

**Alabama First Responder Wireless Commission Meeting**  
**June 24, 2014**  
**Montgomery, AL**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Blair, Ernie – Huntsville-Madison County 9-1-1  
Nail, Curtis – ALEA  
Moffett, Joey – AAVFD  
Hughes, Danny – ALNG  
Johnston, J.T. – AAEM  
Hargrove, Jeb – AEMA  
Linsley, Eric – Mobile County  
Patterson, James – ALDPS  
Fields, Willie – ADOC  
McGhee, Chris – Poarch Band of Creek Indians  
Grabryan, George – Florence/Lauderdale County EMA/9-1-1  
Mackey, Gary – ADPH - Office of EMS  
Peterson, Jim – Guntersville Police/ AACOP  
Murph, Chuck – ALEA SWIC  
Wood, Chauncey – AARS  
Ellison, John – AL 911 Board  
Jackson, Jason – AL 911 Board  
Lee, Michael – Jefferson Co. 911  
Thompson, Steve – ADCNR  
Etheredge, Chris – Dothan Fire  
Ward, Jimmy – Dothan Fire  
Stokes, Michael – ALDOT  
Pilgreen, Scott – AL Fire Marshall's Office  
Dean, Stephen – Mobile County 911  
Cosby, Drayton – Cosby Group  
Ranson, Richard – University of Alabama  
Montana, Scott – Motorola  
Pilgreen, Michelle – SouthernLINC  
Dial, Kristin – SouthernLINC  
Newdome, Tom – SouthernLINC  
McIntyre, Alan – SouthernLINC

**Alabama First Responder Wireless Commission Meeting**  
**June 24, 2014**  
**Montgomery, AL**

Charles Murph called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Mr. Murph called for acceptance of the agenda. Chief Jim Peterson made a motion to accept the agenda. George Grabryan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Murph requested the attendees to review the minutes from the March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting to determine if any corrections are necessary. Capt. James Patterson requested his agency spelling be corrected. Mr. Murph called for a motion to accept the minutes as amended with corrections. Chauncey Wood made a motion to accept the minutes, Ernie Blair seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously and the minutes were accepted.

Special guest, John Ellison was introduced. Mr. Ellison is a contractor with the 911 Board. He is providing an update on the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) and some items that pertain to their participation with FirstNet as we move ahead. Mr. Ellison began his presentation by providing a high level overview of the ANGEN project. The intent of this project is to convert the 911 system in Alabama from the analog system that has served us pretty well from the mid 80's. The predominant conversion to E911 was the late 80's through the mid 90's when many counties passed the referendum that created emergency communications districts started this process. It's worked but we have patched it to add wireless and we are trying to patch it now to add text to 911, it just wasn't built for that. Everything is converting to IP, so we are trying to make that transition now. Another problem we have is neighboring counties cannot transfer calls because they are in different LATA lines. Crooks, Victims and cell phones don't know about LATA lines. This creates a problem, you can send a call to the neighboring county but it has to be sent via admin lines. Now we lose all the data on the 911 call. Retaining the data on the 911 call, redundancy and diversity is a big advantage of the IP system. The Alabama supercomputer network, the AREN Network, is often referred to as the ANGEN network but it is really not. ANGEN rides this existing network that was already built. There are a lot of network paths from one point to another point (redundancy). We have put the ANGEN Alabama Core Call Routing Facility (ACCRF) in Huntsville and Montgomery. Either one of the ANGEN ACCRF's can carry the entire load of the state, talk to any carrier or any 911 center or Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). This was a very big factor when starting this project that this network or backbone was already in place. A lot of states are building this and paying dearly for it. We are very fortunate to already have this and get the cooperation of those folks.

ANGEN phase I call flow as it happens today, the number of wireless phones have increased and the number of wired phones have decreased. We get a lot of wireless calls now on a single

wreck by everyone that drives by until first responders arrive on the scene. Not more wrecks, but increased call volumes. The calls go to the ANGEN ACCRF then it goes to the analog/legacy Tandem then to the PSAP who dispatches the first responders. Nothing changes except we are aggregating all these wireless carriers into the two ACCRF's. There are seven of those legacy routers, so it is good for the carries, they only have to connect to two places now plus they get redundancy. Our friends from SouthernLINC were the first to complete their system. They converted every PSAP they served first in Alabama. ANGEN phase II. The next step, starting next month, the call flow drops out of the Legacy Tandem and we go directly IP from the Alabama owned equipment in Huntsville and Montgomery directly to the PSAP. It bypasses one thing but it gives us a lot more capability and potential for the future. If we have the network and connectivity we are only limited by our imagination and ability to cooperate.

