



1. Attendance Roster

User Council Members and Alternates

P = Present	T = Via Telephone	A = Absent
-------------	-------------------	------------

**Primary**

	Adams	Ocie	Mr.	SOA – DOT&PF
	Fisher	Bryan	Mr.	SOA Other – DMVA (representing all other AK Agencies)
T	Fronterhouse	Bev	Ms	Fed Non-DOD – DOI
	VACANT			Fed Non-DOD – TSA
	VACANT			Municipalities - Southeast Rep
T	Johnson	Brad	Chief	Municipalities - Northern Rep - Fairbanks PD, <b>Vice Chair</b>
P	Leveque	Matt	MAJ	SOA – DPS, <b>Chair</b>
	VACANT			Municipalities - Central Rep
	Mitchell	William	Mr.	DOD - Eielson
P	Murphy	Peter	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - FBI
	Newman	Natalie	Ms.	DOD – US Army Alaska
	Taylor	Marlon	MSgt	DOD – Elmendorf

**Alternate**

	Borrego	Susan	Ms.	Fed Non-DOD - FBI
	Caldwell	Jim	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - TSA
T	Gibbs	David	Mr.	Municipalities, Northern Rep – Fairbanks North Star Borough Emergency Manager
T	Hansen	Glenn	Mr.	SOA Other - DMVA
	VACANT			Municipalities - Central Rep
	Lewis	Mike	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - DOI
T	Patz	Greg	Mr.	SOA - DOT
P	Poindexter	Corey	Mr.	DOD - US Army Alaska
	Royal	Ronald	Mr.	DOD – Eielson
	Schmitt	Sheldon	Chief	Municipalities - Southeast Rep – Sitka PD
	Shearer	James	TSgt	DOD – Elmendorf
	VACANT			Municipalities - Northern Rep
	Wilson	Barry	LT	SOA – DPS

**Other Attendees**

P	Beals	Mark	Chief	Bear Creek Fire Dept
T	Cashen	Cyndi	Ms.	Alaska Highway Safety Office
P	Kohler	Jim	Mr.	SOA ALMR Program Manager
P	Leber	Rich	Mr.	DOD ALMR Technical Advisor
P	Shafer	Sherry	Ms.	OMO Document Specialist
T	Smith	Del	Mr.	Operations Manager
T	Tucker	Jeff	Chief	Fairbanks North Star Borough Fire Dept



Alaska Land Mobile Radio

*ALMR User Council  
Meeting Minutes*

*Date: July 2, 2008*

P	Woodall	Tim	Mr.	DOD ALMR Project Manager
---	---------	-----	-----	--------------------------

2. Meeting Minutes and Action Items

<b>Agenda Item / Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<b>Called to Order</b>	Major Matt Leveque called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.	
<b>Roll Call</b>	Roll call was taken and quorum was achieved.	
<b>Previous Meeting Minutes Approval</b>	Minutes from June 4 were reviewed and approved.  <b>Motion: Accept and approve the June 4, 2008, meeting minutes as written and presented.</b>  <b>Motion:</b> Mr. Pete Murphy <b>Second:</b> Mr. Corey Poindexter <b>There were no objections and the motion carried.</b>	
<b>Review of I&amp;R Log</b>	<b>Active Issues</b>	
<b>#57 – User Council Vacant Positions</b>	Major Leveque advised that Mr. David Gibbs was recently nominated as the new Alternate Representative for the Northern Municipalities. He briefed that Chief Mark Beals has been nominated to fill the Primary representative position as the Central Municipalities Representative and Chief Sheldon Schmidt, Sitka Police Department, will move from the alternate representative to the primary representative position for the Southeast municipalities.	
	<b>Pending Issues</b>	
	There were no pending issues	
	<b>Issues Closed at, or since, last meeting</b>	
<b>#56 - Busies</b>	The User Council adopted a standard for System busies for both percentage and length during day-to-day and emergency operations at the June meeting.	
<b>Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting</b>	Major Leveque addressed the Action Items from the May meeting. Item 1 – Three-digit agency identifiers remains open. The SMO is working to correct agencies with multiple identifiers and get good points of contact. Item 2 – Will be addressed during New Business.	
<b>Operations Management Office Update</b>	<b>Mr. Del Smith, Operations Manager</b>	
<b>Documents Awaiting UC Approval</b>	1. Del briefed that there are a number of documents (23) awaiting review by the User Council document committees and more will be forthcoming. The High Level Strategy is still awaiting comment from Document Committee #2.	
<b>103<sup>rd</sup> CST Rodeo</b>	2. The Communications Support Team (CST) rodeo was conducted last week in Soldotna and CSTs from all over the country attended. On Wednesday June 25, there were tabletop exercises and briefings on DOD resources	



