Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
Agenda
January 27, 2011

	ITEM	PRESENTER
1)	**Call to Order and Roll Call**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
2)	**Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 16, 2010** **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min.
3)	**TRWC Talkgroup Usage and Joint Executive Committee Meeting Update** The purpose of this item is to provide a status of the TRWC's talkgroup usage on the RWC system and an update regarding the joint Executive Committee meeting. **This item is for information, discussion and possible action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix Est. 10 min.
4)	**Special Assessments** The purpose of this item is to review and request Board approval of special assessments for several RWC projects. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix Est. 10 min.
5)	**RWC Financial Statement Audit Update** The purpose of this item is to provide an update on the 2011 RWC Financial Statement Audit and to request Board approval of the scope of work for the audit. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Mr. Tahir Alhassan Est. 10 min.
6)	**Associate Member Billing** The purpose of this item is to provide an update on the Board's request for a legal opinion on direct billing to Associate Members. **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
7)	**Chandler Mall Communications** The purpose of this item is to present information related to the communication issues experienced during a recent situation at the Chandler Mall. **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
8)	**Motorola Scorecard Update** The purpose of this item is to review the 2011 scorecard metric which will provide the basis for evaluating Motorola's performance in 2011. **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director / Mr. Bill Fleming - Motorola Est. 15 min.

9)	**RWC Staff Strategic Plan** The purpose of this item is to review the strategic plan for RWC staff. **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
10)	**RWC Website Demonstration** The purpose of this item is to present an overview of the new RWC Website. **This item is for information and discussion.**	Mr. Dave Clarke – RWC Est. 10 min.
11)	**Call to the Public** **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 1-5 min.
12)	**Next Meeting: March 24, 2011; 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.** **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
13)	**Adjourn**	Chair Meyer - Tempe

Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
2011 Meeting Schedule

Date	Location/Comments
Thursday, January 27￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, March 24￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, May 26￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, July 28￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, September 22￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, November 17￼10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers￼200 W. Jefferson

Board of Directors
MINUTES
December 16, 2010

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

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

*Board Alternate   **Board Alternate (non-voting)

Staff Present			
Tahir Alhassan	David Felix	Sean Kindell	Bill Phillips
Dave Clarke	Celicia Fiedler	Rick Kolker	Mike Rall
Jesse Cooper	John Gardner	Steve Kreis	
Theresa Faull	Jennifer Hagen	Doug Mummert	

Public Present			
Karen Allen	Joe Gibson	Donna Marcum	Vicky Scott
Brenda Buren	Mark Gorla	Brian Moore	Dale Shaw
Jim Case	John Imig	Cy Otsuka	Shannon Tolle
Dave Collett	Lonnie Inskeep	Larry Rooney	Tim Ulery
Bill Fleming	Mark Mann	John Rowan	

1.   **Call to Order**

Chair Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and announced the
following alternate representatives:

- Board Alternate Mr. Nadeau for Mr. Brown – City of Goodyear
- Board Alternate Mr. Brannon for Mr. Melvin – City of Maricopa
- Board Alternate Mr. Sweeney for Mr. Zuercher – City of Phoenix
- Board Alternate Mr. Poorte for Mr. Mark Schott – City of Surprise

2.   Approval of the Meeting Minutes from October 28, 2010

Chair Meyer stated that a motion was not needed to approve the minutes. He asked if the Board had any corrections, additions or changes to the minutes; there were none, and the minutes were approved as submitted.

3.   Staff Recognition

Chair Meyer presented an award to Ms. Celicia Fiedler of Phoenix's Information Technology Services (ITS) Department, recognizing her administrative assistance to the RWC, prior to the hiring of a permanent RWC staff. He noted that her work in support of the RWC was in addition to her regular assignments in ITS. On behalf of the RWC Board of Directors, Chair Meyer thanked Ms. Fiedler for a terrific job. Mr. Felix concurred with Chair Meyer's commendations and added that Mr. Bill Phillips and the rest of the Phoenix ITS staff have been tremendous in helping transition responsibilities to the RWC staff.

The "inaugural" award was presented and Ms. Fiedler thanked the Board.

4.   Equity Ownership

Mr. Alhassan extended his appreciation to Mr. Kindell from Phoenix's Finance Department for his contributions to the work on the equity calculations. Mr. Alhassan reviewed the RWC projects used for calculating the equity, and explained that as projects are completed they will be added to the equity. He also presented each Member's contribution by project.

In response to a question by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Alhassan responded that Sun Lakes Fire District, which contributed through the City of Phoenix, did not have a contribution amount listed because the dollar figure was not received in time for the presentation. He noted that the same was true for the City of El Mirage, which contributed through another Member. He added that once the figures are received, the information will be updated. Chair Meyer requested that the updated figures be distributed to the Board for informational purposes.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Kindell responded that a Member's equity contribution was based on a Member's cash payments to run capital projects that the City of Phoenix managed (construction costs etc.) starting from year one and that the City of Phoenix turned over to the RWC. He stated that if a Member managed and contributed to a project on its own and then turned it over to the RWC, it would be calculated as an asset and included on the RWC financial statements; however any projects that Members have not turned over to the RWC would not be reflected on the RWC financial statements.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe regarding Scottsdale's funding of an upgrade, Mr. Kindell replied that when the RWC makes the payment to

Scottsdale, it will show up as an increase in asset value. The capital portion of the bill will be added to each Member's equity percentage calculation.

In response to questions by Chair Meyer, Mr. Kindell responded that each Member's equity percentage would be reported on the Member's financial statements. Mr. Kindell explained that equity percentage was based on a Member's total contributions, and he confirmed that if the RWC was liquidated, the value of assets would be distributed to the Members based on their equity contributions.

