

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 03.06.2013**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Craig Ebeling – Burnsville; Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Dave McKnight – Farmington; Dave Osberg – Hastings; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Justin Miller - Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul

Members Absent: TBD – Eagan; Sherrie Le – West St. Paul

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County; Dianne Miller – Eagan; Melanie Mesko Lee – Hastings; Tom Vonhof – Lakeville; Bud Shaver – West St. Paul

Others Present: Diane Lind, Cheryl Pritzlaff; Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Peter Behnke, Tom Pavek - Elert & Associates

Call the Meeting to Order

Chair McKnight (Farmington) called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

1. Announcements

Introductions

2. Additions to the Agenda

None

3. Approve Agenda

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the February 6th, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve January 1st – 31st, 2013 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Receive Operations Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes**
 - **Law Enforcement Operations Sub-Committee dated February 7th, 2013.**
 - **Fire/EMS Operations Sub-Committee dated February 28th, 2013.**
- d. **Receive Report on Contracts & Service Agreements Executed by Executive Director between February 6th and March 6th, 2013.**

Action: Motion by Miller (Eagan) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Ebeling (Burnsville). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

5. CAD Feasibility Report

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) reminded members that at the February 6th meeting the Executive Committee asked Elert and Associates to do some more research on the financial impact of bringing a product in-house as well as other hosted solutions such as CAD in the Cloud.

Pavek (Elert) referred to page 2 of the revised Study stating that one thing that was requested of Elert was to review the cost of money over time. Pavek acknowledged that it was certainly a more accurate way to look at it although the findings were not a lot different.

Ebeling (Burnsville) referred to the annual maintenance and personnel recruiting on page 10 of the report stating it reflected an estimated cost of \$730,400. Ebeling stated he thought that was represented in the charts on page 2 of the report but that it reflected \$785,000. Ebeling asked for clarification on the discrepancy. Pavek (Elert) clarified that the difference of \$54,600 was additional costs anticipated for a first year project manager. Pavek clarified that because it was a one year expense, it was included in operating costs, not part of the initial purchase.

Ebeling (Burnsville) referred to the operations costs on page 9 of the report stating it reflected an estimated cost of \$811,859. Ebeling stated page 2 reflected \$859,000. Pavek (Elert) explained that was again attributable to project management. Pavek directed attention to pages 14 and 15 of the report stating that the belief was that given the expertise at LOGIS, Elert believed that project management costs would still be necessary but would not be as high if the decision were to proceed with the LOGIS option.

Ebeling (Burnsville) referred to year zero on page 15 stating there was an estimated cost of \$2,740,000 for hardware and software. Ebeling then referred to page 10 stating the \$2,740,000 appeared to include the \$80,000 acquisition costs. Ebeling stated that he wasn't sure it changed anything but he was just trying to make sure he was able to track the numbers. Pavek (Elert) stated that the \$2,740,000 identified on page 10 did not include the \$80,000 acquisition costs.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that Burnsville did not agree with the numbers identified in the report.

Lind (DCC) referred to the two paragraphs in bold on page 9 of the report and stated that there were three items, Mobile Mapping, E-Ticket and System Development, that Elert and Associates, Tom Venables with Burnsville IT and herself could not decide where the costs should be accounted for. Lind explained that the costs were partially RMS related and partially Mobile related. Lind further explained that Mobile Mapping was a "opt-in" feature that was an estimated expense of \$6,604.00 for each agency electing the feature and E-Ticket was a \$36,266 interface that was not Mobile, but was driven by Mobiles. Lind added that it was agreed that there was a need for a System Development Fund, estimated at \$50,780 that would be set aside for other ancillary interfaces such as community notification. Lind reported that after addressing these items with the Law Enforcement Sub-Committee, it was determined that these items were necessary, but needed to be stand-alone expenses. Lind stated the total estimated cost for the three stand-alone items was \$93,650.