<p><b>Annual User Council Conference</b></p>	<p>including Transportable South (TAS) and the Advanced Mobility Vehicle (ADVON). It was a good exercise with emergency responders from all over the peninsula participating.</p> <p>3. The Annual User Council Conference is scheduled for Sep 16 – 17 and the intent, with UC concurrence, is to have the 16<sup>th</sup> dedicated to speakers and presentation, and the 17<sup>th</sup> kept as a closed session for the User Council only. The OMO has requested a speaker from the Office of Emergency Communications (OEC), and also invited Mr. David Webb in British Columbia, who is dealing with their interoperability/cross border issues and the Olympics.</p>	
<p><b>Florida Interoperability Network (FIN) Summit Workshop</b></p>	<p>4. The Florida interoperability trip was completed and the OMO has scheduled a MotoBridge™ Summit to discuss and begin working on the protocols and procedures for each of the dispatch centers. OMO sent out a notice; the workshop is scheduled for Jul 22 at the Hawthorne Inn from 8 to 5. Organizations are strongly encouraged to send operations personnel, as well as their dispatchers.</p>	
<p><b>Fireweed 400 and Ride For Life</b></p>	<p>5. Del stated the OMO obtained 12 loaner radios from Alaska Air National Guard for the volunteers to communicate in case of emergencies. This was coordinated with AST concerning using Hail channels to communicate with dispatchers if/when needed.</p>	
<p><b>System Busy Criteria</b></p>	<p>6. Del presented the new metric slides on the System busy statistics to the User Council using the criteria they voted on in the June meeting. He requested clarification on whether the UC wanted the site to meet both criteria for reporting or whether if it met either of the criteria is was reported. The council requested that if the site met either of the stated criteria it be reported. The council requested the slide be modified and sited with conflicted channels be color coded and the number of channels per site be added for all sites (with the conflicted channel annotated in red).</p>	<p>1. OMO to update the System Busy metric slide to color code the site names with conflicted channels and list the number of channels at each site (conflicted channel annotated in red).</p>
<p><b>MotoBridge™</b></p>	<p>7. Major Leveque asked about the status of the MotoBridge™ installation.</p> <p>Del stated the equipment order and installation plan was slowly moving along. Some of the organizations slated to receive a MotoBridge™ asked why they would want one. Del explained that with the current Gold Elite consoles, if the microwave connection was lost, the console is no longer operational except locally within reach of the antenna connected to the Gold Elite. What the MotoBridge™ does is create an alternate redundant path, possibly over the internet, to re-establish connection in the interim.</p>	



Mr. Tim Woodall explained that MotoBridge™ provides provide a Gold Elite-type function (Gold Elite Lite). It does not have all of the robustness of the console, but can provide dispatch functions and can access the same resources available on the Gold Elite console if those resources are connected through the CEB. However, if both are running on the State's microwave, and the microwave fails, you lose both. If you have one on the State's microwave and one on internet or on fiber or some alternate path, if one goes down, the other one works.

Major Leveque repeated for his own clarification, that if ALMR lost the State's SATS, and we don't have the MotoBridges™ on a separate system, that connectivity is just shot and the big advantage the MotoBridge™ brings us if we establish an alternate routing mechanism, is that we have redundancy.

Deputy Chief Brad Johnson asked what we are currently on now. Tim stated the current MotoBridges™ are on SATS. Brad stated that would have to change too in order to create that redundancy. Tim stated that was the primary function of MotoBridge™ is to connect disparate radio systems that are not patched into the system. The secondary function is to provide dispatch-centric control over bridged resources that would help you maintain that control. The other great advantage is to provide the redundant dispatch function should dispatch be lost. The function need not be on an alternate source 24/7, but you could have manual or hot switch in the router that says if one path goes out, it routes to the other path. A local internet connection of 256Kb would be sufficient to support the MotoBridge™ operation as an alternate approach. The current installation only installs the MotoBridge™ with connectivity on the State's microwave and not with a redundant path. DOD was going to fund a System Design for completion of an alternate path for dispatch capabilities but ran into some SOA security issues what they we unable to overcome. This is something that Operations (operators on the system – AST, local police, and fire) needs to visit, and settle with, the SOA Department of Administration security office.

