



ALMR User Council Meeting Minutes

Date: July 9, 2025

1. Attendance.

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

User Council Members

Primary				
T	Adams	Nathan	Mr.	DoD USAF, Eielson AFB
U	Atkinson	Ross	Mr.	Federal Non-DoD DOI, BLM-Alaska Fire Service
E	Berrian	Keith	Deputy Chief	Muni-North, Chena Goldstream Fire & Rescue
T	Cole	Henry	Mr.	SOA DOT
T	De Hart	Kaitlyn	Ms.	DoD USAF, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson
E	Goggia-Cockrell	Tammy	Ms.	Municipalities Central, Vice Chair
T	Kalwara	Erann	Ms.	Municipalities Southeast, Juneau PD
U	Kroona	Jon	Mr.	Federal Non-DoD DOJ, FBI
P	Nelsen	Scott	Mr.	SOA All Others, DMVA, Chair
U	Nelson	James	Officer	Federal Non-DoD All Others, US Forest Service
T	Rockwell	John	Mr.	SOA DPS, SWIC
U	Smith	Eric	Mr.	DoD US Army - Alaska

Alternate				
U	Brown	David	Mr.	Fed Non-DoD DOJ, FBI
U	Carter	Bobby	Mr.	Federal Non-DoD All Others, TSA
U	Clendenin	John	Mr.	SOA DOT
N/A	Dante	Ray	SSgt	DoD USAF, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson
N/A	Draves	Kayla	MSgt	DoD USAF, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson
T	Edwards	Karl	Mr.	DHS, SOA All Others
P	Endres	Benjamin	Lieutenant	SOA DPS
E	Green	Kyle	Fire Marshal	Municipalities North, University Fire Department
T	Goodman	Jim	Mr.	Municipalities Central, MatSu Borough
U	Higginbotham	Dave	MSgt	DoD US Army - Alaska
U	Rodriguez	Joe	MSgt	DoD USAF, Eielson AFB
N/A	VACANT			Federal Non-DoD DOI
N/A	VACANT			Municipalities Southeast

Supporting Staff and Guests

P	Burnham	Mary	Ms.	Operations Management Office (OMO)
T	Doherty	Steve	Mr.	Tait Radios
T	Fernandez	Preston	TSgt	176 th Wing CS
T	Flores	Mickey	Mr.	BK Technologies
P	Fussey	Paul	Mr.	Operations Manager - OMO
P	Haas	Zachary	Mr.	Motorola Solutions
P	House	Peter	Cpt	Alaska State Defense Force
T	Jones	Ryan	SPC	Alaska Army National Guard
T	Lane	Donnie	Mr.	SOA Statewide 911 Coordinator



ALMR User Council Meeting Minutes

Date: July 9, 2025

T	Marlow	Ryan	Mr.	Department of Transportation (DOT)
T	McRae	Zack	Mr.	Mat-Su Borough
T	Merkouris	Paul	Mr.	BK Technologies
P	Neuman	Mark	Mr.	Municipality of Anchorage (MOA)
P	Reed	David	Mr.	Motorola Solutions – Security Manager
P	Richter	Bruce	Mr.	DHS CISA
T	Rogell	Pete	Mr.	BK Technologies
P	Stormo	Scott	Mr.	State of Alaska (SOA) - DPSCS
T	Thometz	Tim	Mr.	iCom America
P	Woodall	Tim	Mr.	Department of Defense (DoD)

2. Meeting Minutes and Action Items.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Items Assigned
Call to Order	Mr. Scott Nelsen called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone at 1:32 p.m. He asked Ms. Mary Burnham to provide the roll call.	
Roll Call	Roll call was presented by Mary, who confirmed there was a quorum. Ms. Erann Kalwara, Mr. Henry Cole, Cpt Peter House, and Mr. Nathan Adams joined the meeting after the roll was taken.	
Introduction of Guests/Special Announcements	Scott N. asked if there were any special guests. No special guests were announced.	
Previous Meeting Minutes	Scott N. inquired if everyone had a chance to review the June meeting minutes and if there were any requested changes at this time. Hearing none, he asked if he could have a motion and a second to approve the June minutes. Motion: Approve the June 4 monthly User Council meeting minutes. Motion: Lt. Benjamin Endres Second: Mr. Karl Edwards Scott N. asked if there were any objections or further discussion, and hearing none, he stated the motion has passed and the minutes are approved.	



ALMR User Council Meeting Minutes

Date: July 9, 2025

	Scott N. commented that the council could move on to the Issues and Risks Log.	
Issues & Risks Log	Review	Resolution
	<p>Mr. Paul Fussey briefed that he did not have anything new, but ALMR does still have the alternate positions to fill and there is nothing new for the operational issues.</p> <p>Scott N. thanked Paul and stated that the council could move on to the Action Items unless there were any questions or comments about the Issues and Risk Log. Hearing none, the meeting moved onto the Action Items.</p>	
Action Items	Updates	Action Items Assigned
	<p>Paul briefed that ALMR still has items one and two concerning the APX Next, which are still being tested with the system and ALMR is also testing the software. He noted that once the testing is completed, ALMR will work with Motorola to get classes and also with the additional items that Mr. Kyle Green would like, but right now, ALMR is still in the testing phase of the software and radios.</p> <p>Scott N. inquired if the training is pending and Paul stated that is correct.</p> <p>Scott N. asked the council members if they had any questions concerning the Action Items, hearing none, he asked Paul to provide the Operation Management Office (OMO) updates.</p>	
Operations Management Office (OMO)	Mr. Paul Fussey, Operations Manager	Action Items Assigned
Training	<p>1. Paul briefed that Mr. Dan Nelson has uploaded to the ALMR website (https://alaskalandmobileradio.org/training-videos-2/) a video covering preventative maintenance, which is when the System Management Office (SMO) and Alaska Public Safety Communications Services (APSCS) personnel go out and do the preventative maintenance inspections (PMIs) on the tower equipment. He noted that the video is very informative on what they do out there and some of the issues that they run into. He did not want to</p>	



