



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
P	Claar	William	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, US Forest Service
P	Dalzell	Jacob	TSgt	DOD, JBER
T	Fronterhouse	Bev	Ms	Fed Non-DOD, Bureau of Land Management
T	Johnson	Brad	Chief	Municipalities Northern , Fairbanks PD, Vice Chair
P	Leveque	Matt	MAJ	SOA DPS, AST, Chair
E	Mitchell	William	Mr.	DOD USAF, Eielson AFB
P	Murphy	Peter	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, FBI
	VACANT			SOA All Others, DMVA (representing all other SOA Agencies)
T	Sell	Kris	Lt	Municipalities Southeast, Juneau PD
U	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)
U	Caldwell	Jim	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, TSA
U	Fulton	Jeffrey	MAJ	DOD US Army Alaska
E	Gibbs	David	Mr.	Municipalities Northern, Fairbanks North Star Borough Emergency Manager
E	Horton	Tia	Ms.	Municipalities Central, Anchorage Fire Department
E	Keeney	George	Chief	Municipalities Central, Valdez FD
U	Lambert	Andrew	Mr.	DOD, JBER
E	Leggett	Ray	Chief	Municipalities Southeast, Skagway PD
E	Lewis	Mike	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, US Fish & Wildlife Service
E	Patz	Greg	Mr.	SOA DOT
E	Pyne	Kathryn	Ms.	SOA All Others, DNR Forestry (representing all other SOA Agencies)
T	Royal	Ronald	Mr.	DOD USAF, Eielson AFB
E	Wilson	Barry	Capt	SOA DPS, AST

Other Attendees

P	Bohman	Andreas	Mr.	Security Manager
P	Borg	Casey	Mr.	System Manager
T	Halden	Jordan	Mr.	DNR Division of Forestry
T	Hereford	Carl	Mr.	MatSu Borough



P	Kohler	Jim	Mr.	SOA ALMR Program Manager
P	Newman	Natalie	Ms.	59th Signal Battalion, FRA
P	Shafer	Sherry	Ms.	OMO Document Specialist
P	Smith	Del	Mr.	Operations Manager
P	Woodall	Tim	Mr.	DOD ALMR Project Officer

2. Meeting Minutes and Action Items

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion	Action Items
Called to Order	Major Matt Leveque called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.	
Roll Call	Roll call was taken and a quorum was achieved. There were no guests.	
Previous Meeting Minutes Approval	<p>Minutes from March meeting were reviewed.</p> <p>Motion: Accept March 2, 2011, meeting minutes as written.</p> <p>Motion: Mr. Pete Murphy Second: Mr. Ocie Adams</p> <p>There were no objections. The motion passed.</p>	
Review of I&R Log	<p>Active Issues</p> <p>Item #57 – SOA - All Others primary position is vacant.</p> <p>Pending Issues</p> <p>There were no pending issues.</p> <p>Issues Closed at, or since, last meeting</p> <p>There were no issues closed.</p>	
Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting	There were no action items resulting from the March meeting.	
Operations Management Office Update	Mr. Del Smith, Operations Manager	Action Items Assigned
Army Divesture	<p>1. Del gave a brief synopsis of the topic of discussion involving the first 13 sites that USARAK planned to divest effective July 1, 2011. From the subsequent discussions to follow, the OMO would hope to get actions or recommendations that the User Council would like to make to the Executive Council. The Army plans to put the first 13 sites into a "break/fix" status until Dec 31. After such time, the sites would not be repaired. Del pointed out that the "break/fix" mode would violate the Service Level Agreement (SLA). Although neither the UC nor the EC can tell USARAK they can't do this, perhaps there is a compromise which can be reached which on how that "break/fix" would be structured so as to mitigate the potential issues this entails.</p>	



