

DRAFT MINUTES



ALASKA LAND MOBILE RADIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (A Federal, State and Municipal Partnership)



Memorandum for ALMR Executive Council

December 5, 2005

FROM: DoD Co-Chair

SUBJECT: November 21, 2005 ALMR Executive Council Meeting Minutes

TO: See Distribution

Executive Council Members Present:

Commissioner Bill Tandeske ✓
Colonel Kristine Clifton ✓
Ms. Heather Handyside ✓
Ms. Deborah Smith ✓

Department of Public Safety
Alaskan Command
Alaska Municipal League
US Attorney Office

ALMR Project Team Members Present:

Mr. Mike Callahan ✓ *VLRCB*
Mr. Tim Woodall ✓
Mr. Jim Robinson ✓
Dr. Ken Jones ✓
Mr. Trygve Erickson ✓
Mr. John Madden
Ms. Ruthi Muffler ✓
Mr. Joe Quickel ✓
Mr. Dean Strid
Ms. Karen Felts
Mr. Roger Hull
Ms. Sharon White
Mr. Steve Eason (Phone) ✓

SoA Project Manager
DoD Project Manager
DoD Deputy Project Manager
SoA Deputy Project Manager
MoA Project Manager
SoA Dept of Military & Veterans Affairs
DoD Project Team
DoD Project Team
SoA Project Team
SoA Project Team
DoD Project Team
SoA Project Team
SoA Dept of Administration

Guests Present:

Mr. Corey Poindexter
Ms. Natalie Newman ✓

SoA AST / User Council
DoD Army 59th Signal Battalion
DoD Army 59th Signal Battalion

1. **Call to order:** Colonel Clifton called the meeting to order at 1:38 pm.

DRAFT MINUTES

2. **Opening Statements and Other Announcements:** Colonel Clifton announced that two members on the ALMR Project Team were undergoing significant personal challenges. She asked all attendees to please keep these team members and their families in thoughts and prayers, especially as the holiday season approaches.

Col Clifton introduced Ms. Deborah Smith, the Federal non-DoD representative, to the other members of the Executive Council.

Ms. Heather Handyside provided an overview of the upcoming 26th National Veterans Wheelchair Games, July 3-8, 2006 and asked the members present to consider employing ALMR radios during this event.

Ms. Handyside asked if the Valdez Site Coverage Report had been delivered to the Fire and Police Departments in Valdez. Mr. Woodall replied that it had not. Ms. Handyside stated she would ensure the report was delivered to them.

3. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (October 27, 2005):** Commissioner Tandeske moved that the minutes be accepted as written; Ms Handyside seconded the motion. Ms. Smith abstained due to lack of participation in the previous meeting. There were no objections from the other Executive Council members (Commissioner Tandeske, Colonel Clifton, and Ms. Handyside) and the minutes were accepted unanimously. **(CLOSED)**

4. **New Business:** ALMR Infrastructure 6.8 Upgrade vs 7.x Migration

On behalf of the ALMR Project Team, Mr. Woodall presented a decision briefing and comprehensive analysis on the advantages and disadvantages of upgrading or migrating ALMR to 6.8 or 7.x, respectively. A copy of the presentation is at attachment 2. The ALMR Project Team was lauded by the Executive Council for their thorough analysis. Following the presentation, numerous questions were raised and addressed by the ALMR Project Team. The following are some of the key points that surfaced.

Ms. Handyside asked about current proprietary features and how they would be impacted by an ALMR infrastructure upgrade or migration. Mr. Woodall noted that proprietary features, as opposed to Project 25 standard functions, may or may not work on new platforms. Agencies wishing to employ proprietary features above the Project 25 standards would be responsible for any associated cost increases.

Colonel Clifton noted that Inter-RF Subsystem Interface (ISSI) standards were considered an advantage of the 7.x migration. She asked Mr. Woodall to explain the ISSI standard so all members could understand its significance. Mr. Woodall stated a standardized ISSI is important to driving down equipment costs in the long run because it would enable agencies to pick and choose from myriad P25-compliant consoles and base stations that would operate with infrastructure from any P25 vendor.

DRAFT MINUTES

Ms. Smith asked how federal law enforcement agencies were interacting with the ALMR program. Mr. Woodall explained that the federal law enforcement community is implementing IWIN (Integrated Wireless Network). Initially, IWIN implemented version 6.5 as a concept demonstration in Blaine, Washington. The IWIN project is now out for competitive bid. Ms. Smith asked if IWIN would interface with ALMR. Mr. Woodall responded, as the Western region is implemented, IWIN will most likely choose to interface with ALMR, similar to the MoA-zone approach. This will ensure interoperability and also allow them to function autonomously within their own system.

