



1. Attendance.

P = Present	T = Via Telephone	E = Excused	U = Unexcused	N/A = Not required
-------------	-------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------------

User Council Members

Primary				
E	Adams	Ocie	Mr.	SOA DOT&PF
T	Brinley	John	Capt	Fed Non-DOD, US Forest Service
U	Brown	Byron	LTC	DOD US Army
	VACANT		.	Municipalities Central
E	Johnson	Brad	Chief	Municipalities Northern, Fairbanks PD
T	Kaizer	Bill	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, FBI
T	Kalwara	Erann	Ms.	Municipalities Southeast
	VACANT			DOD USAF, JBER
E	Martin	Chris	Mr.	DOD USAF, Eielson AFB
P	Rockwell	John	Mr.	SOA DPS, Chair
P	Skinner	Nate	Mr.	SOA All Others, DNR Forestry, Vice Chair
U	Wolfe	John	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD DOI, US Fish & Wildlife Service

Alternate				
N/A	Brown	David	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, FBI
T	Cicciarella	Bob	Chief	Municipalities Central
P	Eubank	Greg	Mr.	SOA All Others, DMVA
T	Flowers	Alvin	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, TSA
U	Gibbs	David	Mr.	Municipalities Northern, Fairbanks North Star Borough Emergency Manager
E	Hallett	Kenneth	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, Bureau of Land Management
E	Jones	Dave	Mr.	DOD USAF, Eielson AFB
N/A	Kain	Paul	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD, USFS
E	Patz	Greg	Mr.	SOA DOT
N/A	Morgan	Leon	Mr.	SOA DPS
T	Scott	Heath	Chief	Municipalities Southeast, Haines Borough PD
E	Williams	Rick	Mr.	DOD, US Army
	VACANT			DOD USAF, JBER

Supporting Staff and Guests:

P	Conant	Travis	Mr.	System Manager
T	Shafer	Sherry	Ms.	Document Specialist
P	Smith	Del	Mr.	Operations Manager
P	Nicholl	Jim	Mr.	Motorola Solutions
P	Stormo	Scott	Mr.	SOA OIT SATS/ALMR Manager
T	White	Chris	Mr.	SOA OIT



2. Meeting Minutes and Action Items.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Items Assigned
Call to Order	Mr. John Rockwell called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.	
Roll Call	<p>Roll call was taken and a quorum of User Council (UC) members was in attendance.</p> <p>Ms. Erann Kalwara joined the meeting via teleconference after the roll was taken.</p>	
Introduction of Guests/Special Announcements	<p>The Operations Management Office (OMO) presented the council with a special order of business regarding the results of the 2017 annual election of the Chair and Vice Chair.</p> <p>Mr. Del Smith explained during the “Nomination” process there were a limited number of User Council representatives who were willing to accept nominations for both the Chair and the Vice Chair position. He advised there were only two nominees for Chair position, both individuals being from the State and four nominees for Vice Chair, two who were ineligible because they had no appointment letters from their respective governing parties. Del further stated during the “Voting” process one nominee for Vice Chair withdrew their name at the beginning of the voting period and the two ineligible never got their appointment letters in place prior to the end of the voting period. He pointed out despite the issues involved, the individuals elected by the council were the ones who actually received the most votes.</p> <p>Del stated in the 10 years the OMO had conducted the elections on behalf of the council, they had maintained that the Chair and Vice Chair must be from separate cooperative parties, but on review of the Charter, it only stated they had to be from different sectors. He read the definition of sector as, “an area or portion that is distinct from others” and pointed out that in fact Public Safety is quite distinct from Forestry.</p> <p>Del stated he wanted to bring it to the attention of the UC to see how they wanted to proceed. He also explained that because the council makes its decision through a quorum motion and vote, there would never be an instance where it could be perceived the State was overriding other members. He concluded it was up to the council to determine whether they agreed the term sector meant separate departments.</p> <p>John R. entertained discussion from the group on defining the term sector as presented as generically “department.”</p>	



