



Minutes for the KWIEC continuation meeting conducted on February 4, 2010

Opening Remarks & Roll Call	2
Old Business (continued)	2
P-25 Discussion continued from December meeting	2
Adjournment & Closing Remarks	12

These Meeting Minutes are not a "word-for-word" transcription of the event, and summaries and paraphrasing were used throughout this document.

{PowerPoint presentations are available for download from the KWIEC website at www.kwiec.ky.gov.}

Opening Remarks & Roll Call

Jim Barnhart opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and reminding them that this was a continuation of the December 2009 meeting and as such there would be no minutes to approve. The sole agenda item was to continue the discussion on the P25 digital standard and to call for the KWIEC to make a decision on either endorsing the P25 standard or not.

Jim asked Chuck to take roll. The following members were in attendance. .

Jim Barnhart; Janet Lile proxy for Steve Rucker, Michael Harris – conference bridge; Allen Wells proxy for Dan Mauer; Don Pendleton; Brad Bates; Robert Milligan; Kent Jorette; Bob Stephens proxy for Col Rodney Hayes; Derek Nesselrode proxy for Mary Pedersen; Rodney Murphy; Lonnie Lawson – conference bridge; Wayne Wright; Charlie O’Neal; Mitch Mitchell..

A quorum was in attendance so Jim opened the meeting, asked members to state their name when speaking, and turned it over to Chuck.

Old Business (continued)

P-25 Discussion continued from December meeting

Chuck Miller: At the December 10th quarterly KWIEC meeting, the voting members of the KWIEC decided to table the discussion on P25 for that day and to continue the discussion in Feb. As Jim said, the single question for discussion today is – “Will the KWIEC indorse Project 25”? Most of you are already aware of the background of P25, the Public Safety Working Group recommendations for the adoption of P25, and now the OEC grant guidance. You have a copy of the OEC guidance in your packets and it was sent out via e-mail as well.

We sent several questions to the OEC, they were asked about the 2010 grant guidance that they sent out. In particular there were a couple of subjective questions. Point in case - the term “compelling reasons” and some examples of what they would and would not allow.

Chuck showed the slide with the questions and the OEC responses and asked members to read them for the discussion. He also put out points of consideration to start the discussion.

Considerations –

- The 2010 grant OEC guidance
- OEC questions and answers
- Long-term KWIEC goals for interoperability

- Existing/deployed assets
- Pros and cons of not endorsing P25 as a standard
- Pros and cons of endorsing P25 as a standard

Chuck commented on the considerations as displayed and opened the floor for discussion.

Derek Nesselrode: Chuck would you like to recap the OEC grant guidance, basically what we discussed in our PSWG meeting?

Chuck Miller: I will read it from the e-mail here. *The OEC guidance is as follows: For LMR systems land mobile radio. All new digital voice systems must be compliant with the project 25 suite of standards, this requirement is intended for government owned or leased digital land mobile public safety radio equipment. The requirement does not apply to commercial voice services that offer other types of voice interoperable solutions. To ensure encrypted interoperability the P25 suite of standards references the use of the advanced encryption standard AES in the Project 25 blocking encryption protocol. Entities pursuing encrypted communications capabilities must be compliant with P25 blocking encryption protocol. This guidance does not preclude funding for non P25 equipment when there are compelling reasons for using other solutions. Funding request by agency's to replace or add radio equipment to an existing non P25 system, such as procuring new portables for and existing analog systems will be considered if there is an explanation for how such equipment will improve interoperability or support the eventual migration to interoperable systems. Absent these compelling reasons P25 will be required for LMR systems to which the standards apply.* You all received a copy of this; it is on page 10 of that document.

Col Milligan: I have read the email you sent out. It seems like Mr. Born is saying this is the standard and this is what we're going to have. I think it goes back to not only us, but nations wide who have systems that are not compatible it may cost them a lot of money. Basically it boils down to where is the money coming from, because its going to happen, your not going to get any Federal money if you not compliant.

Lonnie Lawson: Is that totally accurate? Maybe there is someone in the room that knows something about this. We were in a meeting the last couple of days, where their saying their opening up the NTIA funding to public safety. There was no mention at all about having to comply with P25 standards. I understand OEC and FEMA requirements, but I don't know if that is true across all Federal agencies that would be able to fund this type of project.

