



# Minutes for the KWIEC meeting conducted on Oct 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Opening Remarks & Roll Call .....	2
Old Business .....	2
Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes .....	2
Updates and Briefings.....	2
General Information.....	2
Chairperson’s Report .....	3
The Statewide Interoperability Communications Plan .....	3
Public Safety Voice and Data Communications Projects .....	3
Develop Funding and Support Plans for the maintenance and technological upgrades to the Public Safety Shared Infrastructure .....	3
Update on Goals.....	3
KWIEC Member Requests - .....	4
SCIP (State Communications Interoperability Plan) & PSIC Grant .....	4
PSIC (Public Safety Interoperability Communications) Award .....	6
700MHz Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) report .....	7
KWIEC Annual Public Safety Report (APSR).....	15
New Business.....	15
Project 25 Standards .....	15
Other Interoperability Issues or Concerns .....	22
2009 Goals (Recommendations).....	28
Open discussion .....	29
Adjournment .....	29
Upcoming events, next KWIEC meeting.....	29
Closing Remarks.....	29

*These Meeting Minutes are not a “word-for-word” transcription of this event, however great care was taken to capture as much of the comment or intent of the comments as possible. Summaries and paraphrasing were used as required in this document.*

{PowerPoint presentations are available for download from the KWIEC website at [www.kwiec.ky.gov](http://www.kwiec.ky.gov). }

## **Opening Remarks & Roll Call**

---

The Chairperson of the KWIEC, Deputy Commissioner Jim Barnhart, called the meeting to order at 1:36 PM on October 16, 2008. He welcomed everyone to the October 2008 KWIEC meeting and mentioned that the meeting was being held one month late (due to schedule conflicts) and noted that with several new members that he would like everyone to introduce themselves after roll was called.

The following KWIEC members of 20 members identified themselves as the roll was called:  
Jim Barnhart (Chair), Bob Ball, Don Pendleton, Col Bates, Ken Jorette, Col Hays, Mary Pedersen, Rodney Murphy, Lonnie Lawson, Larry Collins (representing Pamela Collins), Rebecca Hopkins, Terry Lewis, and Wayne Wright

A quorum was met so Chairman Jim Barnhart opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

## **Old Business**

---

### ***Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes***

Chairman Barnhart called for discussion on the last meeting's minutes. With there being no discussion, he called for approval of the minutes which was motioned, seconded, and approved.

Jim then said he would turn the meeting over to Chuck to go through the reports.

Chuck mentioned that there was an updated agenda which was sent out the previous week.

## **Updates and Briefings**

---

### ***General Information***

Chuck informed the members that there were several items of general information that members needed to be aware of.

1. New KWIEC members were appointed in July. The KWIEC is comprised of 21 members and with these recent appointments, 20 of the 21 positions are filled (member list provided). The only member missing was the Office of the 911 coordinator.
2. The 2008 KWIEC annual Public Safety report was published last month (provided).
3. The State Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) was published (provided).
4. The PSIC grant money was awarded.
5. We have two new Architecture and Standards working group members - Danny Ball from CRD and Chief Barker from the Department of Military Affairs.
6. DHS released the National Emergency Communications Plan on July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2008.

## ***Chairperson's Report***

(Briefed by Chuck Miller)

Chuck started by reminding members of the KWIEC mandates as discussed in the last meeting. He updated them as follows:

### **The Statewide Interoperability Communications Plan**

With the assistance of a few subject matter experts, Mary led the efforts in writing and publishing the SCIP. She has provided a copy in your KWIEC member packets. The implementation efforts will be led by Derek Nesselrode. Typically I update the KWIEC on all these requirements, but since Mary will be briefing the SCIP, I will let her talk about it in detail.

### **Public Safety Voice and Data Communications Projects**

So far we've had 30 wireless project plans submitted in calendar year 2008. Of those, 26 have been (reviewed by the KWIEC) two are still in evaluation by the KWIEC and two are in review by the Architecture and Standards Working Group.

### **Develop Funding and Support Plans for the maintenance and technological upgrades to the Public Safety Shared Infrastructure**

As previously briefed, the Eastern part of the State is already funded at twenty six million for the KEWS project. We have had no change since the last briefing.

For the West we do have good news. Janet Lile (COT), Jeff Mitchell (KEWS) and I met with the Budget committee and they indicated that they have approval for us to use the \$18 million, but they have not made the money available yet. Since we are not going to need those funds until July 2009 (based upon the current projections), the State will not be selling the bond funds until then. This will save the state money in the long run.

### **Update on Goals**

As previously reported – This committee selected four goals for 2008 and we were successful on all but the KEWS Eastern Segment goal. These goals are:

- Continue efforts to improve statewide interoperability programs for public safety.
- Complete the upgrade of the KEWS Eastern Segment.
- Increase stakeholder awareness and utilize outreach programs to promote public safety and the communications interoperability effort.
- Publish and begin implementation of the long term Strategic plan for communications interoperability for the Commonwealth.

We are not able to complete the upgrade of the KEWS Eastern segment in 2008. The key word is "complete". Chuck went on to say that we have done tons of work, and have completed

nearly everything, but the reason we're not going to be able to complete the East is primarily due to the Harris/Stratex radios simply not being ready.

Moving to the good news, we have been told that Harris will be able to complete the East in 2009. This will not slow us down with the West which we plan on starting in early 2009. This will mean that we are working on both halves of the state concurrently.

We also have direct involvement of the Harris CEO, and we finally have an in-state Harris project manager assigned. This should help Harris to make this schedule.

### **KWIEC Member Requests**

These are the request from the last meeting –

- add the KOHS and the CMRS grant links to the KWIEC Web Site - COMPLETE
- update the PSIC - that's on the agenda for this meeting
- update on the PSWG - we will do that update today
- provide an informational briefing on the 3G wireless routers - I will try to get that set up for December or the March meeting

Chuck concluded the Chairperson's report and asked for questions.

There were no questions so Chuck turned the floor over to Mary Pedersen for her briefings on the State Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) and Public Safety Interoperability Communications (PSIC) Grant update.

### ***SCIP (State Communications Interoperability Plan) & PSIC Grant***

(Briefed by Mary Pedersen)

Mary passed out a copy of the SCIP plan and went on to say that this is an evolving document as discussed over a year ago when several of us began the initial planning of this. It needs to evolve as we implement these projects fully and as things (technology) changes and funding opportunities change. We thought we were thinking out of the box, but in light of recent developments, we are going to have to keep on focusing on the SCIP to see if we can improve upon it to achieve our long term goal. This is something the KWIEC will need to address as we continue to meet over the course of the next year. As you look at this you'll see it's very simple. It was submitted to the KWIEC and some of you are familiar with what we've done.

We have several near term initiatives (many of which we have received some funds from PSIC) among them:

- to enhance our voice mutual aid system
- Interoperability
- KEWS upgrade
- streamlining 911
- our Strategic Technology reserve, which is currently mobile communications vehicles

We also have long term initiatives, one of which we always discuss, which is to achieve near 100% RF coverage where we can. We still have some challenges out there in some of our more remote locations of the Commonwealth, but we're good on our primary interstates and larger communities.

We have mentioned Wi-Max. I have been careful as we have provided updates, requested funding, or talked with local government and other state agencies so as not to limit ourselves to Wi-Max but instead to say we're always looking for some type of broadband connectivity for our first responders out in the field.

As we all know there is a dramatic decrease in the level of funding coming to the State from the Federal Government. I don't know if we'll meet some of the timelines we had hoped to meet. We're still striving toward meeting all of our near term initiatives as well as running concurrent with respect to our long term. I think we're finding more by moving to the PSIC.

