Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
Agenda
March 22, 2012

	ITEM	PRESENTER
1)	**Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Comments**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
2)	**Approval of RWC Board Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2012** **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min.
3)	**Approval of Joint RWC-TRWC Board Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2012.** **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min.
4)	**RWC Subscriber Unit (Radio) Rate for 2012/2013** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the subscriber unit rate for the 2012/2013 budget. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Tahir Alhassan – RWC Accountant III Est. 10 min.
5)	**RWC 700 MHZ Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion, Lifecycle Update** The purpose of this item is to review revised project costs, request approval of a lease/purchase option, and provide an update on the 800 MHz rebanding. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix ITS / Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Mr. Tahir Alhassan – RWC Accountant III Est. 30 min.
6)	**Town of Buckeye Special Assessment** The purpose of this item is to request approval to charge Buckeye a special assessment for site video surveillance equipment. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
7)	**RWC Policy for Approval** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the Overlay Sites policy. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
8)	**Executive Director's Report** a. Strategic Communications Plan b. Awards Submittals c. Federal Communications Commission Petition **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 10 min.
9)	**Call to the Public** **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
10)	**Announcements** The purpose of this item is to communicate any Board announcements and the date of the next Board Meeting: May 24, 2012 from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
11)	**Adjourn**	Chair Meyer – Tempe

Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
MINUTES
January 26, 2012

Maricopa Association of Governments
Ironwood Room – 2nd Floor
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Board Members Present			**Board Members Absent**
Paul Adams*	Mike Frazier	Charlie Meyer	Steven Conrad
Wade Brannon	Mark Gaillard	Susan Thorpe	David Fitzhugh
Steven Campbell	Jim Haner	Shannon Tolle*	Brad Hartig
Wayne Clement	Bob Hansen	Marc Walker	
Bob Costello	Jim Heger	Paul Wilson	
Chris DeChant*	Danny Johnson	Ed Zuercher	

*Board Alternate

Staff and Public Present

Tahir Alhassan	Celicia Fiedler	Doug Mummert	Ronald Stearns
Karen Allen	John Gardner	Chris Nadeau	Mike Sterling
Irma Ashworth	Nolberto Gem	Mark Nichols	Rick Tannehill
Gary Bradbury	Joe Gibson	Cy Otsuka	Randy Thompson
Jim Case	Jen Hagen	Ron Parks	Tim Ulery
Dave Clarke	Dave Heck	David Perdichizzi	
Dave Collett	Lonnie Inskeep	Bill Phillips	
Jesse Cooper	Rick Kolker	Elise Piatt	
Theresa Faull	Mark Mann	Don Schilling	
David Felix	Tracy Montgomery	Nick Spino	

1. **Call to Order**

   Chair Meyer called the meeting to order at 11:15 a.m. and roll call was taken.

2. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes from November 17, 2011**

   A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Zuercher and **SECONDED** by Mr. Haner to approve the minutes as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

3. **RWC Annual Audit for Fiscal Year 2010/2011**

   David Felix, RWC Executive Director, introduced Ronald Stearns of the audit firm Clifton Gunderson, LLC. Mr. Stearns thanked the Board for inviting him and his colleague, Irma Ashworth, to present this item. He stated that the audit firm

issued an "unqualified" or "clean" opinion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011; which essentially meant there was no fraudulent activity. He explained that a meeting was held with the RWC Audit Committee to review the audit findings prior to finalization of the audit opinion. He recapped the RWC's assets and expenses and stated that there were no signs of deficiencies of internal controls. He expressed that RWC staff provided all the required communications during the audit and that no difficulties were experienced. He added that the RWC submitted for a Government Finance Officers Association certificate, which was a certificate of achievement for excellence in financial reporting. He expressed that the firm was pleased to have performed the audit services for the RWC.

Mr. Felix explained that a copy of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report was provided to each Board Member and he thanked RWC Accountant Tahir Alhassan for all his work on the audit. He also expressed his appreciation to the RWC Audit Committee and Clifton Gunderson, LLC.

4. **Executive Committee Member Selection**

Bill Phillips, Phoenix Enterprise Technology Manager, stated that the departure of Peoria's Fire Chief Larry Rooney created a vacancy on the RWC Executive Committee (EC). He explained that the Fire Life Safety Council nominated Glendale's Executive Assistant Fire Chief Chris DeChant to serve as the Fire representative on the EC. He expressed that the EC recommended Board approval of the nomination.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Haner and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve Executive Assistant Fire Chief Chris DeChant to serve as the Fire representative on the RWC Executive Committee. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

5. **RWC Policies for Approval**

a. Gateway
Mr. Felix provided a review of the Gateway policy and explained that it was a means for disparate systems to connect and if the connection was not done properly it could degrade the system.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Campbell and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the Gateway policy. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

b. Programming Authorization
Mr. Felix provided a review of the Programming Authorization policy and explained that it established controls for RWC subscriber unit programming.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Felix explained that if the Operations Manager observed unauthorized use he would have the authority to act immediately.

In response to a question by Mr. Heger, Mr. Felix replied that Creative Communications was one of the authorized service providers.

John Gardner, Phoenix Wireless Systems Manager, added that some entities had the ability to program their own radios.

Mr. Heger commented that he wanted to maintain a competitive edge for entities desiring to program radios.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Gaillard and **SECONDED** by Vice-Chair Thorpe to approve the Programming Authorization policy. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

c. Talkgroup Ownership and Assignment
Mr. Felix provided a review of the Talkgroup Ownership and Assignment policy and explained that it defined who owns and manages the talkgroups.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Felix responded that the policy applied to both Interoperability and Operability.

Mr. Campbell requested that if a policy was a revision, he would like to have the revisions highlighted.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix responded that the policy should be corrected to reflect an effective date of January 26, 2012. He added that the date of July 14, 2010 was a draft date and that the policy was not a revision.

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the Talkgroup Ownership Assignment policy, with the modification to correct the effective date to January 26, 2012. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

d. Waiver or Exception
Mr. Felix provided a review of the Waiver or Exception policy and explained that it established a process for waiving the use or application of approved RWC policies.

