February 10, 2016

***10:00 AM***

1. **Call to Order** (Comm. Huffman)  
2. **Approval of Agenda** (Comm. Huffman)  
3. **Approval of Minutes** (Comm. Huffman)  
   - December 9, 2015  

4. **Issues and Action Requests**
   A. **Radio** (Tretter)
      1. Washington County Request to Use 2014 SECB Grant Funds  
      2. Approval of Dakota County Request for AIS Server  
      3. Approval of Hennepin EMS Request for AIS Server  
   
   B. **EMS** (Robinson) - None  

C. **9-1-1** (Eggimann)
   1. Acceptance of NextGeneration 9-1-1 Strategic Plan  

D. **IT/Capital Expense Update** (Rohret)  

E. **Ratification of Audit Engagement Letter Amendment** (Rohret)  

F. **Amended MEBP Policies** (Rohret)
   1. Policy 007 - Travel  
   2. Policy 008 - Mileage Reimbursement  

G. **New MEBP Policies** (Rohret)
   1. Policy 024 - Wireless Devices  
   2. Policy 025 - Data Requests - Public Access  
   3. Policy 026 - Data Requests - Data Subjects  
      a. Draft Notification to the Commissioner of Administration  
   4. Policy 027 - Violation of Policies  

Page
H. Approval of Executive Director Travel Requests (Rohret)

5. **Old Business**
   A. Update on Building Security Plans

6. **New Business**

7. **Adjourn**
METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 9, 2015

Commissioners Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOKA</th>
<th>Rhonda Sivarajah</th>
<th>ISANTI</th>
<th>Greg Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARVER</td>
<td>Jim Ische</td>
<td>RAMSEY</td>
<td>Blake Huffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHISAGO</td>
<td>George McMahon</td>
<td>SCOTT</td>
<td>Barbara Marschall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTA</td>
<td>Tom Egan</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Ted Bearth - Absent, Fran Miron - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENNEPIN</td>
<td>Randy Johnson</td>
<td>City of Minneapolis</td>
<td>Andrew Johnson - Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Present: Jill Rohret; Pete Eggimann; Kelli Jackson; Troy Tretter; and Jay Arneson, MESB Counsel.
Others Present: Ron Jansen, Dakota County; Chris Kummer, Metropolitan Airports Commission.

1. Call to Order
Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by MESB Chair, Commissioner Rhonda Sivarajah.

2. Approval of Agenda for December 9, 2015
Motion made by Commissioner McMahon, seconded by Commissioner Huffman to approve the December 9, 2015 agenda. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes from August 12, 2015
Motion made by Commissioner Egan, seconded by Commissioner McMahon to approve the August 12, 2015 minutes. Motion carried.

4. MESB TOC Issues and Action Requests
A. Radio TOC
   1. 2016 Radio TOC Chair/Vice Chair
      Motion made by Commissioner Egan, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to reappoint Chief Ulle Seal as Chair and Ron Jansen as Vice Chair of the 2016 Radio TOC. Motion carried.

   2. Approval of HCMC Console Addition
      Troy Tretter stated the Radio TOC recommends the MESB Executive Committee approve the Hennepin County Medical Center request to add two dispatch consoles and one Conventional Channel Gateway.
      Motion made by Commissioner McMahon seconded by Commissioner Huffman to approve the HCMC console request. Motion carried.

   3. Approval of Changes to Regional Funding Priorities for Grant Funds
      Tretter stated that Washington County had requested some changes to the regional grant funding priorities previously approved by the MESB. The proposed amendment is: Non-ARMER Interoperability Infrastructure; Infrastructure investments which generally enhance interoperability but do not provide any material enhancement to the performance of the ARMER backbone. Examples include indoor RDAs for public safety sites such as LECs, jails or courthouse and schools only. The amendment would allow funding of non-ARMER interoperability infrastructure. The Radio TOC recommends the MESB Executive Committee approve the amendment to the FY 2015 and FY 2016 funding priorities previously approved by the Board for the use of grant funds.
      Motion made by Commissioner McMahon, seconded by Commissioner Huffman to approve the amendments to the FY 2015 and FY 2016 funding priorities. Motion carried.
4. Approval of Amendments to Metro Standard 3.14.0
Tretter stated that the amendments Metro Standard 3.14.0 remove dual-naming references to these interoperability resources, which were added as a result of the last Change Management process. The Radio TOC recommends the MESB Executive Committee approve amendments to the Metro Standard 3.14.0.
Motion made by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Egan to approve the amendments to Metro Standard 3.14.0. Motion carried.

5. Discussion: Eligible Users of ARMER
Tretter presented this topic to members. During the October Radio TOC meeting, HealthPartners Medical Transportation (HPMT) submitted a request for full participation on ARMER. The Radio TOC denied the request, however during the discussion it was clear there was not a clear definition of who was allowed on the system as it applies to State Standard 1.10.0 – Requesting Participation and Participation Plan Changes, Metro Standard 1.10.1 – Requesting Participation and Metro Appendix 2 – Definitions & Acronyms. The Radio TOC Chair requested a workgroup make recommendations to define who is eligible for the system. The workgroups findings were approved at the November TOC. These findings will be applied to amendments to Metro Standard 1.10.1 Requesting Participation and Metro Appendix 2 – Definitions & Acronyms, for discussion at the December 2015 Radio TOC meeting.

Chair Sivarajah clarified that the agency requesting full participation on ARMER (HealthPartners) is not an emergency services agency. Their primarily business is to transport non-emergency patients.

Commissioner McMahon said that his county has experienced several requests from security firms and if this request is granted then it would open the gate for all kinds of agencies to request use of the ARMER system. Commissioner Egan agreed. Commissioner Anderson asked what advantages are of allowing HPMT to the join the system. Tretter responded that HPMT would be able to communicate with emergency services and in the case of a disaster where their services may be needed, coordination could take place.

Jill Rohret added that HPMT views themselves as EMS and feel they should be treated as such. Other EMS agencies don't see them as such and doesn't agree with their participation as an EMS agency because they do not have a 911 response area.

Commissioner Huffman asked if the ARMER system has any capacity concerns. Tretter said there are currently no channels available to be added to the system in the metropolitan area, so additional capacity cannot be added.

Sivarajah stated that she did not think HPMT was an EMS provider and she did not support their participation on ARMER. Rohret stated that the Radio TOC will put together a standard and it will come the before board in January. This discussion is just for direction and opinion.

Commissioner McMahon said he was concerned about the time the board needs to review language and have time to change language if necessary. Rohret said the standard will come before the Board and the Board always has the authority to change language on standards being presented. She suggested that the standard could be sent out to Board members earlier than normal.

Chair Sivarajah asked Commissioner McMahon if he was ok with the January standard approval which will clarify the ARMER eligibility. Commissioner Anderson asked how the appeals process works. Rohret replied that the appeal is another issue we would have to wait and see how everything plays out. There is a standard which discusses appeals.

Commissioner McMahon asked if the counties could opt out and create their own standards. Rohret replied that under the cooperative agreements signed by the counties, counties agree to abide by
metro and state standards. Counties could develop their own standards which could be stricter than the metro or state standards, but a county’s standards cannot be weaker than the metro or state standards.

Commissioner Egan said Dakota County gets a 15 day notice to amend standards. He suggested the Board could use this time to wordsmith language to make it acceptable by the board.

B. EMS TOC – None

C. 9-1-1 TOC – None

D. 2016 Legislative Agenda

Rohret stated that in the past, the Board approved its legislative agenda; she would like the Board to do so for the 2016 legislative session. The 2016 session will be a short session so the MESB legislative agenda does not have a lot of active items. Most of our efforts will be to educate legislators and other interested parties.

Three general items are:
- Sales tax exemption slated for January 2017
- Keep Statewide Emergency Communications Board under the Department of Public Safety
- Maintain the 911 revenue fund

911/ARMER items:
- Socialize amendments to MS 403 so they can be introduced in 2017

EMS items:
- Establish long-term sustainable funding
- Maintain the regional EMS grant program under the EMSRB
- Allow opiate tax revenues to be used at the discretion of individual EMS regions
- Create an EMT recruitment plan with high schools and MnSCU agencies

Responding to questions about recruitment, she told members that we do not currently work with individual agencies to recruit. Commissioner Sivarajah said that feedback from her county indicated that the testing process was difficult and people weren’t passing the test which discouraged future participants.

Commissioner Huffman asked for more clarification on the opiate tax revenue topic. Rohret clarified that the MESB would like for EMS regions to determine how they would spend those funds, rather than have a set directive on how to spend the funds. The MESB is not approving the use but asking for discretion on the use of opiate tax revenues.

*Motion made by Commissioner Egan, seconded by Commissioner McMahon to approve the 2016 MESB Legislative Agenda. Motion carried.*

E. Amendments to MESB Bylaws

Rohret presented the proposed changes to the current MESB Bylaws.

First amendment: Isanti County is added to the list of entities who have signed the Joint Powers Agreement.

Second amendment: updates the oath of office process.

Third amendment: adds a reference to the Voting Rules of the Board, which are incorporated into the bylaws.

Fourth amendment: adds the ability for alternates for the Executive Committee.
Amendment in found in Article V. deletes three committees, which are no longer in existence and updates the language for the name of the EMS Technical Operations Committee (name change occurred per Board action in 2012).

Amendment in Voting Rules, where an additional reference to alternates for the Executive Committee is made.

Commissioner McMahon questioned the language regarding the oath of office as January meetings are typically difficult to coordinate with members because county appointments for the year are not all made. He suggested we skip the January meeting. Commissioner Johnson said that would make it five weeks without a governing board. Commissioner Egan suggested having two meetings in February; one just for appointments and annual business and the other for agenda topics. Commissioner Huffman added that all boards have this issue. Commissioner Miron agreed that the board should deal with the alternates and how their coverage is handled in the bylaws. Swearing them in at the next meeting they are in attendance.

Jay Arneson suggested changing the language in Article II, Section 1, to simply read as follows: “At the organizational meeting of the Board each January all representatives present shall be administered the oath of office. Representatives not present at the organizational meeting and alternates shall be administered the oath when they first appear at a Board meeting.” Commissioner Miron added the changes to bylaws need to be posted and a super majority is needed to approve according to state statute. Arneson confirmed that a 2/3 vote and 15 days’ notice is required to change bylaws.

Motion made by Commissioner McMahon, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to approve the proposed and discussed amendments to the MESB bylaws. Motion carried.

F. Amended MESB Policies
   1. Policy 005 – Financial Policies
   2. Policy 006 – Invested Funds
   3. Policy 013 – Use of Board Issued Credit Card
   4. Policy 014 – Flexible Time Off
   5. Policy 018 – Payment Processing
   6. Policy 022 – Billing of User Fees
   7. Policy 023 – Interest Charging

Rohret gave members overview of the proposed amendments to the MESB policies.

Motion made by Commissioner Huffman, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to amend policies 005, 006, 013, 014, 018, 022, and 023. Motion carried.

G. Executive Director Six Month Probationary Review
Commissioner Sivarajah will send out evaluation forms to all members and asked for the forms to come back quickly so Rohret can receive her increase in the current year. Commissioner Sivarajah will provide the forms electronically to all board members.

5. Old Business – None

6. New Business
A. 2016 Meeting Dates
Rohret confirmed the 2016 meeting dates; they follow the regular meeting dates for both the Board and the Executive Committee. There are no conflicting holidays on this calendar.
Additionally, Rohret said that MESB and MMCD will be working together on a response plan for workplace violence. Commissioner Sivarajah said that Anoka County had a voluntary plan but they now will be instituting a mandatory training response plan for all employees.

Commissioner McMahon and entire membership thanked Commissioner Sivarajah for her year of service as chair of the Metropolitan Emergency Services board.

7. Adjourn – Next Executive meeting is February 10, 2016.
RECOMMENDATION
The Radio TOC recommends the Executive Committee approve an allocation from the 2014 SECB grant funds of $11,467.87 for Washington County's VHF interoperability project with Wisconsin.

BACKGROUND
In October, the Radio TOC approved the technical plan for Washington County's interoperability project with Wisconsin. At that time, the Radio TOC grant funding priorities did not allow for funding of interoperability projects. In January, the Board approved the funding priority changes to allow for use of grant funds for interoperability projects, specifically this project.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
There is currently an awarded grant to the MESB that expires in June 2016; the 2014 State Emergency Communications Board Grant from 911 fee collection (2014 SECB Grant). The MESB was awarded $347,315.92. Of the awarded 2014 SECB grant, $347,315.92 there is $45,914.84 that is available for funding Washington County's project. Use of the grant funds for equipment requires a 50% match by the requesting agency. Washington County's project is expected to cost $22,935.74, and is therefore requesting $11,467.87.

Staff will need to amend the 2014 SECB grant agreement and execute a sub-grant agreement with Washington County. The grant closes on June 30th, 2016; all supporting documents for grant reimbursement is due to the MESB by June 1st, 2016 for submittal to ECN. This timeline has been acknowledged by staff act98 from Washington County.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None to the MESB other than staff time to process the grant documentation.
10/20/2015

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

Mr. Seal,

Washington County desires to increase our interoperability with our neighbor agencies in Wisconsin. To achieve this goal, I have designed the following plan:

- Move one existing 4 port CCGW to our site in Hudson Wisconsin
- Connect back to PSAP dispatch switch using RAD Ricci T1 over county owned microwave link to Hudson site
- Deploy one Quantar station using the surplus open dipole VHF antenna on top of the tank. This station will require FCC licensing due to antenna height. Proposed 14 modes are shown in the technical drawing.
- Deploy 3 APX control stations with ¼ wave antennas connected to the ice bridge. One station will contain interoperable mains for Pierce County, another for St. Croix County, and the third for WISCOM.
- All resources will be accessible to other MCC7500s in zone 1, and be connected to the CCGW using 4 wire tone remote control.

We currently have a surplus Quantar station for the simplex interoperable frequencies. We will purchase 3 APX VHF consoles, all with P25 trunking and encryption capabilities, at a quoted cost of $20,805.00.