Mary asked the KWIEC members to take a look at the SCIP and let her know if something was incorrect or that any member took issue with. Mary commented that she felt that we need to take a look at the SCIP more than annually and it should not be a last minute, December or holiday time when we are trying to update the SCIP. She felt that they will ask us for an update soon as to what we accomplished according to our public strategy.

Mary brought up another very important issue tied to funding - Part of the requirements for getting the funding for the Public Safety Interoperable Communications award is for states to establish an Interoperability Coordinator. This was also recommended when we drafted the SCIP and has more recently even been tied to another funding stream coming through Homeland. This is something that Chuck, Bob and I have talked about off record. It's my understanding in talking to Chris (the director of the Office of Emergency Communications in DSS) that as you look at some of those requirements, they are really pushing for that. It's not necessarily a committee requirement that you have a body sitting at the KWIEC but that there is someone where Interoperability is their sole focus and everyday job. Our former Executive Director of Homeland security was acting as that, but the KWIEC will have to have a mandate to take a look at who will be the right person to take on the job in order for us to continue getting funding.

**Col. Hays commented:** I think it's important that we identify that this is not an additional duty; that it needs to be a sole responsibility and job specific to that task.

**Mary Pedersen responded:** Absolutely! Very clear guidelines for that position.

With there being no further questions concerning the SCIP, Mary moved on to the PSIC briefing.

## ***PSIC (Public Safety Interoperability Communications) Award***

(Briefed by Mary Pedersen)

With respect to the PSIC reward I can't begin to tell you the hoops we jumped through allowing us to get this money, it was very bureaucratic, but we do have the money now at the Office of Homeland Security. It is my understanding that in the three projects that were funded out of the \$15.6 million awarded to Kentucky, the bulk of that money went to our Voice Mutual Aid system upgrade, so about eleven million of that will go towards achieving one of our near term initiatives in the SCIP.

In addition to that we were able to fund a project for Louisville Metro, which provides them with enhancements in their network as well as a redundant controller. It was news to us when they applied for the grant, that MetroSafe did not have a redundant controller. It is one of the biggest communications infrastructures around next to COT so it was critical to provide them with a redundant controller, so they were funded for that.

There was a requirement that the State use a portion of that funding, a formula of 15% or \$1.6 million dollars for Kentucky to establish what they call the Strategic Technology reserves. We got creative and they approved us for establishing mobile communication centers. The plan is that we're going to upgrade the existing two communication vehicles owned and maintained by the Kentucky State Police, and make every effort to implement anywhere in between four and seven new communication centers that will be strategically prepositioned across the state to be used by State and local Agencies. We're still working through some ownership and maintenance issues. Derek is working on both Mutual Aid plans from a Project Management perspective and the Mobile communication Vehicle. Louisville Metro has their MOU and they are ready to spend their money. They will be sending their MOU to KSP for Mutual Aid. I think they are just waiting on a couple things to finish the one for the Strategic Technology Reserves, so we should be able to begin to spend that money any day.

Mary reminded everyone that we have a very tight deadline of 2010 to spend the money or the PSIC money is lost. From what is understood, there will be no extensions for this grant so it's critical that once we get the money that we move as fast as possible. There is an additional requirement on the PSIC funds which required a 25% match from the state. Mary said that she needed to speak with Jim and Chuck after the meeting to discuss.

Mary concluded her briefing and asked if there were any questions –

**Rodney Murphy:** I've been away for awhile I would like to ask; who is the recipient of the PSIC Grant and how were the priorities of the money to be allocated?

**Mary Pedersen:** State administrative Agencies. All of the projects had to align with our SCIP, it had to align with our scope to what we said we were going to achieve for long term initiatives, and based upon the amount of funding that we need. We brought that several times before the KWIEC to review step by step what the suggested projects were, and we received their approval to move forward with those.

**Rodney Murphy:** What is this committee's responsibility related to this grant? Do we have an approval role?

**Mary Pedersen:** We did have an approval role early on in the grants. We brought the proposed projects before the KWIEC for review and approval but they didn't have to come back through again. The Kentucky Office of Homeland Security will provide Grant management and they will get a three percent M&A to manage the process. Other than that, the KWIEC needs to assure that they continue to align to the plan set forth.

**Rodney Murphy:** What will the progress reporting methodology be to get those progress reports at this meeting, or will there be other reporting processes used?

**Mary Pedersen:** Like all our other grants there will be a quarterly report from my office, I will be glad to share with the KWIEC. If you need an update you can check with me.

**Rodney Murphy:** I would be interested in those to know what's going on.

**Jim Barnhart:** We will get that to all the Members.

**Chuck Miller:** I normally do a high level briefing on the SCIP for the Chairperson's report. If this committee requires more detailed reporting requirements from now on, let me know.

### ***700MHz Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) report***

(Briefed by Bob Stephens)

Bob Stephens began his briefing by referencing the Wi-Max Mary reported. He said he had an AT&T air card but what the FCC is looking at is another system that would support some sort of connectivity for responders, call it mobile connectivity. Because it does represent a type of air card, they have already suggested a \$49 a month charge, which sounds familiar when it comes to air cards. The spectrum that we hope will go towards connectivity and interoperability for responders will have to come out of this 700 MHz spectrum, which is being competed for.

Bob said that the Block D (PP) was 716 to 722 MHz. The A, B, and C blocks and all the rest of them were sold at close to twenty billion dollars and the FCC made a profit even without selling Block D. Block D was supposed to be put with another ten megs of spectrum for wideband data so they could get 150kbps of data on a mobile device. As it is now, the FCC has what they call the third block. They tried to sell Block D, but no one bid high enough. At one time even Google bid on this 700 MHz spectrum.

Public Safety Public Trust is a commercial outfit that is supposed to be managing this initiative. This National Emergency Management Public Safety Trust is the engine that all this is supposed to happen on. Just recently the Public Safety working group chairs, with 17 members are now part of the group that are going to make decisions on 700Mhz.. They're going to



auction it off again and what they're looking for is one bidder. If they don't get a bid they will then go to 58 regions.

Kentucky is region 17 and from a FCC standpoint from both 700 MHz and 800 MHz and other spectrum issues, what will occur is this – if they don't get enough money on the single bid, they will allow the bid to go out to the 58 regions. It is at this point that we may have the opportunity to be the partner with a commercial company to field a data system, if it goes to the regions, if it goes to one bidder, they will have to deal with us as the States' KWIEC to field that system. I feel this is how we're going to be getting Wi-Max or some other type of broadband mobile data. We are going to be forced in that direction with a public/private partnership. If it goes to the 58 sites then there are some interoperability issues in that regard I'm not going to get into.

Each of these requirements is for the individual sites which they have put on the line as part of the specifications for the bid:

- battery back up
- fuel supply
- critical sites being 35% of the network

Data throughput will be dependent on where you live. In smaller locations you may not get bandwidth until 2013 and then only at 64 kbps.

Bob asked for Questions and opened the floor to comments -

**Mary Pedersen:** You initially said all the spectrum was auctioned off except for the D block? So now is there going to be a re-auction on D? What's changed? No one bought it before so what is the incentive this time?

**Bob Stevens:** The incentive is that they have lowered minimum bid; I think they lowered it to \$750 million instead of the around a Billion range. I have several summaries here that are eight and ten pages to describe this, I'll be happy to show you later. And they will allow the state to bid if no one else bids. What they are wanting is partnering a commercial company with Public Safety.

**Col. Hays:** They're going to sell it to us as a commercial operation; let's make that clear. It's a commercial operation partnering with us nationally or regionally. They're only going to play if we're buying a piece of that spectrum.

**Bob Stephens:** Yes and what they're going to want in essence is \$49 a month. My assessment, the 49 popped up their FCC announcement which is on the Web.

