Inter-Agency Cooperation Group

Camden PD – Rockland PD – Rockport PD – Thomaston PD – Knox County (KRCC, DA, Sheriff, Administration)

A meeting of the Inter-Agency Cooperation Agreement Group Committee took place on Tuesday, September 21, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the Knox County Commission Hearing Room.

Committee members in attendance: Knox County Administrator Andrew Hart; KRCC Director Linwood Lothrop; Chief Bruce Boucher, Rockland PD; Knox County DA's Office Secretary Kelly Perry; Chief Mark Kelley, Rockport PD; and Chief Kevin Haj, Thomaston PD.

Others in attendance: Knox County CIO/CSO Jeff Lake*;* Knox County Technical Support Specialist Mike Dean*;* Jail Administrator John Hinkley; and Knox County Executive Office Administrative Assistant Candice Richards.

Committee members not in attendance: Knox County Sheriff Donna Dennison; and Chief Phil Roberts, Camden PD.

AGENDA

Tuesday – September 21, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.

I.   10:00   **Meeting Called To Order by County Administrator**

II.   10:01   **Approval of Minutes**
1. August 10, 2010

III.   10:10   **Discussion Items**
1. Clarification of IT Staff's Advisory Capacity to the Committee
2. Update from County Administrator re: grant money in reserves
3. Update from Grants Sub-Committee
4. Spillman – who has the authority to contact Spillman Support
5. Access/Usage Policy & Standards
6. Items for October's meeting agenda

IV.   10:50   **Other Business**

V.   11:00   **Adjourn**

I.   Meeting called to order
Administrator Hart called the meeting to order at 10:07 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 August 10, 2010 minutes as written. Director Lothrop seconded the motion. A vote was taken with all in favor.

III.   Discussion Items

Chief Kelley asked if anyone had anything that needed to be added to the agenda. Board members had been encouraged to email agenda items to Candice but she had not received any, so he did not know if any Board members had thought of any issues in the meantime.

METRO/VPN

Chief Haj said he wanted to talk about some technical issues with VPN (Virtual Private Network) meeting certain specifications and similar issues that every agency would encounter while using METRO (Maine Telecommunicators and Radio Operations). He asked if agencies should get a list of questions/concerns to the IT staff regarding questions and deficiencies with VPN standards.

TSS Dean said that the IT staff had already answered these questions to Blair, who is the METRO rep. that does the audits. He didn't understand why each agency was having to answer the questions on their own. Chief Haj said that he didn't have any documentation with the answers that he could just provide to METRO that the VPN meets the encryption level standards. Because he was unable to answer the technical question about VPN standards, he was given a deficiency on that.

The overall problem seemed to be that representatives of METRO have been contacting individual chiefs of police and asking for technical information, including a diagram of the network, and not every agency knew the answers for that.

The agencies and METRO cannot have the County's network configuration diagram because the County is serving as an ISP (Internet Service Provider), or provider, with the Spillman system to the agencies. It is not necessary for METRO to be asking the agencies using the system for the County's network configuration. The only part of the diagram that METRO needs to see is how each agency connects to the County, which would only be the one step from the mobile unit in an agency vehicle with Verizon Wireless to access the "cloud" of data on the network. Once the VPN is turned on, the data is just going to the "cloud". The information stops there. After that, METRO has to ask Verizon about their network diagram. Blair at METRO has already been given a copy of what the County is using for a VPN.

The issue is not what METRO is "doing" with the diagrams, but rather METRO is checking to see if the agency has met certain standards, which includes agencies having a network configuration written down in case anyone from METRO asks for it. Policies have to be in written form for METRO to consider it as being in existence so that if there is a personnel change in an agency, there will be no question about what the policy is.

It was discussed that perhaps the Group could generate a generic policy/diagram that could cover these technical issues and any others that come up. Everyone could adopt it and keep on file for when METRO calls with questions. Having the same document would be simpler for both METRO and the agencies.

1.   Clarification of IT Staff's Advisory Capacity to the Committee

None of the members present could remember who had asked for this item to be placed on the agenda. Chief Kelley asked CIO/CSO Lake if there was anything he wanted to discuss relating to this topic. CIO/CSO Lake said that the IT staff just advises the Group but is not

part of it; they do not vote. Chief Kelley suggested tabling the agenda item until the next meeting since no one could remember what the question was or who had asked it. Two Board members where not present, so it was unknown if one of those two members had been the one to raise the issue.

2. Update from County Administrator re: grant money in reserves
    Agenda item tabled until the next meeting.

3. Update from Grants Sub-Committee
    Discussed as part of agenda item #5: Access/Usage, Policy & Standards.

4. Spillman – who has the authority to contact Spillman Support
    Chief Kelley explained that one goal of the Group was to funnel information to keep things as simple as possible. If each agency contacts Spillman on their own to make changes to the system, that could make things complicated and problematic, especially for the IT staff, who are expected to manage the system as per the Agreement. He asked the Board members for opinions.

