Regional Wireless Cooperative
Board of Directors
Agenda
September 23, 2010

	Agenda Item	Presenter
1)	**Call to Order**	Chair Mr. Meyer – Tempe
2)	**Roll Call of Board Members** RWC staff conducts a roll call of members in attendance.	Chair Mr. Meyer – Tempe / RWC staff Est. 2 min
3)	**Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 22, 2010** **This item is for Information, Discussion, and Action**	Chair Mr. Meyer – Tempe Est. 1 min
4)	**Introduction of New RWC Staff** The purpose of this item is to introduce the new RWC staff: Accountant III, Management Assistant I, and Administrative Aide. **This item is for Information Only**	Mr. David Felix, RWC Executive Director / staff Est. 5 min
5)	**Executive Committee Report: TRWC Request for Operational Talkgroups** The purpose of this item is to review, discuss, and approve the TRWC's request for Talkgroups on the RWC Network based upon the conditions set forth in the Executive Committee's recommendation. **This item is for Information, Discussion, and Action**	Mr. Bill Phillips, RWC Executive Committee Chair Est. 20 min
6)	**RWC Policy Approval** The purpose of this item is to review, discuss, and approve the Talkgroup Ownership and Assignment Authority policy. **This item is for Information, Discussion, and Action**	Mr. David Felix, RWC Executive Director Est. 2 min
7)	**RWC Project Updates** The purpose of this item is to provide status updates on various RWC projects. **This item is for Information Only**	Mr. David Felix, RWC Executive Director / Mr. Bill Phillips, Phoenix ITS Est. 10 min

8)	**Members' Primary and Alternate Representatives** The purpose of this item is to clarify the Governance requirement for notification of RWC Board Representatives and Alternates. **This item is for Information and Discussion**	Mr. David Felix, RWC Executive Director Est. 2 min.
9)	**Call to the Public**	Chair Mr. Meyer – Tempe Est. 1 – 5 min
10)	**Next Meeting: October 28, 2010; 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.** **This item is for Information Only**	Chair Mr. Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min
11)	**Adjourn**	Chair Mr. Meyer - Tempe

Board of Directors
MINUTES

September 23, 2010

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

<u>Board Members Present</u>		<u>Board Members Absent</u>
Mark Brown	Patrick Melvin	David Fitzhugh
Bob Costello	Charlie Meyer	Jim Heger
Chad Dragos	John Poorte*	Mark Schott
Mike Frazier	Rob Sweeney*	Ed Zuercher
Jim Haner	Susan Thorpe	
Brad Hartig	Marc Walker	
Alfred Medina	Paul Wilson	

* Board Alternate

<u>Staff Present</u>		<u>Public Present</u>	
Tahir Alhassan	Celicia Fiedler	Karen Allen	Lonnie Inskeep
Leif Anderson	John Wayne Gonzalez	David Andrews	Chris Nadeau
Bob Ciotti	Jen Hagen	Pat Bailey	David Neuman
Dave Clarke	Bill Hahn	Denny Bennett	Cy Otsuka
Jesse Cooper	Rick Kolker	Dave Collett	Larry Rooney
Theresa Faull	Bill Phillips	Jim Case	Dale Shaw
David Felix	Charlene Reynolds	Alex Deshuk	Audrey Skidmore
Butch Ferner	Dave Scott	Bill Fleming	Shannon Tolle
		Dave Heck	Jim Tortora
		John Imig	Tim Ulery

1. **Call to Order**

   Chair Mr. Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. **Roll Call of Board Members**

   Chair Mr. Meyer announced the new Board Members and alternates:

   - Board Member Mr. Chad Dragos – Daisy Mountain Fire District
   - Board Member Mr. Patrick Melvin – City of Maricopa

- Board Alternate Mr. John Poorte for Mr. Schott – City of Surprise
- Board Alternate Mr. Rob Sweeney for Mr. Zuercher – City of Phoenix

3. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes from July 22, 2010**

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe to approve the July 22, 2010 minutes and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

4. **Introduction of New RWC Staff**

Mr. Felix introduced the new RWC staff: Mr. Alhassan, Accountant III; Mr. Clarke, Administrative Aide; and Ms. Faull, Management Assistant I. Mr. Alhassan shared that prior to coming to Phoenix he had been an accountant with the City of Yuma. Mr. Clarke commented that he has been a City of Phoenix employee for almost nine years with most of those years spent in the Streets Department. Ms. Faull expressed that she has been employed with the City of Phoenix for eight years and has had the opportunity to work in several different city departments.

5. **Executive Committee Report: TOPAZ Regional Wireless Cooperative (TRWC) Request for Operational Talkgroups**

Chair Mr. Meyer commended the Executive Committee (EC) for its work towards developing a recommendation on this very important issue. He commented that this issue expands beyond just the TRWC's request, as it encompasses other entities that may request operational talkgroups. He noted that the Board's decision on how to proceed with these types of requests is vital.

Board Member Mr. Haner joined the meeting.

