



I. Attendance Roster

User Council Members and Alternates

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

**Primary**

T	Adams	Ocie	Mr.	SOA – DOT&PF
T	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			AML Southeast Rep
T	Johnson	Brad	Chief	AML Northern Rep - Fairbanks PD, <b>Vice Chair</b>
P	Leveque	Matt	MAJ	SOA – DPS, <b>Chair</b>
T	McGillivray	Tod	Sgt	AML Central Rep - Soldotna PD
A	Mitchell	William	Mr.	DOD - Eielson
P	Murphy	Peter	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - FBI
A	Newman	Natalie	Ms.	DOD – US Army Alaska
A	Taylor	Marlon	MSgt	DOD – Elmendorf

**Alternate**

A	Blaine	Scott	TSgt	DOD – Elmendorf
A	Borrego	Susan	Ms.	Fed Non-DOD - FBI
A	Caldwell	Jim	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - TSA
A	Fenimore	Kyle	SSgt	DOD - Eielson
A	Hansen	Glenn	Mr.	SOA Other - DMVA
A	Henderson	Randy	Mr.	AML Central Rep - MOA
A	Lewis	Mike	Mr.	Fed Non-DOD - DOI
A	Patz	Greg	Mr.	SOA - DOT
P	Poindexter	Corey	Mr.	DOD - US Army Alaska
A	Schmitt	Sheldon	Chief	AML Southeast Rep – Sitka PD
T	Tucker	Jeff	Chief	AML Northern Rep - North Star Fire
A	Wilson	Barry	LT	SOA – DPS

**Other Attendees**

P	Borg	Casey	Mr.	System Manager
T	Gibbs	Dave	Mr.	FNSB Emergency Manager (**to replace Chief Tucker as Northern Representative upon receipt of appointment letter.)
P	Ince	Chester	Mr.	OMO Subject Matter Expert
P	Kohler	Jim	Mr.	SOA ALMR Program Manager
P	Leber	Rich	Mr.	OMO Technical Advisor
P	Shafer	Sherry	Ms.	OMO Document Specialist
P	Sinclair	Kyle	Mr.	Chenega Federal



P	Smith	Del	Mr.	Operations Manager
T	Quickel	Joe	Mr.	DOD Project Office
P	Woodall	Tim	Mr.	DOD ALMR Project Manager

II. Meeting Minutes and Action Items

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion	Action Items
<b>Called to Order</b>	Major Matt Leveque called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. Due to the teleconference bridge being down, an alternate bridge was provided by 5 Star Team and notification was made via telephone and email.	
<b>Roll Call</b>	Roll call was taken and quorum achieved.	
<b>Minutes Approval</b>	Minutes from December 5, 2007 were reviewed and approved. Motion made: Mr. Corey Poindexter Seconded: Sgt Tod McGillivray The <b>motion carried</b> .	
<b>Review of I&amp;R Log</b>	<b>Active Issues</b>	
#32 – Customer Support Plan	Major Leveque noted this would be covered during the OMO presentation,	
#43 – Missing Audio	Deputy Chief Brad Johnson stated they had done some major reprogramming before the holidays to put in all the changes proposed by EFJohnson as the solution into the codeplugs. Anecdotally, he heard the audio was better but didn't know how to quantify that as of yet.  Mr. David Gibbs stated he had heard from the fire departments that it was better but was also unable to quantify that yet.  Chief Jeff Tucker stated they hadn't seemed to have the same issues as in the past but then they haven't had it (the fix) long enough to really develop a track record to see how the reprogramming is going but it seems to be better. Cautiously optimistic is where we are at right now.  Major Leveque asked Brad if he would like this item held open for another month. Brad concurred.  Will be postponed over to the February 6 meeting.	
	<b>Pending Issues</b>	
#2 – SATS Pricing	Mr. Jim Kohler stated the state is trying to provide insight into the TCO Study a projection of what we anticipate the ETS costs for maintaining SATS are for the fiscal year. That number is being vetted by	1. Revise I & R Log issue to reflect TCO study and move suspense out to Apr.



