



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



MEMORANDUM FOR ALMR Executive Council

April 21, 2016

FROM: SOA Executive Co-Chair

SUBJECT: March 17, 2016, ALMR Executive Council Meeting Minutes

TO: See Distribution

Executive Council Members Present:

Deputy Commissioner Bill Comer	State of Alaska – Department of Public Safety
Colonel Harold Hoang	Department of Defense – Alaskan Command (ALCOM)/J6
Assistant Special Agent in Charge David Condo	Alaska Federal Executive Association /Federal Bureau of Investigation
Deputy Chief Ken Spadafora	Municipality of Anchorage – Anchorage Police Department
Ms. Linda Murphy	Alaska Municipal League (AML) (via teleconference)

ALMR Support Team Members and Guests Present:

Mr. Ocie Adams	User Council Vice Chair (via teleconference)
Deputy Commissioner John Boucher	SOA Department of Administration (via teleconference)
Mr. Jim Steele	Director, Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) (via teleconference)
Mr. Del Smith	Operations Manager
Mr. Scott Stormo	ETS SATS/ALMR Manager
Mr. Tim Woodall	DOD ALMR Program Manager
Mr. Trygve Erickson	Municipality of Anchorage AWARN Manager (via teleconference)
Ms. Sherry Shafer	Operations Management Office (via teleconference)

1. **Call to Order.** Deputy Commissioner Bill Comer, State of Alaska (SOA) Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. **Opening Statements and Other Announcements.**

There were no opening statements/announcements.

3. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes.** Deputy Commissioner Comer asked the Executive Council (EC) members if they had reviewed the February meeting minutes and if they had any changes.

Mr. Del Smith noted there were some minor corrections, which had been sent out prior to the meeting.

Deputy Commissioner Comer requested a motion for approval of the minutes with the noted corrections.

Motion: Approve the February 18 Executive Council meeting minutes with the indicated corrections.

The motion was made by Assistant Special Agent in Charge (ASAC) David Condo and seconded by Colonel Harold Hoang. There were no objections. **The motion was carried and approved.**

4. **Old Business.**

a. FY17 Contract Executions. Deputy Commissioner Comer asked Mr. Scott Stormo and Mr. Tim Woodall if there were any updates to this item.

Mr. Stormo stated they had met with State of Alaska (SOA) procurement this morning and the request for proposal (RFP) was close to final draft, but there were a few outstanding items to address. He advised the State would be looking to get an extension to the current contract, because it did not appear likely they would have a new contract in place for the 1 July start date.

Mr. Woodall advised he had a conversation with the Department of Defense (DOD) contracting office and had requested an extension for 60 days, but it has to be a sole source award. He added, up to six months is authorized for an extension. Mr. Woodall also explained for every dollar that goes toward any extension, it will be deducted from any new contract that results from the RFP. He also noted DOD was getting legal, contracting office and financial review of the RFP, but he believed there was no requirement for an inter-service agreement because the Codicil to the Cooperative Agreement should cover that area. He was getting that confirmed with the Judge Advocate General to ensure all the DOD interests were properly covered. Mr. Woodall briefed he was looking to arrange a meeting between Mr. Feliciano, Mr. Stormo, himself and DOD contracting, which should happen early next week.

b. FY17 OMO Contract. Mr. Smith advised that he was a sub-contractor for the Operations Management Office (OMO) contract and met with Mr. Stormo and Mr. Woodall to discuss the modification of the contract. He explained the current contract was a three year contract with one option for an additional three year renewal. Mr. Smith stated to his knowledge they should be able to do the modification with no particular glitches. Mr. Smith noted since he is not the prime contractor, he'd have to let Wostmann and 5 Star Team work it out but was not aware of any glitches that would prevent a renewal.

Mr. Woodall advised they would be renegotiating with Wostmann and 5 Star Team regarding any reduction in services, which would amount to a reduction in the contract amount. He stated the new amount of the contract had not been provided by the State yet.

Mr. Stormo stated he would be meeting with them in a few weeks, when it worked for their schedules.

Mr. Woodall added the DOD only had "X" number of dollars, so understanding that the two contracts would be built around that amount.

Colonel Hoang asked if the reduced amount of funds would reduce the period of performance.

