

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 02.06.2013**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Craig Ebeling – Burnsville; Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Dave McKnight – Farmington; Dave Osberg – Hastings; Justin Miller - Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul; Sherrie Le – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Tom Hedges – Eagan; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Steve Mielke – Lakeville

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County; Dianne Miller – Eagan; Jenelle Teppen – Inver Grove Heights; Tom Vohnhof - Lakeville

Others Present: Diane Lind, Cheryl Pritzlaff; Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Peter Behnke, Tom Paven– Elert and Associates.

Call the Meeting to Order

Chair McKnight (Farmington) called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. Announcements

Introductions.

2. Additions to the Agenda

None

3. Approve Agenda

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the December 5th, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve December 1st – 31st, 2012 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Receive Report on Contracts & Service Agreements Executed by**
- d. **2013 Official Newspaper.**

Action: Motion by Le (West St. Paul) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Miller (Mendota Heights). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

5. CAD Project Report

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) directed attention to the Elert and Associates in the agenda packet. Lind introduced Peter Behnke and Tom Paven from Elert and Associates and stated that they were prepared to present and review the report and recommendation.

Paven (Elert) informed members that Elert and Associates was engaged to look at three different CAD/Mobile configuration options. The first was to continue to use LOGIS as the host. The second option was to partner with another agency and the third was to bring CAD/Mobiles in-house at the DCC.

Behnk (Elert) gave a brief background of himself stating that he worked in Fire/EMS, then a 911 Dispatch Center and finally for a software company as a project manager. Behnke informed

members that he sat with dispatchers in the center and met with members from DCC management/supervisors, Joint Operations Committee and member IT departments. Behnke reported that one observation he made after meeting with these groups, especially the dispatch staff was that the process was very mentally tough on users.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the report and stated that there was a main recommendation followed by some secondary recommendations that were intended to aid in the healing process and moving forward.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the option of partnering with another community and stated that the topic was addressed at each workgroup session but that none of the participants were real interested in partnering with another community. Behnke stated that the groups discussed strengths and weaknesses of each option and the partnering with another community option really didn't generate any discussion.

Osberg (Hastings) asked Lind to talk about the RFP and the requirement that part of the analysis be about the option of partnering with another community. Lind (DCC) confirmed that the request to evaluate the option of partnering with another community was part of the RFP. Lind stated that she and Behnke met with the Executive Director and CAD manager from Ramsey County. Lind explained that the original recommendation to consider partnering with another agency came out of a staff conversation held with Ramsey County. Lind stated that Ramsey County was in a unique position as they had never had their own CAD system. Lind continued stating that the current system was the St. Paul CAD system and was operated under the Ramsey County IT Staff. Lind stated that as conversations progressed, she and Behnke found that Ramsey County was only interested in a partnership where they had 51% controlling interest and the DCC would not get a vote. Lind stated that there were no other partnership possibilities identified as most agencies had either already converted their CAD system or were a member of LOGIS.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that he could understand the concerns associated with a partnership of that type as it would appear the DCC consortium would have all the negatives with minimal advantages. However, he wished the report would have pushed the option discussion a further than it did. Ebeling stated that the group couldn't possibly have knows what could have been negotiated with without further discussions. Ebeling reiterated that he felt like the evaluation gave up on the analysis of this option.

Richardson (Dakota County) agreed with Ebeling stating that he felt that part of the report was dismissed. Richardson stated that partnerships were difficult to achieve and this group needed to push that. Richardson stated that he felt this option deserved more thought and consideration.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the DCC-based system and stated that there were definite advantages, the greatest of which was control. Behnke stated that there were also disadvantages that included the need to increase IT staffing, addressing IT in-house issues and staff placement in the facility. Behnke stated that the DCC currently ran on a fairly lean management structure and Elert believed that in addition to increase IT staffing, there would likely be the need for an IT supervisor.