	<p>those above him at this time and hopefully will be out soon and distributed to the TCO people. At that point in time he can share it.</p> <p>Corey asked that Mr. Callahan's name be removed from the I &amp; R log.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked that the group if they were interested in keeping this item open but revising it to read 'the User Council is interested in seeing the results of the TCO.'</p> <p>No one objected to rephrasing the wording of the issue.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked Mr. Tim Woodall if there was any idea when the TCO would be finished.</p> <p>Mr. Tim Woodall noted the TCO should be out at the end of April.</p> <p>Suspense moved out to the Apr 2 meeting.</p>	
<p><b>Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corey to provide OMO with a copy of the 'bubble' site map.</li> <li>2. OMO will provide map for distribution at the January User Council meeting. New suspense is 2/6/08.</li> <li>3. OMO and SMO to collaborate on what is an acceptable number of busies for both day-to-day and emergency operations, and what is an acceptable duration of length for a busy. OMO will benchmark the data by contacting other states with trunked radio systems.</li> <li>4. SMO will define what an ALMR User is (i.e. ID versus subscriber) and provide at January meeting.</li> <li>5. OMO will send out email soliciting nominations for Chair and Vice Chair positions. A ballot will be provided to the User Council members for voting. Results to be provided at January meeting.</li> <li>6. OMO will distribute a copy of the AS/NE10 Preparedness briefing to the User Council members.</li> <li>7. OMO will distribute the SCIP Document to the User Council as provided by Mr. Bryan Fisher.</li> </ol>	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>OMO provided the map at the meeting. The User Council requested additional changes.</p> <p>*See SMO Update</p> <p>.</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p>
<p><b>Operations</b></p>	<p><b>Mr. Del Smith, Operations Manager</b></p>	



Management Office Status Update		
	<p>1 – The North Pole Critical Design Review was part of several Motorola presentations in December. Depending on which course of action (if any) the costs varied. The final report from Motorola available at the end of February to assist in grant funding requests.</p> <p>2 – Whittier PD has ALMR radios and used them during the recent SAR for the missing medivac helicopter but unable to use them for 911 calls. OMO is assisting them by researching solutions for fielding the calls. Anchorage PD is looking at the possibility of assisting Whittier at this time.</p> <p>3 – The OMO CSP was reviewed by the UC Document Review Committee #1 and final comments were received on Dec 17. The comments were incorporated.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked Brad for his recommendation on how to proceed with respect to the CSP.</p> <p><b>Brad made a motion that UC take a vote on “accepting it in its final draft and make it a final document.”</b></p> <p>Del noted that the document is a ‘living’ document and can be modified as we go along.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked for a point of clarification on whether the document would be forwarded to the Executive Council for approval.</p> <p>Tim stated this document and the SMO CSP are both contract deliverables and the government is choosing to accept it when the User Council says they understand what services the OMO offers and how they obtain those services. When it is clear and understandable to the UC, then he will pay them for it.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked for any other comments from the Document Review Committee.</p> <p>Mr. Ocie Adams stated he had reviewed it and had not problem approving it as it is.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked for a second on Brad’s motion.</p>	



	<p><b>Corey seconded the motion.</b></p> <p>Major Leveque noted <b>“The User Council accepted the OMO Customer Support Plan as final.”</b> He thanked the reviewers and the OMO for their work.</p> <p>4 – Coverage maps. Del asked everyone to refer to the map provided in their packages. He proposed that this is the map the OMO would provide if asked for a current coverage map.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked if the sites shown were all current and up and running or if it included some proposed sites.</p> <p>Ocie clarified the Phase 4 sites shown were proposed sites.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked that the word “Proposed” be added to the legend next to Phase 4.</p> <p>Mr. Jim Kohler asked that the sites of Skagway, Ketchikan (Phase 3), and Petersburg (Phase 4) be labeled</p> <p>Major Leveque asked everyone if they were comfortable with this map; upon hearing no objections he stated this would be the map that will be offered to individuals requesting to see the ALMR build out coverage.</p> <p>This will be revisited at next month’s meeting.</p> <p>5 – OMO/SMO Budget. The OMO is working on the budget to list out the annual expenditures for both offices and will seek the UC approval. It is not complete at this time.</p> <p>6 – After Action Review document for the Annual User Council Meeting. It was provided to four members in December.</p> <p>Mr. Joe Quickel confirmed that an official acceptance of the document was required from the UC.</p> <p><b>Brad made a motion “to accept the document.” Corey seconded.</b></p> <p><b>The User Council accepted the document, as</b></p>	<p>2. OMO to update the ‘bubble’ map to add “Proposed” in the legend next to Phase 4 and label the additional sites and touch base with Jim to ensure the Southeast labeling is correct.</p>
--	---	--