	<p>Captain John Brinley stated he didn't see that it had any impact on the integrity of the vote.</p> <p>Mr. Bill Kaizer agreed as long as the individuals were not from the same department, it shouldn't have any negative impact.</p> <p>Chief Bob Ciccirella stated he agreed and thought it was fine.</p> <p>John R. stated he didn't see a need for a motion to make any changes to the verbiage, as the council had agreed that sector generically meant department.</p>	
Previous Meeting Minutes	<p>John R. asked the council members if they had reviewed the draft December 2017 minutes and had any changes. Hearing none, he requested a motion to approve the minutes.</p> <p>Motion: Approve the December 6 meeting minutes, as written.</p> <p>Motion: Bill Second: Mr. Alvin Flowers</p> <p>There was no discussion and no objections. The motion passed.</p>	
Issues & Risks Log	Active Issues	Action Items Assigned
	<p>John R. stated the newest open issues were the vacancies created by Ms. Tammy Goggia's retirement and the vacancy that would occur when Mr. Ocie Adams retired.</p> <p>The OMO advised the council members the appointment letter for LTC Byron Brown had been received and Colonel Timothy Maxwell, the Department of Defense (DOD) Executive Council representative, had approved the appointment.</p>	
	Pending Issues	
	There were no pending issues.	
	Issues Closed at, or since, last meeting	
	There were no items closed.	
Action Items Review	Opened Items	Resolution
	There were two closed action items from the December meeting, which John Rockwell read for the benefit of the group.	
Operations Management Office	Mr. Del Smith, Operations Manager	Action Items Assigned
FY18 Membership Agreements	1. Mr. Del Smith stated there was no change in the status and the Operations Management Office (OMO) had sent out	



<p>First Quarter Master Site Rollover</p> <p>DiagnostX</p> <p>Radio Usage</p> <p>December Document Reviews</p>	<p>its fifth 30-day extension notice for the FY17 membership agreements on December 28.</p> <p>2. Del advised the council the first quarter rollover would not occur as there were no core patches to apply since the 7.13 platform was currently up to date. He stated there would be some security patching only that would take place.</p> <p>3. Del stated there was no change on this subject since the last meeting from his point.</p> <p>4. Del informed the council a situation had recently occurred during a vehicle accident and the responding agency had called Mr. Travis Conant, System Manager, stating they were having trouble with their radios and the System. Del noted Travis sent a technician to the ALMR offices to check and there were no issues with the System. Del stated Travis traveled to the area the following day and asked him to brief the council on his findings.</p> <p>Travis briefed that he verified there were no call outs for System issues received from Motorola, then traveled to the area doing radio checks from Anchorage all along the way and had no issues. He stated he acquired one of the agency radios and performed an auto-tune on it, where he discovered it multiple issues. Travis stated the radio had never been looked at since it was put in the field and the codeplug had several preferred sites set. He also stated the dispatch center was on the wrong regional IC channel, different from those personnel in the field.</p> <p>Mr. Scott Stormo stated he had put in a request to acquire three auto-tune units for the State, but the request had been denied.</p> <p>Mr. Jim Nicholl point out the DiagnostX box would help in instances like this. He stated that's what the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) uses.</p> <p>Travis stated the auto-tune procedure takes approximately 15 minutes to complete on a subscriber.</p> <p>Del also pointed out there were multiple agencies at the incident and the others were not having problems communicating.</p> <p>5. Del advised the council the revision of the Roles and Responsibilities document had been approved by the User Council and the OMO had reviewed and approved updates to the System Description, Catastrophic Natural Events (CNE) Contingency Plan, Security Controls Review Policy</p>	
--	--	--



December System Metrics	<p>and Procedure 200-6, Radio Usage and Transmission Protocols Policy and Procedure 300-6, System Account Control Policy and Procedure 400-4, and System Vulnerability Management Policy and Procedure 400-6.</p> <p>7. Del stated there were 2,011,077 push-to-talks and 271 busies, which was up slightly from November. He also noted there was 1,094,609 group calls.</p>	
System Management Office	Mr. Travis Conant, System Manager	Action Items Assigned
Code Plugs	Mr. Travis Conant advised most of what he had to discuss had been covered under the OMO updates, but added agencies could provide their codeplugs to the System Management Office (SMO) and they would be glad to look at them.	
State of Alaska	Mr. Scott Stormo, SOA	Action Items Assigned
Code Plug Maintenance	<p>1. Mr. Scott Stormo stated State agencies codeplugs would be handled by the Office of Information Technology (OIT) technicians.</p> <p>2. Scott advised the 7.17 contract had been amended to incorporate both the DOD, as well as the State, and they expected the upgrade to occur sometime in the September to December timeframe.</p>	
7.17 Upgrade		
Department of Defense	Mr. Tim Woodall, ALMR DOD Representative	Action Items Assigned
	Mr. Tim Woodall was not in attendance.	
New Business	Discussion	Action Items Assigned
Business Case	<p>1. Del briefed the 2017 Business Case would be distributed to the council sometime after the meeting adjournment but wanted to inform the council members there was currently no reference to FirstNet in the document. He asked if it was appropriately to address the status of FirstNet in the Business Case on what it did and did not do, to ensure readers understood FirstNet was not a replacement for land mobile radios (LMR), but will be beneficial in other areas. Del stated this is the point he'd like to make in the Business Case.</p> <p>John R. stated what Del had just said was true that FirstNet is not designed, today, to replace mission-critical push to talk (PTT) for public safety. He added, it is not to say they will not try to pursue non-mission critical PTT in the very near future. John advised he has been working with a lot of different states and entities on the question of will FirstNet replace LMR and, overwhelmingly, the answer is "no it cannot." He added it could not replace mission-critical PTT, but that does not mean there won't be test units out there for</p>	<p>1. The OMO will add paragraph on FirstNet to the Business Case and send out after the meeting.</p>



