



**Regional Wireless Cooperative**  
 Board of Directors  
 Agenda  
 May 23, 2013

	ITEM	PRESENTER
1)	<b>Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Comments</b>	Vice Chair Campbell – El Mirage
2)	<b>Approval of RWC Board Meeting Minutes from March 28, 2013</b>  <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Vice Chair Campbell – El Mirage  Est. 2 min
3)	<b>Approval of Board Chair Nomination – Chief Steve Campbell</b> Vice Chair Steve Campbell was previously nominated to be the Board of Directors Chairperson, but no action could be taken since it was not previously listed on the agenda. <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director  Est. 2 min
4)	<b>Nominations by the RWC Nominating Committee</b> The purpose of this item is to hear from the Nominating Committee and vote to fill the Vice-Chair position. <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Mr. Paul Wilson – Sun Lakes Fire District  Est. 10 min
5)	<b>RWC CIP Working Group Recommendation</b> The purpose of this item is to present the recommendations of the CIP Working Group, and request the RWC Board approve the recommendations for future CIP projects and create a policy to memorialize the process. <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix ITS  Est. 10 min.
6)	<b>Apply the Approved RWC CIP Funding Procedure to the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrade Project</b> The purpose of this item is to request approval to apply the CIP Working Group recommendation to the upcoming 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrade Project. <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix ITS  Est. 5 min.
7)	<b>Governance Working Group Update</b> This purpose of this item is to update the Board of Directors on the continued efforts of the Governance Working Group, and request the RWC Board approve the Governance Working Group to continue their efforts <b>This item is for information, discussion and action.</b>	Mr. Brad Hartig – Scottsdale CIO & Chief Steve Campbell – El Mirage Police Chief Est. 20 min.



**Regional Wireless Cooperative**  
**Board of Directors**  
**Agenda**  
**May 23, 2013**

<b>8)</b>	<p><b>Executive Director's Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Law Enforcement User Forum</li> <li>b. FCC Petition</li> <li>c. 7.11 Upgrade</li> <li>d. Public Safety Radio System Administrators Forum</li> </ul> <p><b>This item is for information and discussion.</b></p>	<p>Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director</p> <p>Est. 15 min.</p>
<b>9)</b>	<p><b>Call to the Public</b></p> <p><b>This item is for information only.</b></p>	<p>Chair Campbell – El Mirage</p>
<b>10)</b>	<p><b>Announcements &amp; Future Agenda Items</b></p> <p>The purpose of this item is to communicate any Board announcements or future agenda items.</p> <p>The date of the next Board Meeting: July 25, 2013 from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.</p> <p><b>This item is for information only.</b></p>	<p>Chair Campbell – El Mirage</p>
<b>11)</b>	<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	<p>Chair Campbell – El Mirage</p>



**Board of Directors  
MINUTES  
March 28, 2013**

Maricopa Association of Governments  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

**Board Members Present**

**Board Members Absent**

Wade Brannon	Mike Frazier	Tim Van Scoter	John Bennett
Brenda Buren	Mark Gaillard	Marc Walker	Wayne Clement
Steve Campbell	Mark Gorla	Paul Wilson	Chris DeChant
Bob Costello	Jim Haner**	Ed Zuercher	Bob Hansen
Susan Daluddung	Brad Hartig		Danny Johnson
*Board Alternate	**Telephone Participant		

**Staff and Public Present**

Kelli Butz	John Gardner	Doug Mummert	Randy Thompson**
Jim Case	Thomas Grebner	Chris Nadeau	Shannon Tolle
Dave Clarke	Jennifer Hagen	Cy Otsuka	Jim Tortora
Dave Collett	Dave Heck	Ron Parks	Timothy Ulery
Jesse Cooper	Kacie Howard	Bill Phillips	
David Felix	John Imig	Dale Shaw**	
Domela Finnessey	Rick Kolker	Mike Sumnicht	
**Telephone Participant			

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

Vice Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum reached.

Vice Chair Campbell introduced the three new Board Members to the group: Mr. Mark Gorla from the City of Avondale, Ms. Susan Daluddung from the City of Peoria, and Ms. Brenda Buren from the City of Tempe.

**2. Approval of RWC Board Meeting Minutes from January 24, 2013**

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Zuercher and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve the minutes as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (14-0).**

### 3. **RWC Board of Directors Nominating Committee**

Vice Chair Campbell briefed the Board on the need to create a nominating committee since former Chair Thorpe can no longer serve due to moving out of State. The Regional Wireless Cooperative Governance does state that the Vice Chair shall step into the Chair role temporarily in the Chair's absence.

In the past, when a vacancy had arisen, a nominating committee was formed and selected nominations for the Chair and/or Vice Chair positions. Vice Chair Campbell asked if there were any volunteers to serve on the nominating committee. It was also suggested by Mr. Zuercher that the nominating committee continue to serve as needed in the future.

Mr. Hartig expressed that he thought there needed to be some continuity in the positions of Chair and Vice Chair, and that in this instance it would make sense for the Vice Chair to step into the Chair roll. Then a new Vice Chair could be nominated.

Mr. Frazier asked if Vice Chair Campbell would be interested in serving as the Chair of the Board of Directors. Vice Chair Campbell responded that, if he was the Board's choice, he would be glad to serve as Chair. Vice Chair Campbell also wanted to make sure that the nomination went through the process to ensure that was what the Board agreed to.

A nomination was made by Mr. Hartig to have Vice Chair Campbell move into the Chairperson role for the Board of Directors. Mr. Fraizer seconded this motion, and it will appear on the agenda for the **May 23<sup>rd</sup>** meeting.