Behnke (Elert) stated that the final option, which was also the ultimate recommendation, was to continue the current relationship with LOGIS. Behnke explained that the points of consideration were primarily technology and staffing, both of which were already in place. Behnke explained that the hardware, network and staffing infrastructure was already in place at LOGIS. Behnke stated that there were also a lot of added benefits that were not very clear up front. Behnke stated that there were good economy of scale benefits associated with the LOGIS option

including more bank for the buck when bringing a product in-house. Behnke added that the added public safety experience that the LOGIS staff had included EMD, CAD, ProQA, Net Motion, Networking, etc. Behnke referred to the financial piece of the LOGIS option and stated that there was really no massive margin that would push the recommendation to the LOGIS option, but he believed there would be significant savings staying with LOGIS. Behnke stated that he believed it came down to letting LOGIS do what they are good at and letting the DCC do what they are good at, communications. Behnke acknowledged that LOGIS made a mistake with the Motorola project. However, it could be argued that the DCC may be in a good position participating in the fix as there would be much better attention to detail. Behnke added that LOGIS had already put a number of fixes in place to improve the process.

Johnson (Rosemount) asked if Elert could speak on specifics that LOGIS had put in place to ensure the previous failure didn't happen again. Behnke responded that there was a better selection process in place, better checks and balances, site visits to agencies that were configured similar to the DCC and project management through their current consultant. Behnke stated that he believed this project would be much more closely monitored. Lind (DCC) added that some differences DCC staff had seen in this LOGIS process was that they hired Deltaworks to be their outside management firm opposed to the previous process that was managed internally. Lind stated that Deltaworks was also managing the Anoka and Ramsey County projects. Lind stated that was what Deltaworks specialized in. Lind stated that LOGIS also put a new system in place a few months ago that allowed for real time entry and tracking of issues that allowed members to log in and see the status of their issues at any time

Osberg (Hastings) referred to conversations Behnke had with DCC dispatch staff and others and asked him to speculate on what degree of confidence he found the dispatchers to have with LOGIS. Behnke (Elert) responded that he did not believe the staff or members were disgruntled with LOGIS as much as the situation. Behnke stated that if done properly and with consideration to the secondary recommendations along with communications and constant project management on behalf of the DCC, staff and members could heal from the previous process and move forward. Behnke stated that Elert recommended the DCC not be the first agency to go live on a new system. Behnke stated that he was surprised to see that the largest LOGIS member was the first to go live on the P1 system. Osberg (Hastings) then referred to Law Enforcement and Fire/EMS to which Behnke (Elert) responded that the disciplines just wanted a product that worked and that it came down to finding a product that could get up and running at some smaller agencies before the DCC allowing responders to see the product working and regain confidence.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that members already beat each other up about what happened but he never heard that members felt LOGIS didn't care or make their best effort. It was simply a really bad situation. Ebeling stated that to him it didn't have much bearing on the discussion as it was about what was the right thing to do now. Ebeling stated that he wasn't comfortable with removing an option from the table at this point because of assumptions. Ebeling acknowledged that the member representatives that were currently involved in the LOGIS RFP process were saying that things were going better this time around. However, he reiterated that he was not ready to take any of the three options off the table. Ebeling added that the previous experience was largely due to a failure on Motorola's part and if they would have delivered what they said they would, the LOGIS and DCC consortiums would all be happy. Ebeling stated that on the other hand, that didn't make LOGIS the shining knight going forward. The consideration just needed to be even-handed. Behnke (Elert) acknowledged Ebeling's comments and stated that in discussions, one topic of discussion was the question if members felt LOGIS had paid the price because of the Motorola failure and the large response was yes. Behnke acknowledged that there really wasn't a silver bullet that identified exactly which option to go with. The bottom line was that the decision came down to good reasons to continue the relationship with LOGIS. Behnke stated that another consideration was that right

now, there were compelling reasons to stay with LOGIS. However, there could be some points along the way where decisions could be re-evaluated. Behnke explained that once the DCC membership received numbers, it may want to consider if the LOGIS recommendation was still the correct one. Behnke added that if that answer was yes, the next step would be to see how installs went at other smaller locations. Behnke acknowledged that the other options should not be taken off the table through the process. Behnke stated that the notification could be to say that the consortium intends to go with LOGIS if things go the way the DCC expects them to go.