Brad asked if that was a recommendation that came out of the MotoBridge™ FIN Summit to provide that secondary path, would we continue to revisit that.

Tim stated that should be the next step. DOD would continue to do the System Design from the DOD installation perspective but not across the entire MotoBridge™ network as originally planned, because DOD wants to know what the alternate path, technical solution would be and what it would



	cost. However, they would not be able to implement it until some agreement or risk mitigation could be worked out with the state.	
<b>System Management Office Update</b>	<b>Mr. Casey Borg, System Manager</b>	
	Mr. Casey Borg was redeploying the TAS to its warehouse storage location and unable to attend the meeting.	
<b>Joint Project Team Update</b>	<b>Mr. Jim Kohler, SOA ETS Program Manager</b>	
	<p>1. Mr. Kohler stated June Executive Council meeting was cancelled and the next meeting is schedule for July 17. They hope to have the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) document ready for the meeting.</p> <p>2. Jim stated that as of Monday, June 30, the Fairbanks area sites should have been resolved. Those sites included Ester Dome, Quarry Hill, Birch Hill, and Fairbanks International Airport.</p> <p>3. Skagway, from the SATS side, is ready to turn on. However, there is no microwave to bring into Juneau until the Haines site is ready to turn up. The T1 is available but they are having a router issue.</p> <p>4. The Honolulu site tower foundation is under construction, the road improvement is also underway, and the tower is to be moved to the site next week some time.</p>	
	<b>Mr. Tim Woodall, ALMR Project Manager</b>	
<b>Cost Share Status</b>	<p>1. Tim stated the recent Executive Council meeting was cancelled because they could not vote on the approval of a Cost Share approach and method. One member was not ready to vote.</p> <p>The Joint Project Team had developed three strawman methods of Cost Share. At the previous meeting, the Executive Council had agreed, in part, on one of those strawman approaches, and tasked the Joint Project Team to develop three strawman methods to implement that approach.</p> <p>Prior to the selection of this particular approach, the Federal Non-DOD agencies had agreed upon a Cost Share strawman approach and provided a tiered method for distributing costs. However, the corresponding method that was chosen by the three stakeholders was not the one the Federal Non-DOD stakeholders had previously agreed upon.</p> <p>The Army and the Air Force had come back with two methods of Cost Share based upon the agreed approach.</p>	



<p><b>MotoBridge™ Implementation Update</b></p>	<p>One of the methods was the same as strawman two put together by the Joint Project Team, which the State and local stakeholders had already stated they were okay with. The three strawman methods had not yet been formally introduced to the Federal Non-DOD stakeholders.</p> <p>What remains is that the Federal Non-DOD stakeholders must take the proposed strawman approach and cost share method to the technical/executive level for a decision to support or not.</p> <p>The strawman approach and method #2 states that site owners pay for maintenance of the equipment they own. The associated services driven by the user base are cost shared (which are OMO, SMO, circuits) and there is a flat fee per subscriber of approximately \$18/month/unit. This was approximately a \$3 increase over what the Federal Non-DOD previously had agreed to. All costs would apply to SOA FY10 which starts in July 09 and DOD FY09 which begins October 09.</p> <p>Del reminded the group that the final Membership Agreements would still be executed for this year but the cost would be annotated as \$0 for this year. Membership Agreements are re-evaluated/re-executed each year. As more subscribers come on the System, the cost per radio would go down. Because agencies are still coming on the System at this time, by next year when the Cost Share is implemented, the cost could be even less than currently projected.</p> <p>Ms. Bev Fronterhouse asked how the Cost Share deals with radios only used during emergencies.</p> <p>Tim stated there is no cost for Part 90 radios. Those radios that operate day to day will be included in the Cost Share apportionment. Brad asked if cached radios were included in the exemption and Tim stated yes, if these radios were not registered on the System.</p> <p>2. Tim stated that 19 modifications have been executed to the contract to date. Most of those have dealt with changes in site locations which led to extensions in the contract.</p> <p>The Coast Guard is not in favor of using MotoBridge™ as a standard gateway into their maritime system. Therefore the decision was made to relocate away from the Coast Guard locations but within close proximity. Dispatchers will need an agreement with the Coast Guard on how they will gain access to maritime channels.</p>	
---	---	--