Mr. Alhassan explained that to determine a Member's equity percentage, a Member's contribution was factored against the total contributions to the RWC. He stated that each Member's percentage was then applied against the RWC's total net assets of 96.8 million dollars to obtain a Member's equity dollar figure.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Alhassan responded that the original value of an asset is depreciated. Mr. Kindell explained that an asset's value is based on the value at the time of contribution; however over time the value is adjusted by a price index and depreciated. He further explained that hard assets are valued at the time of transfer; for example, a hard asset that is 15 years old will be transferred at its depreciated value and not the original value of the asset. He added that the equity of the RWC is lower than actual contributions due to assets depreciating.

No action was taken on this item, as it was for information and discussion.

5.   2011/2012 Budget Overview

Mr. Alhassan began the presentation by reviewing the budget categories and their respective percentage of the budget.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer regarding how Phoenix's Information Technology and Services Department (ITS) determines its charges for time on projects, Mr. Sweeney replied that ITS supports the majority of the technology centrally for all Phoenix operations; therefore services are tracked through Phoenix's SAP financial system using work orders that define the work being performed. He explained that for shared services such as microwave, ITS looks at the trunk lines coming into the system and which department/entity is using it and then proportionate costs based on an end-user's connections into the system.

Mr. Alhassan presented two budget scenarios: with and without Glendale represented as a Member due to Glendale's membership date being undetermined. Mr. Felix expressed that because Glendale would be a significant contributor to the system, if Glendale was not able to obtain city council approval to join the RWC, then the cost to each Member would be at the higher budget scenario.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix confirmed that action taken by the Board this day would be for approval of the budget with Glendale as a Member and the radio rate would be set in April 2011. Chair Meyer stated that if Members wanted to prepare for worst case scenario they could prepare without Glendale as a Member.

Mr. Alhassan reviewed the Five Year Budget projection and explained that the projections assume Glendale would be an RWC Member.

In response to a question from Chair Meyer, Mr. Alhassan responded that the purpose of the Required Minimum Balance was to provide cash flow for operations. He explained that when new Members join the network, they are required to contribute towards the Required Minimum Balance, as will be the case with Scottsdale and Chandler this fiscal year.

Mr. Felix conveyed that a prior discussion had taken place regarding the value of artificially flatten the budget to depict a steady increase over several years rather than having the budget fluctuate; however, it was determined that to do so would be administratively burdensome.

Chair Meyer expressed that with municipal budgets, the Board should be cognizant of items like this which become off-line items that cities do not necessarily have control of. He explained that they become discretionary; therefore the Board has an obligation to not just assume growth and presume higher costs, but rather look at ways to keep costs to a minimum.

In response to a question by Mr. Wilson regarding why some Members who have already transitioned to the RWC do not reflect an Operations &Maintenance (O&M) charge, Mr. Alhassan responded that those agencies have agreements with the City of Phoenix Fire Department for the use of Phoenix radios; and therefore the O&M costs are being paid for by Phoenix.

Mr. Felix clarified that the radio use was essentially a lease program with the City of Phoenix and once an agency purchases the radios, then the agency would be assessed an O&M charge.

In response to a discussion by Chair Meyer, Vice-Chair Thorpe, and Mr. Sweeny regarding how the budget would be impacted by additional agencies adding radios to the network and clarification of which Glendale costs were reflected in the budget total, Mr. Alhassan confirmed that Glendale's software subscription costs have been included, but ITS costs have not.

Chair Meyer noted that slides 6 and 7 which depicted the total budget with and without Glendale should reflect a slightly different number due to subscription costs included in the slide with Glendale's figures; therefore the assumption

should be made that if Glendale does not become a Member, the overall budget number would be reduced slightly.

In response to a questions by Mr. Hartig regarding Special Assessment for Staffing, Mr. Alhassan explained that the increase was approximately 2.5% for salary increases, plus office supplies and other items. Mr. Alhassan confirmed that in the event that the City of Phoenix froze salaries that would affect the projected increases. Chair Meyer expressed that if the overall staffing increase was 5% that meant office supplies were also increasing at 2.5% which was significantly high.

In response to a question by Mr. Frazier, Mr. Alhassan confirmed that Glendale would be responsible for the majority of ITS costs to join the RWC.

Mr. Costello requested that Board action be taken at the end of the meeting to allow the Board to first examine the impact Associate Membership (Item 7) would have on the budget.

Item put on hold at 10:54 a.m.
Item reintroduced at 11:32 a.m.

Mr. Phillips explained that slides 6 and 7 of the budget presentation depicted no difference in the budget with Glendale not becoming a Member; however slide 7 was not accurate, as there would be a slight reduction in the budget if Glendale does not join. He added that subscription estimates were a factor that was not clearly conveyed to Mr. Alhassan. Mr. Felix clarified that the request for Board approval of the budget would include those costs, although actually would be less if Glendale does not join the RWC.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Wilson and **SECONDED** by Mr. Walker to approve the proposed 2011/2012 Budget. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

6.   Scottsdale's Request to become an RWC Maintenance Managing Member

Mr. Tolle presented Scottsdale's request to become a Maintenance Managing Member to manage its portion of the RWC network. He explained that Scottsdale was finishing a new zone that should go into effect in April 2011. He added that the zone would serve the Northeast Valley and could eventually include Paradise Valley should it become a Member. He stated that Scottsdale has three full-time radio staff and was recruiting a fourth position to support the microwave network, Scottsdale's portion of the Phoenix Fire VHF system, Police dispatch equipment, and subscriber radios. He explained that Scottsdale has a radio shop located at Scottsdale and Thunderbird Roads which would be available for use by other RWC Members. He further added that Scottsdale's jurisdiction covers approximately 184 square miles; therefore, there would be an advantage in response time for dispatching staff already located in Scottsdale.