Ebeling (Burnsville) referred to the finances listed in the report and stated that whatever was decided, he was not sure the numbers in the report supported one direction over another. Ebeling stated that he was concerned that the group was discussion conclusions before actual numbers were received.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the finances listed in the report and apologized stating that the bottom of page 9, first year total costs estimated stated 3.9 million dollars. However, the cover sheet referred to 3.55 million dollars. Behnke stated that the 3.55 million was the correct number. Osberg (Hastings) referred to page 2 asking if the heading was correct. Osberg clarified that it stated the LOGIS option was coming in at 1.5 million dollars and DCC-based option was coming in at 3.5 million dollars. Osberg then referred to page 2 of the financial summary and stated the heading referred to capital. Paven (Elert) acknowledged that was the 1st year costs and that the total was actually over a 6 year period. Osberg (Hastings) commented that the last box in the lower left hand corner caption should say "total costs over 6 years".

Ebeling (Burnsville) questioned if there was the need for all 6 recommended IT positions the entire start-up year. Ebeling also asked if it was normal to include a year of maintenance during installation. Ebeling clarified that it seemed the first year costs were overstated. Paven (Elert) responded that whether or not you see the first year of maintenance costs, they are build into the costs. Paven stated that in past evaluations half of the time it was included in the costs and the other times it was not.

Richardson (Dakota County) commented that the difference appeared to be about 200,000 dollars a year over the six years. Richardson asked if it really took six people to run a CAD system. Richardson then referred to the possibility of DCC staff taking on other technology obligations that could be spread over other initiatives. Behnke (Elert) responded that it would be possibly to add other technology obligations as the system stabilized but clarified that there would be significant work on the Geo base and other systems for the first 6 months to 1 ½ years. Behnke stated that the numbers identified were based on personal experience, feedback from other agencies with similar size and makeup, and current LOGIS staff contribution. Behnke acknowledged that the staffing was largely an estimate and added that there may be the need for an additional position for over supervision of the CAD/Mobile work that would report directly to the Executive Director.

Richardson (Dakota County) referred to the comment in the report regarding the inability of the member agencies to standardize. Richardson stated that the membership could have some standardization with an RMS system. Behnke (Elert) acknowledged that there were very basic, brief discussions about RMS as that was going through another analysis process.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that he had accepted the number of IT staff identified under the DCC-based option as he didn't know enough to think otherwise. However, this analysis was not how he would have analyzed two different options. Ebeling clarified that when analyzing two things with associated capital costs, any differing annual operating costs should be assumed that funds would be borrowed on day one and then amortized over the life

expectancy. Ebeling continued stating that whatever the first year costs were should be amortized to assume some value in the cost of the money. Ebeling stated that assuming some of the numbers on the chart were correct, the difference ended up being much less than what the chart reflected. Ebeling stated that Burnsville staff did not believe the numbers were correct and that Burnsville calculations actually figured LOGIS to be the more expensive option. Ebeling reiterated that he did not believe either option should be discarded, but he didn't believe the report showed LOGIS as the superior financial option.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that he agreed with Ebeling's comments and added that someone on Joint Ops stated that the figuring should have been done over the 7 year life expectancy. Johnson added that would also have the effect of narrowing the gap. Behnke (Elert) acknowledged stating that industry standard was between five and seven years so the study split the difference. Paven (Elert) stated that Elert could extend the timeframe the additional year and also look at the cost of money. Paven added that server costs would also need to be added at about the five year mark. Tom stated that although finances were a component of the recommendation, the main recommendation was base more on operational considerations.

King (South St. Paul) referred to the recommended four technical support specialist positions and asked if that was assuming 24/7 coverage. Behnke (Elert) responded that was not necessarily the assumption. Behnke reminded that these positions would not only be servicing DCC staff but also member agency staff. Behnke added that there would be the need for management of network and software components. Behnke stated that he did some research on the Department of Labor and Statistics as well as Salary.com to develop the staffing level recommendation. King (South St. Paul) stated that he interviewed his police, fire and EMS personnel who all took the position that LOGIS didn't provide 24/7 service. King stated that he thought the numbers suggested allowed for presence 24/7. Behnke stated that the findings were based on seven days a week but overnight would be more on-call but that was an operational management concern.

