Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
Agenda
November 17, 2011

	ITEM	PRESENTER
1)	**Call to Order and Roll Call**	Chair Meyer – Tempe
2)	**Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 22, 2011** **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 2 min.
3)	**RWC Annual Audit for Fiscal Year 2010/2011** The purpose of this item is to request the appointment of an audit committee to review the findings of the RWC Annual Audit for Fiscal Year 2010/2011. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 15 min.
4)	**RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA Conversion, and Lifecycle Upgrades** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the Executive Committee's recommendation of an estimated payment schedule for lifecycle upgrades and a potential TDMA conversion. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix ITS Est. 15 min.
5)	**Motorola SUA II Proposal** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the Executive Committee's recommendation to replace the current Software Subscription Agreement (SSA) with the System Upgrade Agreement (SUA II). **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Bill Phillips – Phoenix ITS Est. 15 min.
6)	**RWC Financial Update for Fiscal Year 2010/2011** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the Executive Committee's recommendation to distribute fund balances. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Tahir Alhassan – RWC Accountant III Est. 15 min.
7)	**RWC Budget Overview for Fiscal Year 2012/2013** The purpose of this item is to review and request approval of the RWC Budget for Fiscal Year 2011/2012 **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. Tahir Alhassan – RWC Accountant III Est. 15 min.
8)	**RWC Conditional Participant Policy** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the RWC Conditional Participant Policy. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.
9)	**RWC Good Neighbor Policy** The purpose of this item is to request approval of the RWC Good Neighbor Policy. **This item is for information, discussion and action.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 5 min.

10)	**Executive Director's Report** The purpose of this item is to provide an update on: a. The Federal Communications Commission Petition b. The RWC/TRWC Discussions **This item is for information only.**	Mr. David Felix – RWC Executive Director Est. 10 min.
11)	**Call to the Public** **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 1-5 min.
12)	**Announcements** The purpose of this item is to communicate any Board announcements and the date of the next Board Meeting: January 26, 2012 from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. **This item is for information only.**	Chair Meyer – Tempe Est. 1 min.
13)	**Adjourn**	Chair Meyer - Tempe

Board of Directors
MINUTES
September 22, 2011

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

Board Members Present			**Board Members Absent**
Bob Costello	Bob Hansen	Susan Thorpe	Wade Brannon
Steven Campbell	Jim Heger	Shannon Tolle*	Mike Frazier
Wayne Clement	Danny Johnson	Macara Underwood*	Jim Haner
Steven Conrad	Charlie Meyer	Marc Walker	Brad Hartig
David Fitzhugh	Hank Oleson*	Paul Wilson	
Mark Gaillard	John Poorte*	Ed Zuercher	

*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 Pubic 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 immerged 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

Regional Wireless Cooperative

Board of Directors
2012 Meeting Schedule

Date	Location
Thursday, January 26 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, March 22 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, May 24 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, July 26 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, September 27 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson
Thursday, November 15 10:00-11:30	Phoenix City Council Chambers 200 W. Jefferson

![Regional Wireless Cooperative logo]

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: November 17, 2011
FROM:	David Felix, RWC Executive Director	Item 3

SUBJECT: **RWC ANNUAL AUDIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/2011**

BACKGROUND
The RWC Executive Director will provide an update on the RWC audit process being conducted by Clifton Gunderson, LLP.

THE ISSUE
The first RWC financial audit being conducted by the firm of Clifton Gunderson, LLP is 98 percent complete. The RWC has received draft findings and letters for review, response and approval to finalize the audit process. Based upon these draft reports and discussions with Clifton Gunderson staff, the Executive Director will provide the Board an overview of the draft findings.

RECOMMENDATION
Based upon audit process best practices, the RWC Board of Directors appoint a 3-person Audit Committee to meet with Clifton Gunderson and RWC staff to review the audit findings. The Audit Committee will recommend changes, develop a response if appropriate, and/or approve the draft findings and letters for final publication.

If the draft documents are approved, Clifton Gunderson will formally brief the Board of Directors on the audit process and findings at the regularly scheduled January 2012 Board meeting.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date:	November 17, 2011
FROM:	RWC Executive Committee		Item 4
SUBJECT:	**RWC 700 MHZ NARROW-BANDING, TDMA CONVERSION, AND LIFECYCLE UPGRADES**		

BACKGROUND
The issue of RWC 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) Conversion, and Lifecycle Upgrades have been reported at several, past RWC Board of Directors' Meetings. The purpose of this report is to provide several options and a recommendation on a five year plan for budgeting to accomplish this project.

THE ISSUE
A Federal mandate for 700 MHZ Narrow-Banding forcing a major system change over the next several years. There are also many upgrades and product changes that occur as part of the life of the system, which will also affect the system.

