



Minutes for the KWIEC meeting conducted on December 10, 2009

Opening Remarks & Roll Call.....	2
Old Business	2
Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes	2
Updates and Briefings.....	2
Chairperson’s Report	2
General information for the KWIEC:	2
KWIEC mandates:	3
KWIEC Goals for 2009:	4
Issues & Concerns:	4
Public Safety Working Group Update:	5
New Business.....	7
Digital Interoperability Standards for the Commonwealth.....	7
Interoperability Open Discussion and Questions & Answers.....	10
Other Business	19
Adjournment & Closing Remarks	20

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 indicated that she would be acting as proxy for Jim Barnhart and opened the meeting. She asked Chuck Miller to take roll.

Chuck called roll with the following members in attendance:

Lonnie Lawson, Michael Harris, and Danny Ball on the Conference Bridge; Janet Lile, Terry Stephens for Steve Rucker, Tony Downs - Proxy for Dan Mauer, Don Pendleton, Brad Bates, Robert Milligan, Ken Jorette, Bob Stephens - Proxy for Col. Hayes, Rodney Murphy, Wayne Wright, Mitch Mitchell, Joe Barrows

A quorum was met so Janet opened the meeting.

Old Business

Discussion/Approval of the last meeting minutes

Janet called for discussion or comments on the last meeting's minutes. There were none so she called for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded and 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:

- * 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) –**
 - a) As previously tasked the PSWG met to discuss final revisions for the 2009 year.
 - b) The state and federal required updates to the SCIP were made. It was sent out to the KWIEC members for review and comment.
 - c) All requested changes were made and we now simply require the group to approve its review and reposting.
 - d) Reminder – this is a living document and changes will continue throughout its life. We still need to complete and post the review.

Chuck asked if there were any final changes. Rodney Murphy had a couple points of clarification and a correction to a numbering sequence. Chuck thanked Rodney for the catch and indicated that he would make those corrections.

Janet said if there were no other corrections or issues to the content, she would like to have it voted on for acceptance. There were no other comments, so Janet called for a vote to accept the document with the clarifications indicated as reviewed with a posting date in Jan 2010. The vote was taken and unanimously approved.

- 2) **Report by Sep 15th - Annual Public Safety Report (APSR)**
 - a) As previously reported, this report was completed and turned in on time.
 - b) It has now been posted on the KWIEC website.
 - c) Chuck reminded the group that the report was coming around again and asked that the members of the KWIEC keep that in mind for goals and accomplishments.
- 3) **Evaluate Primary State and Local public Wireless safety voice and data**
 - a) The revised review process continues to work well.
 - b) Chuck has worked with the JAG Grants managers and we are receiving their applications now as well.
 - c) Keep in mind the Grants cycle is just around the corner.
- 4) **Develop a funding support plan to provide for the maintenance and Technical upgrades for the public safety shared infrastructure -**
 - a) The KWIEC Funding Initiatives Workgroup was created to address this mandate
 - b) Colonel Milligan as asked to introduce his members. He indicated that Col Brad Bates and Lonnie Lawson had agreed to join the group. Two other members were also asked to join but had not responded yet.

Colonel Milligan said that based on the recommendations for this work group, he saw their task as to just find and research grants. He asked for notice if anyone saw anything to let

him know. Lonnie Lawson had some information on some grants and said that he would send it over to Col Milligan.

Col Milligan told the group that Fish and Wildlife is into anything that the Coast Guard sends out such as Security and Infrastructure. He knows that there will be a lot of money available in 2010 with no match. There are limitations on it were it comes to water stuff. I know a number of agencies and local and county governments, especially along the Ohio river, where there is a significant amount of money out there. We will put those out too if anyone is interested.

KWIEC Goals for 2009:

1. **Merge the Architecture and Standards Working Group and the Public Safety Working Group and increase the PSWG responsibilities** – this is Complete.
2. **Charter an Infrastructure Funding Committee** – Col Milligan just completed the brief on this. Once staffed, we should consider this goal as complete.
3. **Complete the Eastern portion of the KEWS Digital upgrade project.** - There has been forward motion on the generators and civil work in the East.
4. **Identify immediate needs state level wireless communication projects which are unfunded.** – The PSWG met on this the other day, and we're going to ask the KWIEC to indorse a broadband policy, which Derrick will talk more about during his briefing. Other projects are being looked at by the PSWG and most of the members have been in touch with vendors (for research)

Issues & Concerns:

These are just a couple of the issues we are dealing with; a couple of these have been resolved.

1. There is still no way to remotely monitor the remote radios systems of the major networks for the State. - OPEN
2. Reinstate 911 Director Position, that letter did go up but no response. – I was told that Board and Commissions was working on seating Joe Barrows (*update – problems came up and I'm now working through the Legislative Liaison*).
3. Reappoint existing KWIEC members – Chuck was told that two members had been reappointed. For all others, Boards and Commissions was still working on it and asked members to continue to serve until told otherwise.
4. COML – Will be addressed by Derek.
5. 2010 Goals – We already have goal three, complete the Eastern portion of the KWIEC, and we have three others that we would like to recommend as well.