Le (West St. Paul) commented that she thought member IT staff dealt with on-site components at each city and if there were hardware or connection to server problems, they would be handled by the member staff. Behnke (Elert) responded that if CAD were to come in-house at the DCC, the DCC would also take on mobiles which would include connectivity. Behnke stated that City IT folks said they predominantly managed their own air cards, net motion and in-car computers. However, some of the smaller communities didn't have IT staff which led to the question of how to handle that IT support. Lind (DCC) added that regularly the DCC received calls from member responders and had to triage inquiries. Lind stated that if the issue was not something the supervisors could assist with on the spot, they would refer the responders to LOGIS.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the numbers on page 9 and stated that they were based on real world estimates from companies and did not involve any negotiation or discounts. Behnke stated that the seats and licenses were based on facts obtained from the DCC staff. Behnke stated that annual recurring and software maintenance are industry standards but the 1.4 millions would include training as would the MDC so there wouldn't be the full-blown training on a yearly basis. Behnke referred to the third party software and interfaces such as ProQA and stated the costs were based on real world pricing. Behnke referred to the CAD hardware servers/network and said they were based on a couple different sources and educated estimates. Behnke assured that the DCC facility had space in the data room to host an in-house option. Behnke then referred to the acquisition and RFP costs and stated that the numbers were based on Elert costs to perform the work and put together an RFP allowing for demo traveling, etc. Behnke referred to personnel costs and stated that those numbers came from LOGIS on page 8 and right out of the budget. Behnke added that Elert talked to LOGIS

management and asked what they saw as a potential changes to the budget when they went to the new system. The 2014 cost was projected based on the current Motorola system currently being used. Behnke cautioned that the numbers were estimates that were based on what might happen with a new, not yet identified system.

Behnke (Elert) stated that one question that came up earlier when discussion financials was the question about partnering with another agency, which was again a great unknown as it depended on who the consortium partnered with, the percent of interest, etc. Paven (Elert) agreed stating there was not a whole lot in the numbers as there was change associated with each option and the numbers were simply unknown so the numbers listed were educated assumptions.

Behnke (Elert) referred to the bottom of page 8 and stated that LOGIS requested the information be added to the report as there was the belief there were some added benefits that were possibly overlooked by members including unlimited user training. Battig (Dakota County) asked if Elert felt the items listed adequately addressed the estimates on page 9 and if there were additional costs that needed to be addressed. Behnke (Elert) responded that he felt there were additional benefits and that if the product were taken in house, he would question if members were getting the same benefit as they received through LOGIS. Behnke stated that he believed the consortium was getting a good deal from LOGIS.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that in Burnsville's review of the numbers, it was noted that the 809,587 did not include charges to the cities for fire/mobile mapping/police apps and system development applications and there may be the need for further dialog on that. Ebeling stated that he was not sure it was appropriate to exclude them. Lind (DCC) responded that the adopted 2013 budget was developed in 2012 before going live with CAD. Lind stated the mapping was for 91 mapping and costs specific to P1 software. Lind added that it was included in the Printrak software members were currently on. Lind stated those were not charged to the city nor were they added to the report. Lind added that Ticket Writer was a subset of the RMS system. Lind stated that it didn't link with CAD but did interface with MDCs and since the review as strictly the CAD software and Mobile software, they were not recognized in the projected costs. Lind added there were about 16 interfaces to CAD/Mobile that were currently in place with LOGIS and they Didn't include EMD costs for CAD.

Behnke (Elert) recapped that along with the primary recommendation of continuing the relationship with LOGIS, there were also some follow up recommendations that Elert felt necessary to foster a successful relationship. Behnke then reviewed the follow up recommendations with members.

Richardson (Dakota County) referred to the recommendation to include a project manager and asked if this was in addition to the Technology Manager identified in the study. Behnke (Elert) clarified that the Technology Manager would be if the DCC were to bring the product in-house and would be a member of DCC staff. Behnke further clarified that in the recommendation to continue the relationship with LOGIS, Elert was recommending the DCC consider hiring an outside project manager to manage the process from the DCC aspect.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if it was completely irrational to think there may be another hosted solution for CAD. Behnke (Elert) responded that there were options for CAD in the Cloud but in the 25 years he had been in public safety 911 communications he had always thought a center would want the server on the property or at a very stable platform similar to another local agency or LOGIS. Richardson (Dakota County) acknowledged Behnke's comments and noted that Elert and Associates had not been previously asked to consider that as an option but commented that he would like to hear more about that option Behnke (Elert) agreed to do some additional provide some names of companies the consortium could look at.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that if he had to bet at this point in time, and with all the unknowns, he would bet that the DCC would continue the relationship with LOGIS for CAD/Mobiles. However, because of all the unknowns, he hated to take the other options off the table. Ebeling explained that he would like to see the LOGIS process progress and make sure that the members participating in the RFP review and preliminary meetings with LOGIS were feeling good about where the process was going. Ebeling then offered that he would like to defer the decision also, because of the current CJIN study that was not yet complete.