Drew Chandler: I can speak for the Department for Health and Human Services Grants they do not require P25 when purchasing communications equipment.

Lonnie Lawson: I will tell you that I fully support migration of P25, but I don't know how you force Joe Sherriff out here who finds funding to be able to upgrade his system to go to that standard. Maybe someone else has a better answer.

Rodney Murphy: To get to Roberts Milligan's point, The KWIEC's commissioned mandate would be for things that aren't necessarily grant funded. Local purchases are still required to come before the KWIEC, even if there not grant funded. We still have the decision to accept to either adopt a standard or not a standard; if it's nothing more than the content of our comments back on these things. It would bind some state agency's that may have general fund dollars to purchase systems, not using these grant funds. Our scope is a little broader than this; I would pose the question to the group we still have a decision to make regardless of this.

Col Milligan: And I don't disagree with that, I think that if a agency has money they can go out and purchase where they want to, but this whole thing has to do with grant money. You're not going to get any Homeland Security money for any new radio systems unless there P25. Who has the type of funding to purchase radio equipment outside of funding? That was my concern in the last meeting. It doesn't concern us at Fish and Wildlife; we're fine, I'm thinking about other folks who are going to have to spend a whole lot of money to meet this standard. I did talk to a man from Homeland Security with the state; they have been in discussion with the people in Washington, but apparently these folks in Washington aren't going to budge. It's not fair to a lot of people to say you're not going to get any more funding unless you do this.

Derek Nesselrode: There are concessions in there for existing systems that are not P25, it's not saying that those are disallowed, it's saying if you have a compelling reason, like we just invested a million dollars and its non P25 standard then that is a compelling reason. We just ask that each of those individual applications be looked at on a case by case basis and the decisions be made. Its asking that any new equipment that goes in that is purchased with these Federal dollars is P25 standard. Their obviously looking at interoperability and trying to get everyone to that shared protocol so everyone is on the same page and we can all talk to one another. It's not saying you have to be digital, but if you do they want it to be the P25 standard. People can still purchase analog; there are a lot of places that is necessary and perfectly more than enough.

Lonnie Lawson: Chuck what are we trying to do today, are we trying to set policy on how KWIEC will operate?

Chuck Miller: An endorsement, we cannot set policy for locals, but we can indorse a standard that prioritizes certain policies. The way I have this slide - the first line is specifically OEC grant guidance and questions and answers associated with Ken Born's responses. Line two is the long term direction that this body wants to take us for interoperability without regard to specific grant guidance. For line 2 (Our long term policy) - Do we want to have every county doing their own thing, or do we want to start moving toward an interoperable standard of P25? I don't know that this group really has anything to say when it comes to grant guidance, since the Feds have decided not to give us grant money unless it meets their standards. As far as this group is concerned - Do we want to indorse P25 or do we not what to indorse it? Does this answer your question Lonnie?

Lonnie Lawson: It does. I was one of the big ones that fought for the locals in time past that they not be forced to go P25. However, times have changed, the equipment has changed. I truly believe KWIEC as a body should endorse P25 as a standard. I don't know what kind of timeline we need to put to it. I truly believe we need to endorse migration to P25.

Rodney Murphy: I don't think we need to belabor this point, but I believe in the statue it calls for this body to establish state standards for interoperability communication. Lonnie, I would say it's beyond an endorsement, it's a state standard.

Chuck Miller: An endorsement for locals, if we endorse P25.

Rodney Murphy: The authority this group has with locals is review and comment. If we take this action today it will bind state agencies to P25.

Derek Nesselrode: If they choose to go digital.

Rodney Murphy: That's correct. It won't bind them in the case of upgrades to existing systems, or replacing old worn out radios that they're using on a current system. But it will bind state agencies because it requires approval here.

Lonnie Lawson: Rodney I agree with you but shouldn't we take that next step. The locals are looking to this body for guidance as well. I truly believe an endorsement of P25 for Locals is in order too, don't you?