Chuck asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none so the floor was turned over to Derek to brief on the Public Safety Working Group.

Public Safety Working Group Update:

(Briefed by Derek Nesselrode)

Derek started by saying that the Public Safety Working Group has been working diligently to say the least. They have had monthly meetings and some special sessions to review the SCIP and some other initiatives we have been working on..

1) Evaluating technologies

We have been task on evaluating new technology, technical solutions and planning projects. To this point we have had a couple of meetings with vendors on broadband initiatives for public safety. We have requested those vendors provide us with outlines for pilot projects for those initiatives. Right now what we're waiting on now is for the technology to catch up with the ideas. They're not looking for public safety releases for some of this technology till the first quarter of next year, we're going to follow up with those particular vendors and see where that takes us.

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

This is a constant topic of our discussions. Part of that is the broadband data initiative that we just discussed, and eventually looking at voice systems as well.

3) Publish recommended minimum requirements for all radio systems

This is complete for 2009 and Jeff will give a briefing to follow. All the meetings that we have relate back to the SCIP; we utilize it for our guidelines for what we want to accomplish. We have been working with OEC and the Department of Homeland security to meet the goals and objectives of the National Emergency Communication Plan. Meeting these goals and objectives will assure that the state continues to receive Homeland Security dollars for communications and interoperability. That is the driving force behind everything we're doing so far.

4) Review the AEL for obvious misses to the minimum recommended standards

We are still developing this. We have a base for authorized equipment for portable and mobile radios for Homeland Security dollars. We want to focus on equipment standards and make sure that everyone is purchasing equipment that will be useful in the long term.

5) **Maintain an inventory of State radio assets**

Our CASM Account was created last month; we have a request for technical assistance for OEC to come in and set up the account, do some training and help us import data so we can manage all of our State assets. We decided to start with our state assets and move forward from there. We currently have an inventory of all of our emergency response equipment at the State level, thanks to Chief Barker, he helped put that together. We want a day to day inventory of equipment that we have available for emergency response. From that point we would like to move out at the local level, to see what's out there, that too is an initiative of OEC and DHS is to get an inventory of the local resources as well.

Janet Life: Question - Has it been determined if we are going to have to pay for this?

Derek Nesselrode: It's free. There is some is some discussion to changing some of it, now that everyone is on board they're starting to see other ways to use it or change it.

6) **Conduct an Annual review of State radio infrastructures**

This is what we did several months ago, we plan on keeping it updated as we put that out to CASM, I'm sure that will grow and become more useful in the office.

7) **PSWG Responsibilities**

- Recommend projects to the KWIEC –
 - The obvious one we have been working on that falls in line with the SCIP is the state level wireless broadband pilot project. We're kind of in a holding pattern and we're looking for recommendation on it from the vendors.
- Conduct an annual review of the SCIP and make recommendations for changes, and provide a report back to the KWIEC –
 - This is what we're doing today.
 - The additional changes that are coming are in alignment with the National Emergency Communications Plan for this upcoming year we have to report how we plan on meeting those goals, or at least the first goal. By the end of the year, before 2011 we have to demonstrate goal two. Goal one involves UASI Region in Louisville, showing their capabilities in response for planned events and responding to emergencies, goal two is actual our regional out-reach where we have to stand up regional bodies for interoperability and report their readiness for each and every count in the Commonwealth. This is quite a task in front of us; those changes will be reflected in the upcoming SCIP.
- Provide periodic briefings to the KWIEC as required –
 - Quarterly updates, as we are today.
 - Other informational briefings as requested.

Derek concluded by asking if there were any questions?

Ken Jorette: Is there still any talk about integrating CASM with the GIS system?

Derek: I don't know about intergrading it with our particular GIS, there is definitely a mapping component, a lot of discussion, as it stands now it is what it is. Their talking about a complete rewrite of the software, and their looking to the states input on what they would like to see in the software. The Map overlay that's on there now is very generic, it's meant for plotting potential links of interoperability. There's not a lot of other uses for that map layer, it plots resources, towers, etc., but I don't see a lot that couldn't that, Ill touch base with that in January.

Derek asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Janet asked if there was any other old business for the KWIEC and called for any questions or comments. Chuck mentioned that there was no informational briefing scheduled this time and asked members to send him an email for any informational briefing that the KWIEC would like provided to them. There were no other comments, so she moved the meeting to New Business.

New Business

Janet spoke to the visitor floor and said that the KWIEC was going to talk about Digital Interoperability Standards for the Commonwealth. She went on to say that she knew there are people that are interested in this, but that she would take comments from the visitor floor after the KWIEC briefing.

Janet asked Jeff Mitchell to present his briefing.

Digital Interoperability Standards for the Commonwealth

(Briefed by Jeff Mitchell)

Jeff started by saying that he was going to touch on some things that they've looked at in the grants review process. We'll address items going forward with the new round of grants, and tell you our approach on how we look at this process.

