

**STATE OF COLORADO  
COUNTY OF ROUTT**

**ROUTT COUNTY COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY BOARD  
January 26, 2006**

Chairman Bob Struble, Steamboat Springs Fire and Rescue; called the regular quarterly meeting of the Communications Advisory Board to order. Faith Mendoza, Routt County Communications Director; Chuck Wisecup and Tony Morgan, Oak Creek Fire Protection District, Tyler Whitmore and Dave Ruppel, Yampa Valley Regional Airport; Cheryl Dalton, Emergency Management; Bob Reilley, North Routt Fire Protection District; Joel Rae, Steamboat Springs Police Department; Jody Lenahan and Ed Corriveau, Hayden Police Department; Dan Allen, Yampa Fire Protection District; John Warner, Sheriff; Linda Koile, Oak Creek Police Department; Sue Mariano, Visiting Nurse Association; Glen Hammond, and Dave Hill, Routt County Search and Rescue; Terry Barber, Routt County Information Systems; and Tom Sullivan, County Manager, were present. Chuck Vale, Emergency Management, was present via conference call for a portion of the meeting. Dee Bolton recorded the meeting and prepared the minutes.

**EN RE: REVIEW OF MINUTES**

**MOTION—APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Wisecup moved to approve the minutes of the Routt County Communications Advisory Board for April 28, 2005, July 28, 2005, and October 27, 2005. Mr. Warner seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

**EN RE: 2006 COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY BOARD  
REPRESENTATIVES**

Ms. Mendoza reviewed the list of agencies that had submitted their appointed representatives to the Communications Board for 2006 and asked that all other agencies submit their representatives and alternates as soon as possible.

**EN RE: INTRODUCTIONS**

Mr. Struble requested that those present introduce themselves and state their affiliations since there were several new people present.

**EN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE AND SUNSHINE RESOLUTION**

Ms. Mendoza presented a resolution that listed the posting places for notices of Communications Advisory Board meetings. She stated that regular meetings for 2006 would be held on the fourth Thursday of January, April, July, and October, at 3:30 p.m. in the Commissioners' Hearing Room.

**MOTION—TO ESTABLISH THE MEETING DATES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY BOARD FOR 2006**

Mr. Wisecup moved to hold the regular quarterly meetings of the Routt County Communications Advisory Board on the fourth Thursday of January, April, July, and October, at 3:30 p.m., in the Commissioners' Hearing Room. Mr. Warner seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION—RESOLUTION 06-001, A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING PLACE FOR POSTING OF NOTICES OF MEETINGS OF THE ROUTT COUNTY COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY BOARD IN ACCORDANCE WITH C. R. S. § 24-6-402**

Mr. Wisecup moved to adopt and authorize the Chairman to sign Resolution 2006-001, A Resolution Designating Place for Posting of Notices of Meetings of the Routt County Communications Advisory Board in Accordance with C. R. S. § 24-6-402. Mr. Reilley seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

**EN RE: COMMUNICATIONS REPORT AND RADIO SYSTEM UPDATE**

Mr. Vale joined the meeting via conference call at this time.

Mr. Vale provided an update on the 800 MHz project. He said that the WIN grant, from the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), allowed counties to retain their UHF or VHF systems at their own expense, but that WIN grants were to be used only for the purchase and installation of 800 MHz system equipment. He said that Eagle County had claimed that the WIN grant generators proposed were not of the proper size. He would further research the issue. Representatives from the State would meet with the County Commissioners in February to discuss the 800 MHz equipment that would be funded and to review the specifications and capabilities of that equipment. All Communication Board members were invited to attend the meeting. He said that the State needed to work in partnership with Colorado counties to make the State's 800 MHz system successful. The Routt County sites that would have 800 MHz equipment would be Mount Werner, Hayden, King Mountain, and Farwell Mountain. At this point, the State would not fund the construction of buildings to house the new generators, but Mr. Vale was still negotiating that matter since Routt County has such significant snowfall that the generators would not function without being in covered buildings. He stated that Eagle County would upgrade Routt County's microwave generator on King Mountain; that the State intended to design and construct in 2006 65 new 800 MHz sites in Western Colorado; that the EMS function of the original Homeland Security grant was applying for funds to put 800 MHz radios in all Routt County ambulances; that the enlargement of the Mt. Werner site to accommodate an additional generator would have to be approved by the Forest Service; that the advantage of the 800 MHz process was that all but two of the Routt County 911 communications sites would be fully backed up by the new equipment; that Routt County's microwave system had been designed to allow the partnership with the State's 800 MHz system; and that the

