



1. Attendance Roster

User Council Members and Alternates

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|
| P = Present | T = Via Telephone | E = Excused | U = Unexcused |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|

Primary

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| T | Adams | Ocie | Mr. | SOA DOT&PF |
| T | Beals | Mark | Chief | Municipalities Central, Bear Creek Fire Service Area |
| U | Claar | William | Mr. | Fed Non-DOD, US Forest Service |
| U | Dalzell | Jacob | TSgt | DOD, JBER |
| U | Fronterhouse | Bev | Ms | Fed Non-DOD, Bureau of Land Management |
| T | Johnson | Brad | Chief | Municipalities Northern , Fairbanks PD |
| P | Leveque | Matt | MAJ | SOA DPS, AST, Chair |
| T | Mitchell | William | Mr. | DOD USAF, Eielson AFB |
| P | Murphy | Peter | Mr. | Fed Non-DOD, FBI, Vice Chair |
| P | Morgan | Leon | Mr. | SOA All Others, DHS&EM (representing all other SOA Agencies) |
| T | Sell | Kris | Lt | Municipalities Southeast, Juneau PD |
| T | Williams | Rick | GS-12 | DOD US Army Alaska |

Alternate

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------|-------|---|
| E | Arasz | Paul | Mr. | Fed Non-DOD, FBI |
| E | Ashley | Freddie | Mr. | DOD USAF, Clear AFS (Eielson Alt) |
| T | Flowers | Alvin | Mr. | Fed Non-DOD, TSA |
| | VACANT | | | DOD US Army Alaska |
| E | Gibbs | David | Mr. | Municipalities Northern, Fairbanks North Star Borough Emergency Manager |
| T | Halden | Jordan | Mr. | SOA All Others, DNR Forestry |
| E | Keeney | George | Chief | Municipalities Central, Valdez FD |
| E | Leggett | Ray | Chief | Municipalities Southeast, Skagway PD |
| U | Lewis | Mike | Mr. | Fed Non-DOD, US Fish & Wildlife Service |
| E | Patz | Greg | Mr. | SOA DOT |
| T | Halden | Jordan | Mr. | SOA All Others, DNR Forestry |
| E | Royal | Ronald | Mr. | DOD USAF, Eielson AFB |
| | VACANT | | | SOA DPS, AST |

Other Attendees

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| P | Borg | Casey | Mr. | System Manager |
| E | Leber | Rich | Mr. | OMO Technical Advisor |
| P | Paulick | Adam | Mr. | ETS IT Manager |
| P | Shafer | Sherry | Ms. | Operations Document Specialist |
| P | Smith | Del | Mr. | Operations Manager |
| T | Tucker | Jeff | Chief | North Star Volunteer Fire Department |
| P | Woodall | Tim | Mr. | ALCOM/J6 |



2. Meeting Minutes and Action Items

| Agenda Item / Topic | Discussion | Action Items |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| Called to Order | Major Matt Leveque called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. | |
| Roll Call | Roll call was taken and a quorum of User Council members was in attendance. | |
| Previous Meeting Minutes Approval | <p>The minutes from the March meeting were reviewed. Major Leveque asked the council if there were any corrections. Hearing none, Major Leveque requested a motion of approval.</p> <p>Motion: Accept the March 7, 2012 meeting minutes, as written.</p> <p>Motion: Mr. Leon Morgan Second: Mr. Ocie Adams</p> <p>There were no objections. The motion passed.</p> | |
| Review of I&R Log | Active Issues | |
| | <p>Item #57 – This item remains open due to the fact the SOA All Others alternate, SOA DPS alternate, and USARAK alternate positions are still vacant.</p> <p>The letter designating Mr. Jordan Halden as the SOA All Others alternate was received from the SOA Executive Council Co-Chair. A vote of approval by the full EC is expected at their April meeting.</p> | |
| | Pending Issues | |
| | There were no pending issues. | |
| | Issues Closed at, or since, last meeting | |
| | There were no issues closed. | |
| Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting | There were three actions items from the February meeting. All were closed. | |
| Operations Management Office Update | Mr. Del Smith, Operations Manager | Action Items Assigned |
| Cost Share Working Group | 1. Mr. Del Smith advised the council that the Cost Share Working Group had cancelled any further meetings. They voted to accept the proposed 88/12/25 approach and method where the infrastructure owners pay for what they own and generally shared services would be cost shared based on the 88/12 percentage of ownership. The State would be responsible for any further discussions regarding the 25% of their share costs, which they wish to cost share with non-infrastructure owners. | |
| USARAK Site | 2. Del stated that, of the original 13 sites divested in | |



| | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| Equipment Divestiture | January, only Wolcott Mountain remains to be inventoried. Snow depth and unsafe landing conditions have prevented reaching the site. Once the snowpack melts and it is safe to land at the site, the inventory will be performed. | |
| Funding | 3. Del advised the council that the \$1.5M in O&M funds was in the Senate version of the budget, but not in the House version. Therefore, it would be a discussion item between the two conference committees. | |
| System Management Office Update | Mr. Casey Borg, System Manager | Action Items Assigned |
| Patch Updates | Casey stated that the SMO had performed some patch updates to the ALMR System on March 22. As expected, the sites bounced momentarily and went into site trunking, but came back into wide area within a few seconds. | |
| SOA Update | Mr. Adam Paulick, SOA ALMR Program Manager | Action Items Assigned |
| | Mr. Adam Paulick advised the council that he had no updates to present at this meeting. | |
| DOD Update | Mr. Tim Woodall, ALMR DOD Representative | |
| 7.9 System Software Update | 1. Mr. Tim Woodall stated the DOD had their portion of the funds for the 7.9 update. He advised that their contract was expected to be awarded by May 1, but not later than July 1. | |
| Divestiture | 2. Tim advised that the Memorandum of Agreement for the divestiture of the DOD equipment in the remaining 28 sites was in coordination. He did not anticipate any issues since this agreement mirrored the agreement for the first 13 sites. He also expects the contract to be awarded on June 30 for the inventory of the equipment. | |
| Operations and Maintenance | 3. Tim stated that the DOD had 100% of the funds for operations and maintenance and that the contract award(s) would be completed on June 30. | |
| Donnelly Dome - SOA Antenna Move | 4. Tim advised that LTC Michael Brown, ALCOM J6, had sent a message regarding the expedited approval of the State's request to move their microwave antenna from the AT&T tower to the USAF tower. | |
| Old Business | | |
| Site Prioritization | Del provided the council a synopsis regarding the action items for the information on the number of busies, agencies being affected, and how long busies last at the list of site from the March meeting. Del advised that prior to the meeting two spreadsheets had been distributed by the OMO. One showed priority sites listed by busies. The second contained detailed information on sites that ETS had been tracking. Some of those sites were deleted because they were either already built or would not be built. This spreadsheet also indicated whether | |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>the sites would be a low, medium or high cost to address.</p> <p>Casey indicated that the SMO had been tracking the site busies and busy seconds. Those with high second durations normally indicated sites with a low number of available channels. Higher capacity sites could have more busies but they would be shorter in duration. He stated that although the busy total was higher it was still below the one percent standard for the System, as set by the council.</p> <p>Deputy Chief Brad Johnson asked how this lists compared to the 2008 list the User Council had agreed to during the Annual Training Conference, because addressing site busies would not address the North Pole coverage issue. He said you can't measure what is not there.</p> <p>Del stated that tracking the busy data did not imply that coverage was not a priority issue as there are several areas that could use improved coverage but adding capacity would relatively cheaper and the gains would be seen quicker as opposed to building a green site. Del also stated that the Legislative Audit office had requested the UC priority list when it was available.</p> <p>Leon stated that perhaps looking at the site expansion and the site enhancements separately made more sense than lumping them together. They each have their own value and the costs are so vastly different that building a green site should not be competing against adding a channel; it was not an equitable comparison.</p> <p>Brad agreed but also noted that enhancements could also cost up to \$500K. He emphasized that a site at North Pole could be considered an enhancement because coverage already exists in the North Pole/Fairbanks area; it is just inadequate for the needs of the responders operating there. He stated it should take some priority over expansion beyond the current System.</p> <p>Leon stated he agreed; we need to meet the needs of current users before we talk about building out the areas that are underserved. In the Kenai Peninsula for example, in the next year we are probably going to see a complete migration of all the first responders on to the ALMR System. That's going to put a lot of pressure on Kenai Prism and Kasilof three-channel sites. Not to say they are more important than other areas, but that is where the anecdotal argument may come into play where now we have all these people on the System and they say it doesn't work because they are always getting busies.</p> | |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Casey stated MatSu Borough (mile 49 of the Parks Highway) Paxson, Summit Lake, Delta and North Pole all fall into that area of enhancement where another site is probably needed within the current coverage footprint.