Mr. Zuercher suggested the nominating committee should serve on an annual basis to assist with any future vacancies to the Chair or Vice Chair positions.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Zuercher and **SECONDED** by Ms. Buren to create a yearly nominating committee as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (14-0).**

The nominating committee will consist of Mr. Paul Wilson, Ms. Brenda Buren, and Mr. Brad Hartig.

Vice Chair Campbell and Mr. Hartig stressed to the group that the next year or two in the RWC will have many challenges in progressing with interoperability and partnerships, upgrades, and future projects.

Mr. Felix reminded the Board that the staff assists the Chair and Vice Chair with meeting preparation and updates to help minimize the impact of their service in one of these positions.

#### **4. RWC Auditor Selection**

Ms. Kelli Butz made a presentation to the Board showing the RFP process for selecting an auditor company for the RWC. There were a total of 7 responses and 3 non-responsive companies. Each company's proposal was reviewed to make sure they were qualified, and what hours and costs would be.

Ms. Butz reminded the Board that it is common practice to retain the same audit company for 5 years and then switch to a new firm for a fresh perspective. Clifton Larson Allen has already done the RWC audit for the past two years. The RWC budget for the annual audit is \$21,000 for FY 2013/2014 and \$22,050 for FY 2014/2015.

Ms. Butz requested the Board approve the selection of Clifton Larson Allen as the RWC auditing firm; this was also the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Zuercher and **SECONDED** by Mr. Gaillard to approved Clifton Larson Allen as the RWC auditing firm. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (14-0)**.

#### **5. RWC Subscriber Unit (Radio) Rate for FY 2013/2014**

Ms. Kelli Butz presented the proposed Subscriber Rate to the Board. The rate is based on the numbers of subscribers on the system at the time, plus any known increases to subscribers due to new members. The estimated rate given at the November meeting was \$36.54, but due to changes in the subscriber count, the revised rate is now \$39.75.

Ms. Butz presented a budget summary which shows an Operating Budget of \$8,237,764 and Special Assessments budget of \$11,112,196. Ms. Butz also presented to the Board a FY '13/'14 spreadsheet which shows the totals owed for each Member.

The RWC Executive Committee recommends the Board approve the proposed Subscriber Rate of \$39.75.

Mr. Fraizer wanted to clarify that the increased subscriber rate would mean an increase to all members from the November budget estimate. This rate only changes the Operations & Maintenance and the SUAll special assessment billed to each Member.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Gaillard and **SECONDED** by Mr. Hartig to approve the Subscriber Rate for FY 2013/2014. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (14-0)**.

**6. RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrades and Special Assessment**

Mr. Bill Phillips presented the project to the Board, asking for approval for the project, its estimate cost, and to authorize the special assessment for FY 13/14 to be billed in July 2013.

This project is to comply with the federal mandate to narrow-band all 700 MHz frequencies by January 1, 2017. There are also lifecycle infrastructure upgrades that need to be performed. The project has been divided into two parts; hardware upgrade and the TDMA conversion (narrow-banding).

Hardware upgrades must be completed by November 2015 because they must coincide with the 800 MHz Re-Banding in order to obtain the “cash-out” option, which is estimated at \$4,300,000. The hardware upgrade portion of the project totals \$29,700,000 less the credits of \$4,300,000; equals a total of \$25,400,000.

The second phase of the project is the TDMA conversion, scheduled for January 2017, but we are hoping to receive a waiver by the FCC pushing out the deadline, possibly to 2024. The FCC may not choose to move the deadline and therefore the RWC would have to complete the project by 2017 in order to avoid incurring significant penalties. The estimated cost of this second phase of the project is \$17,700,000. If the deadline is extended, then additional capacity will need to be added to the system at a cost of \$6,900,000. Overall project cost is \$43,102,600, which includes the credits.

The radio counts have changed significantly recently, which does affect the cost of the project for different members. Capital budgets need to be predictable; therefore a snapshot is being proposed to help set the distribution and special assessments for the following fiscal year. The follow-on years will include any predicted changes in radio counts at the time of the snapshot.

Chief Wilson mentioned that it is problematic to their budgets because they usually use a 5 year prediction for CIP programs. Chief Wilson proposes a way to set a 5 year cap and then address new members as they come on. The other members would receive a credit back as the project costs were spread to new members. Chief Wilson suggested we need to find a way to make sure that it's consistent and fair for all members.

Future planning is also important for each city in order to obtain financing for future projects. The set budget must be maintained or go lower, as credits are easier than increases when dealing with financing. Since radio counts go up and down, taking a snapshot to bill project costs seems like a way to smooth out the costs for each member.

Mr. Zuercher suggests forming a CIP working group to help figure out the best way to plan for future projects. The working group will consist of Mr. Zuercher, Mr. Hartig, and Chief Wilson and will come up with suggestions for the Executive

Committee to consider on how to move forward with CIP program funding.

The Board asked that in the future if there are changes to project costs and timelines, the staff use side-by-side comparisons to show the Board where the previous amounts change and what financial impact there would be for each agency.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Hartig and **SECONDED** by Ms. Daluddung to approve the RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrades and Special Assessment in the amount of \$25,365,000. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (14-0).**

## 7. **Executive Director's Report**

### a. **Strategic Communications Plan**

Mr. Felix addressed the Board on the work of the Governance Working Group and the progress that they have made. Mr. Hartig let the board know that the group meets every two weeks and has been looking at all the potential governance options. The group has used a decision making matrix to work out all the options and scored each criteria based on how well that governance option met the criteria.