700 MHz Narrow-Banding is a requirement to change the current 12.5 KHz bandwidth of the 700 MHz channels to 6.25 KHz, effectively doubling the number of channels available. The deadline for this mandate is currently set at January 2017. In order to meet the narrow-banding requirement, the RWC's 700 MHz equipment must use a different communication protocol called TDMA, which allows the equipment to broadcast two voice conversations on a single 700 MHz channel. This is called dual channel equivalence or "6.25e." Currently, the RWC is using the Frequency Division Multiple Access (FDMA) protocol. Although both protocols may be used on the same system, they cannot be used on the same talkgroup at the same time. This limits the seamless roaming ability. Thus, in order to comply with the Federal mandate, the RWC must convert the 700 MHz parts of the system to TDMA, and in order to maintain seamless roaming, the entire network, including 800 MHz sub-systems, must also be converted to TDMA.

The RWC is currently planning for system upgrades to version 7.11, in January of 2013, and to version 7.15 in January of 2015. These upgrades have been included in the RWC five year plan and budget. In addition to these upgrades, Motorola has briefed the RWC on the product roadmap for the next five years. The roadmap includes several key product changes where support for certain products will be ending necessitating upgrades and/or changes in these products. The critical product changes that must be considered are those affecting base stations, consoles, and subscribers. The narrow-banding mandate also requires that all of these components be upgraded.

<u>DISCUSSION</u>
It is apparent that the RWC will need to move forward to address the mandates as well as the lifecycle upgrades. While normal Lifecycle upgrades must be accomplished with or without the Federal mandate for narrow-banding, if the Federal mandate is delayed, the RWC's costs may be extended over a longer period of time. The infrastructure upgrades cannot be delayed more than about a year, but the subscriber replacement costs may be delayed and spread out over a longer period.

The Operations Working Group (OWG) and the Executive Committee (EC) have been examining Motorola's proposal to accomplish the narrow-banding, TDMA conversion and infrastructure upgrades along with looking at options for budgeting to accomplish this project. The federal mandate is the main driver, and given that the mandate must be met by January 2017, all planning has been based on completing the project within that timeframe. Given this fixed end date, the OWG and EC have developed and examined four options to allow the RWC to budget for this major system change. As previously discussed with the Board, this project will cost about $51 M. Motorola's proposal is actually for less than this amount, but additional funding was included to provide for the potential gap in completing the project which may occur if the FCC mandate is delayed. The additional funding will be required to maintain sufficient capacity on the system until the TDMA conversion.

Before discussing the budgeting options, the Motorola proposal should be briefly outlined. This is a significant project which must be approached carefully since major hardware components are being changed on a critical, operational system. Motorola proposed accomplishing the project in four phases. First Simulcast C would be upgraded to make its equipment ready for the TDMA conversion. Then Simulcast A & B would go through the same conversion. The third phase would upgrade the ISR sites in a like manner. The 700 MHz subsystems (Simulcast F, H, J) are already nearly TDMA capable, but some network and server changes are required, and thus these upgrades are reserved for the fourth and final phase. The fourth phase accomplishes the final conversion to TDMA. This phase may be delayed if the FCC mandate is delayed, which allow the Members more time to change out their subscribers to be TDMA capable.

Initially several Members thought that establishing a level budget over a number of years would be the best methodology to collect each Member's share of the project costs. Thus three options were initially developed based on this philosophy. However, it was pointed out that most of the Members often prefer to hold their own funds rather than pay another entity where the funds are held, unavailable for use, perhaps for several years. Thus, a "pay as required" option was also developed. All of the options are shown as Options A – D and are attached to this document for reference. Note that these options are only for the cost of the system infrastructure changes; there are other costs, such as subscribers and consoles, which are the responsibility of each Member, which are NOT included in Options A – D.

Attachment 1 shows a side by side comparison of all four options, along side the phased project approach proposed by Motorola. This attachment also shows the

payments that would be required each FY based on Motorola's typical billing milestones. Attachments 2 – 5 show each funding option with an estimated distribution of the funds required from each Member.

Option A was based on spreading the costs over a five year period starting in FY 12/13. This option was quickly eliminated since most Members felt that it would be too difficult to include any funding in FY 12/13 since this budget process is already too far along.

Option B is the same as Option A, but the funding doesn't start until FY 13/14 and is spread over four years. $12,750,000 would be collected each year starting in FY 13/14. This collection scheme always has sufficient funding on hand to meet Motorola's typical milestone billing schedule. However, this methodology will result in excess funding being collected in the first years of the project. As discussed above, most jurisdictions prefer to NOT have such funding tied up outside of their control, which the OWG and EC agreed would also not be a good option.

Option C is a variation of the above two options. The basic premise is to provide for a level collection of funds over four years for the infrastructure only, and leaving collection of the $11 M required for the TDMA conversion until the final year of the project. The reason for separating the TDMA conversion is that if the FCC mandate is moved, the TDMA conversion may be further delayed allowing the Members more time to provide this funding. As with Option B, funding would not start until FY 13/14, and $10 M would be collected each year for four years, with an additional $11 M collected in the fourth year for the TDMA conversion. This methodology would not meet Motorola's typical milestone billing schedule, and thus would require negotiation with Motorola to adjust the project schedule and or the payment schedule.

Finally, Option D was developed as a "pay as you go" methodology. Thus each Member provides their share of the project in each FY as required as the project progresses.