ALMR User Council Meeting Minutes

Date: July 9, 2025

<p>Outreach</p>	<p>neglect the Anchorage Wide Area Radio Network (AWARN) team also goes out and does the PMIs of their system. Paul stated that crews are out there this time of year, which some of them have to use helicopters, and then also once the teams go out there they can run into some rough weather, especially in the wintertime, when they may use snowmachines to get to the sites. He commented that the teams do really good work keeping the system running, so he encourages everybody to take a look at the new training video.</p> <p>2. Paul briefed that the July Executive Council (EC) meeting is scheduled for 17 July.</p> <p>Paul noted that he and Mary are working with ALMR members with their membership agreements and also to see if the members have any questions on radios. He stated he was working with one agency with their subscriber request since they have about 30 radios that need to be taken off the system.</p> <p>Paul stated that the TDMA testing for the Palmer agencies is postponed and planned to hopefully take place next week.</p> <p>Paul commented that out of the 140 agencies, the OMO is down to 30 that still need to sign and return their membership agreements, which he noted that Mary has been doing the bulk of the work for that, so thank you to everyone who has already signed the membership agreement and returned it. Paul stated that Ms. Terri Warren is working with the Federal non-DoD entities for their cost share agreements and monetary amounts.</p> <p>Paul noted that the July newsletter has been completed and it will be sent to the publisher for hard copies and sent out electronically on July 15th.</p>	
<p>System Upgrade</p>	<p>3. Paul briefed that, as he mentioned earlier with the training video, the SMO team is currently out in the field doing PMIs. He stated that he wanted to stress, since ALMR has had a couple of questions, that Ms. Claire Wittschiede works hand in hand with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the state forestry fire crews to make sure that when ALMR is doing</p>	



ALMR User Council Meeting Minutes

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>PMIs they are not doing anything that would interfere with their operations. Paul has been watching the news and looking at the weather, because there are wildland fires all over the state. He believes the state is over 600,000 acres burned now, so when the crews go out and do PMIs they make sure they are doing them in areas that will not affect any wildland teams or crews.</p> <p>Paul noted that Mr. David Reed has been doing and completing updated system scans, so Paul wanted to say thank you to everyone who has been updating their consoles and computers, the numbers are looking really good.</p>	
<p>June Document Reviews</p>	<p>4. Paul briefed that the June document reviews were completed and they consisted of the Risk Management Plan; Technology policy and procedure; Standard Channel Naming Conventions policy and procedure; Concept of Operation (CONOP); and the Operations and Maintenance Organizational Chart. He noted that the OMO have already started on the August document reviews and they will be forwarded to the entities that need to review them here in a little while.</p> <p>Paul asked if there were any questions before he goes to the metrics, hearing none, he continue to the metrics.</p>	
<p>June System Metrics</p>	<p>5. Paul briefed that the group and individual calls for June were 1,712,397; the push-to-talks were 2,807,730. The monthly busies were 1733, which is 0.0010%. This was a spike, but ALMR did have the PMIs going on and some sites were below three nines.</p> <p>Paul noted that the sites below three nines were 18 and as shown on the slide, the teams have been very busy. He stated that the bulk of the sites below three nines were from PMIs, and as the teams are going out they are also updating the ALIVE antennas, which generally refers to an active antenna that has integrated electronic components that enhances its functionality, and feed lines. Paul commented that as members may recall, ALMR did have some issues with the original ALIVE antennas and they are being replaced along with the regular maintenance and the antenna upgrade, but most of those are PMIs.</p>	



***ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes***

Date: July 9, 2025

<p>Other Items</p>	<p>He also noted that ALMR did have some commercial circuit failures over at High Mountain and the Alaska Railroad is troubleshooting a couple of their sites, which put it down below three nines.</p> <p>Paul stated that as members look at the subscriber chart they can see how much has changed for the better. The 32,226 subscribers is about 250 less than last month. He thanked everyone for going through their subscriber counts, submitting subscriber requests, and deleting the older radios off the system, which gives ALMR more breathing room to the maximum of 33,000 units.</p> <p>Paul asked if anybody had any questions about the metrics, hearing none, he stated he would finish up with his “other” items.</p> <p>6. Paul briefed that the OMO contract has been revised and renewed starting July 1, that leaves three out of nine option years remaining for that contract.</p> <p>Paul noted that in order to gain access to this building and to do the off-site inspections he is required to have Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) certification and he wanted to let everybody know that he just completed the recertification procedures that will give him the building and system accesses.</p> <p>Paul stated that ALMR is actively watching the wildland fires and that ALMR had a little scare. He commented that he wanted to thank the fire crews for their work protecting the Hill 3265 tower. Paul noted that yesterday, July 8, the wildland fire #218 wildland crew ended up conducting backfire operations to prevent damage to the power lines and the tower infrastructure, so he sent an email thanking the fire crews. He stated that by being proactive the fire crews were able to keep the wildland fire from affecting that tower.</p> <p>Paul commented that at the end of this month, he will be attending the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials (APCO) and Motorola Trunked Users Group (MTUG) meetings, which are being held out of state.</p>	
---------------------------	---	--



***ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes***

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>Paul noted that today is Alaska Flag Day.</p> <p>Paul briefed that he wanted to let everybody know, in case they have not heard, Chief Mike Sweet, who has been the chief for the Anton Anderson Memorial Tunnel (Whittier Tunnel) Fire Department for many years had passed away on 25 June. He wanted to pass that on and said, "Chief Mike Sweet, had been a big supporter of the Alaska Professional Volunteers for decades and the fire chief at the Whittier Tunnel."</p> <p>Scott N. thanked Paul and stated that Mr. Nik Fahnestock is not in and that Paul will be giving the SMO briefing.</p>	
System Management Office (SMO)	Mr. Nik Fahnestock, System Manager (briefing by Mr. Paul Fussey)	Action Items Assigned
	<p>Paul briefed that he worked with Claire from the ALMR Help Desk to create the briefing. He and Claire wanted to pass on the PMIs that have been completed, so for June 2025, fourteen of them were completed, which included eleven helicopter and three drive to sites, and for July there have been thirteen completed. Paul noted that there are teams out in the Kenai Peninsula area right now, and the antennas and feed line replacements are weather dependent. He stated that Byers Creek was yesterday, Tuesday, July 8; Reindeer Hill is scheduled for today, Wednesday, July 9; Yanert for tomorrow, Thursday, July 10; Willow Mountain for Monday, July 14; Ernestine Tuesday, July 15; Tsina Wednesday, July 16; and Divide, Thursday, July 17. Paul noted that Claire sends out the daily report with the projected work.</p> <p>Paul stated that is all that he has for the SMO briefing.</p> <p>Scott N. asked if there were any further questions for Paul, hearing none, he stated the next item is the SOA and DoD updates.</p>	
State of Alaska (SOA)	Mr. Scott Stormo	Action Items Assigned



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>Scott S. briefed that he talked about this in the past, but he wanted to let everyone know that APSCS is getting closer to an actual date for when it is going to happen, but they have the new shelter and new tower that is going up at Heney Range in Cordova. He noted that they are going to rehome the ALMR equipment into our generator shelter for the moment, so they should be keeping that site active and on the air during the construction. Scott S. stated that to give an example of how the partnership works, ALMR has one of the commercial partners basically paying for the cost of replacing that tower because they want to improve the site that they have up there as well. ALMR has needed to replace that shelter for quite a few years, so the state actually has some money from the governor's deferred maintenance to do that and APSCS is finally getting to the point of it being replaced. He commented that they are going to basically consolidate what the state has with what the commercial partner has and then both will be in a brand new shelter and a little bit bigger and better built tower. Scott S. noted that the tower might be down for a period of time, but ALMR should not be down other than the time taken to pull the equipment out of and moving it in the other shelter. Scott S. commented that they are expecting to be able to keep the tower up and operational on another partner's tower, so the state is going to put the antennas on the other partner's tower and the state is going to get a circuit from one of them to keep connectivity to it while they are doing the construction. He stated that ALMR will not be so lucky in the future when they are changing a few other places where the state does not have other people at the top of the mountain. ALMR has a few other places that need new shelters, which there will be bigger outages when those type of events happen.</p> <p>Scott S. briefed that the more significant one is the multi-year planning and waiting to finally get to the execution stage of getting the APSCS building's power upgraded from whatever year it was built in the 60s or 70s. He noted that Chugach Electric was doing some power work and they basically said that the transformer has to go and all this stuff needs to be replaced plus some other changes to bring things up to code.</p>	
--	--	--



***ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes***

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>Scott S. stated that on the weekend of August 2nd and 3rd, unless something happens to change that, ALMR is going to lose power to this building for a day, however, he is not sure if it will be a day or not because Chugach Electric may be able to do some of the work at that time, it does not have to be out that long, or they may discover that they could not do some of the work and it will be down for a whole day. He commented that the electricians that the state have contracted are supposed to be doing some rewiring so the generator can run while Chugach Electric is doing the work. The generator can power a few of the rooms in this building that are critical, but it is being done on the weekend and he does not think that there will be lights or power in the wall jacks, but the master site, frame room, the communications rooms, the air conditioning in theory is all going to have power assuming everything is labeled and traced properly, which is hard to know until you flip a breaker and find out for real. Scott S. noted that ALMR can either spend another two years trying to test all that out, or at some point just say it needs to be done and do it, and hopefully ALMR is not down for a day, but the expectations are ALMR will not be.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that was all he had unless there are any questions.</p> <p>Scott N. asked if there are any questions for Scott S., hearing none he moved on to the DoD and asked if Tim had anything for the group.</p>	
Department of Defense	Mr. Timothy Woodall	Action Items Assigned
	<p>Tim stated that he had nothing for the group today.</p> <p>Scott N. stated he would be moving on to the Council Representatives.</p>	
User Council Representative Reports	Represented Areas	Action Items Assigned
SOA DPS	<p>1. Lt. Ben Endres briefed that they are having a meeting/training on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) with the Army National Guard the 20th to the 22nd of July, which he invited Paul, Scott S. and some of the radio engineers as part of that just to work on communications and to</p>	



***ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes***

Date: July 9, 2025

Munis-North	1. No representatives available to provide an update.	
Munis-Southeast	2. Ms. Erann Kalwara stated that her updates are specific to Juneau. She noted that they had a joint training exercise with the Army National Guard, law enforcement, fire department, state, and tribal members on June 9 th through the 12 th for the ORCA 2025 exercise, which is a series of exercises focused on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosive threats to maintain readiness and validate response procedures. Erann stated that they did utilize the ALMR channels for the exercise, and she is working on getting feedback from their users. She commented that they are working on console upgrades at the Juneau Police Department, police and fire dispatch and connectivity to ALMR with this upgrade, and they are excited about that	
Munis-Central	3. No update provided. Scott N. stated that he would go ahead and move the meeting on to New Business.	
New Business	Discussion	Action Items Assigned
CISA	<p>Scott N. asked if there was anything for New Business.</p> <p>Mr. Bruce Richter, from Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), briefed that he wanted to share a couple of things.</p> <p>First Item: Bruce noted that he sent a link to the fact sheet so Mary can put this in the minutes in order for members to read for themselves. (Special Note: see attachment titled "Iranian Cyber Actors may Target...."). He stated that essentially after the United States bombed some holes in Iran, there was an expectation that one of the means of retaliation could be a potential targeted cyber operations from the Iranian state. A joint bulletin went out from the FBI Permanent Defense Cyber Crime Center, National Security Agency, and CISA, just warning of a heightened awareness, heightened threat environment, and recommending some of the basic cyber hygiene things and making sure entities are not the easiest target out there, such as software</p>	



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>patches, multi-factor passwords where they make sense. Bruce commented that he just wants to encourage everyone to take a look at it, however, so far there has not been evidence that they have been successful in any of their server efforts, but things seem to change on a moment's notice.</p> <p>Second Item: Bruce briefed that he wanted to bring up that next week he will be in Seattle at the Seattle Fire Training Center for a jamming exercise in preparation for the World Cup 26. He noted that Seattle is one of the host cities and so CISA wanted to get everybody together and bring in the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and some other players and see what the threat is to public safety communications at that event might pose. Bruce stated that coincidentally just last month, while this is going on, which they have been planning for this event for months, the criminal system down there had a case where burglars are using jammers that have been obtained illegally, people cannot own one in this country. He commented that what the burglars are doing is they are defeating wireless security systems, like Ring cameras, and things with them, so there is actual video footage where the burglars are walking through the crime scene holding these jammers (video link sent by Bruce: https://www.fox13seattle.com/news/wifi-jammers-seattle-athletes-burglaries). Bruce noted that unfortunately some of them turned into home invasion robberies where the motive was they were targeting professional sports athletes and they could read the schedule and figure out when the athletes are playing an away game and not going to be at home. However, the family was home and the burglars are going in there doing these robberies using jamming equipment to try to defeat home security systems, which is sort of a side of the jamming thing that he really had not considered. He stated that on a national level, everyone is seeing more of these things being seized by customs coming into the country, with many of them are made in China, so it is a real world threat here in this region. Bruce noted he will hopefully have some after action report, lessons learned, to share from the exercise next month. (Special Note: see attached Joint Jammer Infographic, which has photos of seized jammers)</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