Chair Meyer requested an example of a type of request that may fall under this policy. Mr. Felix deferred response to Dave Collett, Peoria Radio Systems Engineer, who provided an example of an entity making an encryption management request that fell outside of the Encryption Management policy; he explained that the request could go before the Operations Working Group for approval or denial.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Campbell and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve the Waiver or Exception policy. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

6.   Motorola Long Term Support Issues

Mr. Felix explained that this item emanated from the Board's request for him to meet with Motorola to discuss long term support of equipment; therefore, it was included on the RWC agenda, in addition to the joint agenda, for additional discussion by Board Members related to equipment support specifically for the RWC. He stated that a meeting was recently held with Motorola and he reviewed four main areas that Motorola was committed to: (1) Extending support of the STR base stations, (2) Supporting older MCC 7500's under the new SUAII agreement, (3) Extending parts support until 2019, and (4) Extending software support on Gold Elite consoles. He expressed that another area being looked into was a reduced cost for large purchases of subscriber units. He added that Motorola acknowledged they heard our need to keep costs down on subscriber units.

Vice-Chair inquired whether there was a discussion with Motorola regarding its narrow-banding role. Mr. Felix responded that Motorola had a new single point-of-contract and he would contact him to further discussions in this area.

In response to a question by Mr. Campbell regarding Gold Elite consoles, Mr. Phillips responded that they will only be supported through software version 7.15; however, if the new software version was extended, then support would continue with the extension.

Mr. Campbell inquired what year would support end. Mr. Phillips replied that based on the current upgrade schedule, support would end in 2017 without the extension, or with the extension an additional two years beyond 2017.

In response to a question by Mr. Wilson regarding budgeting for subscriber units, Mr. Felix responded that the information would be brought to the Board in March.

Mr. Frazier expressed that at the last Board meeting there were a list of fees over the next five years; and his understanding was that although Option D was being recommended, a funding option was not adopted.

Mr. Felix replied that his understanding was correct. He explained that staff was attempting to gather information as to whether some of the costs could be extended. He added that it would be an agenda item at the next Board meeting, although he could send the information to the Board in advance of the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Thorpe expressed that what she was hearing was that Option D was the best option, but it may be possible to move out some future costs.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Frazier responded that he would move forward in his budget process using Option D.

7. Executive Director's Report

a. Update on RWC Budget for Fiscal Year 2012/2013

Mr. Felix updated that Motorola stated the new System Upgrade Agreement (SUAII) may be one hundred percent (100%) equity; therefore it tentatively appeared that when the subscriber rate is brought to the Board in March it will reflect the SUAII as equity and billed separately from the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) rate.

b. Revenue Sharing Gaming and Grant Application

Mr. Felix reported that the City of Phoenix would be applying for a Revenue Sharing Gaming Grant. He explained that the funds, if awarded, could be used to upgrade infrastructure that would need to be replaced, either due to end of life or the 700 MHz conversion.

8. Call to the Public

None.

9. Announcements

Chair Meyer announced the date of the next Board meeting and that the meeting would be at its regularly scheduled time of 10:00 – 11:30am.

Vice-Chair Thorpe announced that this year's International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Conference would be held in Phoenix and that the ICMA had an annual excellence awards submittal process. She stated that the RWC should apply for the award.

Chair Meyer expressed that because of what the RWC was doing it would be an excellent candidate.

Mr. Felix stated that he would obtain the needed information to begin the submittal process.

10. Adjournment

Chair Meyer adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Theresa Faull, Management Assistant I

Joint Board of Directors
MINUTES
January 26, 2012

Maricopa Association of Governments
Ironwood Room – 2nd Floor
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

RWC Board Members Present   **Board Members Absent**

Paul Adams*	Mike Frazier	Charlie Meyer	Steven Conrad
Wade Brannon	Mark Gaillard	Susan Thorpe	David Fitzhugh
Steven Campbell	Jim Haner	Shannon Tolle*	Brad Hartig
Wayne Clement	Bob Hansen	Marc Walker	
Bob Costello	Jim Heger	Paul Wilson	
Chris DeChant*	Danny Johnson	Ed Zuercher	

TRWC Board Members Present   **Board Members Absent**

| Alex Deshuk | John Kross | Jerry Ward | Collin DeWitt |
| Ajay Joshi* | Dave Montgomery | | |

*Board Alternate

Staff and Public Present

Tahir Alhassan	Theresa Faull	Mark Mann	David Perdichizzi
Karen Allen	David Felix	Bruce McGregor	Bill Phillips
Bill Anger	Celicia Fiedler	John Meza	Elise Piatt
Harry Beck	Dennis Fulton	Tracy Montgomery	Dale Shaw
Jim Bloomer	John Gardner	Doug Mummert	Nick Spino
Gary Bradbury	Nolberto Gem	Chris Nadeau	Mike Sterling
Dan Campbell	Joe Gibson	Mark Nichols	Rick Tannehill
Jim Case	John Glorioso	Don Schilling	Randy Thompson
Dave Clarke	Jen Hagen	Nick Spino	Tim Ulery
Dave Collett	Dave Heck	Mike Sterling	
Jesse Cooper	Lonnie Inskeep	Cy Otsuka	
Darin Douglass	Rick Kolker	Ron Parks	

1.   **Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Comments**

Chair Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and roll call was taken.

Chair Kross expressed his appreciation for the time and effort extolled by many individuals to bring the joint meeting to fruition. He commended Alex Deshuk,

Mesa Police Chief Frank Milstead and Mesa Fire Chief Beck for their collaborative efforts. He conveyed that by the two cooperatives working together we were establishing a new norm for how to maximize the use of public resources for the region to obtain the highest level of performance.

Chair Meyer expressed that this was a historic meeting and important to the public safety community. He acknowledged and commended the work of the two Executive Directors.

2. **RWC / TRWC Joint Objectives**

TRWC Executive Director Dale Shaw introduced this item. He explained that the fundamental drive for developing the objectives was improved interoperability for public safety. He reviewed and described the concept for each objective. He stated that Objective 1 was about users, especially public safety, and ensuring that they have connectivity.

Mr. Shaw explained that Objective 2 highlighted the strength in working together to seek funding. RWC Executive Director David Felix stated that an example of this objective was applying for technical assistance funding through the Public Safety Interoperable Communications office to develop a strategic plan for both cooperatives.

Mr. Shaw expressed that Objective 3 focused on a broader, state level perspective and not just the immediate region.

Mr. Shaw stated that the fundamental concept for Objective 4 was that it made sense not to build infrastructure on top of existing infrastructure but instead to find economies of scale. Mr. Felix stated that an example of this objective was a federal grant used to build capacity on high sites; and although the capacity was primarily to serve as a backup resource, the RWC Policy Working Group was drafting a policy for broader and increased use of the sites. He added that some type of cost recovery model would then be associated with their use.

Mr. Shaw explained that Objective 5 stressed the importance of having a unified voice.   Mr. Felix expressed that one area where a unified voice was being delivered was with the joint Federal Communications Commission (FCC) petition to address the FCC's mandate to narrow-band 700 MHz by 2017.