The RWC is working with many of the surrounding agencies to petition the FCC to give the local Regional Planning Committee the authority to determine when to convert to narrow-banding, or at least to delay the narrow-banding deadline. However, until the request is submitted and the FCC responds it is necessary to plan as if the current deadline must be met.

As the RWC Board has already been advised, the team is investigating the possibility of a "buy-out" of the 800 MHz Re-Banding project. In-lieu of re-banding the RWC's 800MHz frequencies, they would all be converted to 700 MHz in conjunction with our narrow-banding, TDMA, and lifecycle conversion. Conversion to 700 MHz is not required, but is a good option to avoid having to go through a major 800 MHz Re-Banding effort while simultaneously executing the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding project, and provide funding that may then be used to offset some of our Narrow-Banding costs. At this time we cannot even provide an estimate of how much funding the 800 MHz Re-Banding "buy-out" will provide.

Reminder: The above costs and schedule are for the RWC Network infrastructure only. End user costs for items such as Gold Elite console and subscriber upgrades are not included in the above. Motorola is meeting individually with each Member to assist in addressing end user costs.

RECOMMENDATION
The OWG and Executive Committee recommend that Option D be adopted and included in the RWC five year plan. Since this funding option does not commence until FY 13/14, it does not affect the current budget but it provides each Member with a five year plan to use for developing future budgets. It is requested that The RWC Board approve Option D as the RWC's budgeting plan to accomplish the 700 MHz Narrow-Banding, TDMA, and Lifecycle upgrade.

Attachment 1

				Project Phases (per Motorola Proposal)					Project Funding Stream Based on Option 2 To Meet FCC Mandate of Dec 31 2016			
CY	FY	Quarter	Key Dates or Milestones	I	II	III	IV	Project Payments Required (TBD)	Option A (Evenly Distributed Over 5 Years)	Option B (Evenly Distributed Over 4 Years)	Option C (H/W Even; S/W when due)	Option D (Match Payment Schedule)
								$51,000,000	$51,000,000	$51,000,000	$51,000,000	$51,000,000
2012	12/13	Jul - Sep							$10,200,000			
2013		Oct - Dec										
		Jan - Mar										
		Apr - Jun										
	13/14	Jul - Sep						$3,678,673	$10,200,000	$12,750,000	$10,000,000	$3,678,673
2014		Oct - Dec										
		Jan - Mar										
		Apr - Jun										
	14/15	Jul - Sep						$19,392,176	$10,200,000	$12,750,000	$10,000,000	$19,392,176
2015		Oct - Dec										
		Jan - Mar										
		Apr - Jun										
	15/16	Jul - Sep						$9,668,959	$10,200,000	$12,750,000	$10,000,000	$9,668,959
2016		Oct - Dec										
		Jan - Mar										
		Apr - Jun										
	16/17	Jul - Sep						$18,260,191	$10,200,000	$12,750,000	$21,000,000	$18,260,191
		Oct - Dec	FCC Narrow-Banding Deadline Dec 31,2016									
2017		Jan - Mar										

RWC 700 MHZ Narrow-Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrades
Estimated Payment Schedule and Funding Scheme

Attachment 2

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget
Option A: Level Funding Starting in FY 12/13

	FY		12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total
Funding Required by Payment Schedule			$0	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000
Funding Required by Year			$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$51,000,000
Excess Funding Available by FY			$10,200,000	$16,721,327	$7,529,151	$8,060,191	$0	
Member Shares	Radio Count	%						
Avondale	291	1.73%	$176,458	$176,458	$176,458	$176,458	$176,458	$882,290
Buckeye	188	1.12%	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$570,002
Chandler	893	5.31%	$541,502	$541,502	$541,502	$541,502	$541,502	$2,707,508
Daisy Mountain	4	0.02%	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$12,128
El Mirage	82	0.49%	$49,724	$49,724	$49,724	$49,724	$49,724	$248,618
Glendale	1,449	8.61%	$878,652	$878,652	$878,652	$878,652	$878,652	$4,393,258
Goodyear	348	2.07%	$211,022	$211,022	$211,022	$211,022	$211,022	$1,055,110
Guadalupe	4	0.02%	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$2,426	$12,128
Maricopa	11	0.07%	$6,670	$6,670	$6,670	$6,670	$6,670	$33,351
Peoria	895	5.32%	$542,714	$542,714	$542,714	$542,714	$542,714	$2,713,572
Phoenix	9,916	58.95%	$6,012,912	$6,012,912	$6,012,912	$6,012,912	$6,012,912	$30,064,562
Scottsdale	1,408	8.37%	$853,790	$853,790	$853,790	$853,790	$853,790	$4,268,950
Sun City	40	0.24%	$24,255	$24,255	$24,255	$24,255	$24,255	$121,277
Sun City West	38	0.23%	$23,043	$23,043	$23,043	$23,043	$23,043	$115,213
Sun Lakes	27	0.16%	$16,372	$16,372	$16,372	$16,372	$16,372	$81,862
Surprise	292	1.74%	$177,064	$177,064	$177,064	$177,064	$177,064	$885,322
Tempe	915	5.44%	$554,842	$554,842	$554,842	$554,842	$554,842	$2,774,211
Tolleson	20	0.12%	$12,128	$12,128	$12,128	$12,128	$12,128	$60,638
Total	16,821	100.00%	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$10,200,000	$51,000,000

