Inter-Agency Cooperation Group

Camden PD – Rockland PD – Rockport PD – Thomaston PD – Knox County (KRCC, DA, Sheriff, Admin/IT)

A meeting of the Inter-Agency Cooperation Agreement Group Committee took place on Tuesday, October 19, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the Knox County Commission Hearing Room.

Committee members in attendance: Knox County Administrator Andrew Hart; Chief Bruce Boucher, Rockland PD; Chief Mark Kelley, Rockport PD; Chief Phil Roberts, Camden PD and Chief Kevin Haj, Thomaston PD.

Others in attendance: Knox County CIO/CSO Jeff Lake*; Knox County Technical Support Specialist Mike Dean*; KRCC Supervisor Stephanie Gibbs; and Knox County Executive Office Administrative Assistant Candice Richards.

Committee members not in attendance: KRCC Director Linwood Lothrop; Knox County DA's Office Legal Secretary/Systems Administrator Kelly Perry; and Knox County Sheriff Donna Dennison *(came in at 11:04 am and therefore was only present for the last 4 minutes of the meeting)*

AGENDA

Tuesday – October 19, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.

I.   10:00   Meeting Called To Order by Committee Chair

II.   10:01   Approval of Minutes
      1. September 21, 2010

III.   10:02   Discussion Items
      1. Clarification of IT Staff's Advisory Capacity to the Committee (Jeff).
      2. Issue of Voting by Proxy for Absent Committee Members (Mark).
      3. Update on letter (& contract copy) to Spillman re: contact/authority (Andy).
      4. Update from County Administrator re: grant money in reserves (Andy).
      5. Update on Spillman employee helping to find Homeland Security grants (Mark & Jeff).
      6. Items for November's meeting agenda.

IV.   10:50   Other Business

V.   11:00   Adjourn

I.   Meeting called to order
Chief Boucher called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

II.   Approval of Minutes
Chief Kelley asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

- A motion was made by Chief Haj to approve the September 21, 2010 minutes as written. Chief Boucher seconded the motion. A vote was taken with all in favor (4 voters present at the meeting: Chief Kelley, Chief Haj, Chief Roberts, and Chief Boucher.)

III.   Discussion Items
Chief Kelley asked if anyone had anything that needed to be added to the agenda.

<u>Spillman Access for State Police Troop D</u>
Chief Boucher brought up the issue of whether or not the Board should make a decision on the level of access is given to Troop D of the Maine State Police or if the matter should wait until the Lieutenant from Troop D could attend a meeting to discuss it. The Lieutenant was unable to attend today's meeting because of a family member having a serious health issue.

The consensus of the Group was that since both sides had already waited this long, it was worth putting off the decision until the Lieutenant could attend in person. Not all agencies had spoken to the Lieutenant personally, so it seemed best to have him attend the next meeting on November 16th. Chief Boucher was asked to contact the Lieutenant again and see if he would be able to attend.

1. <u>Clarification of IT Staff's Advisory Capacity to the Committee</u>
    Chief Kelley referred the Board to *Section 8.0: Technical Advisors* of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement:

    8.0   <u>TECHNICAL ADVISORS</u>

    The Knox County Information Technology Department shall serve as the technical advisors to the Board. The Board shall oversee and direct the activities of the technical advisors with respect to the shared database. The technical advisors shall give advice to the Board as required and requested by the Board. The technical advisors shall prepare and present a report to the Board at each Board meeting as provided in Section 7.1.2, and at other times as requested and directed by the Board. The technical advisors shall be responsible for administering the database, including ensuring that integrity standards as set by the Board are followed, that personnel have access to tables and screens necessary, ensuring data backup, software patching and other safeguards against corruption of data. The technical advisors shall recommend to the Board security standards and enforcement mechanisms.

    This was just to make sure that there was no confusion as to the purpose that the IT staff serve to the Board.

2. <u>Issue of Voting by Proxy for Absent Committee Members</u>
    Chief Kelley referred the Board to *Section 7.7: Manner of Taking Action* of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement:

    7.7   <u>Manner of Taking Action</u>
    The Board of Directors acts by vote. Votes shall only be on motions made and seconded at meetings as provided in Section 7.1.2. Any action taken by the Board shall be determined by an affirmative vote, on such a motion, of a majority of those members present and voting, unless otherwise provided in this Agreement, so long as there is a quorum. A quorum shall be a majority of existing members. No proxy votes shall be allowed.