Lawell (Apple Valley) agreed with Ebeling stating that he did not feel as though the Committee was being asked to make a decision at the meeting as there was still much in process. Lawell stated that he did not think the group should act on the Elert recommendation at this time as there are a number of DCC members participating in the LOGIS RFP process and LOGIS was also working on a secondary RMS study that he was interesting in hearing about before proceeding. Lawell commented that he felt the DCC consortium was in a good position with holding five of the 10 positions on the CAD/Mobiles review of the RFP. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that the DCC held two spots, Burnsville Fire held one, Inver Grove Heights Law held one and Burnsville IT held one.

Osberg (Hastings) commented that in reading the minutes from the recent Joint Operations Committee meeting there was reference to Lind bringing Joint Ops Committee member feedback to the Executive Committee meeting. Osberg asked Lind to take a few minutes and relay the feedback. Lind (DCC) informed members that she had anticipated a quite lengthy discussion at Joint Ops, but on the contrary, she had to pull information out of people. Lind said that there were a couple fire agencies who spoke up about their displeasure with the report, specifically the tone, the lack of information in the Technology section, discrepancies in the financials and ultimately the belief that the report was generally short-sighted. Lind reiterated that there was no discussion other than the comments on the report itself.

Vonhof (Lakeville) commented that because it was early and there were viable options available he felt it was wise to stand back and wait. Vonhof stated that everyone knew what the issues were and that it was reticent to get too vocal about anything at this point. Vonhof explained that the DCC makeup was a very large, very unique center. Vonhof commented that all of the RFPs going out now were being bid differently as more psaps across the county were starting to consolidate. Vonhof speculated that there was optimism among the users but that optimism was guarded. Vonhof said without a doubt the consortium was in the position to receive a better system. Lind (DCC) reported that she heard there were six responses to the LOGIS RFP and the previous RFP received three responses. Lind reminded members that while the DCC has membership partners, it was a 911 Communications Center that also had to consider its PSAP partners outside of the county. Lind clarified stating that the DCC had to consider where back-up would be if the center were to go down and what nearby agencies could assist in the event of a facility shut-down. Vonhof (Lakeville) agreed stating that because of the size of the DCC, the partner options were very limited to handle the DCC traffic. Lind (DCC) informed members that as five separate PSAPS, the County centers fell in the 90% of under 6 seats. After consolidation, the DCC fell in the 10% which makes for a unique situation.

King (South St. Paul) referred to member concerns about ruling any option out and asked about the timing concerns. King asked if the group had time to go through the process of bringing a product in-house if down the road during the LOGIS process members started to become uncomfortable with the progress. Lind (DCC) acknowledged that it would be extremely tight. Lind explained that if LOGIS kept to their timetable, they would be looking at a decision on the CAD/Mobile product in April with contract signing in June and implementation beginning in August. Lind stated that the DCC consortium would have to be able to complete an RFP process by the end of the year. Lind also cautioned that LOGIS would be requiring a

commitment from the DCC as the DCC constituted a large number of seats that would come into play during negotiating with which ever agency was chosen.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if staff knew of deadlines. Lind (DCC) responded that LOGIS would not pull the plug on the current system until all their members agencies who also committed to go with their new system were up and running on the new system. Lind (DCC) stated that she would have to check on when the plug was going to be pulled as she believed LOGIS would have some Server needs that might impact that timing.

McKnight (Farmington) referred to the other partnership option and the CAD in the Cloud option presented by Richardson and asked when Elert and Associates felt they could have that information back to the group. Miller (Mendota Heights) reminded that there was also a member desire to look at time value.