    According to Spillman, whoever is sitting as sheriff currently is seen as being in charge of Spillman and making all Spillman related decisions. The Board needs to instruct the Commission to assert this Board's authority over the Spillman system so that the Board makes the decisions and not any individual member of the Board, including the sheriff. The Board now authorizes the contact with Spillman, not the sheriff. The Board needs to take steps to avoid a situation down the road where the sitting sheriff, whoever that might be at the time, makes decisions that go against the Board's wishes.

    Chief Kelley said that it was his understanding that the Agreement that was signed by all the agencies gave the Board the authority. He said that he wanted to know how everyone felt about funneling everything through the IT staff instead of each agency contacting Spillman directly. He was not sure how many agencies are currently contacting Spillman for changes it on their own.

    It was discussed that currently, Sergeant Reggie Walker and former Chief Deputy Ernie McIntosh are authorized to make changes, not just to the County's system, but to the whole Spillman system. One issue with this is that Ernie McIntosh is no longer an employee of Knox County but his authorization has not been cancelled. When a person with the ability and authorization to make changes to Spillman leaves his/her employment, their access should be automatically terminated to ensure the integrity of the system.

    Individual agencies are able to call Spillman with questions or for updates but cannot make system-wide changes; however, if Sergeant Walker, the Sheriff, or Ernie McIntosh call Spillman, they can make changes that effect the whole system, not just Knox County's operating system. Access to making changes to the system needs to be limited to avoid problems. As the Board is now the authority, the Board should be the one to grant authorization to make changes to the Spillman system. Agencies wanting access to the system would need to come before Board and to state their case for why authorization should be granted.

Chief Kelley said that it was his opinion that only the IT staff should be authorized to contact Spillman, at least to start with, to prevent problems associated with giving too many people having access to make changes. If agencies have a request or a question, they can go to the IT staff. If the agency, or the IT staff, is not comfortable with something, the matter can brought to the Board as a whole and let the Board make the decision.

It was discussed that Spillman would need something in writing to show the decision of the Board regarding this issue. Spillman will want to know who grants the authority to make changes to the system. A vote of the Board would authorize individuals to have that authority. If a person with authorization leaves the employ of one of the agencies, it should be automatic that their access is terminated immediately. While the Group did not believe that the employee in question who had left employment with the County but still retained access to the system would do anything to cause problems, the Group recognized that the possibility is still there when access is not revoked.

Jail Administrator John Hinkley *(not a member of the Board)* commented that he would like the issue tabled since the sheriff was not in attendance. He thought that the sheriff would have to be the one to send a letter to Spillman.

It was discussed that once the agencies all signed the inter-agency agreement, the chair of the newly created Board is automatically the one who would have the authority to write to Spillman. The Chair just has to assert his authority once elected by the Board.

- **A motion was made by Chief Haj to have the Board Chair send a copy of the Inter-Agency Cooperative Agreement with a cover letter identifying the Board and the Board's authority, including a directive that support issues have to go through the County's IT department as the only authorized individuals (and whomever the Board wants to grant the authorization to in the future). Any other person's authorization would have to be approved through the Board. Anyone who previously had authorization would automatically have their authorization revoked from the time that Spillman receives the letter, unless otherwise granted to them again by the Board in the future. This includes the authorization given to former Chief Deputy Ernie McIntosh, who is no longer a County employee.**

It was discussed that although the sheriff was not in attendance at the meeting to explain why she needs some of her employees to have access, the Group is just starting with a baseline by having the IT staff as the only ones authorized to contact Spillman directly. The agencies in the group will still be able to make requests to the Board. There needs to be accountability for access and what changes are made to the system. If everybody can have access on their own, who do you hold accountable when mistakes are made or when changes are just arbitrarily made? There has to be some accountability for what happens in the system.

Jail Administrator Hinkley was asked to notify the sheriff of the board's decision since she had sent him to attend the meeting on her behalf. It was also noted that the sheriff would receive a copy of the letter being sent to Spillman and that she was being treated no differently than all of the other agencies which would also have to make a request to the Board to have one of their employees be granted access to Spillman. It would be up to the Board to approve or deny each request. The letter needed to be sent now because one of the

sheriff's employees with access has already left the employment of the County, but still had access. There needs to be an authorization mechanism to remove this person from the system. It's not any different than turning in your keys when you quit a job. It doesn't matter who the person is, the County and other participating agencies need to protect themselves.

- **Chief Boucher seconded the motion. A vote was taken with all in favor, 5-0**

    Members that voted in favor: 5
    Chief Boucher, Chief Haj, Chief Kelley, DA Secretary Perry, Director Lothrop.