    Chief Kelley asked for thoughts on the issue.

Chief Boucher said that the Agreement clearly states it is not allowed. Chief Kelley said that since there had been some conversation about this at the previous meeting, he wanted to make sure everyone was clear about it

Chief Roberts commented that if the Board started allowing voting by proxy, attendance of the Board members would likely drop and the individuals voting by proxy could end up voting on behalf of the Board member without either person having a full understanding of what was being voting on.

Chief Kelley said that any Board member unable to attend could still pass on their thoughts regarding specific issues through another person, but the person attending on behalf of the Board member would not be able to vote.

3. <u>Update on letter (& contract copy) to Spillman re: contact/authority</u>
    At the previous meeting in September, Jail Administrator Hinkley *(who is not a Board member)* did not want the Board making any decisions about authority relating to Spillman access without the sheriff there because prior to this Board being formed and the Agreement signed, she held sole control over Spillman access.

    Chief Kelley referred Board members to *Section 7.6: Power and Authority of Board of Directors* of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement:

    7.6   <u>Power and Authority of Board of Directors</u>
           The Board of Directors is the decision making body of the Public Safety Cooperative. It has the power and authority to acquire, hold or dispose of real and personal property, to raise and spend money, to enter into legally binding agreements with other persons or entities, and to take any and all actions consistent with and/or necessary to carry out the purpose of this Agreement and the Public Safety Cooperative. The Board shall also have the authority to admit and expel Members, and to enforce the terms of the Agreement establishing the Public Safety Cooperative. The Board shall further have the power to establish and implement rules, directives and standards by which the Public Safety Cooperative operates, so long as such rules, directives or standards are not inconsistent with any express provisions of this Agreement.

    and to *Section 19.0: Entire Agreement* of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement:

    19.0   <u>ENTIRE AGREEMENT</u>

           This Agreement contains the entire agreement of the parties. Any written or oral representation made by any party and not expressly made a part hereof shall be of no force and effect. Any modification to the terms, provisions, or requirements of this Agreement shall be in writing, shall be signed by the Members.

    Administrator Hart said that the letter sent to Spillman containing a copy of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement and explaining about the decisions of the Board relating to Spillman access was signed by Board Chair Chief Kelley and sent via certified mail on October 4th. The return receipt showed that the letter and contract was signed for on October 12th.

Chief Kelley asked if anything had been changed to date. TSS Dean said that he had checked with Spillman to inquire about that. Spillman had already updated their records to show that now he and CIO/CSO Lake are the only two individuals with access to make changes to the system.

Chief Kelley reiterated that the issue was not to prevent access by any particular person or agency, but rather it was an attempt to eliminate problems stemming from having too many people with access, and to start off with a baseline that could be built upon. With former Chief Deputy Ernie McIntosh still remaining on Spillman's records as having access even though he had left the County two months ago, it needed to be fixed.

4. Update from County Administrator re: grant money in reserves
    Administrator Hart explained that the County does have money in reserves that could be used as a match for a grant.

Courthouse Computer Reserve	$16,479
State Forfeiture Funds	$81,470
Matching Grants Reserve	$20,120
Sheriff's Computer Reserve	$30,188
	$148,257.00

The use of State forfeiture money would have to be approved by the Commission upon a recommendation from the sheriff. Some of it will be used in the 2011 Sheriff's Office budget. If the sheriff agreed to it, the sheriff's computer reserve is available too.

Nothing has been placed in the 2011 budget for a grant match. The first draft of the budget is done and is being presented to the Budget Committee and the County Commission on Thursday the 21st.

Chief Kelley asked how long the Board had to figure out what amount would need to be budgeted for as a grant match. Administrator Hart replied that the sooner it can be put into the budget, the better.

A firm amount of what would be needed in order to fund improving the communications system has not yet been researched. Homeland Security grants do not require a match.

TSS Dean commented that the IT staff had forwarded information to the Board Chair about what is available for Spillman employees to help with finding grants but that the IT staff is not actively looking for grants for the Board.

Administrator Hart stated that he believed the best course of action would be to use a reserve account for grant matches by transferring money from the above mentioned budget lines. If matching funds were instead built into the budget rather than taking funds from reserves, the taxpayers would be paying money that may not be utilized.

5. Update on Spillman employee helping to find Homeland Security Grants
    (Chief Kelley had to leave the room to answer his cell phone.)

