

**Dakota Communications Center  
Executive Committee  
Meeting Minutes: 04.03.2013**

**Members Present:** Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Steve Albrecht - Burnsville; Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Dave Osberg – Eagan; Dave McKnight – Farmington; Joe Lynch, Inver Grove Heights; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Justin Miller - Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul; Sherrie Le – West St. Paul

**Members Absent:**

**Alternates Present:** Melanie Mesko Lee – Hastings

**Others Present:** Diane Lind, Jen Hildebrandt, Cheryl Pritzlaff, Rose Kruchten – DCC; Joint Operations Committee Chairs – Fire Chair BJ Jungmann, Police Chair Bud Shaver; Apple Valley Fire – Nealon Thompson; Apple Valley PD – Mike Marben; Burnsville PD – Lynn Lembcke; Eagan PD – Jim McDonald; Farmington PD – Brian Lindquist, Jim Constantineau; Inver Grove Heights Fire – Judy Thill; Inver Grove Heights PD – Larry Stanger, Josh Otis; Rosemount PD – Eric Werner; South St. Paul PD – Bill Messerich, Brian Wicke

**Call the Meeting to Order**

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

**1. Announcements**

Chair McKnight requested introductions.

**2. Additions to the Agenda**

Lind (DCC) informed members that she would like to add Telephone Denial of Service to her update.

**3. Approve Agenda**

*Consent Agenda*

**4.**

- a. **Approve minutes from the March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve February 1<sup>st</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Approve Audited 2012 Financial Report.**
- d. **Receive Operations Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes**
  - Law Enforcement Operations Sub-Committee dated March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
  - Joint Operations Committee dated March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
- e. **Receive Report on Contracts & Service Agreements Executed by Executive Director between March 6<sup>th</sup> and April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013.**

**Action:** Motion by Albrecht (Burnsville) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Lynch (Inver Grove Heights). Motion passed unanimously.

*Regular Agenda*

**5. Lease Addendum**

**Discussion:**

Lind (DCC) reminded members that in May of 2012 they approved an addendum to the DCC lease agreement with Dakota County to lease part of the current storage room back to the County for use by Dakota County Facilities personnel. Lind informed members that the

addendum, written by Jay Stassen on behalf of the County, allowed facilities to use 600 square feet of the room at a cost of \$800 per month. Lind stated that Roger Knutsen reviewed the addendum on behalf of the DCC. Lind confirmed that the funds were accounted for in the 2013 budget.

**Action:** Motion by Le (West St. Paul) to approve the lease addendum. Second by Albrecht (Burnsville). Motion passed unanimously.

## **6. CAD/MDC**

### **Discussion:**

Lind (DCC) directed attention to the background on page 81 of the Executive Committee packet and the memo on page 82 reminding members that at the March meeting there were a number of parts to the motion on how to proceed with the CAD/MDC project. Lind informed members that in addition to the background and attachments found in the packet, she and BJ Battig from Dakota County worked to compile a Metro Region Summary Sheet that was provided in handout form to the group.

Lind (DCC) directed attention to page 82 of the packet stating that the first point staff was directed to address was making a determination on what the cost would be to have LOGIS continue support of the current Motorola product. Lind stated that the cost of LOGIS support for 2013 was \$545,389 and as the guidance of LOGIS personnel, it was assumed that there would be an approximate 3% increase on that support in 2014 and again in 2015. Lind stated that if the use of the current product were to continue into 2016, that amount was estimated to increase to between \$800,000 and \$950,000 as the DCC Consortium would be the sole user needing single agency support. Lind explained that the cost would cover software, server and staff support expenses at LOGIS.