Mr. Shaw stated that Objective 6 focused on the need to closely coordinate the technology of both cooperatives, otherwise there would be a risk of the two systems drifting apart. He explained that Objective 7 stated that the resolution between the two Boards could be cemented in an Intergovernmental Agreement.

Mr. Felix explained that the Joint Objectives were well vetted and a result of several meetings among the Chairs, Joint Chair and Executive Directors. Mr.

Shaw expressed that the Joint Objectives were just words on paper unless they were executed in a more formal agreement.

Chair Meyer asked for questions or discussion from the Boards. He explained that the view taken at the Joint Chair meetings was to build something bigger than just the RWC and TRWC, and to be less critical of differences.

In response to a question by Mr. Gaillard, Mr. Felix responded that one area being looked into was broader, more economical procurement opportunities with Motorola.

Chair Meyer stated he received a speaker card from Mesa Fire Chief Harry Beck.

Chief Beck expressed that the Joint Board meeting was an amazing event to be occurring. He stated that a great deal of work had been done and acknowledged the huge improvement in the relationship between the two cooperatives. He proposed that a strategic plan be developed in which users could rate the performance of the system.

Chair Meyer thanked Chief Beck for his role in the process.

For the RWC, a **MOTION** was made by Mr. Wilson and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the Joint Objectives. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

For the TRWC, a **MOTION** was made by Mr. Montgomery and **SECONDED** by Mr. Ward to approve the Joint Objectives. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (5-0)**.

3.   **Regional Communications Systems Connection**

Mr. Felix stated that several years ago, planning for the region included interoperability gateways or connections. He reviewed the Regional Communications System Connection (RCSC) and provided an example of how it would work: a user of one system, such as a Rapid Response Team, could establish communication with a user of another system while responding en route to the scene of an emergency. He stated the RCSC was simply another interoperability resource for rapid response and consisted of a "live" connection available at any time and managed by the Department of Public Safety. He explained that the RCSC required each participating system to dedicate four talkgroups and the systems would be linked at a very low cost. He added that the RWC already had a mechanism in place to connect, therefore there would be no additional funding required. He stated that the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) office provided the staff to write the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) and it contained two parts: the Agreement and an Operational Supplement.

Mr. Shaw explained that the other participating agencies were talking with their respective Boards to obtain approval.

Chair Kross stated that this was another example of a partnership and working together for the region and state.

For the RWC, a **MOTION** was made by Mr. Haner and **SECONDED** by Vice-Chair Thorpe to approve the Regional Communications Systems Connection. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

For the TRWC, a **MOTION** was made by Mr. Deshuk and **SECONDED** by Mr. Joshi to approve the Regional Communications Systems Connection. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (5-0)**.

4. **Nextel Buy-Back of 800 MHz Frequencies**

Bill Phillips stated that both cooperatives were facing Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandates to narrow-band 700 MHz frequencies and re-band 800 MHz frequencies. He provided a brief background of each mandate. He explained that contrary to what was previously heard regarding agencies that vacate the 800 MHz receiving greatly reduced cash out values, Nextel was paying actual re-banding costs. He reviewed four conditions that must be met to use a cash-out option: (1) whatever project is done with the money must be done in the same time frame as re-banding would take, (2) the project cannot cost more than re-banding, (3) if the project costs more, the agency must have the additional funding in place, and (4) the agency must have a contract in place.

Mr. Phillips explained that as it stands now, if the Treaty with Mexico is signed, re-banding would need to be completed by 2014. He explained that there were two items in opposition to each other: the re-banding timeline, which requires the project to be completed in the next two to three years, and the narrow-banding timeline, which the desire was to extend as much as possible. He added that a lease/purchase option may be something to look into to allow re-banding money to be used towards the 700 MHz narrow-banding project while still meeting the four cash-out conditions.

Mr. Felix stated that a great deal of coordination would need to occur and expressed his appreciation to Mr. Phillips for reaching out to the other systems.

5. **RWC / TRWC Executive Directors' Report**

a. **National Public Safety Broadband Network**
   Mr. Felix reported that this item involves the proposed use of 700 MHz spectrum referred to as the D Block. He stated that the concept was to have the broadband network used nationwide by public safety to share and access improved information in the field. He explained that there was conflict with congressional bills that support the D Block allocation. He expressed that one

area of concern was that agencies would have to give back 700 MHz narrowband frequencies once standards were developed in broadband. He stated that this give back provision was in place even though there was no assurance that broadband would support public safety voice communications. He expressed that there was a large national public safety voice speaking out and that Senator Jon Kyl was assigned as one of the Senate Conferees working on the final language.

Mr. Shaw added that it was inevitable that public safety would move in this direction and that it was important for both cooperatives to be aware of this issue and to have a voice.

Vice Chair Thorpe inquired if it was possible to get the names of other conferees and coordinate with other public safety regions.

Chair Kross expressed that other major regions must be equally concerned.

Mr. Felix replied that he contacted seven other major regions and that he plans to facilitate a conference call to discuss this and other issues with them. He added that the Public Safety Alliance includes many groups familiar with the technical issues and it has also spoken out against the give back and other problematic language in the bills.

b. The Federal Communications Commission Petition
Mr. Felix reported that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has put everything on hold with regards to the Public Notice of Rule Making. He explained that his intent was to pursue filing the petition for review and expedited treatment by the end of the month of January. He added that the second petition is currently under review and edits by the TRWC and will be filed once it is finalized.

c. Motorola – Long Term Support Issues
Mr. Shaw reported that the TRWC administrative side participated in the joint discussions with Motorola following the RWC's Scorecard review with Motorola. He explained the discussion focused on long term support. He expressed that there were opportunities to have influence with Motorola in areas such as extending support for equipment and not forcing upgrades in an untimely manner. He added that the response by Motorola was positive. He added that another area discussed was collective volume purchasing and how it affects extended parts support.

Mr. Felix expressed that he was encouraged by the commitments made by Motorola Vice President Michelle Shaughnessy, who came to the meeting prepared. He added that he intends to facilitate a regional communications system conference call to further discuss the FCC and Motorola issues.

Mr. Campbell thanked the Executive Directors and recognized that agencies would feel the effects of costs.

Vice Chair Thorpe inquired whether the commitments by Motorola were going to be memorialized.

Mr. Felix responded in the affirmative, once Motorola brings back additional answers.

6.   Call to the Public

None.

7.   Announcements

Chair Meyer announced the retirement of Karen Allen from Tempe Police Department. He acknowledged her technical expertise and the work she performed on a regional basis.