So in the brave new world of Next Generation 911 (NG911) we are anticipating more data flowing into the PSAP, like text messaging. The people doing this now don't get a lot of text messages, people still call. What we do think will happen is everyone is carrying a smart phone with a camera, it would be helpful if we got a picture of the getaway car or the suspect etc. All this information will be coming into the 911 center and we picture ourselves being the funnel, either some of it going out automatically or selectively to the responders. We already do that by taking information from a caller into Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) and then we relay it verbally or, only recently via mobile data to the responder. If we have this new broadband network (NPSBN) why can't we share that CAD with all that need it. Why couldn't we dump that into a central repository for anyone who needs it? Why don't we tell other law enforcement agencies that are driving by, traversing the area? It would be beneficial for them to know a robbery just took place in the area, response time would decrease. Another big thing is personal health monitors. There is talk about them generating 911 calls, so the human doesn't call the device calls. This data may be flowing into 911, we may need to push this data out to the paramedics, EMT's in the field and to the hospital. First responders may have health monitors. Dash cam video could be watched live in the dispatch center instead of waiting for the evening news or waiting for the officer to scream for help before the dispatcher knows he/she is in trouble. Why is this not happening now, lack of broadband, lack of effort? What about sharing CAD data to virtual Alabama in order to see events across the state and figure out where trends are. We do not have the data in one place yet. We get this ANGEN network to every PSAP in the state then maybe we could do that. If we shared data we might could look and see that a unit is available in the area without placing a phone call. We could share the data with the unit more efficiently. A law enforcement agency could put a watch around an area, or on a tag or on a person and anywhere in the state they are encountered, units would have this information. The fusion center is what Chuck told me is the buzzword for that. So if they wanted to know what is going on in an area, such as a location that is the subject of a terrorist attack, they could draw a boundary around the area and anything that happens they see it. Maybe they know a tag number or a vehicle means more than the local law enforcement knows. When we create a CAD event, why don't we look up everything that we know about that address and return it to the dispatcher? So if there is anybody there that has a warrant, pistol permit, etc. then you would know. We haven't made this happen yet, we don't have the network in place. There is a lot we can do if we share data. My buddy in Chilton County is using

an application that lets his volunteers, primarily, use their own personal smartphone that they are already paying for and carrying, to see where they are sending them. Cost him very little to buy this service, responders are already paying for the device and already have it on their hip, why not use it, works for everybody, but especially good for volunteers. 10 events in three counties, what is the likelihood those other counties know that those people are also dealing with similar events? A big situational awareness improvement if we can make that kind of data flow. Again mobile data out to the responders would be a key to this, 911 centers knowing is nice but if the responders don't know then we have not done a whole lot of good. If Gary Mackey and his group could sit and watch CAD events for FLU like symptoms they might pick up a trend or an event/outbreak quicker. The quicker we can respond the better. The cost would not be significant. Same thing for maps. I met with a group yesterday that was working on the standard for street names, address ranges, all the data elements and attribute that will be applied to GIS data. 911 centers are particular about addresses, we need to have that data accurate, and so we're working to share data, not recreate data. We need to share data, a capable network and people willing to do it!

