



Minutes for the KWIEC meeting conducted on June 30, 2010

Opening Remarks & Roll Call	2
Old Business	2
Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes	2
Updates and Briefings	3
Chairperson’s Report	3
General information for the KWIEC:	3
KWIEC mandates:	3
KWIEC Goals for 2009:	9
KWIEC goals for 2010	11
Issues & Concerns:	14
Public Safety Working Group Update:	15
New Business	17
Adjournment & Closing Remarks	21

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

Janet Lile opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and stating that Jim Barnhart was at the Kentucky Horse park on temporarily assignment to support the World Equestrian Games. Jim asked Janet to Chair in his absence.

She further stated that she appreciated everyone coming to the meeting in light of how tight everyone's schedule was with the close of the fiscal year. She then asked Chuck Miller to call role. The following members answered:

Janet Lile - Proxy for Jim Barnhart; Jeff Mitchell - Proxy for Steve Rucker; Don Pendleton; Col Milligan; Ken Jorette; Dave Barker - Proxy for Col Hays; Mary Pederson –via Conference Bridge; Rodney Murphy –via conference Bridge; Pamela Collins; Rebecca Hopkins; Charlie O'Neal –via Conference Bridge, Mitch Mitchell

A quorum was met so Janet opened the meeting.

Old Business

Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes

Janet said that everyone had received a copy of the minutes along with the invitation and additionally there was a copy of the minutes in the folders of those in attendance. She said that she had hoped that everyone had a chance to review them and called for any discussion or desired changes.

With there being no discussion, she entertained a motion to approve the minutes and received a motion and a second. The minutes were unanimously approved.

With no other comments, Janet asked Chuck to present the Chairperson Report.

Updates and Briefings

Chairperson's Report

(Briefed by Chuck Miller)

General information for the KWIEC:

Chuck started by thanking Bob Stephens and the Department of Military Affairs for hosting the meeting at their facility.

The only empty slot shown was the Local Fire Department slot (potentially Mike Gribbin). Chuck reminded the group that the Governors office had not sent out the new appointments yet but he was told that it would be soon.

{As previously reported - the two year appointment cycle was up for those KWIEC members who were appointed by the Governor – Chuck called the Boards and Commissions and was told that they were working on it and unless relieved, were asked to continue to serve. Chuck also reminded Board and Commissions that the KWIEC has asked that the 911 Director be reappointed as a voting member of the KWIEC}.

KWIEC mandates:

1) Establish and implement a State Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) –

1. As everyone is aware it was completed early in 2010 and we are ahead of schedule. We have done real well this year. The document is posted on the Web Site.
2. OEC came to Kentucky to present their briefing on the 9th of June. The Public Safety Working Group and KWIEC members were invited. They updated us on their NECP goals one and two and offered to assist us with goal two.
 - a. We have successfully completed goal one this year at Louisville. As Kentucky's only UASI, the Kentucky Derby met this goal for the state.
 - b. By 2011 seventy five percent of non-UASI jurisdictions must be able to demonstrate response-level emergency communications within one hour for routine events involving multiple jurisdictions and agencies to successfully meet goal two.
 - i. The SCIP initially identified seven regions but the group is recommending this be revised (to align with new regions).
 - ii. We talked about the creation of Regional Interoperability Groups and Jeff will cover that momentarily. Kentucky's methodology to meet goal two

needs to be identified in the 2010 SCIP Implementation report by July 2010.

3. For their July meeting, the Public Safety Working Group has this as their first agenda item.

Chuck asked Bob Stephens if he had a target date for the PSWG in July. Bob said that he thought it would be close to the time the KOHS reviews were being conducted.

The SCIP Core Group and KWIEC members will be invited. Chuck reminded the KWIEC that the last group had Mary, Derek, and the entire PSWG. Hopefully those same core members will be able to attend. The full briefing will be presented at the next KWIEC meeting or as soon as we know something. Of course there will be e-mails going out ahead of time.

Chuck asked if there were any questions on any SCIP Goals and revisions.

Rodney Murphy: On Goal Two do we have the definition of what meeting that goal means, are there five of six check box things that we could look to? What does meeting that goal mean for Local Jurisdiction?

Chuck Miller: There are quite a few things in the NECP, and actually that's an entire briefing in itself Rodney. I didn't want to drill down into that today but if the Group would like I will send out the briefing that was sent to us.

Jeff Mitchell: We can send them the packet that has a list of different elements. Let's get the list to the members that are on the phone.

Chuck Miller: I will get this information out to you Rodney, and all the KWIEC members.