<p><b>Total Cost of Ownership</b></p> <p><b>Business Case</b></p>	<p>The equipment has been ordered and the original contract was intended to take six months to implement. The State is responsible for the last mile of connectivity and any router programming and configuration. The operational control turn over is currently slated for April 09.</p> <p>3. The Total Cost of Ownership study is still progressing. The Executive Summary has been provided to the Executive Council for review/comment. Hopefully, they will vote on July 17 to accept the Executive Summary after any required fine tuning. Once it is approved, it will be available to member agencies operating on the System.</p> <p>4. The Business Case is still on-going. US Army Pacific has requested an economic analysis and DOD has executed a contract to do this. The analysis will be a cost reasonableness study of the cost for OMO, SMO, SOA (circuit charges). Also, included in the Business Case/Economic Analysis is an evaluation of the cost to split the System apart and the tangible and intangible pros and cons of staying in the shared system or operating a stand alone system. The System Design for stand alone system implementation has already been completed by Motorola. The Economic Analysis should be completed by November/December timeframe.</p>	
<p><b>Old Business</b></p>		
<p><b>OMO FY10 Budget</b></p>	<p>1. Major Leveque mentioned that everyone should have a copy of the draft OMO budget. The budget is now ready to be validated and moved forward to the Executive Council for approval if council members are comfortable and agree to advance it.</p> <p>Tim stated that before the group voted, he just wanted to clarify a few things. He had asked the OMO to restructure the document based on a review by the contracting office. Certain items have to be put in certain contract line items.</p> <p>DOD is now in the last option year on the current contract for OMO and SMO. The required services for future years must be written into future contracts and associated with a contract line item number (CLIN).</p> <p>There was some discussion related to the Army's standpoint on the figures and the inability to validate costs by the representative on the User Council.</p> <p>Tim stated that the UC was not to make cost judgments. They were simply agreeing that what was stated in the requested budget was reasonable and required. He also stated that Colonel Clifton, as the DOD representative on the Executive Council, would staff the budget through the</p>	



<p><b>PSIC Grant</b></p>	<p>appropriate DOD agencies for validation/approval.</p> <p>Major Leveque synopsised the discussion for the group. The UC members' responsibilities are not to validate the budget. They were agreeing that the listed activities were appropriate for the OMO and were only voting to move the document forward to the Executive Council.</p> <p><b>Motion: Approve the draft FY2010 Operations Management Office Operating Budget for submission to the Executive Council.</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Corey <b>Second:</b> Brad <b>There were no objections and the motion carried.</b></p> <p>2. Major Leveque reminded the group of the formation of the State Interoperable Communications Committee that will be a portion of the Statewide Emergency Response Commission (SERC) mentioned at the June meeting. One of the things Bryan needed to put in place was that they get a User Council representative in place and that Federal Non-DOD was under-represented on the committee. Mr. Pete Murphy was nominated as the Federal Non-DOD representative. Major Leveque requested the council also approve Pete as the User Council representative. Pete agreed to do so.</p> <p><b>Motion: User Council to approve Mr. Pete Murphy as their representative on the State Interoperable Communications Committee.</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Brad <b>Second:</b> Corey <b>There were no objections and the motion carried.</b></p> <p>Brad noted that there would be other User Council members on the committee but they would be representing their respective agencies.</p>	
<p><b>Next meeting</b></p>	<p>Major Leveque stated the next scheduled meeting is August 6. The council agreed the September 3 meeting would be cancelled in lieu of the Annual UC Conference on September 16 – 17. The October meeting is scheduled for the 1st.</p> <p>Del advised the council he is currently trying to line up speakers and would welcome any particular subjects/issues of interest the council would like to hear about/discuss.</p>	
<p><b>New Business</b></p>		
<p><b>FEMA Grant</b></p>	<p>1. Major Leveque briefed on behalf of Mr. Bryan Fisher.</p>	