The Public Safety Workgroup is going to look into future of communications in the Commonwealth. We had the opportunity this year to go down to Homeland Security and sit in on their grants process; there was probably one hundred seventy five applications that went

through. Chuck was good enough to whittle them down for us, so the PSWG actually looked at forty one that had to do with the RF Public Infrastructure. Sixteen of those had to do with towers or something other than an RF radio. The twenty five that remain had to do with RF radios or RF networks or infrastructures. We saw things that said it was P25 radios (which was not) and called the vendors. We found out that there is a lot of misinformation floating around. What scared me the most was when some sheriff's office would submit a Kenwood, and in the same town a Police Department would send in a Motorola system. Folks are we not shooting ourselves in the foot?

We would like to have some kind of standards, when it comes to grant money we're going in the same direction, we're not putting in a bunch of silo systems. This is why we're doing this briefing today. There are some mandates coming from the FCC very soon, that's going to require the purchase of new RF equipment to meet these mandates, that's why we're coming to you now. With the grants cycle is coming up next year, we're proposing that the priority for the 2010 grant cycle be on Narrowbanding. The ones that were at the last KWIEC meeting in Somerset heard the discussion on narrow banding and how it works. The reason why we want to do that is that in 2011 there is going to be a cut off on Wideband licensing. New licensing has to be narrowband and all equipment either deployed or manufactured has to be narrowband. In January 2013 you have to be operating on a narrow band frequency. In 2013, if you are not in narrow band licensing it's our understanding that your license will be cancelled.

Someone asked at the Somerset meeting how much fine money are you talking about for noncompliance. To throw out an example- Shelby County has twenty eight frequencies listed, thousands of dollars per frequencies total over \$196,000 a week in fines. Marshall County out west is over a half million a week. This why we're saying for this next couple of grant cycles Narrowbanding should be one of our priorities for federal grant money.

Failing to do this means possible large fines and possibility of loss of function of Radio. You could have people talking over (interfering) each other if we don't get Narrowband. We have to look at the leg work we have to do. Consider the relicensing, the logistics of getting out and reprogramming radios, and possibly upgrading the infrastructure.

Of course we're going to see a great deal of requests for money to purchase new radio systems, because some of these are not going to be able to be upgraded to be narrowband. I don't know what that number is but out of all the radios in the state there are going to be some systems that we cannot upgrade.

When we discuss this stuff, one of the things we think about as the Public Safety Working Group, is how we need to approach this. All the task that you all give us and the things we look at, we try to look at it for a vision for the future, we try to take an enterprise approach, (and ask) what's good for the Commonwealth? We all have our niches, we all want our counties to get everything they can, but we back up and ask what's best for the Commonwealth? What do we need to do to leverage what we have in a time of emergency? What do we have something here we can take to Marion County or Marshall County or whatever in a time they need. What is the task and obligations that the KWIEC members have? And try to make the tuff decisions.

This is what the PWSG would like to request of the KWIEC:

We would like the KWIEC to endorse the same standards that the Office of Emergency Communications 2010 Guidance Program states - that is, all new digital radios need to comply with the P25 standard.

This is a little different than what was debated two years ago, two years ago it was discussed as having a state wide P25 standard which a lot of people looked at that and said you telling me the only thing I can buy is a P25 radio; that's not going to work. In these times that's not going to work. People don't have the money.

Right now the radios have dropped drastically in price than what they were two years ago. What we're saying the bottom line is I if you're using State or Federal grant money, you need to follow a P25 standard. That is also what is listed in the new 2010 Office of Emergency Communications Guidance for Federal Grant Program. It says the same thing. I'm not going to a county and say this is what you need to spend your money on; we don't have the authority. There is no way in this world I would do that. But what we do want to say is if you're going to take Federal Grant money we need to follow what the OEC set out as being the P25 standard to purchase with that money.

The definition of a P25 is not that is upgradable. It comes out of the box ready for P25. We don't have to add any hardware, firmware or anything else. When it comes out, it's P25 ready. The last discussion two years ago and rightfully so was based a lot on money, and at that time there was a drastic difference. I don't remember so I'm going to throw out a wild number, it might have been a thousand dollars for a non P25 and five thousand dollars for a P25 radio, it was that drastic if you remember two years ago. Times have changed and these amounts (on the PowerPoint slide) have come from a local vendor off the statewide contract. Yes a P25 device is still more but they have dropped a lot in the last eighteen months. I honestly believe as more States move toward this standard they will drop even further. So we don't even see this much of a disparity, from where we started we've come a long way.

So like I say, basically we're asking the KWIEC to consider endorsing the standard listed by the OEC if you're using Federal Funds to follow a P25 Standard. If we don't, if you don't this *(picture of a vehicle with two dozen radios or more)* is going to be our future command vehicle

Jeff asked if there were any questions or comments.

Interoperability Open Discussion and Questions & Answers

Col. Milligan: When I retired from the Kentucky State Police, it was my understanding that the P25 standard was becoming common place, but have read that it's not that big of deal now.

Derek Nesselrode: According to the Federal Government their endorsing it for this next round of grants. According to DHS that's the way we're going to go if we're going to spend Homeland Security dollars. If you going to go digital, it must be P25 compliant.