	<p><b>written.</b></p> <p>7 – Metrics. Del presented the first iteration of the proposed OMO metric slides on trends to the UC.</p> <p>Tim stated as a fact that it is an OMO requirement to determine the standards and measures for the system and report trends with regard to those.</p> <p>The slides were presented and the following recommendations were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Break the Help Desk slide into two slides (infrastructure and non infrastructure)</li> <li>• Change the title of the PMI slide to read “PMI Quality Assurance and note beside the outstanding discrepancies who is the responsible owning agency</li> <li>• SOA will address the conflicted sites (ref slides on busies) at the February meeting and all conflicted sites should be transitioned prior to 30 Jun</li> </ul> <p>This will allow the UC to assess the issues and address them accordingly.</p>	<p>3. The OMO to make the recommended changes to the slides.</p> <p>4. SOA to provide a specific schedule on conflict resolution by February meeting.</p>
<p><b>System Management Office</b></p>	<p><b>Mr. Casey Borg, System Manager</b></p>	
	<p>1- Mr. Casey Borg stated the biggest issue the SMO was working on at the moment was watching the System busies.</p> <p>2 - From last month’s meeting, the SMO was to define what was considered a subscriber. For the purposes of the SMO, a radio (base, mobile, portable) is a subscriber.</p> <p>3 - Within the next week or so, the SMO will be contacting all the Dispatch centers and System Management Terminal owners to get an accurate list of their users. The SMO will be implementing individual log ons and working with them to get their IA training to fulfill requirements from the DIACAP and to complete ATO.</p> <p>Brad noted that there will probably be an increase in log in errors after the implementation.</p> <p>4 – Still working with other systems to define what is an acceptable busy.</p>	<p>5. This item will be added to the I &amp; R Log.</p>
	<p><b>Mr. Tim Woodall, ALMR Project Manager</b></p>	



	Tim stated because the meeting was running behind, he would defer to the next meeting.	
<b>Joint Project Team Status Update</b>	<b>Mr. Jim Kohler, SOA ETS Program Manager</b>	
	<p>Jim reiterated that they are working to provide a lot more concrete information on scheduling and status on the specific issues and items the SOA has to complete prior to June 30, and certainly the frequency conflict issues are a major one.</p> <p>He is comfortable that although he may not meet that expectation by the next meeting, the SOA will be far enough along that the UC will see the direction they are going and the kind of communication they are trying to maintain with the UC.</p>	
<b>Next meeting</b>	Major Leveque stated the next scheduled meeting on Feb 6. Mar 5 and Apr 2 are the next three regularly scheduled. Meetings. He asked if anyone had any problems with those dates.	
<b>New Business</b>		
<b>Elections</b>	<p>OMO announced the results of the annual UC election.</p> <p>Major Leveque was re-elected to the position of Chair. He accepted the responsibility for another year.</p> <p>Deputy Chief Johnson was re-elected to the position of Vice Chair. He accepted the responsibility for another year.</p>	
<b>Cost Share White Paper</b>	<p>Del discussed that the draft Cost Share White paper had been written at the request of the UC during the Annual Meeting. It had been reviewed by both Major Leveque and Brad on several occasions and revised.</p> <p>It was distributed to the entire UC in December and some comments were received. He noted we would incorporate Chief Tucker's and clarify the issue from Ms Bev Fronterhouse.</p> <p>After these revisions, Del asked if the UC want to send the document to the EC as the accepted UC position.</p> <p>Tim suggested the UC provide the White Paper to the EC as information only with an explanation that he UC inquired into what other states where doing to address the issue of cost share.</p>	