Quoted price for 2 Ricci T1 devices and APX station antennas (Telewave unity dipole) is $1,880.74. To allow for coax, connectors, unexpected costs, and minor hardware I am estimating the entire project at $24,000. I respectfully request any grant monies that may be applicable towards this project, and TOC approval of the technical plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nate Timm
Radio System Manager
LEC:

Dispatch Site Switch 2, port 10 → RAD Rici Ethernet to T1 → PSAP Equip. Room MUX to room 505 → LEC to Hudson Tank Mwave, T1-2

Hudson Site:

CCGW4, Site ID 32 10.1.32.88 → RAD Rici T1 to ethernet → Hudson Tank from LEC mwave

Port 1- Quantar, WI simplex interops:
- MARC2
- VTAC10
- VTAC11
- VTAC12
- VTAC14
- VLAW31
- MNCOM
- MAR16
- ...
- ...
- ...

Port 2- APX, St. Croix:
- IKING
- IGWC
- 3KING
- 3GWC
- FIRE1
- EVENT1
- HUD PD
- HUD FD
- SOMER PD
- FIRE2
- EOC
- MAR9
- MAR14
- CMN

Port 3- APX, Pierce:
- LAW1D
- LAW1E
- LAW2
- FIRE
- TAC
- EOC
- HWY
- RIV FAL
- PAGE
- CMN
- WI SP
- ...
- ...
- ...

Port 4- APX, WISCOM:
- SCALL1
- STAC2
- STAC3
- STAC4
- STAC5
- STAC6
- STAC7
- STAC8
- RCAL51
- RTAC52
- RTAC53
- RTAC54
- WA TRVL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Awarded</th>
<th>Awarded Expended</th>
<th>Awarded Remaining</th>
<th>Match Expended</th>
<th>Match Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$325,815.92</td>
<td>$279,901.08</td>
<td>$45,914.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Totals</strong></td>
<td>$325,815.92</td>
<td>$279,901.08</td>
<td>$45,914.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Totals</strong></td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$347,315.92</td>
<td>$279,901.08</td>
<td>$67,414.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$347,315.92</td>
<td>$279,901.08</td>
<td>$67,414.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION
The Radio TOC recommends the Executive Committee approval of the Dakota County request to add an Archiving Interface Server (AIS) to its participation plan for its new logging (recording) solution.

BACKGROUND
Dakota County's change is necessitated by the removal of the Gold Elite consoles and Central Electronics Banks, as required by the 7.15 upgrade, scheduled to begin on May 1, 2016. The AIS will be installed at the Dakota County Communications Center (DCC) in Rosemount.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
Due to the timing of meetings, this request has been approved by the State Emergency Communications Board Operations and Technical Committee (SECB OTC) and the State Emergency Communications Board (SECB). Approval by the MESB Executive Board and MESB Board are required for them to move forward.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None.

MOTION BY: ___________________________ SECONDED BY: ___________________________

MOTION APPROVED: ___ YES ___ NO

MOTION: _______________________________
Ulise Seal, Troy Tretter
Chair – Metro Technical and Operation Committee
Metro Region TOC Members

Dakota County would like to respectfully request to modify its ARMER System participation plan. The Dakota Communication Center (DCC) will be adding a Motorola AIS unit to accommodate for logging. This configuration will be required do the obsolescence of the Motorola Gold Elite console configurations.

The Statement of Work for this project has been discussed and routed through MnDOT Radio personnel and there were no issues with the request.

Thank You for your time and consideration on this request,
Ron Jansen
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2016
PRESENTED BY: Tretter
AGENDA NUMBER: 4A3.
Approval of Hennepin EMS Archiving Interface Server

RECOMMENDATION
The Radio TOC recommends the Executive Committee approval of the Hennepin EMS request to add an Archiving Interface Server (AIS) to its participation plan for its new logging (recording) solution.

BACKGROUND
Hennepin EMS’s change is necessitated by the removal of the Gold Elite consoles and Central Electronics Banks, as required by the 7.15 upgrade, scheduled to begin on May 1, 2016.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
Approval by the MESB Executive Board and MESB Board are required for them to move forward. This item does need to go through the Statewide Emergency Communications Board, Operations & Technical Committee (SECB OTC) and full Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB).

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None.

MOTION BY:  SECONDED BY:  MOTION APPROVED:  

__ YES  __ NO

MOTION:

__
January 26, 2016
Statewide Emergency Communications Board
Operations & Technical Committee (OTC)

To Committee Members,

Hennepin County EMS is in the process of adding a Motorola AIS server on the Motorola ARMER system. As part of this, we will be purchasing a new logging recorder system from Revcord that will interface with the AIS server to log talkgroup and Metadata. We are currently using zone 2 logging CEBs and channel banks for logging radio talkgroups. The upcoming 7.15 upgrade to begin at the end of March will no longer support CEBs in the ARMER system. Therefore we respectfully request modification of the Hennepin County EMS participation plan.

Sincerely,

Wendy Lynch
Hennepin EMS Chief
Communications, Technology, WMRCC
Hennepin County Medical Center
RECOMMENDATION
The Radio TOC recommends the Executive Committee approval of revision of Metro Standards, 1.5.2, 3.10.0, 3.22.0, 3.23.0, 3.24.0, 3.27.0, 3.34.0, and 5.2.0.

BACKGROUND
In December 2015, the MESB approved a change to Metro Standard 3.14.0, the use of ME TAC's. This eliminated dual naming of Metro region interoperability channels, ME TAC's, during a change management period where some channels had the corresponding A-TAC & P-TAC language in them. Examining the remaining existing Metro standards for removing and updating any standards with current language used in the Metro, in other regions and statewide. Some of the standards will be going to workgroups to make operational changes as needed. The changes are summarized below.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
Metro Standard 1.5.2 – Revisions and Changes: On page 2, Language changes from Statewide Radio Board to Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECB), replacement of further use of SRB to SECB. Removal of DECN, change to Emergency Communication Network (ECN).

Metro Standard 3.10.0 – Interop Channels & Talkgroups for US Govt. Radios: Changes on Page 4 from P-SOA & A-SOA to the current 8SOA standards. Page 5, changes to reflect the current statewide and regional talk group naming. Page 6, changes to the NE Talkgroups, removing ‘TAC’ from the naming. Page 7, update to the current NW and SE regional channel naming.

Metro Standard 3.22.0 - Use of Mobile Portable Gateways to Connect to Fixed Network Interoperability Resources: Removed the decommissioned channel METTAC-P from page 2, paragraph 3. Added Communications Unit Technician (COMT) under paragraph 4, and COMT to paragraph’s 5, and 6. Page 6, Removed ‘and individuals identified to be trained as COML’s’ as they are no longer listed in the Metro TICP. Also removed the redundancy of spelling out COML as it was already spelled out earlier in the document.

Metro Standard 3.23.0 - Conv. Users Connecting to Regional System: Updated language in paragraph’s 4 & 5 to the proper VHF naming language as addressed in the Minnesota Communications Field Operations Guide (MNFOG). Page 4, removed the reference to connecting from the decommissioned METTAC VHF system. Page 6, deleted the last paragraph about the management of MnDOT as managing the VHF resources as it is redundant to the first paragraph. Noted this standard will have a 4 member workgroup meeting to review the operational context of the standard.

Metro 3.24.0 - RF Control Stations: Page 3, removal of METTAC VHF channels, and language updates to current VHF channel naming. The items that are highlighted in yellow on the bottom of page 3 will be reviewed again after the 7.15 upgrade, as the TOC did not know if there may be an impact to this standard. Page 4, section 6, change MnDOT System administrator to Local System Administrator as this is proper management procedure.
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Metro 3.27.0 – MRCC Talkgroup: Page 1, sections 2 and 3, removed ETAC, PTAC’s and change to regional ME TAC’s and STAC’s. Page 2, added the prefix of EMS- to the SMRCC, XP1 & XP2 talk groups noted that in the state standard 3.36.0. Page 2, end of paragraph 1, corrected a misspelling of SRMCC to SMRCC.

Metro 3.34.0 – Cache Radio Standard: Page 1, section 3, Operational Context: Deleted the language for the dual naming transitional period. Page 2, section 4, Recommended Protocol/Standard, deleted the language for the dual naming transitional period.

Metro 5.2.0 Disaster Relief Organization Access: Page 1, grammar correction. Page 2, updated the talkgroup names to the proper Metro naming and conventional channel naming.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION BY:</th>
<th>SECONDED BY:</th>
<th>MOTION APPROVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION:


1. Purpose or Objective
The purpose of this section is to set forth the process by which changes to METRO region radio operating procedures will be solicited, evaluated, and adopted for implementation.

2. Technical Background:
   - Capabilities: N/A
   - Constraints: N/A

3. Operational Context:
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) is charged with setting standards and determining protocols and procedures for the smoothest possible operations between and among the users of the shared region-wide 800 MHz digital trunked public safety radio system.

   METRO region radio system users fall into multiple groups:
   - Full participants in the shared ARMER infrastructure within the METRO region.
   - ARMER users from other regions transiting into and through the METRO region.
   - Conventional users who will have access to the regional system by utilizing interoperability equipment that has been designed into the system.

   The ability to communicate among and between these multiple groups is possible due to the interoperable hardware and software installed on the region-wide system. The improper use of this equipment can have minor to grave consequences. These standards, policies and procedures have been set forth by teams consisting of radio users and managers from all groups so as to provide optimum service to the citizens of the metropolitan area, while minimizing potential negative consequences. Therefore, changes must not compromise the integrity of the Regional Public Safety system or any of its participants.

4. Recommended Protocol/Standard:
All operational and technical changes that require a change to the METRO region ARMER Standards, Protocols, and Procedures, or otherwise impact system users must be evaluated and approved through this change management process.

5. Recommended Procedure:
Whenever possible, major operational and technical changes will be made on an 18-24 month cycle or longer to allow users to match their subscriber radio maintenance cycle to the major change cycle and to minimize the number of times that major changes need to be incorporated. The MESB will determine when a new change planning process needs to be initiated based on synchronizing with similar Statewide Emergency Communications Board (SECE) processes. Minor changes may be made at any frequency.

**Solicit & Evaluate**

- Change proposals may be submitted at any time. Proposals should be submitted through the proposer's subsystem owner or regional subscriber contracting entity. Change proposals should be submitted on a standard form provided on the MESB or SECE website, and shall include a proposed implementation plan.
- Once a change planning process has been initiated, MESB staff will collect suggestions for changes from subsystem owners and regional subscribers and will present the collected suggestions to the next scheduled meeting of the RTOC who shall determine if the proposed changes are major or minor.

**Minor changes have one or more of the following characteristics:**
1. Minor changes affect a relatively small number of users or are contained to a small portion of the region.
2. Minor changes generally do not contain mandates for other users.
3. Minor changes do not require significant retraining of other users.
4. Minor changes whose costs are accepted by the user.

**Major changes have one or more of the following characteristics:**
1. Major changes impact the majority of users in the region.
2. Major changes impact users in adjoining regions.
3. Major changes mandate the placement of resources in communications equipment.
4. Major changes require revisions to operational procedures.
5. Major changes require updated dispatcher and/or user training.
6. Major changes require reprogramming of console and subscriber equipment.

- Minor changes may be referred by the RTOC to the Regional Radio Services Coordinator, Emergency Communication Networks (RCNs), metro Regional Interoperability Coordinator, and others as necessary for evaluation and recommendation. The Coordinators shall perform the necessary evaluation and recommend changes to the RTOC. The RTOC may elect to vet the request through additional Committees or other user groups. Upon receipt of a recommendation from the RTOC, the Board may approve or deny the requested change.
- Major changes shall be held by the RTOC until such time as the RTOC determines that the number and importance of proposed major changes warrants the initiation of a major change process. At such time, the RTOC will direct MESB staff to notify stakeholders that a major change cycle is beginning through a notice published on the MESB website and distributed to all subscriber agencies.
• The solicitation period should last at least three months to allow sufficient time for proponents to submit change proposals through their subsystem owner or regional subscriber contracting entity.

• At the close of the solicitation period, MESB staff will schedule presentations by the major change proposers to the RTOC. Change proposals will be made available for public review on the MESB website at least one week prior to the RTOC meeting.

• The RTOC shall consider the proposed changes and determine which proposals have sufficient need and benefit to warrant further evaluation. If the RTOC determines that a change proposal does not warrant evaluation, and rejects the proposal, the proponent of the change request may appeal the decision as per MESB Standard 7.3.0.

• Change proposals selected for further evaluation shall be assessed to discover and document the impacts of each proposed change, including the impacts of the proposed transition plan. The RTOC may exclude any of the following assessments or may add other assessments, depending upon the nature and complexity of the change proposals. For complex assessments, the MESB may utilize a professional facilitator to expedite the process.

1. Facilitated focus groups of discipline specific users (such as fire, police, EMS)
2. Table top scenarios conducted by the METRO Communications Response Task Force including creation of ICS205s to test proposed revisions
3. Tactical Interoperability Communications Plan (TICP) conformity review
4. Cost/benefit analysis
5. MnDOT technical review for backbone impacts
6. Interoperability Subcommittee review and comment
7. Training needs assessment
8. Other stakeholder review groups

• The assessment process must be completed within 90 days of initiation of assessment. Input received after 90 days may still be considered, but consideration is not guaranteed. The request for assessment from the RTOC is not asking for a recommendation on the change proposal, but is meant to review how the proposed change will impact operations, finances, training, etc.

• Once all assessments are received or 90 days has passed, MESB staff and the facilitator will assemble the comments and prepare a summary document for public review and comment.