Rodney Murphy: I fully agree, but if we establish this standard by this body, then our Public Safety Working Group who reviews these things, they would tell us this is not a standard P25 purchase on behalf of the local, then our formal comments and review back to that agency we would include that comment, and we would say the standard is adopted by KWIEC is P25. And you're not being compliant here and we suggest you reconsider. But to the extent of us saying yea, nay, approve or disapprove, we can't stop them from purchasing, the grant guidelines just came out by the Fed's they can. But that is not our action from preventing them that's the Fed's action from permitting them. I think it's a mute issue, but if we vote to do this we are adopting the state standards as P25, and it is binding on state agencies. It's not just an endorsement or an opinion, it's a state standard that this group is statutorily authorized to establish.

Chuck Miller: You are absolutely right, if this group endorses a standard. We have approval authority for state agencies, but like you said, we just review local agencies. If they use their own money that's one thing, but if they use federal money, that's a whole different thing. If we continue having no standard, then we are sending out a signal.

Rodney Murphy: I don't know what parliament procedure is here, but I would assume that even if we adopt this as a standard we can adopt a policy, that we will except a compelling reason to grant an exception to that, to a state agency. I think we have some latitude.

Jim Barnhart: You almost have to do that, you have to have a standard. If I'm an agency and I'm analogy, it's not going to affect me unless I upgrade, and if I upgrade, I would probably want to upgrade to the P25. It's my opinion; I think that is OK to move in this direction.

Wayne Wright: The only thing I have with the P25, we applied for a Federal Technology Grant, and they accepted it. If it's a federal mandate, how did they approve not only Woodford County's grant, but Anderson County's grant and there are several others that went to the Next Edge system. I just talk to a county out of Ohio last week and their going to Next Edge, I asked them are you all looking at the P25, and they said it wasn't an issue up here. All of a sudden it's an issue in Kentucky. How can the Federal Government give you a ok to buy all the radios and turn around and say it's got to be P25 compliant and it never was a issue when they funded all the radios.

Derek Nesselrode: That is previous years funding and up until this year it's been unquote recommended by OEC, they even talk about it in their grant guidance. They really didn't have a lot of definitive answers, they've always made these SAFECOM recommendations, kind of wishy-washy, they trying to narrow those down and give specific guidance for these interoperability solutions. I think this is their first attempt to actually giving some teeth to these recommendations that they have been putting out, their attaching it to grant dollars.

Brad Bates: I think one of the issues too I think Drew hit on earlier, I think until all branches of the Federal Government decided what on these types of projects what the standards are, COPS technology money comes out of DOJ, I think, where as DHS has everything else. I know some of those people who sit on and grade those types of technology grants, they are not

communications people, so unless there given a check list of requirements their not going to know what questions to ask, if that an issue in a grants application or not.

Wayne Wright: The biggest requirement at that time is it had to be digital- that was the biggest thing.

Brad Bates: That sounds like in the Health Services world.

Drew Chandler: The Current year DHS requirements came before this, next year they maybe up to speed. I don't know yet, but I'll find out.

Col Milligan: I think that what's already been said here, is these are new requirements and we all know that since 911 they have had this large group working on this stuff, they have been going around the states talking to everybody. And they finally come to the conclusion, well hey we had a real issue in New York, no one could talk to anybody, so now we're going to implement these standards of P25, we're going to require that everyone be interoperable. My whole things is, is there a way for us to petition DHS to say look you belatedly come in and adopted these standards that everyone is going to subscribe too or else there is not federal money for them. Is there a way to make funds available to places such as Woodford County, to say we're going to give you the funds you need to upgrade that system and go forward. I don't disagree that we should recommend P25 standard. I left state government several years ago thinking that we were moving that way, that this committee was going to make everything interoperable and we were all going to talk with one another and all this other stuff was going to happen. But is there a way we could petition DHS or get with some other states and say there's an issue. Because the Federal Government has allowed everyone to buy whatever systems that are out there that looks pretty. Now you adopting this standard, give us a way and a time frame, to give partial funding. New York didn't have a problem; your larger city's....but Kentucky and other cities are going to have a problem. It's going to have to happen, when we have a major event. The Government is going to say this is what you're going to do, look forward to it. It's only going to take one more incident. Maybe we need to draft something, say hey folks this is fine, we'll do this, but the people that already have systems, provide funding for them to do whatever you have to do to get on this P25 standard.