Question: (Mr. Murph) How far away do you think we are away from actually being able to share that data in a common database? CAD systems store data differently, is there a movement to centralize that data into a standard format? (Mr. Ellison) There is a standard, National Emergency Number Association (NENA) has a standard. There is already an XML protocol for exchanging CAD data among agencies. One issue is event types. You call it a 10-70 I call it a traffic stop etc. You build a translator that takes your native event types and translates it into the common format then if I pull it out I translate it into my language so that nobody has to be retrained or gets confused.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Do we have any 911's now that are trying to build a shared database? (Mr. Ellison) No. The reason we have not is because we do not have the network yet. The network is in some PSAP's. We hope next month to start sending test calls and then maybe mid to late August start sending live 911 calls via IP. Then as the network rolls out it makes it simpler, most have the internet, but to touch that and share data is a big obstacle verses a private network. (Mr. Blair) Adding to this, the super computer network we built up the last mile to every 911 center in the state. The bandwidth provided is more than needed for ANGEN. We are actually using the network that is already in place, paying approximately \$25 per MB per month. In Morgan County we have a microwave link also using my switch and we are using super computer network to back it up. So now we have 2 paths and its dirt cheap. So this network can be used for other things. (Mr. Ellison) We are using his microwave to back up the 911 data. So if we lose the terrestrial line we can hop on his microwave to deliver 911 calls. We are putting in a 10 MB circuit but we are only utilizing 2 MB so there is 8 MB there that could be purchased for \$25 a MB per month. We have counties that are doing CAD to CAD, Radio linkage, there are all kind of uses.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Would there be any reason to go back to the super computer folks, especially if we are going to start purchasing some of the excess bandwidth that you have on the network, and see if the board would be willing to go back to the legislature and add public

safety as one of their servicing members? I know right now their focused toward education, but if we are going to start spreading this out, FirstNet and trying to tie together some of these other services we are going to have, do you think this is something we should reach out to them about? (Mr. Ellison) I would talk to them about it, we fit under their charter, because we are government. I think they can service any government entity, they don't compete with the private sector. They buy all these circuits from commercial providers, they are acting as our purchasing agent. They are in every county, they know every provider because they work with all the schools.

Mr. Murph introduced Jason Jackson, Executive Director with the Alabama 911 Board. Mr. Jackson gave a short introduction. He was hired 10 months ago. They are working on ANGEN, building out the system. There are 11 districts working together using a host of solutions to enable collaboration between districts and agencies. This is the path for the next few months.

Special guest, Tom Newdome was introduced. Mr. Newdome the Director of Engineering at SouthernLINC Wireless. He is providing a SouthernLINC Wireless LTE project overview. Mr. Newdome began his presentation and overview of the build out. Originally from Mobile, he has been with SouthernLINC as Engineering Director for about 1 1/2 years. Before that he spent 33 years with Alabama Power in the distribution area after active duty in the Air Force. What data is starting to mean to us. When I first came to work the only way we knew someone's power was out was if they called us. Now our meter talks back to the plant and informs the plant when the power is out. It allows us to centralize our operations and communication. LTE, broadband data is central to that. Key system functions are Voice services (Push to talk and cellular) and Data services (Power System Status, Substation Control And Data Acquisition, Automated Meter Infrastructure System). Traditionally voice has been very important to us. We will continue to operate our iDEN system because push to talk is a mission critical application for us. The focus for the build out on the LTE is similar to the FirstNet concept, data primarily and eventually voice over LTE and push to talk further down the road. Alan Macintyre, SouthernLINC RAN Manager, is a delegate to the 3GPP board who is looking at all the 3GPP standards for LTE which includes push to talk and they are making a lot of progress. We are going to operate iDEN for a mission critical push to talk, it is a very good system. The problem is that it does not carry broadband data. For 2013 & 2014 our primary objectives are to do our detailed planning and vendor contract. We selected Ericsson as our primary RAN EPC vendor, Cisco is also a vendor for the network especially backhaul data. We will be adding a lot of LTE antenna sites, acquisition process has started. The main switch is called an evolved packet core (EPC), we will be putting one in Birmingham, and site preparation will be done this year. Basic system build out will cover 3 years beginning in 2015. In 2016/2017 we will be constructing a redundant EPC, possibly in Georgia. The system is mainly for the operating companies. The build out plan does not include North Alabama because it is not in our service territory, but it could be. As SouthernLINC builds out this system there may be areas of mutual benefit for FirstNet & the State of Alabama such as the sharing of towers, facilities, backhaul services, spectrum and evaluating service options in non-Southern operating areas.

Question: (Chief Jim Peterson) When you refer to North Alabama you are generally referring to the TVA service area? (Mr. Newdome) That's correct.

Question: (Chief Peterson) You said even down to the antenna there is a possibility to share for the FirstNet application? (Mr. Newdome) That's correct, the potential is there, but it needs evaluating, which we are very open too.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Have you had a chance to talk with FirstNet yet, and their intentions? (Mr. Newdome) No, we have not.

