

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 09.04.2013**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Heather Johnston – Burnsville; Dave Osberg – Eagan; Dave McKnight – Farmington; Melanie Mesko-Lee - Hastings; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Justin Miller - Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul; Matt Fulton – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights

Alternates Present: BJ Jungmann - Burnsville

Others Present: Diane Lind, Cheryl Pritzlaff, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Bud Shaver, BJ Jungmann – Joint Operations Committee Co-Chairs

Call the Meeting to Order

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

1. Announcements

None

2. Roll Call

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion:

None

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to approve the agenda. Second by Miller (Mendota Heights). Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the August 7th, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve Paid Claims.**
 - **July 1st – 31st, 2013**
- c. **Approve Unaudited Financial Report.**
 - **July, 2013**
- d. **Receive Operations Committee Meeting Minutes**
 - **August 29th LE Operations Sub-Committee Meeting**
 - **August 29th Fire/EMS Operations Committee Meeting**
- e. **Receive Report on Contracts & Service Agreements Executed by Executive Director between August 7th and September 4th, 2013.**

Action: Motion by Mesko Lee (Hastings) to approve the consent Agenda. Second by Johnson (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Action Items

No action items

Information Updates/Discussion Items

5. Shared Telephone System Update

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) reported that responses to the MESB phone RFP were due by August 20th. Lind informed members that there were seven responses received and one of them was thrown out right away as non-compliant as it was only a letter with a price attached. Lind stated that the remaining six responses were evaluated on three criteria, technical and operations suitability, vendor experience with Next Generation 911 and A911 Backbone and Delivery Schedule and Costs. Lind stated that a second response was eliminated at that time as they had no 911 experience. Lind informed members that review of the five remaining responses in process and was more detailed to include operational benefits, how they interact with State systems, costs, installation timelines and ongoing maintenance. Lind stated that those responses that pass this review will be asked to provide manufacturer demonstrations that would be attended by dispatchers and supervisors from the ten participating agencies. Lind clarified that the group was requesting manufacturer demonstrations as three of the responses were from agencies who were bidding the same hardware product. Lind reported that the costs received were much higher than anticipated but that the group thought that may be because the costs included infrastructure that was already in place as the PSAPs. Lind stated that the MESB was working to clarify that information.

Lind (DCC) referred to the JPA and that the group would be evaluating costs and cost recover for the two data centers. Lind reminded members that the DCC was one of the proposed data centers and that it would involve swapping out two racks in the data room for two different racks and those costs would be shared by the ten participating agencies. Lind added that the JPA also needed to provide assurance that the racks and equipment on them didn't come under the DCC Insurance umbrella, but the Telephone JPA insurance plan.

Mielke (Lakeville) referred to the Primary and Secondary PSAPS identified and asked who they were specifically. Lind (DCC) clarified that they were Allina, Carver County, the DCC, Edina, Hennepin County, Minneapolis, Ramsey County, Ridgeview Medical Center and the University of Minnesota. Lind explained that Hennepin County and the DCC were the identified Data Center locations because of capability and location. Mielke (Lakeville) asked if the pricing was compared to a private sector option. Lind (DCC) confirmed and said that currently the costs were coming in higher than the private sector option, but explained that was possibly due to some confusion that was being worked through. Lind reminded members that the RFP requested bids for the entire system covering all 10 PSAPS as well as the 10 PSAPS individually. Lind reported that the pricing the DCC received was coming in approximately \$100,000 over the quote given one year ago for budgeting purposes.

Johnston (Burnsville) asked Lind to provide a bit of history so she could better understand the \$100,000 discrepancy. Lind (DCC) clarified that the current DCC provider provided estimated equipment replacement pricing for budgeting for capital improvements. Johnston (Burnsville) then referred to bringing in the manufacturers for presentations and asked if the RFP responders were third party vendors. Lind (DCC) confirmed stating that the responding entities would provide the installation and maintenance services on the manufacturer product. Johnston (Burnsville) asked if when the proposals were broken down, the information received was comparable. Johnston clarified that she assumed with the same equipment in three of the five responses, the comparisons would be on the costs, time and installation factors. Lind (DCC) confirmed. Johnston (Burnsville) then asked if the group had enough data on the equipment. Lind (DCC) responded that the group was still working through the information.

Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the role of PSC Alliance in the RFP process and asked if they included what equipment/software the phone equipment would need to be able to interface with. Lind (DCC) confirmed that was in the RFP, but clarified that response to some follow up inquiries may have caused confusion. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if PSC Alliance was representing the group or just DCC. Lind (DCC) responded that PSC Alliance had been engaged by the MESB to release the RFP.

Action: No action. Update only.

6. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

CAD – Lind (DCC) reported that LOGIS would be meeting with TriTech on September 10th to review the acceptance testing plan. Lind stated that LOGIS originally requested extending testing before final acceptance of the program but TriTech had come back with a 30 day test plan after the first PSAP, the second PSAP and the DCC. Lind informed members that LOGIS would be looking to negotiate a minimum 60 day testing period. Lind informed members that LOGIS and TriTech would also be reviewing the Statement of Work but there had been no details shared on that yet.