Le (West St. Paul) asked if there were any other consulting firms that would have more experience with the CAD in the Cloud solution that should be visited with? Lind (DCC) responded that Deltaworks may be an option. However, they were the current consultant for LOGIS and have stated that there would be a conflict of interest. Lind stated that she was unsure if any other consulting firms were familiar with CAD in the Cloud. Behnke (Elert) commented that the concept of CAD in the Cloud was very new. Vonhof (Lakeville) asked if it was operational anywhere. Behnke (Elert) stated that he would have to research that further.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if there were any other counties of PSAPS in the process of acquiring a CAD system. Lind (DCC) responded that Ramsey County was finishing their contract with TriTech. Lind stated that Anoka County was not interested in a partnership at this time due to internal changes but they were also looking at TriTech. Richardson (Dakota County) then asked if there were any pricing results from any of the other places looked at. Lind (DCC) stated that she had not seen any pricing on them but that she heard Ramsey County's product was coming in around \$4,000,000 which they hoped to get down through negotiations. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he met regularly with the other County Administrators and would pose the question at that time.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that although no decision needed to be made, it sounded as though the clock was ticking pretty loudly in terms of ability to recover and go down another path. Battig stated that it sounded as though the group needed to have a better idea of when that point was.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked where the CJIN study was at. Ebeling (Burnsville) stated that it was still in the interview process so it was probably six weeks out. Lawell (Apple Valley) stated that there was probably a point on the horizon when the CJIN Study, the CAD/Mobile Study and the LOGIS Study will all meet and the DCC Executive Committee needed to be prepared for that. Ebeling (Burnsville) agreed stating that he felt more prepared for that time based on the Elert and Associates study but it struck him that there should be more information assembled on both the LOGIS and the non-LOGIS options while continuing participation in the LOGIS study until the DCC arrived at that fork in the road, which sounded to be April.

Lawell (Apple Valley) questioned if April was when LOGIS would be opening their RFP bids. Lind (DCC) clarified stating that the bids had already been opened and were in the hands of the committee members who had begun their independent review. Lind stated that the group would convene the week of February 11th to do a group evaluation of the proposals and in-house demos would be the first two weeks of April followed by site visits and a final recommendation the last week in April. Lind reiterated that it was at that point that LOGIS would probably need to know if the DCC was in or out to prepare for negotiations. Lind added that no cost quotes had been shared as Deltaworks' process held number confidential as they

did not want that to weigh on evaluations. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that it is great to know a system does what is needed of it but if those numbers couldn't be obtained until April, it would be difficult to do background findings.

Le (West St. Paul) asked if the Consortium would want the same people who were evaluating the LOGIS product to participate in an evaluation of an alternative if that were the decision. Vonhof (Lakeville) responded that he felt another committee should be assembled. Vonhof acknowledged that the DCC may elect to have the same staff representing it. Vonhof added that he was interested to see who might bid on it. Lind (DCC) stated that there were some new bids on the LOGIS RFP.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if the DCC Consortium should ask LOGIS what it would take to sustain the DCC on the old system, even if it was at an additional cost if the decision were to bring a system in-house. Lawell (Apple Valley) acknowledged stating it would be a two part question. One to LOGIS and the second to Motorola and both would have to say yes but he was not sure there would be room on the LOGIS servers. Lawell (Apple Valley) agreed to pose the question. Lawell stated that the LOGIS Board approved the refund of money to members that was basically whatever you put into the purchase, you would get back unless you chose the financing option, in which case you would bear your share of the interest costs. Lawell stated that there was another option of leaving the funds with LOGIS on account. Lind (DCC) stated that for the DCC that was about \$250,000 less interest.

Paven (Elert) referred to "plan b" and what it might look like. Paven stated that if the process were to get into April and wasn't seeing what they wanted to see, there would need to be a plan for how to proceed with making the Consortium whole. Paven continued saying that if the process were to proceed to June and members started feeling uncomfortable, there would need to be a plan for how to proceed at that time and the question would have to be asked at which point is it too late?

Battig (Dakota County) commented that between now and the March meeting there would be a lot of activity in response to the LOGIS RFP. Battig questioned if the response to Consortium displeasure with the LOGIS RFP was creation of an independent RFP. Battig noted that the RFP process was where the time drag would occur. Behnke (Elert) responded that in a perfect world Elert and Associates would have all the information on what the LOGIS product looked like along with costs as well as bid results that would allow Elert to make a vendor recommendation. Behnke questioned the need for the RFP process. Behnke added that Elert and Associates could put together a bid or RFI and run a parallel process.