Derek Nesselrode: There is language even in this document that talks about providing migration plans for that. I think that that what is on everybody's mind, if it continues to where this is going to be the digital standard period, which I would expect. Eventually for this to be the P25 as the sole digital standard for digital radio, if you going to use federal money. Right now we can plan for migration, but some of these are brand new systems and we want them to get their life expectancy out of those, so funding should be made available to those guys to e able do that. As long as we have a plan to communicate with those systems that are existing, I think we're good shape. With the mutual aid network and these systems have analog capability's I think we are well on our way to do that.

Rodney Murphy: I'm going to ask anyone on the PSWG or anyone who knows. The way I understand Wayne's project that he's addressing, if this group adopted this standard or indorsed it, he's project would still be ok would it not?

Derek Nesselrode: yes

Rodney Murphy: Because you're enhancing a new system.

Derek Nesselrode: Right

Wayne Wright We found out at the last meeting that the way I took it , they might say Yes, I don't like the word might. Federal Government you ok'ed this, now your trying to tell me that we

have to change, we don't have to money to do it, not without applying for another grant. I don't know if we would even pass that, they're going to go we just gave you a grant for Two Hundred Thousand, and now you're coming back, my argument is going to be, you have changed the rules, we were compliant and now we're not. If we did anything with P25, I like that P25 is compatible, not one can afford them at a pull of a switch. Look at Robinson County you think he's going to be jumping up and down as a one Sherriff, one county, he's going to be worried about P25 radio, that is not he's main issue.

Jeff Mitchell: The situation that you're in is how we based a lot of our questions, our discussion. We have counties that have made huge investment.

Wayne Wright: Our next step will be to convert to P25, somewhere down the road.

Rodney Murphy: The narrow banding issue, do we have a lot of folks, state agencies, local agency, do we a lot of people that are in that bind?

Drew Chandler: Yes

Rodney Murphy: I have a couple of question I need clarity about. So there's is a great deal of pressure on the funding to try to fund narrow banding, which seems to be a much more urgent issue than what we're talking about today, is that correct? The other thing, under narrow banding its says these funds can be used to acquire for upgrades for additional tower sites needed to comply with narrowband conversion. Is narrowband conversion going to require more towers, more sites?

Derek Nesselrode: Eventually, in some instances.

Rodney Murphy: I will tell you all why im asking those questions, my gut tells me that adopting this standard is probably a good thing, and it wouldn't hurt, where I know of the agency are, if they want to repair or add to their existing systems this wouldn't stop them. But if we do a fork lift its go buy Project 25. But on the other hand with this kind of strain on the budget fund, and if the feds aren't mature or consistent, maybe the best thing for us to do is to take another look at this in six months, what is risk if we take no action today?

Chuck Miller: We'll have missed another set of grant cycles.

Rodney Murphy: What is the risk?

Chuck Miller: You'll have to continue to deploy.....

Jim Barnhart: Not according to this....

Rodney Murphy: If we don't act, we can still strongly recommend in our comments to both local and state agency's that they consider a P25 system in a fork lift. There's nothing to preclude us from adding those as recommendations. And if we adopt the standard we'll have to deny a state request for a non P25 forklift, frankly I don't know how that will go over. That's what our standard will say. I agree with us going here, it seems like there is a lot of consternation in this room, there's a lot of confusion at the federal level. Would it be wise to consider deferring this for a little bit?

Danny Ball: In reality the grant cycle, I believe OEC and Homeland Security, any money that is coming down through them; a forklift replacement will be P25. I think they have set a standard when it comes to expenditure of grant funds; regardless whether we take a position on that or not on this.

Rodney Murphy: Danny what your telling me is that we take no risk by not acting.

Jim Barnhart: Unless there is some other type of funding that would come through.... is there?

Wayne Wright: It didn't at the time....

Jim Barnhart: It didn't at the time but they buckled down. This would cover everything that we would be dealing with anyway?

Lonnie Lawson: No it would not, it would not cover NTIA

Rodney Murphy: You right Lonnie.

Jim Barnhart: If we don't act, any NTIA funding could.....

Danny Ball: They can buy whatever they want too.