In response to a question by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Felix responded that regardless of who does the hiring, Phoenix or Scottsdale, additional staff and associated costs were required to maintain the system.

Mr. Hartig clarified that the Five Year Budget Plan that was presented indicated that five (5) staff positions needed to be hired regardless of who hires them: two (2) to support Scottsdale's infrastructure, microwave and radio, and three (3) to support the RWC overall. He added that Scottsdale used the Phoenix ITS/RWC costing model to determine staffing levels. Mr. Tolle added that there were also costs saving because Scottsdale already has city vehicles, test equipment and computers, and would be providing spares for that portion of the zone.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Sweeney expressed that Phoenix wants to ensure that there are no staffing redundancy; therefore, working through the Executive Committee, as entities request to become Maintenance Managing Members each request needs to be examined to determine if the location of the entity is already being serviced by Phoenix, or would there be an offset benefit of not needing to roam to an area not covered today. He added that, operationally, where an entity may have equipment on the same site, such as Thompson Peak, procedures need to be followed so that multiple technicians are not dispatched to the same location.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Sweeney responded that the goal would be to follow the model used by Phoenix Fire and its automatic aide partners in which the closest unit is dispatched; therefore if a need existed, Scottsdale could be called upon to assist with a maintenance issue in another area. Mr. Felix added that Scottsdale's staff received standardized training and therefore would be capable of responding, if called upon.

Mr. Costello suggested that the RWC obtain standardized cost models, so that when entities perform like or same services, the cost to the RWC should be comparable or the same. Chair Meyer concurred with Mr. Costello's recommendation and added that this be an area the Executive Committee examines.

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve Scottsdale's request to become a Maintenance Managing Member. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

7. **Associate Membership Requests**

Mr. Felix explained that the Intergovernmental Agreement outlines a category structure for Associate Members. He stated that written requests for Associate membership were received by Southwest Ambulance and Professional Medical Transport (PMT). Mr. Felix expressed that the Executive Committee recognized the need for the creation of policies and procedures to address procedural and funding issues; however, an immediate need existed for Associate membership

to be granted, as both agencies were currently operating in support of Members. He added that the Operations and Policy Working Groups were working on the development of the procedures and Associate Members would be required to sign a letter agreement acknowledging specific requirements.

In response to a question by Chair Meyers, Mr. Phillips responded that from a cost standpoint nothing changes with granting the agencies Associate membership. He explained that the Associate Members would be bringing radios onto the RWC system. He added that the Associate Members would be responsible for purchasing and programming the radios; therefore, the RWC recovers revenue from the Associate Members.

In response to questions by Chair Meyers and Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Phillips explained that the request was similar to Mesa PD's request; however Associate Members are conducting operations in support of an RWC Member in which they are contracted. He stated that he estimated the radio count would be less than 100, although explained that the count would not be a concern, as it would be traffic that would need to be supported by either the Member or a contracted party.

In response to a comment by Vice-Chair Thorpe regarding agencies adding radios to the RWC system, Mr. Phillips replied that as agencies want to join the RWC as operational users, an examination needs to occur of what kind of membership category this may be. He confirmed that it would be a different membership category, which has not yet been identified.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Phillips responded that if an Associate Member had a contract with Gilbert, it would be handled with Gilbert and the TRWC, and that traffic would not come through the RWC network.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Phillips explained that subscriber rates could be charged to the Member contracted with the Associate Member or the Associate Member could be billed directly. He stated that billing could occur either way but radio counts would need to be separated. He further explained that direct billing to Associate Members may require cities with current contracts to amend any billing sections so that the contracts would be for service.

Mr. Sweeney expressed the need for a legal opinion so that direct billing to an Associate Member does not adversely affect the tax exempt status of Members. He conveyed the need to make sure an agreement dictates that use must be in support of municipal agencies. Chair Meyer concurred with the need for a legal opinion.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe regarding Associate Member status for radio companies contracted with Members, Mr. Phillips responded that the topic had not yet come up, but if the companies do their own maintenance then perhaps Associate Membership may be something to consider.

In response to a question by Mr. Haner, Mr. Phillips confirmed that the radios (being discussed for Southwest Ambulance and PMT) were already being used today and would not add any traffic to the system.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Haner and **SECONDED** by Mr. Sweeney to provisionally approve Southwest Ambulance and PMT as Associate Members until the establishment of signed agreements. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

8. **Approval of Policies**

Mr. Felix presented an overview of the Frequency Management and Compliance Documentation policies. He explained that the Frequency Management policy allows for the Administrative Managing Member to manage frequency licensing for Members; however ownership of frequencies remains with the individual Members. Mr. Felix explained that the Compliance Document policy established guidelines for retaining documentation related to RWC policy compliance and operation, and identifies the responsible party for each category of documentation.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Frazier and **SECONDED** by Mr. Hartig to approve the Frequency Management and Compliance Documentation policies. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

9. **Project Updates**

Mr. Felix presented an update on current RWC projects: COPS Grant - Capacity Increase, PSIC Grant - High Sites, Buckeye/Goodyear, Chandler, Phoenix In-Fill, Scottsdale, Transit, and 800 MHz rebanding. He also provided a status of the following pending areas: Glendale/Avondale, Paradise Valley, and Maricopa County.