Mr. Woodall advised it would not reduce the OMO contract, but the new System Management Office (SMO) contract would be reduced by any extension.

Mr. Stormo explained SOA did not have enough funds for the current year contract and next year contract would be the same. He also noted with the projected FY17 budget cuts, any extension would also have further reduced funding and services. He stated if they didn't reduce the resulting contract by the amount of the 60-day extension, they would not have enough funds to cover the remaining ten months.

Deputy Commissioner Comer asked if they thought they could make it work with what they had.

Mr. Stormo stated he did not know if a vendor would come forward and there would probably be a lot of back and forth with anyone interested. He stated the State was kind of asking for everything for not a lot of money so they might have to revisit the RFP to keep this running.

Mr. Smith noted for the OMO contract, there would be some reduction in services from the current statement of work and they were working to reach an accommodation and he believed they would.

Deputy Commissioner Comer thanked everyone for working so diligently on these issues.

5. User Council Update.

a. User Council Vacancies. Mr. Ocie Adams stated the council was still holding the same vacancies that were noted at the last meeting.

b. Request for Information. Mr. Adams noted the User Council (UC) was made aware of the intent language from the Legislature, both the House and the Senate, to the Department of Administration (DOA) given specific instructions regarding looking at replacing the ALMR System. He stated the UC was currently evaluating how to best assist DOA in responding to that request. Mr. Adams explained the instructions gave until next year to sort out and provide alternate solutions, which would be about 70 percent of the current costs of ALMR.

Mr. Woodall stated, as discussed in the last UC meeting, the only way to appropriately respond to the intent language would be to submit a request for information (RFI) to industry for a technical solution that answers the intent of the Legislature, i.e. is there appropriate technology, new or different that costs less, out there that could be utilized.

Mr. Woodall noted if we compromise the standards that we have set, which is that the system must be APCO P25 compliant and meet the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and other security standards, we will probably get a solution that would be less expensive, but may not perform at the same quality of service. He noted he doubted it would be dispatch centric, which is what most public safety communications are. Mr. Woodall also noted, it would not comply with FSMA standards, the information assurance standards, the APCO 25 standards, the firefighting standards for how radios are built and basic public safety standards that are out there. He advised if you stayed with the same standards and requirements we have now, the only solution that will come across is the solution we are implementing right now – that we have – because that is the system that meets all of those requirements.

Mr. Woodall explained that they previously did submit an RFI to industry to come to the solution we have now, so they don't expect the answer to change. He advised public safety across the world utilizes land mobile radio in a dispatch centric form of operations. Mr. Woodall noted he didn't know if we could give the Legislature what they were looking for, but an RFI would prove what we have the technology now that meets the requirements.

Mr. Woodall noted the Legislature hasn't said in the intent language there was a need to change the standards of the shared system approach and it should be altered, but they are just looking for different technology to meet the existing requirements. He noted the proper way to do this is to do the RFI to industry, provide the results to the Legislature and you've answered their intent. Mr. Woodall advised most probably the answer would be the system we have now does that.

Mr. Jim Steele asked Mr. Woodall if the list of standards or requirements would be a part of the request to industry. He asked Mr. Woodall if what had been done in the past was in the form of an RFI and Mr. Woodall stated it was.

Mr. Smith noted the OMO was gathering all the information they could find even remotely connected to the original RFI, since they became aware of the Legislative intent language, and it would be available. He also advised he was a participant in the original RFI process when they were exploring options and was a participant in interviewing a number of manufacturers who responded to the proposal.

Mr. Steele advised he would like to know what the standards were and get a copy of the previous RFI, if it was available.

Deputy Commissioner Comer asked how long ago the last RFI was and Mr. Woodall stated it was in 1999. Deputy Commissioner Comer stated it would be reasonable to have a new one.

Mr. Woodall agreed the technology has changed, but noted the standards have increased.

ASAC Condo asked who was responsible for delivering the plan and Mr. Stormo stated it was the DOA.

Mr. Smith advised that the User Council had put together a motion regarding the intent language and requested permission from Mr. Adams (UC Chair) to present it to the group, which he gave. Mr. Smith read the modified motion approved by the UC.

Motion: The User Council requests the Executive Council recommend to the Department of Administration that they release a request for information (RFI) to industry in response to the FY17 Legislative Budget intent language regarding potential system replacement options for ALMR.

