



**Board of Directors  
MINUTES  
August 4, 2011**

Phoenix City Hall Subcommittee Room  
200 West Washington Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

**Board Members Present**

Steven Campbell	Bob Hansen	Macara Underwood*
Wayne Clement	Brad Hartig	Marc Walker
Steven Conrad	Jim Heger	Paul Wilson
Mike Frazier	Danny Johnson	Ed Zuercher
Mark Gaillard	Mark Mann*	
Jim Haner	Susan Thorpe	

**Board Members Absent**

Bob Costello  
David Fitzhugh  
Charlie Meyer

\*Board Alternate

**Staff and Public Present**

Tahir Alhassan	Dave Clarke	Rick Kolker	Larry Rooney
Karen Allen	Theresa Faulk	Domela McHenry	Dave Scott
Tim Brandt	David Felix	Doug Mummert	Dale Shaw
Wade Brannon	Bill Fleming	Chris Nadeau	Wayne Smith
Brenda Buren	John Gardner	Mark Nichols	Shannon Tolle
Carol Campbell	Nolberto Gem	Cy Otsuna	
Jim Case	Loretta Hadlock	Bill Phillips	

**1. Call to Order**

Vice-Chair Thorpe called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and announced the following Board Member and Board Alternate changes:

- Board Member Mr. Johnson replacing Mr. Dragos – Daisy Mountain Fire District
- Board Member Mr. Melvin resigned his seat; seat vacant – City of Maricopa
- Board Alternate Ms. Underwood for vacant seat – City of Maricopa
- Board Alternate Mr. Mann for Mr. Costello – Town of Buckeye

**2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes from May 26, 2011**

Vice-Chair Thorpe asked if the Board had any changes to the minutes. Mr. Felix responded that prior to the meeting, staff was informed of a typo; therefore, the minutes had been updated to reflect the correction. The minutes were approved as presented.

### **3. Tolleson Membership Request**

Mr. Felix explained that on July 14, 2011, the Tolleson City Council approved the City of Tolleson's request to enter into the RWC Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). He stated that staff received all the required documentation including Tolleson's signed IGA. He added that the Executive Committee's recommendation was for Board approval of Tolleson's membership request.

Mr. Hansen expressed his appreciation and explained that Tolleson had contributed to the RWC infrastructure years ago. He stated he was thankful to finally be at this point in time.

Mr. Felix explained that Tolleson Fire would immediately transition to the RWC; however, Tolleson Police would not join at this time due to financial reasons.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Conrad and **SECONDED** by Mr. Frazier to approve Tolleson's RWC membership request. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (15-0)**.

### **4. Executive Committee Member Recommendation**

Mr. Phillips explained that there would be a vacancy on the Executive Committee upon Carol Campbell's retirement. He stated that the Executive Committee discussed the process for replacing the position and agreed that consideration should be given to a qualified individual selected by the Law Enforcement community. He expressed that Ms. Campbell volunteered Chief Frazier to take the lead in putting together a selection committee.

Chief Frazier expressed that he would like the commitment of two or three others to assist in the selection process. He requested that interested Members contact him after the meeting or by phone.

Mr. Phillips invited Ms. Campbell to join himself and Vice-Chair Thorpe to the front of the room as he expressed words of commendation to Ms. Campbell and presented her with a plaque recognizing her service to the RWC.

Ms. Campbell expressed her appreciation and pleasure in having worked with everyone over the years.

### **5. Customer Model Update**

Mr. Felix introduced this item and explained that meetings had been held with the TRWC to review its counter proposal to the RWC Customer model. He added that this would be an informational item for discussion and update.

Mr. Phillips explained that the TRWC proposal consisted of four main assumptions: many systems will want to cross-share direct operational use; cost recovery attributed to actual expenses (O&M) and sustainability of the network (capacity); technical connectivity by mutually acceptable method, consistent and economical; and each system had sufficient “headroom” (that is capacity) to accommodate such use.

Mr. Zuercher left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Phillips expressed that the first assumption may also include users that do not have their own system, such as the State Liquor Board; therefore, it would not be actual cross-sharing. He added that there was not agreement on the fourth assumption with regards to the headroom built into the system. He stated that the headroom was paid for by RWC Members and consequently should be for the RWC’s future growth and not for use by non-Members. He reviewed other assumptions that were not stated but implied: all users were treated the same; costs were applied proportionately; and membership may be based on proportion of use, meaning once a user reached a certain percent of use, perhaps 10%, the user may become a voting Member.

Mr. Phillips stated that the TRWC model was based on airtime use. He reviewed that the TRWC’s use equated to approximately .06% when compared against the RWC’s total use. He explained that the model also included a capacity reserve/capital fund to recover costs within four years to expand the capacity of the system by one channel across the whole system. He added that based upon 7 major subsystems and 54 sub-sites, it equated to approximately \$4M that would need to be collected over the four years.