Attachment 3

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget								
Option B: Level Funding Starting in FY 13/14								
		FY	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total
Funding Required by Payment Schedule			$0	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000
Funding Required by Year				$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$51,000,000
Excess Funding Available by FY				$9,071,327	$2,429,151	$5,510,191	$0	
Member Shares	Radio Count	%						
Avondale	291	1.73%		$220,572	$220,572	$220,572	$220,572	$882,290
Buckeye	188	1.12%		$142,500	$142,500	$142,500	$142,500	$570,002
Chandler	893	5.31%		$676,877	$676,877	$676,877	$676,877	$2,707,508
Daisy Mountain	4	0.02%		$3,032	$3,032	$3,032	$3,032	$12,128
El Mirage	82	0.49%		$62,154	$62,154	$62,154	$62,154	$248,618
Glendale	1,449	8.61%		$1,098,315	$1,098,315	$1,098,315	$1,098,315	$4,393,258
Goodyear	348	2.07%		$263,777	$263,777	$263,777	$263,777	$1,055,110
Guadalupe	4	0.02%		$3,032	$3,032	$3,032	$3,032	$12,128
Maricopa	11	0.07%		$8,338	$8,338	$8,338	$8,338	$33,351
Peoria	895	5.32%		$678,393	$678,393	$678,393	$678,393	$2,713,572
Phoenix	9,916	58.95%		$7,516,141	$7,516,141	$7,516,141	$7,516,141	$30,064,562
Scottsdale	1,408	8.37%		$1,067,237	$1,067,237	$1,067,237	$1,067,237	$4,268,950
Sun City	40	0.24%		$30,319	$30,319	$30,319	$30,319	$121,277
Sun City West	38	0.23%		$28,803	$28,803	$28,803	$28,803	$115,213
Sun Lakes	27	0.16%		$20,465	$20,465	$20,465	$20,465	$81,862
Surprise	292	1.74%		$221,330	$221,330	$221,330	$221,330	$885,322
Tempe	915	5.44%		$693,553	$693,553	$693,553	$693,553	$2,774,211
Tolleson	20	0.12%		$15,160	$15,160	$15,160	$15,160	$60,638
Total	16,821	100.00%		$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$51,000,000

Attachment 4

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget								
Option C: Level Funding for Infrastructure, TDMA Conversion in FY 16/17								
		FY	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total
Funding Required by Payment Schedule			$0	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000
Funding Required by Year				$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$21,000,000	$51,000,000
Excess Funding Available by FY				$6,321,327	($3,070,850)	($2,739,809)	$0	
Member Shares	Radio Count	%						
Avondale	291	1.73%		$172,998	$172,998	$172,998	$363,296	$882,290
Buckeye	188	1.12%		$111,765	$111,765	$111,765	$234,707	$570,002
Chandler	893	5.31%		$530,884	$530,884	$530,884	$1,114,856	$2,707,508
Daisy Mountain	4	0.02%		$2,378	$2,378	$2,378	$4,994	$12,128
El Mirage	82	0.49%		$48,749	$48,749	$48,749	$102,372	$248,618
Glendale	1,449	8.61%		$861,423	$861,423	$861,423	$1,808,989	$4,393,258
Goodyear	348	2.07%		$206,884	$206,884	$206,884	$434,457	$1,055,110
Guadalupe	4	0.02%		$2,378	$2,378	$2,378	$4,994	$12,128
Maricopa	11	0.07%		$6,539	$6,539	$6,539	$13,733	$33,351
Peoria	895	5.32%		$532,073	$532,073	$532,073	$1,117,353	$2,713,572
Phoenix	9,916	58.95%		$5,895,012	$5,895,012	$5,895,012	$12,379,526	$30,064,562
Scottsdale	1,408	8.37%		$837,049	$837,049	$837,049	$1,757,803	$4,268,950
Sun City	40	0.24%		$23,780	$23,780	$23,780	$49,938	$121,277
Sun City West	38	0.23%		$22,591	$22,591	$22,591	$47,441	$115,213
Sun Lakes	27	0.16%		$16,051	$16,051	$16,051	$33,708	$81,862
Surprise	292	1.74%		$173,593	$173,593	$173,593	$364,544	$885,322
Tempe	915	5.44%		$543,963	$543,963	$543,963	$1,142,322	$2,774,211
Tolleson	20	0.12%		$11,890	$11,890	$11,890	$24,969	$60,638
Total	16,821	100.00%		$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$21,000,000	$51,000,000