- 2) **Report annually by September 15 to the Interim Joint Committee on Seniors, Veterans, Military Affairs, and Public Protection and the Interim Joint Committee on State Government valuate Primary State and Local public Wireless safety voice and data on progress and activity by agencies of the Commonwealth to comply with standards to achieve public safety communications interoperability**

We have made progress again this year on standards. The KWIEC members previously endorsed Mobile Data in 2006 as the low speed data standard, and now P-25 as the digital voice standard in 2010 (as of last quarter).

Wireless Broadband recommendations will be presented in late 2010 or early 2011 after we do the Vendor Conference, targeted for August 24th at the CRD. For this conference we are asking vendors to come in and show us what they've got to augment the mobile data system so that we

can get wireless broadband data in some of the larger cities. This does conflict with what's been going on with LTE and we're going to look at all the FCC requirements with LTE and look at what the different vendors have. Hopefully we can come back to the KWIEC in a few months with the recommended direction (standard) in which we want to go.

3) Evaluate Primary State and Local public Wireless safety voice and data

I have received seventy seven of projects for review but I've only been able to get twenty two of them done so far. The KWIEC has seen all the State assessments, there are three States, two have been approved, and one is in process. Many of these will be reviewed in the KOHS Grants review, which we have scheduled the third week of July.

For the KOHS grants reviews, the PSWG will hopefully only have half of the two hundred and fifty plus grants to look at. We are following the guidance that the Committee has set up for us which is - projects which fall into the category of Standards already indorsed by the KWIEC are being reviewed and concurred with such as mobile data, P25, Narrowband Analog, and those kinds of things. Projects in question will go to the PSWG and the KWIEC. Of course all State projects go to the KWIEC.

Recall the Project 25 flow chart that was briefed by Jeff Mitchell last quarter. Input was requested but everyone was satisfied with it as there were no changes requested. It's been sent out and it is being used right now by the granting agencies, Area Development Districts, and other key players. It is being used and has resolved a lot of questions normally that come to us.

The Public Safety Working Group coordinated with KOHS to conduct briefings with local first responders concerning the KWIEC requirements. Four regional briefings were conducted in April of 2010, two members of the PSWG or I attended. Jeff Mitchell spearheaded that effort; he went out and briefed every one of those meetings. Thank you Jeff, we had nothing but positive comments on your briefings.

As before, after the packets are received by KOHS I will screen the projects. The evaluation and recommendations will be completed a head of the grants award.

4) Develop a funding support plan to provide for the maintenance and Technical upgrades for the public safety shared infrastructure -

I spoke with Col Milligan who asked to address the group at this point, so let me turn it over to him at this point. Col.

Col. Milligan: I have been uncomfortable with this since we started. First we have staffing issues for the working group. Based upon the scope, we are to research out grant opportunities

and assist state and local organizations in efforts to acquire funding assistance and encourage partnerships with state and local organizations. Also all of these things are to advance the goals of the KWIEC. From the standpoint of funding we have tried to do this. I've been researching and Lonnie looks for things, I haven't spoken with Brad Bates, and really I haven't seen anything out there. I have gone to every site known to me to try to find grants and do research that would be in line with what we are trying to do. And that moves into providing opportunities and assistance to state and local organizations. If we can't find the money we can't assist anybody. At the same time we haven't had any contacts that I know of, any particular local groups, say "we're looking for this assistance with this or that.....".

I think most agencies now have the capabilities of finding their own grant money. Everything is coming through the KWIEC or the public safety working group on any request for equipment, or any grants that they've found themselves. That's one portion of it. The other portion, I think the one exciting thing is I heard on the radios is that they were going to selling off the D Block and that among the recipients of that funding would be public service funding for broadband data. That holds some possibilities for this particular working group to become engaged, which we're just not engaged at this time.

When Chuck and I met Monday I brought up. Is this working group redundant, is it really needed? I understand it's a stop-gap, that everybody is not coming straight to the Public Safety Workgroup, and is not coming directly to Chuck for funding or questions, but are we being redundant? The other thing is maintaining this particular working group through the end of when and come back to the committee at the next quarterly meeting. We'll do as much work as we can and try to advance this particular group and see and just discuss whether it is a necessary entity with in the KWIEC.

Janet Lile: I have a question - When you get applications to the PSWG; if they have researched and gone out and got their own money, are we aware of where that money is coming from? Such that we can learn from that and share?

Chuck Miller: A lot of times they submit the request without having any funding source at all.

Bob Stephens: The other major source for their money is out of local budgets. I presented to a group of people last week at the Emergency Management Workshop and found that folks that were going to use two hundred thirty thousand dollars worth of local funding to redo their public safety communications. What is going on is they're taking local money and using it with Federal grant money. There's not much grant money is out there.