ALMR FY27 Budget Review	<p>Bruce stated that was all that he had.</p> <p>Scott N. asked if there were any questions or does anybody want to make a comment on that, hearing none, the council can move on to the review and approval of FY27 ALMR budget.</p> <p>Paul asked Mary, “with Mr. Jim Goodman leaving the conversation, do we still have a quorum?” John stated that he joined the meeting late and Mary confirmed in the affirmative that there was still a quorum.</p> <p>Paul briefed that the format is one that the OMO has been using for years, and the User Council (UC) has liked this format, so the OMO did not change it. He noted that the OMO/SMO Operating Budget document, which is for FY27, must go to the UC and the UC must look at it, approve it, or make comments and if or when the UC approves the budget, then it goes to the EC, which also meets in July, which will be next week, 17 July. Paul stated that once it goes to the EC and it is approved, then it goes to Scott S., so what the OMO does is work with the Anchorage Wide Area Radio Network (AWARN) team, the DoD team, and the APSCS team to generate the budget.</p> <p>Paul briefed that the OMO contract was just updated on July 1 and there is three years out of nine left remaining. This is a set contract so the number does not change and that number is \$347,220, which includes his office, Mary, and Mr. Dan Nelson, who does the training, it also includes the mandatory travel that is in the contract, that number has not changed for at least 10 years. He asked if anybody had any questions on the OMO contract, hearing none he moved onto the next section.</p> <p>Paul briefed that for the SMO right now is a set contract expiring; however, for FY27 it will be a new contract. Paul asked Scott S, and Paul did not want to speak for John but Paul thinks John added to this number which is an estimate. He asked Scott S. if he wanted to talk about the section regarding the SMO contract proposal .</p> <p>Scott S. briefed that the state basically took the fixed price that they have been paying annually</p>	
------------------------------------	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>for a 10-year contract and it was multiplied by two because they really have no idea what it is going to cost for the new contract. He noted that the state also has no idea if they will get the funding to support whatever it will cost, but they are going to go through a process to negotiate the SMO contract and then they will have it set up in a way that they will fund as much of it as they can. Scott S. stated that they do not want to have something that says it is going to cost \$6 million and then they do not get their money and then they do not have a contract, so the state wants to make sure they have pieces of it that they can fund as they get the additional money appropriated. He commented again that it has been at a fixed price for 10 years, and he thinks everybody knows there has been a ton of inflation, so the expectation is the contract would cost more. Scott S. noted other things the state has purchased from Motorola for example, 10 years ago the cybersecurity program was purchased but it is not for sale anymore and just because they have it under contract it is what they are getting, so obviously a lot has changed. The expectation of things like that and many other new technologies that have happened in the land mobile radio (LMR) system that will probably generate new things for new requirements for them and new bills for them to pay. He stated that they did the budget multiplied by 2 but do not really have that based off of any facts. They will go through the process to try to meet the requirements of the DoD and the state who uses that contract and then they will seek funding as necessary.</p> <p>Paul thanked Scott S. and noted for the UC, the SMO section includes the ALMR Help Desk, which is where members put in a subscriber request to add/delete radios; monitor the system; technicians going out in the field conducting PMIs, which includes travel and helicopter costs; maintaining all the systems on there; emergency repairs; etc.</p> <p>Paul briefed that he would go to the next section, which shows that this is the SOA FY27, but it is also the DoD FY26/27, and the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) calendar year 2026 to 2027, so it is a conglomeration of the three and for the contract the OMO is split evenly between the DoD and the state. Not just one agency is paying</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>for the full amount, the estimated, and he stressed it is the estimated contract support from Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance Services (IOMS), which is the SMO that is split between the DoD and the state.</p> <p>Paul noted that the capital costs, which are essential equipment and infrastructure, are the numbers that the OMO received from Mr. Stormo, is \$6 million and the \$950,000, which is the estimate the OMO received from AWARN team for infrastructure and essential costs.</p> <p>Paul stated that the System Upgrade Assurance (SUA) Plus \$10 million is split between the DoD and the SOA and remember that the system is owned 85% by the state and 15% by the DoD, so taking these numbers at the bottom, which are the grand totals for the DoD, the SOA, and the MOA, it is at \$33 million.</p> <p>Paul asked if there are any questions, and he knows that is a lot of money , but he asked again does anybody online have any questions as to how the OMO came up with the numbers.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that he will just add another comment to the SUA Plus, those were refined budgetary items, but they are a year old and he thinks he has been told that those numbers are probably going to be higher then what they were, but there is other stuff the state would need to talk about before they got to a solid number, so it looks real precise, which is why he brought that up. He noted that it has probably changed, but that is what is was when they got those numbers a year ago or so. Scott S. commented that it is hard to get those really precise because it is a ton of work on Motorola's part to go through all the engineering and analysis, and it is not something that people can expect the vendors to do so it is kind of hard to get a real refined number until ALMR has money.</p> <p>Paul noted that when looking at the SUA, ALMR is one of the few entities that does not have a SUA contract, and he asked Scott S. if that is a correct statement.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that is what he has always been told, that ALMR is the only one in the western region, which is made up of Alaska, Hawaii,</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>Montana, Oregon, Washington, and maybe another state or two, that of all their systems have contracts with Motorola. ALMR is the only one that is not on a SUA, which means upgrades are painful and it is hard to plan for; it is more costly to execute them, which is why it took five years to do what has been done and still not done yet, so being on a SUA makes that whole process a lot easier.</p> <p>Paul continued on and stated that Addendum A is year long term funding requirements, and it is not part of the OMO or infrastructure IOMS, which is the system management contract. He noted that these are the upgrades and the current release for the software and maintenance services, and he wanted to stress here the 3% incremental is the best guess estimate, so this is where the state would be with operating cost and essential equipment. Paul stated that he would once again defer to Scott S. with those numbers.</p> <p>Scott S. noted that the bigger numbers up front are for replacement radios, that is the state still has an enormous amount of radios that have not been refreshed, and then just leaving some money in the other years to try to handle new requirements or radio failures for those listed at a state level. He stated that whether the state funds are from a single budget or the individual agencies take care of their radios that is just kind of a ballpark of what kind of money needs to go into radios, so it is 8,000 or so that the area of responsibility (AOR) coverage enhancements. Scott S. noted that they have asked many times in the past, but again it is just trying to put a request in so they can expand coverage at sites, and new technologies, but you have to have money to go and do that, so that is just asking as they have in the past. He stated that in the infrastructure capital investments, that is what traditionally would be known as the satellite communication (SAT) side of the house and that is what will fund the new shelters; replace the microwaves, battery plants, generators; tower work, all that type of stuff that they have been very closely and slowly spending a chunk of money on that goes way back to the year when APSCS moved to the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs (DMVA). Scott S. commented that four or five years ago, he thinks, because they were not feeling as if it was very likely they</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>were going to ever see any more funds and they really needed that for handling the breaks in equipment and fix emergencies as they were happening, but this is the last year that money is going to be around. He stated that they have no problem spending \$3 million a year, which looks like a lot of money, but that is nothing when talking about it when there is 200 plus million dollars' worth of infrastructure.</p> <p>Paul thanked Scott S. and then thanked Tim for supplying the DoD numbers and asked Tim if he had anything he wanted to talk about.</p> <p>Tim stated that the only comment he would make with regards to the SUA is when looking at those costs, understand that typically the DoD does upgrades via capital funding, which comes every three years or so. He noted that in the SUA process, the DoD would be paying for those upgrades on an annual basis versus every three years, so the system stays in continual upgrade and over the long run of the total cost of the system through 10 years. Tim commented that he does not know if this is still true, but it was said in the past that there is roughly a 17% savings over doing capital investments by doing a SUA approach. That is hard to compare now because that was the sales pitch before and numerically it proved correct. He stated that he does not know when ALMR started thinking about a SUA, probably 9 or 10 years ago, but since there was a lot of inflation and costs, he does not know if that still proves out. Tim noted that what it does do if you can get the system upgrade costs put into the operations and maintenance costs on an annual basis, it is to make sure that all the funds line up at the same time in the system which stays at the best performance level. He commented that one of the things to note is because DoD does not typically keep up with the five year window that Motorola gives us between technology versions to do the upgrades. DoD becomes behind in doing the upgrades and they do not get the full benefit of that upgrade lifespan. Tim stated that, for instance, the DoD might be paying for an upgrade when there are three years into that technology version already, so they are really only seeing two years of that technology version before they have to move to the next technology upgrade. Because the funding between the state</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>and federal typically one has to wait two years for that funding to line up then the state and DoD fall further behind. He noted that one of the things the SUA would do is it would align the upgrades on an annual basis and they would no longer have to do capital investments or any catch up on technology to get into the next contract year and would only move forward.</p> <p>Tim asked if Scott S. had anything to add.</p> <p>Scott S. noted that he should have mentioned the \$24 million that the state has spent on the current ongoing upgrade project. He does not have the DoD's amount in his head, but that is probably \$8 to \$10 million or so that the DoD's contributions have been to do the upgrades, and they did not have to do the GTRs because they had already done that a few years previously. He stated that none of that has to happen anymore if they have that SUA Plus. It would all be covered in there and all the brand new GTRs that we installed, put into Tim's point were not brand new technology wise. The GTRs were a 12 to 14 years old technology when they were bought, so the good news is they are already close to being at their end of life and end of support, and the replacement for all those is included in that SUA Plus funding line to the newest technology. Scott S. commented that the consoles are another example where on top of that \$24 million the state did and the \$8 to \$10 million the DoD did, they went from the gold elites to the MC 7500 platform, and that was a state and local \$5 million plus investment. He noted that the Access console platform, which is the latest console platform from Motorola and probably not far from used. Scott S. stated that if people are buying something, what they are buying are all the upgraded and replaced leads or the MCC platforms will be swapped out to Access consoles in that same process without having to seek those capital funds that have been used in the past and caused issues, as Tim said, having different fiscal years, everybody is kind of sitting waiting for more funds to get it, which just makes it a mess.</p> <p>Mr. David Reed, security manager, stated that to add on to that from the security standpoint, the SUA platform does provide ALMR with a much more stable footing, in that everyone is getting</p>	
--	---	--



***ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes***

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>the system upgrades on an annual basis. He noted that ALMR will actually moving to new versions of software and operating systems and not sitting on vulnerable platforms that workarounds have to be found for.</p> <p>Paul noted that the next chart is blank because it is unknown what the DoD is going to need for radios coming up in FY27, which is the same with the MOA. He stated that the \$950,000, the MOA RF equipment platform migration and then for the MOA console migration, they are estimating \$2.95 million, so keep in mind with the three agencies, everyone has a piece of the pie and everyone is putting in millions of dollars into the system, it is not just one agency that is bearing the burden of the cost of the system. Paul commented that with the three agencies, a lot of money is going into ALMR and the projected upgrades. This is based on the SOA FY27 and that is why he had to describe all three different fiscal years at the top of the paper.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that just to comment on why everyone's budget chart looks different, for example, with the MOA funding process, at least in the eleven plus years he has been with the state, it is a whole lot easier because they put something on the bond and most people, including him, will vote yes, especially when they are reading that it is about public safety stuff. He commented that he does not have a state bonding process and Tim with the DoD does not have a DoD bonding process, so it is a lot harder for them to go through the process of getting money than it is for the MOA. Scott S. noted that the MOA is basically able to effectively do it the way they have been doing it and they are really not concerned about not getting the money, and the state and DoD are the hard ones. He stated that if the state and DoD get the SUA, then they will be looking like the MOA and he thinks that will have solved their problem. He said the way they have been doing this is not good and they have been lucky that they have kept it going the way they are doing it. Scott S. noted that as he mentioned earlier, they are the only ones not on a SUA and they are one of the rarities that do not have one.</p> <p>Paul stated that to just reiterate for the group online, so this is the SOA FY27, the DoD</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>FY26/27, and the MOA calendar year 2027, which is from July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2027. He asked if anybody online or in the room have any questions on the operating budget for ALMR. Paul continued on to reiterate that the UC would have to approve this and then it goes to the EC, then once the EC approves it then it needs to go to Scott S. and Tim so they can have the information to go in front of who they would need to.</p> <p>Tim stated that he would like to make a suggestion that the council remove the subscriber costs for the DoD from the report since it is not essential to the shared system function. He noted that is an internal DoD cost figure that is very difficult to get from the agencies what they are funding for radios.</p> <p>Tim stated that he would just delete that from the chart or Paul can put a note that the DoD does not want to provide it just because it is not essential to the total cost of the infrastructure, and it should contain infrastructure costs not subscribers costs. Tim stated that would be his recommendation to remove that for the DoD, and he suggested the same thing for the state to remove subscriber costs.</p> <p>Scott S. stated it could because the infrastructure, which is the next one down below that the DoD does not have any money in, and that is for solving problems like when a battery plant goes bad, so it does not take a year to get funding.</p> <p>Tim noted that is something that each individual user agency has to provide and never has.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that maybe this is not granular enough, but if there was a number on there like \$250,000 for the DoD to tell everybody else they should need to have something set aside in case something breaks.</p> <p>Tim stated that he thinks the right approach to that is to go through the membership agreement and require them to provide those figures annually and have some way so they can sign the agreement then there is a provision for this budget input for internal costs, but internal costs</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>to support the infrastructure, not internal costs for subscriber equipment.</p> <p>Paul asked if anybody else online has any suggestions or comments, hearing none, he stated that completes his briefing and he wanted to thank the gentlemen here in the room for adding and making some comments. He noted that what the OMO will do is remove the DoD essential equipment per Tim's request.</p> <p>Scott S. said he may remove theirs unless John wants to talk about it now, the state could remove their line as well because Tim's point that whether members replace their subscriber units or not is not impacting everybody else in the infrastructure's operations. He commented that unless they are talking about the TDMA/FDMA conversation, he will not go that far right now.</p> <p>Tim commented unless it can be put on a separate line in the budget for agencies transitioning to TDMA and that projection cost, but he would not relate it to the total cost of operating the ALMR infrastructure from a partnership perspective because subscribers have nothing to do with that.</p> <p>Paul stated that is correct Tim, that this is just for the agencies that own the infrastructure, it is not say for instance, the Steese Volunteer Fire Department or something, that is not part of this budget, this is just the infrastructure owners.</p> <p>Tim noted that it is related to the agreement that the State and DoD have, the Cooperative and Mutual Aid Agreement, which is to mutually share an infrastructure, again, it does not address the requirement for subscribers. so giving this information to the EC might create unnecessary questions and quite frankly, when you start putting subscriber costs in there, he thinks it artificially inflates what already existed like high cost. He stated that he does not think he wants to show what it costs to buy new subscriber units because it is not necessary for the sales requirement that the state and DoD has to get funding approved from the infrastructure.</p> <p>Paul noted that the reason he always had that on there was that those have always been included on there, but he would defer to the infrastructure</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>owners and the UC if they would like that removed.</p> <p>Scott S. stated that he is okay with removing the subscriber line from the state's chart as well, and he would leave the coverage enhancements because it is related to this business and in the UC and EC meetings have always talked about where the state needs to expand on that, so that is infrastructure and that is funding to support that requirement. He noted that it is worth leaving that line there, but the subscriber line can come out because the grand total numbers, as Tim was saying, are scary when you look at them, which is because the state has been underfunded in the past. Scott S. commented it looks like it is, but it is what everybody else in the world has been paying.</p> <p>Tim stated that the state does not want to throw another scary figure in there and on top of that, he thinks it would distract from the conversation that has to take place about infrastructure.</p> <p>Paul asked does anybody online have any questions or comments about the operating budget. Hearing none, he continued stating that with the changes that the infrastructure owners have requested, he and Mary will have to delete those items.. He would like Mary and him to make the changes to the budget and also email them to the UC members for a vote, if that would be okay with the chair and the other UC members.</p> <p>Scott N. stated that it is just fine with him and asked if there were any objections out there.</p> <p>John asked if Mary could tell him when the next EC meeting would be and Paul noted that the next meeting is on 17 July. John went on to comment that the only caution he has is that to make sure that to get this finally approved and voted upon, whether it is a vote now with the changes recommended and/or an email vote. He stated that he does not have an opinion but he just wants to make sure that whatever the council chooses, it is done rapidly so it can be prepared for the EC meeting next week.