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated it sounds as if part of what comes into play is ETS may have a certain amount of discretionary funds in this coming fiscal year, this summer season, to go ahead and applying to areas, which don't require big capital expenditures. So the point of departure is what do we go ahead and buy out of State operating funding, and what do we need to get special capital appropriations for. He stated he believe what Adam needed was for the council to prioritize where ETS could apply those operating funds.</p> <p>Adams stated it was also helpful for ETS to be able to tell the Legislature each year what the number one priority was for the User Council. If the council can rank their priorities by low/medium/high, it would help us move forward this summer.</p> <p>Ocie asked what had previously been done at North Pole to alleviate some of the coverage issues.</p> <p>Del reminded the council that the Transportable Area North had been set up at the North Pole Fire Station and had provided an exceptional level of coverage while it was deployed there.</p> <p>Brad reminded everyone that a System Design Implementation Document had also been accomplished on adding a site at North Pole.</p> <p>Ocie asked if there was some dollar figure ETS was shooting at.</p> <p>Matt stated if he understood what Ocie was asking, is there was some way to blend, mix and match sites, based on what ETS had available.</p> <p>Del stated that to give ETS some idea, possibly provide separate lists - one for busies and one for coverage - and prioritize then one through ten, which could help ETS decide where they could begin to address these issues.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated this looked like the best way to handle this. One list for enhancements (busy mitigation) and one list for coverage issues. If we have functional workarounds in a number of those areas where we can impact more users, we need to put together a rough cut of what we would like ETS to consider. Major Leveque asked the council to</p> | |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>name their five highest areas as needing addressed at this time. Everyone agreed North Pole would be the number one medium cost enhancement to fill in a coverage gap in an existing coverage area.</p> <p>Adam stated that the council could have more than one number one site, if they felt addressing the issues at both sites was equally important.</p> <p>Del stated in future years the continuing support of the Legislature was paramount. If users continue to come on the System and they start getting busies, then they will say the System does not work. Del emphasized although Tolsona has the highest percentage of busies, the population is small. With Kenai, where you have higher population centers and they are going to be coming on the System, you get the most bang for the buck.</p> <p>Major Leveque suggested the council come up with a list where they would allocate less expensive/busy reducing money to start with. He stated his top three would be Kenai Prism, Kasilof and Peger Road.</p> <p>Mr. Mark Beals asked about the possibility of moving FS12 to Goose Bay. It would be cheaper than having to buy all new equipment.</p> <p>Major Leveque agreed and stated that by adding Goose Bay to the list it would be serving all areas - the Interior, MatSu and Kenai.</p> <p>Mr. Pete Murphy asked how many channels were being added to each.</p> <p>Casey stated that we only had a set of channels available so the SMO would have to look at the number of busies and determine how many channels would be necessary. If existing pairs are utilized, they would just need to be relicensed to the new site.</p> <p>Leon stated he liked the suggested list and it was a win-win situation if the council used this as a starting point.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked if anyone had any difference of opinion with North Pole being the number one site where the User Council would ask the State to invest significant resources to fill in the hole for current users. He asked for a motion by the council as such.</p> <p>Motion: Categorize Kenai Prism, Kasilof, Peger Road and Goose Bay as sites one through four to be</p> | <p>1. The OMO will post the North Pole SDID to the ALMR web site for review by the council.</p> |
|--|---|---|



| | | |
|---------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | <p>addressed with regard to busy/capacity issue, and North Pole as the number one site for coverage issue resolution.</p> <p>Motion: Leon Second: Pete</p> <p>There were no objections. The motion passed.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated he would brief the council's decision to the Executive Council and explain how they reached the decision. The outcome would hopefully be the Executive Council's blessing on the recommended list and ETS could then proceed forward. Major Leveque asked that the council be prepared for continuation of the discussion at the next meeting on where they would see other significant investments as beneficial. He asked if there was additional information that the council would like to see added to the tracking spreadsheets.</p> <p>Mark asked if there was any information available regarding what it takes to bring a green site on line - the steps, timeline, studies, etc.</p> <p>Tim stated he could get that information.</p> | |
| New Business | | Action Items Assigned |
| | There were no items presented. | |
| Next meeting | | |
| | Major Leveque announced the next two regularly scheduled meetings were May 2 and June 6. He asked council members to come to the May meeting prepared to pick an alternate date for the July meeting, which falls on the 4th this year. | |
| Adjourn | | |
| | The meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m. | |