10. **2011 Board Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Felix presented the Executive Committee's recommendation to move to a bi-monthly Board meeting schedule beginning with the month of January 2011. He explained that a bi-monthly schedule would allow for full meeting agendas and reduce the need to cancel meetings due to a lack of agenda items. He further explained that if an item arose that required immediate action, the Executive Committee could take interim action until the next Board meeting, or a special Board meeting or teleconference could be called, if necessary.

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Hartig to approve the bi-monthly Board meeting schedule. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

11. **Call to the Public**

None.

12. **Next Meeting: January 27, 2010; 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.**

Chair Meyer announced the date of the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Thorpe requested the following agenda items for the next Board meeting: (1) an update on the TRWC and its plans to handle coverage issues in the West Valley, and (2) the traffic on the RWC network from the operational-use radios by the TRWC.

13. **Adjournment**

Chair Meyer adjourned the meeting at 11:43 a.m.

Regional Wireless Cooperative

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: January 27, 2011
FROM:	Executive Committee	Item 3
SUBJECT:	**TRWC TALKGROUP USAGE AND JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING UPDATE**	

BACKGROUND
In June 2010, the RWC Board of Directors conditionally approved the TRWC's direct operational use of two talkgroups, H15 and H16, on the RWC system, necessary to support Mesa's covert surveillance operations in the downtown and west valley metropolitan areas. RWC Board action in September 2010 extended the conditional use through July 1, 2011. Since the two talkgoups allocated were originally Interoperability channels used by the RWC, and now that the TRWC's use was extended, the need developed to move the TRWC off the Interoperability channels and onto its own talkgroups, MesaPD Invest I and MesaPD Invest 2. In December 2010, the two new talkgroups were activated and by the end of the month, H15 and H16 were deactivated for operational use by the TRWC.

THE ISSUE
At the December 16, 2010 Board Meeting, a request was made by the Board for staff to provide an update on the TRWC's use of the RWC system. A review of the TRWC's talkgroup usage for December 2010 indicates that use for H15 and H16 was down from the preceding months, and Mesa's Investigations talkgoups started to be used. Overall total usage was down, which may have been a result, in part, of December being a holiday month.

The TRWC and RWC Executive Committees met on Monday, January 24, 2011, and a verbal report of that meeting will be provided at the RWC Board meeting.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for informational purposes only.

Attachments: TRWC Talkgroup Use Data
              TRWC Maximum Busy Hour by Month

TRWC Talkgroup Usage: FY 2010/11

Talkgroup Name	July Number of Calls	July Call Duration hh:mm:ss	July Overall % of Channel Use	August Number of Calls	August Call Duration hh:mm:ss	August Overall % of Channel Use	September Number of Calls	September Call Duration hh:mm:ss	September Overall % of Channel Use	October Number of Calls	October Call Duration hh:mm:ss	October Overall % of Channel Use	November Number of Calls	November Call Duration hh:mm:ss	November Overall % of Channel Use	December Number of Calls	December Call Duration hh:mm:ss	December Overall % of Channel Use
H15 PS 15																		
Simulcast A	272	1:13:17	0.16%															
Simulcast B	186	0:50:59	0.11%	833	3:0:11	0.40%	2,117	8:28:17	1.18%	1,135	03:45:26	0.52%	3,130	12:19:55	1.71%	792	02:59:07	0.41%
Simulcast C	25	0:06:41	0.01%															
Simulcast F	320	1:25:51	0.19%	799	2:54:48	0.39%	541	2:29:2	0.34%									
Simulcast G	251	1:12:54	0.16%	678	2:23:47	0.32%	1,813	7:18:48	1.02%	351	01:12:39	0.17%	2,359	08:58:49	1.25%	50	00:09:43	0.02%
White Tanks	15	0:03:57	0.01%															
H16 PS 16																		
Simulcast A	834	3:15:58	0.44%															
Simulcast B	477	2:05:35	0.28%	3,138	12:57:29	1.74%	2,495	9:0:12	1.25%	4,377	17:49:03	2.47%	3,447	13:06:10	1.82%	243	00:40:18	0.09%
Simulcast C	527	2:15:22	0.30%	3,064	12:29:58	1.68%	1,076	3:41:26	0.51%									
Simulcast F	878	3:24:24	0.46%															
Simulcast G	665	2:38:15	0.35%							1,306	05:04:57	0.71%	1,466	05:32:50	0.77%	4	00:00:56	0.00%
White Tanks	204	0:46:31	0.10%	2,401	9:34:47	1.29%	1,517	5:23:6	0.75%									
MesaPd Invest 1																		
Simulcast A																		
Simulcast B													11	00:01:29	0.00%	2,402	08:00:13	1.11%
Simulcast C																		
Simulcast F																		
Simulcast G													3	00:00:20	0.00%	441	01:23:50	0.19%
Estrella																		
Outlet Mall																		
South Mt																		
Sky Harbor																		
Quintero																		
White Tanks																		
MesaPd Invest 2																		
Simulcast A																		
Simulcast B													2,269	08:32:10	1.19%	72	00:23:35	0.05%
Simulcast C																		
Simulcast F																		
Simulcast G													219	00:47:54	0.11%			
Totals																		
Simulcast A	1,106	4:29:15	0.60%															
Simulcast B	663	2:56:34	0.40%	3,971	15:57:40	2.15%	4,612	17:28:29	2.43%	5,512	21:34:29	3.00%	8,857	33:59:44	4.72%	3,509	12:03:13	1.67%
Simulcast C	552	2:22:03	0.32%	3,064	12:29:58	1.68%	1,076	3:41:26	0.51%									
Simulcast F	1,198	4:50:15	0.65%	799	2:54:48	0.39%	541	2:29:2	0.34%									
Simulcast G	916	3:51:09	0.52%	678	2:23:47	0.32%	1,813	8:37:1	1.20%	1,657	06:17:36	0.87%	4,047	15:19:53	2.13%	495	01:34:29	0.22%
White Tanks	219	0:50:28	0.11%	2,401	9:34:47	1.29%	1,517	5:23:6	0.75%									
Grand Total	4,654	19:19:44	2.60%	10,913	43:21:00	5.83%	9,559	37:39:04	5.23%	7,169	27:52:05	3.87%	12,904	49:19:37	6.85%	4,004	13:37:42	1.89%
Actual Total	3,354	07:33:43	1.02%	3,902	15:44:07	2.11%	4,395	16:38:02	2.31%	5,440	21:02:29	2.92%	11,365	44:09:49	6.13%	3,352	11:35:47	1.61%