Plan & Approve

• The completed change proposals should be vetted by all MESB member entities and regional subscriber agencies. The discipline associations (Police Chiefs, Fire Chiefs, Sheriffs, Metro Region EMS' Communications Subcommittee, state agencies, etc.) and other interested stakeholders shall be notified of the pending changes and shall be afforded an opportunity to provide comments. MESB staff along with regional or discipline association representatives to the MESB Committees and working groups will be responsible to facilitate this review and discussion. MESB staff will provide a summary of all comments received.
If there is a cost to implement the change proposals, MESB staff will forward the recommendations through the Executive Committee who will be responsible for determining how the costs should be allocated. Once the cost allocation is approved or if there are no costs to allocate, MESB staff will present the change proposals to the RTOC for final review and recommendation. The MESB staff summary shall include a draft change plan addressing comments received. The RTOC shall review the comments, recommend approval or denial of each change proposal, and create an overall change plan for approval by the Board. The change plan including transition steps and schedules will be made available for review and comment prior to presentation to the Board. The Board shall review the recommendations of the RTOC and may approve the change recommendations, reject the change recommendations, or return the recommendation to committee for further review.

Create & Implement
- This phase will vary in length depending upon the transitional plan adopted by the Board. The change plan may also involve multiple changes on different implementation schedules.
- Activities in this phase may include code plug development, radio programming, procedure writing and implementation, training development and implementation, physical construction, equipment replacement, or other activities as outlined in the change plan. Entities named in the plan will be responsible for completing the changes in the plan as per the approved schedule and reporting their status in writing to the MESB.
- MESB staff will report on the status of the implementation to the Board, including any waivers filed under Metro Standard 1.5.3.

6. Management
The Executive Director and staff of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, acting on behalf of the board, will manage this process.
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## 1. Purpose or Objective
To establish policy for recommended interoperability channels and talk groups for U.S. Government radios.

## 2. Technical Background:

- **Capabilities**
  These channels and talk groups can be programmed into user VHF, UHF, and 800 MHz ARMER radios, incident command posts and emergency operations centers. These nationwide, statewide and region-wide channels and talk groups can meet a wide range of interoperability needs and can function as the primary communications component in local, regional, statewide and national plans.

- **Constraints**
  The availability of and the use of these channels and talk groups must be easily understood by radio user personnel who are primarily concerned with their mission and not the operation of radios under stressful conditions. Because U.S. Government agencies may need to work with any local agency in any part of the state, it is highly recommended that when agencies purchase 800 MHz ARMER system radios, they obtain radios that have displays, are capable of DES-OPB encryption, and allow a minimum of 10 zones.

## 3. Operational Context:
These channels and talk groups can be used to facilitate communications among agencies and service branches that typically do not communicate with each other on a regular day to day basis and to support effective command and management of major incidents under the NIMS protocols.

---
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4. Recommended Protocol/Standard:
It is recommended that U.S. Government agencies program selected nationwide, statewide and region-wide interoperability channels into their day to day VHF and UHF radios that can be patched to the ARMR trunked system. It is also recommended that U.S. Government agencies each acquire a small quantity of 800 MHz P25 trunked radios for use on the ARMR trunked system and direct interoperability with state and local users. A list of recommended shared interoperability resources is attached to this Standard. Specific programming information will be provided to the federal agency's technical personnel upon request.

5. Recommended Procedures:
Best Practices Encouraged
All agencies are encouraged to follow practices outlined by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security SAFECOM Program. Key elements of SAFECOM include:

- Regional and statewide Interoperability SOPs for incident response should be developed and should be molded to conform to the elements of the National Incident Management System.
- Users should be provided with regular comprehensive training on the interoperability SOPs.
- Interoperability SOPs should be tested through realistic exercises to address potential problems.
- The interoperability systems and SOPs should be used every day for managing routine as well as emergency incidents requiring interoperability. In this optimal solution, users are familiar with the operation of the system and routinely work in concert with one another.
- Trained Communications Unit Leaders should be developed to assist with incident pre-plans and to provide on-scene incident support by managing communications and apply available technical solutions at larger or unexpected interoperability incidents.

6. Management
The MERS's Radio Technical Operations Committee and the Interoperability Subcommittee will periodically review and update the recommended resource listing attached to this document.
### VHF Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Recommended</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDCOM-MP</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDCOM-SP</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCALL10</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTAC14R</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE-2</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-2</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLAWS31</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTAC11</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTAC12</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTAC13</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTAC14</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNCOMM</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR23</td>
<td>FIRE SUPPRESSION ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMED28</td>
<td>MEDICAL ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTAC-3</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UHF Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Recommended</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTAC41</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE-12</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-12</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCALL40</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCALL40D</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAC41D</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAC42</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAC42D</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAC43</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAC43D</td>
<td>ALL FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 700 MHz CONVENTIONAL CHANNELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7SOA1</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA2</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA3</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA4</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA5</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA6</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA7</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA8</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA9</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA10</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA11</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SOA12</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARMER 800MHz CONVENTIONAL CHANNELS AND TALKGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVENTIONAL</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCALL90</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCALL90D</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC91</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC91D</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC92</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC92D</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC93</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC93D</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC94</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTAC94D</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOA1</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOA2</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOA3</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOA4</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSOA-1</td>
<td>FIRE/EMS ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSOA-2</td>
<td>FIRE/EMS ONLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deleted:** Due to the Statewide and Regional Change Management process, some talkgroup names will be changed effective November 22, 2013, but will not necessarily be changed in all radios and consoles at that time. Agencies must reprogram radios and consoles with the new naming by June 30, 2015. The names and eligibility effective after November 22, 2013 are in brackets [BSoA].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTAC1</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC2</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC3</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC4</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC1</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC2</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC3</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC4</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC5</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC6</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC7</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC8</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC9</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC10</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC11</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC12</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC13E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC14E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCATAC7</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC5E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC6E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC7E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTAC8E</td>
<td>ENCRYPTED LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIU1E</td>
<td>ENCRYPT. LAW ENF. TASK FORCE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIU2E</td>
<td>ENCRYPT. LAW ENF. TASK FORCE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIU3E</td>
<td>ENCRYPT. LAW ENF. TASK FORCE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIU4E</td>
<td>ENCRYPT. LAW ENF. TASK FORCE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMTAC</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDH-EM1</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDH-EM2</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO REGION TALKGROUPS</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC1</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC2</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC3</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC4</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC5</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC6</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC7</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC8</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION TALKGROUPS</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MET AC8</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METPH1</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METPH2</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METPH3</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METPH4</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME RVR HAIL</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME RVR OPS</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEM</td>
<td>ALL USERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL REGION TALKGROUPS</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM CALL</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 3</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 4</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 5</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 6</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 7</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 8</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 9</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 10</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 11</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 12</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST REGION TALKGROUPS</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE CALL</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 2</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 3</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 4</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 5</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 6</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 7</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 8</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 9</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 10</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 11</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 12</td>
<td>ALL USERS – REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST REGION TALKGROUPS</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| NW CALL | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 2 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 3 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 4 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 5 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 6 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 7 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 8 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 9 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 10 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 11 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| NW 12 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |

| SOUTH CENTRAL REGION TALKGROUPS | ELIGIBILITY |
| SR CALL | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 2 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 3 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 4 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 5 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 6 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 7 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 8 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 9 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 10 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 11 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SR 12 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |

| SOUTHEAST REGION TALKGROUPS | ELIGIBILITY |
| SE CALL | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 2 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 3 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 4 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 5 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 6 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 7 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 8 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 9 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 10 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 11 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 12 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 13 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
| SE 14 | ALL USERS - REQUIRES PERMISSION |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTHWEST REGION TALKGROUPS</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE 15E</td>
<td>ENCRYPT. ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW CALL 1</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC2</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC3</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC4</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC5</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC6</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC7</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC8</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC9</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC10</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC11</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC12</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW TAC13</td>
<td>ALL USERS -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQUIRES PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose or Objective:
Establish a policy and procedure for the use of mobile/portable audio gateway devices when interconnecting to ARMR conventional or trunked shared resources.

2. Operational Background:
- Capabilities
Various audio gateway devices have proliferated within the public safety community. These devices are marketed under different names but basically provide the ability to "patch" one radio system to another radio system. A partial listing of the common devices is contained in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GATEWAY NAME</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>FUNCTIONALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACU-1000</td>
<td>Raytheon JPS Commun.</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR</td>
<td>Communications Applied</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIOS Portable</td>
<td>SyTech Corporation</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmartMSG</td>
<td>Codespear</td>
<td>VoIP Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>Link Communications</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIPER</td>
<td>Telex Communications</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Gardner</td>
<td>Transcrypt International</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>Microvoice Corporation</td>
<td>Audio Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motobridge</td>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td>VoIP Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave for LMR</td>
<td>Twisted Pair</td>
<td>VoIP Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPICS</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>VoIP Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Constraints

Metro 3.22.0 Use of Mobile Portable Gateways to Connect to Fixed Network Interoperability Resources

Metro 3.22.0
Unless used properly with knowledge of the networks being patched, these devices can be harmful to the normal operations of those networks. Their use can be particularly harmful to a simulcast digital trunked radio system such as the metro area ARMER system.

Mobile/portable gateways must be optimized in order to provide intelligible audio through the patch. Non-optimized gateway connections often cause message truncation (loss of words at the beginning or end of a transmission), audio holes in the middle of messages, audio level problems (too loud or too quiet), audio distortion, excessive end of message hang times resulting in "bonks" or call rejects, and other problems.

If multiple connections are established to the same resources on different gateways (one of which may be a console patch) an audio loop will occur locking up all channels/talkgroups in the patch causing constant noise which cannot be talked over by a user.

Connecting multiple patches in a "daisy chain" fashion causes excessive key-up delays, message truncation and most commonly intelligibility problems due to multiple audio processing conversions of digital to analog / receiver to transmitter, etc.

3. Operational Context:
Patching disparate radio systems is essential to facilitate interoperability between users that do not have compatible radio equipment. The preferred method of patching is currently the use of a fixed gateway (dispatch console) which is hard wired to the radio infrastructure needing to be patched. Such patches are commonly established between ARMER trunked talk groups and the metro region ARMER conventional interoperability system (VME28, VLA93, etc.) This method of patching is effective when all end users are within the coverage range of the radio infrastructures involved in the patch.

In some cases, an incident requires the interconnection of channels with no associated infrastructure interfaced with the fixed gateway system, or out of the coverage range of these channels. In these cases the use of mobile/portable gateways is necessary.

4. Recommended Protocol / Standard:
Because of the high potential for harmful interference and disruption of communications, no mobile/portable audio gateway device may be connected, attached or used on the metro region ARMER system unless the patch is setup by a trained gateway operator and such use has the approval of a certified ICS Communications Unit Leader (COML) or Communications Unit Technician (COMT) under an approved ICS-205 Incident Communications Plan.

5. Recommended Procedure:
An agency desiring to implement a mobile/portable audio gateway patch for a pre-planned event should prepare an Incident Communications Plan using an ICS-205 form indicating the resources to be patched. If the agency does not have a certified COML or COMT, it should
request assistance from a certified COML from the subsystem owner it will be connecting to or from the MESB. The COML will be responsible to review the proposed patch to determine that it will not cause interference. The COML will also be responsible to notify the appropriate dispatch center responsible to update the status board application to indicate the resources are reserved for use.

An agency desiring to implement a mobile/portable audio gateway patch for an emergent incident should notify the dispatch center controlling the incident to inform them of the resources requested to be patched. The dispatch center will update the status board applications to indicate the patched resources are in use and patched. If the agency does not have a certified COML or COMT, it should request assistance from another certified COML and complete an ICS-205 as soon as possible for dissemination to the Incident Commander and the dispatch center controlling the incident. COML assistance may be provided remotely. If a certified COML is unavailable the appropriate ARMER Subsystem Administrator should be consulted prior to initiating the portable/mobile gateway patch.

The following guidelines should be followed when utilizing mobile/portable gateways:

- Mobile/portable gateway patches should only be setup by a trained gateway operator that is familiar with the equipment and the resources to be patched.

- Radio resources should only be contained in a single patch in a single mobile/portable gateway. "Daisy chaining" resources across multiple gateways, e.g., a talk group to a conventional channel in one gateway and the same conventional channel patched to a different talk group in a second gateway should not be attempted due to poor performance.

- Radio ports should be configured for COR detect rather than VOX whenever possible to reduce the problem with loss of the first few syllables.

- Prior to establishing the patch the gateway operator should make an announcement on the applicable resources that a patch is being set up.

- Upon connecting the patch the gateway operator should test the patch end to end to verify acceptable performance.

- If performance is poor, the gateway operator will make any necessary adjustments to audio levels, delay timers, tone control, etc.

- The gateway operator will make an announcement that the patch is setup and ready for use.
• The gateway operator will monitor the performance of the patch while it is in use.

• Once the patch is no longer needed the gateway operator will announce that the patch is being removed and will disconnect the patch.

6. Management:
The metro region TIC Plan will contain a list of certified COMLs and CONTs which may be consulted regarding the use of mobile/ portable gateways. The System Managers Group will have the responsibility to investigate and resolve problems associated with the use of mobile/ portable audio gateways.
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## 1. Purpose or Objective
Procedure for connecting to the metro region 800 MHz radio system.

## 2. Operational Background:
- **Capabilities**
  Users of conventional radios may communicate with radio users on the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system.

- **Constraints**
  Conventional radio system users may only communicate on those common conventional radio channels that they are permitted to transmit on and available on an 800MHz console via a soft patch.

## 3. Operational Context:
The communications pathways may be used for day to day coordination, for urgent or emergency mutual aid situations, for task forces, tactical teams, and for other purposes. No new equipment is required; existing conventional radios can be used.

## 4. Recommended Protocol/Standard:
Permission from the MHSB is not required to communicate by means of the existing conventional channels, such as VLAW31, VMED28, VFIRE23, or MNCOMM. Conventional radio system users throughout the state of Minnesota (and many government conventional radio system users in Wisconsin) already have these frequencies in their radio systems. The specific frequency, or frequencies, in that list that are authorized for use in the radios depends upon the service of the owner agency for the radios.

## 5. Recommended Procedure:
Dispatch centers may request that conventional radio users switch to VLAW31, VMED28, VFIRE23 or MNCOMM if the designated channel has not been installed in the mobile or portable radio being used, the radio user must inform the dispatch center operator of that fact.

---

**METRO 3.23.0** Connecting to the 800 MHz System

**Metro 3.23.0**
Dispatch centers may attempt to select another interoperability resource that the radio user has available.