Jeff Mitchell: I'm kind of jumping ahead, but one thing I want to talk about is where we're looking maybe to add districts of being a regional interoperability group. Maybe when we discuss this, we back up. Instead of it being at this (KWIEC) level, maybe this is the

responsibility we can talk about once we have these. I'm out in the future a little bit, but when we get these regional groups set up, that they would like to do. I know if I was in a region I would be looking for funding myself and my region. Maybe we back it up one step and say you know this is something else you could be doing to help yourself find you own funding. Our grant money coming from feds is getting smaller and smaller every year; we're all going to have to be looking for outside sources. Whatever we find, you know at this level we can find enough to pass it out to everybody.

Janet Lile: Right. But the group is maybe ahead of its time right now. In this budget, economic situation, maybe there's not much cause for it, but when the cycle reverses and we do have more money and more grant opportunities then it would be good to have the committee established. We have the rules for it and it may be more useful at that time.

Jeff Mitchell: Or even change the scope some of what it is. Instead of it all being right here in the KWIEC maybe the KWIEC is just one piece of, and then all the regions out here have all their little grants people and it's a collaboration instead of just one small group here and that's the whole state looking for moneys.

Col. Milligan: And I can see the need for the last piece that was spoken - where you encourage the partnership between State, Local and private partnerships, so that everybody doesn't have their own little systems out there. And I think in that respect that this working group can be a benefit to the committee as a whole. I guess we need to advertise more to say hey we are in existence; this is what this group is. So that everything doesn't come in Chuck handling everything from everybody or that the working group is not handling everything.

I can see some benefits for it but from the standpoint of developing or finding funding and coordinating with people, it's just not happening. And if the funding is not there like Bob said, and it isn't; funding is going every place else but like Janet said, it will probably cycle back around. So, I can see the benefit of this group but maybe just we need to change the focus and find some way to be proactive. I mentioned to Chuck if I had some method or some way to send stuff out from my desk to agencies, or maybe to your ADD districts, you know, to say hey we're in existence now. What can we do for you as opposed to them trying to look us up. I think a lot of times we form stuff and expect people to find us; let's go out and tell them we're here.

Jeff Mitchell: And that might be as we move forward with our visions of having a regional approach. We can push data out and receive data and pull data from. Janet probably hit it on the head, we might just be a little bit ahead so as we keep evolving and our outreach keeps growing, maybe that's what we need to look at more.

Col. Milligan: Is there a way, and I don't know how many agency we have in the state right now, thousands? Is there a way that we can get that information and I can put it on an address

book and just send stuff out and it goes out to everybody? I know we do some marvelous stuff with technology.

Janet Lile: You don't want to clutter up email.

Jeff Mitchell: We can set up some distribution list. I think our thing is getting you the correct members to be on that list. I think that's when we would need to come together and say as we move forward and as we build relationships with the locals out there and find out who we need to talk too? Once we get information, we can provide you with better information and better solution to reach what your goals are.

Col Milligan: So with that I guess the bottom line with this is - do we want to continue this particular working group and come back at the next quarterly meeting and say let's do something or not do anything and suspend the group till a better time? I don't know, I'm just throwing it out to everyone. Because right now it is frustrating for me because I feel like I'm not doing anything. I'm just sitting there and that's just not me.

Janet Lile: We could talk about some options. We could just go inactive and not have a report every quarter or take any action until a need arises.

David Barker: I guess I'm confused because I thought there was money - A group that was set up where we had that big working session about a year ago talking about money coming to the state.

Chuck Miller: The (OHS) IECGP workshop? Is that what you're talking about?

David Barker: Yes, I thought that is what that group was set up to look at that; at where it was going.

Jeff Mitchell: I don't think we get to see any of that, I thought it was set up to find additional funds that we currently don't have.

David Barker: It's written somewhere...

Chuck Miller: There is a charter, Rodney wrote the charter and it was approved by the group. Like you said (Jeff), it's designed to go out and find additional funds for KWIEC priorities, goals and things like that. Is there further discussion on that?

Col. Milligan: We'll just do some more stuff, I'll just get with Brad and Lonnie and see what we do and I can bring a report back to the next meeting and then make a determination. Maybe we can brainstorm something.

Bob Stephens: Let me ask this. Mary, maybe you can answer this. I know that the Office of Homeland Security is the State clearing house and I was on your website today giving out the links to people who were looking for grants. Is this for multiple types of grants that aren't necessarily communications? I noticed some other stuff on there and I'm wondering with the kind of stuff Col Milligan is doing, how does that match up with what clearing house activities you all are doing?

Mary Pederson: In our office we don't have the time to go out and research these, especially since they're not the kind of grants that have utilized us in the past. Though we're administrative agencies for these grants that are, as you point out, are not communications specific. I think what the Colonel and that group is doing is good. They're staying very focused on the coms and looking for the various sources. If we found a grant for the KWIEC it may be required to utilize the FAA here and it may not. I think they complement one another.