Rodney Murphy: That's exactly right.

Col Milligan: Who manages NTIA issues?

Lonnie Lawson: I think its Jonathon Millers office.

Charlie O'Neal: I 'm going to make it very clear, I cannot vote to indorse P25. The reason that I can't indorse P25 is that it is not the ultimate solution to interoperability alone. We can fill this room full of P25 radios and they still don't have the ability to communicate with one another. The solution is not only the operating platform technology for the radio, but it's also designing and implementing a programming and channeling solution as a part of that technology. Realistically we can take a room full of Next Edge, analog and P25 compliant radios, and if they are properly programmed they can communicate with each other, it has nothing to do with being P25 compliant. Likewise we can take a room full of P25 compliant radios with the same frequency band on 150, 450, 800 you take your choice and they will not be able to talk to each other unless there properly programmed. The mutual aid frequency's that are designed to be utilized in this state go much farther in my estimation in bring us much closer to interoperability than the adoption of the P25 plate form. We have been unsuccessful in getting the public safety community to program those frequencies into equipment. All we have required them to do is sign a MOA. I will tell you time and time again those MOA's have been executed for the use of that mutual aid frequencies and in brand new radios the frequency were never installed in the equipment. So P25 is not our solution to interoperability. Now I would vote for a motion that would indorse the P25 plate form, for the purposes' of obtaining grant funds that specify the equalization of the P25 platform in order to be eligible for the funding.

But, I will not vote to indorse P25 platform outside of the requirements that are set forth in grant funding process, because it is not the solution, it is not the solution alone. If we are going to fix interoperability in Kentucky we need to fix it completely and not partially.

Lonnie Lawson: Charlie don't you think that's part of this groups responsibility as well.

Charlie O'Neal: You mean develop the overall, yes; I agree that is a part of it.

Jim Barnhart: Everything you said we're covered right here.

Charlie O'Neal: I agree if the grant guidance specifies it that the radio equipment has to be P25, then if and agency chooses to apply for that grant they are saying when they apply for the grant, we'll buy P25 equipment. Outside of that I just can't indorse it unless we come up with a total interoperability solution that will give us true voice interoperability outside the P25 platform which alone does not give us.

Rodney Murphy: But a consistent platform Charles is that not a necessary part of interoperability?

Charlie O'Neal: No, like I said you can take this room full of Next Edge, P25 and analogy radios and if there programmed appropriately they can talk to each other, they don't have to be P25.

Rodney Murphy: On analog.

Chuck Miller: But not on digital.

Charlie O'Neal: Not on digital, but analog, and that is what your mutual aid frequency's are.

Chuck Miller: I have received several calls from applicants who are concerned about having Bubba up on the hill with his scanner listening in on what's happening. In fact one of the Wardens called me a couple of days ago and talked to me about that, a maximum security prison, their wanting to put some new radios in and their looking for some guidance. Absence the guidance from this committee their going to buy whatever that serves them best, basically the cheapest piece of equipment that does what they need to do. There use to be a standard called IPX those of you in computers remember that, there use to be a standard called Token Ring, and there use to be a standard called TCP/IP, now TCP/IP is the standard and it makes everything better. There's pain in growing. Charlie is absolutely right on an analog system - they can, but if you get a Moto turbo with a NEXEDGE in here nobody talks on digital.

Ron Pannell: I'm from Louisville, I think as long as we have the option to choose between digital and analog, which we do, I think twelve and a half. If you choose to go to a digital format for whatever reasons, say security, then there should be some standard. Now, when it gets to six and a quarter, we're all going to be digital, period, that's when it really kicks in that we need some kind of a standard definitely. That's where Charlie was saying we can be P25 or not, but if you choose analog, that is probably the most interoperability we have out there. We have band problems, we have 800 MHz, VHF and UHF that creates a little bit of a problem there as well, but I would say as long as we have an option if you can afford digital or if you have a digital system like Woodford County, your backward compatible to analog, your good to go up until the point its mandatory that every public safety radio system be digital and that's six and a quarter. I don't really see that as a problem. I don't mean to sound redundant, if you choose to go digital for whatever reason, being security, or just the fact that you want to convert your system over to digital, it should be a standard, and I think that's what we're trying to get across with P25. If you lock yourself down with digital in Next Edge no one could even talk to you.