PCAD – Lind (DCC) reported that CAD and Mobiles would be down on October 9th for eight to twelve hours during which time dispatch staff would be using paper and pencil. Lind assured that both Law Enforcement and Fire/EMS representation had been notified and would continue to be reminded that their responders would need to be equipped with paper and pencils during that time as there would be limited resources during that time. Mielke (Lakeville) asked for the reason for the shutdown. Lind (DCC) reminded members that the current CAD servers needed to be replaced in order to host PCAD for the next 12 to 18 months. Lind stated there was no warranty or extended maintenance available for the servers any longer and replacement was necessary. Lind stated that LOGIS staff would be at the DCC during that time as there was the need to physically touch each computer, as well as each MDC to get everything back online. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if the DCC would be treating this downtime like an emergency preparedness event. Lind (DCC) confirmed. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that about half of their law enforcement responders had previous experience with pen and paper and his Chief was looking at this as a training opportunity. Lind (DCC) informed members that weekly reminders would be sent out to ensure everyone is prepared. Lind stated that the DCC would have access to DVS, but it may take longer to get information. Lind added that officers would have less access than the DCC staff but that all access would be limited.

Contract Negotiations – Lind (DCC) reported that negotiations had started with both the dispatcher and the supervisor groups. Lind informed members that David McKnight, Cheryl Pritzlaff and Kevin Rupp were representing the DCC in both negotiations.

Active shooter trainer – Lind (DCC) reported that in an effort to develop a dispatcher active shooter protocol, DCC supervisory staff invited members DCC dispatch, MAAG, Burnsville Swat and Fire/EMS Operations to participate in a workgroup to discuss active shooter events from all responder perspectives and assist in creation of the protocol. Lind informed members that the DCC had been participating in some member active shooter trainings and Supervisors Rose Kruchten and Doris Lake were attending agency meetings in an effort to share the protocol with responders and provide them with information on what they can expect from the DCC if such an event were to occur. Lind stated that the intent was to meet with command staff from all member agencies and Kruchten and Lake were about half way through the consortium. Lind informed members that the DCC was the only PSAP to have developed a protocol and was being asked to share the material with surrounding agencies. Lind applauded Kruchten, Lake and DCC staff for their efforts. Lind reported that most recently the DCC participated in a 3Echo training in Lakeville that involved all of the Lakeville teaching staff. Lind commented that one of the Lakeville teachers commented that it was the best training they had in a number of years. Mielke (Lakeville) agreed that the training was pretty powerful. Lind informed members that Kruchten and Lake would be meeting with Inver Grove Heights in the next couple of weeks.

Action: No action. Update only.

Other Business

Miscellaneous

Discussion:

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked for some information on staffing levels. Lawell referred to the recent Law Enforcement Operations Sub-Committee meeting minutes that stated staffing was at an all-time low and recent recruiting efforts had not been very productive. Lind (DCC) commented that the DCC was having the same experience other centers were having, struggling to get candidates through the testing and background process. Pritzlaff (DCC) informed member that the most recent effort specifically was difficult as there were eight scheduled interviews that resulted in only one actual interview. Pritzlaff stated that three cancelled prior to their interviews, two didn't show up and two failed their typing tests. Mielke (Lakeville) commented that some of the technical colleges were considering picking up some curriculum. Lind (DCC) acknowledged stating that Century College was one of them and would have their first classes starting in the fall. Lind stated that she had been working with Century College in an effort to foster a good working relationship and hopefully get some good candidates in the DCC doors. Lind informed members that Minnesota was one of fifteen states that had no required licensing or certifications for dispatchers. Fulton (West St. Paul) asked where the DCC was currently recruiting. Lind (DCC) responded that the DCC used APCO, NENA, the League of Minnesota Cities, Dakota County Vo-Tech and other PSAP agencies. Mielke (Lakeville) asked if the DCC had ever thought of using member agencies. Lind (DCC) responded that the DCC had never considered that but that it would be very welcome assistance if members would consider putting a link on their employment page to the DCC. Fulton (West St. Paul) asked if the DCC had used any workforce centers. Lind (DCC) responded that the DCC had not. Fulton (West St. Paul) suggested Dakota Scott Workforce Investment Board. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if any Veteran organizations had been contacted. Lind confirmed that she would look into the workforce suggestion and assured that she had been in contact with some Veteran organization contacts.

October 2nd, 2013 Meeting – McKnight (Farmington) reminded members that the time for the next meeting, October 2nd, 2013, was changed to 3:00 pm.

Action: No action. Update only.

Adjourn

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to adjourn. Second by Mielke (Lakeville). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:16 pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

October 2nd, 2013

3:00pm

DCC Training Room