Chair Kross thanked the group and all involved in this process. He expressed that the needs of the greater community were being accomplished.

Mr. Felix acknowledged the work performed by the RWC staff to put the meeting together.

8.   Adjournment

Chair Meyer adjourned the meeting at 11:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Theresa Faull, Management Assistant I
Regional Wireless Cooperative

![Regional Wireless Cooperative logo]

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: March 22, 2012
FROM:	Tahir Alhassan, RWC Accountant III	Item 4
SUBJECT:	**RWC FISCAL YEAR 2012/13 SUBSCRIBER UNIT RATE**	

BACKGROUND
On November 17, 2011, the RWC Board of Directors approved the budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012/2013, with an understanding that the Subscriber Unit Rate would be set in the spring of 2012.

THE ISSUE
The Subscriber Unit Rate is determined by dividing the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget by the average number of subscriber units on the network. The rate for FY 2012/13 has been calculated to be $39.35, which is approximately the same as the current rate of $39.30. The cost of staffing has been included in the calculation of the subscriber rate.

The City of Phoenix Budget and Research department conducted a technical budget review in February 2012, and as a result the overall budget was reduced by $342,325. The adjustment is due to a cost reduction in the Phoenix ITS portion of the RWC budget.

Annual O&M Budget (includes staff costs)	$8,238,946
Average # of Subscriber Units	17,448
Monthly Subscriber Rate	$39.35

RECOMMENDATION
The RWC Executive Committee recommends the Board approve the FY 2012/13 Subscriber Unit Rate in the amount of $39.35.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: March 22, 2012
FROM:	RWC Executive Committee	Item 5
SUBJECT:	**RWC 700 MHZ NARROW-BANDING, TDMA CONVERSION AND LIFECYCLE UPGRADES**	

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to advise the RWC Board of the revised Motorola proposal, long term financing options and present a revised budget to accomplish this project. The purpose is also to request the RWC Board approve the budget and financing option to permit Members to plan accordingly.

BACKGROUND
As a reminder, this project is necessary to meet the federal mandate to narrow-band all 700 MHz frequencies by January 1, 2017, and perform key lifecycle upgrades to replace components that are no longer supported.

700 MHz narrow-banding is a requirement to change the current 12.5 KHz bandwidth of the 700 MHz channels to 6.25 KHz, effectively doubling the number of channels available. The deadline for this mandate is currently set at January 1, 2017. In order to meet the narrow-banding requirement, the RWC's 700 MHz equipment must use a different communication protocol called Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA), which allows the equipment to broadcast two voice conversations on a single 700 MHz channel. Currently, the RWC is using the Frequency Division Multiple Access (FDMA) protocol. Although both protocols may be used on the same system, they cannot be used on the same talkgroup at the same time. This limits the seamless roaming ability. Thus, in order to comply with the Federal mandate, the RWC must convert the 700 MHz parts of the system to TDMA, and in order to maintain seamless roaming, the entire network must be converted to TDMA.

The RWC is currently planning to upgrade the system to version 7.11, in April 2013, and to version 7.15 in January of 2015. These upgrades are included in the System Upgrade Assurance II (SUA II) plan which has been approved by the Board and is part of the ongoing budget. In addition to these upgrades, Motorola has briefed the RWC on the product roadmap for the next five years. The roadmap includes several key product changes where support for certain products will be ending, necessitating upgrades and/or changes in these products. The critical product changes that must be considered are those affecting base stations, consoles, and subscribers.

The issue of RWC 700 MHz narrow-banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrades has been discussed at several previous RWC Board of Directors' meetings. At the last Board meeting, several options were presented for funding the project based on the $51 M cost. The Board was also advised that the RWC is working with many of the surrounding agencies to file petitions with the FCC in an effort to extend the narrow-banding deadline to at least 2019 to permit Members more time to provide funding for the project. However, until the FCC responds, it is necessary to plan as if the current deadline must be met.

RWC Board Members requested the team investigate more options for financing, and more time to discuss the project with their respective budget and finance staff.

DISCUSSION
As previously reported, the cost of this project has been estimated at $51 M to upgrade the system infrastructure. Motorola has provided a revised proposal which **reduces the cost to $38.5 M**. The reasons for the cost reduction are as follows:

1) No additional capacity is required to maintain system loading at a 2% Grade of Service.
2) The revised upgrade is based on a more simplified approach by totally shutting down each subsystem (Simulcast A, B &C) during the upgrade rather than having to upgrade live subsystems.
3) Simulcast J will be converted to TDMA capability early in the process to provide a "test bed" for TDMA capable subscribers. This will not affect Simulcast J's normal operational capabilities.

The revised timeline and costs are shown in Attachment A. Including the RWC costs and a small contingency, the total project cost for the infrastructure is $39.5 M not including financing charges. The deadline to complete the project remains the same, but the completion of each phase changes somewhat. Estimated milestone payments are not provided for the revised proposal due to the revised long term funding options. The Motorola proposal has been sent out to the Operations Working Group (OWG) and the Executive Committee for evaluation. Comments are due by the end of March to be collated and discussed at the April OWG and Executive Committee meetings. The results of those evaluations will be discussed with Motorola and presented to the RWC Board for final approval in May.

The revised cost significantly reduces the RWC's costs but the costs are still very high. In an effort to spread these costs over several years, RWC staff discussed long term financing options with the City of Phoenix Finance staff (as the RWC's Administrative Managing Member). Finance is looking into options for long term financing and suggested long term financing through Motorola as one option.

Motorola provided a proposal for long term financing based on the RWC's request to provide six (6) and ten (10) year payback options. Motorola added additional options for either a one or two year deferral to begin payments in arrears. These options are shown

in Attachment B. Note that the interest rates shown are based on the current market and are subject to change depending on when a contract is finally executed. These options do spread the cost of the project evenly across longer time frames, but of course they are more expensive with longer deferrals and payback periods. Note that Attachment B shows only the cost of carrying the Motorola portion of the project; the RWC and contingency costs would not be financed. RWC costs are still being developed.

Attachment C shows a comparison of the original project cost for infrastructure and milestone payment plan versus the revised project cost and long term financing payment schedule. The cost shown for the revised project and financing give a new tentative budget of $42.2 M (including financing costs) for the project. As was previously noted, the RWC continues to explore the "cash-out" option of the 800 MHz re-banding mandate, which appears to be imminent. Motorola has been given Notice To Proceed to perform the Preparation Of Estimate (POE) which will give us an estimate of the cost to negotiate for "cash-out." This estimate should be ready within the next few months, at which time we may begin negotiations with Sprint/Nextel.