Lind (DCC) reminded that the discussion on continuing LOGIS support on the current product led to another direction by the Executive Committee, which was to engage member IT Directors to determine the possibility of bringing the current Motorola product in-house and supporting the CAD/Mobiles internally. Lind (DCC) informed members that the minutes from that discussion that was held on March 15<sup>th</sup> were in the packet starting on page 86. Lind reported that feedback from that meeting was confirmation that yes, moving the product to the DCC and servicing CAD/Mobiles internally could be done. However, the question of if it should be done was raised. Lind stated that the IT representatives at the meeting did not believe the servers should be relocated from LOGIS stating that servers were very sensitive and could be damaged in the move. Lind reiterated that the group acknowledged that it could be done, but that they did not believe it was the best choice as reinstall and recertification of the servers alone could be a \$50,000 expense. Lind added that the IT group believed the costs to maintain the servers and Printrak software would be approximately \$300,000 which did not include costs for additional staffing. Lind stated that in the meeting, the IT group felt IT staffing needs would be anywhere from 5 full-time employees to 8 full-time employees based on 24 hour coverage and servicing both CAD and Mobiles at an expense ranging anywhere from \$305,000 to \$490,000. Lind continued reporting that the IT group stated there were also other expenses that they could not really quantify in terms of dollars such as additions to MDC functions and costs of a secondary server location that had appropriate security according to BCA regulations. Lind stated that when asked for a possible timeline for moving equipment and implementing within the DCC Consortium the IT Group felt it would be 24 months based on hiring and training needs. Lind summarized that the IT meeting consensus was that although it was possible to move the equipment and service of the current Printrak product to the DCC Consortium, it was not recommended.

Lind (DCC) referred to the third item in the motion she was directed to address which was determining what the costs would be to buy into the LOGIS implementation as of January,

2015. Lind stated that Mike Garris commented that it was not possible to determine initial or future costs as no vendor had been identified and no contract negotiations had started. However, it would likely be around \$800,000. Garris explained that would be largely due to the need for additional staffing needs to support the DCC on the current Printrak as current LOGIS staff would be focusing on the new product.

Lind (DCC) informed members that the final point she was directed to address was evaluating the costs to develop a CAD/MDC RFP for the DCC. Lind referred to the Metro Region CAD handout provided at the meeting and stated that as part of this consideration, she wanted to address what the neighboring communities were currently doing and what RFP or other opportunities may arise. Lind reviewed the handout which detailed where neighboring communities were in their software processes. Lind stated that in addition to the information on the handout, there were a few key points that she wanted to bring member attention to.

1. Anoka County had identified Tritech as their CAD vendor of choice and commented that if the LOGIS vendor selection process also identified Tritech as the vendor of choice, they would consider engaging LOGIS for future support, which could potentially bring DCC costs down.
2. In the past week, Ramsey County communicated that they were looking at possibly developing an RFP for managed technical support services. Lind reported that if this were to happen, Ramsey County stated they would create the RFP to allow for other agencies. Possibly Anoka County, Minneapolis and Dakota County to "piggyback" on to the agreement. Lind clarified that each agency would retain their own servers and software. However, they would share technical support services, which could decrease costs.
3. Minneapolis currently used the Tritech product and contracted out for their managed services at a cost of 1.5 million dollars. Lind stated that Minneapolis reported many benefits from a CAD management of this nature but also that they were not a priority for their current services provider and they were considering the "piggyback" option mentioned by Ramsey County.

Lind (DCC) informed members that Washington County had an experience similar to the LOGIS Consortium where they implemented a product that did not meet their needs. Lind stated that Washington County was in month 51 of their 60 month process and it was anticipated their timeline would be pushed back.

Lind (DCC) commented that although the timeline was trending towards 60 months, given the fact that LOGIS and neighboring PSAPS were already engaged in processes, she believed the timeline for the DCC to go out for RFP and possibly implement a product internally would be closer to 36 months.

Lind (DCC) referred to the LOGIS consortium and commented that one advantage observed by being part of the consortium was that LOGIS had its site in Golden Valley with a secondary site in Brooklyn Center. Lind reminded members that if a product were to be brought internal to the DCC Consortium, there would be the need for that secondary site that was held to BCA regulations. Lind acknowledged that it could be done but commented that when there was a failure on the main, there would be the need for an automatic fail-over. Lind added that given the complexity of DCC Consortium use of CAD, there would be the need to for a Tier-1 product which was a larger system with bigger names. Lind acknowledged that the field of vendors decreased significantly after identifying some necessary parameters.

Lind (DCC) referred to the opportunity to "piggy-back" on a Ramsey County RFP for managed services and acknowledged that if the decision were to bring a product in-house, and that

product was Tri-Tech, there may be possibly cost savings. She cautioned, however, that this option was a moving target as it was in very preliminary discussions.

Lind (DCC) also reminded members that it was necessary to consider Consortium mutual aid partners like Allina, Bloomington, Rice-Steele and Washington County and potential operational savings and CAD efficiencies. Lind stated that Bloomington and Rice-Steele were both currently on the LOGIS product allowing immediate sharing of information and eliminating that phone call.