</p> <p>Scott N. thanked John and commented that these are minor changes. He noted that Mr.</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>Henry Cole had his hand up and told Henry to go ahead.</p> <p>Henry stated that his question was that for the DoD one it was an obvious change because it was a blank line and he asked what is the other line being proposed to be removed, he was not sure if he was following it correctly.</p> <p>Paul highlighted the line on the chart and stated to Henry that it is the line that he just highlighted and that the amount for the radios will be removed.</p> <p>Henry stated that his question is because that is \$33 million over that eight-year span, is that all intended for subscriber radios, because the line says radio services and systems, and he assumed that was kind of the state's share of repeater units and towers and whatever else that may be required. He noted that the members hear about maintenance and other activities every month and that is the largest single row on this budget that he can tell, and it seems like it would be worth it for the members to have a better understanding of what that is before it is just removed.</p> <p>Scott S. noted that it is mostly radios the fact that it says services and systems is because the radios now have a lot of new technology, there is radio management, and there are subscriber annual service fees for that. He stated that the state has the new long-term evolution (LTE) radios, the SmartConnect, and those all come with service fees that have a bill that has to be paid every year, so that is why those extra words are on that line, but it is basically radios and fees that go with the radios that the state is using now that they did not have those fees a couple of years ago. Scott S. commented that right now they are paying for those fees out of hide and the state is only able to do that because a small number of radios that are using that technology, but as the state gets more and more radios, the state cannot afford to pay that.</p> <p>Tim noted that to the point it is not related to the infrastructure costs.</p> <p>Henry stated that he understands that, but as a representative of one of the SOA agencies, it is</p>	
--	---	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>part of the operating cost at least it is going to reflect on the DOT, DPS, and the other departments that are represented here, and he just thought it is worth calling out, but that is just his opinion.</p> <p>Mary stated that she had a comment in the Team's chat from Ms. Erann Kalwara that reads: "I would appreciate seeing the document as an email attachment and having the ability to ask questions prior to the vote."</p> <p>Paul stated, what the OMO can do is make the changes, and in regard to Henry's comments, the OMO will have that line tentatively removed, but as a UC member , Henry can comment and vote however he wants to. He noted that what he and Mary will do is get this deleted and do what needs to be done and get it sent out to all the UC members today with a cut off of Monday, and that way if someone wants to look at it over the weekend, but the votes need to be back by Monday for the EC meeting next week. Paul commented that will give enough time for the council, DoD, the state, and AWARN to have a finalized product sent out to the EC.</p> <p>Mary stated that is good for her.</p> <p>Paul noted that is Monday, July 14th and the EC meeting is July 17.</p> <p>Scott N. said he is not really expecting a whole lot of people to be reading this on the weekend, but he does know they will have Thursday and Friday then Monday to close of business. He stated that the council is just entertaining these two changes and he can see that there are questions about it and people are not comfortable to vote on it and he is not going to force to vote on it.</p> <p>Tim stated that he would like to recommend that the OMO remove the line and put it so it has the infrastructure costs and total that cost, then have subscriber services and costs and then you can put the state's cost. Everyone is not getting a full picture because everyone has these costs: local government, federal non infrastructure owners, etc. He noted that what happens is that the group is not telling the EC what the cost is because the team is not including all the cost of</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>subscriber equipment on the current system, so if the group is going to put those figures there, then a caveat is needed saying only the state has provided the figures, and the DoD, other federal agencies, and all other agencies on the system has not provided those figures. Tim commented that now there is an inaccurate picture of the cost of all of the users on the system with regard to subscriber costs.</p> <p>Scott N. asked Scott S. whether all the divisions within the state on ALMR have provided those kinds of cost.</p> <p>Scott S. noted that those are just rough knowing what an idea of how many radios need to be replaced, and if the state had that kind of money they would be able to continue that process to get them right now.</p> <p>Scott N. noted that it is just a wild number, an educated guess/estimate, but it is still just an estimate just the same and the state can break those out.</p> <p>Scott S. noted that he agrees with what Tim was saying and he thinks it is misleading to have it there because it does not show the whole picture and he also hears what Henry is saying that he is fighting for money and if it is taken out of there it does not help him to have that information. He noted that the state agencies may be able to tackle that outside of this as a state issue before the state's departments are putting their budgets together.</p> <p>Scott N. asked does it depend on this document.</p> <p>Scott S. stated not that he thinks going down the path that Tim has kind of pointed out here, he thinks using it in this document is not the right way to do that.</p> <p>Scott N. acknowledged that Erann had her hand up.</p> <p>Erann stated that she just wants to make sure she is understanding that it sounds like most people think there is a value to removing subscribers and things that are agency specific from the ALMR budget, but perhaps that needs to be either a separate category or at least a</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>footnote for people who are reading this so that they know that every municipality, federal, and state agency submits those in their budgets separately. She noted that this is not a total cost to use the system, this is just the system itself. Erann commented that she is trying to clarify the different comments.</p> <p>Tim stated that, yes, he thinks Erann is correct that this budget to the EC would be for the shared infrastructure costs, so, the Infrastructure owners do not share subscriber costs and each individual agency pays for their own subscriber costs. He noted that this is the shared infrastructure cost, so it would be misleading to put subscriber costs in that report unless everybody's subscriber costs are in there and it was defined as the total cost of the subscriber cost for operating on the system. Tim commented that the recommendation is for it to be removed and if it is put in, there should be a caveat that the figures are an estimate by the state but no one else has provided those figures and there is no requirement to provide figures at this point, so it becomes non-essential information for that fact at that point and why include it because it only drives questions.</p> <p>Erann stated that she just went through a big funding thing these last three years in Juneau and sometimes people who do not understand the technology may look at it and think it is all inclusive she did not know how to say that in a more official way. She noted that she does not know that it even belongs as a category or a line item on the document, but just a reference to the fact that this is not a total cost because of those subscribers and that is something that people will be asking for money later, which may be an advantage.</p> <p>Tim states that he agrees there should probably be a caveat on there that these costs are for infrastructure and do not include individual agency subscriber costs.</p> <p>Paul stated that he wanted to make sure he is capturing what Erann is looking at, so everyone online and in the room please look at Addendum A where the first paragraph states: "The following reflects near- and long-term funding requirements, which are not included with the</p>	
--	--	--