CIO/CSO Lake said that at the last meeting in September, he had told Chief Kelley he would forward to him the email from Tag at Spillman so that Chief Kelley could contact Spillman himself regarding getting assistance from a Spillman employee to look for grants. He said that he was not sure what more Chief Kelley needed from him. Chief Haj asked if the Board was in communication with Spillman regarding getting their help with applying for grants. CIO/CSO Lake said that he did not know.

Chief Roberts asked if CIO/CSO Lake had spoken to other departments/agencies that have utilized the Spillman grant person and asked whether it would it be better to just do it all ourselves. CIO/CSO Lake said that it's always better to do it yourself and not rely on someone else. The key is just to keep on applying for grants as you can. Spillman puts out a newsletter from time to time and it shows that Spillman has assisted with agencies getting grants but he did not know if any of those agencies are in Maine.

Chief Roberts asked how to handle having his "designee" come to the meetings (an interim chief) when Chief Roberts is done being the Police Chief of Camden. It was suggested he write a letter to the Board explaining the transition of Board membership so that there is a paper trail.

It was noted that there was a Homeland Security grant deadline coming up for November 14th. While Administrator Hart left the room to ask EMA Director Ray Sisk to join the meeting, Chief Roberts explained that he had attended an EMA meeting and was the only law enforcement member there. He had been asked to talked about the current communications system and possible upgrades. He said that he had told EMA Director Sisk that he didn't think he was qualified to speak for all law enforcement, but that the Group had discussed grants.

Chief Boucher stated that in 2007, the original price quoted for the Geo-base, CAD mapping, and pin mapping (crime analysis) was $87,640.

Chief Roberts said that the most recent quote he heard was for just the Geo-base and CAD mapping (without the pin mapping) and it was $76,040. He said that he gave Director Sisk the previous quote of $87,640. and so Director Sisk wrote $90,000 up on the board at the meeting for an estimate.

Chief Roberts said that Director Sisk had asked the agencies represented at that meeting to write their own letter of support rather than all of the agencies collaborating on a single letter containing everyone's signatures. Chief Haj thought it showed singularity of mind for the Board as a whole if everyone signs the same document. Chief Roberts said he did not bring up the Cooperative Group at the meeting so it was possible that Director Sisk may not have thought of that. Chief Boucher suggested that each agency write a letter, and in addition to that, the Board could also have a jointly signed letter to cover all the bases.

Chief Kelley asked how hard it would be to get an updated quote so that the Board could come up with a firm price figure and decide what would be needed as a match from the County. CIO/CSO Lake said that it would not take long and that he would send an email to Spillman and ask for a quote. He said that he would also ask for Response Plans and AVL into the quote because those are the ones that go good with consolidating.

[*EMA Director Sisk came to the meeting at 10:40 am.*]

Chief Kelley summarized the discussion thus far to Director Sisk. He asked if a letter from the Cooperative as a group would suffice as support for the grant.

Director Sisk said that each agency and group is an individual organization. Having a letter from the Group would be good but that he would also like to have individual letters from each town on town letterhead from the town manager/selectmen because it shows the broader picture of support. He has sample language for the agencies and the Board to use.

Chief Boucher, Chair of the Grants Sub-Committee, said that because of everything going on lately, he does not have the time to devote to writing the grant but that he would definitely be willing to assist.

Chief Roberts asked if traffic control issues would be included in the grant. Director Sisk said that he was looking to include a traffic control trailer that would have a messaging board, barricades, cones, etc. which would be available to all agencies. The trailer should have a minimum of 75 barricades and 100 cones. If the County ever had to do an evacuation or if there was a bad accident, the trailer can be used for control points instead of having to wait for the DOT to show up. During recent exercises it was hard scraping up enough materials from the various local agencies to do the exercise adequately. Letters of support for this would be helpful too. The materials would also be available for special events like the Lobster Festival in Rockland or the Windjammer Days in Camden. Patrol Administrator Tim Carroll commented that the Lobster Festival Committee may be able to help with that too.

EMA Director Sisk said that he would send out a "skeleton" letter that the agencies can all fill in and alter to their own preference. Grant applications are due at the end of the business day on the 19th of November and then there are three more weeks to clean them up. There is currently $1.53 million dollars in unspoken grant funds left. The County should try to get as much of it as possible. He said that he needed very specific information showing what the County currently has for resources and what it would cost to make the changes that the County wants. TSS Dean said he would cc Director Sisk when they get the quote from Spillman.