6. Management
Overall management of the regional public safety radio system is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, with operational management the responsibility of the Minnesota Department of Transportation.
Base radio stations may not be added on the METTAC channels in geographic areas beyond the metro counties as the frequencies used for those channels are used elsewhere in greater Minnesota.

Installation of new mobile and portable radios is not required as existing radio equipment can be used. However, use of the system can be enhanced by taking several steps: With authorization a radio technician can add the METTAC-A, METTAC-P mobile relay (repeater) and talk around channels to existing and new, mobile and portable radios. With authorization agencies may add RF Control Stations operating on the METTAC-A, METTAC-P channels. For METTAC-A and METTAC-P authorization may be received from the Office of Electronic Communications in the Minnesota Department of Transportation (See Metro Standard 3.6.0—Use of the METTAC-P and METTAC-A).

Agencies may not add base mobile relay (repeater) radio stations on the METTAC-A, METTAC-P channels to avoid interference when two separate base transmitters are on the air at the same time.

VHF MINSEF (MINSF VLaw31), National EMS (EMS VMed28), Statewide Fire Mutual Aid (SwFIRE VFire23), MIMS, METTAC-A, or METTAC-P. 1
1. Purpose or Objective:
Establish procedures for the use RF control stations for various purposes. Establish procedures for use of the limited-800MHz participating agency PSAP 911 halling talkgroups.

2. Operational Background:
- **Capabilities**
  A RF control station is a radio transmitter and receiver that is set up with the same transmission and reception capabilities as a mobile radio or a portable radio. A RF control station, however, is used at a fixed location and is not moved.

  The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) is providing two radio control stations to each of the limited-800 MHz participating PSAP centers in the metropolitan area. A PSAP 911 halling talkgroup is also created for each of these limited-participating agencies for agencies to be able to contact the PSAPs as needed for interoperability.

- **Constraints**
  The talk group that is operated using radio communications control console electronics can function on one trunked radio system talk group only.

  Care in design must be exercised when multiple RF control stations are used at the same physical location to limit the amount of intermodulation interference generated.

  Use of RF control stations to patch regional 800 MHz talk groups to VHF, UHF, or other 800 MHz radio systems, may have a region-wide impact. This type of patch can be easily accomplished, but may cause harmful interference under certain circumstances.

  The PSAP 911 halling talkgroups are not for normal business operations, they are intended for interoperability between agencies. The number of PSAPs creates a significant number of talkgroups, which can make the radio channel lineup planning more complex.

3. Operational Context:
There are a number of uses for RF control stations including:
- An agency that does not have a dispatch center, such as a fire department that is remotely dispatched or a public works department may use a RF control station to communicate...
with the network. Normally that would be a RF control station that is surface mounted and has a means for controlling one of multiple talk groups.

- RF control stations may be used to gain access to the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system from a dispatch center that is on a radio system other than the new regional system.
- RF control stations may be used for day-to-day purposes, for urgent or emergency situations, for task teams and for other purposes.
- An individual hailing talkgroup has been created for every limited-800 MHz participating PSAP in the metropolitan area, the IDs for these talkgroups have been pre-planned to facilitate agencies in their radio programming planning.
- The MESS is providing two radio control stations to each of the limited-800 MHz participating PSAP centers in the metropolitan area. One of the two stations is intended to be on the PSAP 911 hailing channel for that agency, the other is for the agency to be able to initiate communications with other agencies as needed.

4. Recommended Protocol / Standard:

- Use of RF control stations is recommended to gain access to the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system network by radio user agencies that are not on the regional system. Agencies desiring to initiate manual or permanent patches from trunked RF control stations to other radio resources must be pre-approved by the owner of the resource in accordance with Metro Standard 1.10.1 Requesting Participation.

- Use of RF control stations for backup dispatching may be permitted, and it is an optional use determined by each agency. Some agencies may elect to use portable radios in portable radio battery chargers for this backup capability.

- Use of RF control stations by an agency without a dispatch center may be permitted and is an optional choice for radio user agencies that are served by the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system.

- Use of RF control stations by agencies that have a dispatch center on the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system at locations away from the dispatch center may be permitted, and is an optional selection available to each agency.

- Use of RF control stations rather than microwave for dispatch center access to the regional 800 MHz radio system by subscriber agencies may be permitted if there is a design that will limit the intermodulation products in an acceptable manner.

- A small number of RF control stations may be permitted at a single location provided that care is exercised to limit intermodulation products (see ARMER Standard 1.7.0 for specific design requirements). Multiple RF control stations can be used for day-to-day communications, for urgent or emergency situations, for communications with task teams and for other purposes.

- An individual PSAP 911 hailing talkgroup will be created for each limited-800MHz participating agency PSAP in the metropolitan area.
• These talkgroups can be patched by the PSAP agencies to conventional infrastructure as needed to meet the communications needs of an event involving multiple agencies.

**Talkgroup Sharing / Eligibility:**

• The PSAP 911 hailng talkgroups are optional and available for any public safety agency for programming into their radios.

• Non-public safety agencies are at the discretion of the individual PSAP for which that talkgroup is the 911 hailng channel, as defined in ARMER Standard 2.7.0 “Shared Talkgroups”.

**5. Recommended Procedure:**

• Any agency that wishes to use more than one RF control station at one location shall only be permitted to use that configuration if the design is compliant with ARMER Standard 1.7.0. The process for obtaining permission will be to submit an application for multiple RF control stations to the System Managers Group (SMG). The application will describe the location and use of each control station and make it clear that the multiple RF control station configuration design meets the criteria in ARMER Standard 1.7.0.

• No permission will be required for an Authorized User that wishes to purchase and use a single RF control station on the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system. However, the RF Control Stations must meet the standards for radio equipment operating on the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system as defined in ARMER Standard 1.7.0.

• Non-participating or unauthorized radio users will need to obtain permission from the OESB before installing a RF control station.

• Talk groups that can be accessed using RF control stations shall be governed by the permission granting process for shared talk groups in ARMER Standard 2.7.0.

• The regional 800 MHz radio system includes an extensive VHF Interoperability system for MIWCRS and I-6928. NCOSF has several posting receivers throughout the region, and a series of transmitters that are managed by a system dispatch console position operator. A regional 800 MHz trunked radio system RF control station may not be patched to any of these VHF radio channels at any dispatch center.

• MIMS and State wide EMS/HB have several posting receivers, but only one transmitter site. Use of this site will result in high signal level radio coverage over an area greater than the nine county service area of the regional 800 MHz trunked radio system. In some cases, use of a patch between a regional 800 MHz RF control station and a local agency’s transmitter on one of these channels may be desirable to minimize the radio coverage area. If an agency desires approval to perform this type of patch, that agency must submit a plan describing the intended use to the Radio Technical Operations Committee, and receive approval.
- In some situations, there may be operational reasons to permanently/gradually patch a local conventional radio channel to a regional 800 MHz system RF control station. Normally this type of patch should only be used if other suitable means for interagency communicating are insufficient for the need. If an agency desires approval to perform this type of patch that agency must submit a plan describing the intended use to the Systems Managers Group (SMG) and receive approval.

- The transmit and receive audio on RF control stations may be logged by the owner of the RF control station.

- Control stations/PSAP 911 hailing talkgroups can be used as a transition stage for an agency in the process of converting its communications operations to 800MHz trunking.

- The PSAP 911 hailing talkgroups can be used as dispatch "Point to Point" communications with the permission of the owning agency.

6. Management:
All dispatch center operators shall be trained on the use of RF Control Stations and there shall be continuing training to maintain a good level of understanding of the procedures by all dispatch center operators.

The owners of RF control stations on the regional 800 MHz radio system will be permitted to obtain mobile radio licenses for those stations.

The PSAP 911 hailing talkgroups will be created and administered by the Local System Administrator.
1. Purpose and Objective:
To establish operational policy for use of the Medical Resource Control Center (MRCC) related talk groups. These EMS talk groups are a regional EMS system resource to facilitate communications with the West Metro MRCC located at Hennepin County Medical Center and the East Metro MRCC located at Regions Hospital for the purpose of patient care and EMS resource coordination.

2. Technical Background
   • Capabilities
     To enable EMS personnel operating in the metro region to contact West and East Metro MRCCs. The MRCC is an EMS communications resource for the purpose of EMS incident coordination, relay of patient care information, obtaining physician medical control or system medical direction, cross patch of radio and/or telephone communications, assignment of MR TACs, STACs and other shared EMS resources or any other operational needs as required and allowed by system policy.

   • Constraints
     None

3. Operational Context:
   EMS personnel operating in the metro region may use West and East Metro MRCCs as an EMS communications resource for the purpose of EMS incident coordination, relay of patient care information, obtaining physician medical control or system medical direction, cross patch of radio and/or telephone communications, assignment of MR TACs, STACs and other shared EMS resources or any other operational needs as required and allowed by system policy.

   • WMRCC & EMRCC Talk Groups
     The MRCC talk groups are the primary 800 MHz communications channel between EMS personnel in the field and the MRCCs. Requests for and communications with the MRCCs shall be initiated on this talk group. Personnel calling the MRCCs should clearly identify their service, unit number, and request. MRCC operators will direct communications to other talk groups if necessary and as appropriate.
• **EMS-SMRCC Talk Group**

  EMS-SMRCC is a statewide hailing talkgroup for EMS agencies in Greater Minnesota to contact the MRCCs. Refer to State Standard 3.36.0 for information on the use of the statewide resource EMS-SMRCC.

• **EMS-XP1 and EMS-XP2**

  EMS-MRCP1 and EMS-MRCP1 are statewide resources available for patching. Refer to State Standard 3.36.0 for information on the use of these resources.

4. **Recommended Protocol/Standard:**

   Talk Group requirements:
   - Highly Recommended for All EMS
   - Recommended for __________
   - Optional for __________
   - May not be used by: __________

   These talkgroups shall be in the MRCC consoles.

5. **Recommended Procedure:**

   N/A

6. **Management:**

   Both the West and East Metro Medical Resource Control Center’s will be responsible for monitoring and controlling communication traffic on WMRCC and EMRCC EMS talk groups. The MRCC operators will ensure that policies related to the provision of a regional 24/7/365 EMS communications access point are followed; this includes but is not limited to monitoring and responding appropriately to radio traffic and performing radio patches as required and authorized.

   West and East MRCCs work in collaboration and are in constant contact. The MRCCs back each other up in various failure scenarios and work together to create a seamless communication environment for the EMS field personnel that use these talkgroups.

   Operational responsibility and performance monitoring shall be a function of the MRCC Supervisor or Manager.
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1. Purpose and Objective:
To establish policy & procedures for the programming and use of metro region ARMER system cache radios to promote consistency of use and to minimize usage conflicts when an interoperability talk group is needed for an event.

The cache radios are to be a metro-wide resource to facilitate communications between agencies that typically do not communicate with each other on a regular basis or may have a shortage of radios for a large scale or mutual aid incident. These radios are typically reserved for use for intercommunication when coordination of activities between personnel of different agencies is needed for an incident or event.

2. Technical Background:
   - Capabilities -
     Shared interoperability talkgroups exist for the purpose of providing communications within and among ARMER system radio users. These talkgroups can be programmed into user radios including cache radios.

   - Constraints -
     ARMER system radios have a finite number of programmable talkgroups. In many ARMER radios these talkgroups are organized into zones. Some ARMER radios have fewer zones than others. Recommendations for the standardization of zones of interoperable talkgroups in cache radios are difficult when different types of radios are part of the radio cache.

3. Operational Context:
   It is important when radios are deployed to make sure that users are not changing the assigned zone. It is not permissible to have one branch of public safety / public service use a zone not assigned.

   For cache radios having fewer than three zones it is recommended that as many as possible of the talkgroups in the zones listed below be programmed into the radios.

   All SOAs can be used in the State of Minnesota only.

METRO 3.34.0—Cache Radio Programming 1

METRO 3.34.0
4. Recommended Protocol/Standard:

State

Talkgroup requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>For Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>800MHz cache radios - Branch Specific Incident Command Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>National Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Allowed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Patch Standard:
Refer to individual talkgroup standards for patching availability.

*Denotes required zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Interop*</th>
<th>Channel Selector</th>
<th>Channel Display Name</th>
<th>Conventional Interop*</th>
<th>Channel Selector</th>
<th>Channel Display Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Display Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zone Display Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAC1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCAL590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STAC2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STAC91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>STAC3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>STAC92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAC4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAC93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STAC5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STAC94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>STAC6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SCAL59D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>STAC7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>STAC91D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>STAC8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>STAC92D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>STAC9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>STAC93D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>STAC10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>STAC94D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>STAC11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SSOA1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>STAC12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SSOA2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>STAC13E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SSOA2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>STAC14E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SSOA4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FSOA1***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>FSOA2***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAC 13E and STAC 14E are required in those radios equipped with Data Encryption Standard (DES).**

***FSOA1 and FSOA2 are restricted to Fire and Emergency Medical Service (EMS) radios only.**
All cache radios in the metropolitan region are highly recommended to have the following zone programmed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Regional Interop</th>
<th>Channel Display Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>METAC8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Recommended Procedure:
Cache radios capable of three or more zones should be programmed consistent with the talkgroup requirements specified in Section 4. Radios with fewer than three zones should be programmed with as many as possible of the talkgroups listed in Section 4.

Cache radios should be issued with the appropriate service branch zone enabled.

Cache radios should be reported in the TIC Plan.

Fleetmap documentation must be included with the radio cache for deployment purposes.

6. Management:
System managers and sub-system managers are responsible for the proper programming and reporting of cache radios as specified above.

Communications Leaders (COMLs) or their designee(s) are responsible for the enabling of the appropriate service branch zone when cache radios are disbursed at a critical incident.
1. Purpose or Objective
To establish a policy that provides for non-government organizations (NGOs) providing disaster relief services to be included as "Authorized Users" of the regional 800MHz trunked digital public safety radio system for communications services.