Deputy Commissioner Comer asked if the motion seemed reasonable and Mr. Stormo stated it did, although he hadn't spoken to Deputy Commissioner Boucher to know if he wants to go this route.

Mr. Stormo noted there had been several studies in the past that have already looked at this and answered this question but didn't think the RFI process would be that difficult to go through to have current, fresh information for whoever is asking this question.

Deputy Commissioner Comer noted his concern was how expensive it was to go through the process.

Mr. Woodall stated typically it didn't cost anything other than contracting's time to prepare it. He explained the process how the RFI works for the group's benefit.

Colonel Hoang stated he wasn't sure the RFI would get to the costs, if the vendor's stated they had the available technology.

Mr. Woodall stated the responding vendors would have to provide a rough order of magnitude (ROM) as part of the RFI and it must be within 10 percent of the actual cost.

He stated we have a lot of information now, an as-built system, number of subscribers, stated requirements and specific standards that must be implemented, and if we provide that they should be able to provide a pretty accurate ROM.

Colonel Hoang also noted the RFI needs to take into account if they will be utilizing the existing infrastructure.

Mr. Woodall stated that was a very good question and maybe DOA needs to go back to the Legislature for clarification on whether they are asking us to look for a totally new and different technology or if they want us to use the existing infrastructure with some sort of modification.

Colonel Hoang stated otherwise we could be setting ourselves up for failure.

Mr. Smith noted when he saw the intent language, clearly the one by the House was driven totally by cost considerations and the second (from the Senate) just talks about a more efficient and reliable system. He noted nobody has ever held a hearing or considered, from the Legislative perspective; "What is wrong with ALMR?" Mr. Smith stated he has continued to hear sniping comments that it doesn't work and has requested repeatedly from the offices making the complaints for specifics, but has never received a response. He stated it's difficult to discern what they are looking for, so we are sort of operating in the blind. Mr. Smith briefed there are almost 1,000 P25 systems spread around the world at present and it's pretty frustrating to continually hear the complaints but those complaining are unable to voice exactly what it is they don't like.

Mr. Steele stated he knew where the intent language came from and that it was from Cisco's lobbyist down in Juneau, whispering in the lawmakers ears, and was probably written by Cisco. He noted Cisco is claiming they have the technology and they can use it in a hybrid- sort of way that complements our existing infrastructure, handsets and equipment using an Interoperability and Collaboration System (IPICS) core. Mr. Steele stated he didn't know the standards, but was anxious to see what the former RFI looked like, and if the standards are inherent to radio, they may indeed find using radio is the best option. He needed to get some clarity on the standards, because he's not an expert and just doesn't know enough about it.

Colonel Hoang stated they could expect Cisco would be one of the respondents to the RFI, but they needed to make sure they were comparing apples to apples as they move along. Technology has changed but IP technology has additional cyber security implications that have to be taken into account and additional vulnerabilities involved.

Deputy Commissioner Comer stated Mr. Steele was absolutely correct that Cisco has a lobbyist down in Juneau who is making the rounds, not only within DOA and OMB, but also within the Legislature. He noted his opinion, with his limited knowledge, is that he doesn't think Cisco has all the requirements ALMR needs.

Mr. Woodall asked if the lobbyist was Mr. Eldon Mulder and Deputy Commissioner Comer stated he thought it was.

Deputy Commissioner Comer stated Cisco had told him they could provide the same services, the same end results ALMR is producing for “a fraction” of the cost. He noted Cisco was telling the State it was going to cost them \$40M of upgrades to the Quantar® repeaters and packaging it in the most expensive terms when they are pitching Cisco products. Deputy Commissioner Comer stated he and Mr. Matt Leveque talked to Cisco about putting it into perspective and also told them they weren’t being fair or relevant in their discussions and that they were also being somewhat disruptive to the process of moving communications forward to a good end result.

Mr. Smith stated what is before the Executive Council then was whether they wanted to proceed with the recommendation of the UC.