Attachment D gives an approximate breakout, by RWC Member, of the total cost of the RWC Network infrastructure portion of the project. Attachments E, F and G provide more detail by displaying the RWC's total annual budget, including O&M, SUA II and project costs, through fiscal year 18/19 and each Members total share of the cost for each fiscal year.

The RWC staff is also pursuing options with the FCC to delay the deadline for the 700 MHz narrow-banding conversion to allow more time for Members to convert their subscriber fleet. These efforts are being reported in a separate agenda item.

Long term financing provides a methodology to ensure that our network is upgraded on a known time schedule, to meet the FCC deadline without having to provide all of the funding to do so by that deadline. It also permits the RWC to meet the lifecycle upgrades required to keep the system current. Finally, as the RWC Board has already been advised, the team is investigating the possibility of a "buy-out" of the 800 MHz re-banding project. In-lieu of re-banding the RWC's 800 MHz frequencies, they would all be converted to 700 MHz in conjunction with our narrow-banding and TDMA conversion. This funding may then be used to offset some of our costs towards accomplishing that effort. At this time it is premature to estimate how much funding the "buy-out" option will provide.

At this time, it is prudent to remind the RWC Board that the above project costs are only for the RWC network infrastructure changes required. There are still significant end user costs which each Member will have to bear on their own. Those costs include replacing the subscriber fleet with TDMA capable radios and replacing Gold Elite consoles with TDMA capable MCC 7500 consoles. As part of their Scorecard metrics with the RWC, Motorola is meeting individually with each Member to help assess those costs. Also

note that other options are being explored to provide alternate consoles and subscribers that may provide more competitive pricing.

The Executive Committee has examined the financing options and unanimously agreed long term financing is probably the best option for the RWC. In order to minimize the interest costs, the Executive Committee recommends using the six year term, starting payments one year in arrears of contract signing. The Executive Committee also wanted to ensure that the financing period was not so long that the Members would still be paying for the cost of the equipment long after its useful life. Since it is late in the budget "season," the Executive Committee recommends that the RWC Board adopt the revised budget and selected financing option for the project to permit RWC Members to plan and budget accordingly. It is recognized that this is a tentative budget and there may be some small changes to same. Also, if a better long term financing option becomes available, it may be used in lieu of Motorola financing.

RECOMMENDATION
It is requested that the RWC Board of Directors approve the revised network infrastructure project budget of $42.2 M, and the use of long term financing to pay for the infrastructure portion of the project. This does not commit the RWC to entering into a contract or financing agreement at this time, but gives the Members the ability to move forward with reasonable planning and budgeting activities.

Attachment A

Comparison of Original and Current Proposal for Narrow-Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade																					Total
CY	2012		2013				2014				2015				2016				2017			Total
FY	12/13				13/14				14/15				15/16				16/17					
QTR	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar			
Original Proposal																						
I: Simulcast C			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓													
II: Simulcast A&B									▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓				
III: ISR's																		▓	▓			
IV: TDMA Conversion																			▓			
Estimated Cost by FY (Including RWC costs and contingency)					$3,678,673				$19,392,176				$9,668,959				$18,260,191					$51,000,000
Revised Proposal																						$39,476,700
I: Simulcast C							▓	▓	▓													
II: Simulcast A&B										▓	▓	▓	▓									
III: ISR's								▓	▓	▓												
IV: TDMA Conversion and Simulcast J Testing										▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓				

Attachment B

Motorola Financing Options	Payment One Year in Arrears		Payment Two Years in Arrears	
	Option One	Option Two	Option One	Option Two
Amount Financed	$38,516,700.00	$38,516,700.00	$38,516,700.00	$38,516,700.00
Lease Term:	Six Years	Ten Years	Six Years	Ten Years
Payment Frequency:	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
Payment Structure:	Arrears	Arrears	Arrears	Arrears
Lease Rate:	1.99%	2.74%	2.21%	2.95%
Lease Factor:	0.178466	0.115680293	0.183786	0.120389
Number of Payments:	6	10	6	10
Lease Payment:	$6,873,921	$4,455,623	$7,078,830	$4,636,987
Amount Repaid:	$41,243,528	$44,556,231	$42,472,981	$46,369,870
Interest	$2,726,828	$6,039,531	$3,956,281	$7,853,170

Attachment C

Comparison of Original and Current Proposal for Narrow-Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade									
CY	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
FY	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/19		19/20	
Original Proposal by Milestones		$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191				$51,000,000
Revised Proposal 6 Year Financing		$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$6,873,921		$6,873,921	$42,203,528

The payments for the first four years are higher to include the RWC costs and contingency; ONLY the Motorola project costs are included in the financing.

Attachment D

Revised 700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget; Six (6) Year Lease To Purchase Funding										
	FY		12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	Total
Funding Required by Year			$0	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$6,873,921	$6,873,921	$42,203,528
Member Shares	Radio Count	%								
Avondale	263	1.51%		$107,231	$107,231	$107,231	$107,231	$103,613	$103,613	$636,149
Buckeye	188	1.08%		$76,652	$76,652	$76,652	$76,652	$74,066	$74,066	$454,738
Chandler	903	5.18%		$368,172	$368,172	$368,172	$368,172	$355,751	$355,751	$2,184,192
Daisy Mountain	5	0.03%		$2,039	$2,039	$2,039	$2,039	$1,970	$1,970	$12,094
El Mirage	82	0.47%		$33,433	$33,433	$33,433	$33,433	$32,305	$32,305	$198,343
Glendale	1,723	9.88%		$702,504	$702,504	$702,504	$702,504	$678,804	$678,804	$4,167,623
Goodyear	109	0.62%		$44,442	$44,442	$44,442	$44,442	$42,942	$42,942	$263,651
Guadalupe	4	0.02%		$1,631	$1,631	$1,631	$1,631	$1,576	$1,576	$9,675
Maricopa	11	0.06%		$4,485	$4,485	$4,485	$4,485	$4,334	$4,334	$26,607
Peoria	897	5.14%		$365,726	$365,726	$365,726	$365,726	$353,388	$353,388	$2,169,679
Phoenix	9,943	56.99%		$4,053,973	$4,053,973	$4,053,973	$4,053,973	$3,917,205	$3,917,205	$24,050,303
Scottsdale	1,404	8.05%		$572,441	$572,441	$572,441	$572,441	$553,128	$553,128	$3,396,020
Sun City	40	0.23%		$16,309	$16,309	$16,309	$16,309	$15,759	$15,759	$96,753
Sun City West	38	0.22%		$15,493	$15,493	$15,493	$15,493	$14,971	$14,971	$91,915
Sun Lakes	27	0.15%		$11,008	$11,008	$11,008	$11,008	$10,637	$10,637	$65,308
Surprise	310	1.78%		$126,394	$126,394	$126,394	$126,394	$122,130	$122,130	$749,833
Tempe	1,481	8.49%		$603,835	$603,835	$603,835	$603,835	$583,464	$583,464	$3,582,269
Tolleson	20	0.11%		$8,154	$8,154	$8,154	$8,154	$7,879	$7,879	$48,376
Total	17,448	100.00%		$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$7,113,921	$6,873,921	$6,873,921	$42,203,528