2. Policy Background:
NGOs providing disaster relief services are defined as "Eligible Users" of the regional 800MHz trunked digital public safety radio system as provided for in section 90.20(a)(2)(vii) of the FCC Rules and Regulations. The Board is empowered under Minn. Stats. §473.894 Subd. 15 to enter into system use agreements with such eligible NGOs for inclusion in the system.

3. Operational Context:
An umbrella organization entitled "Minnesota Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster" (MnVOAD) has approximately 30 member organizations which provide a broad mission in times of emergency and disaster. Services provided by MnVOAD member organizations include:

Advocacy for Victims
Bulk Distribution of Goods
Case Management
Child Care
Clean-Up & Rebuilding
Community Outreach
Counseling
Damage Assessment
Debris Removal
Disaster Education
Disaster Planning
Donations Management
Elder Care
Emergency Assistance
Emergency Repairs

Financial Assistance
Financial Planning
Funeral Services
Health Care
International Relief
Mass Care
Massage Therapy
Mental Health Services
Mitigation Planning
Mobile & Fixed Feeding
Organizational Mentoring
Pastoral Care/Chaplaincy
Pet & Animal Care
Radio Communications
Relocation Services
Resource Coordination
Sanitation Services
Special Needs
Technical Assistance
Training
Translation Services
Transportation Services

Two member organizations (the American Red Cross and the Salvation Army) provide initial response disaster services to both large scale and smaller scale emergencies occurring in the community. These organizations often work directly with public safety agencies. Other MnVOAD members are not normally mobilized until a substantial disaster has occurred. Since MnVOAD radios may be deployed elsewhere in the country for disaster response they should be equipped with 700 MHz and 800 MHz nationwide interoperability channels.

4. Recommended Protocol/Standard:
MnVOAD and its member disaster relief organizations will be authorized to use the system for the following types of communications: Government Agency to MnVOAD members; MnVOAD members to Government Agency; MnVOAD members to other MnVOAD members; and internal MnVOAD member communications. All communications using the system shall be limited to the protection of life and property, emergency situations, disaster relief planning, response, mitigation, recovery and related supporting operations including planned drills. Internal day to day, administrative and other non-disaster relief related communications are not permitted.

Assignment of priorities and use of the system by MnVOAD members for internal MnVOAD communications will be considered “Public Service” and “Non-Critical Operations” as defined in Appendix 2 of the Board’s Standards.

The following four priority 7 talk groups will be established for internal MnVOAD operations: DRO-1, DRO-2, DRO-3 and DRO-4. These talk groups will not be capable of encryption. DRO 1 will be assigned as primary use by the American Red Cross Disaster Services and DRO 2 by the Salvation Army Disaster Services. DRO-3 and DRO-4 will be assigned as needed by MnVOAD. Operation on other public safety, public service and interoperability talk groups by MnVOAD members will be at the direction of the Responsible Government Official coordinating the incident. It is recommended that MnVOAD radios be equipped with the following capabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talk Group</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRO-1</td>
<td>8SOA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRO-2</td>
<td>8SOA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRO-3</td>
<td>8CALL90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRO-4</td>
<td>8TAC91, 8TAC92, 8TAC93, 8TAC94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC5</td>
<td>8TAC92, 8TAC93, 8TAC94, 8TAC95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC6</td>
<td>8TAC93, 8TAC94, 8TAC95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC7</td>
<td>8TAC94, 8TAC95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAC8</td>
<td>8TAC95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC1</td>
<td>8CALL90 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. **Recommended Procedure:**
MnVOAD shall enter into a User Agreement with the Board. MnVOAD shall be responsible to coordinate all use of the system by MnVOAD members. Individual MnVOAD members shall sign a Memorandum of Understanding, on a form approved by the Board, with MnVOAD agreeing to comply with the Board’s Standards, MnVOAD’s User Agreement with the Board, and Board approved Standard Operating Procedures for disaster relief organization use of the system prior to use of the system. The User Agreement shall specify the maximum number of radios that may be owned by MnVOAD and its members and activated on the system. The User Agreement shall also specify enforcement provisions including consequences of misuse.

The acquisition cost of radio equipment for use of the system is the responsibility of MnVOAD and its member organizations. There will be no access fee charged by the Board for access to the system, however, users may be responsible for the actual costs associated with programming the radios to operate on the system and Board assessed User Fees. The Board shall designate an entity or entities to perform the programming.

The Board or any Authorized User, at their discretion, may loan, lease or otherwise temporarily provide radios to MnVOAD or any other eligible disaster relief organization for the authorized purposes provided for within this Standard.

The talk groups programmed in MnVOAD radios shall be limited to those specified within this Standard, the User Agreement and those additional public safety talk groups that have been authorized by the respective agencies owning those talk groups.

6. **Management**
The staff of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board shall manage the User Agreement process and maintain a list of DROs that have been approved to use the system. Billing users for the cost of programming shall be the responsibility of the programming entity.

The Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management is the lead agency for planning and coordination of MnVOAD communications operations. MnVOAD radios shall be considered part of the State of Minnesota subscriber fleet for purposes of FCC licensing. Radio IDs will be allocated by MnDIT.
RECOMMENDATION
The MESB staff submits the attached MESB NG9-1-1 Transition 2016-2017 Strategic Plan for the Board’s review and acceptance. The plan lays out the current progress in the transition, and also identifies eight priorities in the transition process to be completed in the next two years.

BACKGROUND
The transition from analog-based E9-1-1 to a digital NG9-1-1 system has been underway for several years and will continue for several more before the entire 9-1-1 system from call origination through call processing at the PSAP is completely NG9-1-1 standards compliant. In addition to the analog/digital transition, the 9-1-1 system has to move from the E9-1-1 system design based on fixed, wired telephone instrument location to an NG9-1-1 system design supporting full mobile communication device location in real time. This transition involves synchronization of the location determination methods and the underlying location databases used by both E9-1-1 and NG9-1-1 systems. The 9-1-1 system will also be moving from a single 9-1-1 Service Provider model in E9-1-1 to an NG9-1-1 system that relies on multiple 9-1-1 Service Providers involved in location and delivery of NG9-1-1 calls.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This is a planning document. Any specific project implementation of the priorities described in the plan which would have a potential financial impact to the Board beyond staff time and office resources will be brought to the Board for approval on a project by project basis.

MOTION BY: 
SECONDED BY: 
MOTION APPROVED: 
____ YES  ____ NO

MOTION:
MESB NG9-1-1 Transition
2016-2017 Strategic Plan

Executive Summary:

MESB staff has been actively engaged for several years in transitioning the metro area 9-1-1 system from the analog-based Enhanced 9-1-1 (E9-1-1) system, which has served the metro area since 1982, toward a fully standard compliant digital Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system as defined by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA). This plan will document the progress that has been made, and the implementation milestones currently planned for 2016 and 2017.

The diagram below has been used to depict the major components that will compose the metro area NG9-1-1 system when it becomes current with the NG9-1-1 standards.
Current Progress:

The MESB, in cooperation with the State 9-1-1 Program, and the metro area Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), has made significant progress in preparing the foundation for the implementation of the metro area NG9-1-1 system. Each of the major NG9-1-1 components are listed below with a summary of the current status toward NG9-1-1 compliance:

1. **Regional GIS** – This effort has been underway for several years. All 9-1-1 call routing in a NG9-1-1 environment will be based on geographic information. The PSAP and emergency response agency service areas are currently being mapped. In addition, the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG), which is the basis for 9-1-1 call routing in E9-1-1, is being synchronized with local GIS information. This will allow for telecommunication service providers to transition from MSAG-based routing to geo-based routing without any major disruptions in service or call routing accuracy. This NG9-1-1 GIS data preparation is approximately 70% complete for the nine-county metro area.

2. **Enhanced PSAP Connectivity** – The State 9-1-1 Program took the initiative five years ago to move the 9-1-1 system connectivity, including the metro area system, to digital, IP-based connectivity between the 9-1-1 Service Provider and the PSAPs. The 9-1-1 system currently transports 9-1-1 calls in a digital format. This digital 9-1-1 network is referred to as an Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet). Currently, eight of the primary metro PSAPs are able to accept calls directly in that digital format. The other eleven primary PSAPs in the metro area utilize a gateway between the 9-1-1 system and the PSAP 9-1-1 call answering application to convert from the digital format to the analog signaling used by the PSAP application. Most PSAPs are making the transition from analog to digital when they replace or upgrade their call answering applications.

3. **NENA i3 Architectural Standard** – NENA has several standard development work groups currently defining design and operating standards for NG9-1-1 components. As with most software driven applications, the NG9-1-1 standards are expected to regularly evolve in order to remain consistent with the current trends in how telecommunications services are being used by the general public. This need for the 9-1-1 system to continue to evolve was recognized as the use of wireless communications began to rapidly replace the use of the wireline telephone system on which 9-1-1 was originally designed. The current 9-1-1 system in Minnesota, and 9-1-1 systems throughout most of the country, do not yet utilize NG9-1-1 system functions that are compliant with the NENA i3 NG9-1-1 standard. The telecommunications service providers serving the metro area are also not yet operating in compliance with the NENA i3 NG9-1-1 standard.

4. **Multi-media Features** – A fully standard compliant NG9-1-1 system will support the delivery of emergency calls for service using different communications mediums,
including voice, real-time text, images, and streaming video. Most of the PSAP answering applications currently in use in the metro area would be capable of handling these different call formats, although a software upgrade may be required. The 9-1-1 system and the telecommunications service providers are unable to support the delivery of anything but 9-1-1 voice calls at this time.

Strategic Initiatives Planned for 2016 and 2017:

Based on the MESB’s ongoing work with the PSAPs, the State of Minnesota, and other MESB member agencies and departments (e.g. IT departments, GIS departments, etc.) which support the PSAPs and the 9-1-1 system, the MESB staff have identified eight priorities in the transition process for completion in the next two years.

1. Complete the metro centerline/MSAG reconciliation project. (Regional GIS)

2. Design a pilot project to explore NG9-1-1 standard compliant ESInet implementation options that address cost, availability, reliability, and quality assurance. (NENA i3 Architectural Standard and Enhanced PSAP Connectivity)

3. Identify the GIS data requirements needed to support dispatchable location accuracy from nomadic or mobile telecommunication devices. (Regional GIS)

4. Continue to evaluate the current 9-1-1 system and identify issues that could be improved within the metro area, considering PSAP needs and the 911 Service Provider capabilities. (Enhanced PSAP Connectivity)

5. Explore NG9-1-1 systems which mirror the Twin Cities region to identify what options are working well and which options have caused problems. Use that information to further develop and refine the metro area transition plan. (Enhanced PSAP Connectivity and NENA i3 Architectural Standard)

6. Expand MESB’s quality assurance processes beyond the legacy wireline system to include wireless and VoIP customer and routing data. (Enhanced PSAP Connectivity and NENA i3 Architectural Standard)

7. Coordinate the MESB NG9-1-1 transition planning with the State 9-1-1 Program, while maintaining the option to permit the metro area to move quicker, or specify a higher level of service, in the transition process if it is in the best interest of the metro area PSAPs and residents (e.g. implement additional ESInet redundancy and diversity than is practically available in greater Minnesota). (Enhanced PSAP Connectivity and NENA i3 Architectural Standard)
8. In coordination with the State 9-1-1 Program, implement an interim SMS Text-to-9-1-1 solution in the metro area by the end of 2016 in order to adequately support the hearing and speech impaired community until fully NG9-1-1 standard compliant real-time text messaging becomes available within the 9-1-1 system. (Multi-media Features)

Conclusion:

The transition from the legacy E9-1-1 system to a standards compliant NG9-1-1 system will continue over the next several years. The 9-1-1 system will continue to evolve over time to remain compatible with the current trends in technology and how people routinely communicate. This will be challenging, but not insurmountable. It will, however, require an awareness that the system will always be changing and not a one-time project which can be completed and not need to be addressed for another few years.

Minnesota, and the metro area in particular, is well positioned in this transition process. Minnesota is moving forward as one of the leaders in the process, without the risk of being too far out in front of the technology or the standards. 9-1-1 staff is leveraging the experience of the early NG9-1-1 adopters, and using that experience to make sure the metro area’s level of 9-1-1 service is not compromised during the transition. The MESB’s goal is to continue to provide the most reliable and accurate 9-1-1 system possible with the resources available.
RECOMMENDATION
No formal recommendations are being made at this time.

BACKGROUND
Though the MESB had an IT support contract through a company from 2012 – 2015, an IT maintenance and update plan was never established.

Additionally, the MESB has been utilizing a Microsoft small business server as part of its IT operations.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
The MESB is beginning to establish a regular IT maintenance and update plan as part of its work with its new IT contractor, Brad Stine of Unison Net.

Microsoft announced that it will no longer support its small business server effective January 1, 2017. This means the MESB, in early 2017, will have to make some major IT changes to continue operations. In replacing this small business server, other IT changes will be made, such as utilizing the Cloud through Office 365 rather than purchasing new Microsoft servers and Microsoft Office software with each release, and establishing an MESB account with Dropbox for file sharing.

Additionally, some MESB servers are outdated and need to be replaced, as well as staff computers. As part of the maintenance and update plan, a regular rotation of staff computers will be established, so that not all computers are being replaced at the same time and costs can be included within the annual budget.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None to the MESB at this time. Financial impacts will be included in the 2017 operational budget or the MESB's five year capital improvement plan, to be presented to the Board in June and July 2016.
2017 MESB IT Expense Discussion

The following page details the estimated expenses for some IT changes which need to occur in early 2017. This page is providing a narrative explanation of those expenses.

**Servers:** The Microsoft small business server must be replaced with a basic Microsoft file server to act as the MESB file directory. The replacement of this server is included in each of the solutions. Costs are included to replace the current GIS server, which is quite old and has a high number of running hours, which adds to wear and tear on the server.

**Switches:** The MESB has several network routing switches. Our current switches have a high number of running hours, as well as failing ports. This means our switches should be replaced proactively. It is likely that is we do not replace them proactively, we will be replacing them in 2017 when they fail.

**NAS Boxes:** The Network Attached Storage (NAS) devices are hard drives which server as backups for the servers. Again, these devices are old and have a high number of running hours.