Behnke (Elert) reported that another aspect Elert and Associates was tasked with reviewing was the concept of CAD in the Cloud, also known as Software as a Service (SaaS). Behnke stated that after further investigation it was determined that there was really only one vendor who was really operating in a proven environment and that was Tiburon. Behnke explained that Tiburon was one of the top-tier CAD/Mobile/RMS companies but they had less than a handful of up and running CAD customers using the Cad in the Cloud feature. Behnke explained that SaaS was when data, servers and tech support were at an outside location. Behnke acknowledged that looking five years down the road, CAD in the Cloud may be common place. Behnke added that it was already becoming commonplace for RMS. However, when a CAD system goes down, it is a huge deal. When an RMS system goes down, it is not as immediate a need. Lind (DCC) commented that when she checked with BCS security she was told the BCA would not entertain the idea of out-of-state hosting. However, Chief Aschenbrener from Mendota Height received conflicting feedback from another BCA representative. Lind stated that part of the reasoning she was given by the BCA was that no data outside of Minnesota could be used so there would be the need for a separate server. Lind added that the BCA must have access to the equipment for their audits to ensure security of the facility and the servers in the facility. Lind referred to Red River Valley and explained they had to have their servers and separate

phone circuits at point of demark in a secure enclosure with two levels of security in a secure government facility. Lind also explained that given their proximity, Red River Valley was able to meet that requirement as their servers were housed in Moorhead and accessible by the BCA.

Lind (DCC) informed members that there were copies of the raw minutes from the Fire/EMS and the Law Enforcement January meetings with Elert, as well as additional information on SaaS, for anyone interested.

Johnson (Rosemount) asked if Washington County was looking at a Cloud solution. Lind (DCC) clarified that Washington County contracted with Tiburon, who offers CAD in the Cloud. However, their server was onsite. Lind added that much like the DCC experience, Washington County was currently tracking 18 months behind schedule with their implementation due to some security and database issues. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he also spoke with Washington County directly who stated the Cloud option was not available to them at the time of their RFP but they believed it was the way of the future.

Lind (DCC) informed members that LETG was a small company out of Woodbury that was looking at putting servers in a commercial computer location. However, there were many regulations they were working through with the BCA and they were "not there yet".

Pavek (Elert) commented that essentially, the Consortium was operating on a Cloud environment with LOGIS already.

Ebeling (Burnsville) referred to the minutes from the February 6th meeting and stated that there was reference to amending the report as well as preparing a document laying out a timeline that reflected what steps needed to be taken if it was determined that LOGIS was not the answer. Pavek (Elert) referred to Risk Mitigation dialogue on page 13. Pavek stated that there were safety checks identified along the way and the first point was March when the group could take steps to do an aggressive RFP if they didn't see or hear what they were looking for. Pavek acknowledged that it would be risky but it could be done in the timeframe prior to LOGIS turning off the current Motorola system. Pavek stated that Elert and Associates would not necessarily recommend this option but there would be the ability to prepare an RFP. Pavek then stated the next point would be once LOGIS started deploying the new product in other agencies. If the Consortium didn't like what they were seeing in system performance, Elert and Associates believe LOGIS would have to slow their implementation down which would also allow the DCC Consortium to start an aggressive RFP process. Pavek commented that not knowing the LOGIS timeline made it very difficult to create a DCC timeline.

Lind (DCC) informed members that she also followed up with Ramsey County pushing the partnership idea with them. Lind explained that in speaking with the PSAP manager, it was their belief that the only sort of partnership they were looking for would be sharing a backup server. Lind stated that Ramsey was also watching the LOGIS RFP process to see what that decision was. Lind explained that Ramsey was looking to enter into a contract with Tri-Tech and if the LOGIS Consortium made the same decision, they may approach LOGIS with a request for back-up server possibilities. Lind stated that Ramsey County stated as they had never hosted their own system, it was a big project to undertake themselves much less enter into a partnership. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he was not surprised by the feedback. Richardson stated that if the Consortium were truly interested in a partnership it could look at pursuing an opportunity more aggressively. Lind (DCC) agreed stating that was what was currently being done with the phone and audio logger systems.

Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he was surprised with the estimated partnership costs addressed in the study as it seemed much more expensive than what he was hearing.