Mr. Zuercher rejoined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Conrad left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Phillips presented a chart which depicted the TRWC’s share of costs for recovery. He reviewed a five-year breakdown of the following categories: RWC Budget, Capacity Reserve, Total RWC Airtime, TRWC Airtime, TRWC Percent Use, and TRWC Annual Charge. He explained that the TRWC’s annual charge (\$5,775 – \$7,724) included O&M, special assessments and capacity. He added that \$600 of the annual charge was for capacity and the remainder was O&M and special assessments.

Mr. Phillips reviewed a second chart which provided a summary comparison of the following 5 billing models, based upon 200 radios on the system: Annual Cost of Member (baseline), Annual Cost of Customer with Start-up Fee (RWC Customer model), Annual Cost as Customer without Start-up Fee, Annual Cost of New Member with Capacity Start-up Fee, and the TRWC Airtime Model.

Mr. Phillips explained that the Executive Committee and Operations Working Group (OWG) had reviewed the TRWC's proposal and outlined the following concerns: all users were to be treated and pay the same; airtime billing would be more expensive to administer; the model did not account for what Members have invested to build the system; the model assumed headroom was for all users, and Members were basically paying for capacity increase. He expressed that the Executive Committee and OWG were not in favor of the proposed TRWC model. He stated that the Executive Committee was still working towards the September 22, 2011 Board Meeting deadline to either identify a mutually acceptable solution or recommend adoption of the RWC Customer model. He added that if the Customer model was to be implemented, a change to Exhibit A of the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) would be required, per the recommendation of the Phoenix Law Department. He noted that City Council approval would not be needed; however, each Member would have to sign approval of the change.

Mr. Felix explained that if the Customer model was adopted, its definition would be added to Exhibit A, but any rules associated with it would be outside of the IGA.

Mr. Wilson inquired whether the statement on slide 3, "Membership MAY be based on proportion of use," was derived as a user benefit or an RWC requirement.

Mr. Conrad rejoined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Zuercher left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Phillips replied that it was a suggested idea that if proportionate billing was used, a threshold could be established that once a user reached a certain percent of use of the system, the user may gain voting membership status.

Vice-Chair Thorpe inquired whether this idea came forth from the TRWC.

Mr. Phillips replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Felix explained that the TRWC was considering a new billing structure based on airtime for its Members and that billing structure would be applied to this situation. He added that the concept of a user becoming a voting Member may fit into the airtime model once a user attains enough usage; however, it would not fit with the RWC model because voting rights were based on membership and not on amount of use.

Mr. Wilson expressed that there was some value to this concept as an interim step. He explained that use of the system up to 10% with a set time frame, such as 18 months, would allow interim use before a entity comes on to the system. He added that in the future some RWC agencies may want interim use of the

TRWC system. He stated that there might be value in allowing a certain amount of capacity for a short duration of time and then you have to become a Member.

Vice-Chair Thorpe commented that was sort of what has been done with the TRWC this past year, on an ad hoc basis, and at some point a decision must be made to become a Customer, a Member or find another solution.

Mr. Phillips stated that the IGA does contain a provision for a Conditional Participant which can serve for temporary timeframes.

Mr. Wilson expressed that it may be beneficial to have a transition step of allowing temporary usage in the cost model.

Vice-Chair inquired whether the Customer model could be implemented on a monthly basis.

Mr. Phillips replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Frazier inquired whether anyone else had requested access to either system; East to West or West to East.

Mr. Phillips replied that the Town of Gilbert had expressed interest (to access the West). He added that at the OWG meetings, the feedback had been that there was interest in having access to the East but that it was not critical.

Mr. Felix explained that Gilbert would like the same arrangement that Mesa currently has. He stated that Gilbert was programming radios with some Chandler-specific talkgroups, which was allowed, for use when working with Chandler. He added that Scottsdale had expressed that access to the Queen Creek area would be a nice to have, but not a need to have. He stated that no other interest had been expressed. He explained that the RWC coverage extends farther into the East Valley than, conversely, the TRWC extends to the West Valley and the coverage would be further enhanced when Thompson Peak becomes activated.

Mr. Wilson expressed that the access may not be needed for Law Enforcement or Public Works but it was for Fire, as Fire floats back and forth across both systems everyday.

Mr. Phillips explained that Fire operations would not change since Fire still had interoperability and that model was in place.

Mr. Wilson expressed that he has not seen anything in writing and potentially either Board could change that situation because it was a handshake arrangement.

Vice-Chair Thorpe suggested that a discussion regarding formalizing that arrangement should be a topic at a Joint Chair meeting.

Mr. Felix stated he made note of it.

Vice-Chair Thorpe stated that this item was just for information and that the Customer model would be coming back at the September Board meeting.

## **6. RWC Lifecycle Planning and TDMA Conversion**

Mr. Felix explained that this topic, which was postponed from the last meeting, would be an item that the Board would be kept updated on.

Mr. Phillips explained that the accompanying report was a repeat of what was presented several Board meetings ago and his intent was to review the proposed timelines in relation to Lifecycle Planning and the TDMA conversion. He explained that RWC costs were displayed in yellow (in the presentation) and end user costs in magenta. He added that Motorola would be meeting with individual Members for specific equipment changes and subscriber costs.