generator for Emerald Mountain would have to be huge and would require a partnership for funding the purchase, but it was possible that a Homeland Security grant could cover the purchase.

Mr. Vale ended telephone contact at this time.

To continue with the Communications Report, Ms. Mendoza said that the 911 telephone had been fluctuating and had gone down a few times since the upgrades had been installed in mid-December, 2005. At present, placing calls on hold, creates a problem with the system, which was major concern, but to date, no delays in response have occurred. The installer was currently working on the problem, which would hopefully be resolved within two weeks.

Ms. Mendoza then reviewed the Number of Calls by Department, by Complaint, and by Day of the Week Reports for January, 2006, after which she discussed the compiled reports for 2005. She noted that the statistics were categorized based on the initial report received. To summarize, she noted that 49,584 CAD calls were made in 2005, and more than 132,000 telephone calls were made within the Communications Center, which averaged more than 11,000 calls per month.

#### **EN RE: NETWORK CONNECTIONS TO CAD/RMS**

Ms. Mendoza said that some agencies had requested a connection to the County's CAD system. She had invited Mr. Barber to address the request and explain the process involved.

Mr. Barber said that extending the CAD system to County agencies had been considered several years ago. He provided handouts that diagramed two plans for network connectivity to the County and noted that they were conceptual and based on current County policies, practices, and paradigms. He stated that if network traffic from Routt County were desired, an agency would have to be connected via the network and would be considered an untrusted network since he had no control over the connection. He said that if an entity desired a record management system other than Visionair software, the purchase of an interface system would be necessary, which was an expensive, complex procedure. Also, the County Information Systems Department would not build the system, which was another cost consideration, nor would the County house the records management server. He discussed the diagram that depicted the public safety service network that could be created rather quickly and simply (Page 1 of the handout) and that would be a private point-to-point connections network through which all connected agencies could talk to one another. He noted that a T-1 line, although expensive because the cost was calculated on distance, guaranteed reliability and service; that wireless was not a guaranteed service; and that it was possible to aggregate the system so that some costs could be shared. On Page 2 of the handout was an optional approach: Virtual Private Network (VPN), the use of public internet to provide private service, which was less expensive but had no guaranteed services. To summarize, an entity should consider and be responsible for the software interface, the

service network equipment, the firewall restricted holes, the entity WAN devices and services, the internet/VPN versus a private T-1 line, and the development of an IGA with the County that would require agencies to share the cost of the CAD system with the County. He volunteered to speak with any agency interested in the network connection.

#### **EN RE: ALARMS/AUTO DIALING TO 911**

Ms. Mendoza said that the City of Steamboat Springs had recently transferred some alarm calls to the County 911 system. She asked for the Communications Advisory Board's support and agencies' cooperation in agreeing that no agency instruct its alarm system company to automatically contact 911 because it would result in a great increase in in-coming calls to the Communications Center and would tie up the 911 line. However, auto-dialed calls could be sent to a Communications Center administrative phone line and could then be rolled over if appropriate.

#### **MOTION—TO ESTABLISH A POLICY THAT NO AUTOMATIC ALARM SYSTEM CALLS BE SENT TO THE COUNTY'S 911 SYSTEM**

Mr. Warner moved that the Routt County Communications Advisory Board recommend that the Communications Department pursue a policy that would prohibit all automatic alarm calls from going to the 911 system. Mr. Wisecup seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

#### **EN RE: RADIO EQUIPMENT CONSISTENCY**

Ms. Mendoza stated that the MCS 2000 mobile and the MT 2000 packsets that were currently County standard equipment were no longer available from Motorola. A new product line was being researched. She asked that all agencies itemize their current equipment and suggested that, when upgrading radio equipment, all agencies consider purchasing the same equipment. She said that although all Routt County radios would be programmed the same, other agencies would not necessarily be programmed the same when the 800 MHz system was incorporated.