Attachment 5

700 MHz Narrow Banding, TDMA and Lifecycle Upgrade Budget								
Option D: Funding to Match Payment Schedule								
FY			12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total
Funding Required by Payment Schedule			$0	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000
Funding Required by Year			$0	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000
Member Shares	Radio Count	%						
Avondale	291	1.73%		$63,640	$335,481	$167,271	$315,898	$882,290
Buckeye	188	1.12%		$41,115	$216,737	$108,065	$204,085	$570,002
Chandler	893	5.31%		$195,295	$1,029,500	$513,310	$969,404	$2,707,508
Daisy Mountain	4	0.02%		$875	$4,611	$2,299	$4,342	$12,128
El Mirage	82	0.49%		$17,933	$94,534	$47,135	$89,016	$248,618
Glendale	1,449	8.61%		$316,889	$1,670,487	$832,907	$1,572,975	$4,393,258
Goodyear	348	2.07%		$76,106	$401,194	$200,036	$377,775	$1,055,110
Guadalupe	4	0.02%		$875	$4,611	$2,299	$4,342	$12,128
Maricopa	11	0.07%		$2,406	$12,681	$6,323	$11,941	$33,351
Peoria	895	5.32%		$195,732	$1,031,805	$514,459	$971,575	$2,713,572
Phoenix	9,916	58.95%		$2,168,582	$11,431,712	$5,699,863	$10,764,405	$30,064,562
Scottsdale	1,408	8.37%		$307,923	$1,623,220	$809,339	$1,528,467	$4,268,950
Sun City	40	0.24%		$8,748	$46,114	$22,993	$43,422	$121,277
Sun City West	38	0.23%		$8,310	$43,808	$21,843	$41,251	$115,213
Sun Lakes	27	0.16%		$5,905	$31,127	$15,520	$29,310	$81,862
Surprise	292	1.74%		$63,859	$336,634	$167,846	$316,983	$885,322
Tempe	915	5.44%		$200,106	$1,054,862	$525,956	$993,287	$2,774,211
Tolleson	20	0.12%		$4,374	$23,057	$11,496	$21,711	$60,638
Total	16,821	100.00%		$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191	$51,000,000

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date:	November 17, 2011
FROM:	RWC Executive Committee		Item 5

SUBJECT: **MOTOROLA SUA II PROPOSAL**

BACKGROUND
There are two main support contracts in place to maintaining and update the RWC network. One is the Radio Support Agreement (RSA) which is a contract with Motorola to provide support services for the RWC Network hardware. The other is the Software Support Agreement (SSA), which is also a contract with Motorola to provide software support and upgrades. Separate from these agreements, the RWC also performs a system upgrade every two years to keep the system current. While the SSA includes the cost of the software for these upgrades, the RWC must contract separately for the installation and any additional hardware required to perform the upgrade. The purpose of this report is to examine an option to combine software and hardware upgrades and refreshes into one, more cost effective contract. The RSA would remain in place as a separate support agreement for the normal ongoing hardware maintenance and support.

THE ISSUE
Motorola has developed a long term approach which combines the SSA with hardware refreshes of network components such as servers, routers, PC's, etc., and with a regular program of system updates every two years. The program is called System Upgrade Assurance II (SUA II). There are several versions of the SUA and the SUA II is more complete.

The issue is to examine the cost of the SUA II verses the cost of the SSA plus the cost of hardware refreshes, and system upgrades to ensure that:
    a) Verify that the SUA II accomplishes everything now covered by the SSA and system upgrades;
    b) Ensure that the cost of the SUA II is less or more cost effective than what the RWC is currently spending.

DISCUSSION
As the Maintenance Managing Member, Phoenix, along with the Operations Working Group (OWG), and Executive Committee (EC) have reviewed the SUA II proposal. The groups developed a significant list of questions to verify that the SUA II does indeed cover everything covered by our current agreements with Motorola. Motorola answered all of the questions acceptably, but in one area it was found that our current network

intrusion and virus protection was not covered by the SUA II. This function is being added to the SUA II, but at this time we only have estimated cost for same. The final pricing will be negotiated once a final contract agreement is developed. The cost change associated with adding these elements does not affect the outcome of the evaluation of the SUA II.

Attachment 1 provides a detailed cost comparison of the SSA and system upgrade costs over the next five years verses the costs of the SUA II, including the estimated cost of virus protection and system intrusion. This comparison does not include miscellaneous expenditures by the RWC for items such as console PC, and network client replacements. Collecting these costs, many from various RWC Members, would be difficult, and in any case would only make the SUA II more advantageous and is therefore unnecessary.

The cost comparison is based on starting the SUA II in FY 12/13, on July 1, 2012. RWC staff has included the SUA II as part of the proposed budget. This will require a short term "bridge" of the SSA, to maintain service from the SSA expiration of March 30th through the end of the FY on June 30th. This funding is already included in the current FY budget.

Since the five year roadmap presents Motorola's cost for planned system upgrades in terms of a high and low range, this range is used to provide a high and low comparison cost of the SUA II verses our current costs. It is clear that for either case the SUA II provides a substantial savings over the next five years.