The conversation died down so Chuck asked -

Chuck Miller: So, there is no action to this Committee other to be aware that you feel the group is languishing right now and that we need to bring this up and make it a specific agenda item next quarter, is that a fair statement?

Col Milligan: Yes

Chuck Miller: Thanks, any other comments?

KWIEC Goals for 2009:

Chuck said that he was going to report on the first two 2009 KWIEC Goals one last time because they were complete and would be reported on in the Annual Public Safety Report.

- **Merge the Architecture and Standards Working Group and the Public Safety Working Group and increase the PSWG responsibilities**

This is one of the best things we ever did. Everyone on the committee recognizes how much the PSWG has accomplished in the last year, so this was a very productive.

- **Charter an Infrastructure Funding Committee**

We just finished talking about this. We've chartered the committee; however we know that the money is not out there.

The next two goals are not complete...

- **Complete the Eastern portion of the KEWS Digital upgrade project.** –

Circuit cuts are occurring now and this has been such a long time coming, I can't tell you how great this is. Jeff I'm going to let you talk about this...

Jeff Mitchell: The North Leg towards Covington, Walton, down to Frankfort, is complete and everything is cut. We are cutting the other circuits by KSP post areas. Post Twelve here in Frankfort Area, which is here down toward Louisville has been cut to the new system. Post seven which is probably as with the number of circuits the biggest post area, has been cut, minus I think three voice circuits that are actually off of our PBX phone system. KSP uses to call from Post to Post. I think there are three circuits left in seven. We're getting stuff geared up and moving on to Post eight which I believe is up toward the Morehead area. We're just going to keep on working around the loop until we get right back down toward Somerset and close the Eastern half of the State.

Lonnie Lawson: What is the time line?

Jeff Mitchell: Sixty days. Now after that is cut we still have work to do in the East. We still have old dishes to take down off the towers and waveguide and old equipment to be removed, stuff like that. For the sixty day time line - if nothing happens we will have all the circuits cut to the new digital network in the Eastern half of the State. The Eastern half will probably two thirds or better of the old circuits in the State.

David Barker: Jeff you've got generator back up at major sites; is that correct?

Jeff Mitchell: Yes. As we go forward, especially since the storm, all backbone sites will have permanently placed generators there and all major spur sites. Basically out of one hundred forty some sites there will be twenty some sites that will not have a permanently placed generators on site along with the batteries. All of them have batteries that will give you three to five days on batteries. We have either a diesel or propane depending on the terrain and we can haul diesel fuel to them. We figured out in the snow and ice storms we can't count on the propane people, so we had to make a few modification to some of the places.

Chuck Miller: This might be something to put on the agenda for next quarters meeting. For goal four we have -

- **Identify immediate needs state level wireless communication projects which are unfunded.**

We talked about this before under Task issues and concerns. It's been identified as an immediate need state level project (remote monitoring of the radio systems). I've put this as the project for this goal. Unless anyone has any issues or concerns about it, I think that's the recommendation that the PSWG put forth to the KWIEC. It has been briefed for better than a year now and is still a critical need. Is there any discussion on that goal?

KWIEC goals for 2010

Goal One - Endorse a Public Safety Communication standard for Digital Voice in the Commonwealth.

This is already covered since we have done that. We endorsed P-25 as a standard, and it's actually simplified some things. I've had agencies sending me assessments with P-25 and they now understand that it's not an unfunded mandate. We're (the OEC) is saying "If it's free money, this is how we want you to spend your free money" and it's working out rather well. We are following this meticulously; if they already have employed a system in place that is not P-25 but it was approved and sent through this committee prior to this, then we are not going to hold that against them.

Goal Two- Encourage/Push for a Public Safety Broadband Data Pilot Project.

I have already briefed you on this. The August 24th, 25th conference is hopefully going to identify some of the Broadband capabilities that are going to be available to us, and we will come back and brief you. The PSWG will evaluate it at the conference. Yes we know the FCC is in the process of defining a national Broadband Standard using LTE (Long Term Evolution). Also Louisville has submitted a KWIEC broadband pilot assessment. Ron was going to update us but he is not available so we will just catch that next time around.

Goal Three - Complete the Eastern portion of the KEWS Digital upgrade project.

We're going to carry this goal forward; Jeff has already briefed us on that. We are going to continue to carry it forward until complete. We intend to have this Eastern portion of this project complete in 2010, which is our best target guess. Jeff will update us on that next quarter.

GOAL Four – Establish trained regional interoperability groups.

Jeff, once again I'm going to turn this over to you.