Mr. Phillips stated that Option 1 was based on STR's going out of support in Fiscal Year 2013/2014 and a complete change out occurring; therefore, due to the amount of money needed to be raised in a short timeframe, this was not an option to be considered.

Mr. Zuercher left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Phillips reviewed Option 2 of the presentation and highlighted that equipment changes would need to occur in 2014/2015, at a cost of approximately \$40M with an additional \$10M needed in 2016-2017 to meet the TDMA conversion deadline. He explained that this was the most likely timeline. He stated that if a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) waiver was granted then the timeline would get spread out and extended possibly to 2019. He added that the 700 MHz was under the control of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and discussions were taking place by the National Regional Planning Committee (NRPC) to request the FCC to either eliminate the deadline or allow the region to decide when a transition needed to occur.

Mr. Felix explained that a draft FCC waiver was complete. He stated that he received an email from the chairman of the NRPC that indicated there was interest in delaying or eliminating the FCC TDMA 700 MHz narrow-band mandate for the region. He added that there would be a conference call with the region this week. He stated that the draft waiver was sent to the RPC for review and his intent was to have it filed by October/November. He explained that the City of Phoenix Government Relations staff had a lobbying firm in Washington DC and, if appropriate, he would push the waiver in that area as well. He stated he would have a copy of the waiver for review at the next Board meeting. He

added that the TRWC, Arizona Department of Public Safety, Yuma Regional Communications System, Pima County Wireless Integrated Network, RPC, the State, Public Safety Interoperable Communications Office (PSIC), Maricopa County, and NPRC have all expressed interest in supporting and signing the waiver.

Mr. Hartig inquired that although the FCC timeline existed, what the end of life was for some of the equipment beyond the Gold Elites.

Mr. Phillips replied that the biggest sunset was the STR base stations in the year 2013/2014. He added that they were being pushed out another year but needed to be changed out on time because there would not be support for them anymore. He requested confirmation from Mr. Fleming of Motorola regarding the 2018 sunset date for the Gold Elites.

Mr. Fleming responded that since end of new shipments was this year, the 2018 date was correct.

#### **7. Annual Report Update**

Mr. Felix reviewed the Table of Contents for the RWC Annual Report and stated that the report was almost complete. He requested that if a Member desired a hard copy to let him know, otherwise it would be posted electronically on the website.

Vice-Chair Thorpe requested that Members be sent a link to the report once it has been posted.

#### **8. RWC Financial Audit Update**

Mr. Felix explained that a kickoff meeting was held on July 21, 2011 with the audit firm of Clifton Gunderson. He stated that staff was provided a list of documents for compilation. He added that the auditors would be on site the first two weeks of October and their audit report would be issued the first week of December.

#### **9. Project Updates**

Mr. Felix reviewed the following projects: COPS Grant – Capacity Increase; PSIC Grant – High Sites; Buckeye/Goodyear; Chandler; Glendale/Avondale; Phoenix In-Fill; Scottsdale; Fire Transition; Transit; 800 MHz Rebanding; and various other. He explained that many projects were complete, operational and awaiting final documentation. He stated that there were access and County issues with the PSIC High Site at Thompson Peak but some of the issues have now been resolved. He added that a February/March 2012 transition was expected for the Buckeye/Goodyear project.

Mr. Zuercher rejoined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Phillips highlighted the project status of the Fire Transition. He stated that all but five Members have portables programmed for non-hazard operations. He added that Fire hired Buford Goff to assist in the hazard zone transition planning.

Mr. Felix explained that Transit had decided to narrowband its UHF system and would not be joining the RWC at this time. He also reviewed the 800 MHz Rebanding status.

In response to a question by Mr. Felix, Mr. Phillips explained that the 800 MHz Rebanding project was divided into two parts: performing inventory and awaiting a border treaty with Mexico. He stated that the inventory portion, funded by Nextel, was already performed but may need to be done again by the time the treaty is put into place.

Mr. Felix stated that many projects would be coming off of the projects' list. He explained that Paradise Valley had funding issues and Maricopa County was implementing a new system. He added that conversations would continue to take place and stressed that interoperability was alive and well with non-RWC entities. He highlighted the total figure of \$67.9M that was spent on RWC projects and commended Bill Phillips and the Information Technology staff for the great work performed to bring the projects to fruition.

**10. Call to the Public**

None.

**11. Announcements**

Mr. Campbell expressed his commendation for the work of all the policy makers involved in the process of interoperability. He conveyed that he had the privilege to sit on the Governor's Public Safety Communications Commission and see what others in the State were doing in the area of interoperability. He stated that many throughout the State were trying to get where we were today.

Mr. Zuercher expressed his apologies for leaving and returning several times during the meeting. He explained that he had been notified of a police shooting that required his attention.

**11. Adjournment**

Vice-Chair Thorpe adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Theresa Faull, Management Assistant I