The cost savings seems too good to be true and the OWG and EC have been very cautious since this seems like a deal that is too good to be true. However, as already noted, Motorola has confirmed through our detailed question and answer process that the SUA II truly provides everything the RWC is currently receiving from Motorola. Motorola has been able to make price reductions in the SUA product due to labor reductions due to Upgrade Operations Team service automation, and corresponding decreases in supporting products. Motorola also gains a steady income stream instead of the unknown income from system upgrades (users may delay upgrades). This point is also an advantage for the RWC since it levels our payments such that we do not have a spike every two years for a system upgrade. This program places the RWC on a regular schedule to keep the system up to date.

RECOMMENDATION
The OWG and Executive Committee recommend that the SUA II be adopted and included in the RWC budget and five year plan. It is requested that the RWC Board approve adoption of the SUA II and authorize the Executive Director to enter into an SUA II contract with Motorola.

Attachment 1

Comparison of Current SSA and Upgrade Costs Vs SUA II Costs						
	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	5 Year Totals
Notes:	Includes Upgrade 7.7 to 7.11 *		Includes Upgrade 7.11 to 7.15		Includes Upgrade 7.15 to 7.19	
Current Costs (Low Range)						
SSA Annual Cost	$1,740,630	$1,908,975	$1,966,245	$2,025,232	$2,070,460	$9,711,542
Upgrade H/W	$526,737		$1,037,120		$1,166,670	$2,730,527
Installation, training, Taxes	$599,077		$414,848		$456,332	$1,470,257
Upgrade S/W Installation	$552,856		$1,112,440		$1,131,584	$2,796,880
Total Current Costs (Low Range)	$3,419,300	$1,908,975	$4,530,653	$2,025,232	$4,825,046	$16,709,206
Current Costs (High Range)						
SSA Annual Cost	$1,740,630	$1,908,975	$1,966,245	$2,025,232	$2,070,460	$9,711,542
Upgrade H/W	$526,737		$1,296,400		$1,426,040	$3,249,177
Installation, training, Taxes	$599,077		$518,560		$570,416	$1,688,053
Upgrade S/W Installation	$552,856		$1,112,440		$1,131,584	$2,796,880
Total Current Costs (High Range)	$3,419,300	$1,908,975	$4,893,645	$2,025,232	$5,198,500	$17,445,652
SUA II Costs	$2,569,026	$2,696,126	$2,713,326	$2,718,126	$2,757,526	$13,454,128
Potential Savings						
Low Range	$850,274	($787,150)	$1,817,327	($692,894)	$2,067,521	$3,255,078
High Range	$850,274	($787,150)	$2,180,319	($692,894)	$2,440,975	$3,991,524

* The low and high range costs for the 7.7 to 7.11 upgrade are the same since we have a final proposal finalizing the cost of this upgrade.

Regional Wireless Cooperative

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: November 17, 2011
FROM:	Tahir Alhassan, RWC Accountant III	Item 6
SUBJECT:	**FINANCIAL UPDATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/2011**	

BACKGROUND
The purpose of this report is to present Fiscal Year 2010/11 financial updates to the Board. The Executive Committee's input and recommendations have been incorporated into the budget proposal.

THE ISSUE
The RWC governing documents state that Year-End Expenditure reporting should be provided to the RWC Board. This report is a summary of total revenues and expenses throughout the year. Total revenues for the Fiscal Year 2010/11 that ended June 30, 2011 were $8,464,751.15 and total expenses were $6,380,233.08. Total revenues exceeded total expenses by $2,084,518.07.

There were a number of line items in the budget that resulted in cost saving which contributed to revenues exceeding expenses. These include three (3) unfilled Information Technology Services (ITS) positions, Shared Sites, Wireless Services and Microwave.

RECOMMENDATION
The RWC Executive Committee recommends Board approval of the proposal to apply each Member's Fiscal Year 2010/11 settlements towards their respective billings for Fiscal Year 2012.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: November 17, 2011
FROM:	Tahir Alhassan, RWC Accountant III	Item 7
SUBJECT:	**RWC BUDGET OVERVIEW FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012/2013**	

BACKGROUND
The purpose of this report is to present the 2012/2013 RWC Budget and Five Year Plan to the Board. The Executive Committee's input and recommendations have been incorporated into the budget proposal.

THE ISSUE
The RWC Budget is made up of the following categories:

1) Motorola Contracts
    a. Service Agreement and System Upgrade Agreement (SUA II)
2) Phoenix Information Technology and Services (ITS)
    a. Wireless Services, Microwave, Network Services, and Share Sites
3) RWC Staffing
    a. The cost of six (6) staff positions
4) Other Budget Items
    a. Including maintenance costs for City of Scottsdale, Site Leases, Electricity and costs related to relocation of the White Tanks site
5) The RWC Five Year Budget also includes the projected costs for 700 MHz narrow-banding, TDMA conversion, and lifecycle upgrades

The summary of the RWC's Five Year Budget is reflected below for planning purposes.

RWC ANNUAL BUDGET	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017
Subscriber Rate	$55.15	$55.20	$56.60	$58.32	$60.20
Average Radio Count	16,580	16,821	16,821	16,821	16,821
O & M, Staffing, Upgrade	$10,972,644	$11,142,490	$11,424,718	$11,771,879	$12,151,097
Required Minimum Balance	$62,936	$12,587	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
700 MHz, TDMA & Life Cycle	$0.00	$3,678,673	$19,392,176	$9,668,959	$18,260,191
Total Budget	**$11,035,580**	**$14,833,750**	**$30,816,895**	**$21,440,838**	**$30,411,289**

The budget allocation for each Member is presented bellow.