    Members that voted against: 0.
    None.

    Members not in attendance: 2
    Chief Roberts, Sheriff Dennison.

5. Access/Usage Policy & Standards
   Chief Boucher briefly related the information he had sent to the rest of the Group via email:

Knox County Public Safety Information Sharing Cooperative Association

Date: Thursday 9/2/2010
Time: 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM
Location: County Commissions meeting room-Knox County Court House

Present: Kelly Perry, Mike Dean, Jeff Lake, Mark Kelly, Bruce Boucher

Agenda-Results

1.Tech support reported that an inventory does exist and is available concerning Software and Hardware that is owned and used by the county which supports the Spillman System.

2. Short Term Hardware and software needs- Maintenance agreements for Software and Hardware for a total of 29K will be needed in the next year- funding is already set aside.

3. Short term Hardware Upgrades- None needed.

4. Short term Hardware upgrades- Encryption software for each agency mobile platforms- Grant funded vs. free- costs covered by Byrne grant. Jail module needs to be upgraded.-No Cost.

5. Long term Software needs- Looks like the GEO base Spillman software is the staring point for now to focus on as this is the base for other anticipated Spillman modules. It was the discussion of the group that this would be the focus for any future grant funding as a priority to expand the system.

6. Training Needs- Need to train on "data entry" so all are uniform. Jail booking process for officers when the do a booking at the jail. Recommendation was to get the KRCC Personnel involved in the data standards training as they are the most familiar with user entry.

7. Policy Needs-
        1. Data Standards needs to be set and adhered to by- Use Penobscot document as the template to use.
        2. Software Management Change Policy is needed to make uniform system changes which

---

affect all users.
        3. Access and Usage Policy- Individual users and contractors who have access to the system- Use Penobscot policy as a template for ours.
        4. Security Policy- Need to develop this as to breaches and unauthorized entry into the system.

Chief Kelley asked if Chief Boucher planned to make a recommendation as chair of the Grants Sub-Committee regarding which software would be the best for the agencies to use. He asked if the recommendation would be to start with the GEO base software. Chief Boucher replied that the sub-committee had decided that if the Group looks at anything, it should start with GEO.

There was a short discussion of costs relating to software and where the money would come from to pay for it. An estimate was given that it would probably cost around $100,000 and there would be a lot of labor intensive work to get it set up. There may be some upcoming grants that could help with the costs. The current software is good but the Group is looking to improve things for all users.

CIO/CSO Lake informed the Group that Spillman has someone in their employ who's sole job is to look for applicable grants. He offered to send an email to the Chair with the contact information of that employee.

It was discussed that with such a high price tag, the Group may have to do a Homeland Security Grant or something similar that will allow for a grant of that size. It might happen that a grant may not be found to fund it entirely but rather a portion of it, and then the Board might want to try to pitch the remaining expense to the Commission and Budget Committee to add to the IT budget (in the Executive budget). The end users could show support for the project by attending the budget meeting.

Probable Costs: $110,000 is just the GEO base.

The Group would be looking to start with the base and in later years add to it as funds became available to upgrade. Every agency, whether it be law enforcement, EMS, fire, etc., would benefit from the upgrade. This should make it easier to sell it to the Commission and to the individual municipalities. Fire and EMS agencies have been asking for this at every dispatch meeting so the Group should have their support. Without the new software, the KRCC is unable to do what the agencies want. If there is going to be a County match built into the 2011 budget, a figure would have to be placed in the draft of the budget for review by the Commission and the Budget Committee.

It was discussed that Dispatch Supervisor Stephanie Gibbs was looking at Penobscot's policies to use them as templates and will email drafts out to the Board soon. The Penobscot policies are a good starting point and Stephanie can identify what changes need to be made to them to match the needs of the agencies as a whole. The Access and Usage policy is well written and defines what to do when new people are hired and when employees leave. It should be possible to combine the two policies, the SIMS (Safety Information Management Systems) Access and Usage Policy, and the SIMS Data Entry and Data Standards, into one.

Hopefully the combined policy can be reviewed and approved by the Group by the next meeting and get all agencies to sign off on it by January 1st. The signed confidentiality agreement for each individual using Spillman will have to be handed in to the IT staff before contacting the IT staff and requesting any changes being made. There needs to be a software change management policy. The Penobscot Use policy covers some of that.

The Grants Sub-Committee felt that the Group either needed to come up with a security policy or find out if one already existed. The Board as a whole needs to agree on a policy instead of each department coming up with their own. Every single employee working for those agencies will have to have signed the confidentiality agreement prior to January 1st or they are cut off from being able to use the system. It will be a way to "clean house" and find out if there are people with access that shouldn't have access.