Lind (DCC) referred to the DCC CAD Option Summary which was the third page of the handout and acknowledged current LOGIS/Printrak costs of approximately \$624,000 stating that \$520,000 of that was for CAD Software/Hardware and \$104,000 covered internet support, payroll software, website support, video conferencing, EMD and OET which was the state connection to the BCA and FBI. Lind acknowledged that in some cases, there may be duplicated costs but there was also possibly savings in consolidated effort. Lind stated that the costs listed for 2014 and 2015 were anticipated budget costs going forward. Lind referred to the 2016 LOGIS Printrak product and acknowledged that increase was the anticipated increase mentioned earlier if the DCC were to continue on Printrak service through LOGIS as a stand-alone agency.

Lind (DCC) addressed the possible expenses identified by Elert & Associates for a stand-alone in-house system starting at \$785,000 in 2014. Lind acknowledged possible variance in the pricing. Lind added that Elert & Associates stated staying with LOGIS on the new product would cost approximately \$840,000 but Mike Garris stated that he believed that would be worst case scenario and that he would estimate costs closer to \$720,000 which would reflect savings.

Lind (DCC) referred to the possibility of buying into the LOGIS product at a later date and stated that costs would be higher than what they are today by 30 – 50%. Lind directed member attention to the last sentence of point #3 on page 84 in the packet.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) referred to page 82 of the packet and stated that the 2013 LOGIS CAD option was stated to be \$525,000. However, on the handout, that amount was listed under the 2014 column. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that there was an adjustment made based on the LOGIS costs received after the packet went out and reflected on the handout.

Mielke (Lakeville) asked which neighboring PSAP was most similar to the DCC in terms of complexity. Lind (DCC) responded that Anoka County was most like the DCC. Lind clarified that although Anoka was smaller than the DCC Consortium, the similarity was based on the number of Law Enforcement and Fire Agencies they support. Lind continued stating that Ramsey County would be the next neighboring PSAP in similarity to the DCC and that was based on the fact that they also service St. Paul. Lind acknowledged that Ramsey was larger than the DCC in terms of users and CAD work stations. Mielke (Lakeville) commented that none of the neighboring PSAPS were organized the way the DCC was organized. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that the Anoka County governance was run through the County Attorney's Office and the County Attorney was the chair of their Board. Lind stated that Ramsey County, who also managed St. Paul, was run through the County as was Washington County. Lind stated that Minneapolis was a stand-alone agency within the City and Hennepin was a stand-alone entity within their Sheriff's Department.

Lawell (Apple Valley) thanked staff for the data and the layout of the information. Lawell asked for clarification on the Washington County similar experience to the DCC. Lind (DCC) clarified that Washington County was on a 60 month track. However, 18 of those months were lost after implementing a product that did not perform as desired. Lind stated that Washington County then went with Tiburon.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked for clarification on the LOGIS process. Richardson questioned LOGIS's need for a statement of intent without available pricing. Lind (DCC) explained that LOGIS needed to know which agencies intended to participate in the new product implementation before they negotiated a contract as pricing was based on the number of licenses. Lind acknowledged that Mike Garris had an idea of non-negotiated pricing which allowed him to provide estimates for this discussion. However, he did not share those numbers nor was he participating in the process. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that the LOGIS Executive Committee had not met specifically on this topic recently but he too raised the question with Mike Garris and received the same response as Diane Lind had. Lawell commented that Mike Garris felt that the prices provided may decrease down as low as \$720,000 per year. Lawell stated that he had received no indication from Mike Garris that the Consortium would be negatively surprised. Lawell added that Deltawrx would be assisting in the contract negotiations. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that he would like to know a worst case scenario. Richardson added that he would like to know what would happen if the DCC stated intent to participate in the project and then decided to withdraw. Miller (Mendota Heights) agreed asking if the statement of intent was binding. Members requested Mike Garris be invited into the meeting to address some of these questions.

Osberg (Eagan) commented that it appeared the recommendation was to stay with LOGIS. Osberg then asked if the group talked about contracting a consultant to serve as a DCC Consortium advocate. Lind (DCC) responded that there was a desire to have representation that could provide some assurances. Lind then referred to the members of the LOGIS RFP Workgroup and asked them to provide some feedback on how the process had been going.