During discussion on when the final migration decision must be made, Mr. Woodall explained the Executive Council still a little bit of time remaining. The driving factor is the MoA requirement. Colonel Clifton asked for a deadline date. Mr. Erickson stated January 2006 but that Motorola is pushing for the decision as quickly as possible so that they can begin construction of the system elements and components.

Colonel Clifton MOVED that ALMR migrate from the infrastructure platform 6.5 to 7.x on 2 zones in 2006, contingent upon funding. Commissioner Tandeske SECONDED the motion. There were no objections and the motion PASSED unanimously. (CLOSED)

5. Executive Council Focus Areas:

a. ALMR Communications System Cooperative Agreement Motion: Colonel Clifton asked the Executive Council to vote on this motion which has been carried over from previous meetings (see attachment 1). This agreement is needed to lay the framework for operational support of the ALMR infrastructure. Ms. Smith requested the motion be tabled until she and the Department of Justice had the opportunity to review the document. **(OPEN)**

b. Total Cost of Ownership and Cost Share Plan: Mr. Callahan expressed concern that the cost share plan has not been finalized. He stated outreach activities have stalled pending approval of a cost model. He further stated that efforts were underway to ensure a placeholder of \$1.7M was in the SoA budget to accommodate ALMR operations and maintenance requirements. Ms. Handyside commented that the Baseline Cost Sharing Model presented at the 27 October 2005 ALMR Executive Council Meeting was a good starting point but the Executive Council has not yet endorsed the content or formula. Mr. Callahan noted that if actions were not taken soon, the budget window could be missed. Mr. Eason stated he has some concerns on the fundamental basis of the costs projected in the DMVA Baseline Cost Sharing Model and he needs time to validate some of the data and assumptions. Mr. Woodall recommended the establishment of an ALMR Executive Council subcommittee, led by the SoA, to assess the options presented in the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Study conducted in early 2005 along with the DMVA Baseline

DRAFT MINUTES

Cost Sharing Model. Mr. Madden reminded the members that the TCO Study did not address the cost of administering the various models. Ms. Handyside agreed and asked Mr. Eason to provide the administrative cost figures to the Executive Council by the next meeting. Mr. Eason was also asked to complete a feasible cost share approach by the end of January. **(OPEN)**

Due to time constraints, Colonel Clifton moved to table all remaining agenda items until the next meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Tandeske and approved by all.

6. Summary of Meeting Action Items:

- a) Ms. Handyside will provide additional information on the 26th National Veterans Wheelchair Games to be held in Anchorage in 2006.
- b) Ms. Handyside agreed to deliver to the Valdez Site Coverage Report to their Fire and Police departments.
- c) Mr. Eason was asked to present the cost of administering a cost share model by the next meeting
- d) Mr. Eason was asked to complete a feasible cost share approach by the end of January.
- e) Executive Council (Colonel Clifton, Commissioner Tandeske, Ms Handyside, Ms Smith) are to review the six (6) change requests for site implementation moves from 2005 to 2006.
 - Gerstle River
 - Byers Creek
 - Cooper Mountain
 - Tahneta Pass
 - Tsina
 - Honolulu

7. NEXT MEETING: December 08, 2005, 1:30 p.m. in the Federal Building at 222 W. 7th Avenue.

Colonel Clifton made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Ms. Handyside. Without further discussion, the Executive Council Meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

KRISTINE M. CLIFTON, Colonel, USAF
Department of Defense, Executive Co-Chair

Attachments:

1. 21 November 2005 ALMR Executive Council Agenda
2. ALMR Upgrade or Migration Decision Briefing

11-21-05

Call to Order
1:38

^{KC}
Motion Adjourn
Second ~~H~~
AT 03:19

Opening statement

→ Mr. Terry Callies - Surgery 5-Bypass
- going well today

→ Mr. Tony Vita - Son injury in Iraq
keep them in your thoughts

Introduction of Deborah Smith
presentation of trinkets
binder of AWP History

Agenda chgs - 6.8 to 7X Presentation

2006 Wheelchair Games Annual
700 Athletes
8 Venues
Outdoor Events

①

Sponsored by DAD, Veterans group
local support group

07-03
08

Need radios - work with
176 Fed ALMR person

Demonstration Project

Public Outreach

Radios, Training

EC in support Hett
will get additional information

WT Infrastructure in place?

TW where

WT in Bowl -

TW OK

(2)

Htt Radios & training

MC In Bldg coverage??
Outdoors no problem

Htt Provide additional info -

KC Used ALMR during P Bush
visit last week

Htt asked about Valdes
report - was it delivered?