	<p>Mr. Tim Woodall gave a history of how this all came about. In March 2010, the Army sent a letter stating they could not sustain the equipment because it no longer supports their daily mission. Tim pointed out that the equipment does support the Defense Support to Civil Authorities (DSCA) role but the Stafford Act prohibits funding based solely on DSCA missions. The equipment must be used in the Army's daily operational requirements.</p> <p>There was a meeting scheduled in March and the Army identified their intention again. At the meeting, they discussed the "break/fix" strategy. This was the first mention of this. Previously, they had intended to hand over the equipment completely on July 1, 2011. The State was not prepared to give the Army a determination on whether they were going to accept the equipment or not. As such, the Army extended the "break/fix" offer. Effective July 1, 2012, the remaining sites would enter "break/fix" status through December 31. The issue is "break/fix" has not been defined.</p> <p>Tim stated he would turn the discussion over to Mr. Jim Kohler to brief the council on the State's plans and then Mr. Casey Borg could give a technical analysis of the ramifications of a "break/fix" status for the System. Afterwards, he suggested the council could discuss what actions they would take.</p> <p>Jim referenced the latest meeting between DOA Commissioner Hultberg and the Army, stating that the State was not in a position to tell the Army they could accept the equipment until it has the authorization of the dollars to maintain that equipment through a Legislative appropriation and authorization. Jim stated that process will involve a discussion in front of the Legislature where they will be asking a lot of questions and expecting answers. DOA also cannot agree to take the equipment after December 31 until the money is secured. Previously, the Legislature had initially assigned a \$150K to be charged to the municipalities. The Governor requested general funds for this to which the House refused and added an additional \$150K to be collected. This still must be addressed in the Senate version of the budget and ultimately approved by both bodies. . At this point in time, there is no money on the table for the State to say they can pick up any "break/fix" responsibilities beginning January 1, 2012. Therefore, Jim stated he couldn't tell the council what would happen at that time.</p> <p>Mr. Casey Borg stated for site maintenance there were several different levels of services that would impact the</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>users. One was on-site response, the second was System monitoring, and the last was equipment repair. There is currently a significant stock of spares with the exception of site controllers. They could put into place a break/fix contract that would specify that the contractor would need to respond within a certain timeframe.</p> <p>Tim clarified this is a time and materials contract, meaning whatever time it takes to fix the problems and whatever parts are need is what the contractor bills against, versus a cost CLIN which provides a not-to-exceed price.</p> <p>Casey stated as far as the impact to the user, it could be a long time from the time the site goes down until there is a response to the site to repair it. If there is no site monitoring in place, the SMO would not know until someone contacted them to tell them.</p> <p>Tim stated the risk exists that if the Army executes a contract with an independent contractor, that contractor may have no obligation to coordinate with the existing maintenance, including the SOA. He advised the council they should consider the relationship between who they give the contract to and who currently has the contract. The best approach would be to give it to the entity that currently has it. That would make it easiest to live with. Another concern is the definition of "break/fix." The council should suggest to the Army the level of "break/fix" that limits the liability and risk. It doesn't mean they will do it, but it provides something to consider. In a standard "break/fix" contract, it could be weeks to months before a site is repaired.</p> <p>Pete asked if the sites were going to be given to the State, why wouldn't the State just go out and fix it the equipment like they already do.</p> <p>Tim explained that currently the State does not own the equipment, the Army does, and they are offering to put a "break/fix" contract in place for the six months until such time that either the State accepts the equipment or the equipment is removed.</p> <p>Major Leveque stopped the conversation at this point and gave a broad overview of the situation. He stated for the last year the council was operating under the assumption that the Army was going to give the sites to the State. The State has said 'no thank you, we don't want them.' The EC does not really know about all this.</p> <p>Jim stated that the State has not done a good job of articulating to the Army is that the issue of what the Army is</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>proposing is not just an issue of direct conversations between the Army and the State. Anything that has to do with the sites and the divestiture is a consortium issue. These are the conversations that have to take place with the Executive Council because no decision can be made independent of the consortium. There is a whole host of consortium issues at stake here.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated that the issue before the User Council is that the UC draft a letter to the EC proposing whatever process is chosen, there be some degree of specificity on response times, monitoring, and so forth. We don't want to end up in a situation where a site goes dead and no one knows it's dead until someone doesn't come up on a radio. He emphasized that the UC needs to encourage the EC to pursue an agreement with the Army to obtain a contractor who would provide good support. He stated that the User Council also needed to convey to the EC the same level of concern about what happens on January 1, 2012, because the Army has told us they will cover it until the end of the calendar year, then the users are out of luck. The council needs to provoke some serious executive actions regarding what do they ask the Army to do the next six months, what do we ask the State to do on January 1, 2012. This immediately affects the Kenai Peninsula, Valdez, and Glennallen. He stated the issue before the council today, and he requested Deputy Chief Brad Johnson weigh in, was how does the council best communicate the two principal concerns: a) about break/fix and, b) about what happens next January to the EC.</p> <p>Brad agreed. He stated the biggest issue he had was the State position stating because they did not have the increased funding to maintain the equipment, therefore they would not accept it. The fact is that the State needs to retain operability of that equipment for everybody that uses it. If the State doesn't accept it, then what happens? Worst case, the Army says fine and they surplus it off and it's gone and suddenly we have no communications on the Kenai Peninsula and then potentially that spreads to other areas of the State as further divestiture takes place. While he understands both the State's and Army's perspectives, he stated that the responsibility of the User Council is to address the viability of the System and its needs as users through a letter to the EC directing recommendations to both the State and the Army addressing each of those concerns.</p> <p>Mr. Ocie Adams stated that all the users already have a level of service promised in the Membership Agreements and the level of service should remain the same regardless of whether the Army remains a partner or not.</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>Major Leveque agreed. He stated the challenge is to articulate from the User Council to the Army that the UC does not feel the Army should not have the authority to unilaterally stop maintaining the equipment. The other challenge is that if the Army is really going to do this, they need to consider the needs of the other users on the System.</p> <p>Tim stated that it is in the user's best interest at this point to advise the Army the best approach for "break/fix" that would reduce the risk to the System and agencies and give the best level of operability. The UC should ask them to do the minimum such as monitoring, 72-hour response time, critical spares on hand, and if a spare is used it is replaced, notification to the SMO if it is an outside contractor. There will be a lot of coordination issues between the current contractor who maintains the spares and any other one that might be hired to provide break/fix repairs.</p> <p>Casey stated the critical needs to address for the "break/fix" strategy would, be monitoring, setting a response time minimum and a POC at the Army to be available 24/7 to give the go ahead, and if another contractor is hired, they still have to meet all the DIACAP requirements.</p> <p>Ocie asked how many of the channels at the 13 sites were involved. Casey advised it is all the equipment at all the sites and the majority of sites in the first 13 are three-channel sites.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated that it is already April and this is all happening beginning July 1. The User Council needs to get a letter out in the next couple of weeks. He stated from what he heard the letter needs to address three things: 1) that this is a rotten thing for the Army to do and they don't have the right to change the SLA, 2) if they are going to do this, that for the sake of the System and the safety of those operating out there, that they address the five elements in the contract that Casey identified, and 3) they come with some sort of resolution with the EC and the State as to what happens January 1, 2012. He then asked the council if they trusted the OMO/SMO to put the letter together and then he and Brad would review it.</p> <p>Pete stated that he would make a motion to support that.</p> <p>Motion: Request a letter be drafted by the Operations Manager and the System Manager, collaboratively with Major Leveque and Deputy Chief Johnson, on behalf of the User Council regarding break/fix recommendations</p>	
--	--	--