TRWC Maximum Busy Hour for Each Month (2010)

Month	Talkgroup Name	Talkgroup ID	Number of Calls	Call Duration (seconds)	Average Call Duration (seconds)	Busy Hour	Sub-System	% Channel Use
July	H16 PS 16	80002841	124	1,673	13.49	7/20/2010 8:00:00PM	SimulA/F/G	46.47%
August	H16 PS 16	80002841	140	2,586	18.47	8/3/2010 4:00:00PM	SimulC	71.83%
September	H15 PS 15	80002842	147	2240	15.24	9/15/2010 11:00:00AM	SimulB/G	62.22%
October	H16 PS 16	80002841	160	2,124	13.28	10/20/2010 9:00:00PM	SimulB	59.00%
November	H16 PS 16	80002841	187	2501	13.37	11/3/2010 2:00:00PM	SimulG.csv	69.47%
December	H15 PS 15	80002842	123	00:27:56		12/2/2010 12:00:00PM	SimulB.csv	46.56%

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: January 27, 2011
FROM:	Executive Committee	Item 4

SUBJECT: **SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS**

BACKGROUND

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

THE ISSUE

There are currently several ongoing projects to bring various agencies onto the RWC network. While each of these agencies is managing their own projects and have contracted directly with Motorola to build-out the network, there is still work that must be performed by the RWC to complete integrating these agencies into the network. This work includes general engineering and support activity, establishing and verifying microwave connectivity, network and alarm configuration, tower studies, antenna mounting, testing, documentation, and coordination with the vendor and agencies.

Prior to the ability to use the Special Assessment, individual Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA's) were used to mutually agree to the costs being assessed. In the case of Chandler and Scottsdale below, changes in scope, and increased work necessitates an increase on costs. In these cases, the Special Assessment is being requested only for the increase in costs.

The table below outlines the cost for each Member/project. The costs are being negotiated and the assessments are pending final agreement with each Member. RWC Board action is being requested at this time since the projects listed are either already underway, or will begin prior to the next RWC Board meeting.

Project / Description	Original Estimated Cost	Revised Estimated Cost	Covered by Existing IGA	Special Assessment Required
Buckeye	$107,220.50	$107,220.50		$107,220.50
Chandler	$10,000.00	$27,013.44	$10,000.00	$17,013.44
Goodyear	$69,070.50	$69,070.50		$69,070.50
Scottsdale	$25,500.00	$28,146.54	$25,500.00	$2,646.54

RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Committee recommends approval of the Special Assessments as outlined above, contingent upon mutual agreement with the Members.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: January 27, 2011
FROM:	Tahir Alhassan, RWC Accountant III	Item 5

SUBJECT: **RWC FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT UPDATE**

BACKGROUND
The RWC Intergovernmental Agreement, Exhibit A, Section 4.4 outlines that, "an audit of RWC financial records will be conducted annually. The Board of Directors shall determine the scope of the independent annual financial audit."

THE ISSUE
There are various options for professional engagements including compilation of financial statements, review of financial statements, and an audit of financial statements. Staff has drafted an audit scope of work that reflects the highest level audit and is an industry standard. The proposed scope of work has been reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee.

OTHER INFORMATION
The audit solicitation will be sent to firms listed on the City of Phoenix Audit Department's Qualified Vendor List and/or under existing contract. Staff expects to have a vendor selected in the month of March 2011 and a kick-off meeting to be held by July 2011.

RECOMMENDATION
The Executive Committee recommends approval of the scope of work for the audit of the RWC financial statement.

Attachment: Request for Independent Audit of Financial Records for Joint Venture

REQUEST
FOR
INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR JOINT VENTURE

1. Introduction

The City of Phoenix, on behalf of the multi-jurisdictional Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC), invites your firm, as an approved vendor on the City of Phoenix's Qualified Vendor List for Auditing Services, to submit a proposal to audit fiscal year financial records. The contract with the successful proposer will be a one-year agreement. The independent auditors will make an examination of, and render an opinion on the financial statements and supplemental information of the multi-jurisdiction RWC, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011.

2. Background

The VHF communications system formerly used by the City of Phoenix's public safety and other departments was replaced with a Project 25, digital, 800 MHz trunked radio system. 2001 Bond Funds were approved by Phoenix residents to pursue the replacement, along with funding from enterprise departments and the Fire Automatic Aide partners. The initial build-out was completed in 2005. The City formed the Phoenix Regional Wireless Network (PRWN) and began transitioning Phoenix Police, Fire and municipal departments to the new system. PRWN was intended to be a regional radio system supporting the city's operations as well as the Fire Department's Automatic Aid partners. Since the initial build-out, other cities and towns have participated in system additions and expansions to add new agencies and improve coverage and performance.