TW said no

WT moved to accept minutes
Htt second

Vote - DS abstain

No object KC motions
Accept

(3)

Skip to 6a 6.8 to 7.X
TW Speaker

→ Overview Motorola presentation

↳ Met with ↓
Tech issues
Ops " "
Admin " "

→ Mot rept to PM team last week

→ EC has copies of ~~report~~

Recommendations

see presentation
Costs -

After D
EC

Mot tech upgrades forces
customers to move ~~except~~
instead of stabilizing

New-training, processes, etc

Engage Motu bitten pantren

④

2) 2 step Approach

WT 7.0 good how far out?

TW +4 years

3)

KC what about 6.5 to 6.8 to 7.x

TW Process is quick

TECHNOLOGY

HH Proprietary features —

TW May / May not be on new platform

Must pay for upgrade

Not come forward

Other manufacturers??

Standards approach

Proprietary not guaranteed

(5)

KC - How many in system now?

TW None (Dad)

TE None (Statowida)

KC SC encourage users to understand "proprietary" features impact

KC in layman terms explain

ISSI

TW Account for platform platform

currently works for subscribers
std between consoles being worked

6

7.x Infrastructure will
be standard across manufacturers
Vendor options / choices
increases interoperability

KC better negotiation place with
ISSI

Weighted Chart for Tech

DS question about HSD
BWD

TE ~~no~~ dependant upon need
TW no Non-DOD rep

DS interact with Feb law
enforcement

PM, Tim Ritter on IWIN
initially CoS; as concept demen,

(7)

⑧ Out for Contract

in receiving process - today

DS IWIN to interface with ACWR

TW Yes, in a zone approach
to all atomomy in IWIN
while having inter-operability

TE - More reason to be at >

DS Time Table

TW \$80 Billion process - build
single system across
USA - ~~FED~~ law enforcement
5 year period

DS ?

TW 5-10 years

HH Complete vs step approach

⑧

TW
Fed agency under same
bandwidth restrictions as

DoD -

Need waiver (1-1-08) if not
ready

DS ? Meantime, what does local
FBI do?

TW They use ALMIL with XTS5000
subscribers

Are currently compat to 6

DS with 7.X

TW YES
OPERATIONS

WT process rating due to
7 unknowns

TW agreed

(9)

DS installed anywhere?

TW a couple of sites; no info at this ~~site~~ time

KC Wait for some "practical" sites before ACMR

Administration / MAINTENANCE
+ Security

DS Security ^{Accreditation} C/A ^{assessment} delay?

TW In 6.5 window; others (6.8) ACMR will need to wait until higher level accomplished

DS IMPACT

TW DGA weight risks

Tech ~~weighted~~ gap

but other security C/A

DS Operations impacted

TW can work ~~with~~ but need to work towards A/C C/A

SUMMARY

7.8

TE

Important points
MoA/SoA generally similar
DoD/non DoD " "

But important differences

KC Funding available

DoD yes for 2 contractors,
↳ in Appropriation Bill

TE

MoA 7x slightly cheaper

MC

Some things higher costs —
like ISSA security

WT

Thought 7.8 would be very
expensive

TE

(11)

Stepped approach more \$

WT - Higher numbers

KC - Appreciate/ Applaud work together

DS - how many zones

TW 2 now
1 in MoA

TE double upgrade more costly
have 8 now for 6, 8 or 2x

TE Problem with Controller
zone placement

TW Geographical redundancy

TE Heavy hand with MOA

MC ISSI strands for Non-DoD
needs

HH Time lines

TE No a crunch yet

KC When is deadline

TE January 2002

TE MOTOROLA WANTS A
quicker decision

KC Anyone know status
of Appropriations bill

TW House is weakest point

Senate stronger support

Sen McClain anti-ALMR

We need to educate McClain

DS Radio with "bridges"?

WT Radio to nowhere

DS December congress

TW Appropriations to fund war
ALMR included

(3) TW 50% cut - privatization of action

WT Must do something
Status quo doesn't work
Get out from under Me7
Not staying by 6.5

KC When do we need to work
the points.

TW Make a motion to ~~amend~~ migrate
under the work-financial

KC Motion

TW Use 3rd option
Move to migrate 6.5 to 7x
platform by 2026 contingent
upon funding

WT Seconded

No objections Motion passed

TW Originally thought 6.8 was the route

KC Thanks

MC Pointed out that Ken Jones did SA work

59/83

KC ~~EC~~ Focus Areas

SA Cooperative Agreement

Previous motions to implement

Have SC rep gone to their users for feed back

KC who would sign SA

DoD 3 star general?

TW Joe Q can provide history of revisions

JQ SA law here reviewed

TW Marjory reviewed to DoD JA 3 times until SA/JA AGREED

TW Same IA at DoD

WT What do we need to do

KC Second? HH

KC Any objections

DS Any non-DoD review -

JM Ran it through.