Jungmann (Burnsville Fire) informed members that he felt Deltawrx was keeping everyone on task and was also very knowledgeable. Jungmann admitted that he was not on the last selection committee but that this process, which had much information to sift through, seemed to be very organized. Jungmann added that the group had only seen half of the first product demonstration but the system looked very promising. Jungmann stated that the current product being demonstration, Integraph, was able to handle multiple PSAP needs.

Kruchten (DCC) stated that the memo on page 82 of the packet encapsulated where the LOGIS project came from and where it was currently at. Kruchten stated that the current demo was going well and Integraph was able to provide options for all questions and concerns raised.

Mike Garris arrived in the meeting and Chair McKnight (Farmington) asked him if the DCC Consortium was to commit to the LOGIS project and after knowing costs, there was a timeframe where it could opt out. Garris (LOGIS) responded that LOGIS was looking for at least a verbal statement that would allow LOGIS to determine the number of licenses it had to negotiate with. Garris stated that he did not want to negotiate with a vendor in bad faith. Garris stated that he believed LOGIS would have an idea of costs in May and at that time, they would do a set of budgets for 2014 and estimated 2015 based on the identified needs, which would be available to members by the end of May. Garris stated that if the numbers were acceptable, he would assume that members would state their intent. Garris acknowledged that legally, members had the ability to opt out until June 15<sup>th</sup>. Garris added that the DCC Consortium could remain with LOGIS for 2014 and then pull out of the project. However, opting out after negotiating would require LOGIS to renegotiate and costs could negatively impact the LOGIS partners. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that the information provided by Mike Garris helped a lot and that it did not appear as though any decision needed to be made at the current meeting. Richardson assured that he did not believe the group would make a statement of intent without good faith. However, it was reassuring knowing the option of opting out was available.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) referred to the indication that if the DCC Consortium opted out of the new product with LOGIS it could expect to see a 30 – 50% price increase. Lynch then asked if the DCC Consortium opted out the other LOGIS members would expect to see that 30 – 50% price differential. Garris (LOGIS) confirmed that the other LOGIS participants would see added costs and that LOGIS would renegotiate with the vendor in hopes they could minimize the impact. Garris acknowledged that the other LOGIS participants would likely see a significant cost increase if the DCC did not participate.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked Garris to comment on the numbers he had seen in the vendor responses. Garris (LOGIS) commented that he needed to have an idea of potential costs in order to look at some projections. However, he was not involved in any of the RFP or vendor evaluation process. Garris stated that there could be a 10% differential but the Consortium should not see a significantly larger dollar amount assigned to the DCC. Garris admitted that the bids were significantly complex and that he would be looking to Deltawrx to help evaluate the different modules and operations cost components. Lawell (Apple Valley) then asked Garris to comment on implementation and when the DCC may make its move. Garris (LOGIS) responded that he believed the DCC Consortium would be looking at implementation sometime in the first three quarters of 2015. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if Printrak would remain viable until that date. Garris (LOGIS) confirmed. Garris stated that there would be a significant expenditure out of the LOGIS fund balance dollars to upgrade the current CAD system and ensure they maintain until that time. Garris added that LOGIS was not aware of any sunset dates for the Printrak product over the next few years so there should be no issue.

Mielke (Lakeville) asked if the DCC Consortium were to opt in, how long the commitment on the product would be. Garris (LOGIS) responded that it depended on how long the pay-back period was. Garris reminded the Committee that members could get out of LOGIS any year as there was no continued contractual commitment. However, the methodology of the new product was to spread the cost out over a five year period so the desire would be to have commitment during that time. Garris stated that members would not get their return on investment if they were to opt out a couple years down the road as members would still owe their obligation for the assessment for the software and hardware. Mielke (Lakeville) clarified that the year to year commitment was on the maintenance of the product. Garris (LOGIS) confirmed.

Albrecht (Burnsville) commented that he was reassured knowing the Consortium had an out if anything went wrong.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked Lind to repeat what she said about the potential for piggybacking on the Ramsey RFP. Lind (DCC) informed members that if CAD/Mobiles were brought in-house, and if the product choice was Tritech, there may be the opportunity to share maintenance staff support through an RFP process. Lind stated that similar to the DCC, Ramsey County did not have the Technical staff to support an infrastructure at this time. Lind stated that Ramsey was looking at having a management company do their infrastructure maintenance and support their servers and hardware. Richardson (Dakota County) asked if that was something Lind thought the Consortium should be thinking about. Lind (DCC) confirmed that the Consortium should certainly continue to participate in the conversations. Lind stated that Ramsey County was going ahead with the RFP and writing it in such a manner that others could possibly piggyback on to the service. Richardson (Dakota County) asked if the participants would have their own servers and just the support would be shared. Lind (DCC) confirmed and added that there may be the opportunity to share backup space also.