	<p>non-mission critical PTT using application like Kodiak or integrated WAVE solution, so if you see someone with a handheld, broadband device doing PTT, just know it is focused on non-mission critical PTT.</p> <p>John continued that he was unsure how to educate the policy users and decision makers because he's afraid if they go out and do some testing, the decision makers might see someone with an iPhone talking on an ALMR group, and all of a sudden say FirstNet is replacing ALMR.</p> <p>Scott briefed he would say right now that at least the Chief Information Officer for the State of Alaska believes ALMR is going to be replaced in the not so distant future with FirstNet. He agreed that education needs to happen or we are going to suffer more budget cuts and more cuts to staff, more "I don't want to upgrade Quantars because I'm not sure if ALMR is going to be around in the future" and if you don't get that education done, we are not going to be able to sustain ALMR which is what we've been working so hard to do over the last couple years. Scott advised ALMR is going to stop dead in the water if that education doesn't get figured out real fast. He then added it already stopped, because there is nothing in this year's Governor's budget.</p> <p>John said with the education, can we be proactive even when we don't know all the answers.</p> <p>Mr. Greg Eubank asked if anyone has put out a presentation that shows what FirstNet actually is, and it would go a long way toward educating our legislators.</p> <p>Scott stated it's been put out there and presented and they still don't pay attention to it.</p> <p>John R. said he's had presentations on FirstNet to policy makers and SMEs within the State to talk about what FirstNet is, and if you talk to first responders, they understand.</p> <p>Mr. Nate Skinner added it looks like it is pretty plain what it's for and what it's not for, if you were to just read the first page.</p> <p>Travis asked John if he'd heard what any of the other 50 states are going through.</p> <p>John R. said most are in the exact position we are with funding challenges, sustainability challenges regarding their LMR network and then trying to educate their legislative bodies on what FirstNet is and isn't. He added the smaller states with a broadband network that paints every corner are in a better position to roll out a dual LMR and PTT over</p>	
--	---	--



<p>Annual Information Assurance Audit Report of Findings</p> <p>User Council 2017 Annual Assessment on System Operations and Management Performance</p>	<p>broadband. John pointed out if you just start with coverage, FirstNet cannot replace LMR until it has compatible coverage and if you go beyond that and calculate cost, it's more expensive to do FirstNet looking at broadband charges today. He added the contract shows it will be around the \$50/month range and when we take the number of users we have on ALMR, we get to a lot less per user/per month rate, plus the cost would be borne by the end user.</p> <p>John R. pulled back the conversation to the original question on whether the council wanted information added to the Business Case.</p> <p>Del added it's not just adding something, but also where to add it that it would attract attention and he had considered putting it in the "risks" area.</p> <p>Scott said if you don't put something in there, it looks like you've ignored it.</p> <p>2. Del stated the OMO had completed the 2017 Annual Information Assurance Audit Report of Findings and would be sending it out to the council after the meeting for their review and approval.</p> <p>3. Del added every year the OMO prepares a report on behalf of the User Council assessing how the OMO and the SMO have done running and overseeing the System, which goes to the Executive Council. He stated it would also be sent out after the meeting.</p>	<p>2. The OMO will distribute the document after the conclusion of the meeting.</p> <p>3. The OMO will distribute the document after the conclusion of the meeting.</p>
<p>Next meeting</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	
	<p>John R. advised the next regularly scheduled meetings were February 7 and March 7 and asked if anyone had any problems with those dates. There were no objections.</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	
	<p>John R. asked if there were any other comments or discussion items. Hearing none, he made a motion to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Adjourn the January monthly User Council meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Bill Second: Alvin</p> <p>There were no objections. The motion passed.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.</p>	