

The Meeting of the Utah Communications Authority's PSAP Advisory Committee
Thursday, November 30th 2020 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Location: Telephone Conference Bridge

Meeting Minutes

1. WELCOME

Meeting was started by Chairman Justin Grenier

2. ROLL CALL

Shelley Peterson-Absent
Justin Grenier-Present
Neil Johnson-Present
Karl Kuehn-Absent
Beth Todd-Present
Jack Walkenhorst-Present
Alicia Gleave-Present
Kevin Rose-Present
Travis Trotta-Present

Public Safety Advisory Committee Members Present

Jim Miguel
Rob Nelson
Tom Ross
Mike Mathieu
Mike Rapich

3. INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW

Justin: The fleet map presentation that was presented at the UCA stakeholders meeting will be played. After that we will go over three different configurations to show what it is currently and what it would look like under the suggested fleet map.

4. UCA FLEETMAP PRESENTATION – JAMES BAKER UCA

UCA played a recording of the fleet map presentation that was done at the UCA Annual Stakeholder's meeting on November 18th 2020.

James Baker: Most agencies already operate under the generic channel naming. This would make things consistent throughout the state.

Jim Miguel: Were the concerns that were raised after the summit, were they more about product or process? I understood that Justin wanted to make sure that everyone had a chance to see this and understand it

Justin: Yes, it is important that we support this in an educated fashion. I was hoping that James could show the three loads and show what would be different. Could you show the Washington County load and show what would be different?

James: I don't have any actual templates to show. The value is to encourage a uniformity across the state. The only things that will be different will be the names of the talkgroups and quantity of talkgroups.

Justin displayed the current template for Washington County.

James: There are a couple of changes with option B. The channel names wouldn't be specific to a jurisdiction. Car to car talkgroups can remain the same. It appears you operate under option B already.

Justin: Are we allowed to have our ops channel in zone 2?

James: There is value to uniformity. Your template is not uniform. I would encourage that the interoperable talkgroups should be consistent statewide.

Justin: James, what about Davis County. Can you show how option B would impact them?

Karl: With multiple PSAPs in the county, how would those builds set up? Would all agency share Law channels?

James: That is correct. I don't have a perfect world scenario to pull up a template. I would rather generalize that focus on one agency. You would work with UCA to determine how many law talkgroups you would need. It would be one Davis County uniform template. Does that answer your question?

Tom Ross: Sounds like Davis County would need to sit down together with UCA to determine what we need and then that would be the template.

James: That would be accurate.

Tom Ross: Sounds like right now you need a vote on which option to go forward with and then at a later time we would work out the detail.

James: We would need to figure out what needs and wants are.

Andy Smith: There was discussion about local talkgroups not dragging traffic, they would be cut off when they moved into a different area, is that correct?

James: That is correct. In order to support roaming statewide, we would need all users to be phase 2 to have the capacity. With option B, you would be able to communicate within your community and in adjacent communities. You could use a regional talkgroup to talk within the region or an Event channel to use statewide.

Andy Smith: How will this affect safety as responders roam.

James: Questions like this should be sent to the email so we can identify what your need is.

Justin: Karl has got a bad connect and asked me to ask about the LZ channels.

James: I do not have a direct answer at this moment. We need to get with the medivac companies to see what their needs are. LZ-1 and LZ-2 are necessary. I haven't had a coordinated effort with the helicopter companies and fire departments.

Alicia: So we're mostly talking about the theory of how the system will be set up?

James: Yes, in the future.

Alicia: When we set up our templates there will be open discussion with those affected?

James: This is an opportunity to understand options A and option B. In your case, you are rather consolidated as you are which means you would have uniform talkgroups for the agency you serve. Are your agencies able to make it more specific later on? We would need to see what their issues are.

Kevin: Are we just voting for the general concept of the fleet map? And then there would be a deeper discussion with each county as their templates are being developed?

James: That is accurate

Quin: I think there may be some confusion about what is going on. The idea is that there will be an opportunity for people to weigh in questions, comments, and concerns. fleetmapcomments@uca911.org. If you have specific questions, send them to that email. We will be able to take all the comments and present them to the UCA board. There is another email at fleetmapvote@uca911.org where we are looking for votes for which options to choose. Our vision is to present these two ideas and make sure everyone has a chance to be heard and presented to the UCA board. Once it's decided, when we get to putting the meat on the bones there will have to be conversations with the counties. The details will have to be ironed out individually. What you are voting on now is the overall structure.

Mike Mathieu: You mentioned that this promotes intra and inter operability. Within Weber County we share talkgroups and we interoperate very well. Does Option B give us better opportunities to interoperate? Is it just as good or is it better? Does this enhance or simplify this?

James: There are three layers, right now if you want to communicate with another agency within your county, you need to go to a region talkgroup or call UCA and add their talkgroup to your radio. This gives an extra layer of interoperability with a set of county interoperable talkgroups. The next

layer, is with Ops channels, and then statewide event talkgroups. Uniformity is important for interoperability.

Bryan Low: Up until now, the agencies have the ability to customize their first and second zones. Will that go away?

James: It wouldn't go away. There may be talkgroups you have that you wouldn't if they are outside your doughnut. You would use a wide-area talkgroup. If you have a SLC law talkgroup in your radio it wouldn't work because it would not be in your "doughnut". Right now, there are only 16 statewide talkgroups. This gives us an opportunity to add more.

Bryan Law: I am just referring to the day-to-day channels. I just want to make sure that nothing will prevent them from putting them where they want them.

James: Certainly. Sending an email would be a great place to send that. I would encourage it is uniform across your county.

Tom Ross: As I've listened to the presentation, to me this doesn't really sound like it should be a voting thing. It is driven by two things. We have a statewide radio system. If I'm educated to know that I can't keep doing what I'm doing today going into the future.

Dave Edmunds: That is really well said. Our board is sensitive to what our users want to see. This is an opportunity to give us feedback. Ultimately this decision will be made by our board. It's pretty clear what is best for the system. Option B is universally seen as the best option.

Justin: Are there any other questions?

Quin: Someone send me a text asking for clarification on the voting. We are looking for any sheriff, police chief, fire chief, commissioners, executive directors, head of a PSAP, and the chairs of UCA committees. There are a large number of votes.

5. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Was done in agenda item 4

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Justin: Any public comments?

Scott Ruff: If a fire agency wants a talkground are they going to be on the backside of the talkgroups.

James: That will be specific to the agency. That would be introduced within the first two zones.

Justin: I think the choice is clear.

Mike Rapich: It seems that it is an obvious decision. One of the great features of the system is the statewide coverage. It sounds like with Option B, you would be restricted to your area. Is there any option to create a specific zone or channel that would give you the ability to connect with a frequency across the state?

James: It's critical to understand the problem with dragging traffic across the state. You create a situation where you could be restricting a responder from being able to talk on the system. You have an option to purchase an application where you would have access to all the talkgroups statewide that wouldn't use the system frequency.

Rob Nelson (L3 Harris): if you use a device with LTE, just be smart about it. We want to have a grip of who has LTE access. It's a great solution, it's not new. I tell Dave and Quin to optimize your system. You should get the best of what the system has. That means that you need a structure to your fleet map. Option B is that structure.

Mike Rapich: We can figure out the statewide issues.

Bryan Low: Where are we at with location with the new radio system – GPS. Is that going to happen?

James: I think that will be a later question. It will be specific to the devices that you currently own. It will be best answered further down the road, closer to system acceptance.

7. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion: Kevin Rose

Second: Justin Grenier

Vote:

Meeting Adjourned