Jeff Mitchell: One of the things that was discussed, I think it's been discussed in OEC and several others was setting up a regional presence. One of the things, I went around and talked on the grants presentations, when we talked to the locals, one of the things I talked about was getting them involved in a regional Interoperability group. One of the first things we were thinking about is what would we base these groups on? So it really didn't look like the State was pushing something we based it on the ADDS. Based it on their districts to get the ADDS involved. In August the ADDS will have a meeting here in Frankfort with all the Directors coming in for this two day meeting, I will get in to talk to them and try to get a buy-in, with the ADDS being kind of the leaders in the regional group. The spin I try and put on it - right now we have a local setting out there that has a very small voice. We do not know what all these locals need, we just don't hear that. So what we're looking for is the regional group coming together, and we can look at projects and hear peoples voices as a larger regional group instead of a single local PD or Fire Department or something like that. I'm going to ask if the ADDS might be the administrator of this or something like that, where we would have each county in that ADD district would have representation. We would have everything from EM to law enforcement.

That's kind of our first step into molding this into a regional group. Once we get there and we get something established, which I don't know how much push back we'll get. Like I said we really don't have the funding to get the ADDS to take this on, hopefully we can do a good sales job there. It really is going to be a good thing. Col some of your stuff, we can get them evolved. What can you do to help us, what can we do to help you, what funding do you all have, or can you find, and work it that way. Our goal is to set up regions that we can push information to, pull information from, and which will also work as we go through the OEC goals to do our 75% of the non UASI. It will go to our goal to get their inventory into CASM. The regional approach hopefully will solve a lot of the past that we have coming from the Feds and stuff. We're not real sure how we're going to conquer otherwise.

Janet Lile: I have a question about your goals; you say we're going to establish trained regional groups. What does that training entail; are you speaking of formal training or that we would just train them on Narrow Band?

Jeff Mitchell: Probably a bit of both. It could be everything from train them on the policies and procedure we use, some training on CASM and how to use and enter data. We can get Bob and train them in COM-L, so we have COM-L's and COM-T's (Communications leader, Communications Technician) out in the groups for train-the-trainer and things like that. So when we say train we don't have just one thing in mind its several things. To bring the counties and the locals and to provide as much service as we can. This is a long term relationship we want to build. It is not going to be train them on what we need to do administratively but what other training can we provide you, what do you need, what can we provide for you?

David Barker: And if you think about CSCG, this would kind of roll up and information that we're lacking, where we can't get it. You know if we get this going they should be able to roll that up to us, and we'll know what's out there. It's hard to find out what's out there.

Bob Stephens: This also has a operational training and exercising piece that's really not stated here, but ultimately these regions need to be able to operate. Not only are we concerned about funding and grants and stuff like that, but this regional governance thing ought to include the UASI goals. Can they all show up and talk on the radio or be interoperable. That's actually the goal. We can't do it at the state level; it's going to have to be done regionally.

Chuck Miller: That's a good point – 120 counties verses 16 ADDS is a huge difference. Like Jeff and I have talked about already; we have already made that first initial step. When Jeff went out there with Homeland Security, and most of the Members went out I should say, that briefing presented them with Narrowbanding and I don't remember all the stuff you trained them on, but Jeff provided quite a bit. So the regional training was provided, at least at the initial early stages, and now we need to expand on that and put it on our long term calendar. And of course there is nothing that says when we have a Public Safety Working Group meeting that they can't come in and meet with the Public Working Group Safety Group and we provide them with additional information. As the engineering arm of the KWIEC they're ideally suited to do that kind of stuff.

Pamela Collins: I just want to follow up with that Jeff. I think the ADD districts are one of the best ways to approach, especially for small and rural counties. We have used them a lot in projects that we have and it's always been a positive experience. You never know what's going to happen, I'm hopeful that they will be receptive to this.

Jeff Mitchell: I actually talked to, and I can't think of his name, but he is a gentlemen here over the ADDS. I talked to him and explained what we were going to do and they seemed very, very receptive and saying that makes a lot of sense and would be a good thing. That is how I got my foot in the door. My thing to them is I don't have all the answers, you tell me what works for you area. It's not a cookie cutter thing here, what I do for this area it might not work here, how can we work together to get that done?

Pamela Collins: That is a good approach.

Dave Barker: I think they have shown signs that they really want to get involved with Public Safety more than they are. They put up a piece of legislation to get the representative from the ADD 's name to the CMRS Board. I know there working with the CMRS Board in mapping, doing street center lines for all the PSAPs around the State and they really like it. They want to be part of this thing.

Jeff Mitchell: I hope so, it is high profile and high visibility. I'm hoping - I have a good feeling that they're not going to kick me out and shut the door on me anyhow. I hope later on to have some good results to come back to talk to you about. There might be things moving forward that you all want. We really don't have a hard task that wants you to do this, this, and this. It's really not there yet. We have a vision that we know that this will work if we can get this and we know that a regional approach is the way to go. We'll start out with one thing in mind but who knows in three or four years this might lead down a whole different path. I don't know but you have start somewhere.