**Col Hays:** The Provision though is that the Public safety will have a better rate.

**Bob Stephens:** Exactly, and priority in a disaster, and they will have a whole series as what defines a disaster. Here's what we're talking about, \$48.50 a month to buy an air card, a single



nation wide license, which is how they want to sell it, or 58 regional licenses, which is their second position. I put LTE and Wi-Max as the emerging technology for wireless data.

**Rodney Murphy:** Say more about a single nationwide license verses 58 regional licenses, I'm not clear on it

**Bob Stephens:** What the FCC wants to do is sell this as a package to a company, AT&T, Google or another. The same way the others got sold. A, B, C had over one hundred people actually bid on that spectrum and were awarded pieces of it. In this case the market will determine this single nationwide license. It could be Motorola, Motorola and Google, it could be any number.

**Rodney Murphy:** Could it go to a foreign concern, can they buy that?

**Bob Stephens:** I don't know.

*/- Comment from the visitor floor -/*

**Keith Caroline with Motorola:** Yes it could be a foreign competitor; they would like to do a nationwide rollout, meaning East Coast, West Coast. Big population things would go first and eventually it will roll down to the Kentucky area. If it does not meet the minimal requirements it will go out to these 58 regions, each region will be able to implement as needed with the technology, hopefully they would be allowed to do. One big thing Bob, is about the comment period through November 3<sup>rd</sup>, as they're looking for comments, these are all the things the FCC is looking for is what you would like to see happen, if you would like to see Kentucky owning Kentucky's spectrum and figure out what's best for Kentucky or a nation wide one that's best for the entire Country, that's what they're looking for.

**Bob Stephens:** In the last two periods I have responded for us that we wish to be a partner in this as the Commonwealth of Kentucky and I've stated our biggest reasons is that we already own a microwave infrastructure that we could parlay as part of this network. That created a lot of business problem for the State; for example, as KEWS sites were leased for very small amounts, because we said we wouldn't generate income from it. I'm only suggesting that those KEWS sites have a commercial value to us and public safety for sure, because we can talk almost all over Kentucky on wireless, because of this robust network. This robust network can also represent an investment on our part with a major carrier, if they didn't mind putting up a site at Blade for example, it's a site where you can drive for twenty miles and have no cell coverage. That site serves public safety; it has no commercial value to a cell phone company as there is not a user out there. But we want to participate, because we have this network and were one of 500 who responded.

**Col Hayes:** Don't we think it's to Kentucky's advantage to have the regional licensing?

**Bob Stephens:** That is my feeling on that.

**Col Hayes:** I think the KWIEC should put together a comment formalized by the committee that we are endorsing a regional licensing so that we can set priorities in Kentucky. We don't do very well when you start measuring us against Houston, and the East and West coast, so if we can identify the priorities and work with the vendor locally, I think we have a lot better chance to meet the needs of our citizens.

**Bob Stephens:** I do plan on sharing with you my notes before the comment period is over, I'm a small voice for us, I would like to say the Governor's office supports this, if I could find a way to get his signature on this, the letters that I have read online have a lot of horsepower, big money.

**Rodney:** I think that would be possible if you can educate this group enough to get the floor, this would be the way to do it.

**Jim Barnhart:** If we put something together we could probably get some signatures on it.

**Rodney:** Do we know who would be a partner? We should have an idea before we say if we want it.....

**Bob Stephens:** I don't know, in the last two auctions the bids have been kept secret, this is a huge business issue, billions of dollars.

**Rodney Murphy:** Does anyone know who we would find as an acceptable partner in a regional license?

*/- Comment from the visitor floor -/*

**Keith Caroline with Motorola:** It wouldn't have to be a partnership, what they're looking for is a company of companies that says I will bid on this block of spectrum for the Kentucky area such as AT&T for example. They would not so much partner with you as they would implement the network system. Then you would sign an agreement with them for hopefully \$49 a month or whatever the agreement.

**Rodney Murphy:** Which I call a partnership, I want to know somebody I can trust, that's going to be supporting me.

**Bob Stephens:** What we don't know is if we did nothing, would it give us the air card? That's really what we're talking about in my opinion. If we did nothing would the network build out anyway? Because of demand, the reason it wasn't bought before, they couldn't see a way to get a return on their investment, and otherwise they would have bid more money. I don't know how it's going to go down; I hope it is the 58 regional licenses. What they did in here is create a lot of specifications so that we would be interoperable with everybody else on these regional licenses. So we would have it ready for emergencies.

*/- Comment from the KEWS Branch Manager -/*

**Jeff Mitchell:** You said something about leveraging KEWS, the thing is; I was in Legal this week, and we were talking about that. One of the things that's scaring us is that I have 27 years

on the lease and they're not costing me anything right now, but if I go and renegotiate right now in today's market it might cost me two million a year just to pay the leases.

**Bob Stephens:** That is the point, however if you put together a network, obviously whoever gets the bid would have their own towers to put up hopefully, or going to have them. What I would suggest some of the existing towers would have value. Yes you'll have to renegotiate the lease because you'll have earned income. I think that's a business thing that can be worked out. How many sites do you have?

**Jeff Mitchell:** 144

**Bob Stephens:** I do want to reiterate that we do have a National Emergency Communications Plan, 83 pages. I have done a one page summary that is still pretty heavy duty that is available if you would like an e-mail of it. In the National Emergency Communications plan is seven objectives. The seventh has to do with the formation of a FEMA animal called a Regional Emergency Communications Coordination Workgroup. Which is going to look at regional issues and try to coordinate with the KWIEC on regional issues, I'm on that committee. Drew is on the ESF8 piece of this committee for coms. That's another briefing; I'll put some of this on the web site. December 4<sup>th</sup> is a 700 MHz meeting.

**Mary Pedersen:** Can you send that summary out to the KWIEC?

**Bob Stephens:** I shared it with Chuck last week, but there is so little time for briefing. I can send it out. This new National Emergency plan was written after the SCIP, everything that's in the States Interoperability plan has to feed into the National Emergency Plan. Now we have a new international organization called COMS its part of DHS, they give over site to all of these issues. I total support the issue to do Interoperability. All of this is on line.

**Chuck Miller:** Col Hayes you indicated that we need to identify priorities concerning D block as far as the KWIEC is concerned, is that an action item the KEWIC wants to take at the next meeting?

**Col Hayes:** I think we need to have a discussion on what the options are for the KWIEC, I don't know by the KRS if we can indorse a particular vendor.

**Chuck Miller:** No

**Col Hayes:** But I think we do need some kind on statement whether it comes from the Governor's Office or the KWIEC endorsing a 58 regional licensing as opposed to a single nationwide license. I don't like our odds of us getting any priority in the next decade if it goes national. I think they're going to go where the market place is at, and we won't be able to address our needs effectively. That doesn't mean a national vendor couldn't listen to what our priorities are, but I don't think they're going to be very responsive to us when they've got places like Chicago, Denver, Kansas City what ever to deal with first.

**Bob Stephens:** The priority begins with cities in 2010 and goes up to 2013. The vendor has a long time to develop an approach.

**Chuck Miller:** Bob at what time do we need to say the KWIEC is endorsing a 58 regional license as opposed to a national plan?

**Bob Stephens:** Of course they publish 58; I think it's appropriate to say we wish to have more say in region 17. We can say we're truly interested in local licenses, is that a business case we have any impact on?

**Chuck Miller:** We're only concerned about region 17, so we want to say region 17, is that where we're going?

**Col Hays:** I think so, I'm proposing that we should think that way, but this is a committee, one voice.

**Chuck Miller:** Jim, this is something you can call for a vote if you like...

**Rodney Murphy:** When does the comment period close?

**Bob Stephens:** November 3<sup>rd</sup>, three weeks.

**Rodney Murphy:** So we need to deal with it today if we were going to deal with it.

**Bob Stephens:** My comments to the FCC were one-pagers identifying our strengths which is our network, and why, since we had the network, we were in a position to take advantage of it. I also said in both cases we already had the basis for a data network, slow as it is at 800 MHz, and very few States have done that. I put those two together, I think this is leverage; we've started something we wanted to go the next step. Fact is, I told them we were disappointed because we had taken the first step and we're ready with our current 800 MHz system, but they took the Channels away from us, and we couldn't continue with our plan.