Deputy Commissioner Comer stated he was ready to entertain that but asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Stormo stated the only thing he would say was maybe it was worth Deputy Commissioner Comer having some conversations with Deputy Commissioner Boucher or Commissioner Fisher and write a half page based on facts and previous studies that have looked at all of this before to answer it and be done with it. He also noted that on the other hand, in order to get people to stop talking about this they may have to prove it and the RFI might be the way to do that. Mr. Stormo noted he had also talked to Cisco and they claimed to him, that Cisco was not trying to replace ALMR, but they were looking to add to it in areas where they don’t have coverage.

Deputy Commissioner Comer stated they had changed their story then.

Colonel Hoang agreed that it needed to be killed once and for all with an RFI, based on the requirements standards, or we’d just keep spinning our wheels trying to prove otherwise. He stated he agreed with the UC motion. Colonel Hoang noted he had made a couple notes and felt the Department of Public Safety (DPS) needed to provide the technical expertise and the type of data we’ve been collecting to DOA and then there needs to be a collaboration between Deputy Commissioner Comer and Deputy Commissioner Boucher to go forward. He briefed the Executive Council needs to take the Legislature’s direction, request to do an RFI and then either kill it or put it in the same context.

Mr. Stormo stated he currently had a quote from Cisco to put in a new five-channel, and the hardware is more expensive than what he bought a six-channel site with Motorola™ equipment for. He noted when he broached the topic to Cisco, they responded with “we need to look at our numbers.”

Mr. Smith noted he wasn’t aware of any other companies that were out there talking about how they could replace the ALMR System so why we didn’t just ask Cisco for an RFP, since they keep claiming they can do it quicker, better, faster.

Mr. Woodall stated if we were to do that, we wouldn’t have any competing solutions or proposals to weigh Cisco against. He advised, by doing the RFI, you have a number of companies responding with competing technologies and solutions that will have to meet

the standards and requirements that we put forward. If they fail to meet the standards, then they are eliminated. If we are left with only two, then the step beyond that is to do the cost analysis of the competitor's ROM against the ALMR life-cycle management plan.

Deputy Chief Ken Spadafora asked if there was a downside if the RFI went out, doesn't it send a message to the politicians that we might need something new and if there was a downside to this.

Mr. Woodall advised him the Legislature is asking us to do the RFI and provided Deputy Chief Spadafora with a copy of the intent language.

ASAC Condo asked if the RFI would be sending a mixed message.

Mr. Woodall stated the council would include the Legislative intent language in the RFI, because that is really what they were trying to answer – if there was a more efficient, more effective capability than what we have currently.

The members agreed that it should go to as many companies as possible for maximum transparency and maximum information.

Mr. Woodall stated there are plenty of studies from the past that show we have the best technology and the right technology, but the studies are old. He noted the separation study also shows what we would lose in terms of interoperability if we took the system apart, but these reports are dated which is part of our problem. Mr. Woodall advised that part of Cisco's argument is they have new technology that can meet the requirement, but he pointed out he doesn't believe anyone has provided Cisco with the complete requirement ALMR has.

ASAC Condo noted that the requirements should definitely include the difference in security requirements for a cyber IP-based system, which would be vastly different, and it might end up being an apple-to-oranges type comparison.

Mr. Woodall agreed that DOD and the Federal agencies have explicit requirements that have to be in place before they can play. He also stated public safety has certain standards in place, but he didn't know if there was a written policy, but that was something for Mr. Matt Leveque and those folks to determine. Mr. Woodall advised he thought, nationally, the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO) was the accepted standard for law enforcement, firefighting and medical response agencies.

Deputy Chief Spadafora advised that if the State did decide to build a new system, they would definitely have to hook up with their system (Anchorage Wide Area Radio Network - AWARD) because the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) had spent a ton of money to build it and keep it up.

Mr. Woodall stated the requirement was to sustain the interoperability and the group would have to strongly state the requirement in very explicit terms.

Colonel Hoang asked who the request for proposal (RFP) that was being drafted was going out to and Mr. Woodall advised that was for the maintenance and management contract and not for a technical solution for new infrastructure associated with the RFI.

Mr. Steele pointed out Mr. Woodall had brought up a very good point regarding whether it was reasonable to expect that any responses to include costs of migrating to the new technology. He stated that an RFI that only addresses the steady state costs is vastly different than one that takes into consideration any migration costs.

Mr. Woodall advised it could be stated as part of the requirement in the RFI.