Mr. Warner said that he liked the ability of using different vehicles that were programmed the same, but he was unsure whether the Communications Advisory Board should dictate the equipment that agencies should purchase and the way in which agencies should program those radios. He thought the concept would work if the County issued all radios. Mr. Struble commented that having all radio equipment the same and programmed the same had been unsuccessfully attempted in the past. Mr. Wisecup said that the idea could be identified as a plan. Mr. Reilley said that new radios were designed with different features to sell radios. He felt that if the equipment were similar, but not exactly the same, the use of Green Cards would suffice because reprogramming radios posed a challenge.

#### **EN RE: 911 SURCHARGE**

Ms. Mendoza said that the Communications Center could increase the surcharge on wire lines and wireless to \$1.25. The current charge was \$.70 per line. To initiate the increase, an application would have to be sent to the Public Utilities Commission. She requested that entities write letters supporting the increase that would accompany the application. The purpose of the increase would be to supplement the Communications Department's budget, which would augment the 911 system budget and cover radio system, personnel, and operational costs within the Center. The surcharge funds collected at present only were used for the two former costs. She asked that the agencies present this day support the increase, after which she would request support from city and town governments throughout the County.

#### **MOTION—TO INCREASE THE COUNTY'S 911 SURCHARGE**

Mr. Wisecup moved that the Communications Advisory Board support the increase in the 911 surcharge. Mr. Warner seconded.

Under discussion, it was asked what the current income from the surcharge was and where the funds were spent. Ms. Mendoza did not know the current income. Mr. Sullivan said that the surcharge funds went strictly into the Capital Pool to increase the annual fund balance in the Communications Department's budget and would cover upgrades to the microwave system and other Communications infrastructure items. He noted that letters of support from all local governments were required by the Public Utilities Commission. He added that the current annual intake was approximately \$120,000. He stated that the application had to be submitted to the PUC by the end of March, but information as to the charge and the ways in which the funds were spent would be sent to all local governments. Ms. Mendoza noted that an administrative fee was deducted from the surcharge by the telephone company.

The motion carried unanimously.

#### **EN RE: SIMULTANEOUS PAGING FOR SEARCH AND RESCUE AND AFFECTED FIRE DISTRICT**

Ms. Mendoza said that the concern had been raised at an EMS Council meeting regarding the initial paging of searches and the notification to stand by of the pertinent fire or ambulance district. She noted that there was a call guide protocol for a search and another for a rescue. On a search, the appropriate law agency and the Sheriff's Office liaison for Search and Rescue were notified by the Communications Center. Those agencies advised Dispatch as to other agencies to page.

The Board discussed examples of incidents that related to the concern expressed and debated the protocol that should be followed. Mr. Struble said that Dispatch should ask the initial pager what other agencies should be called to assist and that coordinates should be provided so that the correct fire or ambulance district was called. Mr. Hammond stated that Search and Rescue should be more proactive and call for other agencies once the person's location was known rather than tie up

resources before the needs of the situation were completely clear. It was also suggested that when Search and Rescue entered an area, all agencies within that district should be notified. Mr. Wisecup stated that the critical issue was getting medical treatment to a victim as quickly as possible, which meant contacting the closest available agency. Mr. Warner commented that de-briefings should occur so that communications among agencies and Dispatch continued to improve.

**EN RE: MEETING OF TASK FORCES**

Ms. Mendoza wanted to set up meetings with the Task Force. She said that if a meeting were scheduled prior to the CAB meeting in April, agencies could be contacted.

**EN RE: NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Communications Advisory Board will be held on April 27, 2006, from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. in the Commissioners' Hearing Room. Agenda items should be submitted to Sue Heineman.

No further business coming before the Board, same adjourned sine die.

---

Dee Bolton, Recorder

---

Bob Struble, Chairman