Miller (Mendota Heights) asked if Ramsey County is aware that this may be something the DCC Consortium would be interested in. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that the PSAP Managers from Ramsey, Anoka and Dakota Counties, and Minneapolis had spoken about it and Ramsey County

was proceeding with their IT staff and Legal department to evaluate how this might play out. Lind assured that the DCC was not committed to anything at this point.

Mielke (Lakeville) commented that it sounded as though Anoka and Ramsey Counties may have their costs by the first part of May which may allow the DCC Consortium the ability to see how those costs look compared to the DCC Consortium operation. Mielke asked if either of them were purchasing with the ability to add on additional agencies. Lind (DCC) responded that they were not and both were only considering shared system management. Lind stated that Anoka County was looking at an end to end solution from time of phone pickup all the way through the court system. Le (West St. Paul) stated that because they are currently on a DOS based system, they will likely require more training. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that their transition costs would likely be higher.

Osberg (Eagan) asked for some discussion on development of a long-term play. Lind (DCC) responded that there had been discussions about looking at how Ticketwriter and RMS play a CAD/Mobile product. Lind stated that putting together an end to end solution for a continuum of information was desired among the Consortium. Lind stated that internal to the DCC there were communications changes that would play into the CAD system.

McKnight (Farmington) referred to the desire for a DCC advocate in the LOGIS process. Albrecht (Burnsville) asked about Deltawrx. Lind (DCC) stated that Deltawrx was hired by LOGIS to work through the process with LOGIS. Lind added that Deltawrx was also the vendor contracted by Anoka and Ramsey Counties for their processes. Lind stated that there had been discussions about contracting a project management group to assist. Messerich (South St. Paul PD) confirmed that had been discussed as part of the product implementation. Jungmann (Burnsville Fire) commented that Deltawrx was only on contract with LOGIS through the contract negotiations. Jungmann agreed that he thought it would be in the DCC Consortium's best interest to have an advocate during implementation. Lind (DCC) also agreed. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that it was his impression that LOGIS wanted to evaluate vendor experience and then make a decision of if there was a need for additional project management assistance. Lawell commented that he wasn't sure project implementation was as much a specialty for Deltawrx that that didn't change the fact that the DCC may need representation. Osberg (Eagan) agreed and commented that the decision about the need for an advocate was probably months out. Albrecht (Burnsville) agreed with waiting to see the system and making a determination down the road. Mielke (Lakeville) stated that before a decision was made, he would like to have a scope of work defined for the advocate. Mielke stated that he would like an update on the Anoka and Ramsey County processes at the May Executive Committee meeting. Lind (DCC) agreed stating that she would expect that Ramsey County would have their numbers in May but she was not sure about Anoka County. Richardson (Dakota County) suggested engaging the IT Directors to assist in advocate discussions. Lind (DCC) agreed stating that she would engage both the IT Directors and the Operations Committee.

Osberg (Eagan) commented that it did not sound as though there was a need for any action and until action was taken otherwise, the Consortium would stay on track with the LOGIS project. Mielke (Lakeville) agreed. Johnson (Rosemount) commented that he did not think there was the need for any motion until May.

McKnight (Farmington) recapped that there would be no action taken at the current meeting but that it sounded as though the Consortium was leaning towards continuing with LOGIS. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if LOGIS needed anything from the Consortium now. Lind (DCC) clarified that they requested a phone call. Lind added that the DCC would need something to base the budget process on. Lind stated that she would bring an update on the Anoka and Ramsey County processes to the May meeting.

Mielke (Lakeville) thanked everyone for their efforts and the work put into this discussion.

Lindquist (Farmington PD) asked what would happen if the LOGIS selection process identified a product that the DCC Consortium would select. Thompson (Apple Valley Fire) agreed asking what would happen if the DCC Consortium were to determine it could implement the product at a lower cost than the LOGIS partnership. Mielke (Lakeville) responded stating that if Tritech works for Anoka and Ramsey and they are most like the DCC, having that information may give the DCC Consortium a hint of what it would cost to bring the product in-house. Albrecht (Burnsville) acknowledged that it sounded as though that option was still on the table. Lindquist (Farmington PD) suggested possibly negotiation for ownership of the licenses from LOGIS if the DCC Consortium were to go on its own. Lind (DCC) stated that she did not know how to answer the question since she had not been involved in any of the negotiations.