Lind (DCC) referred to the meeting with the Law Enforcement Operations Sub-Committee and stated that at the special meeting on Monday there was considerable discussion on the short timeline as well as the need for an umbrella solution that included an RMS piece. Lind stated that there was also discussion on what the group felt was necessary if the decision were to stay with LOGIS and, along with many assurances between LOGIS and members, the response was that during the probably 5-year commitment with LOGIS, the Consortium needed to look at an overall flow of technology within the County including CAD, Mobiles, RMS, E-Ticket, Fire RMS, Community Notification and Paging as well as a complete continuity of management. Lind stated that there was a strong desire to have a consultant guide the entire review process. Shaver (West St. Paul) agreed that the group was concerned about the short timeline. Shaver acknowledged that the group understood the need for LOGIS to have a commitment in June so they could accurately negotiate and by not committing it would put the Consortium at risk of being left out or joining later at a higher cost. Shaver stated that by opting into the LOGIS commitment, it could allow more time to evaluate the possibility previously identified by Lind as well as watch the progression of CAD in the Cloud. However, there was still definite trust concerns with LOGIS as well as the feeling that members had no choice.

Johnson (Rosemount) agreed that the timeline was tight. Johnson then requested discussion on the information received by Tom Lawell from Mike Garris with LOGIS. Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the email he received today and forwarded to the group prior to the meeting that talked about LOGIS sustaining the DCC on the old system or relocating the equipment to the DCC to sustain itself on the old system. Lawell then addressed the rough estimates identified in the email adding that the DCC would likely lose out on the volume discount with any option other than opting in on the new system. Lawell reminded members that one thing LOGIS offered was a completely independent remote backup. Lawell added that LOGIS would be willing to come in and discuss the identified options further if it was the desire of the Committee. Johnson (Rosemount) requested some context to the numbers provided. Lind (DCC) stated that some of the costs were included in the amount currently paid but some would be in addition to. Richardson (Dakota County) agreed stating that there was a need for more clear numbers prior to making a decision. Lawell (Apple Valley) reminded members that either option identified in the email from LOGIS included use of Printrak which was not a long-term option. Richardson (Dakota County) acknowledged that Printrak was not a long-term solution but commented that it could be a one-year solution while the Consortium considered another option. Lind (DCC) confirmed that there were options with bringing a system in-house but cautioned that LOGIS had experienced some issues with the current system as it was aging and if, during that time, something were to go wrong, it could be a significant problem.

Ebeling (Burnsville) voiced frustration that although there were identified options, there didn't really seem to be an option because a commitment to LOGIS was required and any option other than "opting in" in was dangerous and risky. Ebeling acknowledged that LOGIS may be the best of all worlds, but he wasn't sure he was able to arrive at that decision at this point. Ebeling stated that because the Consortium was so closely tied to LOGIS, it seemed afraid to go elsewhere. Ebeling cautioned the Members should not get so tied to a vendor that they were afraid to run their own business.

Lawell (Apple Valley) stated that one take away was that the lead time on acquiring a system like this was very long compared to product lifespans so members were always in a position where they needed to start buying new sooner than desired. Lawell then asked if there was any anticipation of life span of the new system LOGIS was looking at. Lind (DCC) responded that the life cycle of a new CAD system was seven to ten years, ten years being the very outside. Lind noted that the current system in operation was past the ten year mark, which was very unusual.

Osberg (Hastings) referred to DCC leverage and LOGIS learning from their mistakes and asked

why, then, would the Consortium need an advocate/project manager if they were to go the LOGIS route. Osberg stated that it seemed conflicting. Behnke (Elert) responded that in some ways he agreed that it was a "belt and suspenders" approach. However, Elert and Associates felt it necessary for the Consortium to have an advocate between them and LOGIS to prevent issues and enhance staff during the implementation process. Pavek (Elert) stated that although Elert and Associates could fill this role, he would rather the Consortium hire a competitor than not hire anyone at all.

Osberg (Hastings) commented that he needed to revisit the timeline. Lind (DCC) informed members that the DCC Consortium had five people on the ten-person LOGIS RFP Committee, 50% of the vote.

LOGIS RFP TIMELINE:

Currently:

LOGIS RFP Committee is reviewing 6 responses to the LOGIS RFP

Week of March 11th :

LOGIS RFP Committee will identify two finalists

First two weeks in April (dates and times yet to be determined):

LOGIS will host demonstrations of the final two products. All LOGIS Public Safety Members will be invited to attend.

Week of April 15th :

Deltawrx and LOGIS RFP Committee will split, some will do site visits and others will do reference checks.