**Chuck Miller:** I'm going to use your briefing here Bob; that comment "Critical Sites must have backup, battery for eight hours and forty eight hours fuel for generators. Critical sites shall not be more that forty five percent of the network". At the completion of the KEWS digital upgrade projects we will meet those requirements. As a matter of fact the eastern segment can meet most of them right now.

**Bob Stephens:** By the way that was the other piece, I did reference it was ready for digital network. It presents a marvelous partnership and business opportunity for the Commonwealth with an existing carrier. We have it places that we want to have it, where they wouldn't want to have it. If you package the right stuff together, you'll have a pretty good deal.

**Chuck Miller:** We're talking about public safety, not talking about making money off of our KEWS towers. If we're talking about selling, as Jeff said, that is something you need to be real

careful about. Col. Hays you made a proposal that this committee adopt, would you please rephrase for the record?

**Col. Hayes:** I make a motion that the KWIEC endorse a regional licensing of block D spectrum as the preferred methodology in our region.

**Rodney Murphy:** As a potential amendment don't we need to authorize Jim or someone to submit that on the behalf of the KWIEC, on this comment period?

**Terry Lewis:** Would it be appropriate to send something to the Governor stating that we need your help, we need your signature, it that something that should come from this committee?

**Jim Barnhart:** I think it should come from this committee.

**Col Hays:** Maybe a cover letter from the Governor's office would be appropriate, but I think the comment needs to come from the KWIEC as the representative of the public agency that we're all here for.

**Bob Stephens:** My previous two comments back to the FCC funded period, they were not from the KWIEC, I was doing it as it applied to the 700 MHz spectrum only. And again, I would certainly indorse this coming from the KWIEC.

**Rodney Murphy:** One last question, is there a possibility to go with this 58 separate licenses that not all of them could sell? Does this put us at any risk?

**Col. Hayes:** It puts us at risk at not having a vendor.

**Rodney Murphy:** In which case where would we be? I think I strongly support the separate licenses, but I'm a little concerned if we didn't sell we'd be left holding nothing.

*/- Comment from the visitor floor -/*

**Keith Caroline:** one of the recommendations might be that if there was not a D block winner in this particular area that the licenses fall back to public safety, fall back to KWIEC.

**Rodney Murphy:** I like that, I like that a lot.

**Bob Stephens:** We hold the licenses for voice right now; they took away the channels for data. By the way the fifty-eight number is fifty states and all the territories, we have some states that are big geographically and have multiple areas. But in most States cases that region is the boundary of the State.

**Chuck Miller:** Are we ready to Vote?

**Col Hays:** What I was proposing is the KWIEC indorse/ support a 58 licensing of the block D of the 700 MHz data spectrum.

**Jim Barnhart:** And what he has is some recommendations that we can put in that if it's not awarded that it can go back to the public safety.

**Col Hays:** If the KWIEC would were to adopt this resolution I would think we would have to identify a couple of people to work out the details, the comments and the proper format, if we're looking for the Governors office cover letter, then I'm sure that would be a separate action. I think what we're really talking about here is we want to get into is steer it too a 58 license verses a national license.

**Rodney Murphy:** As far as a table all we need to do is mend that together, Jim maybe you with the authority to draft that language and get it in before the comment periods over.

**Bob Stephens:** The comments are filed electronically, simple process.

**Rodney:** I second the motion.

**Chuck Miller:** Kathy, Rodney Seconded the motion Jim you can call for a vote.

**Jim Barnhart:** All in Favor?

**Unanimous:** Aye.

**Chuck Miller:** Bob, are you going to take lead on that?

**Bob Stephens:** I will provide the comments I have done; if you want work with.....

**Col Hays:** I think all the members need copies of the comments made thus far, a draft of this comment going to the FCC prior to its submission not afterwards.

**Chuck Miller:** I will send it out and get your approvals in the same way we have been doing approvals and comments on the assessments. Once I get approvals or corrections, I'll get it back out there for a final. What are we looking for a timeframe, by the end of the month for sure, I would imagine.

**Jim Barnhart** Especially if I'm going to need other signatures on it, I'm going to need some time there.

**Chuck Miller:** Bob can you stay after this meeting to work on this?

**Bob Stephens:** Yes

There were no further comments or questions on the 700 MHz D block, so Chuck moved us into KWIEC Issues.

## ***KWIEC Annual Public Safety Report (APSR)***

(Briefed by Chuck Miller)

Chuck reminded the members that they had a copy of the 2008 KWIEC Annual Public Safety report in their packet. He asked that they take it with them, read through it when you have time, and send any questions they may have.

Chuck summarized the report and the year as a year of continuance. Most of the Commonwealth's State projects and pilots were started the previous years. Some of these were finished and transitioned into operational programs. Others, like KEWS, are multi-year projects and are continuing. There have been no new major state interoperability projects started or reported as started in 2008. Improvement of the voice mutual aid, mobile data and other programs per the SCIP are planned.

Chuck asked if there were any questions on the APSR, or anything covered up to now before moving into new business. There were no questions, so we moved to new business.

## **New Business**

---

Moving into new business - I've asked Derek to brief this committee on Project 25 Standards. We've had some conflicting information sent to the Architecture and Standards working group that needs clarification by the KWIEC. Derek is a member of the ASWG which requires clarification on the P-25 standard.

*As a reminder, the Architecture and Standards Working Group is an ad-hoc working group comprised of engineering gurus that evaluate all the wireless project assessments prior to being sent to the KWIEC.*

## ***Project 25 Standards***

(Briefed by Derek Nesselrode)

Derek began by saying that the Architecture and Standards group reviewed all the wireless applications that come through.

**Derek:** It's fairly cyclic with grant funding as you can well imagine. Prior to grant submission and after grant awards we get inundated with these applications. Our first responsibility is to review these assessments and make recommendations technically if there feasible and also review them against any existing standards that the Commonwealth of Kentucky has. One of the things we've noticed with this last grant application process is an influx of proprietary voice system applications. In the past we've always asked ourselves is this system P-25? Is it capable of Interoperability? What type of system is it? That's typically been due because Homeland Security has made P-25 a funding mandate, for at least the past several years it's been that way. They have actually asked us if this radio is P-25 is this system P-25. But this



last grant cycle I would say four out of the five applications that came in were not only not P-25, they were proprietary and would not operate with the P-25 network. We are seeking guidance on where we go with this.

It is our understanding, on the P-25, that there is no requirement for the Commonwealth as we know of through the KWIEC or any other body. There are however funding requirements through the Kentucky Office of Homeland Security. We need to know - do we approve these with a note that they're not P-25 and pass that along, or do we disapprove?

**Don Pendleton asked:** Where are we on the actual equipment? Do all vendors now have P-25 capabilities? That was the issue before, vendor specific, and we were actually driving people to a particular vendor.

**Derek Nesselrode:** I'm going to touch base on that right now. Kind of an overview on P-25 verses these propriety systems, to give you an idea of what P-25 is for those of you who don't know, I'm going to leave out the vendor specific and the technology specific. P25 is an open architecture, which means that a consortium came together to set standards with APCO and the Association of State Telecommunications Directors. Federal Agencies along with a lot of the vendors, came together to develop these standards with open architecture for all vendors to be able to adhere to. As it stands right now a lot of these standards are technical in nature, you'll hear a lot of people talk about Common air interfaces, TDMA, FDMA and all this other stuff. It's really not important. They are all means of voice and data being encrypted and encoded, and the way it comes out on the other end of the radio.