Col. Milligan: How does this fit in with Narrowbanding?

Derek Nesselrode: You don't have to be digital to be narrowband. That's a huge misconception. Narrowbanding does not have to be digital, you can have an analog system and be narrowband.

Bob Stephens: You could elect to replace every radio. There is no requirement that it be digital, or P25. It is simply saying if you are a jurisdiction that is going to go digital we recommend you go P25. If you are NEXEDGE, our opinion is you can buy more NEXEDGE stuff.

Wayne Wright: But you can apply for the grants, I think that is wrong. You basically holding my feet to the fire, I think we need to have it where it's upgradable.

Jeff Mitchell: It's the Federal Government that is saying this if you use their money.

Wayne Wright: The Federal Government is saying by 2013 I'm not in compliance therefore I can't talk on the radio system, I don't think it's an obtainable goal for them, they can say it if they want to, but is it realistic? No, not with the way funding is going right now; people getting laid off. There is no way; we don't have the money to do it. I can see up there on the screen where you're talking about what it's going to cost to go upgradable, Motorola is going to cost \$95 per, I don't have that in my budget, it's just not obtainable.

Bob Stephens: We just got this new document today and the guidance states if you are already a system, then you are authorized to apply for a grant and buy more stuff. You can buy more NEXEDGE stuff, it doesn't say, (and I'm picking on Woodford, because you're a really good example of a small town) there is nothing in this standard that says you have to go P25.

Wayne Wright: We made sure when we bought our stuff if we wanted to upgrade we could. But I know there are a lot of departments that can't.

Bob Stephens: The next step doesn't require anyone to go digital. There is no requirement for anyone to go P25 unless they're going on a recommendation standpoint unless they go digital. There is no requirement for any jurisdiction to go buy a Motorola P25 radio. If you want digital, start from scratch, Fayette County, they're taking about wanting to upgrade their existing system, police department, if they go digital we are recommending that it be a P25 upgrade.

Drew Chandler: If they want to use federal grant money it needs to be P25.

Rodney Murphy: Bob you're saying if they want to upgrade their existing system with a new digital system it should be P25. You all are not proposing that we do anything more restrictive than what the Federal Regulations say.

Bob Stephens: That is correct.

Jeff Mitchell: Somewhere we need to draw a line, have a vision for the future.

Rodney Murphy: Seems like the more pressing issue is the Narrowbanding issue. Does the P25 standard insure that you will be compliant to the narrow banding issue?

Bob Stephens: Yes.

Rodney Murphy: Are there other ways?

Bob Stephens: Yes, analog or P25.

Rodney Murphy: You had said Motorola verses Kenwood, are we still in the place where you can't have a Dell PC talking to as HP PC? Are we still at that point?

Bob Stephens: Worse.

Jeff Mitchell: That is why we're looking to P25, it's not vendor specific.

Drew Chandler: It's not a catch all... Not to pick on Motorola but you can buy a P25 Motorola and add a feature to it and that now makes it a proprietary P25.

Bob Stephens: As State Police and Military Affairs we all have the same features, we're VHF and you're (State Police) UHF. Works well.

Rodney Murphy: Is that the nature of all P25 systems?

Bob Stephens: Two radios don't have vote-scan, it can scan, but it doesn't scan the same way. We have jurisdictions that use Kenwood, we have jurisdictions on our system that use E. F. Johnson and we have some Vertex too, we have some that work on our digital P25 system. I'm thinking about getting a NEXEDGE radio for my Mobile Command Vehicle, because there's a lot of that that has been approved and going in. But Public Safety Nationwide has drawn a line. That's what SAFECOM has done making this recommendation, we just got this today, we were willing to get our nose bloody before this came out, but this has taken some heat off us making the recommendation. Five years from now everything is going to look like a silo, RF and RF Data converging quickly. None-the-less we still suggest, even if the KWIEC doesn't support this recommendation, most likely Office of Homeland Security will have to follow it whether we support it or not.

Rodney Murphy: In my understanding KWIEC doesn't have the authority to establish this as a requirement for locals but OHS has the ability to adopt our standards and any others as theirs, even if we don't vote this in OHS can do it.

Bob Stephen: I think it will affect funding weather we support it or not. It is also our opinion, our State Interoperability Committee have a place to discuss this. We are presenting a controversial topic to this group and we have to do it. It's unpopular any way you go, an issue.

Col Milligan: We have the Kenwood, we don't have the vote-scan, and I'm hoping the Federal government is working from the back end. Are the manufactures all on the same page on what their putting out? That's the issue there what are they making?

Jeff Mitchell: I'm going to say this and you correct me, every manufacture to my knowledge makes a P25 radio. Is that a true statement anybody?

Bob Stephens: Pretty much, if they don't it's not the mainstream stuff we run into.

Jeff Mitchell: I think the majority of what we have in the Commonwealth will fall under Motorola or Kenwood.

Bob Stephens: I think those two have the biggest market share.