In 2008, in order to meet the needs of the expanding network and its many new partners, the RWC was formed; PRWN transitioned to the RWC upon its formation. The RWC oversees the administration, operation, management, maintenance and growth of this regional communications network.

The RWC is now a 16-member cooperative. The City of Phoenix participates with the cities/towns/fire districts of Avondale, Buckeye, Chandler, Daisy Mountain, El Mirage, Goodyear, Guadalupe, Maricopa, Peoria, Scottsdale, Sun City, Sun City West, Sun Lakes, Surprise, and Tempe, in an intergovernmental agreement for the construction, operation and maintenance of the jointly owned and used RWC. As the Administrative Managing Member, the City of Phoenix is responsible for administration and financial management of the RWC, and for billing member jurisdictions. Currently, the members pay for costs of operation and maintenance based on radio count, a special assessment for RWC staffing, a special assessment for upgrades, and required minimum balance.

3. <u>Scope of Work</u>

Task A:

The Independent Auditors will make an examination of and render an opinion on the financial statements and supplemental information of the RWC.

Task B:

The examination will be made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards as adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Government Auditing Standards, and to the extent practicable, the audit procedures will follow those prescribed in the publication of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants entitled "Audits of State and Local Governmental Units"; the authoritative status of National Council on Governmental Accounting pronouncements, AICPA Industry Audit Guide, and all other applicable standards and interpretations issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. The examination will not include the preparation of financial statements and schedules, statistical tables or supporting schedules.

Task C:

Based on the results of the examination, the Independent Auditors shall advise the RWC concerning methods of improving internal control, accounting and auditing; shall advise in the installation of new procedures; and give such other assistance as the Independent Auditors may deem necessary or desirable.   A written report (Management Letter of Recommendations) commenting on the audit findings will be submitted to the RWC as soon as the examination is completed, but not later than four weeks after the date of the audit opinion.

Task D:

The City of Phoenix maintains the financial records for the RWC and agrees to submit to the Independent Auditors the exhibits, statements and schedules subject to the examination as they are completed (usually by October 1) and the Independent Auditors agree to exert every effort toward completing the examination at the earliest possible date thereafter, and in no event more than thirty (30) calendar days after the date the last exhibit, statement and/or schedule is submitted to them. The RWC endeavors to receive the certificate or achievement in Financial Reporting and it is very important to meet submission deadlines.

Task E:

It is agreed that the work will be done on a current or continuing basis. Interim or progress billings will be submitted and paid as the services are rendered. Supporting documentation for billings rendered indicating staff names, time worked, and specific areas of audit will be made available for review upon request.

Task F:

Working papers will be retained for at least three years and will be available for examination by authorized representatives of RWC.

4. <u>Content of Response</u>

Response shall include the following:

    A. Address experience in the following areas:
        a. Firm's municipal auditing experience and expertise
        b. Local office and audit team's municipal auditing experience and expertise
        c. Local office and audit team's experience auditing governmental joint ventures

    B. Description of audit approach

    C. Estimation of the numbers of hours to be devoted to the engagement work plan and schedule

    D. Proposed time frame for completion of the work

    E. Proposed fee

5. <u>Submittal</u>

Submittals are **due by February 28, 2011** and must be sent in writing via mail or email to:

<div align="center">
Regional Wireless Cooperative
c/o Tahir M. Alhassan, CPA
200 West Washington Street, 12th floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
tahir.alhassan@phoenix.gov
</div>

6. <u>Contact Person</u>

For information regarding the scope of work or submittal process, please contact:

<div align="center">
Tahir M. Alhassan, CPA
Regional Wireless Cooperative
Telephone: (602) 534-3780
Fax: (602) 534-3644
Email: tahir.alhassan@phoenix.gov
</div>

Regional Wireless Cooperative
Annual Planning Retreat
November 24, 2010

<u>Welcome and Opening Activities (8:30-10:00)</u>:
- Review of today's agenda:
- Ground rules
- Icebreaker—*Getting to Know You*
- Overview of RWC and Radio 101

<u>Goals for the day</u>:
- *Seeing / Aiming / Doing*
- Review how we are organized for what we do
- Develop future scenarios for our division and how we work together

<u>Seeing—Where are we now?</u>
- Environmental scan of our current reality

  o **Customers and stakeholders**—who are they and what are their expectations?

Customers	Stakeholders
• I.T. staff • Radio users: Police / Fire / Municipal • Board Members • Finance Department • Budget & Research • Office of Government Relations	• Member entities: cities / fire districts • State & Federal entities • Motorola and other equipment vendors • COP management and … • Mayor and City Council • Interoperability Partners • Citizens and residents • Funding recipients

  o What are the **values** that guide our plans, actions, and decision making?

• COP Vision and Values: Integrity, customer service, teamwork, learn, change & improve • Open-mindedness in our transactions	• Public safety (employees and the public) • Innovative (new approaches) • Good stewards of our funding

  o **SWOT analysis**—what are our current Strengths (what we do well) / Weaknesses (not do well) / Opportunities (outside positive forces) / Threats (outside negative forces) that will impact or drive our future plans?