You'll hear things like Phase I, Phase II and Phase III of P-25. These all deal with that technical voodoo that were talking about compressing then decompressing the audio spectrum efficiency. There are some data applications but what it all comes down to is that it's an open architecture that all major communications vendors have a solution for. Pretty much all of them offer a P-25 radio system now, of some sort.

The interoperability and nonproprietary P-25 network and the proprietary radio systems have as we talked about the technical terms, the TDMA and all that voodoo that happens after you key the radio. It's different - it does the same thing, it compresses the audio into a digital format, decompresses it, it has the same type features and function, but the P-25 radio will not talk on a non P-25 system or vice-versa. Most systems will talk on Mutual Aid since they're backward compatible. Our Mutual Aid network works on the least common multiple of radio systems which is analog voice. They'll both do that, they're both capable of Gateway technology, patching technology, sending radios IP to IP, they both have that in common. P-25 is an interoperability solution within itself and that's the whole idea of the development of the P25.

Going back to the Safecom report, if you look at the different levels of interoperability, I think they called it the interoperability continuum, if you start out with a level one, which is radio swaps, we know how logistically bad that is. You have a level two which is Gateway technology, P-25 systems will do Gateway technology; these proprietary systems will do Gateway technology. Level three is shared channels which is our Mutual Aid solution, that's what we

have here in the Commonwealth. Both types of systems will do that. You can turn a P-25 radio to a Mutual Aid channel or a proprietary radio to a Mutual Aid radio channel. When you start getting to level four and level five, with level four it's a shared system infrastructure, that's where it starts climbing up a little bit, these proprietary networks will only work with that proprietary network. You can't put that network on that frequency or on that particular standard and talk on other networks. It doesn't work. Level five is a kind of a "can all, be all" interoperability solution. It is a statewide shared type of network that's based on standards, so it would be like a statewide P-25 which obviously these proprietary networks won't do that.

The biggest push behind this and what's driving this discussion itself is money. IP radios are typically four times as expensive, you have to think about the smaller counties, if they want to buy ten radios for a P-25 network they going to pay fifty thousand dollars, where they could get one of these proprietary networks for fourteen or fifteen thousand dollars. They're being told that the reason that these P-25 systems are so expensive is because the vendors have to build to this standard that's set. All of their radios are more expensive than their common analog counterpart or these proprietary radios. Its like the auto industry, when the Government came out and said you have to meet these crash standards, and you have to put air bag in, the price of cars went up.

What we need to look at is the interoperability road map and the future strategic Plan. We talked about the SCIP and when we look at the current interoperability solutions; our current solution is Mutual Aid, augmented with regional and tactical gateways. Part of our strategic plan is to build out part of that network to offer interoperability solution to everybody. P-25 will work on the Mutual Aid network so will these proprietary networks. Like I said, if you take Mutual Aid frequencies and program them in proprietary radios they work just like P-25 radios operate. I guess what we need to look at is future goals and objectives. The SCIP calls for us to have a long term goal to actually build out statewide radios. We know there's funding challenges especially in today's climate that make that a pipe dream, a futuristic thing that's taking ten or fifteen years down the road. There's nothing more that I would like to see than a state wide P-25 standards based network that all public safety could get onto, but the reality is that's a long way away. What we need to do is determine -Do we keep the P-25 and make it a standard, or do we start making accommodation for these individual stovepipe systems that are actually being requested through KWIEC?

**Mary Pedersen:** I have an update for the most current grant cycle from Homeland; they removed the P-25 requirement.

**Derek Nesselrode:** That would explain the influx of all the applications.

**Mary Pedersen:** They removed it as far as the MOU. I'm not really certain unless they were given a heads up and that was fairly recent that we processed our grant guidelines this time. So it's not a requirement this year.

**Col Hayes:** The requirement is this - interoperable, not P-25.

**Mary Pedersen:** Our requirement has been that its P-25 or P-25 upgradeable. That in and of itself may reduce the cost, but it would be a very big cost to the agencies in order to upgrade to a full P-25 compliant radio.

**Derek Nesselrode:** There's a lot of what they call P-25 upgradable radios that are really just analog radios, you actually have to take all the guts out and put new guts in it.

**Mary Pedersen:** We have talked with the KWIEC about this before - Is this going to become a Federal mandate or not? With our understanding a couple of years ago it was and it was going to happen sooner rather than later. As of today it has not. I've been calling directly to the Office of Emergency Communications and spoke with Chris, their new Executive Director. I also made contact with Ken Born, who now works for OEC and is on point for Kentucky, and I've asked is this becoming a mandate and if so when is it becoming a mandate? All I'm getting from the OEC is that yes it will be a mandate. They have been saying that for a while and tied it to the grant dollars we've been getting. They say P-25 should be, "should", but it will become a "shall". What I can't get is a commitment from them as to when, and it's what we've been talking about since 1995, and it's still dragging on. We're getting to a point now where we're making good strides with interoperability; we've got people who have an interoperability issue, and what I don't want to see is some to these small towns and small counties and small departments and even some of the big ones not to be able to have a radio that works on a day to day basis because they can only buy two as opposed to fifteen. For some standard that may or may not even happen. So, I would like my fellow KWIEC members to put the heat on OEC to tell us is this really going to become a mandate and if so how will this impact the future funding or any future projects that we may be doing. I can't get anyone to say that. I agree with this round, forget it, they can talk on Mutual Aid.

**Derek Nesselrode:** You have to realize if that's adopted that level III Mutual Aid and Gateway technology will be as far as those systems will ever go. There will never be a standard spaced shared network solution. Then again you have to realize we're looking at fifteen years and most of us cant look beyond our two year budget cycle much less fifteen years down the road to build out a statewide network.

**Bob Stephens:** We have been given the term P-25 here; let me define that, for those of you who don't know. P-25 stands for Project 25 which came out of the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials desire for interoperability. We have a strong organization in Kentucky. Derek, I, and a couple of other folks just recently went to the convention which is probably the biggest Public Safety Communication exposition in the world annually in Kansas City. We got to see some of these new technologies. Historically the biggest reason P-25 came into existence is that we had Motorola, and I don't see any of your competitors here, not to pick on you, but you won the game. We had Motorola; we had Macom and some folk who had been around public radio for umpteen years. We had trunking systems which is another two hour briefing. But metropolitan areas had limited licensed frequencies, so they came up with a system so that they could use the frequencies they had in the most efficient manner and that's called trunking. The trunking systems were proprietary, Motorola build theirs, Macom built theirs, GE and whoever built their trunking system. And what we have in major Metropolitan areas, let

pick on New York City, 9/11, they said no one could talk, they couldn't have talked anyway because they had proprietary trunking systems, and they were using handheld radios that wouldn't have worked even if they were all on the same channel. All this occurred and it mainly affects big metropolitan areas and trunking systems, and they had no way to be interoperable. So they came up with P-25 and the result was as it affects us was, they each one had to have some analog frequencies to talk to each other, a thing call CAI Commentary Entrance. So here we are in Kentucky, we don't have many trunking systems except in a couple of major metropolitan areas. But what we had is a rural economy with lots of two way radio systems. So the direction, emerging technology, some of this stuff is more modern now than the P-25, the voodoo as you say, however the committee took over, it has to take a long leap to look at what our standard is going to be, is our standard going to be a statewide interoperability at some standpoint, where we all are, or Gateway technology. But right now those of us to sit on the Architect Review Committee threw our hands up because there was no way trying to justify keeping everyone on a P-25 standard for the sake of P-25. That's why it's been thrown on the table for you all to chew on today for that purpose.