Col Milligan: I believe years ago that the goal was that this state be interoperable and that just hasn't happened. Everybody has developed what they want. And this committee doesn't have any teeth in it. With the Narrowband mandate and the funding mandate is going to make folks do

what has been talked about for fifteen years. Kentucky is not the only state that is having these problems. KWIEC should use their influence to say to Homeland security, look here is some issues we need to look at, people can't afford to do these upgrades and say from this point on you're not going to get any money. There has to be some balancing here with these jurisdictions that have done other things, and now we're mandating them to now come on into the fold.

Bob Stephens: No Sir, let me restate, if they want more money to add NEXEDGE Stuff, this document doesn't prohibit that, it simply says they can do that.

Wayne Wright: Prime example... To get NEXEDGE, when we applied for our grant, it was a digital standard, that is what we went with, all services in Woodford County went digital, through a grant. For that grant, we all went that way.. So now it's like I ordered a Cadillac but I got a Chevette. So that's what your telling me now across this table and that's hard to swallow. When we sat down here a year ago and talked about P25 and what our group said we're going to lift it, it's not mandated that we have to use it, we're going lift it. So people moved forward with the purchase of radios, because we did gave some breathing room. But now we're saying you did spend your money but you didn't spend it wisely.

Derek Nesselrode:: If you recall the last standard was P25 upgradable, which has no teeth what so ever. P25 upgradable - I could take any radio and call it P25 upgradable, but they require more than firmware, they require a new board or something major done to them to make them P25 upgradeable. So a lot of this stuff we we're providing anyway was standard analog or something to that effect, a lot of it wasn't P25, because of the cost.

Wayne Wright: If we say it has to be upgradable, and if that radio comes back and says it is now in compliance, who are we to say it is or not? If I come back and say my radio is now compliant who are we to say the radio is not to standard. If I send it to a shop and say upgrade the radio to P25 and the radio shop sends it back and say ok we have put in new circuit boards or whatever you want to put in there and say now it's compliant. Who are we to say sorry you didn't make it. Do you follow me? If I take this radio and say I want it P25 compliant, the shop sends it back to me and tells me ok now you meet the P25 standard, how do we approve or disapprove? How do I know if I am or if I'm not?

Bob Stephens: First of all the twelve page document defines.

Wayne Wright: It's too late then.

Bob Stephens: That's the way we do it, and yes you're right.

Janet Lile: I see hands from non KWIEC member do we want to open the floor?

Bob Stephens: One more thing, the document we got today is driven from forces way outside the Commonwealth. You and I are a lot closer to agreement than you can ever imagine. I have some Kenwood radios and some Motorola, I have some Macom, and the guard has a lot of E. F. Johnson's. What is driving P25, and what has been is the multitude of Trunked Radio systems in the big cities. Trunk Systems were the first one that our entire vendor buddy went out and created systems for. So in reality the big picture, 911, those folks were all using Trunked systems, 800Mhz systems primarily and they couldn't talk. Now you go to Kentucky, unless we

get another initiative to put in a statewide Trunk System, where we all become client to a state wide system, that is in fact interoperable vertically horizontally, I think I will be retired and I don't see that accruing. We're going to a voice and data doing this thing. It is decision weather if we support it or not, it might not be as import here as New York or in a place where this document is driving people buying stuff to be a part of a big system, very important to them, maybe not as important to us. The real engine was the requirement was to get these trunks systems to talk, therefore the P25 standard.

Jeff Mitchell: As you read this document that's where you see talk about the National Emergency Communication.

Janet Lile: What would be the impact if this Committee took no action, knowing that there is no funding?

Bob Stephens: My personal Opinion, I think our OHS who owns the SAA, is going to have more difficulty trying to sort our grants, because their guidance is coming from SAFECOM and here.

Rodney Murphy: Going back in history 1974, when the tornado was going through the state, Governor Carol, I believe it was, couldn't make a phone call and as a result he said build me a system that allows communication in a situation like this, we have KEWS as a result of that. As with 911, we had all these problems with our emergency responders not being able to talk to one another, Treasury and the folks at the Feds got together and created something at the national level, we became a part of that, and from that we generated this committee to try to help Kentucky to move forward toward interoperability. We have a tendency sometimes to get caught up in P25 standards, all the technical talks, vendor issues and all those other things, but the points is what we want to do is have folks responding to disasters being able to talk to one another. As a personal comment I don't care if it Kenwood, Motorola, P25 or anything else, the point is have we gotten closer to the goal then a few years ago? I think yes, we have Mutual Aid capability's across the state, we have the statewide data network, we have KYWINS, we have made good progress, except in the terms of a voice radio is what I'm hearing. What I'm saying is we have the responsibly to take some action that action, that action to me is to establish standards for public safety communications. The law requires us to approve state level applications for new systems, not upgrades, and it provides us the ability to comment, I don't think it says approve for local jurisdictions. The Homeland Security in partnership with us has decided with us that they would put our recommended standards in their grant criteria, which I think is major step forward. We decided we couldn't afford it. We had an 800mhz state wide process that we tried to get funded and it didn't get passed. So we decided that instead of a fork lift project we were going to evolve interoperability. I think it's important that we address this issue. I'm still iffy about the upgradable P25 verses P25. I can tell you my strong opinion about two and a half years ago we we're not ready to establish P25; it was a unfunded mandate that counties and locals could not afford. It seems to me like were closer now, the question I see, if we're going to spend money on new systems should it be on a standard that will gets on interoperability. If you all are telling me that P25, as your pulsing will give us true interoperability on new systems I would have to think

I would vote for adopting that standard, if it will not it's only going to cost these guys more money or restrict them from increasing their capacity then I would not be for this standard.