Your position is outside
of org lines

You, in your current role,
should review

Judge Advocate for DoD and
used it,

FAt did not have counsel

DS - Wants it reviewed by Justice of non-dod

DS - TABLE Agree to Dec Mtg

KC - Don't understand problem with extension

MC - Could EXC Approve User Council?

TW - EXC already did that

History

MoA to implement

No documented Authority for O&M

Comp Agree does that

KC Expedite within organization

Critical points

MC Cost Model

need to solidify and
take to users

Need to expedite what
can we do to support
EC -

Outreach - what are costs?

Not available

WT Follow up with governor's
office to see what is
happening

\$MC - DMYA Commissioner will
help

- Put together paper

- Moving DMYA to DoA -
may fall through the crack

HH - Presentation good
But EC did not endorse
content

EC endorsing

MC Included info

TW Consider a date / goal to
Name Cost Share / Cooperative
Agreement DUE

EC addressing issue by
such date

Maybe use similar process
to G.O. to T.X. Assessment

MC - Each EC member would
work their own users
HH to Mum's . . .

- Provides some feedback

WT Expect strategy to
answer finance questions?
What is plan B?

SE MC in Juneau met with
DOT commissioner
E

Put place holder in Budget
MC stated we needed place
holder

MC Bigger question is what is
the final model

TW Recommend EC propose a
Sub committee to work
the issue - to rep all 4
groups and place timeframe

MC by December Mtg.

KE who

MC who plus work completed

MC Outreach stalled

WT What is your timeline for other alternatives, Spenceman

SE Working with Spencer Stem

WT No options at this time

SE Some concerns on fundamental basis

SATS cost

ACMR component

Want to validate some assumptions

TW What is your timeline Spenceman?
60, 90, 120 days

If EC established committee
gather, create recommendations

SE Sooner than later
Cost questions coming

WT Do not go to legis late
with no concrete info

TW When in January

SE Depends

WT Committee meetings

TW With holidays, not much
time

SE Shoot for January end

JM Non DoD in 10 different
franchising bills

Cost assignment by agency
most ~~to~~ cumbersome part

filled with "NO" opportunities
before OMB

SS Each agency pays for setup
(capital)

TW No on by O&M costs

TW Subscriber has fee to cover costs — not fair & equitable — but must be balanced dependant upon use & organization,
EC rules of engagement
↳ Interoperability
↳

HH Local ok with what Mike & Ken did compared to TCO

HH To go forward — EC must endorse the approach

TW TCO provides 3 approaches
evaluate that c. 52A's

Select a model from 1 of these 4 models

JM TCO did not address administration of cost collections

- KC DoD wanted lumpsum
- JM Fed does not allow "reserve"
- KC Who bills/collects fee?
- SE Nightmare for DoA
- MC Back to SA Steering Committee
- KC Need budget people to support requests
- DoD wants to be included
- MC Learn each lane for each
ExC to resolve
- HT If we chose to go through
with the approach
- WT With A, we can pick them
in order
- WT Thinks money is there do
need answers to the anticipated
questions

MC Need to be expeditions (fast)

DS Would a committee be fast enough?

TW TCO report presented 3 approaches — but not a solution

MC & KJ to variances & presented a 4 course of action

Committee would select 1 or 4 or combination

JR Same Prog Mgrs do review

TW Prefer to stay out of review

KC — Stay out of soft funding
- Want a flat fee

WT — All approaches have costs
MC/KJ significantly lower
Soft can't do it — Needs to be for all players

DS - ? Each entity pays for each radio

HA - Agrees with JIM on Admin costs
SE can you provide Admin costs by 12-8

~~TW~~ - Reviewing baseline & TCO
-
- Proj Mgr can present O&M costs

WT - Then what

MC - Legislative insessor

DS - Alternative analyzed?

KC - Proj Mgr cannot do that
Expertise outside of EC
& Proj Mgr

TW - If Port brings a plan -
others need to take plan
through their own
orgs

W6 SoA provide a plan
EC to constituency for
vote / feedback

then to EC

All this with families

Rush - things can be missed

Select a single plan

DS Does it, EC decide how it
is funded

W7 How we get to option 4 (MCKJ)

Funded with minimal costs to
local communities.

SoA would absorb a large portion
of costs (with DS)

If you review TCO, you will
see

MC AK State Steering Committee
have seen Mc/KJ proposal

#WT Catch 22 — balanced with
needs

HH you have it out there

HH \$5

MC Get better numbers; then
re-submit to SA players
& the budget peeps

HH Prog Mgmt ok numbers

MC Need #s from Steve

TW CBM develop proposal
to EC; or allow agency
to work back to EC position

MC Keep coordinating until sobel

TW - hard plan for approach?

(3) SE No plans for Thanksgiving

KE Use original rules of criteria
Lump sum
ease of use
SE ok

~~SE~~

Last Comments -

Proj Change to be sent out
for vote of EC