Wayne Wright: We even have an analog frequency that we can switch too.

Ron Pannell: You're good to go, it's only a problem when we're all forced to go digital, then it becomes a problem. But I personally feel P25 is what you need to if you go digital.

Wayne Wright: We had some growing pains going digital, it was a headache for a while, especially when you use to analog you had a lot of officers who didn't like it. But once we had it worked on more it's a better system. I can speak on range coverage it's great, it doubled our range and that was a big plus for me, how far we could talk.

Col Milligan: What is the trend? Is it to stay analog or to go digital?

Derek Nesselrode: The trend is to go digital

Col Milligan: I think this body is allocating our responsibilities if we don't step up and say here's the trend, here's how its going to be ten years down the road, now if your still back here then its our fault. We have a responsibility to say here is the trend; we have people that know what is going to happen. A train wreck is coming and we can let everyone stand on the track that is wrong. We have to do something, what better time to do it, the old saying if not now when, if not you, who. I still say we need to talk with Homeland Security people and see if we can travel on them, to be clear about the migration, there does need to be a time line to make all this has to happen, we can just say at 6 am on March the 21st everybody's got to be. We cant do that. You all know more about this then I do. Maybe a three to five year or maybe a ten year transition.

Derek Nesselrode: I think a part of that fall into our SCIP, we have to develop a statewide strategy and migration plan. We can tie that into a lot of our partnership, we can say within ten years we expect the state to follow this group of indorsed standards or move to toward

standards based radio. I think that's where that will be reflected and the job of the PWSG to make recommendations. Along with Charlie, I don't think anybody is under the delusion that adopting this standard will fix interoperability; we all know there is not one solution. I think this is a huge step in the right direction and I think this is the step this group needs to take to adopt a standard.

<MOTION>

Rodney Murphy: I move we indorse.

Lonnie Lawson: I second it.

Chuck Miller: Before you vote on this I have a couple of questions I have written down. If this committee indorsed the P25 standard what is the time frame we want to work toward?

Jeff Mitchell: I think the PSWG would have to meet to decide that.

Bob Stephens: We spent a lot of time discussing this in our meeting the other day. I also like the term indorse verses standard. What we were looking at is the next grant cycle, those of us that sit on the committee that are going to be reviewing these, we did not want to have ambiguous guidance form this group as to what we were going to approve or not approve. We did not want to have to guess about what this group's intent was. From a time standpoint we were considering the new grant cycle, when the date that's due here is the date that's popped in my mind. If we were to adopt an endorsement, either way we look at, I think the discussion on the money I don't want to say is taken out of our hands, but the control of it is almost at the Federal level now when it comes to new money. What I was hoping for as a member of the PSWG is if we get an endorsement of this when April comes around and we start considering new grants we will know how to act on behalf of this group and try to do what's best. This is not about whether we ought to be Next Edge or P25 that is a dangerous position to be, I can get in trouble with my friends at Kenwood, I am also of the opinion a digital standard, whatever it is, for new grants only, I would like to see us follow this guidance.

Chuck Miller: We have no choice but to follow this, the motion on the table is for the KWIEC to indorse P25. Correct me if I'm wrong, but we are going to require State Agency's to deploy P25 equipment (if digital), and it's going to be recommenced for Local Agency to deploy P25, is that right Rodney?

Rodney Murphy: I don't know. If we don't adopt it as an actual standard I would assume that State agency would not necessarily have to comply.

Chuck Miller: What was your motion?

Rodney Murphy: My motion was to say indorse. I said that on purpose because that seemed to be a great comfort for everybody. My opinion is it should be a standard and following this meeting if we approve this standard or indorse, whatever the language is, the PSWG has some work to do. What do we do with current request? Do we grandfather everything in; do we start in the 2010 Federal Funding? Do we adopt the test for P25 compliance in here? A lot of people are going to claim P25 compliance. Are we just going to take their word for it?

Jeff Mitchell: Those are things we would be tasked with this committee and say this is our recommendations.

Rodney Murphy: Everything screams for us to write formal standards with those things in and put before this group at the next meeting. I did make the motion to endorse, so we can take it where we want to. Drew you guys are the ones that are going to have to live by it, what do you all think.