Jeff Mitchell: I'm speaking for the group, if this group didn't believe that an open architecture standard, like P25, none of us would be here bringing this to the table.

Rodney Murphy: I'm asking the group not to turn our back on this.

Janet Lile: I think we need a motion to continue the discussion.

Bob Stephens: I think the people will want us to continue to discuss this.

Rodney Murphy: How about, Federal Mandate.

Chuck Miller: They're saying if you use our money we want you to use it on P25 radios, it not unfunded.

Bob Stephens: Guidelines? They use language such as, if you want to use something different, you're a NEXEDGE guy, and you make a case for your NEXEDGE system the language says they will not approve it.

Chuck Miller: May I read the Language? You have seen the part Jeff had on the Power Point concerning if you get new radio systems it must be P25. Its goes on to say, this guidance does not preclude funding for non P25 equipment when there are compelling reasons for using other solutions. Funding request by agency's to replace or add radio equipment to a non P25 system "such as procuring new portables for an existing analog system" will be considered if there is an explanation for how such equipment will improve interoperability or support eventual migration to interoperable systems. Absent these compelling reasons P25 equipment will be required for LMR systems, to which the standards apply.

You have to Justify, Wayne Wright is talking about the NEXEDGE system that he has deployed, from what I read, you could continue buying those as long as there is an eventual upgrade path toward to interoperability.

Wayne Wright: There again, I can still buy if as long as it's upgradable. We're right back to where is says P25 upgradable. I can keep buying my radios as long as I go in an upgradable fashion. Then why not have upgradable in there?

I started in 1985, in 1989 or 1990 we went to the KLEEN system, anyone remember that, who talked on it, zero, who used it, zero, some used it as a talk around channel. We get a lot of standards handed to us telling us we have to make these changes, nothing happens. I just hate to see us spend money, and make people spend money, if it's going to change again.

Chuck Miller: You're not required to spend money. With your local funding you can buy what you want.

Wayne Wright: Only if I move forward with grant money, we are very fortunate that we got a great grant to get our emergency service new equipment, we had bad radios before.

Chuck Miller: Your NEXEDGE system is P25 firmware upgradable. You could actually move toward an eventfully P25 by doing that firm ware.

Derek Nesselrode: I don't think it says they have to do that, it say that they have to move towards interoperable solutions.

Chuck Miller: I guess where I was going with this is if they do decide to ask for grant funding, they could ask for grant funding to reprogram those radios to P25.

Derek Nesselrode: Or buy more portables for the system that exists, just like the ones they have.

Chuck Miller: If there is a compelling reason.

Derek Nesselrode: The compelling reason is P25 radio won't work on their system, so they can continue to apply for additional funds, the compelling reason to me is we just bought a NEXEDGE system, we don't have P25. As long as they are progressing toward interoperability.

Wayne Wright: Let me ask you this, what makes P25 more valuable than the NEXEDGE digital that we're using?

Rodney Murphy: If you were the foot print in Woodford County, if were P25, it would allow someone in Shelby County who has a P25 radio on the same frequency, would allow them to roll into Woodford County and talk, and they would not be able to do that today if they had a P25 compliant system.

Wayne Wright: We just had our large exercise in Midway. Was our NEXEDGE Available, I wasn't there.

Drew Chandler: I was there, and NEXEDGE worked fine. Woodford County, when they did their upgrade, had the wisdom to leave up a voting analog system, and it is now used as a county wide Mutual Aid channel.

Bob Stephens: We had to use analog to make it work, instead of digital. He had the capability on the Next Edge radio to go to a different channel, to analog. What that did was allow for Mutual Aid in our State of Kentucky channel. On my Motorola, we did the same thing; we went from P25 to analog, one channel. That is the long term, short term plan in Kentucky. You asked the question what is this doing for interoperability? What this is doing for interoperability in Kentucky right now is this KSP deployment of VHF, VHF Repeaters that are analog, this is really what is going to give us statewide interoperability, none of these systems, NEXEDGE, the P25 actually give us interoperability in their native state, except by talking to an analog system.

Rodney Murphy: Can we open the floor to our guest.

Janet Lile opened the floor to visitor comments.

/-Open comments from the Floor-/

Brad Camp (with Kenwood): I would never sit here and tell you what you should do; I just have a few points for clarification and to ponder. We need to understand the difference in narrow banding and P25 and NEXEDGE. P25, Next Edge, LTD, Trunking, Passport... Those are protocols that have nothing to do with how much of the spectrum is taken. When we talk about narrow banding, we're talking about how much of that air space you occupy. The FCC wants to basically create a smaller doorway. No one is making wide band protocols these days.