STRENGTHS—*Internal positive* factors that contribute to our success and we can leverage in the future	WEAKNESSES—*Internal negative* factors that work against us that we must address, minimize, or eliminate
• Diverse background of staff (subject matter experts) • Strong leadership • Teamwork among staff • COP support structure and track record • Funding outside of the COP budget gives us flexibility • We are a new group and have new thinking: we are defining ourselves and our roles / more out-of-the-box, can-do thinking	• We are still on a learning curve for our roles and responsibilities; not yet defined • Red tape and bureaucracy can slow down what we need to do • Technical complexity of our issues • Need more training • Limited operating funds • No history to justify our expenditures and requests (e.g. line items on the budget) ***How do we reduce or eliminate these***

• We are a model for this system of operating • Connections through OGR can help us **How can we leverage these strengths to be more successful?**	**weaknesses?**
OPPORTUNITIES—*Outside positive* factors or forces that we can capitalize on to work in our favor • Institutional knowledge of ITS dept. • Public Safety related associations and agencies (e.g. MAG) free of charge—logistical and support services staff • Good relations with vendor (Motorola): funding resources and ideas for improvement • Grant opportunities • Relations with elected officials and Public Safety • Network ties to Washington DC through OGR • Model system and governance structure • Supportive leadership in OGR and CMO • Positive organizational leadership • Possible new members will drive down costs • RWC and TRWC connectivity **How can we capitalize on these opportunities for our future success?**	**THREATS—*Outside negative* factors that we** must mitigate or ignore at our peril • Changes in FCC regulations • Technological changes (TDMA costs $$) • Current economy may prevent potential members from joining * • Cell phone companies: interference / 800 MHz re-banding • Board may move in another direction adding another layer of red tape * • RWC/TRWC relationship • Membership costs: members may feel "taken advantage of" * = *we don't have much control over this* **How do we reduce or minimize the effect of these threats to ensure our success in the future?**

- o What are some other **customer and stakeholder needs** not identified above that we need to address in our plans?
    - Information and communication to RWC Board
    - Avoiding "we vs. they" between RWC and IT staff: sustaining partnering relationships, maintaining balance, keeping people in the loop
    - Engage and maintain relationships with the Executive Committee and the Operations group re: information, time, etc.
    - Follow through on protocols and maintain relationships with the Finance Dept.

Aiming—Where do we want to go? ***SEE SEPARATE EXCEL SPREADSHEET FOR PLAN***

- • What are the priority customer / stakeholder needs we need to address in the short term future? How do we best manage these relationships?
- • Which issues identified in the SWOT analysis are most promising or most need to be included in our plan for the next year?
- • What specific goals do we want to achieve in each area?

Doing—How will we get there?
- • What specific objectives / tactics will support each goal?
    - o Performance measures?
    - o Other critical success factors?
- • How do we need to organize ourselves to achieve our goals in the future?
    - o **Roles & Responsibilities grid *SEE SEPARATE EXCEL SPREADSHEET***

<u>Next Steps:</u>
What steps need to be taken in the next **30 days** to jumpstart the plan? **Next 60-90 days**?

- Transcribe notes and Roles and Responsibilities (Judi)
- Work on "filling in the blanks" on Roles and Responsibilities at next staff meeting
  - ***Double check assignments***
  - ***Add more to spreadsheet if necessary***
- Present draft of plan to Board in January
  - ***Work on "filling in the blanks" on due dates, resources, responsible parties***
- Follow through on Grant training (February)
- Follow through with Chairman's letter
- Start work on desk manuals

Radio Wireless Cooperative Strategic Plan 2010-2012

Strategic Area 1: *STAFF*

Goal 1-1: Create well-defined roles and responsibilities for staff

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Create Roles & Responsibilities grid	a. Draft at retreat		All	11/24/10	
	b. Fill in missing info at staff meeting		All	12/01/10	

Goal 1-2: Staff learns unfamiliar duties

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Training on SAP	City of Phoenix training	Complete class	Tahir & Theresa	Ongoing	Enrolled
b. Training on taking minutes	City of Phoenix training	Complete class	Dave	06/30/11	
c. Training on grant writing	City of Phoenix training	Complete class	Theresa	Ongoing	
d. Job shadowing Finance Dept.	Identify opportunity	Complete 8 hours	David & Tahir	03/31/11	

Goal 1-3: Improve understanding of RWC

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Eight hrs./yr. onsite w/ Police/Fire	Site visit / ride along	Complete 8 hours	All	06/30/11	
b. Get user feedback	OWG feedback	Identify a method	Dave	01/31/11	

Goal 1-4: Continue Personal & Professional development

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Identify training needed to promote	Research a training opportunity	Idenfity 1 class/opportunity	All	01/31/11	
b. Enroll and attend classes					

Strategic Area 2: *FUNDING*

Goal 2-1: Acquire additional program funding through grants

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Get training in grant-writing	City of Phoenix training	Complete class	Theresa	Ongoing	
b. Identify programs / projects for grant opportunities	Make contact with PSIC office	Identify requirements for TA on strategic plan	Dave	02/28/11	
c. Identify grant money sources	Possible: OGR, UASI, PSIC office, Mark Bauer (Motorola)	Obtain information / data	Theresa	Ongoing	
d. Contact, network with, develop relations with orgs. that have grant money			Theresa & Dave		

Goal 2-2: Develop fee structure for participants who are not members

Strategies	Tasks to complete and resources needed	Performance Measures	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
a. Research how others do this					
b. Keep this topic on Executive Committee agendas					
c. Develop options to recommend to Board / Exec. Committee					