Mr. Phillips delivered a presentation that provided a background of the TRWC's request to obtain two talkgroups on the network and the RWC's response to grant the TRWC interim access until August 26, 2010, and then subsequently extended access to September 23, 2010. He stated that this is not a typical request, because it is a request for direct operations on the network. Mr. Phillips explained the following steps that the EC took to examine the TRWC's request:

1. Contacted the TRWC to gain an understanding of its needs;
2. Examined what kind of membership was available under the current Intergovernmental Agreement;
3. Researched how other regional systems handle this kind of situation;
4. Talked to RWC operational users (with emphasis on East Valley cities: Scottsdale, Tempe, and Chandler) to obtain their input and determine any reciprocal needs on the TRWC system; and
5. Examined the system impact for usage for the months of July and August 2010.

Mr. Phillips relayed that the TRWC validated its need for covert portable radio communications in the West Valley for undercover detectives performing surveillance and other functions. He reported that the TRWC is exploring other options in lieu of the RWC system and has offered reciprocal use of its system, if needed.

Mr. Phillips shared some EC concerns of setting a precedent of allowing entities easy access on the system without commensurate responsibility financially or capacity-wise, which could be a deterrent to true regional participation. He noted that if the TRWC is allowed access as an entity, current RWC members could form their own mini-cooperatives from within the RWC. He also expressed that the EC considered the possible need of creating a new membership category with a corresponding new fee structure.

Mr. Phillips clarified an EC report item. He explained that RWC East Valley users' interest in coverage in the Queen Creek area was for operational use and not simply because users resided in the area.

Mr. Phillips concluded his presentation by explaining that for an extended period until July 1, 2011, the EC has recommended to approve, with the conditions stipulated in the report, the TRWC request for use of the RWC system. He stated the extended period allows for more time to identify a permanent solution, which may be a new membership category. He noted that part of the EC's recommendation is not to consider similar requests, until the evaluation period has ended.

Mr. Frazier questioned whether the TRWC has anything it could use in place of this arrangement. Mr. Phillips remarked that Mr. Felix has begun discussions with the TRWC Executive Director Dale Shaw. He added that the evaluation period would give the TRWC time to look at options such as special portable antennas and adding additional sites.

In response to a question from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Felix replied that he had a preliminary discussion with Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Felix was not aware of any problems the TRWC may have with the EC's recommendation. Mr. Felix commented that the July 2011 extension would allow the TRWC time to develop options, and it gives the TRWC and RWC a chance to take a more in-depth look at the issue.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Ms. Thorpe, Mr. Phillips replied that Mesa's undercover operations in the West Valley are ongoing and permanent. He remarked that prior to the RWC system, all agencies were on the UHF and VHF systems; he added that similar communication problems with those systems existed then, as today. He further explained that at times agencies would request use of each other's VHF channels, and that was one reason for a having a regional network.

3

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Phillips replied that the TRWC has not directly provided a timeline to examine other options; however, that was why the EC recommended one year from start to finish for the TRWC to use the RWC system.

Vice-Chair Thorpe inquired if there was a concern that the TRWC's usage could overwhelm the system based upon the usage figures for July and August 2010. Mr. Phillips explained that one entity would not overwhelm the system and the TRWC would be limited to Simulcasts B and G; therefore, there was plenty of capacity.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Phillips replied that as far as he knows the TRWC's 30 radios are only being used for undercover operations.

In response to a question from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Phillips identified examples of other entities such as Bureau of Alcohol and Firearms, Drug Enforcement Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigations, US Marshall's Office, Transportation Security Administration, and Arizona Fraudulent ID Task Force that have or may request operational use of the RWC system.

Mr. Felix noted that there is a difference between interoperable and operable use. He explained that interoperable use is accessible to agencies working on joint task forces, but agencies now want operational use for better coverage than provided on their individual networks.

In a response to a question from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Phillips explained that the entities, previously identified, have radios programmed for interoperable use to work jointly with the RWC. He defined operational use as entities working independently and using separate channels; he noted that this has a greater impact on the network.

In response to a question from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Phillips replied that interoperability users cannot access interoperability talkgroups without permission and activation by the RWC; therefore, this aspect of the system is part of the RWC's operating costs. He added that some funding has come from the COPS and PSIC grants to increase capacity and construct high sites.

Mr. Hartig asked for confirmation of the RWC's ability to turn on and off usage and to watch radio traffic to ensure the system would not be overloaded, if a significant event occurred. Mr. Phillips confirmed that was true.

Mr. Frazier added that a user cannot come onto an interoperability channel unless it has been preprogrammed and approved. He mentioned, as an example, the Super Bowl event in which federal, local, and state agencies were all on one system talkgroup. He also commented that if a catastrophic event

occurred, the need would exist for all agencies to communicate with one another and that was the reason for interoperability.

In response to a question from Mr. Melvin, Mr. Phillips responded that San Diego has a membership category called "customer," in which the entity buys time on the system and is assessed a special operations and maintenance (O&M) rate that is higher than what others pay. He commented that he was not sure how the buy-in fee is applied.