Steve Tracy - Woodford County: I installed the NEXEDGE system. It works very well; it talks to the state when it needs to. As we get in to this document on the mandate I'm having fewer problems with it as we go through this discussion. Woodford County can still get grant money to finish it, to upgrade to P25 later on.

Derek Nesselrode: I think standing up these state regional government groups have really helped with making contact with the locals and communications. I'm looking at setting up regional interoperability plan so we all know what's going on. We just want to make sure we're communication.

Jeff Mitchell: Coming up at the first of the year is when we want to start going out, Homeland Security will go out talking to people about the grants program, we want them to be informed before the grant cycle started.

Steve Tracey: Woodford County applied to the grants and we didn't get near the money we had to have. We were able to put a plan together, we are all able to talk, and we're where we need to be. If we have to be narrowband next week, we can meet that goal.

Keith Coralline with Motorola: The Project 25 Standard was developed by the user community, not by the vendors, for interoperability. How useable is it today, is was adopted in 1995 and going for 14 years, currently there are seventeen states that are either operating on, or have plans to go forward with that. We see that about ninety percent of the RFPs are for Project 25 compliance, so it is a standard that is very proactive. It does move forward with technology, there was a phase one, phase two; there will be a phase three. The last thing, it was mentioned if you had to turn your radio in and get it upgraded, who would say it was really a P25 radio. As part of the standards there is something called a Compliance Assessment Program (CAP plan), that is certified labs, different manufactures, Motorola has one, Harris has one, EF Johnson, Kenwood is going to have one, where you can send the radio and they will actually verify that is a P25 radio.

Kenwood Rep: The only thing I would like you all to understand about P25 is yes, the price of the radios has come down, but the price of the repeaters has not. If you choose that technology you will have to appropriate more dollars to build that infrastructure in P25. As long as you understand that the average P25 repeater is fourteen to fifteen thousand dollars as oppose to a thirty five hundred dollar non P25 repeater that Motorola carries, Kenwood has a NEXEDGE repeater that list for twenty two hundred dollars state price contract. It has a lot to do with company philosophy, that's why Kenwood developed NEXEDGE so it would be P25 upgradable. One thing about interoperability, there is a huge case nationally, one thing we have to realize is it seventy percent of the state of Kentucky is on VHF and thirty percent is on UHF, as long as those two bands are in use then the bottom line is there will not be interoperability without the use of gateways. The gateways are in use in Kentucky as they are in most every other state. The gateways are huge in achieving true interoperability in a true disaster situation. Along with Radios for emergency deployment that as I understand are part of your committees plan to implement. The vote scan was not a part of it, so when were approached to implement it in our product we said no we won't do it, they consider our radio to be the most P25 compliant, we go right down the list, doing anything other than that would cause the radio not be compliant. As long as it's held true that these non compliant features are not implemented than I think you would achieve true P25 interoperability within that bandwidth.

Janet Lile: Are there other question that the vendor community might be able to answerer for us? Do you make a motion that we table this discussion?

/- MOTION -/

Col Milligan: I make a motion that we draft a statement from this committee to Home Land Security on how we are to deal with the funding; I don't feel comfortable on giving any clear direction right now.

Derek Nesselrode: Homeland Security has their recommendation here, a recommendation of support from us.

Don Pendleton: A little clarification on this... We walked away from P25 as a requirement several years ago as a committee. As I remember, because of a lot of project couldn't move forward due to the funding issues. I remember we saw many projects move forward at that one time. Chuck was sending us volume of projects to review and I was under the impression that it did take a KWIEC approval at the local level and not for just review. A lot of us spent a lot of time on that. My concern is having spent twenty seven plus years with State Police, and being involved in their upgrade a few years ago. This is a once in a generation thing for an agency. Sherriff Wright has said very well; there is nowhere to go right now. A lot of the folks around the Commonwealth that worked on communications systems know there's nowhere to go anywhere soon. I think we did those folks a disservice by walking away from it originally, thinking it was the right thing to do. I think we table it and try to figure out what is it. This body needs to help advance those things as opposed to making it compliance. I understand Homeland Security can change the rules, which is kind of what they did, as I recall our KY Homeland Security seconding the abandoning P25. We are sending mixed signals across the state and that is my concern.

Derek Nesselrode: That was addressed in this document that the OEC admittedly said that they were wishy-washy at best on requirements in years past. They alluded to the fact that you should go P25, but they never came out and said P25 is the way to go. This document here has a lot more teeth, in the fact that is talks about standard for VoIP, it talks about standards for land/mobile radio, it talks about spending money on specific training, it talks about this is what you should do with your funding, it's very specific. It's refreshing to see this document compared to years passed.

Don Pendleton: From my personal perspective having lived in Woodford County, knowing Steve Tracy, hearing Steve say that, I feel better.