Chuck Miller: Again I would like to say the PSWG works for the KWIEC and this is the PSWG's recommendation to the KWIEC. I would ask that a motion be made to endorse this decision. This is the recommendation, we just need the KWIEC to say go forward, or no we need to change a few things. I think a lot of work and preparation has gone into this and as the problem was put to the PSWG, they have identified a solution to the problem, I think it's a great solution so I'd asked that is be accepted by the KWIEC and endorsed.

Charlie O'Neal made a motion to approve the plan to create Regional Interoperability Groups based at the ADDS in support of goal four. The motion was seconded by Janet Lile, and approved by the KWIEC.

Issues & Concerns:

We have four issues on our list -

- There is currently no way to monitor the remote radio systems of the major RF networks in the State
This is a recommended project when funding becomes available.
- Reinstate 911 Director position
This is still pending. Chuck worked with the Legislative Liaison and made the request. At the last update, he is working on it.
- Reappoint existing KWIEC members
This is partially complete. We are waiting on the Governor's Office for the appointment letter.
- Fill empty seats in the FIWG (2 needed)
This may be moot based on today's conservation so we'll revisit it next quarter.

Chuck concluded by asking if there were any questions on the Chair Persons report?

There were no questions so the floor was turned over to Bob to brief on the activities of the Public Safety Working Group.

Public Safety Working Group Update:

(Briefed by Bob Stephens)

Bob Stephen started by stating that Derek is not here, and the KWIEC has seen everything the PSWG did in the Chairpersons report.

1) Evaluate new technology technical solutions to planned projects –

We're going to continue to evaluate new technology, and I think one of the things we're going to do is get outside of our two way radio box here in August and look at some data solutions.

2) Using SCIP as a source, begin efforts to create a long term plan which makes the eventual voice and data convergence of technology a priority -

Being good bureaucrats we're going to follow the SCIP, we think is a very important document, its one that's laid the State Communication Interoperability Plan. We think that continues to be a good guideline. We did get a briefing from OEC regarding the National Emergency Communications Plan at our meeting last month, and it reconfirmed for us to us our own SCIP to go forward.

3) Publish recommended minimum requirements for all radio systems –

Minimum Standards for radios system is Thirty Two Channels, even that is probably too little, but that's the basis for where we are now.

4) Maintain an inventory of State radio assets –

That needs to be done. We have requested assistance from OEC to help us put information into CASM, CASM is an acronym for a data base that all the states are using to put resources in. That is our goal; that is our job.

5) Conduct an annual review of State radio infrastructure –

This again related to CASM and to the same sort of information that we're trying to collect.

6) Recommend Projects to the KWIEC –

We saw that awhile ago the projects that we wanted to keep above board, trying to find funding for. We know what the problems are if we could figure out a way to fund them.

7) Conduct an annual review of the SCIP, make recommendations for changes, and provide a report back to the KWIEC –

8) Provide periodic briefings to the KWIEC as required –

I have one other comment regarding 700 MHz. Because I'm still working on the 700 plan, I'm responsible for the management of 700 MHz and all the narrow band frequency, I get daily ten or fifteen e-mails about 700 MHz data. There are two pieces to this, there are a whole bunch of channels that are for voice and then there is this piece that we refer to it as Block D.

In the original 700 plans we had a number of channels that were to be for data. Because it was such a valuable resource it was controversial. The FCC decided to take that and move it from the Public Safety arena and move it over to, and essentially give it to an organization and try to create a public, private network public safety. They also wanted to use it for regular cell phone data also. That is terribly unresolved, terrible is the wrong word, the 700 MHz Block D is not resolved.

Like I said I get all these email everyday about the President has recommended Congress to do this, the Congress has recommended that it all go to Public Safety and then they'll be another group from an engineering standpoint saying they want to do something else. I don't know where it's going but I think public safety has an edge here. I still don't know where it's going and if it's sold I don't know how much money will filter down to us because we're actually the customer. The big argument goes beyond what the money ought to do. The big argument now is an engineering argument. The IT people - I'm picking on you forgive me for just a second, on the IT side of communications there is that piece that is now said we want every bit of that 700Mhz spectrum to be used for next generation cell phones with all IP based software defined use.

There is an argument as to what you need (i.e. push to talk). And then there are some of us on the other side of the argument who want to see a radio you push to talk using digital and analog like we're using it today. The people on the IT side want to do the same thing, but they think it's all about networks. We still think it's critical that if I pick up my radio if I want to talk to Paul I can talk to Paul and not go through a network. That's our very broad generalization summary of what going on.

