



**Regional Wireless Cooperative**  
**Board of Directors**  
**MINUTES**  
**September 22, 2011**

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

**Board Members Present**

Bob Costello	Bob Hansen	Susan Thorpe
Steven Campbell	Jim Heger	Shannon Tolle*
Wayne Clement	Danny Johnson	Macara Underwood*
Steven Conrad	Charlie Meyer	Marc Walker
David Fitzhugh	Hank Oleson*	Paul Wilson
Mark Gaillard	John Poorte*	Ed Zuercher

**Board Members Absent**

Wade Brannon  
Mike Frazier  
Jim Haner  
Brad Hartig

\*Board Alternate

**Staff and Public Present**

Tahir Alhassan	Theresa Faull	Dave Heck	Mark Nichols
Rick Bartee	David Felix	John Imig	Cy Otsuna
Brenda Buren	Scott Fleisher	Lonnie Inskeep	Bill Phillips
Jim Case	John Gardner	Rick Kolker	Mike Rall
Dave Clarke	Nolberto Gem	Mark Mann	Vicky Scott
Dave Collett	Joe Gibson	Brian Moore	Dale Shaw
Chris DeChant	John Gonzales	Doug Mummert	Rob Sweeney
Jesse Cooper	Loretta Hadlock	Chris Nadeau	Tim Ulery

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and announced the following Board Member and Board Alternate changes:

- Board Member Mr. Brannon filling vacant seat – City of Maricopa
- Board Alternate Ms. Underwood for Mr. Brannon – City of Maricopa
- Board Alternate Mr. Tolle for Mr. Hartig – City of Scottsdale
- Board Alternate Mr. Poorte for Mr. Frazier – City of Surprise
- Board Alternate Hank Oleson for Mr. Haner – Sun City Fire District

**2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes from August 4, 2011**

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Wilson and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the minutes as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0).**

### **3. RWC Network Security Policy**

Mr. Felix explained the purpose and background of the RWC Network Security Policy. He expressed that the policy contained similar processes and procedures used to ensure the security of any computer network. He stated that the policy was vetted by Operations Working Group and the Executive Committee.

In response to a question by Mr. Gaillard as to whether the policy contained any fiscal impacts, Mr. Felix replied that there were none.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Zuercher and **SECONDED** by Mr. Campbell to approve the RWC Network Security Policy. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

### **4. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Waiver**

Mr. Felix explained that this issue (700 MHz narrow-banding) and its fiscal impact on the RWC and its Members had been discussed for some time. He stated that the petition would request the FCC to delay the transition or grant a waiver for the region. He expressed that this issue had been brought before the regional group that deals with frequency management, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). He explained that the RPC, along with a number of regional partners, have agreed to be signatories on the petition. He stated that the petition had also been vetted by the Executive Committee, Operations Working Group and other entities with large radio systems. He reviewed five main points contained in the waiver.

Mr. Felix recapped a recent conversation with an engineer at the FCC Public Safety Bureau in which he learned that a Public Notice from the FCC that requested comment from Public Safety entities regarding flexible use of 700MHz for broadband had been posted. He added that one of the questions in the notice asked if the 2017 deadline should be moved out and most of the responding entities said yes. He explained that because this issue had been elevated to a review status and a possible change in the rules to extend the date, there may not be a need to file the petition, although he still recommended moving forward with filing it by November 1, 2011. He also stated that he was planning a trip to Washington DC to speak with staff from Homeland Security and the FCC to obtain more information.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix replied that his understanding was that the petition would receive a tracking number and a response by the FCC would be provided.

In response to a question by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Felix replied that the signatories on the petition reflected a cross section of local, state and regional entities and that the Arizona Public Safety Communications Advisory Commission (PSCC), which was managed under the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA), was listed as a signatory.

In response to a question by Mr. Campbell, Mr. Felix provided the following factors that may be contributing to the FCC weakening its position on the 2017 deadline: the National Regional Planning Committee elevated this issue before the FCC; focus previously had been on the 2013 deadline for narrow-banding UHF and VHF; more entities were becoming aware of the 700 MHz issue and voicing their concerns; and the digital TV transition was delayed by two years.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix replied that the RWC had agreed to take the lead on behalf of the entities listed in the petition and that most of the entities had already reviewed the draft.

Mr. Felix expressed that the Executive Committee had also approved the draft petition and he was requesting Board approval to proceed with obtaining signatures.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix replied that the November 1, 2011 deadline to obtain signatures on the waiver was a self-imposed date and it could be extended, if necessary.

A **MOTION** was made by Vice-Chair Thorpe and **SECONDED** by Mr. Heger to approve the FCC waiver and proceed with obtaining signatures on the waiver. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0).**

## 5. **Executive Committee Member Selection**

Mr. Phillips explained that due to the retirement of Carol Campbell, Chiefs Campbell and Frazier put together a group to select a replacement on the Executive Committee to represent the Law Enforcement community. He stated that Jesse Cooper was selected as the nominee.

Chief Campbell explained that Chief Frazier solicited input from Member law enforcement agencies to identify an individual who had the technical competency and worked well in a team environment. He expressed that the overwhelming nomination was Mr. Cooper. He added that Mr. Cooper had proven himself in several areas not only with the wireless entities but also in developing programs and policies in public communications. He stated that Mr. Cooper's name was sent to all the Chiefs and Partners in the cooperative and all were fully in favor of his nomination.