Bob Stephens: I don't think we're going to hurt anyone here by it, I don't see state agencies, I see the analog piece like Fish and Wildlife, I see you guys having to worry about narrow band, but you not having to worry about digital, no one is telling you to go digital.

Allen Wells: We're analog, we're already narrowband.

Jim Barnhart: I think you brought up a good point, there's a bigger problem here, if we make this a standard there's more to do than just that. And by making the standard we are moving in the right direction if we force or develop a programming plan.

Rodney Murphy: To make this a little easier, I put it in mind to say, as articulated in this document under land mobile radio, and that covers the compelling factor exception and compliance with P25 standards, this document does that, correct? I will amend my motion to say as articulated in the office of Emergency Communication FY2010 SAFECOM Guidance for federal grant Programs, chapter four under land mobile systems.

Chuck Miller: Any further?

Jim Barnhart: Vote

Rodney Murphy: Endorse

Chuck Miller: To endorse the Project Twenty Five Standard as articulated in the OEC 2010 grant guidance.

Rodney Murphy: Chapter four under Land Mobile Radio.

Chuck Miller: I guess that's it.

Lonnie Lawson: Second

<VOTE>

Jim called for the vote. Charlie O'Neil voted against, all other members voted for the motion.

Chuck Miller: Motion carries. I will get back with the group with the next meeting time, sometime in late March, the last week. Is there anything else?

Charlie O'Neal: One other I would call upon the Chair since the Committee has chosen to endorse the P25 Standard to move us towards complete implementation of a plan that would achieve voice interoperability in the State by either assigning PSWG or other committee that you might wish to appoint Mr. Chairman with the task of coming back recommendations pursuant to the implementation of the mutual aid radio frequency in the Commonwealth, mandating the implementation of those in public safety system, ect.

Jim Barnhart: Is there a test that we do to test all these mutual aid channels?

Derek Nesselrode: Once they're programmed in we tell the agency they have permissions to test.

Rodney Murphy: We don't certify.

Charlie O'Neal: That goes back to monitoring of the grant funds, once the equipment has been purchased someone out of here will be going by to verify first the equipment has in fact been purchased and a part of that should be to verify those radio frequencies have been installed in the equipment.

Chuck Miller: I know Homeland Security goes out and does that, I don't know if they check frequencies. I know they verify what they say they're going to buy with the grant funds is what they have bought.

Derek Nesselrode: We recommended they do that as a part of that process, this was flagged during the Midway exercise as a problem. Not from Woodford County they came through with flying colors. But a lot of the local agency showed up without that frequency plug. We told them our primary operating frequency is going to be VTAC 1, and they said we don't have that.

Jim Barnhart: So if you do it again, do you think there would be a problem?

Derek Nesselrode: Our next Public Safety Working group actually we will be meeting with representatives from OEC. And we will be going over the Nation Emergency Communications Plan and the future goals and objectives talk about regional outreach. To this point we have only discussed it with the PSWG. We have plans to go out across the Commonwealth and meet with these different interoperability regions. And this would be the time to work with the local agencies and talk about: we need to look at your radios, lay some hands on them, do some testing, so some mutual aid, make some channel plans and enforce a lot of that stuff. We'll get a good bit of information. Part of our job to report back to OEC will actually be the readiness of each and every county, in accordance with the SCIP, their abilities to response to disasters, their abilities to be interoperable with other partnering state and local agency. So the PSWG ultimate responsibility is to talk to each of these individual counties and make sure that they have the capability to use mutual aid frequencies. A lot of that will be coming in the next year, to make sure we check off those emergency communication plan goals.

Bob Stephens: We did not address this document except as to discuss P25 and next meeting, for those of us who are training zealots and exercise zealots, this plan if you take a few minutes and go through a few pages of it, gets and discusses our requirements for planning, personnel training exercises and equipment. We only picked on one item for discussion that we asked you all to look at. We are excited that we are going to get to touch on some of these later on with the group.

Adjournment & Closing Remarks

With the purpose of the meeting being concluded, Jim Barnhart asked of anyone had anything else. With no further discussion, a motion, second, and vote adjourned the meeting.