**Derek Nesselrode:** If you look to our neighbors to the North, their scenarios' a little different when they call for standards these guys all have shared statewide trunking systems. They tie public safety into these networks. Sure you're going to jump on to our network you're going to have to be P-25. These are kinds of things we need to take a look at and make a discussion on how we're going to handle these applications now and set a roadmap as to what we're going to do in the next fifteen years.

**Col Hayes:** The applications the Architecture and Standards Committee are reviewing and recommending to the KWIEC for supporting or approving, what keeps them from buying whatever they want to anyway? Is it Grant money or is it their own procurement? Is it just a formality that they're asking for our approval for project?

**Chuck Miller:** By KRS they're required to get approval.

**Rodney Murphy:** For State Agencies it's approval, but it's not approval for local agencies – it is review and recommendation. It goes on and says review and recommendation by the Committee and the Committee shall forward the plans to the Executive Director for final approval. So State agencies require approval, local agencies are required to submit, but it's for review and recommendation.

**Col Hayes:** So if we said no, they can go ahead and do what they want to anyway.

**Rodney Murphy:** That's correct, and if we do not want to adhere to a P-25 standard, we have to take no action today. Now that the criteria is taken out of Homeland Security, that's the only place there was P-25. When we first considered P-25 in this Committee at that time, there were a number of vendors who had P25 conventional but only one that had P-25 trunked systems. In order to have the statewide vision that we had, you really needed the trunk technology to have P25, so we didn't move. We didn't take an action on it plus the Feds were taking forever to get anything done on it. My opinion is we're in reach of Wi-Max now and radio

over IP and that sort of thing. By the time the Feds get around to doing anything with P-25 they'll want to go there (IP) or some other new technology. My opinion is based on the study from Safecom where operability was the biggest problem rather than interoperability. In my time on the Standards and Architecture Committee when we were looking at additions to local radio systems, not replacements, I don't know that I think P-25 is an issue that we need to be concerned about, I think its the lowest cost way for them to get radios and to focus on the Gateway and the Mutual Aid solutions so that those guys can talk and we have a footprint statewide. I think that's money better spent.

**Col Hayes:** And the sooner we can identify the multi data standard that we want to build a network for, the sooner the local agencies and regional agencies and municipalities can identify the target we want to work for. We want to try and get in front of them and not behind them, and P-25 is behind them, as far as the technology.

**Mary Pedersen:** Remember I said that is no longer a requirement for Homeland Security funding. We kept being told it was going to be a requirement where to use our money, but it never came out this year, we can forget it, it's not a requirement, we're fine to approve those.

*/- Comment from the visitor floor -/*

**Bob Simpson:** I'm with Kenwood Communications and also represent JPS Communications which is a Gateway Solutions Interoperability. One thing that I want to mention to you that you might want to consider is that if you do go forward with Project 25 there are a couple of things we have seen occur in various states. Indiana has a major issue because they tried to do a statewide system. They have literally run out of IDs in their system configuration, so in essence what you find is a very set number of frequencies within a given market area or a statewide area. In order to get all those agencies on that system – it's almost impossible to do so in the same band. So if you roll it out and say it's going to be a seven or eight hundred system, it's very difficult to get those agencies on the same band in those markets. What actually they have to consider now is alternative frequencies being fit in the Project 25 System in different bands. The other thing that you have to consider is that if you're going to adopt Project 25, and this is just my recommendation; please take it at what it's worth. NTIA established guidelines and said this is the very basis for Project 25. If you hold to the letter of that, there are companies that have created modifications to that and offered them as options, but the minute those options are chosen the product is no longer compatible with anything out there. If you write the spec's for instance and say the radio has to have (something), then that radio is no longer able to be supplied by all the manufacturers that produce Project 25. A lot of the manufacturers have held fast that they will comply specifically with NTIA Standards and will not offer anything that is not compliant. So, if you use that as a basis, it will give you a radio no matter who the manufacturer is that can be utilized by everyone throughout the State.

**Wayne Wright:** It might be utilized and I'm sorry to say this but a sheriff in Kentucky can't afford them. We can't afford these radios. I'm applying for radios now and when you get to looking at them and if you have to go P-25, I've cut my radios in half. Some guys will have them and some won't. I'm from Woodford County and we are blessed in Central Kentucky, but when we

get into Eastern and Southern Kentucky and some of these small departments, they're not going to be able to do it. There is no way.

*/- Comment from the visitor floor -/*

**Bob Simpson:** Our biggest concern right now is that we're utilizing Homeland funding. Using all these dollars to acquire the initial product, but what happens when you add twenty down the road or just look at the raw maintenance cost. The average maintenance cost on a P-25 Radio is \$2500 per unit as the average repair cost on an analog product is typically in the fifty to two hundred dollar range.

**Rodney Murphy:** I think our biggest question is, does a P-25 radio improve your ability to serve your citizens? I don't think it does today, and I think that's the thing we have to keep in front of us. In these economic times there's no need to force these agencies to spend additional dollars for no improvement in their services. I think it would be wrong of this committee to make the P-25 a standard at this point and time. It hasn't been the requirement or has been removed from Homeland Security, so I think we leave it where it is.

**Col Hayes:** Don't add a requirement that we don't fully endorse.

**Derek Nesselrode:** As Architecture and Standards workers we had a conference call last week very similar to the discussion that took place here. Our view was that without a roadmap to build out a P-25 network on a statewide basis we could not consciously reject any non P-25 award for proprietary network. Now we might have to make accommodations as far as interoperability, and working with Mutual Aid and working with Gateway technology to improve interoperability so we prevent these small agencies who can't afford these radio systems or the ability to communicate with agencies short of that

**Col Hayes:** I think it's prudent for us to look at the Gateway technologies, because all I have to have is one of their radios to talk to them. I think that's economic for them and for us.

**Derek Nesselrode:** Then again we do have Mutual Aid; the great equalizer is analog communication. It will always be there and it will always work regardless of what type of radio system you have.

**Rodney Murphy:** And correct me if I'm wrong, for these Mobile Command Centers, it will also allow those folks to utilize communication with the Mobile Command Centers, which is a big deal. The Gateway gives us that.

**Derek Nesselrode:** That's all I have, does anyone have any questions? Thank you. Chuck...

Chuck noted for the record that the decision of the Committee is: Project 25 is not a requirement that the KWIEC wants to impose at this point.

Chuck moved on to the next order of business.



## ***Other Interoperability Issues or Concerns***

Chuck opened by stating that he was asked to create a slide to address other concerns. He was asked to bring up these items for discussion by various members of the KWIEC. These points were made after meetings, on phone calls, email, and etcetera.

1. There's currently no way to remotely monitor the (State) radio systems – This is something we really need to think about especially as we build out this network. Note - With the new KEWS system it will allow us a much better monitoring capability.
2. P25 requirement – That decision has just been made.
3. No dedicated State Interoperability Coordinator - Mary has already discussed that, is there any further discussion on that?

**Mary Pedersen:** Yes. Currently the requirements as stated by OEC are that the Interoperability Coordinator shall be their sole responsibility, and they shall have no other job duties whatsoever. They can have staff that work for them, but their sole focus is interoperability. And as well, the recommendation is that the individual report directly to the Governor. This is coming down from the Federal level. We've been able I think just because of the progress Kentucky has made, and the fact that we have had such a strong interoperable committee, OEC has let us slide around the overall Coordinator requirements for now, but if they keep pushing it we really need to look closely at establishing that role. The biggest concern is that they have no other responsibilities, that they're not a program manager. We could probably get around the reporting to the Governor if need be, but interoperability is their job.

**Chuck Miller:** Is this an action item to this Committee to determine who the State Interoperability Coordinator should be? Is it something we need to present to the Governor's office; is it a Homeland Security Issue? I'm not sure, who owns this issue?