Not only are we arguing about the money, we're arguing about where is the money going? And it may be all going this way over a period of time, however there is still a need in my opinion for Public Safety direct communications as seen using a two way radio or using something that resembled it. I figure both are going to win over the long term; right now there is that argument. That argument also goes to who gets the money.

Janet Lile thanked Bob and concluded the old business. She asked if anyone had any further discussion, questions, or motions pertaining to old business. With there being none she moved onto new business.

New Business

Janet asked if there was any new business.

Charlie O'Neal: Madam Chairman, in an earlier KWIEC meeting I voiced my concern that P-25 was not the sole solution to Voice Interoperability. A huge chunk of that issue related to appropriate programming of radio equipment. At that point and time I was told that the memorandum of agreement that is initiated for the use of Mutual Aid frequencies probably should address that and I still don't feel that it is being adequately addressed. The memorandum of agreement has been executed by a huge number of agencies across the Commonwealth. But I would be brazen enough to suggest that probably less than fifty percent of the radio equipment owned by those agencies has actually been reprogrammed to incorporate those mutual aid frequencies into the equipment.

Without those radio programmed with those frequencies you're never going to achieve interoperability. And as technology continues to evolve the chances of achieving that voice interoperability outside the purview of these mutual aid channels is probably growing slimmer every day. I would like to see the chair charge the Public Safety Working Group with the responsibility of changing the language in the memorandum of agreement. Not only to include the utilization of those frequencies but to require that those frequencies be installed in the radio equipment in which the Memorandum of Agreement is being executed and to require that that installation be accomplished in a certain time frame of the execution of that Memorandum of Agreement and also to enable the Public Safety Working Group to formalize a policy to be reviewed by and approved by the KWIEC. Hopefully, that would require Public Safety agencies in the commonwealth by a certain date to reprogram their radio equipment and include mutual aid frequencies in the radio equipment, which ever frequency band their equipment operated within.

Jeff Mitchell: Derek is not here, so I might be speaking out of turn. I apologize upfront. I am thinking that currently when they signed that MOU with KSP it states that it has to be, those channels programmed in to those radios. The problem we've identified, same as yours, was that they were not being done. But we did not have a good way to follow up and ensure that these agencies were doing it. That was one of the goal that we had, or one of the tasks that we were looking at when we went to a regional approach. We would have more eyes or body's that can insure that the MOU was being followed and the radios were being programmed. What it comes down to is Derek made the comment at one of our meetings that they told them to go to VTAC or whatever channel and came to find out they never got around to programming the channels in there. So I think I agree with what you're saying, and we might be further along in getting to where you want to be. I hate saying without Derek being here but I think the biggest problem we have seen so far is that we agree with what you want to get, but the enforcement piece of it is where we didn't have the man power to ensure it was done.

Charlie O'Neal: I think it can be addressed through a couple of different venues. Number one, a lot of these radios are being acquired through Homeland Security Grants, when Homeland Security goes back to do their grant verification or verification of the purchased under the grant, one of the things they can be required to do is verify the presence of all those frequencies and each piece of radio equipment that was purchased with grant funds.

Mary Pedersen (Conference Bridge): Derek has been on that. Jason Childers: are you there from our office?

Jason Childers: Yes

Mary Pedersen: I believe Jeff is right, I think that it is in the signed Mutual Aid agreement and we do require a signed Mutual Aid MOU as part of our grant package when you receive those funds to purchase radio equipment. Now Jason may speak to it, I don't know, I know we do site visits, but whether or not on our end, I don't know. We may ask if they programmed in the Mutual Aid frequencies or we may not. Whether we say prove it to us or not; I don't know.

Jason Childers: No we don't.

Mary Pedersen: And would we even have the expertise if they said yes we do to know if that is accurate. I don't think so. But we do have the MOU as part of the package.

Bob Stephens: The way of determining this of course is we do more exercising that emphasizes communications more completely. That's a pretty good way of finding out if they got them in there. If during the exercise their not able to demonstrate that, then we're going to know they're not programmed. Plus when you're prepared for the program I suspect that's going to be one of

the goals and objectives. And again this works a lot better regionally then looking over everybody's shoulder.

David Barker: In COML this is a huge thing that we went over in the training to make sure this was programmed in. When you go out to these districts, would that be part of that - make sure?

Jeff Mitchell: Sure, I think when we go out to do this we will be putting together a whole list of touch points together. Charlie is absolutely right. They might sign the paper and say I got my money I'll do what I want too.....

??: I don't believe that MOU has a time frame in it, as Charlie was saying I don't think there is anything that specifies that you have to have programming completed by a time frame from the date of execution.

Chuck Miller: When that was written, the idea was that we were providing an opportunity and that it wouldn't be looked at in that way, so no it didn't get written where it said you have ninety days to do this. Charlie is right we can go back and revise it, maybe like Dave was saying, we use the trained regional operability groups to start doing the police work. I don't know, there is no way we can visit one hundred twenty counties or thousands of agencies.