Chief Boucher asked if it would be worth looking at all the modules available for Spillman and put them in order of priority so that there can be a complete list of what the County wants, and that way, if any grant given does not cover the cost of all of it, the County would just get what was most important to acquire first.

Director Sisk commented that there is a risk in asking for grant funding for *everything* in one grant application. It depends on the people reviewing the grants. It might be better to ask for funding for the "solution"; meaning, show what gaps there are in the system and then show how the grant will solve the problems that you have. It is the multi-jurisdiction / multidiscipline models that get more attention and go much farther.

Chief Boucher asked if Spillman already has the fire module. Director Sisk said he wasn't sure what EMS uses from the list. Dispatch Supervisor Gibbs said that Dispatch uses the fire module. TSS Dean said that anything map based has to have the geo package first.

It was discussed that it is better to have the agencies all apply for grants as a group because cooperation increases the odds of success and consistency. Grant applications that request funding for multi-jurisdiction/multidiscipline projects increases the likelihood of being approved. If there was not enough funding to support the fire and EMS side, the grant would fund the law enforcement part as a stand-alone project. Every partner/agency should include their support for it.

Chief Roberts brought up an issue with encryption software. He said he had been approved for a grant of $149,000 and asked how much the County was planning to spend. TSS Dean explained that the County would be getting free software that will encrypt any hard drive. There would be no technical issues if not all agencies used the same software. The software is used by the US military so it would meet the Maine State standards. The only costs associated with it would be if an agency hired someone to install the software for them. If the agencies wanted the County IT staff do it, they would need to speak to Administrator Hart about that.

Chief Roberts said that if the grant money he had received already would not be used to purchase software, it needs to be sent back. Administrator Hart asked if there was a plan to use the money for something else. Chief Haj said that if there was money left over, it would go towards something else the agency needed to spend money on. Chief Roberts commented that he could use it for animal control.

CIO/CSO Lake said he could get an estimate for the agencies of what it would cost for the IT guys to do it.

There was short discussion of whether it was a good idea or not to have the County IT staff installing software on mobile units owned and used by other agencies. There would be the question of who would be responsible for the software and the mobile units after that. The four police chiefs present seemed to feel that if the IT staff installed the software, that is all the agencies would ask of them. After the installation, the rest is the responsibility of the agency.

It takes roughly two hours per machine to do the software installation so it is a significant time commitment to do that many units. In discussing whether it would be better to have the IT staff do the installation at each agency or have the agencies bring their units to the IT staff at the courthouse, Chief Kelley suggested that there be a cost estimate determined for both onsite and offsite. TSS Dean suggested also checking with whatever vendors each agency uses for technical support to see how much *they* would charge to do the software installation.

Chief Boucher commented that it does not matter who is paid to do the installation, but that to him it seemed like a good opportunity to have it all done the same way at the same place, and the agencies could be confident that it was done right. Chief Kelley suggested letting Administrator Hart and the IT staff discuss this amongst themselves later and decide what they want to do.

6. <u>Items for November's meeting agenda – November 16th</u>
Spillman Access by State Police Troop D
Draft Dissemination document – Linwood and Stephanie working on it
Draft Information Management System Data Entry and Data Standards Policy Stephanie and Linwood
IT – updated Spillman quote (CIO/CSO Lake)

IV.   Other Business

<u>Dissemination Form/policy</u>
It was discussed that Communications Director Linwood Lothrop was working on it. Dispatch Supervisor Gibbs had worked on the policy that goes with the form, but Director Lothrop is working on the one-page form that everyone needs to sign by January 1, 2011. It was unknown what the status of this was because Director Lothrop was not in attendance at the meeting.

[*Sheriff arrived at 11:04 am*]

<u>Knox County Information Management System Data Entry and Data Standards Policy</u>
Dispatch Supervisor Gibbs handed out drafts. Any changes she had made to the document were highlighted in yellow. She said that she has the document saved on her computer so Board members can email any changes to her that they would like to see made and she would update it. She added that she had included geo-based tracking even though the County does not have that yet.

V.   Adjourn

- Chief Boucher motioned to adjourn; Chief Haj seconded; a vote was taken with all in favor.

Meeting adjourned 11:08 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Candice Richards
Administrative Assistant
Inter-Agency Cooperation Group Recording Secretary