Question: (Chief Peterson) Chuck, on the operations side have there been any discussion about who might operate the FirstNet system? (Mr. Murph) The way the legislation is written we have an opportunity once FirstNet submits the plan to the Governor to decide if we want to opt in and accept FirstNet's plan and become a customer, or we could write our own plan, do our own RFP and have a potential partnership and move forward in that manner. Ultimately FirstNet has to approve whatever the State does and connectivity to the FirstNet core. This could be a great opportunity for us, if we can't use the LTE core, to utilize our backhaul, shelters, towers, etc. What I would like to see, you have a company like Southern company building out this system with excess capacity and these are the people that FirstNet needs to be talking to now. If this is coordinated correctly then there is a chance that we could have 3-4 states already starting coverage build out in the next 2 years. FirstNet will not be able to do that unless they are partnering with someone. Hopefully FirstNet will not let this opportunity drop. It is out of our hands, as far as the state is concerned because we do not have the power to start planning what we are going to do without knowing what FirstNet is going to bring to the table. We get back to the cost aspect. How much is this FirstNet service going to cost? Will the cost be competitive? There are a lot of unknowns there.

Question: (Eric Linsley) What frequency bands are you on? (Mr. Newdome) We are in the 850 MHz, Band 26. You bring up a good point. The FirstNet band looks attractive to us for potential use. (Mr. Murph) FirstNet will have the opportunity within their state plan to sell excess bandwidth to companies like SouthernLINC, Verizon, AT&T, etc. Ultimately we need to ensure that whatever plan we have, when FirstNet starts their planning process with us, incorporates what SouthernLINC is doing because it will be that much more important when we start looking at multi-jurisdictional collaboration, Alabama, Georgia and part of Mississippi.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Your existing microwave system that you have, will it facilitate the LTE backhaul? (Mr. Newdome) We will actually adding more microwave backhaul between the cell sites than we have today and we will have dual points of redundancy as far as the network itself. Most of our backhaul now consists of fiber and some microwave.

### **Reports from Workgroups**

Michael Lee, P-25 System Administrators Workgroup. Mr. Lee began with an overview of the status of connectivity between systems and counties.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Is Birmingham, Jefferson County a P25 Switch? (Mr. Lee) SmartX P25. To be a full blown P25 we will have to change out the repeaters at the sites, but the core is ready to start connecting to the ISSI equipment. The SmartX upgrade was successful, all the consoles came up like they were supposed to and also we have Birmingham police and fire and sheriff's office, about 6000 users on this system without any problems reported.

Update on 700 MHz Narrow banding (6.25 MHz) mandate. We have several 700 MHz systems here in Alabama and it would very costly to them to try and meet this 2016 deadline. Louisiana has a statewide 700 MHz system and has recently received a waiver from the FCC to extend their deadline out to 2024. The workgroup's recommendation to the AFRWC is for Alabama to file for a waiver to request an extension of the deadline to 2024.

Inter RF Subsystem Interface (ISSI) is another issue that we discussed for our P25 systems. ISSI connects systems together. This would allow any user with connectivity to roam on multiple connected P25 systems without having to change channels etc. We really need this in Alabama for increased interoperability. The workgroup's recommendation to the AFRWC is that this deserves further consideration & evaluation.

Microwave is a very reliable system to connect towers together, but the towers that we have are mission critical to public safety agencies. Alabama Public Television is not really a mission critical carrier. If one of the sites were to go down it may take some time to get it back up. We really need to look at connecting these systems together with mission critical microwave. This will be a very costly effort. A consultant will help the evaluation and help the state do this in a more efficient way. The workgroup's recommendation to the AFRWC is for Alabama to fund a microwave a consultant(s) to work with the P25 workgroup to develop a short & long term strategic vision, mission strategy and to define and prioritize funding requirements.

Funding sources we discussed were state legislation, federal grants and appropriations. Immediate need is to start work on the AFRWC receiving an annual appropriation from the Alabama state legislature. This would provide funding to start planning, determining cost & implementing some of these projects.

Our workgroup will be meeting again in 6-8 weeks.