Dave Barker: But the COML guys that we've trained know what to look for. They know how to go to the people in those counties. That would be the way to pull that information out.

Jeff Mitchell: And if we're going to be looking at them and touching anyway to develop CASM and to push this up we're going to have to touch these somewhere down the line, or somebody is.

Dave Barker: One of the things I've heard is that they come back with is we don't have the money. It's going to cost a hundred dollars to reprogram each radio. If they signed it they agreed to it already, right?

Jeff Mitchell: That's part of the grants deal, is you have to, Mary if I misspeak, as far as getting the Homeland Security grants money is the signature of this MOU, you will comply

Mary Pedersen: Yes MOU is required.

David Barker: So Charlie is asking for a revision of it.

Chuck Miller: And that probably prudent, it's been over three years, Mary when did we put that out three or four years ago?

Mary Pedersen: It's been longer than that I think, four years maybe. Everything probably needs a good going over and update. Maybe there is a timeframe by which you have to do that in the MOU.

Jeff Mitchell: I think we take Charlie's recommendation as a task for the PSWG like he recommended, pull that document in review it make changes and submit it back to the group.

Mary Pedersen: That's a State Police form so you don't have review and approve any recommendations.

Janet Lile: What's the pleasure of the Committee do we need a motion, or just assign it to the Public Safety Working group?

Chuck Miller: Just assign it.

Janet Lile: So you all will be working on revising the MOU.

Bob Stephens: It's a KSP document

Janet Lile: You'll make a recommendation?

Jeff Mitchell: Yes, and I will make the assumption that Derek agrees.

Janet Lile: And develop a time line for agency to comply with installing the new frequencies.

Bob Stephens: This goes along with the Tactical Communications plan which would embody that.

Chuck Miller: Along with that we will have to revise the SCIP to indicate that we're going to make that a requirement. But I think that is all doable and we can probably have something in three months when this committee meets. We can send it out via email ahead of time for any comments and put it to the group to look at afterwards.

Charlie O'Neal: And Bob I think what you touched on is very important, a very important part of that process is not only to require the frequencies to be installed but also to have some type of plan in place how there to be utilized, when there to be utilized etc.

Chuck Miller: That is already in the MOU, it basically tell them what they need to do to play fairly in that sand box.

Bob Stephens: But that document is not a tactical SOP.

Chuck Miller: No, it's not designed to be. It's a MOU.

Dave Barker: What about the national little cheat sheet?

Jeff Mitchell: NIFOG?

Bob Stephens: Since, well, there's a national publication that identifies the frequencies by name and since the Nation Interoperability Field Guide, since that document was written, the ANSI, American National Standards Institute, has adopted and that's a big fire initiative, has initialed and national naming protocol. I think that's a done deal as far as I'm concerned, when ANSI deals with it that's a done deal. And that even tells you how to label the radios.

Jeff Mitchell: I think the new NIFOG that I got yesterday has the new naming convention for all of the interoperability channels listed in it.

David Barker: You could order those and hand them out through the training.

Jeff Mitchell: Yes they said any reasonable amount. I have a web site we can call and request them.

Janet Lile: Thank you Charlie, we will look for the new report. Is there any other new business?

Adjournment & Closing Remarks

Janet Lile: We are going to have our vendor conference in August.

Pam Collins: Will the KWIEC meeting be there?

Chuck Miller: This is entirely separate from the KWIEC meeting. It's in order to meet one of the goals for the KWIEC's agenda, which is to identify basically an update for our digital data standard.

Pam Collins: So this group will not meet is what you're saying?

Chuck Miller: The Public Safety Working Group will meet, they'll do there engineering magic and come back and brief this group. Of course the KWIEC will be invited to attend this; we will be inviting vendors to come in.

Pam Collins: So you're not scheduling a formal meeting at that time.

Chuck Miller: No, it wasn't my intention to do so in August. My intention is to schedule the KWIEC in September to give everyone maximum time; it seems like everyone has so much happening

Jeff Mitchell: August 24th and 25th is what we got on the calendar.

Bob Stephens: Before the WEG.

Janet Lile: We have the report that is due to Legislature September 15th, so if anyone has input for Chuck, get that to him. I also heard we're doing a Homeland Security grant review the third week of July, that is right up on us. And some of you will be meeting with the ADD Group August 12th and 13th; we have a busy calendar ahead.

Sometimes I think we keep talking about the same things, but its slow and steady progress that we make over time and I applaud those of you that are diligently working on this day in and day out. It's a hard job but you're making progress.

Janet asked if there was any other business, and with there being none, she made a motion to adjourn which was seconded and a vote adjourned the meeting.