RWC FIVE YEAR BUDGET

Member	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
Avondale	203,109	256,403	533,126	370,922	526,109
Buckeye	124,418	165,649	344,425	239,634	339,892
Chandler	590,987	786,832	1,636,020	1,138,260	1,614,487
Daisy Mountain	2,647	3,524	7,328	5,099	7,232
El Mirage	54,268	72,251	150,228	104,521	148,251
Glendale	1,011,359	1,276,729	2,654,639	1,846,964	2,619,699
Goodyear	70,813	319,214	637,553	443,577	629,162
Guadalupe	2,647	3,524	7,328	5,099	7,232
Maricopa	7,280	9,692	20,153	14,021	19,887
Peoria	592,311	788,594	1,639,684	1,140,809	1,618,103
Phoenix	6,562,409	8,737,094	18,166,597	12,639,400	17,927,492
Scottsdale	931,814	1,240,604	2,579,525	1,794,703	2,545,574
Sun City FD	26,472	35,244	73,282	50,986	72,317
Sun City West	25,148	33,482	69,618	48,437	68,702
Sun Lakes	17,869	23,790	49,465	34,415	48,814
Surprise	193,246	257,284	534,958	372,197	527,917
Tempe	605,547	806,216	1,676,325	1,166,302	1,654,261
Tolleson	13,236	17,622	36,641	25,493	36,159
Total	**11,035,580**	**14,833,750**	**30,816,895**	**21,440,838**	**30,411,289**

RECOMMENDATION
The RWC Executive Committee recommends Board approval of the proposed
2012/2013 Budget.

REGIONAL WIRELESS COOPERATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	**Regional Wireless Cooperative**
	No.

Subject:	Effective Date
RWC Conditional Participant Policy	**11/17/11**

1.0 Purpose

    1.1. Defines the policy to form a relationship between the Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) and Conditional Participants in order to facilitate operations.

2.0 Owner

    2.1. RWC Operations Working Group (OWG).

3.0 Applies To

    3.1. Entities that are granted temporary RWC capability for special events, tactical situations or emergency circumstances in support of an existing Member.

4.0 Background

    4.1. The RWC Members may require assistance from non-Member entities for special events, tactical situations or emergency circumstances in order to supplement existing resources.

    4.2. Or, conversely, non-Member entities may require assistance from RWC Members for special events, tactical situations or emergency circumstances beyond the non-Member's current available resources.

5.0 Policy Statement

    5.1. The RWC Governance and Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) provide a definition of Conditional Participant. This policy outlines the notification requirements and participant responsibilities.

6.0 Supporting Rules

    6.1. An entity may become a Conditional Participant to support existing Members with temporary operational situations.

    6.2. Conditional Participants do not have RWC voting rights.

6.3. Conditional Participants do not have a representative on the OWG.

6.4. Conditional Participants do not have representation on the Board of Directors.

6.5. The OWG may approve planned Conditional Participants.

6.6. The Executive Director may authorize emergency Conditional Participants.

6.7. Categories of membership are specifically defined in Exhibit A of the RWC IGA, Section 3.1.4.

6.8. No guaranteed independent dispatch support will be provided for Conditional Participants.

6.9. Conditional Participants should not assume a talkgroup is recorded.

7.0 Responsibilities

7.1. Requests to become a Conditional Participant must be submitted to the RWC Executive Director.

7.2. Submissions must include:

    7.2.1. Member single point of contact information.

    7.2.2. Estimated number of subscriber units.

    7.2.3. Purpose of request.

    7.2.4. Conditional Participant entity name.

    7.2.5. Estimated duration of activity.

    7.2.6. Specific talkgroup to be used in subscribers, including encryption.

7.3. The Executive Director will provide the OWG a written summary of the application packet to include:

    7.3.1. Requesting Conditional Participant.

    7.3.2. Supported RWC Member(s).

    7.3.3. Requested talkgroup(s).

    7.3.4. Purpose of request.

    7.3.5. Estimated number of subscribers/users.

7.4. The OWG will approve, deny or request additional information.

7.5. The OWG is responsible for advising the Executive Committee of recommendations or issues related to potential RWC Conditional Participants.

    7.5.1. RWC costs may be incurred and will be the responsibility of the Conditional Participant or the supported RWC Member(s).

    7.5.2. The talkgroup request will be approved by the OWG.

    7.5.3. The control and programming of the programming materials into subscriber units must be approved by the OWG.

7.6. The Executive Committee may forward the recommendation to the Board of Directors through the Executive Director, if necessary.