Mr. Sweeney inquired whether San Diego was a separate entity or a cooperative and whether a liability existed if a "customer" pushed to talk on a radio and could not communicate. Mr. Phillips responded that the San Diego system is a mix between a centrally managed system and one that is a group of members. He explained that its Board has representatives that vote on how the system is operated. He further explained that, in reality, it is a county-maintained system, although members pay into it. He noted that liability is an issue that needs to be researched further.

Chair Mr. Meyer stated that Mr. Sweeney's liability question is something that needs to be examined; he suggested that it be incorporated into the EC recommendation, if the Board moves in that direction. He then inquired whether the assumption was made that the customer fee was high enough to support the system's infrastructure and not just operating costs. Mr. Phillips acknowledged that more detail needs to be obtained. He presumed that San Diego looked at its cost model and took infrastructure into consideration.

In response to a question from Mr. Costello, Chair Mr. Meyer stated that some Board Members may need historical information on the relationship between the TRWC and RWC to make decisions on this and other items. He also commented that the RWC does not want to create artificial barriers due to past disagreements between the two cooperatives. He further stressed that he has never observed a metropolitan area where two systems existed, and he believed that it was important not to create obstacles that would discourage the creation of a single cooperative entity one day.

Mr. Walker inquired whether there had ever been a need for an RWC Member to have access to the TRWC system. Mr. Phillips responded that it is "a nice to have," but at present, it is "not a need to have" due to the expansion of the PSIC high sites. He noted, however, that the need could change. Mr. Felix added that these are issues that would continue to occur as other entities develop systems, and in the short term, it was important to bridge the gaps until the vision of one regional network is realized; therefore, as these issues come up, solutions, like this or similar, need to be created.

Mr. Sweeney clarified that the TRWC and RWC have interoperable use; the TRWC is requesting operational use for its day-to-day West Valley operations.

In response to a request from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Bill Phillips introduced the following EC members: Mr. Heck, City of Tempe; Mr. Rooney, City of Peoria; Mr. Tolle, City of Scottsdale, and Ms. Campbell, City of Surprise (absent).

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Haner to approve the TRWC's request for talkgroups on the RWC Network based upon the conditions set forth in the Executive Committee's report. Mr. Sweeney **SECONDED** the motion, with the clarification that since the budgetary process may cause a rate change, Report Item 4 under the subheading "Recommendation" should identify the O&M charge as the O&M Board-approved rate per radio rather than a defined dollar amount of $46.15 per radio. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Mr. Felix commented that he would be following up with TRWC Executive Director Dale Shaw. Chair Mr. Meyer acknowledged that Mr. Shaw and TRWC Vice-Chair Alex Deshuk were in the audience.

6.   RWC Policy Approval

Mr. Felix stated that the RWC Operations Working Group has a Policy Working Group that was reviewing and updating previously named Phoenix Regional Wireless Network policies and procedures to determine if they were appropriate for the RWC. He explained that if an item is a procedure, it would not be brought forward to the Board for approval; however occasionally, policies may be presented to the Board for approval. Mr. Felix stated that he obtained legal opinion on the need to have legal review of policies; the outcome was that if a document were a statement of fact, it would not need legal review.

Mr. Felix summarized the purpose of the Talkgroup Ownership and Assignment Authority policy and requested it receive Board approval. A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe to approve the policy and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

7.   RWC Project Updates

Mr. Felix shared a presentation that highlighted the status of the following projects: COPS grant, PSIC grant, Buckeye/Goodyear, Chandler, Phoenix In-Fill, Scottsdale, Transit, and 800MHz rebanding. Mr. Felix stated that the 800MHz rebanding project was an issue that would be discussed in further detail at a later time with the RWC Board. He concluded by mentioning other potential projects: Glendale/Avondale, Paradise Valley, and Maricopa County. Chair Mr. Meyer inquired if there were any representatives from these entities in the audience. Mr. Andrews and Mr. Tortora from the Town of Paradise Valley identified themselves and expressed interest in joining the RWC, pending the Town's budgetary outcome.

8.   **<u>Members' Primary and Alternate Representatives</u>**

Chair Mr. Meyer explained the importance of having, in writing and on file, the name of the authorized RWC Board Member and any designated alternates for each member entity. He further expressed that if neither an entity's Board Member nor its alternate was available to attend the RWC Board meeting, then any substitute representative would be welcome to attend but would not be allowed to vote. In response to a question from Chair Mr. Meyer, Mr. Felix stated that the RWC staff would notify Board Members that do not have a letter on file. He added that future periodic requests would be made.

9.   **<u>Call to the Public</u>**

None.

10.   **<u>Next Meeting: October 28, 2010; 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.</u>**

Chair Mr. Meyer announced that the next meeting is October 28, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the Arizona Department of Transportation. He requested that directions to the location be included with the meeting agenda when it is sent to the Board Members.

11.   **<u>Adjournment</u>**

Chair Mr. Meyer adjourned the meeting at 11:22 a.m.