<p>AFEA Cost Share</p> <p>Cost Share Cooperative Agreement</p> <p>Site Grounding</p> <p>Interoperability Zone Changes</p>	<p>to the Executive Council for the period of July 1 - December 31, 2011.</p> <p>Motion: Pete Second: Jacob</p> <p>There were no objections. The motion passed.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated that he would like to get it to the EC within a couple weeks.</p> <p>Tim stated that the Army would need to get the Statement of Work to contracting by the end of April in order to get the contract in place by July 1.</p> <p>Major Leveque stated he understood this but the EC hasn't met in at least six months and at this point there are two new EC members. He also stated the three voting members have not yet met either. He said the UC would try to expedite the letter.</p> <p>2. Del advised the UC that the Air Force has agreed to accept the funds.</p> <p>Tim stated they will be annotated as reimbursable funds and transferred via interagency agreements. There are currently six agencies with funds. The agreements must be in a standard draft format. Tim also notified the council that he needs someone to take the lead and get all the agreements together and work with him to finalize everything.</p> <p>3. Del reminded the council that the Cost Share Cooperative Agreement must be renewed annually and funds must be in place by May 1.</p> <p>4. Del stated that all sites/equipment are to be grounded per the R56 Standard as stated in the SLA. SOA ETS receives a copy of all QA/QC reports from the OMO. This has been an on-going issue for six years. SOA ETS stated they had received deferred maintenance funds in 2009 to correct outstanding maintenance deficiencies, but none of the grounding issues have been fixed.</p> <p>5. Del advised the council that all ALMR radios will need to have the wideband frequencies in the OP Zone reprogrammed to narrowband by December 31, 2012</p>	<p>Action Items Assigned</p>
<p>System Management Office Update</p>	<p>Mr. Casey Borg, System Manager</p>	<p>Action Items Assigned</p>
<p>Maintenance Issues</p>	<p>1. Casey advised that the Kodiak microwave link is down more than it is up at this time. Pillar Mountain is in site</p>	



	<p>trunking and Womans Bay is off line until the connectivity issues can be resolved by SOA</p> <p>2. Casey stated he doesn't believe Channel 6 is the cause of the interference with the Coast Guard. Interference could be seen even with the channel off. He was leaving it off until he could talk to the Coast Guard regarding the issue.</p> <p>3. Casey advised the council that the Moose Pass site was repaired. The technician had replaced a jumper.</p> <p>4. Casey stated that the antenna was replaced at Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport and that resolved the problem there.</p> <p>5. Casey updated the council on the issue at Birch Hill. There is an intermod issue on the receive antenna. At this time the antenna had not been replaced.</p> <p>6. Casey advised the council that the broken antenna mast at Cooper Mountain was still causing some issues but that as soon as the weather permitted, technicians were going to replace it.</p> <p>7. Jacob asked, regarding the interference at R1N caused by the tower light, if he could get an email on what the technician did to resolve it.</p>	
Joint Project Team - DOD Update	Mr. Tim Woodall, ALMR Project Manager	
	Tim had nothing further to add to the meeting.	
Joint Project Team - SOA Update	Mr. Jim Kohler, SOA ETS Program Manager	
	Jim stated he appreciated the User Council's approach to the Army divestiture.	
Old Business		
	There was no old business presented during this meeting.	
Next meeting		
	The next regularly scheduled meetings are May 4, June 1 and July 6.	
New Business		
	There was no new business presented this meeting.	
Adjourn		
	<p>A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ocie and seconded by Jacob. There were no objections.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 2:51 p.m.</p>	