Question: (J.T. Johnston) Will every P25 system need ISSI? Right now we have Huntsville and Baldwin County and so many other sites talking to each other, I understand the need between Harris & Motorola, but would ISSI interconnect some of those systems that are on older versions of P25, like 7.4? Is it necessary for every switch to have that or if for example, we tie the Mobile Harris system via ISSI into Baldwin County will that by default tie them into Madison? (Mr. Blair) Probably would since Baldwin & Madison are on the same platform. One of our goals is to get everyone on the same level. Probably would need ISSI for every Harris system to link them into the big system. (Chief Peterson) What about Shelby county and the VHF issue, will ISSI fix that. (Mr. Blair) You would need a separate ISSI system for that. (Chief Peterson) What's the cost for a single application? (Mr. Blair) A lot of money, unsure of the

exact amount. (Mr. Lee) I think if you have the different platforms, bands and vendors then the ISSI allows them to communicate with each other. (Mr. Blair) If we already have 5 switches on the same platform, then anyone else with a different version or system, being VHF or different brand would need ISSI. Our workgroup was tasked with identifying some priorities, these are the priority recommendations that we came back with. Now we need to strategize on what to do next.

Mr. Murph, Since the 2 of the recommendations from the P25 Workgroup deal with funding and we are developing a legislative strategy, would it be acceptable with the workgroup if we table these until our next meeting? This way it allows us to incorporate these into our legislative strategy. (Mr. Blair) Would like to adopt these as our priorities pending funding. (Mr. Wood) We should consider the election cycles and their effect on our efforts. (Mr. Murph) We need a strategy moving forward which should incorporate these recommendations as well as other priorities into an overarching, clear & precise statewide strategy. (Chief Peterson) If we start presenting options to the legislature piecemeal it could dilute our overall statewide goals. (Mr. Johnston) I suggest that a microwave consultant may be too specific and should be a network consultant or back haul consultant. I think this requires more than just microwave. (Mr. Blair) Michael if you are good with this then we should change microwave consultant to something that covers the broader requirements. (Mr. Lee) Agreed.

Mr. Murph, I'll entertain a motion for the 2 recommendations at this time. No motion from the AFRWC.

Jeb Hargrove, State Agency Workgroup. Mr. Hargrove covered last week's national level exercise. One of the accomplishments was connecting to Mississippi State's EOC through the 700 MHz system from Clanton, also radio checks were conducted between state agencies to the state EOC. We would like to get more state agencies involved in this and test every quarter. This will allow us to train to communicate as a group. Several draft frequency use agreements were completed and will work with stakeholders for review.

Update on the State 700 License, information has been provided as requested, and it is in a pending status. This usually takes 2-3 weeks for approval or request for more information. Also with the help of Richard Ranson, University of Alabama, we have a band plan for the 700 MHz state license to go forward with.

The next state agency workgroup meeting July 22, 10:00 am. We will have CASM workshop.

Question: (Mr. Murph) Since the state 700 License has been filed and is in a pending approval, did we meet the filing deadline? (Mr. Hargrove) Yes.

Question: (Mr. Murph) If we file a waiver for phase II, do we have to redo our states 700 MHz plan? (Mr. Linsley) You do not have to do anything as far as the state use frequency plan. The waiver would be just for the state license. It will be up to each individual agency to file for a waiver as well. The intent of filing for the state waiver was to have Alabama be the lead entity

for all the different agency licensees that have 700 MHz for phase II. We can use Louisiana as a template since they were successful in filing and received a waiver.

Mr. Murph, If this does not require funding how does the commission feel about doing this? Mr. Wood made a motion that the AFRWC apply on behalf of the entire state for an extension to the 700 MHz Phase II deadline and George Grabryan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Old Business**

Mr. Murph, discussed the Army Corp of Engineer towers. The Corp is looking to dispose of 4 tower sites located basically between the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers down to Mobile. A site survey was conducted on one of the sites located in South Clark County. The site looked pretty good, good shelter, maintained, adjacent to some forestry land. I have tried on numerous occasions to find someone at the Corp who knows the process for getting the towers transferred over to us, to no avail at this time. Mr. Wood offered a contact he had worked with in the past, with success. I will continue to pursue these sites.