At this time, the group has settled on two options: single governance and a Communication Authority. These two options are being worked through and attorneys from Mesa and Phoenix have been consulted. The group will come up with a recommendation and then present to the Strategic Planning committee as well as the RWC & TRWC Boards.

Mr. Felix informed the Board that we are working on a Law Enforcement User Forum to help spread information on how to use the radio system in the field. The forum will also solicit information from the user if they have questions or comments about the radio system and how it could be improved. We hope to hold the forum on Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, and will be soliciting attendees from each of the member police agencies.

### b. **RWC Inventory & Value Report**

Mr. Felix informed the Board that a comprehensive RWC Inventory and Value Report has been composed by the Phoenix ITS Radio Service group which shows a total equipment value of \$113,340,957 (does not include Scottsdale's equipment).

### c. **Media Request**

Mr. Felix informed the Board that there has been a media request from the Arizona Republic regarding information on the RWC and TRWC networks. Mr. Felix has not been contacted yet, but thinks that this may be coming

soon.

**8. Call to the Public**

None

**9. Announcements and Future Agenda Items**

Mr. Hartig announced that the RWC will be doing a presentation at the LEIM Conference in Scottsdale at the end of May. Mr. Felix has asked Jesse Cooper (Phoenix PD) and Tom Melton (Scottsdale PD) to present an RWC overview at the conference.

Vice Chair Campbell thanked the staff for all of their hard work. Vice Chair Campbell also mentioned the challenges of creating a seamless system with interoperability statewide.

**10. Adjournment**

Vice Chair Campbell adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kacie Howard, Management Assistant I





## BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

---

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members      Agenda Date: May 23, 2013

FROM: David Felix, RWC Executive Director      Item 3

SUBJECT: **Approval of Board Chair Nomination**

---

---

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to formally approve the nomination of Chief Steve Campbell as the RWC Board of Directors Chairman.

### BACKGROUND

At the March 28<sup>th</sup> RWC Board Meeting, a motion was made to elect Chief Campbell as the RWC Board of Directors Chairman. Unfortunately this action should not have been voted on, as it was not listed as an action item on the agenda. The agenda item for the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting was only to create a nominating committee to solicit nominations for the Chair position.

### DISCUSSION

#### **Arizona Revised Statutes**

#### **A.R.S. § 38-431.02. Notice of meetings**

H. Agendas required under this section shall list the specific matters to be discussed, considered or decided at the meeting. The public body may discuss, consider or make decisions only on matters listed on the agenda and other matters related thereto.

#### **Arizona Agency Handbook - The Arizona Ombudsman**

**7.7.6 Discussing and Deciding Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.** The public body may discuss, consider, or decide only those matters listed on the agenda and “other matters related thereto.” A.R.S. § 38-431.02(H). The “other matters” clause provides some flexibility to a public body but should be used cautiously. The “other matters” must in some reasonable manner be “related” to an item specifically listed on the agenda. *Thurston v. City of Phoenix*, 157 Ariz. 343, 344, 757 P.2d 619, 620 (App. 1988). If a matter not specifically listed on the agenda is brought up during a meeting, the better practice, and the one that will minimize subsequent litigation, is to defer discussion and decision on the matter until a later meeting so that the item can be “specifically” listed on the agenda. If the matter demands immediate attention and is a true emergency, the public body should consider using the emergency exception described in Section 7.6.9.

### RECOMMENDATION

The RWC Board is requested to approve the nomination of Chief Steve Campbell as the Chairman of the RWC Board of Directors.



## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT**

---

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members      Agenda Date: May 23, 2013

FROM: Bill Phillips, RWC Executive Committee Chair      Item 4

SUBJECT: **VICE-CHAIR NOMINATION & SELECTION**

---

---

### BACKGROUND

The Vice-Chair position has become vacant with the election of Vice-Chair Campbell to assume to the Chair position. The RWC Board of Directors was notified of this at the March meeting and created a Nominating Committee to seek a Vice-Chair replacement.

### THE ISSUE

The Nominating Committee solicited nominations via email and has compiled a list of nominated candidates. The nominees are Ms. Susan Daluddung (Peoria) and Mr. Brad Hartig (Scottsdale).

### RECOMMENDATION

The Board Members will vote on their choice for Vice-Chair at the May 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting to satisfy Open Meeting Law requirements.



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

---

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members      Agenda Date: May 23, 2013

FROM: RWC CIP Working Group      Items 5, 6

SUBJECT: **RWC CIP WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION AND  
700 MHZ NARROW-BANDING, TDMA CONVERSION AND LIFECYCLE  
UPGRADE**

---

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to report on the recommendations of the CIP Working Group, and request the RWC Board approve the recommendations for future CIP projects, and for the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion and Lifecycle Upgrade project.

### BACKGROUND

At the March 28<sup>th</sup> RWC Board Meeting, the Board of Directors established a CIP Working Group to develop recommendations for a fixed level of CIP cost and funding. The CIP Working Group was made up of three Board Members, Mr. Brad Hartig, CIO Scottsdale, Chief Paul Wilson, Sun Lakes Fire Department, and Mr. Ed Zuercher, Assistant City Manager, Phoenix. RWC members wanted to stabilize the cost and funding distribution of CIP projects, for a specified term, so agencies could budget CIP costs appropriately.

### DISCUSSION

Chief Wilson prepared a proposal for the CIP Working Group to use as a starting point on how to handle CIP projects. The CIP Working Group met twice to discuss and refine the proposal. The attached memo (Attachment A) represents the final recommendations to achieve the goals requested by the Board. The overall goal is to assess CIP project costs and special assessments for each Member that are as stable and fixed as possible. The main premise is that once the Board approves a project, including its cost and special assessment by Members, the amount of funding required from each Member would not change during the term of the project, except under limited circumstances. Any revenue collected as a result of these limited changes would be over and above that needed to fund the project, and would be added to a long term CIP account that would be applied to future projects.

At the March 28<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting, the Board approved the Hardware Phase of the 700 MHz Narrow-banding, TDMA conversion and Lifecycle Upgrade project at a cost of \$25.4 M, and the special assessment for same. Attachment B provides an example of how the CIP Working Group's recommendations would be applied to this project.

## RECOMMENDATION

The RWC Board is requested to approve the CIP Working Group's recommendations as stated in Attachment A. The CIP Working Group also recommends that, if approved, their recommendations be turned over to the Executive Director and staff to create a written policy.

It is also recommended that the RWC Board also apply the CIP Working Group's model to the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion, and Lifecycle Upgrade project as shown in Attachment B. This would not increase the fixed assessments as currently approved, but does provide a mechanism for adjusting the special assessments due to the estimated changes in radio counts due to the addition of Goodyear and Paradise Valley Police, Scottsdale Fire and other Member changes that exceed 10% of their established radio count.

The RWC Executive Committee concurs with the CIP Working Group and also recommends the above.

### Attachments:

- A) RWC Working Group Recommendations dated April 30, 2013
- B) CIP Working Group Model Applied to Hardware Phase Costs and Comparison dated 05/10/2013

## **Attachment A: RWC Working Group Recommendations dated April 30, 2013**

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC)  
Board of Directors

Date: April 30, 2013

David Felix, RWC Executive Director

FROM: Capital Improvement Plan - Working Group  
Ed Zuercher, Assistant City Manager  
City of Phoenix  
Brad Hartig, CIO/ Executive Director Information Technology  
City of Scottsdale  
Paul Wilson, Fire Chief  
Sun Lakes Fire District

SUBJECT: RWC Capital Improvement Plan Proposal

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to recommend parameters for future RWC Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. The report outlines the establishment of total project cost, method of pro-rata funding by agencies and identification of RWC members multi-year funding commitments.

### BACKGROUND

The RWC Board of Directors, at their March 28, 2013 meeting, tasked the CIP Working Group to develop recommendations on how to address a fixed level of CIP cost and funding. RWC members expressed interest in knowing the required cost and funding, for a specified term, so agencies could budget CIP costs appropriately.

### DISCUSSION

Using the RWC Board meeting, March 28, 2013, Agenda Item 6 - RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding Hardware Upgrade Report, defining the Hardware Phase project costs, the CIP Working Group developed and recommends the following;

1. Assess CIP project costs and special assessments for each Member that are as stable and fixed as possible. Special assessments will be based on a fixed radio count for each Member established at the beginning of the project.
2. Special assessments to a Member may not be increased except under the following circumstances:
  - a. Special assessments will be added for any new Members who join during the term of the project.
  - b. Special assessments for existing Members will be increased only if their radio counts increase more than 10%. For example, the City of Goodyear adding its Police Department to the network would result in an additional special assessment.
3. The RWC Board of Directors, with recommendations from the Executive Director, and the RWC Executive Committee, will establish the point in time when an upcoming CIP project

## **Attachment A: RWC Working Group Recommendations dated April 30, 2013**

budget will be “frozen.” CIP projects will be established for a specified term and will require an RWC Board of Directors formal Resolution stating the purpose of the project, term of project, total cost of project and each RWC Member’s fixed share of the project costs, programmed across the specified term. The project must be adopted early enough to allow RWC Board Members sufficient time to seek appropriate funding authority from their respective jurisdiction and/or elected officials.

4. A snapshot of radio counts will be used to establish the fixed cost special assessments for the term of the project for each Member. Based on the snapshot, the fixed cost, and the term of the project, a CIP rate for each year of the project will be established. The CIP rate will be used to determine any changes to special assessments for the allowed circumstances in Paragraph 2 above. A CIP rate is required for each year since the amount of funding may not be the same for each year of the term of the project.
5. Once the CIP project and the fixed special assessments are approved by the RWC Board of Directors, a member agency would not be entitled to any refund, from a reduction of radio counts during the term of the project.
6. Each fiscal year end, a true-up for added subscribers, as allowed under Paragraph 2 above, will be calculated for the fiscal year just completed. At this time, an estimated true-up for the remainder of the project will also be calculated so Members can see a reasonable estimate of the final amounts due for each Member. These special assessments will be calculated based on the CIP rates, as described in Paragraph 4 above, and the number of months those subscribers are on the system. Example: Agency Y joins the RWC as a member in the thirteen month of a thirty-six month CIP project. They would be responsible for the remaining twenty-four months of CIP costs. These special assessments will result in an excess of capital funds once collected.
7. Excess funds are to be collected at the completion of the project. This will allow Members time to budget for and obtain those additional funds. However, if a Member has the funds available earlier, a special assessment may be issued at that time if the Member so desires. All special assessments, or changes to special assessments, must be approved by the Board.
8. At the end of the CIP project term any excess funds shall either remain in the RWC CIP reserve fund for future projects, or, upon request, be returned to the Member(s) as a credit memo. Funds collected from a new agency(s) would remain in the RWC CIP reserve fund for future projects.

**Attachment B: CIP Working Group Model Applied to Hardware Phase Costs and Comparison dated 05/10/2013**

05/10/2013

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Hardware Phase Fixed Counts Costs Distributed by RWC Member							
	FY 13-14		FY 14-15		FY 15-16		Project Total (With Re-Banding Credit)
Funding Required by Year	\$8,455,000		\$8,455,000		\$8,455,000		\$25,365,000
Member Shares	Radio Count	Amount	Radio Count	Amount	Radio Count	Amount	Total by Member
Avondale	265	\$120,604	265	\$120,604	265	\$120,604	\$361,811
Buckeye	193	\$87,836	193	\$87,836	193	\$87,836	\$263,508
Chandler	967	\$440,090	967	\$440,090	967	\$440,090	\$1,320,269
Daisy Mountain	5	\$2,276	5	\$2,276	5	\$2,276	\$6,827
El Mirage	82	\$37,319	82	\$37,319	82	\$37,319	\$111,957
Glendale	1,558	\$709,059	1,558	\$709,059	1,558	\$709,059	\$2,127,176
Goodyear	100	\$45,511	100	\$45,511	100	\$45,511	\$136,532
Guadalupe	11	\$5,006	11	\$5,006	11	\$5,006	\$15,019
Maricopa	138	\$62,805	138	\$62,805	138	\$62,805	\$188,415
Paradise Valley	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0
Peoria	898	\$408,687	898	\$408,687	898	\$408,687	\$1,226,061
Phoenix	10,848	\$4,937,014	10,848	\$4,937,014	10,848	\$4,937,014	\$14,811,041
Scottsdale	1,393	\$633,966	1,393	\$633,966	1,393	\$633,966	\$1,901,897
Sun City	42	\$19,115	42	\$19,115	42	\$19,115	\$57,344
Sun City West	38	\$17,294	38	\$17,294	38	\$17,294	\$51,882
Sun Lakes	30	\$13,653	30	\$13,653	30	\$13,653	\$40,960
Surprise	401	\$182,498	401	\$182,498	401	\$182,498	\$547,495
Tempe	1,580	\$719,071	1,580	\$719,071	1,580	\$719,071	\$2,157,213
Tolleson	29	\$13,198	29	\$13,198	29	\$13,198	\$39,594
Total Distributed Costs	18,578	\$8,455,000	18,578	\$8,455,000	18,578	\$8,455,000	\$25,365,000
Monthly CIP Rate (Per Radio/Per Month)		\$37.93		\$37.93		\$37.93	

The above Table represents the total cost for the Hardware Phase of the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA, Lifecycle Upgrade project, distributed among the RWC Members. The distribution is based on using the same fixed radio count, that was approved by the RWC Board at the March 28, 2013 Board Meeting, for all three years of the project.

The monthly CIP Rate is simply the methodology for determining the amount of Special Assessments which are permitted under the RWC IGA.

**Attachment B: CIP Working Group Model Applied to Hardware Phase Costs and Comparison dated 05/10/2013**

05/10/2013

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Hardware Phase Additional Counts Costs Distributed by RWC Member										
	FY 13-14		FY 14-15		FY 15-16				Allowed Percent Increase	
Funding Required by Year									10%	
Member Shares	Change in Radio Count	Amount	Change in Radio Count	Amount	Change in Radio Count	Amount	Total Additional Cost by Member	Final Average Radio Count	Available for Credit or CIP	Net Cost if Credit is Taken
Avondale	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	265	(\$3,084)	(\$3,084)
Buckeye	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	193	(\$2,246)	(\$2,246)
Chandler	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	967	(\$11,253)	(\$11,253)
Daisy Mountain	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	5	(\$58)	(\$58)
El Mirage	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	82	(\$954)	(\$954)
Glendale	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	1,558	(\$18,130)	(\$18,130)
Goodyear	0	\$0	250	\$47,407	250	\$113,777	\$161,184	218	(\$2,537)	\$158,647
Guadalupe	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	11	(\$128)	(\$128)
Maricopa	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	138	(\$1,606)	(\$1,606)
Paradise Valley	0	\$0	63	\$11,947	63	\$28,672	\$40,618	30	(\$349)	\$40,269
Peoria	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	898	(\$10,450)	(\$10,450)
Phoenix	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	10,848	(\$126,236)	(\$126,236)
Scottsdale	0	\$0	0	\$0	36	\$16,247	\$16,247	1,405	(\$16,350)	(\$102)
Sun City	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	42	(\$489)	(\$489)
Sun City West	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	38	(\$442)	(\$442)
Sun Lakes	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	30	(\$349)	(\$349)
Surprise	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	401	(\$4,666)	(\$4,666)
Tempe	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	1,580	(\$18,386)	(\$18,386)
Tolleson	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	29	(\$337)	(\$337)
Total Distributed Costs	0	\$0	313	\$59,354	349	\$158,696	\$218,050	18,738	(\$218,050)	\$0
Monthly CIP Rate		\$37.93		\$37.93		\$37.93				

The above Table represents the estimated changes in radio counts, by Member for FY 14/15 and FY 15/16. The changes in radio counts are due to Goodyear and Paradise Valley Police coming onto the network, along with Scottsdale Fire adding radios in FY 15/16. These are only estimates at this time, and would be finalized at the end of each Fiscal Year.



**Attachment B: CIP Working Group Model Applied to Hardware Phase Costs and Comparison dated 05/10/2013**

05/10/2013

<b>700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade</b>				
<b>Hardware Phase Net Total Costs</b>				
<b>Distributed by RWC Member</b>				
<b>Member Costs</b>	<b>Fixed Radio Counts</b>	<b>Fixed Project Costs</b>	<b>Additional Costs</b>	<b>Final Total Costs</b>
Avondale	265	\$361,811	\$0	\$361,811
Buckeye	193	\$263,508	\$0	\$263,508
Chandler	967	\$1,320,269	\$0	\$1,320,269
Daisy Mountain	5	\$6,827	\$0	\$6,827
El Mirage	82	\$111,957	\$0	\$111,957
Glendale	1,558	\$2,127,176	\$0	\$2,127,176
Goodyear	100	\$136,532	\$161,184	\$297,717
Guadalupe	11	\$15,019	\$0	\$15,019
Maricopa	138	\$188,415	\$0	\$188,415
Paradise Valley	0	\$0	\$40,618	\$40,618
Peoria	898	\$1,226,061	\$0	\$1,226,061
Phoenix	10,848	\$14,811,041	\$0	\$14,811,041
Scottsdale	1,393	\$1,901,897	\$16,247	\$1,918,144
Sun City	42	\$57,344	\$0	\$57,344
Sun City West	38	\$51,882	\$0	\$51,882
Sun Lakes	30	\$40,960	\$0	\$40,960
Surprise	401	\$547,495	\$0	\$547,495
Tempe	1,580	\$2,157,213	\$0	\$2,157,213
Tolleson	29	\$39,594	\$0	\$39,594
<b>Total Distributed Costs</b>	<b>18,578</b>	<b>\$25,365,000</b>	<b>\$218,050</b>	<b>\$25,583,050</b>

The above Table represents the final total costs assessed to each Member. The Fixed costs from page 1 are added to the changes on page 2 to produce the final total. The additional costs would produce an excess revenue which may be applied to an ongoing CIP account.

**Side by Side Comparison  
Hardware Phase Only  
Baseline to Revised Model**

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget Distributed by RWC Member			
	Sept 2012 Hardware Phase Only Total (With Re-Banding Credit)	Revised Model Hardware Phase Only Total (With Re-Banding Credit)	Differences
Funding Required by Year	\$25,365,000	\$25,365,000	
Member Shares	Amount	Amount	Amount
Avondale	\$364,203	\$361,811	(\$2,392)
Buckeye	\$265,250	\$263,508	(\$1,742)
Chandler	\$1,328,996	\$1,320,269	(\$8,727)
Daisy Mountain	\$6,872	\$6,827	(\$45)
El Mirage	\$112,697	\$111,957	(\$740)
Glendale	\$2,141,237	\$2,127,176	(\$14,061)
Goodyear	\$137,435	\$297,717	\$160,282
Guadalupe	\$15,118	\$15,019	(\$99)
Maricopa	\$21,990	\$188,415	\$166,425
Paradise Valley	\$0	\$40,618	\$40,618
Peoria	\$1,234,166	\$1,226,061	(\$8,105)
Phoenix	\$14,908,947	\$14,811,041	(\$97,906)
Scottsdale	\$1,914,469	\$1,918,144	\$3,675
Sun City	\$57,723	\$57,344	(\$379)
Sun City West	\$52,225	\$51,882	(\$343)
Sun Lakes	\$41,230	\$40,960	(\$271)
Surprise	\$551,114	\$547,495	(\$3,619)
Tempe	\$2,171,473	\$2,157,213	(\$14,260)
Tolleson	\$39,856	\$39,594	(\$262)
Total Distributed Costs	\$25,365,000	\$25,583,050	\$218,050

The Table to the left provides a side by side comparison, of the full Hardware Phase, of the original "Baseline" distribution as approved by the Board in September 2012, verses the distribution proposed under the Revised Model developed by the CIP Working Group. The last column shows the total difference between the Baseline and the Revised Model.

### **Overview**

We will establish the Arizona Regional Communication Authority (ARCA) with single governance that will manage a regional system, yet allows for sub-regional independence (autonomy) where appropriate. This Authority will strive to achieve seamless radio and data communications to meet the operational needs of Law Enforcement, Fire, and Municipal users in a cost effective and sustainable manner.

### **User Driven**

The Authority's primary focus will be meeting the operational needs of Law Enforcement, Fire, and Municipal users. The Authority will instill in the entire governance process, methods to ensure it understands and measures the effectiveness of the communication system as it relates to the services users deliver to the community.

### **Responsibilities**

The Authority will have responsibility for oversight of system operation, outreach, technical and performance standards, policy and procedures, maintenance, planning, design, implementation, and financing of the system.

### **Composition & Voting**

The Board will be comprised of city and town managers, fire and police chiefs, and information technology executives. Voting provisions will be established that are equitable yet do not reserve the ability to effectively mandate or veto an outcome by a single member.

### **Interoperability & Roaming**

Interoperability with other systems will always be accommodated with non-member agencies and other systems. As a guiding principle the ARCA will strive to establish reciprocal roaming agreements or flexible cost recovery models with other partner regional systems to expand seamless radio and data communications.

### **Cost Allocation & Standards**

The Board will adopt an equitable universal cost allocation model, but sub-regions can allocate those costs by whatever means those sub-region participating members choose. The Authority will establish system technical standards and policies for use. The Board is overall responsible for establishing and adopting a master plan, but sub-regions may deviate where appropriate to support those sub-regional needs as long as those are compatible and consistent with the master plan, standards, and procedures.

### **Sub-regional Management & Asset Ownership**

Sub-regions may also manage their sub-system, and any required staffing for this will be a part of the overall regional budgeting, but managed by the appropriate sub-regional agency. Similarly, where necessary, sub-regional agencies may retain ownership of system assets, yet still contribute the use of those assets to the larger system. Compensation for the use of these assets will be established as part of the overall budget.



**Arizona Regional Communication Authority  
A Case for Merged Governance**

- Single vision, mission, goals, guiding principles and strategic plan
- Maintain consistent system technical standards and compatibility
- Standard policies and procedures for system management and usage (such as interoperability participants--IGA versus Operations Working Group approval)
- Consistent financial management, cost recovery and CIP funding models:
  - Specialized for other regional systems
  - Single point of contact for regional participation
- Cost savings through shared infrastructure
- Larger influence to keep vendor costs low
- Economies of scale and cost savings on software, hardware and subscriber units.
- Mutual Aid – one ubiquitous system is more efficient and effective and ensures the safety for end users
- Enhanced roaming capabilities
- Cost efficiencies for tax payers
- Models other successful regional efforts

<b>Weights:</b> 1 = Remove item 2-4 = Not as important of an item / No action needed 5-7 = Highly desirable / Important but not life threatening 8-10 = Life & Safety Importance / Non-negotiable <b>Scores:</b> 5 = A 4 = B 3 = C 2 = D 1 = F	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Separate Governance:</b> •Support guiding principle •Interoperability between RWC & TRWC systems always addressed •Stay the course	<b>Lead System:</b> •Unified "lead" system with sub-regional systems with members (manage their own individual systems) •Allows operational independence and sub-regional autonomy	<b>Umbrella:</b> •Governance over two different systems with corporate control over integrated systems and cost recovery models •"Regional Wireless Performance Board" •Accountability •Multiple organizations come together but do not give up independence	<b>Single Governance:</b> •Merging systems into one system, one governance	<b>Communication Authority:</b> •Create new independent legal entity •Legal authority to run the system •Different funding sources possible
<b>Provide Valley-wide Operable &amp; Interoperable Communication Services</b>		<b>580.3</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>741.7</b>	<b>844.8</b>	<b>883.6</b>
Effective operational coverage (People who need it can get it)	9	<b>Average: 22.5</b>	<b>Average: 28.5</b>	<b>Average: 40.5</b>	<b>Average: 45.0</b>	<b>Average: 45.0</b>
Flexible and agile radio operational resource deployment (talkgroups, channels, radio equipment)	8	<b>Average: 21.3</b>	<b>Average: 25.3</b>	<b>Average: 22.7</b>	<b>Average: 30.7</b>	<b>Average: 33.3</b>
Provides trusted multi-agency incident communications (must be reliable)	10	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 31.7</b>	<b>Average: 33.3</b>	<b>Average: 46.7</b>	<b>Average: 48.3</b>
Facilitates larger region consistency (any future decisions should promote larger region consistency - operational and administration )	8	<b>Average: 14.7</b>	<b>Average: 18.7</b>	<b>Average: 30.7</b>	<b>Average: 34.7</b>	<b>Average: 40.0</b>
<b>Maximize Use of all Existing Resources (financial &amp; personnel)</b>						
Costs are sustainable	8	<b>Average: 28.0</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>	<b>Average: 30.7</b>	<b>Average: 32.0</b>
Achieves economies of scale	7	<b>Average: 15.2</b>	<b>Average: 17.5</b>	<b>Average: 21.2</b>	<b>Average: 32.7</b>	<b>Average: 31.5</b>
Ease of administration (not just executive director level)	5	<b>Average: 10.8</b>	<b>Average: 12.5</b>	<b>Average: 15.8</b>	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 20.0</b>
Technically manageable (people to support the system)	7	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 25.7</b>	<b>Average: 30.3</b>	<b>Average: 29.2</b>
Ease of operational support (beyond technical side, operational people - keep system running on day to day basis)	7	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>	<b>Average: 29.2</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>

<b>Weights:</b> 1 = Remove item 2-4 = Not as important of an item / No action needed 5-7 = Highly desirable / Important but not life threatening 8-10 = Life & Safety Importance / Non-negotiable <b>Scores:</b> 5 = A 4 = B 3 = C 2 = D 1 = F	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Separate Governance:</b> •Support guiding principle •Interoperability between RWC & TRWC systems always addressed •Stay the course	<b>Lead System:</b> •Unified “lead” system with sub-regional systems with members (manage their own individual systems) •Allows operational independence and sub-regional autonomy	<b>Umbrella:</b> •Governance over two different systems with corporate control over integrated systems and cost recovery models •"Regional Wireless Performance Board" •Accountability •Multiple organizations come together but do not give up independence	<b>Single Governance:</b> •Merging systems into one system, one governance	<b>Communication Authority:</b> •Create new independent legal entity •Legal authority to run the system •Different funding sources possible
Ease of accounting (financial/budget & audit accountability)	7	<b>Average: 26.8</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 32.7</b>	<b>Average: 32.7</b>
Ease of governance (policy and decision making)	7	<b>Average: 16.3</b>	<b>Average: 18.7</b>	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 32.7</b>	<b>Average: 35.0</b>
<b>Establish and Maintain System Compatibility which is Sustainable Over Time</b>						
Supports intersystem communications (operable valley-wide, ease of attaching to other systems)	9	<b>Average: 18.0</b>	<b>Average: 19.5</b>	<b>Average: 33.0</b>	<b>Average: 39.0</b>	<b>Average: 39.0</b>
Compatible with emerging regulations & technologies (always have to be mindful of the future/emerging technology)	6	<b>Average: 19.0</b>	<b>Average: 21.0</b>	<b>Average: 19.0</b>	<b>Average: 24.0</b>	<b>Average: 24.0</b>
Provides high performance (coverage & capacity with functionality, standards to be developed later/5% DB loss (95% in building) described in TRWC governance)	9	<b>Average: 21.0</b>	<b>Average: 25.5</b>	<b>Average: 31.5</b>	<b>Average: 39.0</b>	<b>Average: 43.5</b>
Consistent with industry standards	7	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>	<b>Average: 26.8</b>	<b>Average: 25.7</b>
<b>Focus on the Needs of the End User (first responders &amp; public)</b>						
Easy and effective use by the boots on the street	9	<b>Average: 18.0</b>	<b>Average: 24.0</b>	<b>Average: 33.0</b>	<b>Average: 43.5</b>	<b>Average: 45.0</b>
Encourages/facilitates user participation/input (defined area in governance showing user input in end decisions)	8	<b>Average: 20.0</b>	<b>Average: 22.7</b>	<b>Average: 30.4</b>	<b>Average: 29.3</b>	<b>Average: 29.3</b>

<b>Weights:</b> 1 = Remove item 2-4 = Not as important of an item / No action needed 5-7 = Highly desirable / Important but not life threatening 8-10 = Life & Safety Importance / Non-negotiable <b>Scores:</b> 5 = A 4 = B 3 = C 2 = D 1 = F	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Separate Governance:</b> •Support guiding principle •Interoperability between RWC & TRWC systems always addressed •Stay the course	<b>Lead System:</b> •Unified "lead" system with sub-regional systems with members (manage their own individual systems) •Allows operational independence and sub-regional autonomy	<b>Umbrella:</b> •Governance over two different systems with corporate control over integrated systems and cost recovery models •"Regional Wireless Performance Board" •Accountability •Multiple organizations come together but do not give up independence	<b>Single Governance:</b> •Merging systems into one system, one governance	<b>Communication Authority:</b> •Create new independent legal entity •Legal authority to run the system •Different funding sources possible
Facilitates effective responsiveness to citizens	10	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 28.3</b>	<b>Average: 38.3</b>	<b>Average: 43.3</b>	<b>Average: 46.7</b>
Ease of system performance measurement (not just tech)	5	<b>Average: 13.3</b>	<b>Average: 13.3</b>	<b>Average: 17.5</b>	<b>Average: 21.7</b>	<b>Average: 23.3</b>
Effective decision involvement at all levels (everyone has buy-in and accountability when involved)	6	<b>Average: 11.0</b>	<b>Average: 15.0</b>	<b>Average: 21.3</b>	<b>Average: 25.0</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>
Promotes end-user safety & quality service delivery	10	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 28.3</b>	<b>Average: 36.7</b>	<b>Average: 45.0</b>	<b>Average: 46.7</b>
<b>Effectively Accounts for local economic and management considerations</b>						
Allows for sub-regional management (flexibility for a member to manage their own system/different options or levels)	7	<b>Average: 29.2</b>	<b>Average: 29.2</b>	<b>Average: 30.3</b>	<b>Average: 19.8</b>	<b>Average: 17.5</b>
Allows for sub-regional administration	7	<b>Average: 32.7</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>	<b>Average: 28.0</b>	<b>Average: 15.2</b>	<b>Average: 16.3</b>
Provides for local asset ownership and control	7	<b>Average: 31.5</b>	<b>Average: 30.3</b>	<b>Average: 30.3</b>	<b>Average: 21.0</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>
Provides equitable distribution of costs	7	<b>Average: 17.5</b>	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>	<b>Average: 24.5</b>	<b>Average: 30.3</b>

<b>Weights:</b> 1 = Remove item 2-4 = Not as important of an item / No action needed 5-7 = Highly desirable / Important but not life threatening 8-10 = Life & Safety Importance / Non-negotiable <b>Scores:</b> 5 = A 4 = B 3 = C 2 = D 1 = F	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Separate Governance:</b> •Support guiding principle •Interoperability between RWC & TRWC systems always addressed •Stay the course	<b>Lead System:</b> •Unified "lead" system with sub-regional systems with members (manage their own individual systems) •Allows operational independence and sub-regional autonomy	<b>Umbrella:</b> •Governance over two different systems with corporate control over integrated systems and cost recovery models •"Regional Wireless Performance Board" •Accountability •Multiple organizations come together but do not give up independence	<b>Single Governance:</b> •Merging systems into one system, one governance	<b>Communication Authority:</b> •Create new independent legal entity •Legal authority to run the system •Different funding sources possible
Provides for equitable decision making (replaced weighted voting with this criteria)	7	<b>Average: 19.8</b>	<b>Average: 22.2</b>	<b>Average: 23.3</b>	<b>Average: 25.7</b>	<b>Average: 33.8</b>
Supports local legal or regulatory requirements	10	<b>Average: 35.0</b>	<b>Average: 33.3</b>	<b>Average: 33.3</b>	<b>Average: 33.3</b>	<b>Average: 35.0</b>





## BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

---

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative      Agenda Date: May 23, 2013  
(RWC) Board Members

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 items:

A. LAW ENFORCEMENT USER FORUM

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this item is to provide the Board with an update on the first Law Enforcement User Forum held at the Burton Barr Library on Monday, April 29, 2013.

B. FCC PETITION

BACKGROUND

The Executive Director will provide an update and information regarding the FCC's Omnibus Public Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) for 700 MHz narrowbanding and deadlines for filing comments.

C. PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO SYSTEM ADMINISTRATORS FORUM

BACKGROUND

The Executive Director will provide information regarding the upcoming Public Safety Radio System Administrators Forum that will be held Tuesday, June 25, 2013 from 10:00am to 2:00pm.