**Firewall:** Device which protects the network; it filters traffic touching our network.

**Desktops and Laptops:** The summary includes the replacement of all staff workstations, as well as some workstations which operate in our server area. For budgeting purposes all of the workstations are included, but if any workstation is in good operating shape and the replacement of it can be delayed by a year, it will be delayed. There are a few workstations which must be replaced in 2017. For planning purposes, the MESB will begin to plan on workstation replacement every four years. At least one current laptop will be replaced with a desktop computer.

**AV:** This line item includes all MESB-owned AV equipment including SmartBoards and projectors. It should be noted that the likely cost to replace the big projector in room 205 alone is $10,000; the budget for both solutions is a total of $10,000.

**UPS:** Uninterrupted Power Supplies are essentially battery back-ups. A variety of UPSs must be purchased; doing so will create an auto-shutdown process in the case of power outage or brown-out. It would also save any file which is open at the time of the event. It provides a 10 – 15 minute window to shut systems down safely.

**Printers:** Three staff members (Administrative Assistant, Financial Services Specialist and Executive Director) have their own printers. Two of the current printers have scanning capabilities as well. It has been determined that these three staff positions should have their own printers and scanners as each has the opportunity to deal with non-public data; printing and scanning on the shared Toshiba copier (as the rest of MESB staff does) is not appropriate for certain documents. This line item would replace each of those printers.

**WiFi:** This line item is for expenses related to the replacement of the MESB WiFi devices in rooms 205 and 227.

*It should be noted that MESB staff and the IT contractor are mindful when purchasing IT equipment to purchase quality devices, but at a reasonable price.*
## Capital Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware / Equipment</th>
<th>Medium Tier Solution Total</th>
<th>High Tier Solution Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Box</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Box</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewall</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computers</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop Computers</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Equipment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi Devices</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Software / 2017 & Ongoing Operational Budget Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office 365 Standard</td>
<td>$1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited Storage</td>
<td>$2,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropbox (file sharing)</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,386</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Director recommends the Board ratify her action regarding the amendment to the 2015 audit engagement letter.

BACKGROUND
Each year, the MESB's auditor, Redpath and Company, has the Board sign an audit engagement letter for its annual financial audits. The audit engagement letter for the 2015 audit included costs of $20,000 for the audit, $0 - 4,100 for accounting services and $500 for the OPEB determination. These costs aligned with what was in the 2016 budget. At the August 12, 2015 Executive Committee meeting, authorization for the Board Chair to sign the letter was given.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
The implementation of GASB 68 begins with the 2015 audit. GASB 68 is meant to improve government accounting and reporting on pensions.

There are some intricacies involved in this process and staff is not confident in accounting for this requirement for the first year. As such, staff would like our audit firm to assist with the implementation of GASB 68 for the 2015 audit. MESB staff will provide the accounting for this requirement beginning in 2016.

The additional work will add another $500 to the cost of the audit.

Redpath and Company sent an amendment to the audit engagement letter for signature. At the advice of Board Counsel, the Executive Director has signed it, but the Board needs to ratify the action.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This adds an additional $500 to the 2015 audit expense.
December 29, 2015

Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Kelli Jackson
Metro Counties Government Center
2099 University Avenue West, Suite 201
St. Paul, MN 55104-3431

RE: Addendum to Engagement Letter Dated July 13, 2015

We are pleased to confirm our understanding of the services we are to provide the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board for the year ended December 31, 2015. The scope of services includes the following:

- Nonattest services for assistance with GASB 68 implementation

Unless additional work is requested, or circumstances require additional work, we agree that our basic fee for GASB 68 implementation assistance will be $500 for the year ended December 31, 2015. The fee is based on the anticipated cooperation from your personnel and the assumption that unexpected circumstances will not be encountered during the engagement. Unplanned scope increases, late arriving, piecemeal, incomplete or inaccurate information, may result in additional fees.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board and believe this letter accurately summarizes the significant terms of our engagement. If you have any questions, please let us know. If you agree with the terms of our engagement as described in this letter, please sign the enclosed copy and return it to us.

Sincerely,

REDPATH AND COMPANY, LTD.

Peggy Moeller, CPA
PAM/aer
Response
This letter correctly sets forth the understanding of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board:

By: [Signature]
Title: Executive Director
Date: 2/3/16

Nonaudit Services
The employee(s) assigned to oversee the nonaudit services is as follows:

Employee (name and title): Kelli Jackson, Financial Services Specialist
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE:</th>
<th>PRESENTED BY:</th>
<th>AGENDA NUMBER:</th>
<th>4F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 2016</td>
<td>Rohret</td>
<td>Amendments to MESB Policies 007 and 008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**
The Executive Director recommends the Board approve amendments to MESB Policies 007 and 008.

**BACKGROUND**
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board has established 23 policies ranging from the succession of Board officers to a gift acceptance policy to an insurance deductible policy. Many of the policies were derived from the Metropolitan 911 Board and were established 1997-1998; others were approved and implemented later, including after the merger of the Metropolitan 911 Board and the Metropolitan Radio Board in 2005. Most of the policies were updated after the merger and the creation of the MESB, but the updates primarily focused on the name change and little to no substantive changes have been made.

**ISSUES & CONCERNS**
Upon reviewing the policies, it became apparent that most, if not all required some sort of amendment to reflect the current state of the MEB, of technology and of practice. Staff is in the process of reviewing all of the policies and will be presenting amendments over the course of the next several months.

Policy 007 – Travel: this policy discusses travel and travel reimbursement policies for the Board. There are a couple of basic formatting changes to the policy, which are intended to have consistent formatting for MESB policies. Substantive amendments include:

- **Page 1, Approved Expenses, Transportation:** an addition stating that if use of a personal automobile for out-of-state travel is approved, reimbursement will not exceed the cost of coach air fare for the destination (30 days ahead of travel). Additionally, employees must make requests for rental cars and have them approved no later than 30 days prior to travel.

- **Page 2, Approved Expenses, Meals:** language permitting payment of meal charges for non-MESB staff/Board member, even for business purposes, is being removed. Language is added referencing MESB Policy 013 if using the Board issued credit card for purchases.

- **Page 2-3, Approved Expenses, Other Expenses:** language is added referencing MESB Policy 013 if using the Board issued credit card for purchases.

- **Page 3, Reimbursement Requests:** language is added requiring receipts for all claimed expenses on the reimbursement request. This addition is simply formalizing practice.

- **Page 3, Procedures, Approval:** language is added to include the destination’s per diem rate when submitting the Request for Travel Authorization and Advance form.

Policy 008 – Mileage Reimbursement: this policy discusses the Board’s mileage reimbursement policy, for both Board members and staff. The amendments to this policy are not substantive in nature. They include the removal of references to the Cost Allocation and Finance Committees and to a policy date. Additions include a reference to other standing committees in the event the Board creates such committees in the future, as well as language allowing staff members who travel irregularly to file for reimbursement twice a year.
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION BY:</th>
<th>SECONDED BY:</th>
<th>MOTION APPROVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION:**


Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Subject: Travel Authorization, Advance Funds and Reporting

Purpose of Instruction: The purpose of this policy is to establish procedures for requesting authorization to travel, to prescribe reporting and accounting procedures, and to provide a means for an employee or a Board member to receive advance funds for travel.

Statement of Policy: The board will pay or reimburse the individual (Board member or employee) who travels for or on behalf of the Board for all reasonable and necessary costs of required travel subject to the provisions of this instruction. All out-of-town or out-of-state travel for the purpose of attending meetings or conferences or to conduct other business of the Board must be approved by the Board. The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board shall approve all travel through the annual budget process. The Executive Director, or in the absence of the Executive Director, the Chairperson of the Board, must approve all employee travel, prior to travel.

APPROVED EXPENSES

Transportation
Coach air travel is considered standard for out-of-state travel. Use of a personal automobile for long distance travel may be approved by the Executive Director (or the Chair of the Board for travel by a Board member or the Executive Director) provided that the total cost of mileage, food, and hotel during travel between home and the destination does not exceed the cost of coach air travel. When a personal automobile is used for out-of-state travel, reimbursement will be made at the current mileage rate in effect at the time of travel, and will not exceed the cost of coach air fare to the destination, no later than 30 days prior to travel. Mileage reimbursement will be computed on the basis of the most direct route from the Board offices to the travel destination and return.

Transportation to and from the air terminal is considered part of travel cost. Reimbursement for airport transportation, and any other required local travel, will be made only upon presentation of a dated receipt.

If it is expedient or more convenient to rent a car at the travel destination, reimbursement will be made for business related rental car costs only. Rental car requests must be made
and approved by the Executive Director (or the Chair of the Board for travel by a Board member or the Executive Director) 30 days prior to travel.

**Lodging**

Hotel or motel accommodations are to be appropriate to the purposes of the travel. Receipts are required for all reimbursement for lodging and such receipts must clearly show the room charges and any other fees or charges. If family members accompany employees on approved travel, the receipt must clearly show the single room rate and reimbursement will be made at the single room rate.

**Meals**

Meals with an overnight stay shall be reimbursed at the per diem equal to the IRS allowable amounts as determined by the General Services Administration (GSA) Meals and Incidental Expense (M&IE) rate (www.gsa.gov/mie). The M&IE rate includes meal taxes and tips.

Note: Travel days may not be eligible for full day per diem depending upon the departure time at the beginning of the travel, or the arrival time at the end of the travel. And in the event that meals are included in the registration fee, charges for those meals shall not be reimbursable. Below is an example on how to break down a daily per diem:

- Breakfast 20%
- Lunch 30%
- Dinner 50%

If reimbursement is claimed for meals for persons other than the Board member, employees or representatives of the Board, their names and purpose of the meeting shall be included with the receipt for reimbursement. Reimbursement claims for meals will be only for Board members, employees or representatives of the Board. No alcohol will be reimbursed.

If meals are paid for via the Board’s credit card, those expenses are subject to the Board’s Credit Card Policy 013. Receipts are required for all expenses, including a copy of the itemized expense receipt. Employees and Board members shall be mindful that meal expenses when using the Board’s credit card shall not exceed the amount allowed by the per diem.

**Other Expenses**

All other costs which are necessary for carrying out the purposes of the travel must be itemized on the request for reimbursement. Individual expenses which exceed $10.00 require a dated receipt if reimbursement is requested. If the Board’s credit card is used for...
these individual expenses, receipts will be required, including a copy of the itemized receipt, per the Board’s Credit Card Policy 013.

REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS
All reimbursement requests shall be submitted to the Executive Director for approval and payment no later than the month following when they were incurred. Any reimbursement request which is submitted after the end of the month following the occurrence of the expense may be denied. All reimbursements requests must include receipts for all claimed expenses.

PROCEDURES

Approval
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board shall approve all travel through the annual budget process. The Executive Director, or in the absence of the Executive Director, the Chairperson of the Board, must approve all employee travel, prior to travel. All unbudgeted out-of-town travel must be approved by the Board for Board members and for the Executive Director. The Executive Director, or in absence of the Executive Director, the Chairperson of the Board, must approve unbudgeted travel for all other employees prior to date of travel.

All approvals will be recorded by using the Request for Travel Authorization & Advance form which will include: the beginning and ending date of the travel, the destination, the per diem rate, and an estimate of the total cost of the travel along with a statement as to the reason for the travel.

If registration or other costs must be pre-paid with Board funds, the amount and reason shall be noted on the Request for Travel Authorization & Advance form.

Travel Expense Report
All expenditures from advance funds and all expenditures for which reimbursement is claimed must be described in detail on the Travel Expense Report.
Travel Expense Report

Subject: Travel Authorization, Advance Funds and Reporting

Effective Date: 07-06-1998
Revision Date: 07-13-2005
2nd Revision Date: 06-10-2006
3rd Revision Date: 02-13-2013
4th Revision Date: XX-XX-2016

The Travel Expense Report must be submitted within thirty (30) days of the return from travel. If the amount of the advance exceeds the amount reported in the Travel Expense Report and approved by the Executive Director, the balance must be returned to the Board at the time the Travel Expense Report is submitted.
All requests for reimbursement must be substantiated by signed receipts except as noted herein. Receipts must be dated and contain the name of the person or firm to whom payment was made. Cash register receipts or charge card forms are acceptable. Receipts that include charges for other individuals will not be accepted except as provided herein.

No Free Travel through Vendors

No employee or Board member involved with evaluation, recommendation or approval of Board purchases shall accept free transportation or lodging from any person, firm or corporation where such transportation or lodging is for participation in vendor marketing activities. Where such activities require use of the vendor’s corporate transportation or lodging facilities, fair value reimbursement by the Board is required. Participation in such activities requires advance approval by the Executive Director for employees and by the Board Chair for Board members and the Executive Director. This policy is not meant to limit participation, where appropriate, in vendor sponsored seminars and education related activities or in product marketing activities where automobile travel or a meal is provided.
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Subject: Mileage Reimbursement

Number: 008

Effective Date: 04-07-1997
Revised Date: 06-10-2006
Revision Date: xx-xx-2016

Mileage Reimbursement

Board members shall be reimbursed for round trip mileage for meetings of the Board, Executive Committee, Finance Committee or Cost Allocation Committee and other standing committees on which they are members. Board members shall annually validate round trip mileage from their home or County Courthouse location to the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board offices at 2099 University Ave. W, St. Paul. Reimbursement to Board members shall be made in accordance with Board Policy 004 dated 09-10-97; "Per Diem Procedures."

Board staff shall be reimbursed for round trip mileage from the Board office to any authorized meeting required in the normal course of employment and as a part of their assigned duties. Mileage reimbursement will be computed on the basis of the most direct route from the Board offices to the travel destination and return. All reimbursement requests shall be submitted to the Executive Director for approval and payment no later than the month following when they were incurred. Any reimbursement request which is submitted after the end of the month following the occurrence of the expense may be denied. [Emphasis existing for previous two sentences] For Board staff which travel irregularly, mileage expenses shall be submitted no less than twice a year, by June 30 and December 31.