Goal 2-3: Support new members in their budget process for joining					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Provide fee structure to key officials	Glendale; Buckeye; PV	Attend meeting and/or provide data	David & Tahir	Ongoing	
b. Prepare proposals and options	Glendale; Buckeye; PV	Timely response	David & Tahir	Ongoing	
Strategic Area 3: *ADMINISTRATION*					
Goal 3-1: Set up external procedures					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Create procedural steps for Interoperability Partners	Fact sheets / letters	Documents in draft form	David & Theresa	02/28/11	
b. Create procedural steps for Associate Members	Fact sheets / letters	Documents in draft form	David & Theresa	02/28/11	
Goal 3-2: Create desk manuals for each position in RWC					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Brainstorm tasks & responsibilities	Roles & Responsibilities grid	Finalize grid	David	01/31/11	
b. Include list of contacts & key people	Create list	Complete document	All		
c. Create manual structure	Develop outline	Distribute	David & Theresa	1/27/2011 Board mtg	
Goal 3-3: Develop / Expand contacts for counterparts or key people in member organizations					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Make contact with at least one counterpart or key person with each member	Phone call or email	Obtain at least 1 contact per Member	David & Tahir	Ongoing	
b. Develop an information or data collection process	Letters / Meetings	Launch survey	All	Ongoing	
Goal 3-4: File Organization					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Develop a filing system	Set up folders & files	Complete basic structure	Theresa	06/30/11	
Strategic Area 4: *RELATIONSHIPS*					
Goal 4-1: Develop accountability to follow through with Chairman's letter					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. The 5-7 things the two groups will do					
Goal 4-2: Define a minimum communication and meeting schedule with the Executive Director of TRWC					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Conduct in-person meetings	Schedule meetings	Monthly meeting held	David	Monthly	
b. Conduct telephonic meetings	Initiate calls	Weekly discussions	David	Monthly	

Goal 4-3: Assist the Executive Chairs in having joint meetings					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Develop schedules	Schedule meetings	Invite sent	David & Theresa	Quarterly	
b. Keep at the forefront	Updates / bulletins	Reminders sent	David & Theresa	Monthly	

Strategic Area 5: *INFORMATION / COMMUNICATION*					
Goal 5-1: Develop website					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Uploaded & running	Various	Operational	Dave	01/31/11	
b. Create a "members only" section	Research log-in features	Provide options	Dave	06/30/11	
Goal 5-2: Increase communicaiton with Board					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Create "alternate" month report	Identify topic areas	1 report per month	David	Monthly	
b. Create a list (and keep updated) of Board members and Alternates	Monitor	Accurate list	Theresa & Dave	Ongoing	
Goal 5-3: Increase public relations with the Public Safety community					
Strategies	**Tasks to complete and resources needed**	**Performance Measures**	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Status**
a. Develop and deliver presentations	Create standard presentation / toolkit for any staff to use	Bi-Monthly	David & Dave	Ongoing	
b. Write articles for their newsletters	AACOP / Fire Chiefs Assoc. / Sheriff's Assoc. / MAG / League of Cities / Muni Users (ICMA)	Bi-Monthly			

Tasks / Activities / Projects	Measurements	David	Theres	David Clarke	Tahir	OTHER
R! = Overall/Sponsoring Responsibility R=Primary Responsibility r = contributing/partial responsibility						
A = Must approve C = Must be consulted T = Touch base with I = Must be informed S = Support only						
RWC PROGRAMS & RESPONSIBILITIES						
Full Board						
Present RWC budget to the Board		C			R	EC=C ITS=C
Provide agendas / minutes		C	R	r		Chair = A/C
Update contact lists		I	R	r		
Plan; conduct RWC Board meetings		C	R	r	S	
Executive Committee						
Present budget to Executive Committee					R	
Prepare agendas and minutes		C	R	r		Chair = A/C
Update contact lists		I	R	r		
Plan; conduct Executive Committee meetings		C	R	r		
Joint Ops & Operations Working Group						
Track projects		I / r		R		
Prepare schedules, agendas and minutes		A / C	r	R		
Update contact lists		A / C	r	R		
Correspondence and staff support		A / C	r	R		

Tasks / Activities / Projects	Measurements	David	Theres	David Clarke	Tahir	OTHER
R! = Overall/Sponsoring Responsibility R=Primary Responsibility r = contributing/partial responsibility						
A = Must approve C = Must be consulted T = Touch base with I = Must be informed S = Support only						
Administrative (Day-to-Day)						
Procurement / purchasing supplies			r	R	A / C	
Web page maintenance and updates		A	r	R	S	
Develop desk manuals		R!	R	R	R	
Write weekly reports / summaries		A/R	r / S	S	S	
Project reporting		r / I		R		
Drafting correspondence		A/R	S	S	S	
Set up meetings / conference calls		R!	S	S		
Attend other jurisdictions Council meetings		R	r	S	S	
Maintain records for RWC	Records retention schedule	R!	R			
Tech support to RWC staff, Board & committees		I	r	R		
RWC Liaison: meeting with Board members, users, and governmental & funding bodies		R!	r	S	C	Bill = C
Coordinate FCC or Regulatory issues impacting RWC		R!	r	r		
Process leave slips		A				Terrie = S
Financial						
Manage RWC finances		A / C			R	
Report on RWC finances		A			R	
Bill members for payment		C			R	
Enter invoices			R	r		

Tasks / Activities / Projects	Measurements	David	Theres	David Clarke	Tahir	OTHER
R! = Overall/Sponsoring Responsibility R=Primary Responsibility r = contributing/partial responsibility						
A = Must approve C = Must be consulted T = Touch base with I = Must be informed S = Support only						
Approve invoices		A			R / A	
Equipment capital expenses		A			R	
Find grant funding sources		C	R			Various entities=C
Apply for and write grant proposals		C	R			Various entities=C
Budget Related Activities						
Develop Annual RWC Budget		R!	S	S	R	B&R = A ITS = C
Contract Monitoring						
Manage / monitor contracts		C	R			
Track contract payments / due dates		C	R		I	