Steve Tracey: I think most of it has to do with the agency getting along, we had our meetings, we had our plans, and this is what we agreed to do, try to stick with it. The digital had some getting used to, Kenwood kept coming out with upgrades, and it's made them sound much better with the last couple of upgrade that they did. Our people are now happy. Day one - it was sad, they were not happy with me, but Kenwood came to my recue.

Bob Stephens: With regard to Homeland Security first effort of standardization which was the grant process, they said everything had to be P25. It didn't matter what kind of radio. I recall that

Homeland Security thought that every radio we bought should be P25. Because of our collected education level about what it was we were trying to do, what they saw P25 was something that we all should do, not really understanding what was going on. This new proposal makes the distinction quite clearly that we are talking about anyone that wishes to do a digital standard that we are recommending P25. The distinction is all the radios should fit. Having got to sit on the review committee we observed jurisdictions, progressive jurisdictions, the progressive jurisdictions and they are the ones that the sheriff talk to the Emergency Management Director, the Emergency Management Director talked to the Fire chief and they had a good solid line of communications. We also observed regions. We actually had counties going together to put in systems. I saw counties doing NEXEDGE, regions doing NEXEDGE and I saw counties and regions doing P25 Motorola; we saw both. We had people who wanted to go P25 and they did, their grants were reviewed favorably. We review favorably for NEXEDGE systems; we did both without any preconceived notion. We are at the point with this Federal guidance; we are narrowly defining where we want to go if you want to start from scratch. I don't know anyone who will be starting from scratch. We think it is defined not to exclude anyone.

Janet Lile: I have heard several people express they would like more information about it. Chuck can we get a copy of the OEC document to everyone?

Chuck Miller I can get that out.

Rodney Murphy: When does the Homeland Security Grant Cycle start, March?

Chuck Miller: Yes, The next scheduled KWIEC meeting will be in March which will be too late.

/-Motion-/

Janet Lile: I will make a motion to call a meeting in January.

Joe Barrows: Second,. I would like to make a comment on the motion. I think this is a wise decision to continue the discussion. From what I have heard, it may not be as far apart as the earlier parts of the discussion, I feel what is needed is for someone to put it down in black and white to what the motion might ultimately be, to then get clarification and something voted on before the grant cycle. And getting down to the people down in the trenches, do the people filling out the grant application really understand what has taken place here?

Col. Milligan: The legislators convene in January; maybe push it to early February.

Joe Barrows: I think we need someone who will take the initiative to get something out to everybody that talks about the kind of motion that you want, I don't know who would do that.

Chuck Miller: That would be me, I will send something out.

Joe Barrows: I don't know off the top of my head how soon the Homeland Security Grant applications or requirements go out, seem like we want to have some decision before that. The sad thing is that when you have review thousands of grants before from Homeland Security, all I hear from Tom Preston is there is no more money anywhere, but we shouldn't use that as a reason not to address the issues.

Bob Stephens: I'm speaking for the Public Safety Working Group, I think an executive summary, this thing is only twelve pages, my boss fussed at me before I came here saying "you need to do an executive summary, because no one is going to understand it".

Rodney Murphy: I would like to suggest you do a few case examples, that says here's an action that would not be subject to this description, here's an example that would be. I think that would make it clearer for everyone to understand you're not trying to restrict them from keeping communication slots. What we're saying if you spend a new dollar on communications, you have to spend it on something you can use in the future.

Bob Stephens: I'm getting to go to a SAFECOM meeting on Monday; I think this will show up now that this has been published. What concerns me I know how emotional this can be with a group of professional that we have in this room, much less our customer, our county officials our agencies thinking that we are trying to pull something, I do not want that to happen. I want to people we support thinking that we're doing the right thing for them.

Chuck Miller: Was the decision to have the meeting in late January or early February?

Rodney Murphy: Move toward the second week of February.

Janet Lile: All in favor to have the meeting the second week of February say aye; opposed.

Janet Lile: Motion carries. Chuck if you'll get that out. We have had some real good discussion today; I believe we have been brought closer together today. Is there any other business to discuss?

Other Business

Chuck showed the members his recommended goals but said that he would speak with the PSWG first and then send them out via email when final recommendations were made. The anticipated recommended goals for 2010 are:

- (1) Endorse a Public Safety Communications standard for digital voice in the Commonwealth.
- (2) Push for a broadband pilot project.
- (3) Complete the KEWS Eastern phase.
- (4) Educate Public Safety Agencies on the FCC narrow banding mandate.

Derek mentioned that he was going to dedicate some web space and put some educational links on the KWIEC website. He was also looking into doing some educational videos and some other interactive stuff on-line to send out to different public safety agencies with pointers back to the web site. We have a lot of resources in the PSWG to provide these services at zero dollars.

Chuck said that he would send the final recommended goals out to the KWIEC for your comments, and we'll hopefully vote on them at the next quarterly KWIEC meeting.

Adjournment & Closing Remarks

Janet asked if there were any other upcoming events or any further discussion. The follow-up Interoperability discussion and meeting will be scheduled and invites sent out by Chuck.

With no further discussion, a motion, second, and vote adjourned the meeting.