	<p>Brad stated he felt it needed broader distribution but that the UC could not compel the EC to distribute it.</p> <p>Tim stated that it was within the UC structure to determine where to send it and each UC member's own choice as to who to send it to in their chain of command.</p> <p>Brad asked Jeff his position as a newly appointed member of the EC.</p> <p>Jeff stated he had not sat in on any EC meeting yet but felt a positive vote from the UC would be beneficial when presenting it to the EC.</p> <p>Brad agreed this might carry more weight.</p> <p>Matt stated he had reservations voting at this time as the DPS representative but agreed that UC recommendation/acceptance would carry more weight. He did clarify that he wasn't sure it was good to push for a unanimous vote for it.</p> <p><b>Tod made a motion to "Forward the White Paper to the Executive Council for their information."</b></p> <p><b>Ocie seconded the motion.</b></p> <p>Brad made a note concerning the motion. He stated that the document still needed to be amended with the comments and that the UC needed to accept it as a finished document. He said at that time it could be forwarded to the EC for informational purposes and distributed by UC members to those agencies they saw fit.</p> <p>Jeff proposed a suspense date of COB Friday (Jan 4) for completion of updates and Wednesday (Jan 9) the following week for votes.</p> <p>Jim stated that SOA has made no decision on ALMR members paying but they were doing a presentation to the House State Affairs on Jan 3. There had been a rumor of a \$25 charge per radio circulating by one of the legislators.</p> <p>Brad stated it was normally non-ALMR members who perpetuated the rumors.</p> <p>Several members of ALMR were going to give a</p>	
--	---	--





<p><b>Service Level Agreement (SLA)</b></p>	<p>brief demonstration of the System capabilities.</p> <p>Jeff asked who the legislator was and that person was identified as Representative Seaton from the lower Kenai peninsula.</p> <p>Del noted Ms Sue Heck had also contacted him stating she had heard the rumor as well. He reiterated to Ms. Heck that there has never been a charge to be on the System up to this point.</p> <p>Tod stated he would do a follow-up check with the Kenai Borough and Central EM.</p> <p>Del stated with the signing of the Cooperative Agreement, the SLA had to be approved within six months of the date of signature per language contained within. He reminded the group that they had previously reviewed and approved the SLA but that the OMO would review it for accuracy as some things had changed.</p> <p>Tim responded that the members needed to vet the SLA through their respective chains of command because they are signing up for a standard which equates to a cost. This will ensure each agencies position is obtained and that either they support maintaining the System at the proposed levels in the SLA or they do not support it, and recommended changes are vetted and approved by the UC before providing the EC with validation of the SLA. When the package is sent through the EC to the appropriate parties for signature all the pre-coordination will have taken place and prevent the coordination issues, changes and long delays experienced with the Cooperative Agreement.</p>	
<p><b>Mobile Data Workshops</b></p>	<p>Major Leveque stated if there were any new members on the UC that were not familiar with the SLA, they could give any of the others a call for some background update.</p>	
<p><b>UC Northern Alternate Representative</b></p>	<p>Joe briefed there were several Mobile Data Workshops being presented next week for the military bases and the local first responders had asked that they to be opened up. He stated he would provide the specific information to the OMO to get out to the UC members with the concurrence of the DOD and UC. DOD and UC concurred.</p>	



<p><b>North Pole Coverage</b></p>	<p>Brad announced that the regional user group had selected Mr. David Gibbs as Jeff Tucker's replacement. There should be an appointment forthcoming next week.</p> <p>Brad stated that the cost to address the coverage issues in North Pole clearly exceeds what local agencies can afford on their own and this issue also affects AST, DOT, and any other agency on the fringe.</p> <p>He stated he would like to make a motion that a repeater site in North Pole be included in future plan for build out of the System. He noted that there needed to be some method in place that as we identify gaps we can address them.</p> <p>Major Leveque asked if this item could be added to the February agenda and Brad was okay with that.</p> <p>This item was tabled for further discussion until the February meeting.</p>	
<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	<p>A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Tod and seconded by Brad.</p> <p><b>The meeting was adjourned at 1534.</b></p>	