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	<p>individual Operations Management Office or Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance Services contracts but are part of the capital costs expected for lifecycle management and maintenance of a public safety grade, telecommunications system.” He noted he could add a sentence, and he paraphrased: “this also does not include the additional cost of subscriber units, upgrades for TDMA, and other software costs for subscribers.”</p> <p>Tim suggested “individual agencies” instead of subscribers.</p> <p>Paul agreed to “individual agencies,” and asked Erann if that would cover her concerns.</p> <p>Erann stated that she thinks that seems like a good idea to her.</p> <p>Paul stated he will work on the proper wording.</p> <p>Henry stated that seems like a good compromise to him.</p> <p>Scott N. thanked Henry and stated that he needs a motion if the group is ready for that.</p> <p>Motion: To have the FY27 OMO SMO Operating Budget document sent out in an email with the changes discussed and providing the appropriate time, which is close of business Monday, July 14, to review, ask questions, and vote online on this document.</p> <p>Scott N. asked if there are any comments or questions before we move forward with the motion, hearing none, he asked if he could have a motion and a second.</p> <p>Motion: Mr. Henry Cole</p> <p>Second: Mr. John Rockwell</p> <p>Scott N. asked if there were any nays on the motion, hearing none, he stated the motion is carried.</p>	
Next Meeting	Discussion	



*ALMR User Council
Meeting Minutes*

Date: July 9, 2025

	Scott N. briefed the next meetings are currently scheduled for August 13 and September 3.	
Adjournment	Discussion	
	<p>Scott N. asked if there was anything else anyone would like to offer up.</p> <p>Scott N. stated that at this time he would accept a motion and a second from any of the council members to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Adjourn the July 9, 2025, User Council meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Lt. Ben Endres</p> <p>Second: Scott Nelsen</p> <p>Scott N. stated that the meeting was now adjourned and thanked everyone for attending.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.</p>	