Mr. Phillips explained that the Executive Committee had reviewed and recommended approval of Mr. Cooper as an Executive Committee representative.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Conrad and **SECONDED** by Mr. Campbell to approve Mr. Cooper as the Police representative on the Executive Committee. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0).**

## 6. Customer Model

Mr. Felix reviewed that Joint Chair meetings were established last year to set the stage for ongoing relationships that would keep the two systems (RWC and TRWC) compatible and to look for opportunities for resolving issues that dealt with operational use of the two systems. He clarified the distinction between interoperable and operable use, and explained that interoperable use between the two systems was in place and free of charge. He recapped that over the course of this past year two cost recovery models for operational use of the systems were brought forth: the Customer Model which was very expensive and the Airtime Billing Model which was very inexpensive. He explained that at a recent Joint Chair meeting it was expressed that both models appeared to be too extreme and direction was given to look at another model that identified a reasonable cost recovery so that Public Safety could make operational use of the systems. He expressed that the Joint Chair discussion raised two main points: encourage and approve broad based Public Safety communications for single agency operational use, and discourage overbuilding or duplicating expensive infrastructure among and between the systems.

Vice-Chair Thorpe questioned the recommendation (in the report) to table further action on the Customer Model and inquired whether the recommendation was with respect to the TRWC only, because her understanding was that the Customer Model would be available for other entities that wanted to come forward.

Mr. Phillips replied that the idea for tabling the Customer Model was that there may be close interaction between a regional participant and the Customer Model which could result in changes to the Customer Model; therefore, rather than bring the Customer Model forward for approval, it would be best to look at this as a whole and bring the whole package forward for approval at a later time.

Chair Meyer expressed that Vice-Chair Thorpe correctly understood the discussion from the Joint Chair meeting. He clarified that what Mr. Phillips was saying was that based upon what the Executive Committee heard come forth from the Joint Chair discussion, the Executive Committee was recommending holding off on the Customer Model.

Mr. Felix summarized the chronology after the Joint Chair meeting. He stated that he knew that the Executive Committee had an agenda item to approve the Customer Model and discontinue use of Mesa's two operational talkgroups; therefore, a meeting was held the following Monday so that the Executive Committee could be briefed on the discussion from the Joint Chair meeting. He explained that the Executive Committee did not believe it made sense to move forward with the Customer Model if it may change with ongoing discussions with the TRWC.

In response to a question by Vice-Chair Thorpe, Mr. Felix replied that he and Dale Shaw had already begun discussions on this issue, but he was not able to provide a date as to how long it would take.

Chair Meyer explained that at the Joint Chair meeting there had been intense conversation about two important principles: substantial investments into the systems and the protection of those investments and the opposing principle that the reason the systems were built in the first place was for Public Safety communication. He expressed that the concern was raised as to what was best for the Public Safety community and whether access to the systems on an occasional basis was a higher principle than trying to fairly allocate the cost for use of the systems.

Vice-Chair Thorpe expressed that over the last year the RWC has worked hard to find a way for the TRWC to have some type of access that would be fair. She explained that as the principles were talked through at the Joint Chair meeting, Public Safety emerged as being very important; therefore, the concept of a Network Partner was discussed. She stated that the option of a Network Partner would not just be someone coming on as a Customer but rather a way for networks to work together. She added that the look and cost for a Network Partner was still an unknown at this point. She emphasized that she believed it to be a good approach but still stands by the fact that the RWC created a system that works for its Members and that the RWC was trying really hard to make something work for another agency.

In response to a question by Mr. Campbell on whether the RWC incurred costs when the systems separated, Mr. Phillips replied that there was minimal cost related to system reprogramming. Mr. Felix added that there was, however, substantial cost to the TRWC to establish a master site and make the separation.

Chair Meyer explained that there was a larger implication of what happens moving forward. He identified that one option would be for the TRWC to make substantial investment in the White Tanks site which would mean that the public would be paying for investments that were duplicated. He expressed that although he desired to see one regional cooperative, he would also support the concept of a Network Partner.

Mr. Felix explained that he would like an opportunity to continue to work with Mr. Shaw to develop a solution between the two extremes of a very expensive way to join the system and a very inexpensive way that appears inequitable. He added that Public Safety was not concerned about the type of model implemented but instead just wanted to use the system. He expressed that he believed Public Safety users may insert themselves into this process. He stated that he supported the Executive Committee's recommendation to table the Customer Model and move forward with looking at the Network Partner concept.

Chair Meyer restated that the recommendation from the Executive Committee was to table further action on the Customer Model and move to support staff development of the “Network Partner” Model and approve an extension of Mesa Police Department’s current use of RWC talkgroups “Mesa Investigations 1 and 2”.

In response to a question by Chair Meyer, Mr. Felix replied that the TRWC was being charged Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for 35 radios; therefore, there was some cost recovery occurring. He added that a specific time frame was not determined for the extension period.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Heger and **SECONDED** by Mr. Conrad to approve the Executive Committee’s recommendation. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (18-0)**.

**7. Maricopa Police Department and Gila River Indian Community**

Mr. Felix explained that although Maricopa Fire Department was already on the RWC, Maricopa Police Department (PD) was not. He stated he received an inquiry from Maricopa PD and Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) as to cost information to join the RWC. He expressed that if the request moves forward there may be efficiencies associated with the build out due to their physical proximity to each other geographically.

**8. Strategic Plan**

Mr. Felix explained that he received feedback on the need to develop a strategic plan, which would be a long term vision, for the RWC. He expressed that he had started the process of meeting with each Board Member to obtain individual ideas.

**9. Call to the Public**

None.

**10. Announcements**

None.

**11. Adjournment**

Chair Meyer adjourned the meeting at 10:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Theresa Faull, Management Assistant I