End of April – Mid-May:

Deltawrx will compile evaluations and develop a recommendation.

Mid-May:

Deltawrx will present recommendation to the LOGIS Public Safety Committee and LOGIS Board.

June:

LOGIS contract negotiations begin.

Lind stated that a DCC commitment would need to happen prior to LOGIS beginning negotiations. Osberg (Hastings) asked if the Consortium was "in" unless it opted out. Lind (DCC) clarified that at some point the DCC would have to opt in. Pavek (Elert) suggested members consider telling LOGIS they should look at negotiations two ways. The first would be to include the DCC and the second would be to exclude the DCC. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he thought the Consortium needed to let LOGIS know sooner than later so they could continue with their negotiations.

Lind (DCC) informed members that there was also an RMS piece to the LOGIS RFP process. Lind stated that there was a five-person committee reviewing the RMS piece, with one Dakota County agency (Lakeville) holding a seat on that committee. Lind explained that the RMS piece of the RFP could be part of the CAD/Mobile product but did not have to be. Lind clarified that the RMS committee had the option of determining that the best RMS product was something other than the product identified by the CAD/Mobile committee.

Osberg (Hastings) asked if there was a reluctant recommendation to stick with the LOGIS option given the lack of another option. Shaver (West St. Paul) responded that it wasn't so much reluctant as it was frustrated. Shaver explained that the Law Enforcement Operations Sub-Committee found itself in the same position with the same threat that the "plug would be pulled". Shaver stated that it was important to thoroughly research if it could be done better and if the Consortium willing to pay for it. Shaver commented that speaking on behalf of West St. Paul, DCC costs were burdensome and he was not sure he could add to those costs. Vonhof (Lakeville) agreed stating that some agencies had very strong feelings about the recent failure.

Vonhof commented that going back to the very first committee that selected LOGIS, he was amazed that the Consortium was sitting in the same position. Vonhof reminded members, however, that the failure happened thirteen months prior and it was at the direction of LOGIS public safety members to rush the LOGIS RFP process. Vonhof commented that no matter what the decision was, the Consortium needed to think about where it was going from here and if the Consortium wanted to be in the driver's seat.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if it was assumed that the product selected by LOGIS would be acceptable to the DCC Consortium. Richardson commented that if the Consortium elected not to do something different, it was basically locked-in. Lind (DCC) acknowledged that the Consortium would probably be locked into the purchase price. Lind stated that last time it was basically a five-year commitment. Richardson (Dakota County) clarified that the DCC Consortium had 50% seat on the panel and the assumption was that everyone would be happy with the end result. Richardson then questioned if there might be another option where the DCC Consortium could exercise their option one year later. Lind (DCC) acknowledged that the request could be made of through the LOGIS Steering Committee but reminded that a decision to do that would also come with some sacrifices. Lawell (Apple Valley) reminded members that LOGIS was also a joint collaborative, just like the DCC and it wasn't what LOGIS picked for the Consortium but what we pick jointly. Lawell commented that he was hopeful the DCC Consortium representatives on the LOGIS RFP Committee would be able to pick a product that would be palatable for DCC membership. Lawell acknowledged that the DCC Consortium could ask LOGIS for a price based on a late "opt-in" and that they may be willing to bid on it. Ebeling (Burnsville) then suggested consideration of asking to "opt out" on something other than the capital investment. Ebeling then suggested a year-to-year commitment on the annual maintenance. Lind (DCC) responded that she believed that would be an option as she had that conversation with Tom Folie from LOGIS earlier in the day. Lind explained if the Consortium were to commit to the capital expense and then determine in one year that it wanted out, the only commitment the Consortium would have would be the original capital expense commitment.

Mielke (Lakeville) questioned if the dual-track was still appropriate. Mielke commented that there would be about one year's time while LOGIS supported the current system where the DCC Consortium could transition away from LOGIS. Mielke questioned if it would be feasible to think the DCC Consortium could acquire and implement its own system in that time. Pavek (Elert) commented that the question was at what point to you make the decision to start another RFP process. Pavek stated that it was Elert and Associate's belief that the DCC Consortium would feel better if they waited until they had actual numbers to look at.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he was not sure he was comfortable with the CAD in the Cloud solution but if that was the way technology was going, it may be worth the time to prepare an RFP that looked like the LOGIS RFP. Pavek (Elert) stated that the DCC was currently using a cloud solution in LOGIS and if control was the issue, a cloud solution would not be the driving opportunity as the host does what is best for the total customer base.