Attachment E

	RWC Annual Budget Summary						
	Fiscal Years						
Budget Items	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
O & M (Including Staffing Cost)	8,238,946	8,489,490	8,754,519	9,096,879	9,436,698	9,786,698	10,136,698
Required Minimum Balance	71,834	12,587	-	-	-	-	-
System Upgrade (SUA II)	2,391,373	2,653,000	2,670,200	2,675,000	2,714,400	2,759,400	2,794,400
700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	-	7,113,921	7,113,921	7,113,921	7,113,921	6,873,921	6,873,921
Total Budget	10,702,153	18,268,998	18,538,640	18,885,800	19,265,019	19,420,019	19,805,019

Attachment F

		RWC Annual Budget Summary By Member						
		Fiscal Years						
Member	Radio Counts	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Avondale	263	$169,748	$275,185	$279,440	$284,672	$290,389	$292,725	$298,528
Buckeye	188	$114,540	$196,711	$199,752	$203,492	$207,578	$209,248	$213,397
Chandler	903	$550,159	$944,838	$959,445	$977,412	$997,038	$1,005,059	$1,024,985
Daisy Mountain	5	$3,046	$5,232	$5,313	$5,412	$5,521	$5,565	$5,675
El Mirage	82	$49,959	$85,799	$87,126	$88,757	$90,539	$91,268	$93,077
Glendale	1,723	$1,112,071	$1,802,831	$1,830,701	$1,864,984	$1,902,432	$1,917,738	$1,955,757
Goodyear	109	$66,409	$126,637	$115,813	$117,982	$120,351	$121,319	$123,725
Guadalupe	4	$2,437	$4,185	$4,250	$4,330	$4,417	$4,452	$4,540
Maricopa	11	$6,702	$11,510	$11,688	$11,906	$12,146	$12,243	$12,486
Peoria	897	$546,504	$938,560	$953,070	$970,917	$990,413	$998,381	$1,018,174
Phoenix	9,943	$6,057,844	$10,403,685	$10,564,517	$10,762,352	$10,978,455	$11,066,784	$11,286,182
Scottsdale	1,404	$855,397	$1,469,051	$1,491,761	$1,519,696	$1,550,211	$1,562,684	$1,593,664
Sun City FD	40	$24,370	$41,853	$42,500	$43,296	$44,166	$44,521	$45,404
Sun City West FD	38	$23,152	$39,761	$40,375	$41,131	$41,957	$42,295	$43,133
Sun Lakes	27	$16,450	$28,251	$28,688	$29,225	$29,812	$30,052	$30,647
Surprise	310	$188,870	$324,363	$329,377	$335,546	$342,283	$345,037	$351,877
Tempe	1,481	$902,310	$1,549,619	$1,573,574	$1,603,042	$1,635,230	$1,648,387	$1,681,066
Tolleson	20	$12,185	$20,927	$21,250	$21,648	$22,083	$22,260	$22,702
Total Budget	17,448	$10,702,153	$18,268,998	$18,538,640	$18,885,800	$19,265,019	$19,420,019	$19,805,019

Attachment G

RWC Detail Budget By Member

Fiscal Years			FY 2012/13				FY 2013/14		
Members	Radio Count	O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total		O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total
Avondale	263	133,702	36,046	-	169,748		127,965	39,990	107,231	275,185
Buckeye	188	88,774	25,767	-	114,540		91,473	28,586	76,652	196,711
Chandler	903	426,397	123,763	-	550,159		439,363	137,303	368,172	944,838
Daisy Mountain	5	2,361	685	-	3,046		2,433	760	2,039	5,232
El Mirage	82	38,720	11,239	-	49,959		39,898	12,468	33,433	85,799
Glendale	1723	875,922	236,149	-	1,112,071		838,342	261,985	702,504	1,802,831
Goodyear	109	51,470	14,939	-	66,409		65,622	16,574	44,442	126,637
Guadalupe	4	1,889	548	-	2,437		1,946	608	1,631	4,185
Maricopa	11	5,194	1,508	-	6,702		5,352	1,673	4,485	11,510
Peoria	897	423,563	122,940	-	546,504		436,444	136,390	365,726	938,560
Phoenix	9943	4,695,085	1,362,759	-	6,057,844		4,837,861	1,511,851	4,053,973	10,403,685
Scottsdale	1404	662,969	192,428	-	855,397		683,130	213,481	572,441	1,469,051
Sun City FD	40	18,888	5,482	-	24,370		19,462	6,082	16,309	41,853
Sun City West FD	38	17,944	5,208	-	23,152		18,489	5,778	15,493	39,761
Sun Lakes	27	12,749	3,701	-	16,450		13,137	4,105	11,008	28,251
Surprise	310	146,382	42,488	-	188,870		150,833	47,136	126,394	324,363
Tempe	1481	699,328	202,982	-	902,310		720,595	225,189	603,835	1,549,619
Tolleson	20	9,444	2,741	-	12,185		9,731	3,041	8,154	20,927
Total	17,448	8,310,780	2,391,373	-	10,702,153		8,502,077	2,653,000	7,113,921	18,268,998