Ebeling (Burnsville) suggested asking Elert and Associates to do two things prior to the March meeting. The first would be to make the noted amendments along with further investigations on the existing report. The second would be to prepare a document that lays out a timeline that reflects what steps would need to be taken at different points along the timeline if the determination was made that LOGIS was not the answer. Ebeling clarified that he would like to have the course charted. Ebeling stated that this information, along with a LOGIS process update at the March meeting would provide more information and better equip members with how to proceed.

Lind (DCC) informed members that the demos that LOGIS would be hosting the first two weeks of April were in-house and open to all member public safety personnel. Lind stated that each person would receive an evaluation form but only the representatives had voting power. Lind stated that she would notify members as she receive more concrete information.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if the DCC knew who the other centers across the Country that looked and operated similar to the DCC were. Lind (DCC) responded that the DCC could

produce a list but that off the top of her head she was aware of Lansing, Michigan and Aurora, Colorado. Behnke (Elert) also agreed to do a couple case studies of similar centers, what they paid and what their staffing levels were. Behnke (Elert) acknowledged that multi-agency center needs changed everything.

Johnson (Rosemount) agreed with Ebelings recommended three part solution and added that if there was the need for special meetings, that should also be considered. McKnight (Farmington) asked Elert and Associates if they could complete the requests by the next meeting scheduled for March 6th. Paven (Elert) confirmed. – think Ebelings three part solution sounded good and special meetings to meet the schedule should be done. McKnight – possible to get in 4 weeks or less? Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if the requested additional work was covered or if there was an additional cost for it. Paven (Elert) responded that the fee quoted was a range that Elert expenses were currently at the bottom of so there should be enough funding to cover the additional work.

Action: No action.

6. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

Reimbursement letters from LOGIS – Lind (DCC) reminded members that they should be receiving reimbursement letters from LOGIS if they hadn't already done so.

Dakota County Solar Project – Lind (DCC) reported that in talking with Dakota County Facilities, Dakota County was looking at using grant dollars to put solar panels in on the Campus where the DCC was housed. Lind stated that it was believed the use of these panels would reduce DCC facility energy costs as much as 8% and Radio Tower costs as much as 40%.

Board of Directors Representation – Lind (DCC) asked members to remember to notify DCC staff as soon as their Board designations had been made.

Rosemount American Legion – Lind (DCC) stated that the Rosemount American Legion awarded one Police Officer, one Fire Fighter and one Dispatcher yearly for their services to public safety. Lind reported that for 2013, Dispatcher Mandy Voss was nominated by her co-workers for the award and what made this especially exciting was the fact that normally, Dispatcher of the Year is awarded to a dispatcher who is in the top 1/3 of seniority. Mandy, however, is in the bottom 1/3 and just recently completed her first year of employment with the DCC. Lind (DCC) stated that Mandy's skills, ability and poise have exceeded expectation. Lind added that Mandy had dealt with several suicide calls in her first year of service and she hung in there and made some very good decisions on some very difficult calls. Lind commented that she was personally very pleased to hear Mandy's co-workers nominated her for this position.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that he was happy to have read there had been discussions in the Joint Operations Committee about Active Shooter protocol. Lind (DCC) responded that the training was scheduled for May and would incorporate a new EMD procedure. Lind added that DCC staff would be working with LE and Fire/EMS personnel to obtain the important information that dispatchers may not know is beneficial to responders in times of crisis like this. Lind added that the hope was that with the development of this protocol, it may be shared with neighboring agencies for use in the metro area.

Action: No action.

7. Executive Director's Performance Evaluation

Discussion:

Prior to yearly performance evaluation discussions, Operations Director Pritzlaff and Executive

Assistant Hildebrandt were excused from the meeting.

Action: Motion by Osberg (Hastings) to accept the report as presented. Second by Johnson (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Miscellaneous

Discussion:

None

Action: No action.

Adjourn

Action: Meeting adjourned by Chair McKnight at 3:28pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

March 6th, 2013
DCC Training Room