Johnson (Rosemount) asked if there was a way the DCC Consortium could buy more time through LOGIS, the Chiefs thought looking at an internal DCC Consortium solution would be worthwhile and preferable. Vonhof (Lakeville) responded that control was a huge issue but not knowing what LOGIS was going to do made it very difficult to respond to the question. Shaver (West St. Paul) commented that he hadn't see the Chiefs more amenable to finding a unified approach than the recent meeting. Shaver stated that there was a strong interest in bringing a CAD/Mobile/RMS solution internal to the County. Lind (DCC) commented that at the DCC level there were instances where DCC staff witnessed agencies saying, "yes this is great, but can you make this exception for us". Lind stated that the DCC did that due to the desire to make everyone happy. However, that is part of the concern and there was a definite need to bring

the Chiefs together and get back to a standardization of operations originally conceptualized. Lind added that doing that would lessen the complications of the CAD system going forward. Lind acknowledged the desire for individuality but stressed the need for standardization.

Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he almost felt a responsibility to explore the options for buying time between now and commitment time at LOGIS. Johnson (Rosemount) agreed stating that the math needed to be done and a determination would need to be made if the LOGIS options presented by Mike Garris were feasible. Shaver (West St. Paul) acknowledged stating that while that was happening, the DCC Consortium should also work on a plan to prevent from being in this same situation in the future. Shaver commented that there was an immediate problem that needed to be solved but if bringing CAD/Mobiles/RMS –house didn't work out, there still needed to be a plan in place to bring someone in that would be devoted to the project and could be accountable for their findings.

King (South St. Paul) asked who had the responsibility of how this plays out if the DCC Consortium were to request an extension. Lawell (Apple Valley) responded that the vendor would price the product based on who was in the pool and that Printrak would stay alive during the conversion. Lawell questioned whether or not the DCC Consortium got a free exit at the end of that time or if there would be additional debt due to the delay.

Mielke (Lakeville) Reminded members that the RMS component was also being discussed. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that it was more about whether or not people would work together, not an actual RMS system. Mielke (Lakeville) acknowledged stating that he was expecting some discussion about the benefits of an RMS system that reintegrated members of the county. Mielke added that it seemed a premise-based solution offered more hope for an RMS solution than a LOGIS option because of past experience. However, he was still interested in keeping both options on the table at this time while there was further definition of the calendar of events showing both options and when decisions needed to be made. Mielke then stated that there were fears with either option as both had unknowns at this point. Mielke then suggested keeping both options moving forward because the Committee was not in a position to decide. Mielke commented that he did not feel the Consortium was at the point where it should go out for RFP yet. However, it should be preparing to do that.

Shaver (West St. Paul) referred to the RMS and stated that it wasn't really a technology question but a policy decision. Mielke (Lakeville) acknowledged stating that the ability was there but it was a LOGIS decision not to share information. Shaver (West St. Paul) agreed stating that LOGIS members made the policy and some LOGIS member agencies who were further away from the DCC Consortium did not see the value in sharing the information.

Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he did not think it was outside the realm of possibility for the DCC Consortium to compile the information needed and prepare for the point when a decision would need to be made.

Osberg (Hastings) commented that the decision would need to be made by the Board of Directors at their May 16th meeting. Lind (DCC) confirmed but stated that the Board of Directors was prepared to hold a special meeting if needed.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that logically, speaking with Mike Garris at LOGIS was the first and most important point as without more time, there were no other options. Johnson suggested that the DCC Consortium ask LOGIS to reconsider their RMS policy and follow with a request for a vote. Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the RMS policy and stated that LOGIS was trying to protect the integrity of the data on their system and the best way to solve that was to buy a product that everyone could live with. Lawell stated that until the integrity of the data

could be guaranteed, he didn't see the LOGIS Board changing their minds. When that discussion is held at LOGIS—logically Garris option is first and most important because no other options are available without more time. Think been told by someone somewhere what policy is but should ask for up and down vote on if they are willing to change that policy. Would like to see them vote on it. However, if that guarantee could be made, he hoped there would be the possibility of changing their minds. Vonhof (Lakeville) commented that there was a way to mirror the servers outside of the firewall but there were associated costs. Lind (DCC) suggested with advancements in the technology, there may be the ability to give sharing permissions based on log-in. Vonhof (Lakeville) agreed that the new product would have very different capabilities.