Werer (Rosemount PD) thanked the Executive Committee for keeping the possibility of bringing a product in-house on the forefront even if the decision were to proceed with LOGIS for the time. Werner then asked about the possibility of setting a timetable to begin a study of bringing a product in house. McKnight (Farmington) commented that he did not have an issue with starting that process. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that there was the need to evaluate the monetary aspect of a decision to bring a product in-house. Lawell stated that cities in the Metro area have not necessarily found a cheaper option in a stand-alone product. Lawell added that he would want to look at economics and make sure the Consortium was getting a better price by bringing a product in-house.

Shaver (West St. Paul PD) commented that there was a level of frustration in not having options. Shaver suggested that the group might need to consider that an RFP process is different than implementing a plan to bring a product in-house and implementing a plan is something that the Consortium may want to start working on now so five years from now the plan can be acted on. Shaver referred to the P1 failure stating that he would like to avoid any similar experiences going forward.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked if there was anything that may be beneficial to have at the next meeting in terms of conditions of DCC Consortium participation in case the decision were to get out early? Mielke (Lakeville) commented that it sounded as though the Consortium could get out anytime, but would still be committed to the identified costs. Mielke then questioned if there might be some way to get those costs waived or reduced. Lind (DCC) agreed to do some research by engaging legal counsel. Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) suggested a condition going into the agreement based on product failure or unsatisfactory performance that would allow for cost avoidance. Thompson (Apple Valley Fire) commented that licensing was a big component of buying into a product and the DCC Consortium could go into the LOGIS process with the understanding that the DCC owns and maintains the CAD/Mobile licenses if the decision were to opt out. Werner (Rosemount PD) agreed stating that the Consortium would also take the debt with it. Thompson (Apple Valley) added that the Consortium would want to take all that it had paid for.

**Action:** No action. Discussion only.

### ***Information Updates/Discussion Items***

#### **7. Executive Director's Report**

##### **Discussion:**

Budget – Lind (DCC) informed members that the budget committee was scheduled to meet on April 15<sup>th</sup> and review the first draft of the budget. Lind acknowledged that the CAD piece of the CIP was still unknown but the budget overall was looking good. Lind stated that members of the workgroup would be receiving a copy of the budget as soon as it was available from DCC

Fiscal Agent.

LMCIT on Telephone Denial of Service – Lind (DCC) informed members that there was a new internet program that captured telephones and flooded phone systems. Lind stated it was a new extortion scheme that the FBI was watching very closely. Lind explained how the scheme worked and stated that it had happened to a business in Farmington and the Bloomington PSAP. Lind informed members that DCC Law Enforcement partners had been requested to notify the FBI if they have any reports of this scheme. Lind stated that on the DCC front, she had been working with 911 service provider CenturyLink to put efforts into place that would immediately address an event if it were to happen to DCC phone lines. Mielke (Lakeville) asked if the source of the scheme was in the US or foreign. Lind (DCC) responded that the FBI and Homeland security were both involved and although they didn't know where the source was from, some foreign accents had been identified.

Richardson (Dakota County) referred to an increasing number of prank calls that were diverting resources. Lind (DCC) responded that was known as "swatting" and there had only been one incident in Dakota County that she was aware of. Lind stated that "swatting" was when a third party called and reported a significant event that required Law Enforcement and SWAT involvement. The third party would then stand by and watch the event play out. Richardson (Dakota County) asked if the call was traceable. Lind (DCC) responded that it was only traceable if the caller was not using a disposable phone. Lind added that the best information Dispatch could provide was the latitude and longitude of the call which should provide a 1,000 foot perimeter.

**Action:** No action. Update only.

### *Other Business*

#### **Miscellaneous**

Chair McKnight (Farmington) noted that the next meeting, scheduled for May 1<sup>st</sup>, was in conflict with another event. Members agreed to move the meeting date to May 8<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm. The location is yet to be determined based on the size of the agenda. DCC staff will send out a meeting change notification.

**Action:** No action.

#### **Adjourn**

**Action:** Motion by Mielke (Lakeville) to adjourn. Second by Richardson (Dakota County). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:54pm.

#### **Next Regular Meeting:**

May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013

2:00 pm

Location: TBD