7.7. Members will update the OWG of Conditional Participant activities.

7.8. Conditional Participants will adhere to all applicable RWC policies and procedures.

8.0 Conditions for Exemption or Waiver

8.1. None.

9.0 Applicable Procedures

9.1. RWC Confidentiality Policy.

9.2. RWC Configuration Management of Radio Templates Procedure.

9.3. RWC Contractor Procedure.

9.4. RWC Encryption Management Guidelines Policy.

9.5. RWC Lost and Compromised Radio Procedure.

9.6. RWC Member-Specific Talkgroup Usage Policy.

9.7. RWC Subscriber Equipment Radio Maintenance Procedure.

9.8. RWC System Performance Issue Reporting Procedure.

9.9. RWC Talkgroup Plan Approval Procedure.

REGIONAL WIRELESS COOPERATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	**Regional Wireless Cooperative**
	No.
Subject: **RWC Good Neighbor Policy**	**Effective Date** **11/17/11**

1.0 Purpose

1.1. To temporarily assist entities with an immediate communications emergency, such as a complete loss of system resources for public safety daily operations.

2.0 Owner

2.1. RWC Operations Working Group (OWG).

3.0 Applies To

3.1. Non-RWC Members.

4.0 Background

4.1. Non-RWC entities who experience an immediate communications emergency, such as a physical system failure may request to use the RWC network on a temporary basis.

5.0 Policy Statement

5.1. This policy outlines the RWC's ability to assist non-RWC public safety entities on a temporary basis.

6.0 Supporting Rules

6.1. In an emergency situation, the Network Manager has the authority to immediately activate appropriate resources.

6.2. Emergency communications will be provided on a temporary basis.

6.3. Continued use must be approved by the OWG, Executive Committee and Board of Directors.

7.0 Responsibilities

7.1. The Network Manager will notify the Executive Director and OWG.

7.2. Requests for continued temporary use must be submitted to the RWC Executive Director on agency letterhead.

7.3. Submissions must include:

    7.3.1. Agency name and single point of contact.

    7.3.2. Number of subscribers (an RWC Subscriber Inventory form may be required).

    7.3.3. Estimated length of access to talkgroups.

    7.3.4. The authorized service provider or entity that will program the subscribers (when applicable).

    7.3.5. Specific talkgroups to program into subscribers, including encryption.

    7.3.6. Purpose of the request.

    7.3.7. Signature of authorized agency representative.

    7.3.8. Signed form acknowledging requirements to follow identified RWC Policies and Procedures.

8.0 Conditions for Exemption or Waiver

8.1. None.

9.0 Applicable Procedures

9.1. RWC Confidentiality Policy.

9.2. RWC Configuration Management of Radio Templates Procedure.

9.3. RWC Contractor Procedure.

9.4. RWC Console Equipment Maintenance Procedure.

9.5. RWC Encryption Management Guidelines Policy.

9.6. RWC Lost and Compromised Radio Procedure.

9.7. RWC Member-Specific Talkgroup Usage Policy.

9.8. RWC Notification of Service Activities.

9.9. RWC Subscriber Equipment Radio Maintenance Procedure.

9.10. RWC System Performance Issue Reporting Procedure.

9.11. RWC Talkgroup Ownership and Assignment Authority Policy.

9.12. RWC Talkgroup Plan Approval Procedure.

Regional Wireless Cooperative

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

TO:	Regional Wireless Cooperative (RWC) Board Members	Agenda Date: November 17, 2011
FROM:	David Felix, RWC Executive Director	Item 10

SUBJECT: **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

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

A. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PETITION

BACKGROUND
The RWC Executive Director will provide an update related to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandate that all 700 MHz frequencies are to be narrow-banded by 2017.

THE ISSUE
On Thursday, October 13, 2011, the RWC Executive Director met with the FCC's Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau staff to discuss the Region's proposed FCC petition for an extension or waiver of the 2017 deadline for 700 MHz narrow-banding. During the meeting it was learned that the states of Missouri and Louisiana have already filed petitions related to the same issue which will impact these states.

The FCC staff is developing a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) which will address these petitions and a number of other 700 MHz issues. The NPRM is used to solicit public comment for Commission review and decisions. Generally, the public comment period is 30 days with an additional 15 days for replies. FCC staff anticipates that the NPRM will be posted in early 2012. At that time, stakeholders may post comments individually or jointly as planned with the RWC/TRWC petition.

The RWC's comments to this NPRM will help expedite a decision by the Commission. The RWC and its partner signatories will still file their petition and waiver, requesting an "expedited review and treatment by the Commission.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

B. RWC/TRWC DISCUSSIONS

BACKGROUND
In October 2010, the RWC/TRWC Joint Chairs/Vice-Chairs and Executive Directors met to set the stage for future cooperative efforts to ensure the joint use, compatibility and interoperability of the two regional radio communication systems.

THE ISSUE
At the RWC/TRWC Joint Chairs meeting on September 8, 2011, Executive Directors were tasked with developing a set of principles for a Network Partner category, to be memorialized in an intergovernmental agreement (IGA). Since then, the Executive Directors have met in person and via conference calls to develop the draft document which will be presented to the Joint Chairs at the next scheduled meeting. Since these are in draft form, approval of the Joint Chairs will be sought before briefing the RWC Board of Directors.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.