Lawell (Apple Valley) suggested during the demonstrations one of the questions be if the vendor's RMS would interact with the second RMS system being used by some of the Dakota County members. Kruchten (DCC) clarified that all responses to the RFP included an RMS piece. However, if the people reviewing the RMS piece liked Vendor A and the people reviewing the CAD/Mobile piece liked Vendor B, they could be divided. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if the current situation where the RMS data on the LOGIS system could not be shared with ProPhoenix was addressed in the RFP. Kruchten (DCC) responded that it was not an RFP issue but a Consortium issue. Kruchten explained that the DCC Consortium was not the only group to request information sharing, LETG also requested it. Kruchten added that it was the LOGIS Law Enforcement members who made the decision not to share the information because there was another way to get that information through CIBRS so the question on why build another network to share when everyone already has that capability was asked. Kruchten stated that there were costs associated with building a network to do another share. Kruchten added that the question came up at a CJIIN meeting when Ramsey County wanted to access the information so the concerns went both ways. Kruchten stated that the RFP itself did not address sharing of data outside of LOGIS.

Osberg (Hastings) asked when the DCC Consortium would have an idea of the final two RFP responses. Kruchten reiterated that the RFP Review Committee was meeting the week of March 10th to narrow responses down to two. Kruchten stated that LOGIS would then be inviting all public safety members to demonstrations the first two weeks of April. Kruchten encouraged members to send representatives, including field responders from both Law and Fire/EMS to participate in the mobile portion of the demonstrations and ask questions.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if Kruchten had a sense of how many Dakota County representatives planned to participate. Kruchten (DCC) responded that it was open to everyone. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that it was imperative that members get their staff to those demonstrations and provide feedback to the five Dakota County members on the RFP Review Committee. Lawell added that member IT staff should also be involved in those demonstrations. Kruchten (DCC) acknowledged and commented that it was going to be complex because the members on the Committee were tasked with identifying a product that would work as a total package for both CAD and Mobile users and it was important that all participants kept that in mind during demonstrations.

Mielke (Lakeville) suggested an opt-out clause may be more beneficial than a buy-in clause. Johnson (Rosemount) referred to the LOGIS email shared with the group and stated that the possibility of a 1-year buy-in was already acknowledged as a possibility so he would like to see that. Richardson (Dakota County) agreed stating that it may be at a higher price but the Consortium may be in a better position to make a decision at that time. Kruchten (DCC) commented that she understood why the Consortium would want to wait to make a commitment to LOGIS. Kruchten cautioned that waiting to commit would eliminate DCC Consortium participation in any decisions made at the beginning of the LOGIS CAD implementation process. Ebeling (Burnsville) acknowledged and stated that the group would

have to take that into consideration when making a decision, or live with it. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he couldn't imagine a group would go through all the work and then opt out afterwards.

Pavek (Elert) commented that Elert and Associates would like the opportunity to look at the options discussed in this meeting and bring that back to the group. Pavek stated that moving the equipment to the DCC and working with the current product offered a unique opportunity that could allow the Consortium to start developing their Technical Support staff as the first step to bringing a product in-house. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he felt it would be important to have the Consortium IT Directors heavily involved in that process and answer the question of if it could be done, how and at what cost. Lind (DCC) stated that the DCC had an IT workgroup that could be pulled together to have that discussion. Osberg (Hastings) commented that he was concerned about continuing the process with Elert and Associates. Osberg explained that it was inherent in the proposal that the study needed to look at what the Consortium needed to do to bring the CAD/Mobile product in-house. Pavek (Elert) acknowledged but reminded the group that Elert and Associates was tasked with a set of options and relocating the current product in-house was not one of them. Behnke (Elert) added that it also sounded as though the group now felt it was important to consider a full suite which included an RMS component. However Elert was told to exclude RMS consideration from their scope of work.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that the most important thing in this process was to have options and it really didn't seem as though there were any viable options presented yet.

Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that the April 3rd meeting would be key and that he could not envision what decisions would come about in June until receiving findings at the April meeting.

Action: Motion by Osberg (Hastings) to direct compilation of the following additional information and take the following steps in anticipation of the April Executive Committee meeting:

1. Determine what the cost would be to have continued support of the current Motorola product at LOGIS.
2. Engage the Consortium IT Directors to determine the possibility of bringing the current Motorola product in-house. Determination would include how it would be done, how it would be managed, who would manage it, and at what cost.
3. Determine what the cost would be to buy-in to the LOGIS implementation as of January, 2015.
4. Ask Elert to re-evaluate the numbers on page 10 of the current CAD Study and prepare a determination of what the cost would be for DCC development of an RFP.
5. Invite members of the Joint Operations Committee to attend the April 3rd meeting.
6. Strongly encourage a cross-section of responders from member agencies to participate in the LOGIS demonstrations the first two weeks of April.
7. Invite DCC Consortium members on the LOGIS RFP Committee to attend and provide feedback on how they feel the process is going as well as the two vendors members will have the opportunity to see at demonstrations.

Second by Johnson (Rosemount).

6. LOGIS CAD Refund Election

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) informed members that the LOGIS refund was in process and that she needed to know how members felt the DCC portion of the refund should be handled. Lind stated that there were two options. The first would be to leave the funds with LOGIS to apply towards future expenses. The second would be to request the cash back. Lind reminded members that the DCC had paid \$244,698, which was two of the five installments towards the previous CAD

project and that \$67,838 of that was interest on the debt so members could be expecting to see a DCC refund amount of \$176,860.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) asked for clarification on the \$67,838 debt responsibility. Lind (DCC) responded that there were four bonds issued for this expense, two of which could be prepaid. Lind stated that the \$67,838 debt was the DCC portion of interest on the five year funding bonds that could not be prepaid.

Action: Motion by Ebeling (Burnsville) to request the cash back option for the \$176,860 refund. Second by Osberg (Hastings). Motion passed unanimously.

Information Updates/Discussion Items

7. Executive Director's Report

Discussion:

Budget Sub-Committee – Lind (DCC) informed members that the preliminary budget process was almost complete and ready to be sent to Finance for preparation in anticipation of the May Executive Committee meeting. Lind stated that for the 2013 budget process the Executive Committee had a Budget Workgroup convene prior to presentation to review and provide feedback. Lind then asked for three volunteers to review the budget with her prior to presentation. Justin Miller, Joe Lynch and Steve Mielke volunteered to participate on the Workgroup. Lind stated that she would be in touch with all of them to schedule a meeting once the process was ready to be reviewed.

Shared Phone System – Lind (DCC) reminded members that at the February meeting there had been discussion on the possibility of a shared phone system among the nine metro-area PSAP agencies. Lind updated members stating that at their February meeting the Board of Directors approved DCC participation in the RFP process. Lind reported that two of the nine agencies were still waiting for approval from their councils but that it appeared that all nine were planning to participate in the RFP process. Lind clarified that the RFP would be to research the possibility of a shared phone system on the 911 backbone. Lind also stated that the DCC CIP had a scheduled audio logger upgrade planned for 2013 but was going to postpone that until a phone system determination was made because going into a shared environment may also allow for a shared audio logger which would decrease potential DCC costs.

Ebeling, City Manager of Burnsville – Lind (DCC) informed members that as Craig Ebeling was retiring, the March 6th meeting would be his last meeting with the DCC Executive Committee. Lind thanked Ebeling for his efforts and contribution to the Committee and the DCC.

Action: Motion by Osberg (Hastings) to formally thank Craig Ebeling, founding member of the DCC Executive Committee, for his efforts and contributions to the DCC Consortium. Second by Richardson (Dakota County). Motion passed unanimously.

Action: No action. Update only.

Other Business

8. Miscellaneous

Discussion:

No discussion.

Action: No action. Update only.

Adjourn

Action: No motion. Meeting adjourned by acclamation at 3:25 pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

April 3rd, 2013

DCC Training Room