Attachment G

RWC Detail Budget By Member

Fiscal Years			FY 2014/15				FY 2015/16		
Members	Radio Count	O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total	O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total
Avondale	263	131,960	40,249	107,231	279,440	137,121	40,321	107,231	284,672
Buckeye	188	94,329	28,771	76,652	199,752	98,018	28,823	76,652	203,492
Chandler	903	453,079	138,193	368,172	959,445	470,798	138,441	368,172	977,412
Daisy Mountain	5	2,509	765	2,039	5,313	2,607	767	2,039	5,412
El Mirage	82	41,143	12,549	33,433	87,126	42,752	12,572	33,433	88,757
Glendale	1723	864,514	263,684	702,504	1,830,701	898,322	264,158	702,504	1,864,984
Goodyear	109	54,691	16,681	44,442	115,813	56,829	16,711	44,442	117,982
Guadalupe	4	2,007	612	1,631	4,250	2,085	613	1,631	4,330
Maricopa	11	5,519	1,683	4,485	11,688	5,735	1,686	4,485	11,906
Peoria	897	450,069	137,275	365,726	953,070	467,670	137,521	365,726	970,917
Phoenix	9943	4,988,892	1,521,653	4,053,973	10,564,517	5,183,991	1,524,388	4,053,973	10,762,352
Scottsdale	1404	704,456	214,865	572,441	1,491,761	732,005	215,251	572,441	1,519,696
Sun City FD	40	20,070	6,122	16,309	42,500	20,855	6,133	16,309	43,296
Sun City West FD	38	19,066	5,815	15,493	40,375	19,812	5,826	15,493	41,131
Sun Lakes	27	13,547	4,132	11,008	28,688	14,077	4,139	11,008	29,225
Surprise	310	155,542	47,442	126,394	329,377	161,625	47,527	126,394	335,546
Tempe	1481	743,090	226,649	603,835	1,573,574	772,150	227,056	603,835	1,603,042
Tolleson	20	10,035	3,061	8,154	21,250	10,427	3,066	8,154	21,648
Total	**17,448**	**8,754,519**	**2,670,200**	**7,113,921**	**18,538,640**	**9,096,879**	**2,675,000**	**7,113,921**	**7,113,921**

Attachment G

RWC Detail Budget By Member

Fiscal Years		FY 2016/17					FY 2017/18			
Members	Radio Count	O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total		O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total
Avondale	263	142,243	40,915	107,231	290,389		147,518	41,593	103,613	292,725
Buckeye	188	101,679	29,247	76,652	207,578		105,450	29,732	74,066	209,248
Chandler	903	488,385	140,480	368,172	997,038		506,499	142,809	355,751	1,005,059
Daisy Mountain	5	2,704	778	2,039	5,521		2,805	791	1,970	5,565
El Mirage	82	44,349	12,757	33,433	90,539		45,994	12,968	32,305	91,268
Glendale	1723	931,879	268,049	702,504	1,902,432		966,442	272,492	678,804	1,917,738
Goodyear	109	58,952	16,957	44,442	120,351		61,139	17,238	42,942	121,319
Guadalupe	4	2,163	622	1,631	4,417		2,244	633	1,576	4,452
Maricopa	11	5,949	1,711	4,485	12,146		6,170	1,740	4,334	12,243
Peoria	897	485,140	139,547	365,726	990,413		503,133	141,860	353,388	998,381
Phoenix	9943	5,377,641	1,546,841	4,053,973	10,978,455		5,577,094	1,572,485	3,917,205	11,066,784
Scottsdale	1404	759,349	218,421	572,441	1,550,211		787,513	222,043	553,128	1,562,684
Sun City FD	40	21,634	6,223	16,309	44,166		22,436	6,326	15,759	44,521
Sun City West FD	38	20,552	5,912	15,493	41,957		21,314	6,010	14,971	42,295
Sun Lakes	27	14,603	4,200	11,008	29,812		15,144	4,270	10,637	30,052
Surprise	310	167,663	48,227	126,394	342,283		173,881	49,026	122,129	345,037
Tempe	1481	800,994	230,400	603,835	1,635,230		830,703	234,220	583,464	1,648,387
Tolleson	20	10,817	3,111	8,154	22,083		11,218	3,163	7,879	22,260
Total	17448	9,436,698	2,714,400	7,113,921	19,265,019		9,786,698	2,759,400	6,873,921	19,420,019

Attachment G

RWC Detail Budget By Member

| Fiscal Years | | | | FY 2018/19 | |

Members	Radio Count	O & M	SUA II	700 MHz, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade	Total
Avondale	263	152,794	42,121	103,613	298,528
Buckeye	188	109,222	30,109	74,066	213,397
Chandler	903	524,612	144,621	355,751	1,024,985
Daisy Mountain	5	2,905	801	1,970	5,675
El Mirage	82	47,639	13,133	32,305	93,077
Glendale	1723	1,001,005	275,949	678,804	1,955,757
Goodyear	109	63,325	17,457	42,942	123,725
Guadalupe	4	2,324	641	1,576	4,540
Maricopa	11	6,391	1,762	4,334	12,486
Peoria	897	521,127	143,660	353,388	1,018,174
Phoenix	9943	5,776,547	1,592,430	3,917,205	11,286,182
Scottsdale	1404	815,677	224,859	553,128	1,593,664
Sun City FD	40	23,239	6,406	15,759	45,404
Sun City West FD	38	22,077	6,086	14,971	43,133
Sun Lakes	27	15,686	4,324	10,637	30,647
Surprise	310	180,100	49,648	122,129	351,877
Tempe	1481	860,411	237,191	583,464	1,681,066
Tolleson	20	11,619	3,203	7,879	22,702
Total	**17448**	**10,136,698**	**2,794,400**	**6,873,921**	**19,805,019**

Regional Wireless Cooperative

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: March 22, 2012
FROM:	Executive Committee	Item 6

SUBJECT: **TOWN OF BUCKEYE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT**

BACKGROUND
The RWC Intergovernmental Agreement, Exhibit A, Section 4.2.2 describes events that may warrant the need for Special Assessments. One such situation is to pay the costs of special projects or system changes and/or expansions not previously included in the budget.

THE ISSUE
There are two sites currently being build-out for the Town of Buckeye. While Buckeye manages its own projects and has contracted directly with Motorola to build-out the network, there is still work that must be performed by the RWC to connect these sites to the network. This work includes general engineering and support activity, establishing and verifying microwave connectivity, network and alarm configuration, tower studies, antenna mounting, testing, documentation, and coordination with the vendor and agencies. At the January 27, 2011 Board meeting, the Board approved a Special Assessment in the amount of $107,220.50 to Buckeye for RWC costs associated with the projects.

As these two sites near completion, Buckeye desired to install additional equipment to support Operations, Administration, Maintenance and Provisioning (OAM&P), video surveillance and access control that was not included in Buckeye's original Special Assessment.

Buckeye notified RWC staff that its Police Department acquired funding for the cost of the additional equipment and requested that the RWC pursue ordering the equipment. Since the optimal time to install this equipment is prior to project completion and due to the long lead time for ordering some of the equipment, the Executive Committee approved that the RWC order the equipment and charge Buckeye a Special Assessment in the amount of $46,394.72 for equipment costs. Buckeye has paid the Special Assessment in full.

RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Committee recommends retroactive Board-approval of the Special Assessment in the amount of $46,394.72 to the Town of Buckeye.

REGIONAL WIRELESS COOPERATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	**Regional Wireless Cooperative**
	No.
Subject:	**Effective Date**
Overlay Sites	**3/22/12**

1.0 Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to define the interoperable and operable use of the Regional Wireless Cooperative's (RWC) Overlay Sites by RWC and Non-RWC Members.

2.0 Owner

2.1. RWC Operations Working Group (OWG).

3.0 Applies To

3.1. This applies to all approved users of the RWC network.

4.0 Background

4.1. The Overlay Sites consist of the following locations: Far North Mountain, North Mountain, Sacaton Peak, South Mountain, Thompson Peak, Towers Mountain, White Tank Mountain, and associated network sites.

4.2. The primary intent of the Overlay Sites is to provide the ability for any entity with capable subscriber equipment to use the sites as a redundant backup system in the event of a primary communications system failure.

4.3. The Overlay Sites are designed to support mobile on-street use.

5.0 Policy Statement

5.1. Users are assigned a system priority level.

5.2. Priority order for use of the Overlay Sites is as follows:

5.2.1. Redundant backup system.

5.2.2. Interoperable use.

5.2.3. RWC Member operational use.

5.2.4. Non-RWC Member operational use.

5.3. Backup use may preempt other usages.

6.0 Supporting Rules

6.1. Users of the Overlay Sites must be either a Member or Participant of the RWC Network.

6.2. Sufficient capacity must be set aside to ensure that sustained busies do not occur on the system.

    6.2.1. Monthly utilization reports will be reviewed to determine capacity allocations.

6.3. No assumptions should be made that service levels will be adequate for the needs of the user due to the design of the system.

    6.3.1. While in-building coverage may be available, it cannot be guaranteed.

    6.3.2. Geographical terrain can affect the ability to service sites.

6.4. Operational use of the Overlay Sites by Non-RWC Members will incur charges (e.g. operations and maintenance, capital fund).

6.5. When the Overlay Sites are used as an immediate backup resource, the stipulations of the Good Neighbor Policy apply.

7.0 Responsibilities

7.1. RWC Member requests for operational use of the Overlay Sites must be submitted to the OWG for approval.

7.2. Non-RWC Member requests for operational use of the Overlay Sites must be submitted to the RWC Executive Director on Agency letterhead.

    7.2.1. Submissions must include:

        7.2.1.1. Agency name and single point of contact.

        7.2.1.2. Number of subscribers (an RWC Subscriber Inventory form may be required).

        7.2.1.3. Estimated duration of access.

        7.2.1.4. The authorized service provider or entity that will program the subscribers (when applicable).

        7.2.1.5. Specific talkgroup requirements, including encryption.

        7.2.1.6. Specific site(s) requested.

        7.2.1.7. Purpose of the request.

        7.2.1.8. Signature of authorized agency representative.

    7.2.2. The Executive Director will provide the OWG a written summary of the application packet to include:

        7.2.2.1. Requesting Participant.

        7.2.2.2. Talkgroup requirements.

            7.2.2.2.1. Duration.

            7.2.2.2.2. Site(s).

            7.2.2.2.3. Number of talkgroups.

            7.2.2.2.4. Encryption Requirements.

7.2.2.3.   Purpose of request.

7.2.2.4.   Number of subscribers/users.

7.2.3. The OWG will provide a recommendation to the Executive Committee.

7.2.4. The Executive Committee will forward its recommendation to the Board of Directors through the Executive Director.

7.2.5. The Board of Directors will approve, deny or request additional information.

7.2.6. The Executive Director will contact the requestor regarding approval status.

7.2.7. Upon approval, the requestor will enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Administrative Managing Member.

7.3. Approved Non-RWC Members desiring additional talkgroups and/or an increase in the number of approved subscriber counts must notify the Executive Director of proposed changes.

7.3.1. Notification must include:

7.3.1.1.   Agency name and single point of contact.

7.3.1.2.   RWC Subscriber Inventory form, if changes.

7.3.1.3.   Estimated duration of access.

7.3.1.4.   Talkgroup requirement changes.

7.3.1.5.   Purpose of request.

7.3.1.6.   Signature of authorized agency representative.

7.3.2. The Executive Director will provide a written summary of requested changes for OWG recommendation or approval.

8.0 Conditions for Exemption or Waiver

8.1. As provided in the Waiver or Exception Policy.

9.0 Applicable Policies and/or Procedures

9.1. As listed at www.rwcaz.org.

Regional Wireless Cooperative

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: March 22, 2012
FROM:	David Felix, RWC Executive Director	Item 8
SUBJECT:	**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**	

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the following two items:

A. STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

BACKGROUND
The RWC and the Phoenix Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) have received an award of technical assistance from the Federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) to enable stakeholders in the metropolitan region to develop a Strategic Communications Plan (SCMP).

THE ISSUE
Federal DHS Contract Support, with oversight from Arizona's Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Office, will facilitate meetings and the follow-up work to develop a SCMP. The development workshops will be the first key step towards developing a regional plan that identifies current and future requirements and documents the region's strategic plan.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information and discussion.

B. AWARDS SUBMITTALS

BACKGROUND
At the January meeting of the RWC Board of Directors, RWC staff was asked to apply for the International County/City Management Association (ICMA) Award for Community Partnerships.

THE ISSUE
The ICMA Award for Community Partnerships has been submitted for the RWC. Staff has also submitted a nomination on behalf of the RWC and TRWC for the 2012 Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Desert Peaks Awards for Regional

Partnerships. Both of these awards were due on March 16, 2012. A similar nomination is being prepared for the federally sponsored 2012 Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee (LECC) Award for Outstanding Contributions to Community Partnerships for Public Safety. This submission is due by April 18, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information and discussion.

C. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PETITION

BACKGROUND
The Executive Director will provide an update related to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandate that all 700 MHz frequencies must be narrow-banded by 2017.

THE ISSUE
The RWC Board of Directors has previously approved the Executive Director to pursue signatures and filing petitions with the FCC to delay or waive the 2017 deadline to narrowband 700 MHz. On February 21, 2012, an RWC-authored petition for "expedited review and decision" was filed with the FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau. As of this writing, the second RWC/TRWC petition is being routed to the TRWC, 700 MHz Regional Planning Committee (RPC), Arizona Public Safety Communications Advisory Commission (PSCC), Arizona Department of Public Safety (DPS) and Yuma Regional Communications System (YRCS) for signatures.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information and discussion.