**Col Hayes:** There are a number of agencies who own this responsibility per the KRS' for emergency communication or emergency alerts or emergency operation centers. It crosses so many agencies, I don't know. This is probably the appropriate forum for that discussion. Is it somebody that works in COT, is it somebody who works in KSP, Homeland Security, Military Affairs, or the Governors Cabinet.....

**Mary Pedersen:** I don't know how it's set up. I would see an Interoperability Coordinator because of the makeup, the representation of this committee that they would report directly to this committee, and not toward any particular agency. And I don't know how you go about doing that; I'll leave that up to the personnel type folks. That's my thoughts. We have everyone here that's represented from an interoperability standpoint; I think that individual would be accountable to this committee because this committee is appointed by the Governor so it really is appointed by the Governor by virtue of the KWIEC.

**Chuck Miller:** So is it a Committee issue based on what we just discussed?



**Rodney Murphy:** I'm not necessarily sure I agree with that point. For one thing we have no funding streams. Second thing, in Legislation most of our activities are vetted through the Executive Director as chair, I know we're appointed by the Governor, but our report is really through the Executive Director. I'm not sure we've got the clout to manage that person.

**Mary Pedersen:** Well it just needs to be modified.

**Rodney Murphy:** I don't know, I think of the Adjutant General or someone like that.

**Chuck Miller:** Rodney you know the KRS was changed. It did read "the CIO" before.

**Rodney Murphy:** I agree, now it's the Executive Director

**Chuck Miller:** Perhaps that is something to have changed back again to have the KRS read CIO, or whomever you want.

**Rodney Murphy:** Let me pose my comment differently, I'm not sure that we have the authority to decide that this person works for this committee, that's a better way to put it.

**Jim Barnhart:** I think it's just been brought up for discussion.

**Rodney Murphy:** I guess I thought it was up as an action item, we need direction from the Governor on what he wants us to do.

**Chuck Miller:** From what Mary has said the funding from the Federal Government is not yet contingent upon this, but soon will be.

**Col Hayes:** How do surrounding states in our region stand in regard to that? Do they all stand tall with a Statewide Interoperability Coordinator?

**Mary Pedersen:** Not all, I can't give you any detail; I'm talking about initial conversations we've had with OEC about a year or so ago. There are several states that said we don't need that, and Kentucky being included. Are we going to make any more progress than we've already made? We've already made a heck of a lot, with not a lot of money. And with a (dedicated) person and with the budget now... My goodness could we afford to have somebody where all they do is coordinate interoperability? Right now Bob and Derek and folks at this table, we've all done a fairly good job of doing it. So we said we're not going to hire anybody right now to do it, but pretty soon they're going to be tying funding to no one unless you meet their requirement of having that one POC.

**Chuck Miller:** When Mary and I were discussing this before, one of the things we talked about was the PSIC funding; they wanted to have a dedicated State Interoperability Coordinator.

**Mary Pedersen:** We have a name one in there right now its Thomas L. Preston, Executive Director of the Office of Kentucky Homeland Security. So we have a primary contact for that, but

understanding that Mr. Preston has a lot more responsibilities than interoperability. They didn't pressure us to do that for the first location of SCIP and the PSIC. And then again I'm still trying to get some information from OEC on when these things are going to become mandate.

**Rodney Murphy:** Have they written a job description for this position?

**Mary Pedersen:** Not a detailed one.

**Rodney Murphy:** One thing that would make sense is for the Chair of this Committee to be considered as that again.

**Chuck Miller:** This slide will stay until we find some resolution, so if our resolution is its not our concern then I will go ahead and take it off.

**Mary Pedersen:** Maybe not statutory, but I think it's our concern.

**Chuck Miller:** So it's something as an informational item.

**Mary Pedersen:** Right, we're trying to find out again trying to find out what those requirements are, and if and when it's going to become a "shall" instead of a "should".

**Chuck Miller:** And again these are things that's been addressed to me, concerns from the senior Committee Members. Action Item four, interoperability exercises need to be conducted, this was something that was mentioned previously by several different members, is there any discussion on that?

**Rodney Murphy:** I have a question, I haven't said anything off my notes yet, so you know we're in trouble. We've got a number of mobile command vehicles already in the state; we've got more on the way. I know you guys have has a lot of discussions about public health issues, MITOCS and that sort of thing. Do we know that all of these mobile command posts aren't going to show up at the same place and step all over each other when they get to the same location? Are those things being used in these exercises, and do we have them coordinated? I've asked this question to several people, but I'm just concerned about that, I know they all have different footprints and that sort of thing.

**Bob Stephens:** I feel I'm stealing the Col's thunder. We've stuck our neck out November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>. We've invited everybody that's got a command post, and we're going to circle the wagons at Midway College on Friday. Midway College is law enforcement band emergency management, and I use that in a broad term. It's a National Guard exercise, the theme is Pandemic Flu, however it's a communications exercise, we're not playing who is sick, who's not. We've invited everyone with a command post and we want to eyeball each other and see how messed up it gets. David Barker, my boss is doing a great deal of planning to do this. On Saturday we're going to the Horse Park, we're doing the same thing, but we're going to have a Mobile Law enforcement National Guard flavor to it. We've involved everybody from amateur radio, too. If you have a command post, and you're a state agency, I think you have been

invited. Woodford will be playing with us on Friday; we're going to show up at your ELC with a Mobile Command Vehicle as part of the Friday event

**Wayne Wright:** This Friday!?!

**Bob:** No, remember the 14<sup>th</sup>. Each time we do one of these things we find out how much we don't know and how much more we need to coordinate. So we just invite everybody, we've invited Central Government to bring theirs, the whole purpose to find out what we do well together and what we don't do well together. Interoperability for satellite, we think all our two way radios will do fine, but we have other systems that we would really like to see, and the only way we can do that is to show up and exercise. Frankly this is doing exercising backwards, because you are supposed to sit down and write a plan, but we're doing the exercise first so that we can figure out where to start writing some of these plans. We're excited about it, when you start doing communications with each other out in the fields, it's interesting, it's fun and a lot of work.

**Wayne Wright:** I agree with you, it looks good on paper, but when you go to use it, and then it doesn't work.

**Bob Stephens:** I give my boss credit; fortunately we have the money to seed what some of us do. But we want to encourage coming together; some of these command posts have huge investments in them. Frankly I don't know how Derek is going to take care of that many of them. We work like dogs to keep up with what we've got and we have Federal money for some of them. It's a huge amount to keep them running, the satellite providers, the IT people, technicians, the people that think they know how to do Ops and don't. Frankly, it's fun, we need to do more.

**Col Hayes:** I think we're all anticipating in 2010 the Equestrian Games, is going to be a huge concentration of these assets. And I think that what we're all referring to is the spectrum saturation and doing some of the spectrum management ahead of time helping. You guys stay on UHF and we'll stay over here on VHF and by the way you 800 MHz guys that's fine, you just walk over all of us. I think that some of that exercise has already started, and some of these exercises are pulmonary to that where we can start identifying that. We can bring a repeater in and different places can do that to amplify our capabilities in the Horse Park and that's what we're doing in November, to say ok when we get people on the ground how do they work together?

**Rodney Murphy:** I think that's excellent. Do any of these TV Station Mobile units interfere with any of that stuff?

**Bob Stephens:** Yes

**Rodney Murphy:** So we should get those guys to play with us, to see the impact they'll have.

**Derek Nesselrode:** Something to think about, somebody for the games, a single coordination point.

**Rodney Murphy:** That would be an awful time to get embarrassed.

**Col Hayes:** An Interoperability Coordinator would be a good person to do that, but also a person who has good state management ability.