The mileage rate applicable for Board and staff shall be approved federal government rate as reported by the IRS.‡

‡Adopted by Board Action, April 17, 1997
Revised Date: 06-10-06
RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Director recommends the Executive Committee approve new MESB Policy 024 – Wireless Devices.

BACKGROUND
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board has established 23 policies ranging from the succession of Board officers to a gift acceptance policy to an insurance deductible policy. Many of the policies were derived from the Metropolitan 911 Board and were established 1997-1998; others were approved and implemented later, including after the merger of the Metropolitan 911 Board and the Metropolitan Radio Board in 2005. Most of the policies were updated after the merger and the creation of the MESB, but the updates primarily focused on the name change and little to no substantive changes have been made. A draft of this policy was discussed at the August 2015 Executive Committee meeting; staff has made some changes since that meeting (see underlined language on page 2).

ISSUES & CONCERNS
The MESB’s auditors, Redpath & Company, have recommended the MESB implement a wireless device policy which details whether or not an employee may be eligible for a wireless device stipend and how much the stipend may be.

Staff researched wireless device policies from each of the MESB member agencies, as well as the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Metropolitan Council. All of the policies allow for either agency-issued devices or reimbursement/stipends for personally-owned devices. Two entities only allowed agency-issued devices; all others allowed a combination of agency-issued and personally-owned devices.

Employees must demonstrate a need for wireless devices to be used for business purposes in order to receive a wireless device stipend.

Reimbursement/stipend amounts varied widely across agencies. When drafting the draft MESB policy, staff used an average of the other metro agencies’ amounts. The draft MESB policy includes a maximum of $55/month stipend for use of personal smartphones (voice and data/email) for business use. If the employee demonstrates a need for voice-only stipends, the amount of the stipend would be lower than $55. It is unlikely that an MESB employee would wish voice-only services, thus this option is not explicitly enumerated in the policy. The draft policy includes a $40/month stipend for those employees which use tablets (data only) for business use.

The policy requires the employee to pay the monthly service plan, and be responsible for any amount over and above the stipend amount.

The policy and the accompanying Wireless Device Stipend Agreement have been reviewed by MESB Counsel.
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The MESB currently reimburses employees for cell phones, thus the expense is already in the budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION BY:</th>
<th>SECONDED BY:</th>
<th>MOTION APPROVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION:
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Subject: Wireless Devices

Number: 024

Effective Date: xx-xx-2016

Purpose: The intent of this policy is to establish clear guidelines for the appropriate acquisition, management and reimbursement of wireless devices and service. The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board recognizes the need for wireless devices to conduct its business.

All wireless devices used to access any information related to MESB business and the content of the wireless device are subject to review by the MESB, and by third parties in compliance with Minnesota’s Government Data Practices Act or such other applicable federal or state laws or regulations.

Definitions: Wireless devices include all cell phones, smartphones, tablets or any other electronic device capable of wireless communication.

Smartphones are cellular phones that perform many of the functions of a computer, typically having a touchscreen interface, Internet access, and operating systems capable of running downloaded applications.

Tablets are mobile computers with touchscreen interface, Internet access and operating systems capable of running downloaded applications.

Policy: The Executive Director will determine which positions require the use of a wireless device as determined by the following criteria:

1. Employee frequently travels for MESB business; and/or
2. Employee frequently attends off-site meetings; and/or
3. Employee frequently needs to maintain communications while off-site.

The authorized employee(s) shall complete a Wireless Reimbursement Authorization Form [see attached], which will be kept on file by the Executive Director and the Financial Services Specialist. The authorized employee(s) shall receive a monthly wireless device stipend via the MESB payroll system.

If an employee wishes to use a smartphone as the chosen wireless device, the employee must purchase, activate, own, maintain and pay for the device and service plan. The MESB will provide the employee a maximum of $55.00 per month stipend; the employee will pay any costs exceeding the amount of the wireless device stipend.

If an employee wishes to use a tablet device, the Executive Director may choose to have the MESB purchase the device. Employees may use their own tablet with the consent of the Executive Director. The employee would be responsible for activating, maintaining and paying for the service plan. The MESB will provide the employee a maximum of $40.00 per month stipend; the employee will pay any costs exceeding the amount of the wireless device stipend.

Employees may only receive reimbursement for one device.

MESB employees shall follow all local, state and federal laws and regulations regarding the use of wireless devices while operating motor vehicles. The use of wireless devices while operating motor vehicles is discouraged.
When using wireless devices, employees shall continue to adhere to MESB Policies 009 – Information and Data Security Policy; 010 – Use of Internet Policy; and 011 – Access and Disclosure of E-mail Messages Policy. If a device is found to be harming MESB IT networks and security, it may be wiped in an effort to maintain said security. The wireless device may be wiped or disallowed if it is found to be compromising MESB IT security.

If an employee loses his/her wireless device, the Executive Director will be notified immediately and the employee shall suspend service on the device as soon as possible.

This policy will be reviewed at least annually to keep up with technology changes. Additional reviews may be triggered internal MESB technology changes.
MESB Wireless Device Stipend Agreement/Authorization

Employee Name: ____________________________

I agree to the following regulations regarding wireless devices:

1. I understand I will be authorized to receive a Wireless Device Stipend to be used toward the service cost of a wireless device which is used for MESB business purposes;
2. I understand the stipend will be paid to me via Washington County Financial Services;
3. I understand that I will be required to provide reliable wireless device service for all work-related needs;
4. I understand that I may be periodically required to provide billing documents for the wireless device service and if I do not provide the documents when asked the stipend may be terminated;
5. I understand my ability to receive the Wireless Device Stipend ceases if I am in unpaid leave status;
6. I understand the Wireless Device Stipend will cease immediately upon my termination of employment, whether for retirement, voluntary or involuntary reasons;
7. I understand that any current or future obligation with the wireless device service provider is exclusively my responsibility without any liability to MESB;
8. I understand I must abide by MESB policies in order to continue to receive the stipend, including, but not limited to Policy 024 – Wireless Devices; Policy 009 – Information and Data Security Policy; Policy 010 – Use of Internet and Online Services Policy; and Policy 011 – Access and Disclosure of Email Messages Policy;
9. I understand that the personal or MESB-issued wireless device may be wiped or disallowed if it is found to be compromising MESB IT security;
10. I understand that I am responsible for following all local, state and federal laws and regulations regarding the use of wireless devices while operating motor vehicles. I understand that the MESB strongly discourages the use of wireless devices while operating motor vehicles.
11. I understand that failure to comply with this agreement may result in termination of the Wireless Device Stipend.

__________________________
Employee Name (print)  

__________________________
Employee Signature  

__________________________
Amount of Stipend Authorized  

__________________________
Date  

__________________________
Executive Director Signature  

__________________________
Date
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2016
PRESENTED BY: Rohret

RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Director recommends the Executive Committee approve the new MESB policies 025 – Data Requests-Public Access and 026 – Data Requests-Data Subjects.

BACKGROUND
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board has enacted several policies which govern many aspects of Board operations.

Minnesota Statutes 13 requires each government entity to establish policies governing the treatment of government data. One policy must deal with public access to government data, while the other policy must explain the rights of data subjects.

The Minnesota Department of Administration’s Information Policy and Analysis Division has drafted model data access policies for governments to use when establishing data access policies.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
Staff used the model policies created by the Department of Administration when drafting the MESB policies. The policy drafts have been reviewed by MESB Counsel. Also included in the meeting materials is a draft notice to the Department of Administration stating that the MESB adopted their model data access policies. Lastly, a draft Tennessee notice is also included.

Policy 025 – Data Access-Public Access details how members of the public can and should make data requests to the MESB. The policy also details how the MESB staff will process such requests.

Policy 026 – Data Access-Data Subjects details how subjects of data held by the MESB, primarily MESB employees, can and should make data requests to the MESB, as well as how MESB staff will process such requests. A draft Tennessee warning was also drafted so MESB staff members can know their rights regarding data the MESB keeps about them.

The last document included with these policies is a draft notice to the Commissioner of Administration stating that the MESB adopted the model data access policies.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The only costs to the MESB would be staff time and copy costs of any data requests made to the MESB.

MOTION

MOTION BY: ___________________________ 
SECONDED BY: ___________________________
MOTION APPROVED: _______YES _______NO 

MOTION:
Data Practices Policy for Members of the Public

Right to access public data
The Government Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13) presumes that all government data are public unless a state or federal law says the data are not public. Government data is a term that means all recorded information a government entity has, including paper, email, flash drives, CDs, DVDs, photographs, etc.

The Government Data Practices Act also provides that this government entity must keep all government data in a way that makes it easy for members of the public to access public data. Members of the public have the right to look at (inspect), free of charge, all public data that the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) keeps. Members of the public also have the right to obtain copies of public data. The Government Data Practices Act allows the MESB to charge for copies. Members of the public have the right to look at data, free of charge, before deciding to request copies.

How to make a data request
Members of the public can look at data, or request copies of data that this government entity keeps. All data requests must be made in writing to the appropriate individual listed in the Data Practices Contacts on page five (5). Data requests will be accepted via US Mail and email, using the data request form shown on page seven (7).

If members of the public choose not use to use the data request form, requests must include:
- The request is a request for public data under the Government Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13).
- Whether the request is to inspect the data, have copies of the data, or both.
- A clear description of the data being requested for inspection or copied.

This government entity cannot require members of the public to identify oneself or explain the reason for the data request. However, depending on how the request is being processed (if, for example, copies of data are being mailed), the MESB may need some personal information. If identifying information is not supplied to the MESB, the requestor will be provided with contact information so the requestor may check on the status of the data request. In addition, please keep in mind that if the MESB does not understand the request and have no way to contact the requestor, the MESB will not be able to begin processing the request.

How the MESB responds to a data request
Upon receiving a public data request, the MESB will work to process it.
- If it is not clear what data are being requested, the MESB will ask for clarification.
- If the MESB does not have the data, the MESB will notify the requestor in writing within ten (10) business days.
- If the MESB has the data, but the data are not public, the MESB will notify the requestor as soon as reasonably possible and state which specific law says the data are not public.
If the MESB has the data, and the data are public, the MESB will respond to the request appropriately and promptly, within a reasonable amount of time by doing one of the following:

- Arrange a date, time, and place to inspect data, for free, if the request is to look at the data, or
- Provide the requestor with copies of the data as soon as reasonably possible. The requestor may choose to pick up the copies, or the MESB will mail them to you. The MESB will provide electronic copies (such as email or CD-ROM) upon request if the data is kept in electronic format.

Information about copy charges is on page 6. We will provide notice to requestors about the MESB's requirement to prepay for copies.

If the requestor does not understand some of the data (technical terminology, abbreviations, or acronyms), please let the MESB know. The MESB will give an explanation if requested.

The Government Data Practices Act does not require the MESB to create or collect new data in response to a data request if it does not already have the data, or to provide data in a specific form or arrangement if the MESB does not keep the data in that form or arrangement (for example, if the data requested are on paper only, the MESB is not required to create electronic documents to respond to the request). If the MESB agrees to create data in response to a request, it will work with the requestor on the details of the request, including cost and response time.

In addition, the MESB is not required under the Government Data Practices Act to respond to questions that are not specific requests for data.

Requests for summary data

Summary data are statistical records or reports that are prepared by removing all identifiers from private or confidential data on individuals. The preparation of summary data is not a means to gain access to private or confidential data.

We will prepare summary data if the request is made in writing and the requestor pre-pays for the cost of creating the data.

Upon receiving your written request – you may use the data request form on page 7 – we will respond within ten business days with the data or details of when the data will be ready and how much we will charge.
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

Subject: Data Access – Public
Number: 025
Effective Date: x-xx-2016

Data Practices Contacts
Responsible Authority
Name: Jill Rohret, Executive Director
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8394 / jrohret@mn-mesb.org

Data Practices Compliance Official
Name: Jill Rohret, Executive Director
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8394 / jrohret@mn-mesb.org

Data Practices Designee(s)
Name: Kelli Jackson, Financial Services Coordinator
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8382 / kjackson@mn-mesb.org
Copy Costs – Members of the Public
This government entity charges data subjects for copies of government data. These charges are authorized under Minnesota Statutes, section 13.03, subdivision 3(c).

Copy charges must be paid before copies are released to the requestor. The MESB will not charge for copies if the cost is less than $10.00.

For 100 or fewer paper copies – 25 cents per page
Per Minnesota Statutes 13.03, Subd.3c, 100 or fewer pages of black and white, letter or legal size paper copies cost 25¢ for a one-sided copy, or 50¢ for a two-sided copy.

Most other types of copies – actual cost
The charge for most other types of copies, when a charge is not set by statute or rule, is the actual cost of searching for and retrieving the data, and making the copies or electronically transmitting the data (e.g. sending the data by email).

Per Minnesota Statutes 13.03, Subd. 3d, in determining the actual cost of making copies, the MESB will factor in employee time, the cost of the materials onto which the data are being copied (paper, CD, DVD, etc.), and mailing costs (if any). If the request is for copies of data that the MESB cannot reproduce itself, such as photographs, the requestor will be charged the actual cost the MESB must pay an outside vendor for the copies.

The cost of employee time to make copies is $31.35 per hour in 2016.

If, because of the subject matter of the request, the MESB finds it necessary for a higher-paid employee to search for and retrieve the data, the MESB will calculate the search and retrieval portion of the copy charge at the higher salary/wage.
Data Request Form – Members of the Public

Request date:
I am requesting access to data in the following way:
☐ Inspection
☐ Copies
☐ Both inspection and copies

The MESB will respond to your request as soon as reasonably possible.

Contact information
Name:
Address/phone number/email address:

Note: You do not have to provide any contact information. However, if you want the MESB to mail/email you copies of data, the MESB will need some type of contact information. In addition, if the MESB does not understand your request and needs to get clarification from you, without contact information it will not be able to begin processing your request until you contact the MESB.

These are the data I am requesting:
Describe the data you are requesting as specifically as possible.
Data Practices Policy for Data Subjects

Data about you
The Government Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13) says that data subjects have certain rights related to a government entity collecting, creating, and keeping government data about them. You are the subject of data when you can be identified from the data. Government data is a term that means all recorded information a government entity has, including paper, email, flash drives, CDs, DVDs, photographs, etc.