Mr. Stormo stated the RFI also needs to include some form of this is a “turnkey” operation and we aren’t going to shut down the current system down for a year, while a new one is put in. He pointed out it has to be fully operated and managed by the offeror.

Mr. Woodall briefed that the RFI needed to include a ROM on life-cycle costs of any replacement.

Mr. Stormo stated one of the earlier pitches was that Cisco was trying to sell the State a piece of hardware, but didn’t address whose putting it in, whose programming it and whose is managing it.

Mr. Steele advised his understanding is that Cisco is going to present a solution that leverages the State’s voice network and drop some IPICS voice gateways in the core but he didn’t know if it addresses the interoperability requirements so those need to be clear.

Deputy Commissioner Comer stated at this point the group was back to entertaining the motion that the UC introduced.

Mr. Adams referred to the motion read earlier by Mr. Smith, and asked that it be read again. Mr. Smith re-read the motion for the council members.

Motion: The User Council requests the Executive Council recommend to the Department of Administration that they release a request for information (RFI) to industry in response to the FY17 Legislative Budget intent language regarding potential system replacement options for ALMR.

The motion was made by ASAC David Condo, as presented, and seconded by Colonel Hoang. There were no objections. **The motion was carried and approved.**

Mr. Adams stated that was all he had on behalf of the User Council.

6. Operations Management Office.

a. Annual Subscriber Inventory. Mr. Smith stated the OMO was currently engaged in completing the annual inventory confirmations and of the 123 agencies on ALMR, 67 had

responded so far. He noted periodic reminders were being distributed, but the agencies had until the end of April to respond.

b. February metrics. Mr. Smith briefed the total number of voice calls and busy and advised the council that the downward trend in February was consistent with previous years.

c. MOA WAVE Server. Mr. Smith advised the council members the MOA was working with Motorola to install a WAVE server and there was a System Change Request form that would eventually come to the Executive Council for their approval of this action, He noted the WAVE server would allow for the ability to push-to-talk on cell phones, computers, etc., voice over IP, similar to what IPICS is proposing although he's not a technical expert. Mr. Smith also briefed the ALMR security manager had reviewed the information to ensure it did not affect the Defense Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process (DIACAP). He pointed out there can only be one server on the System, although Eielson had recently inquired on getting a server.

Mr. Stormo explained that others could get the App for the program to connect to the MOA WAVE server and the MOA was open to others using it, as long as it did not interfere with the police or fire calls. He also pointed out those acquiring the App would be responsible for any associated license costs/fees. Mr. Stormo added that this could also present the capability to connect the Dalton Highway system or any other type of radio system out there, eventually maybe the North Slope Borough.

Mr. Smith stated it was essentially an inter-RF subsystem interface (ISSI) system and Mr. Stormo agreed.

Deputy Chief Spadafora didn't recall hearing about this, but Mr. Trygve Erikson advised him it had just been a while since he'd been briefed about it.

7. New Business.

Mr. Smith stated he would be out of state attending the International Wireless Communications Expo (IWCE) in Las Vegas, starting on Sunday, but would be available via phone, if needed.

8. Next Meeting. Deputy Commissioner Comer briefed the next meeting is scheduled for April 21, at 1:30 p.m. at 5900 E Tudor Road in the Enterprise Technology Services Conference Room and asked if that would work for everyone. There were no negative responses.

9. Adjourn Meeting. Deputy Commissioner Comer asked if there were any other items for the council's discussion.

Hearing no comments, Deputy Commissioner Comer requested a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Adjourn the March monthly Executive Council meeting.

The motion was made by ASAC Condo and second by Colonel Hoang. There were no objections. **The motion was carried and approved.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.



Bill Comer, Deputy Commissioner
State of Alaska, Department of Public Safety
ALMR Executive Council

Distribution:

SOA DPS, Deputy Commissioner Bill Comer
ALCOM/J6, Colonel Harold Hoang
FBI, ASAC Dave Condo
MOA, Deputy Chief Ken Spadafora
AML, Ms. Linda Murphy
SOA DOA, Deputy Commissioner John Boucher
SOA ETS, Director Jim Steele
SOA ETS, Mr. Scott Stormo
ALCOM/J64, Mr. Timothy Woodall
MOA, Mr. Trygve Erickson
OMO, Mr. Del Smith