**Bob Stephens:** You have Federal agencies that are already on the ground. You only hear about it because I asked, they don't volunteer it. We already actually have FEMA and other agencies walking the ground over there, looking at what their coms are going to be. We haven't been invited to play in that arena yet, but we figure its law enforcement stuff that we don't have on our side as a need to know. But on the other side of the fence, there are those areas that we do want to play ourselves, but the guard and the State Police have things that are need to know only.

**Chuck Miller:** Any further discussion on that before we go on? Are there any other issues or concerns you would like me to add to this list?

**Rodney Murphy:** Yes, I'm sorry but in my previous role I was able to see some things that I felt like this committee would be interested in. One of the things that I've have been concerned about and there has been some discussion, I think there are a couple of programs represented in this room that could help us out, is the lack of understanding of local officials in knowing what these resources are or how to get them going, what to do in the event of an emergency and that sort of thing. Lonnie and I have had a number of conversations about this. I know Lonnie has programs that might be able to support some education in that area, I know Eastern Kentucky University has a RECP consortium that focuses on those types of things. I know that there has been other interest in trying to support out of Homeland Security, some training for local officials. I think it would be helpful if this group could sanction that sort of activity to try to get something going. Frankly every election we have a new person who walks in the office who doesn't know what to do if a tornado comes through their county, who to call, what resources are available to them, and that sort of thing. And I think Bob would agree with me, one of the most important lessons learned in disasters is that local response is a key to effective response and if you have local community decision makers who do not know where these resources are and who these contacts are, then I think that's a real missing point. I would like for us to consider in a future meeting, I think we need to consider some sort of program, launching a program, endorsing a program, suggesting a certification, of I don't know what, but something related to making sure our local Mayors, County Judges, possibly Sheriffs, Police Chiefs have some minimal training on emergency response capabilities, recourses that sort of thing that are available in the State. I'll just leave that as a comment and consideration and for future discussion by the board.

**Bob Stephens:** That exists. Emergency Management, after every election, conducts local official's training and that has been, in the past, part of that package. Certainly it would be beneficial for you all to understand maybe as a group what that training accrues. That training

does accrue; it goes on an online basis. Local officials in a major training are a major piece required out of the KRS 39 when there's an emergency declared.

**Drew Chandler:** It also covers resource management and emergency equipment list.

**Rodney Murphy:** In my experience unless someone tells me that I'm wrong and you guys know better than me, the county officials that I talked to don't seem to be aware of that

**Terry Lewis:** I have been through several tornados and things of that nature; do you know what's going to happen? At least on a local level, regardless on how much you train, local officials, Judges, Mayor, Counsel people, what they're going to do is walk up to you in the middle of all this as incident commander and say, "What do you need me to do?" It doesn't matter that twelve months ago I sat down with the guy and said here's what we've got, this is what we're capable of, that goes out the window. It's what do you need from me? I've told my local emergency manager is what he needs to do is take this piece of paper and have him a list and fold it up and put it in his back pocket, so the next time the brown stuff hits the fan and the county judges walks up and says what do you need, pull that piece of paper out and say this is what I need from you and your county magistrates, go take care of this and get the <....> out of my hair so I can deal with it. Honestly you can educate them and I don't disagree doing the education like what you talked about, or the county managers doing that stuff, but when it comes right down to it that's what they're going to do.

**Mary Pedersen:** I think we may be touching on a little bit of that, and I came late on the conversation with respect to a program our office is rolling out a prepared community program, and we're touching on that at a very high level. And Herb knows far better more on that, and we can share about that, but it's a community awareness program that covers a whole area of response with an associate tax break for the community once they become a certified prepared community.

**Terry Lewis:** I hate to say this too, but you have all the IS100, 200, 800, 800B and 900 and how ever the <....> else they want, all your county mayors and county magistrates are worried about is when is the garbage getting picked up, how we are going to clean the streets with snow, because these are the issues the general public is worried about. Nine times out of ten, if you go around and talk to some of the county people and the city people you're going to find out those elected officials have to sit through IS100, 400, 300 you want that question on line, it was some emergency official somewhere that did it for them or the secretary did it for them, they don't have the time to mess with that, I've got to deal with this zoning issue over here.

**Rodney Murphy:** Maybe it's a bad idea, that's why I brought it up here.

**Wayne Wright:** One way to get them, elected officials have to attend what use to be GOLD. They would go forty hours, and they get paid to attend. That might be the way to go, where they would have classes to get the hours.

**Bob Stephens:** Can I suggest that is outside the scope of the Committee, however, what is within the scope of this Committee is training on the communications side that all of us should be getting to operate and support our Government. When it comes to training, there are some things online, when it comes to communication, COM-L, COM-T these are NIMS certified courses. I am an encourager and supporter of NIMS based training for all of us, so we will know how to operate together. If I have to go help this man, I want to fall into his incident command and do what he needs me to do, not what I think he needs me to do. We have some funding issues that are involved, not sure how we're going to pay for the training. That's another question for Mary. We can't solve the local officials, but we do have an obligation to ourselves to make sure we are all good wireless communicators and support what we do. That's my remark on that.

**Col Hayes:** The following comment to that, the COM-L course traditionally is all outside of the Commonwealth and out of state travel is highly scrutinized. I think we should maybe look at adopting or sponsoring courses inside the Commonwealth, maybe in Frankfort or regionally where people come in and teach COM-L or COM-T classes to where we could maximize our participation and people who are trained at that level without having to invest a lot of money to Atlanta or Washington DC or Dallas, where ever the next COM-L course will be taught. More of a problem for state employees than it is for those of us in a federal uniform.

**Terry Lewis:** Along those same lines, and I think it was two weeks ago we were in Owensboro and we talked about the Mutual Aid thing, I think if we want to do something in the way of education, we should do it through the communications section. And we had that thought in here somewhere. There was a comment made about doing something like that, and if you want to direct it back to the public officials so that they understand the system that is being built and how that's going to enhance those of us out here where the rubber meets the road. So we can garner support from them to start getting the equipment we need, to take advantage of the infrastructure that's here.

**Rodney Murphy:** And that's sort of what I was talking about, maybe it's teach them how to get out of the way, maybe what they need to understand, this is what you need to expect your incident commander to do and here's what you need to do. A thought, something we could consider in the future.

**Wayne Wright:** Come to Woodford County November 16, and will find out.

There were no further comments so Chuck moved on to the next agenda item.

### ***2009 Goals (Recommendations)***

Chuck reminded the Committee that it was time to start thinking about 2009 KWIEC goals. He asked the members to think about them until the December meeting where it would be brought up as an item of discussion and possible adoption.

## **Open discussion**

---

Chuck indicated that the entire meeting seemed to be an open discussion, however, he opened the meeting to the visitor floor and asked if there were any issues that anyone present would like to discuss.

There were no additional comments so Chuck said that he would make a couple of announcements and then turn the meeting back over to Jim for adjournment.

## **Adjournment**

---

### ***Upcoming events, next KWIEC meeting***

Chuck mentioned that the next meeting would be on December 16<sup>th</sup>, and the following meeting would be on March 18<sup>th</sup>. The March meeting was to align dates with a visit from the Feds.

Mary mentioned that we are being good partners and since they offered us some technical assistance she felt that it would be a good idea to take them up on their offer.

Chuck asked any new members with questions to please stay after the meeting when he would be glad to answer any questions they might have about the KWIEC. He went on to thank Kathy Bartlett who prepared their packets for them.

Chuck thanked the members and turned the meeting back over to Chairman Barnhart for his remarks.

### ***Closing Remarks***

Chairman Barnhart thanked everyone for their time and reminded everyone that the next KWIEC meeting was scheduled for December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008. He also said that he would get the 700 MHz information to the Governor for his endorsement letter.

The Chairman asked for any further discussion or comments.

With nothing further, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded, a vote taken, and passed.

The meeting was adjourned.