The IT staff was asked to provide something that the board could use as a starting off point for getting a policy into place, and to work on a confidentiality agreement for each user of Spillman to sign before they could be given access.

6. <u>Items for October's meeting agenda</u>

   Classification of IT staff's advisory capacity to the Group
   Update from county administrator re: matching grant money in reserves
   Update on agreement and cover letter sent to Spillman re: authorizations
   Update on if Spillman contact can help with acquiring homeland security grants (Jeff & Mark)
   Update from IT staff re: security policy (Mike & Jeff)
   Spillman Access by State Police Troop D
   Items for November's meeting

IV.   Other Business

<u>Maine State Police Troup D</u>
Jail Administrator Hinkley reminded Chief Boucher about the sheriff's email about the State Police.

Chief Boucher explained that the Rockland Police Department has a vacant office that they are willing to let Troup D from the State Police use since they no longer occupy the barracks in Thomaston. The lieutenant from Troup D wanted to know if they could also have read-only access to Spillman so that they can see the calls that the agencies in Knox County respond to. They are only asking for read ability only because they know of the issue of too many people having access.

Chief Kelley commented that he did not have an issue with that but that any of the State Troopers accessing Spillman would have to sign the confidentiality agreement by January 1st like the other agencies.

There was a discussion about how letting the State have read-only access only handles part of the problem of the State and the County not sharing information with each other. The State isn't giving the County their information, but they still want access to ours. The KRCC is "double-dispatching" because the troopers call Augusta and tells the State dispatcher to tell

Knox County what the trooper is doing. That part of the communication problem with the State would not be solved by giving the troopers access to the Spillman system.

The State has been making things more complicated and difficult because they aren't using Spillman and are not allowing access to their information by the PSAP's, even on a read-only basis. If someone calls a PSAP and asks a question but a matter handled by the State and not by the County, the KRCC can't see any information about what, if anything, that the State has done. The State is looking to significantly lessen the number of PSAP's in the State but that is going to require having everybody use the same system for the exchange of information, or the PSAP's will end up having to use two CAD systems, which would be really difficult for the dispatchers.

CIO/CSO Lake explained that the State Police are not currently participating members of the Spillman package because there was no mechanism to add them. If the Board wants to give access to the State Police to be able to read what's on the Spillman system, it's not a technical issue. The IT staff can do whatever the Board wants.

It was discussed that the County needs to decide if it made more sense to give the State read-only access to the system, or if they should be given more than that. It was suggested that the Troop D lieutenant be invited to attend the next meeting so that the topic could be discussed and questions asked. Chief Boucher would invite him to attend.

Having the lieutenant attend will also be beneficial if there is any discussion of costs as part of giving the State access to the information in Spillman. They will probably want access for free, which would not be a benefit to the County because then the County would have to cover the costs. If there is going to be an exchange of information, it needs to benefit both sides and not just the State. To make it worth the County's while, the State Troopers would have to put enough information in the narrative in Spillman so that the agencies in Knox County know what the State has done and responded to. The consensus of the Group seemed to be that if the County is going to give the State access to Spillman, it made more sense to give them *complete* access so that the troopers can put their own information into the system for the County to see Right now, the State Police are the gap in the database in the sense that the County is not kept informed of what the State Police do.

Chief Haj asked if access to Spillman should be given to just Troop D or all State Police troopers in our area. TSS Dean asked what kind of access the Group intended to give the State Police. Chief Boucher said that the troopers can bring their mobile units into the Rockland PD office. They would just need wireless access, but would need their own log-in's and cannot log in under each other's ID's, or other agencies' ID's either. Each trooper would also have to sign a confidentiality agreement like everyone else before being granted access to Spillman.

The issue is whether the Group has enough licenses for the State troopers to use or if more would be needed for them to be able to connect. If the County has to purchase more licenses for them to use, that will be a problem because no one will want to pay for that. The State cannot expect the County to pay for licenses when it's the State that wants the access. Ideally, it would make sense to have it included in the cost-sharing agreement.

CIO/CSO Lake explained that there are no technical problems with adding the troopers into Spillman. If they want to be added in, the board can decide what it wants the State to be able to see, and then that's how the IT staff would set the trooper's access up.

Chief Kelley suggested that if the State is going to have access, they need to return the favor and add their own information to the system, not just read ours. If the state isn't willing to put anything in to the narrative in the Spillman system, what use would it be to us?

Administrator Hart commented that the Group just needs to make sure that this does not incur more cost to the county and its municipalities when it's something the State wants but they aren't willing to do the same thing for the County.

V.   Adjourn

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

Meeting adjourned 11:36 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Candice Richards
Administrative Assistant
Inter-Agency Cooperation Group Recording Secretary