



1. Attendance Roster

P = Present	T = Via Telephone	A = Absent
-------------	-------------------	------------

Primary

A	Barrie	Tony	354 MDSS	Eielson AFB
A	Browning	Greg	Juneau PD	Chief
T	DuPont	Sue	Fairbanks AST Dispatch	Radio Dispatcher III
A	Goggia	Tammy	Soldotna AST Dispatch	SPSCC/AST Communications Center Manager
T	Johnson	Brad	Fairbanks PD	Deputy Chief (Chair)
A	Lamasko	Susan	APCO	Sr. Electronics Technician
T	Paiz	Pablo	Anchorage PD	Sergeant
T	Provost	Pam	APCO	Executive Council Member
A	Sell	Kris	Juneau PD	Lieutenant
T	Stearns	Dan	MATCOM	Public Safety Dispatch Manager
T	Stewart	Janie	Homer PD	Dispatch Supervisor
A	Tamagni	Al	Anchorage FD	Dispatch
T	Tucker	Jeff	Chief	North Star FD
A	Wallace	Jimmie	Corrections	Probation Parole, Director's Office

Others Present

T	Piscoya	Lonnie	Deputy Commander	Fairbanks AST Dispatch
P	Shafer	Sherry	ALMR	Operations Management Office
P	Smith	Del	ALMR	Operations Manager

2. Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion	Action Items
Called to Order	The meeting came to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken.	
Welcome and Introductions/Roll Call	Mr. Del Smith confirmed members in attendance and welcomed the group.	
Previous Meeting Minutes Approval	Minutes from January 30 meeting were reviewed. Motion: Accept and approve the January 30, 2009, meeting minutes as written. Motion: Deputy Chief Brad Johnson Second: Sgt Pablo Paiz The minutes were approved.	
Chair Comments	1. Chief Johnson asked that Ms. Stephanie Johnson,	



	<p>Fairbanks ECC Dispatcher Center Manager be added to the Working Group. There were no objections.</p> <p>2. With regard to the Working Group and this endeavor, Deputy Chief Johnson stated he liked the KISS principle. If we are all moving toward the same goal and if we are all transitioning to Common Language, the current codes are irrelevant and determining an acceptable list of terms really did not apply. The only issue that really needed to be addressed is the use of signal codes.</p> <p>The OMO clarified that the table was just to draw attention to the fact that much of the language that the 10 codes reflected was basically the same.</p>	
General Discussion		
Adoption of a Standard	<p>1. Del asked the group if they had any additional research results they wished to share with the group. There were no responses.</p> <p>2. Del reminded everyone that this is purely voluntary and no one would be disciplined for not transitioning to Common Language.</p> <p>3. Brad stated that even though all agencies within the Working Group may not agree that this is what they want to do, the group needs to continue to move forward and establish a standard for those that are willing to go this route.</p> <p>4. Del asked Ms. Stephanie Johnson if she had any input on the use of 10 Codes versus Common Language. She stated at this point she was just sitting back and observing since it was her first meeting</p> <p>5. Del then asked Ms. Pam Provost is she has any comments on this so far. She asked the scope of this, and what are we looking at with this. She noticed law enforcement on the list, what are we looking at as far as disaster response Is this strictly for disaster response where we have civilians/NGOs on there on ALMR, or is this strictly for all Public Safety?</p> <p>Del stated that the goal of this is within interoperability is that when on the radio, whether it is dispatch or fire or police, anyone can understand what is being said.</p> <p>Brad stated there is probably potential for expansion but this is really primary focused on bringing law enforcement in line with fire, EMS, and emergency management and getting them away from reliance on 10 Codes and getting</p>	



	<p>them into using Common Language on a daily basis since they have to do it when they are working with the other disciplines any way. It just makes sense.</p> <p>Pam stated there were some fire standards terminology (plain speak if there is such a thing in Alaska) in FEMA and it might be added to this. We could take what is available at the Federal level and incorporate that into this.</p> <p>Del asked if Pam had it available would she send it to the OMO so we could have it available for group discussions.</p> <p>6. Del readdressed Brad's earlier comment about signals and stated he, personally, did not like the term 'signal.' It was too 'old fashioned and east coast.' He felt calling them codes was more appropriate.</p> <p>Brad stated that term was from the Virginia model and we (Alaska) could call it anything we want. The whole point of this is to make this is to make the ability to talk on the radio understandable and universal. It doesn't make sense for Fairbanks to use one set of signals or codes, APD to use another, and Wasilla PD to use another, because then we are just defeating the purpose.</p> <p>Deputy Command Piscoya stated that we had the discussion last meeting, and it bears further discussion, regarding the fact that all the codes end up on the internet anyway and anyone can figure out what they are. When they first come out they may be somewhat confidential, but they certainly are not after a while. The majority of officers today are using earpieces, so do we really need any codes. If we do we certainly should standardize them.</p> <p>Del asked Stephanie if right now an officer stops a suspect and that person is armed and dangerous or has a felony warrant, how do they notify the officer of that fact, do they say 10-99?</p> <p>Stephanie stated that is all they say right now and then stand by for the officer to acknowledge it. Most of the Fairbanks and City of North Pole are wearing the earpieces right now. She didn't know how it was working for the rest of the state, but that for them it had almost eliminated the issue of codes/signals, but then you can't always count on someone's equipment working and they may not have their earpiece in, and it may come out the microphone. She also stated that there is a concern among the fire chiefs that do EMS response that if something goes wrong during a call they are able to get on the radio and say 'something' and they know that help is</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>on the way. That be may a situation where a signal or a code or whatever we want to call it might be applicable, but it needs to be common between police and fire and then if we can agree to that maybe work through APFC and the Fire Standards Council to get common training.</p> <p>Ms. Janie Stewart stated the only thing she could think about was officer safety and a lot of times the officer may not have time to describe the whole situation if it is an unsafe situation. That would be the only reason to have an emergency code or signal.</p> <p>Del then asked the group if they objected to having a standard then for these emergency codes or signals; even though the purpose of the group is to transition even to common language.</p> <p>Stephanie said that from a dispatcher's point of view that it made sense that if you are in trouble you would say Code Red. But whatever is chosen, it needs to consistent across the board. Janie stated their fire department used Code Red when they were responding with lights and sirens.</p> <p>The OMO requested each agency provide their emergency/duress codes or signals. The language was the focal point, not necessarily the code name or number. The focus is to compare each agency's emergency situations that would require special handling and then go forward with figuring out how to address them either with codes or signals.</p> <p>Del asked Janie if she dispatched both police and fire. She stated she dispatches police, fire, and EMS. For their purposes, EMS never goes into a potential volatile situation without police being on scene.</p> <p>Del stated that agreement on the codes/signals is the important issue at hand. Everyone who wants to start using common language should go ahead and start doing so. There isn't a huge disconnect if you say 'unreadable' or 'reception poor' or 'unable to copy.' These all mean the same to a dispatcher. He asked if anyone had any objections to proceeding with this effect. There were none.</p>	<p>1. OMO will compile each agency's information into a single list for the WG on situation where they would require a code or signal.</p>
Meeting Schedule	The next, agreed upon, regularly scheduled meeting is May 1. Meeting start time is 1:30 p.m.	
Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:39 p.m.	