Classification of data about you
The Government Data Practices Act presumes that all government data are public unless a state or federal law says that the data are not public. Data about you are classified by state law as public, private, or confidential. See below for some examples.

Public data
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) must give public data to anyone who asks. It does not matter who is asking for the data or why the person wants the data. The following is an example of public data about you:

__________________________________________________________
Your name and job title

__________________________________________________________

Private data
The MESB cannot give private data to the general public, but you can have access to private data when the data are about you. The MESB can share your private data with you, with someone who has your permission, with its government entity staff who have a work assignment to see the data, and to others as permitted by law or court order. The following is an example of private data about you:

__________________________________________________________
Your Social Security Number

Confidential data
Confidential data have the most protection. Neither the public nor you can get access even when the confidential data are about you. The MESB can share confidential data about you with its government entity staff who have a work assignment to see the data, and to others as permitted by law or court order. The MESB cannot give you access to confidential data. The following is an example of private data about you:
The identity of a subject of an active criminal investigation.

Your rights under the Government Data Practices Act
This government entity must keep all government data in a way that makes it easy for you to access data about you. Also, the MESB can collect and keep only those data about you that are needed for administering and managing programs that are permitted by law. As a data subject, you have the following rights.

Access to your data
You have the right to look at (inspect), free of charge, public and private data that the MESB keeps about you. You also have the right to get copies of public and private data about you. The Government Data Practices Act allows us to charge for copies. You have the right to look at data, free of charge, before deciding to request copies.

Also, if you ask, the MESB will tell you whether it keeps data about you and whether the data are public, private, or confidential.

As a parent, you have the right to look at and get copies of public and private data about your minor children (under the age of 18). As a legally appointed guardian, you have the right to look at and get copies of public and private data about an individual for whom you are appointed guardian.

Minors have the right to ask this government entity not to give data about them to their parent or guardian. If you are a minor, we will tell you that you have this right. We may ask you to put your request in writing and to include the reasons that we should deny your parents access to the data. We will make the final decision about your request based on your best interests. Minors do not have this right if the data in question are educational data maintained by an educational agency or institution.

When the MESB collects data from you
When the MESB asks you to provide data about yourself that are not public, it must give you a notice. The notice is sometimes called a Tennessen warning. The notice controls what the MESB does with the data that collected from you. Usually, the MESB can use and release the data only in the ways described in the notice.
The MESB will ask for your written permission if it needs to use or release private data about you in a different way, or if you ask it to release the data to another person. This permission is called informed consent.

If you want the MESB to release data to another person, you must use the consent form it provides.
Protecting your data
The Government Data Practices Act requires the MESB to protect your data. The MESB has established appropriate safeguards to ensure that your data are safe.

In the unfortunate event that the MESB determines a security breach has occurred and an unauthorized person has gained access to your data, it will notify you as required by law.

When your data are inaccurate and/or incomplete
You have the right to challenge the accuracy and/or completeness of public and private data about you. You also have the right to appeal the MESB’s decision. If you are a minor, your parent or guardian has the right to challenge data about you.

How to make a request for your data
You can look at data, or request copies of data that this government entity keeps about you, your minor children, or an individual for whom you have been appointed legal guardian. Make your request for data to the appropriate individual listed in the Data Practices Contacts on page 6.

Make a written request. You may make your request by mail or email, using the data request form on page 8.

If you choose not to use the data request form, your request should include:
- You are making a request, under the Government Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13), as a data subject, for data about you.
- Whether you would like to inspect the data, have copies of the data, or both.
- A clear description of the data you would like to inspect or have copied.
- Identifying information that proves you are the data subject, or data subject’s parent/guardian.

This government entity requires proof of your identity before it can respond to your request for data. If you are requesting data about your minor child, you must show proof that you are the minor’s parent. If you are a guardian, you must show legal documentation of your guardianship. Please see the Standards for Verifying Identity located on page 9.

How the MESB responds to a data request
Once you make your request, the MESB will work to process your request.
- If it is not clear what data you are requesting, the MESB will ask you for clarification.

If we do not have the data, we will notify you in writing within 10 business days.
• If the MESB has the data, but the data are confidential or private data that are not about you, it will notify you in writing within 10 business days and state which specific law says you cannot access the data.

• If the MESB has the data, and the data are public or private data about you, it will respond to your request within 10 business days, by doing one of the following:
  o Arrange a date, time, and place to inspect data, for free, if your request is to look at the data, or
  o Provide you with copies of the data within 10 business days. You may choose to pick up your copies, or we will mail them to you. The MESB will provide electronic copies (such as email or CD-ROM) upon request if it keeps the data in electronic format.

Information about copy charges is on page 7. The MESB will provide notice to you about its requirements to prepay for copies.

After the MESB has provided you with access to data about you, the MESB does not have to show you the data again for 6 months unless there is a dispute or it collects or creates new data about you.

If you do not understand some of the data (technical terminology, abbreviations, or acronyms), please let the MESB know. The MESB will give you an explanation if requested.

The Government Data Practices Act does not require the MESB to create or collect new data in response to a data request if it does not already have the data, or to provide data in a specific form or arrangement if it does not keep the data in that form or arrangement (for example, if the data you request are on paper only, the MESB is not required to create electronic documents to respond to your request). If the MESB agrees to create data in response to your request, it will work with you on the details of your request, including cost and response time.

In addition, the MESB are not required under the Government Data Practices Act to respond to questions that are not specific requests for data.
Data Practices Contacts

Responsible Authority
Name: Jill Rohret, Executive Director
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8394 / jrohret@mn-mesb.org

Data Practices Compliance Official
Name: Jill Rohret, Executive Director
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8394 / jrohret@mn-mesb.org

Data Practices Designee(s)
Name: Kelli Jackson, Financial Services Specialist
Address: Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, 2099 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55104
Phone number/email address: (651) 643-8382 / kjackson@mn-mesb.org
Copy Costs – Data Subjects
This government entity charges data subjects for copies of government data. These charges are authorized under Minnesota Statutes, section 13.04, subdivision 3.

You must pay for the copies before the MESB will give them to you.

The MESB does not charge for copies if the cost is less than $10.00.

Actual cost of making the copies
In determining the actual cost of making copies, the MESB factors in employee time, the cost of the materials onto which it is copying the data (paper, flash drive, CD, DVD, etc.), and mailing costs (if any).

If your request is for copies of data that the MESB cannot reproduce ourselves, such as photographs, it will charge you the actual cost it must pay an outside vendor for the copies.

The cost of employee time to make copies is $31.35 per hour.

Copy Charges Set by Minnesota Statutes 13.03, Subd. 3c and Subd. 3d.
Data Request Form – Data Subjects

To request data as a data subject, you must show a valid state ID, such as a driver’s license, military ID, or passport as proof of identity.

Contact information
Data subject name:
Parent/Guardian name (if applicable):
Address:
Phone number/email address:

Staff verification
Request date:
Identification provided:

I am requesting access to data in the following way:
☐ Inspection
☐ Copies
☐ Both inspection and copies
The MESB will respond to your request within 10 business days.

Note: Inspection is free but the MESB charges for copies when the cost is over $10.00.

These are the data I am requesting:
Describe the data you are requesting as specifically as possible.
Standards for Verifying Identity
The following constitute proof of identity.

- An adult individual must provide a valid photo ID, such as
  - a state driver’s license
  - a military ID
  - a passport
  - a Minnesota ID
  - a Minnesota tribal ID
- A minor individual must provide a valid photo ID, such as
  - a state driver’s license
  - a military ID
  - a passport
  - a Minnesota ID
  - a Minnesota Tribal ID
  - a Minnesota school ID
- The parent or guardian of a minor must provide a valid photo ID and either
  - a certified copy of the minor’s birth certificate or
  - a certified copy of documents that establish the parent or guardian’s relationship to the child, such as
    - a court order relating to divorce, separation, custody, foster care
    - a foster care contract
    - an affidavit of parentage
- The legal guardian for an individual must provide a valid photo ID and a certified copy of appropriate documentation of formal or informal appointment as guardian, such as
  - court order(s)
  - valid power of attorney

Note: Individuals who do not exercise their data practices rights in person must provide either notarized or certified copies of the documents that are required or an affidavit of ID.
March 9, 2016

Commissioner of Administration
C/o Information Policy Analysis Division
201 Administration Building
50 Sherburne Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Commissioner Matt Massman:

The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board has adopted the Commissioner’s Model Policy for the Public and Model Policy for Data Subjects.

This notice to the Commissioner satisfies the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board’s obligation under Minnesota Statutes, section 13.073, subdivision 6.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Blake Huffman
Chair, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Ramsey County Commissioner
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2016
PRESENTED BY: Rohret
Approval of New MESB Policy 027 – Violation of Policies

RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Director recommends the Executive Committee approve new MESB Policy 027 – Violation of Policies or Directives.

BACKGROUND
The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board has established 23 policies ranging from the succession of Board officers to a gift acceptance policy to an insurance deductible policy. Many of the policies were derived from the Metropolitan 911 Board and were established 1997-1998; others were approved and implemented later, including after the merger of the Metropolitan 911 Board and the Metropolitan Radio Board in 2005. Most of the policies were updated after the merger and the creation of the MESB, but the updates primarily focused on the name change and little to no substantive changes have been made.

Some policies include statements saying if the policies are violated the employee will be disciplined, including and up to termination. However, there is no guidance for employees as to what the discipline process looks like.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
The purpose of this policy to provide guidance to MESB employees regarding the violation of Board policies or policy directives. As written, draft Policy 027 provides a five-step disciplinary process. The process is similar to Dakota County's disciplinary process.

The draft policy does contain a statement that depending upon what policy is violated and the nature of the violation, the Executive Director has discretion to skip a step or steps in the violation of policies process.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
None to the MESB.

MOTION BY:  SECONDED BY:  MOTION APPROVED:

___ YES  ___ NO

MOTION:
The intent of this policy is to establish a process to handle violation of policies or directives by MESB staff.

Staff is responsible for being aware of, understanding and adhering to MESB policies and policy directives from the Executive Director.

Effective 2016, all staff shall receive an updated MESB policy manual. Each staff member shall sign a document stating they have read, understand, and will adhere to Board policies. Staff review of policies, including signing a document stating policies were reviewed, shall occur annually. The Executive Director shall keep copies of the signed documents in employee files.

Policy manuals will be updated as policies change.

If a MESB staff member knowingly and willfully violates any MESB policy or policy directive from the Executive Director, the following disciplinary action shall be taken by the Executive Director:

1. First Violation: the staff member will receive a verbal warning from the Executive Director and a discussion of what the correct policy/action is;
2. Second Violation: the staff member will receive a written warning to be placed in his/her employee file;
3. Third Violation: the staff member will receive a five (5) day work suspension without pay;
4. Fourth Violation: the staff member will receive a thirty (30) day work suspension without pay;
5. Fifth Violation: the staff member will be terminated.

Depending on what policy or policy directive is violated, the Executive Director has the option of skipping some of the steps delineated above.
RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Director recommends the Executive Committee approve travel requests for the Executive Director for the MTUG Chapter President’s Meeting and annual NENA conference.

BACKGROUND
Metropolitan Emergency Services Board Policy 007 – Travel requires Board approval of travel requests for the Executive Director.

ISSUES & CONCERNS
The Executive Director is seeking approval for two travel requests.

The first travel request is for the Motorola Trunked Users Group (MTUG) Chapter President’s Meeting in Chicago, IL. Travel dates are April 24 – 26, 2016. This is an annual meeting of chapter presidents from across the country. Jill Rohret is the immediate past president of national MTUG, and remains a member of the Executive Committee. Attending this meeting will provide information on future technology for the ARMER system.

The travel request is for $310.00, of which approximately $260.00 would be reimbursed by MTUG (members of the Executive Committee are eligible for travel reimbursement). The MESB credit card would be used to purchase the flight, but that cost would be reimbursed. These meeting costs are not included in the 2016 budget.

The second travel request is to attend the 2016 National Emergency Number Association (NENA) conference in Indianapolis, IN, June 12 – 16, 2016. This is an annual conference for 9-1-1 professionals and will foster increased knowledge of advances in 9-1-1 technology, including NextGeneration 9-1-1.

The travel request is for $2,370.00, which includes all travel and registration costs. All efforts will be made to purchase flights at a reasonable cost. Costs included in the travel request are estimates. This travel request is included in the 2016 budget.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The NENA conference travel costs are included in the 2016 budget. The MTUG costs are not, however the majority of the costs will be reimbursed by MTUG.
REQUEST FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION

Employee Name: Jill Rohret
Travel Purpose: Motorola Trunked Users Group Chapter Presidents Meeting
Location: Chicago, IL
Travel Dates: April 24 – 26, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab Fare/Ground Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi Charges (at hotel only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is travel cost included in current budget? No, see notes

Notes: As immediate Past President of this organization, I am eligible to not only attend this informational meeting, but also for travel reimbursement from the MTUG organization (not Motorola Solutions). This means my air fare costs and cab fare* would be reimbursed.

As a member of the organization's Executive Committee, the MTUG organization would directly pay lodging costs.

Meal costs will be nominal as most meals will be provided through the meeting. The estimate includes meals only for travel days, dependent on flight times. Note: the 2016 travel day per diem for Chicago is $55.50.

Submitted by: Jill Rohret Date: February 1, 2016

Board approval
Motion by: Seconded by:
Motion carried/Motion denied Date:
METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

REQUEST FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION

Employee Name: Jill Rohret
Travel Purpose: National Emergency Number Association 2016 Annual Conference
Location: Indianapolis, IN
Travel Dates: June 12 – 16, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Cost Estimate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$539.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Fare</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab Fare/Ground Transportation</td>
<td>$50.00 roundtrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi Charges (at hotel only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>$189.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$2,379.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is travel cost included in current budget? Yes

Notes:

Submitted by: Jill Rohret
Date: February 1, 2016

Board approval
Motion by: 
Seconded by: 
Motion carried/Motion denied
Date: