



Regional Wireless Cooperative
 Board of Directors
 Agenda
 May 24, 2012

	ITEM	PRESENTER
1)	Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Comments	Chair Meyer – Tempe
2)	Approval of RWC Board Meeting Minutes from March 22, 2012 This item is for information, discussion and action.	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min.
3)	RWC Board of Directors Chairperson Nominating Committee The purpose of this item is to select a new Board Chairperson and Vice-Chair. This item is for information, discussion and action.	Brad Hartig – Scottsdale Est. 15 min.
4)	Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting The purpose of this item is to present the RWC with a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for the FY 2011/2012. This item is for information, discussion and action.	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Vicki Rios – GFOAz Est. 10 min.
5)	RWC Policies for Approval The purpose of this item is to request approval of the following new and/or revised policies: a. Radio Amplification Systems b. Programming Authorization This item is for information, discussion and action.	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
6)	RWC Staffing The purpose of this item is to update on the status of personnel vacancies. This item is for information and discussion.	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
7)	Executive Director’s Report a. Glendale / Avondale Final Acceptance b. Membership Evaluations (SRPMIC and PV) c. City of Maricopa Police onto the RWC d. Communications Strategic Plan e. MAG Desert Peaks Award This item is for information and discussion.	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 15 min.
8)	Call to the Public This item is for information only.	Chair
9)	Announcements The purpose of this item is to communicate any Board announcements and the date of the next Board Meeting: July 26, 2012 from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. This item is for information only.	Chair
10)	Adjourn	Chair



Regional Wireless Cooperative
Board of Directors
MINUTES
March 22, 2012

Phoenix City Council Chambers
200 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Board Members Present

Wade Brannon	Mike Frazier
Steve Campbell	Jim Haner
Wayne Clement	Bob Hansen
Bob Costello	Brad Hartig
Chris DeChant	Jim Heger
David Fitzhugh	Danny Johnson

Board Members Absent

Mark Gaillard
Paul Wilson
Ed Zuercher

*Board Alternate

Staff and Public Present

Tahir Alhassan	Dave Collett	Doug Mummert	Dale Shaw
Karen Allen	Theresa Faull	Mark Nichols	Wayne Smith
Adam Baker	David Felix	Cy Otsuka	Nick Spino
Scott Benhow	Jen Hagen	Ron Parks	Mike Sterling
Brenda Buren	Dave Heck	David Perdichizzi	Mike Sumnicht
Mirela Butler	Lonnie Inskeep	Bill Phillips	Shannon Tolle
Jim Case	Rick Kolker	Michelle Potts	Tim Ulery
Dave Clarke	Steve Kreis	Geoff Price	
Rick Clore	Domela McHenry	Vicky Scott	

1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Comments

Chair Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He stated that Glendale Board Member Steve Conrad had taken a new position as Police Chief of Louisville, Kentucky; and therefore, Assistant Fire Chief Chris DeChant would be serving as Glendale's Board representative.

Roll call was taken and a quorum reached.

2. Approval of RWC Board Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2012

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve the minutes as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

3. Approval of Joint RWC-TRWC Board Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2012

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Frazier and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the minutes as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

4. RWC Subscriber Unit (Radio) Rate for 2012/2013

Tahir Alhassan, RWC Accountant III, explained that the subscriber unit rate was based on the approved budget presented in November 2011. He reviewed that in January 2012, the proposed rate included all RWC costs; however, some Members indicated that it was problematic for the rate to include the System Upgrade Agreement II (SUA II) costs. He presented the revised billing methodology, which reflected a rate of \$39.35. He explained that the rate now included staff costs but not the SUA II costs, which would be billed by special assessment. He added that the budget presented in November 2011 underwent a technical review by the Phoenix Budget and Research Department in February 2012, and the result was a \$342,000 reduction. He reviewed each Member's proportionate share of costs for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012/2013.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Alhassan responded that the \$342,000 reduction was due to the reassignment of Information Technology staff.

Chair Meyer recapped for clarification that the Board's directive was to separate out the SUA II costs as a special assessment as opposed to incorporating it into the rate, which was now reflected in this revised billing methodology. Mr. Alhassan replied in the affirmative.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Walker and **SECONDED** by Vice-Chair Thorpe to approve for FY 2012/2013 the subscriber unit rate of \$39.35, a special assessment for allocation of the SUA II, and authorization to bill Members. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

5. RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion, and Lifecycle Update

David Felix, RWC Executive Director, explained that a revised proposal was received from Motorola which would be discussed by Bill Phillips, Phoenix Enterprise Technology Manager. He added that his expectation was that the Board might want to spend sufficient time on this item so that all questions and concerns could be discussed.

Mr. Phillips reviewed that the purpose of this report was to present and request approval of the revised budget for the project and the concept of long-term financing. He reminded that the reason for the project was to meet the federal mandate to narrow-band all 700 MHz frequencies by January 1, 2017. He added that converting the system to a new protocol, Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) would be used to accomplish the narrow-banding project. He explained that in order to preserve the ability to maintain wide-area roaming, the 800 MHz frequencies on the system would also need to convert to TDMA. He stated that the Board-approved SUA II, which Mr. Alhassan spoke about, was already included in the RWC budget and it included normal hardware and software upgrades every two years; however, base stations, consoles and subscriber equipment were not included and would not be a part of this presentation. He

explained that the original project estimate was \$51 M for the infrastructure portion and the Board requested staff to investigate financing options. He stated that discussions with Motorola resulted in a revised proposal \$38.5 M. He explained the main reasons for the reduction included no additional capacity would be needed during the transition to maintain Grade of Service; a simplified approach to implementation; and using a small subsystem, Simulcast J, as a test bed which would not affect operational capability.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the revised project budget, which included an additional \$240,000 year contingency for the first four years for RWC costs during the rough implementation period; the long term financing options provided by Motorola (not including the contingency amount); and each Member's proportionate share of the cost for the project. He explained that the attachments in the Board report provided a more detailed breakdown of the total RWC budget to include Operational and Maintenance costs, SUA II costs, and 700 MHz project costs.

Mr. Phillips reminded the Board that a possible "buy-out" option of the 800 MHz rebanding costs potentially could be applied toward reducing the 700 MHz narrow-banding costs. He explained that long term financing provided a methodology to ensure that network upgrades occur by the federal deadline, lifecycle upgrades are accomplished, and buy-out requirements for funds expenditure are met if the project were extended. He expressed that other options continue to be explored such as delaying the federal deadline, which would allow more time to purchase subscribers and looking at other financing options. He stated that a critical reminder was that the current project estimate of \$42 M, which included finance charges, was for network infrastructure, and that end users were still responsible for replacing subscribers and consoles. He added that Motorola was meeting with Members to develop those costs and timeframes so that they would coincide with the overall project.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Executive Committee recommended long term financing as the best option for the RWC and suggested that the six (6) year term with one (1) year in arrears was the favored choice to minimize the cost of financing. He added there would not be a commitment to sign anything at this point but rather this option would form a platform on which to start planning.

Mr. Campbell requested confirmation that the SUA II cost assessed in the upcoming fiscal year was for the upgrade in 2013/14, and that the proposed six-year lease costs (shown on slide 11) was in addition to the SUA II cost. Mr. Phillips replied in the affirmative.

In response to a question by Mr. Fitzhugh, Mr. Phillips responded that as the project was laid out, the initial thought was that Grade of Service could be affected because for a period of time some of the subsystems would only be operating with 15 channels. He added that after viewing the simulations, it was determined that additional channels would not be needed, and once the system converted to TDMA, the 15 channels would become 30.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Philips deferred to Motorola's Mike Sumnicht in the audience. Mr. Sumnicht responded that the 800 MHz rebanding proposal would be ready mid- to end of May.

In response to a question by Mr. Heger as to whether the project or costs could be delayed if the deadline was pushed out, Mr. Phillips responded that network upgrades would still need to occur in order to apply any rebanding funds to the overall project, although subscriber costs could be delayed.

Vice-Chair Thorpe requested clarification that the funding amount was the worst-case scenario and whether it could get better if either more favorable financing terms or rebanding funds were obtained. Mr. Phillips replied in the affirmative.

Chair Meyer expressed that the request was for the Board to approve the budget for the project and the intent of a long-term financing plan.

Mr. Felix commented that depending on how everything moved forward, the possibility existed that long-term financing would not be needed.

Chair Meyer requested clarification whether that meant structuring the acquisition in the same manner by spreading out the payments minus the financing costs. Mr. Felix replied in the affirmative, if all the facets came together such as the deadline extended and the buy-out of 800 MHz rebanding costs.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Heger and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve the revised budget of \$42.5 M and the concept of long-term financing for the infrastructure portion of the project. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

6. Town of Buckeye Special Assessment

Mr. Felix explained that the remote location of the two new Buckeye sites raised concern of the need to install security equipment (video surveillance and access control) that was not in the original project costs. He stated that discussions with Chief Costello and Chief Mann resulted in Buckeye securing the additional needed funds. He explained that the desire was to move quickly because the project was nearing completion; therefore, the Executive Committee approved the special assessment, which had already been paid, and the equipment ordered. He added that per the Governance, procedurally, the Board must approve special assessments, thus he was requesting retroactive Board approval of the special assessment to Buckeye.

In response to question by Mr. Hartig, Mr. Felix responded that every site had some form security and alarms; however, he was not sure all the sites had video surveillance.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Campbell and **SECONDED** by Mr. Fitzhugh to retroactively approve a special assessment for \$46,394.72 to the Town of Buckeye. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

7. RWC Policy for Approval

Mr. Felix explained that through a federal Public Safety Interoperable Communications grant, seven high sites were built that were to serve primarily as a backup system; however, per the grant and Federal Communication Commission requirements there needed to be some activity on the sites. He reviewed the Overlay Sites Policy and explained that it defined a set of rules for operable and interoperable use of the sites by RWC and non-RWC Members.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Felix responded that Section 6.4 of the policy stated that operational use of the sites by a non-RWC Member would incur charges.

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve the Overlay Sites Policy. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (17-0).**

Mr. Felix added that per the Governance, RWC policies needed to undergo an ongoing review process; therefore, if policies had only minor, non-substantive word changes they would be reviewed by the Executive Committee and not brought to the Board. He stated that policies with substantive changes would go before the Board for approval.

8. Executive Director's Report

a. Strategic Communications Plan

Mr. Felix stated that a meeting with the Westside Chiefs prompted a need for a strategic plan. He explained that the RWC, in concert with the TRWC and Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), was awarded a non-monetary Technical Assistance grant from the Office of Emergency Communications for staff assistance for the development of the plan. He expressed that two full-day workshops would be scheduled and he desired to have participation by two or three Board members. He added that he envisioned having a mix of Board members, Executive Committee members, technical experts, and users. He explained that the Joint Objectives would provide the foundation for the plan.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Felix responded that the dates were Thursday, May 3, 2012 and Tuesday, June 5, 2012 and the location was the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Office.

b. Awards Submittals

Mr. Felix explained that he was submitting the RWC for three awards: the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Award, the MAG Desert Peaks Award, and the Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee

(LECC) Award. He thanked Vice-Chair Thorpe for her work on reviewing the ICMA submittal. He added that the MAG Desert Peaks and LECC submittals were joint submissions with the TRWC for partnership categories.

c. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Petition

Mr. Felix updated that both petitions were filed with the FCC. He stated that the federal mandates would be the subject of an interview he and Mr. Phillips provided for the April issue of Mission Critical. He added that the interview would also appear as the feature article in the Radio Resource weekly newsletter. He explained that he had received emails from other jurisdictions all over the country and, in particular, the State of Idaho intended to submit a public comment to the FCC. He added that he would be staying in contact with FCC staff.

9. Call to the Public

None.

10. Announcements

Sun City West Fire District Deputy Fire Chief Jim Heger announced that he was retiring in June and thus resigning his position on the Board. He stated that Operations Chief Tim Van Scoter would serve as his replacement. Mr. Heger expressed his appreciation to the Board and RWC staff. Chair Meyer thanked Mr. Heger for his contributions and service on the Board.


Chair Meyer announced that his two-year term as Board Chair had ended and a new Chair needed to be selected. Vice-Chair Thorpe suggested that a subcommittee from the Board serve as a nominating committee. She added that although her seat did not have a term limit, if anyone was interested in the Vice-Chair position, she would be agreeable to vacating her seat. Mr. Hartig expressed his interest to serve on a nominating committee. Chair Meyer suggested that RWC staff communicate to the Board to solicit interest of other Members desiring to serve on the nominating committee.

Chair Meyer announced that the Phoenix City Council Chambers would be the location for next Board meeting.

13. Adjournment

Chair Meyer adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Theresa Faull, Management Assistant I

<p>REGIONAL WIRELESS COOPERATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES</p>	 <p>Regional Wireless Cooperative</p>
	<p>No.</p>
<p>Subject:</p> <p>Radio Amplification Systems Policy</p>	<p>Effective Date</p> <p>5/24/12</p>

1.0 Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to provide standards for the deployment of radio amplification systems to improve radio signal coverage inside of buildings and underground spaces on the Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) network.

2.0 Owner

2.1. RWC Operations Working Group (OWG).

3.0 Applies To

3.1. Any entity installing radio amplification systems within the RWC service area and within the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) frequency licensed by a RWC Member(s).

4.0 Background

- 4.1. Radio amplification systems are used to enhance radio signals within buildings, structures or other locations where signals would otherwise be inadequate.
- 4.2. Improperly installed or maintained amplification systems can cause interference or degrade radio performance.
- 4.3. FCC 47 CFR Part 90.219 Use of Signal Boosters and 47 CFR Part 2 FCC Certification Requirements govern use and certification of radio amplification systems.
- 4.4. Radio amplification systems may include Bi-Directional Amplifiers (BDA), Distributed Antenna Systems (DAS) or other active devices designed to amplify radio signals.

5.0 Policy Statement

- 5.1. Entities desiring to operate radio amplification systems on a RWC Member’s licensed frequency and within the service area of the RWC network must obtain written consent and approval from the licensee.
- 5.2. RWC network licensed frequencies are managed by the Administrative Managing Member.

6.0 Supporting Rules

- 6.1. The RWC will not be responsible for installation, upgrades, maintenance or replacement of radio amplification systems.
- 6.2. RWC will provide minimum technical requirements and written consent, upon approval.
- 6.3. The RWC does not require entities to maintain any minimum coverage requirements within buildings or structures; however, individual cities may have their own rules or ordinances.

7.0 Responsibilities

- 7.1. Entities desiring to operate a radio amplification system must advise the RWC Frequency Manager of the following:
 - 7.1.1. Facility point of contact.
 - 7.1.2. Technical/contractor point of contact.
 - 7.1.3. Detailed location information (e.g., site address, building floor, room location).
 - 7.1.4. Installation design.
 - 7.1.5. Technical specifications (e.g., model number, FCC certification number, frequency band).
- 7.2. The RWC will work with an offending entity to resolve problems due to interference, pursuant to CFR 90.173(b).
- 7.3. In the event of interference or malfunction of radio amplification systems, the entity responsible for its installation and/or operation shall discontinue operation of the system until it is repaired or interference has been eliminated.

8.0 Conditions for Exemption or Waiver

- 8.1. None.

9.0 Applicable Policies and/or Procedures

- 9.1. RWC Frequency Management Policy.

<p style="text-align: center;">REGIONAL WIRELESS COOPERATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES</p>	
	<p>No. A-07.12</p>
<p>Subject: Programming Authorization Policy</p>	<p>Effective Date 1/26/12 (rev. 05/24/12)</p>

1.0 Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to establish controls for RWC subscriber unit programming.

2.0 Owner

2.1. RWC Operations Working Group (OWG).

3.0 Applies To

3.1. All Members, Interoperability Participants, Associates and approved service providers that have access to RWC subscriber programming.

4.0 Background

4.1. Programming parameters can cause degradation of the system. Proper control of subscriber programming is required to maintain the integrity of the system.

4.2. The risk of inaccurate programming substantially increases when multiple entities are allowed to program subscriber units. This risk translates into an increase in subscriber radio operational anomalies and the associated administrative/maintenance activities. There is also an increased risk of possible unauthorized transmissions, interference or monitoring of public safety radio communications channels.

5.0 Procedure Statement

5.1. All Members, Interoperability Participants, Associates and approved service providers that have access to RWC subscriber programming equipment/software shall at all times employ appropriate operational and network security practices, as adopted by the OWG, to protect RWC users from programming errors that could potentially cause disruptions or failures in service.

6.0 Supporting Rules

6.1. All Members, Interoperability Participants, Associates and approved service providers are responsible for programming subscriber equipment.

6.2. [Agencies requesting authorization to program RWC subscriber equipment must contact the Administrative Managing Member.](#)

- 6.2.1. Each authorized programming agency must identify a responsible point of contact, accountable for programming and changes.
 - 6.2.2. The OWG will approve, deny or request additional information upon review of programming authorization requests.
 - 6.2.3. The Administrative Managing Member will conduct an annual audit to establish authorization renewal.
- 6.3. Revisions, changes or modifications to the radio programming affecting any talkgroups, personalities, systems or encryption not allowed by this authorization includes, but are not limited to, the following:
- 6.3.1. Trunking configuration.
 - 6.3.2. Network configuration settings.
 - 6.3.3. Trunking system settings.
 - 6.3.4. System thresholds, limits or message parameters.
 - 6.3.5. Use of radio IDs ~~which are~~ not specifically assigned to the agency and provided by the RWC Network Managing Member ~~Operations Manager~~.
 - 6.3.6. Talkgroup assignment modifications or additions.
 - 6.3.7. All other configuration settings requiring authorized ~~which requires the appropriate~~ programming materials.
- 6.4. The RWC Administrative Managing Member ~~Operations Manager~~ reserves the right to ~~suspend revoke~~ this authorization at any time if any of the above items are not adhered to, by the disabling of IDs of the offending agency.
- 6.4.1. The OWG will review the suspension and recommend corrective action.
- 6.5. Authorized entities are expressly forbidden from the loaning, giving, selling, subcontracting or assigning the RWC programming materials to any ~~unauthorized person(s) or entity that is not authorized~~.
- 6.6. Any radio or device that exhibits symptoms of duplicate IDs or altered settings that detrimentally affect the RWC system or users of the system will be inhibited by the RWC Operations Manager after a notice is made to the owning agency via telephone or E-Mail, ~~rendering the device unusable~~.
- 6.7. There shall be no revisions, modifications or changes to the authorizations provided by this procedure, unless the RWC Network Managing Member ~~Operations Manager~~ has agreed in writing to such revisions, modifications or changes.

7.0 Responsibilities

- 7.1. Any programming materials necessary to enable programming must be secured to prevent the potential of theft, loss or misuse.
- 7.2. All radio serial numbers, IDs, current code plug revision file names and asset ownership will be provided to Phoenix Wireless Services on the RWC Radio Inventory Form.
- 7.3. Programming personnel will establish procedures to ensure radio programming and cloning activities do not produce two active subscribers with the same radio ID.
- 7.4. Loss or breaches of RWC programming materials shall immediately be reported to the RWC Administrative Managing Member ~~Operations Manager~~ who will take immediate

steps to minimize the danger to the operational capabilities of the RWC and report to the OWG.

- 7.5. The RWC does not assume any responsibility for the functionality of subscriber equipment related to the programming of the device or configuration. Each entity is responsible for subscriber functionality.

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.



BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO: Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members Agenda Date: May 24, 2012

FROM: David Felix, RWC Executive Director Item 7

SUBJECT: **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

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

A. GLENDALE/AVONDALE FINAL ACCEPTANCE

BACKGROUND

The cities of Glendale and Avondale migrated to the RWC Network in February 2012.

THE ISSUE

The RWC received the Final Acceptance “signoff” letter that closes out Motorola's contract with Glendale/Avondale for the completion of their project to fully transition onto the RWC network. The Motorola contract was with Glendale for all Motorola work related to both Glendale and Avondale. This major project began in early 2011 and was only delayed by the completion of the Arizona Cardinal's football season. Compliments go out to the leadership of former Glendale Police Chief Steve Conrad, the City of Glendale and Avondale's technical and operational communications staff, Phoenix Information Technology Services, RWC staff and Motorola Solutions for keeping this project on time and on budget.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information and discussion.

B. MEMBERSHIP EVALUATIONS

BACKGROUND

Periodically, the RWC receives inquiries from entities for information in terms of infrastructure and financial requirements for membership into the RWC. Two such inquiries have come from the Town of Paradise Valley (PV) and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC).

THE ISSUE

The RWC has provided preliminary budget information, technical and staff support to PV and SRPMIC for possible membership into the RWC. PV already contracts with the

City of Phoenix for fire response service and has acquired two-year funding to improve a radio communications site and fund their RWC participation in 2013. SRPMIC contracted with Federal Engineering to complete a comprehensive study of alternatives for upgrading their radio system including the benefits of joining the RWC. Currently, most of the SRPMIC public safety resources work in partnership with the cities of Scottsdale and Tempe, so bringing them onto the RWC would help to support these joint agency efforts.

C. CITY OF MARICOPA POLICE ONTO THE RWC

BACKGROUND

The City of Maricopa Police Department and the Town of Buckeye Police Department are in discussions to have Buckeye provide dispatch services for Maricopa PD and transition onto the RWC network.

THE ISSUE

The RWC and Phoenix Information Technology Services have met with Buckeye and Maricopa to provide administrative, operational and technical perspectives to facilitate this transition. While the City of Maricopa targeted July 1, 2012 for completion of this project, technical requirements may delay this by at least a couple of months.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information and discussion.

D. REGIONAL COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGIC 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 Joint Strategic Communications Plan (SCMP).

THE ISSUE

Federal DHS Contract Support, with oversight from Arizona's Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Office, will facilitate two meetings and the follow-up work to develop a SCMP. The development workshops are scheduled for June 5 and August 2, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information and discussion.

E. MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS DESERT PEAKS AWARD

BACKGROUND

On March 16, 2012, staff submitted a nomination on behalf of the RWC and TRWC for the 2012 Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Desert Peaks Award for Regional Partnerships.

THE ISSUE

MAG notified the RWC that the RWC and TRWC were chosen as recipients of a Regional Partnerships Award. RWC Board Members are encouraged to coordinate with their government officials regarding acceptance of the award at the awards ceremony scheduled for June 27, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information and discussion.