) A Designated Agency Head; or (3) An Incident Commander. (See attachment "D" Verification / Certification of completed task book Form)

5. Obtain "Agency Certification" from the Designated Agency Head employing the candidate indicating that the candidate has met all qualifications for IDT certification. (See attachment "C" Agency Certification Form)
6. Submit the signed-off Task Book, NIMS course certificates (a printout from the HSEM training repository will suffice) and copies of relevant Incident Action Plans, Incident Communications Plans, and After Action Reports to the Metropolitan Radio Services Coordinator to be brought before the MESB RTOC (Radio Technical Operations Committee) for approval.
7. The Metropolitan Radio Services Coordinator will review the qualification documents to make sure they meet the requirements as set out in this certification process and then go before the MESB RTOC presenting the candidate's credentials and requesting a resolution that the IDT candidate be recommended for certification.
8. The Metropolitan Radio Services Coordinator will review the qualification documents, copy the Task Book and relevant documents for filing and sign off on the original Task Book and return it to the candidate. This will serve as Certification of the Incident Dispatcher and will be good for three years. (Submitting these documents by mail is acceptable. If the documents are lost a copy will be deemed the original and marked as such)
9. Recertification will be accomplished by participation in a NIMS Type III training drill, functional exercise, full scale exercise, incident or pre planned event at least once every three years to keep the Incident Dispatcher qualifications and skills up to date.
10. Certification will be recorded and kept on file by the MESB.

6. Management

The MESB Communications Response Task Force (CRTF) Steering Workgroup will manage the IDT certification and re-certification process in Minnesota.

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	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 2	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 3	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 4	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 5	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 6	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 7	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies
ME-TAC 8	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies

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
ME-TAC 1	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 2	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 3	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 4	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 5	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 6	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 7	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	
ME-TAC 8	Portables & Mobiles	Wright County Deputies	

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

State of Minnesota – Statewide Radio Board – ARMER System

Address: 3800 Braddock Ave NE, Buffalo, MN 55313

Phone: 763-682-7605

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

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_____

ME TAC Permissions

Agency	Channels	Type	Date Approved
St.Cloud PD	ME TAC1-8	PD radios	8/4/2011
Kanabec County	ME TAC1-8	All Squads	8/26/2011
Dept of Corrections	ME TAC1-8	All DOC Units	8/29/2011
Mille Lacs County	ME TAC1-8	MLCSO & Princeton PD & FD	8/29/2011
Murray County	ME TAC1-8	Law, Fire, EMS Radios	10/10/2011
Elk River Fire Dept	ME TAC1-8	Fire Dept Radios	10/27/2011
St.Cloud VA	ME TAC1-8	VA PD Radios	7/19/2012
Nicollet County	ME TAC1-8	Law (ME TAC1-4), Fire, EMS, Public Safety (ME TAC5-8)	8/15/2012
McLeod County	ME TAC1-8	Law, Fire, EMS (ME TAC1-4). 5-8 (All Radios)	10/31/2012
Delano Fire Dept	ME TAC1-8	Portables, Mobile Command Post	8/9/2013
Mn Dept of Health	ME TAC5-8	All Radios	9/26/2013
Sherburne County	ME TAC1-8	Law Radios	2/20/2014
Moorhead Fire CAT	ME TAC1-8	1 Mobile	4/6/2014
Goodhue County	ME TAC1-8	Law, Fire, EOC Radios	4/7/2014
Olmstead County	ME TAC1-8	Deputies, Syrs(?), Captains	8/11/2014
Civil Air Patrol	ME TAC5-8	8 Portables	3/25/2015