Approved Policies & Procedures were distributed to the group in the accepted format. In the future, when the website is available, these will be posted online. It was agreed that copies would be emailed out to the commission.

### **New Business**

Curtis Nail, ALEA Program Manager, Planning & Governance. Mr. Nail was hired under SLIGP to assist with FirstNet preparation, planning & rollout. He will work closely with the AFRWC. Mr. Nail worked as a government contractor for 20+ years doing system design & engineering of Tactical Operation Centers (TOC's) for the military. Mr. Nail began his briefing of Divisional Advisory Committee's (DAC's) by reviewing a key element of Governor Bentley's Executive Order 34 and the AFRWC mission statement, state agency collaboration and information sharing. This justifies the need for the creation of Divisional Advisory Committees (DAC's). By having advisory committees from each geographical division of the state deliver their input into the AFRWC this will facilitate collaborative decision making, efficient use of public resources and a statewide interoperable communications system. The DAC's should include technically savvy professional association members and stakeholders in each division. Each DAC will hold its own regularly scheduled meetings and elect a Chairman and Vice Chair to attend the AFRWC meetings. This will assist the AFRWC in statewide communications system planning and additionally FirstNet requirements and outreach. We will need to define the information needs of the AFRWC and the DAC's such as infrastructure, coverage, data/voice usage, applications, education/training, challenges, FirstNet, cost, etc. We will use Communications Assets Survey & Mapping Next Generation (CASM NextGen) to collect & disseminate state asset data. The Mobile Data Survey Tool (MDST) is very important in the efforts of the AFRWC and FirstNet and should be filled out by all jurisdictions/agencies. This will provide everyone with a comprehensive view of state assets and coverage area, or lack thereof. Each professional association representative on the AFRWC is asked to submit one person from each division to serve on the DAC. Please have those names submitted to me NLT August 1, 2014.

Mr. Murph, The DAC working group under the AFRWC that will be your broadband users' workgroup. The chairs from each of the seven divisions will form the broadband user's workgroup. This way we can show FirstNet how we are providing governance and how we are reaching the local levels throughout the entire state. Some agencies and jurisdictions that choose not to participate, that's fine. We want to be able to show that there was an effort, on behalf of the AFRWC, to include them in this process. The information from those users that choose to participate will be invaluable.

Question: (Chief Peterson) Who will facilitate those first divisional meetings and how will it be presented? (Mr. Murph) Mr. Nail will be involved with all the divisions. The first meetings will be face to face, later meeting may be via teleconference/VTC. A full briefing will be presented at the first meeting defining why I am here, our mission, what I need from you, etc.

Mr. Murph, PSCR meeting in Denver. FirstNet had their quarterly meeting there as well. A lot more information is starting to flow from FirstNet. There has been some turnover in the leadership of FirstNet. FirstNet has brought several new staff on board. Several of the new staff came from the Office of Emergency Communications (OEC). FirstNet has established a new website, [www.firstnet.gov](http://www.firstnet.gov). We have begun to use the SLIGP funds by hiring Mr. Nail. I am working on hiring a person for education and outreach. FirstNet outreach to the states will begin in August, 2014. Initial consultation with FirstNet should be conducted with the AFRWC to determine their needs from us.

Mr. Murph, Alabama Interoperability Summit. We are considering holding another summit. We had one 2 years ago and it was a great success. We covered a lot of topics. Some of the FEMA Region 4 states indicated that they would be interested in partnering with Alabama to hold a Gulf Coast Region 4 meeting. Also we will invite Texas & Louisiana from Region 5. Considering a weeklong conference. Starting Alabama's sessions on Monday & Tuesday. Regional sessions starting Wednesday afternoon through lunch on Friday. We could hold our AFRWC meeting at the conference. Possibly late November, early December timeframe. Considering the Perdido beach area. I will need one of the professional associations in the state to partner with us. We do not have the mechanism at the state to bring in revenue for the vendors. Vendor participation is important.

Question: (Mr. Hargrove) Is there plans for a SharePoint or a website for the AFRWC to share documents? (Mr. Murph) Yes, we are working with ACJIC get this established.

The next AFRWC meeting will be held September 9, 2014 in Montgomery, AL.

Mr. Murph called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Linsley made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Johnston seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.