

MINUTES
PCWIN Technical Committee Meeting
January 14, 2005
10:00 a.m.

City of Tucson
Information Technology
481 W. Paseo Redondo
Tucson, Arizona 85701
Submitted by Kari Price

Members present:

Gary Bynum, Scott Ferguson, Tim Hoban, Richard Hughes, Joseph Jakoby, Patsy Joy, Greg Lugo, John Moffatt, Jim Perry, Kerry Reeve, Larry Sayers, Gary Schmitz, Anita Velasco

Members absent:

Harry Findysz, Don Harrison, Theodore G. Martin, Ben Standifer

Others present:

Mike Sacco, Kory Siquieros, Richard Brace, Kari Price

Call to Order and Roll Call

Jim Perry called the meeting to order after reaching the 9-member quorum at 10:05 a.m.

Introductions

Each member and others present took turns around the table introducing themselves.

Future Meeting Times and Location

Jim Perry explained that Arizona Open Meetings Law is required to be followed at these PCWIN Technical Committee (Pima County Wireless Integrated Network) meetings. The meetings cannot begin until a quorum of at least 9 members are present; alternates are not counted as part of quorum. Only items listed on the agenda may be discussed; any additional topics that come up can be added to the next agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

Jim Perry asked the committee to decide on a future location, date and time for meetings. He said to consider a place with plenty of free parking and with a large enough conference room. He said he'd like one spot for every meeting that is a good central location. Jim said he will coordinate with Scott Ferguson on the Pima College meeting location, and will check with Parks about meeting at Randolph Golf Course's Mesquite Room. Jim added that meetings will eventually be monthly, but the committee will meet twice a month in the beginning stages, or as often as needed.

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Scott Ferguson, and carried unanimously.

Motion: The next meeting is currently scheduled for Thursday, January 27, 2005, at 1:00 p.m. A permanent meeting location needs to be confirmed, but it will either be at Pima Community College's Downtown Campus or Tucson Parks and Recreation's Randolph Golf Course Mesquite Room.

Official Recorder Appointment

Jim Perry explained that an Official Recorder needed to be selected from the members. Kari Price will continue attending the meetings and taking notes. However, the Official Recorder participating as a regular member will also conduct a technical review of Kari Price's transcribed minutes for accuracy before final distribution of record. Larry Sayers volunteered to be the Official Recorder. Jim reminded Larry that the minutes are required to be posted 3 business days after the meeting. Kari will send a draft to Larry for technical review, then Larry will send it back to Kari right away for final proofing and formatting, then Kari will send it to Annette Romero at the County for posting.

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Larry Sayers, and carried unanimously.

Motion: Larry Sayers will be the committee's Official Recorder.

Feedback on PCWIN Technical Requirements Document – Draft 1

Jim Perry explained that the committee needs to take action on this report. He said the committee's expectations of the report need to be considered. This report is the first stone in a foundation to building a regional communications system. If we start out weak, we'll end up weak. It's important that this report convey a vision as to what this project is supposed to be in Pima County. He asked the members for their viewpoints of the report. Most members agreed that it was a good start, more of a rough draft, that covered some highlights with details missing, which could come later. Several members saw the report as having gaps and inconsistencies. Detailed information was missing about how the Federal agencies would be integrated. The State's needs as well as the Public Safety Communications Committee needs must be considered in the report since they have part of the bigger picture. Jim said that the reason the committee is doing this is we need to provide feedback and a report summary to the consultant, to our bosses and to the executive committee. We need to point out where we believe additional information should be added, so it's okay to point out holes and deficiencies, that's our charge. The Technical Committee needs to be a sounding board for the consultant. Jim asked for a summary of viewpoints. Several members stated that the report is a good general assessment and inventory of where we are now, but does not have the guidelines for future projections. Jim said the committee needs to figure out how this report fits into the project and determine if there is a need for another report. It was suggested that another consultant should be brought in to create a bigger view of what this project should look like and what the cost will be to build it. The committee felt the current report is really a state of the 32 agencies and not a technical report. The next step in this process should be a detailed assessment of future regional operational needs. It was suggested that a new introduction be written to define what this report really is about and that the report be given a different name.

Traffic Model

Jim presented a handout of a traffic model provided by the consultant. The consultant was trying to determine the number of users on the system, future growth of these users, and then develop traffic models for various times of emergencies. They are trying to get a better feel for the number of future users who will be using the system. He asked members for their viewpoint. Some members said the report numbers didn't seem accurate based on their own data, which was probably due to different members using different methodologies to come up with the numbers asked for by the consultant.

PCWIN Technical Requirements Document Corrections

Several members noted errors or inaccuracies that they will bring corrections for at the next meeting. Mike Sacco said that the user committees will probably need to be contacted because not all agencies have members on the technical committee. He volunteered to contact the agencies not represented and ask for their technical corrections.

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Patsy Joy, and carried unanimously.

Motion: Mike Sacco will contact the agencies not represented on this committee and ask for their technical requirements. He will report results back to Jim Perry.

Committee Plan of Action for Additional Information

Jim said the committee is being asked to try to update information in the report such as radio counts. The committee indicated that this was a realistic task for it to do. Jim said we need to get some understanding on how we're going to update it and how it applies to future traffic loading. It was agreed by the committee that the focus of loading needs to be toward meeting peak emergency demand. Jim added that the consultant said they could not complete the traffic loading model because they did not have consistent data on radios. The committee agreed that it appears the consultant has provided an inventory of current information, but its accuracy is in question and we may not know what we need to have in 5 years. Jim said he thinks the consultant was trying to capture some vision of growth by counting the number of hand-held radios. Maybe the committee can do a better service by providing a projection of public safety personnel. This would at least show growth. The needs analysis that should be done next would include a projection of future radio requirements. It was suggested to do two tables: 1) current radio inventory, then 2) personnel data. Jim said other pieces of a load model in addition to the number of personnel and radios would be: how the user wants to use talk groups, how much talk time are they going to be using per transmission, what is the average PTT count for users (it will vary by agency, i.e. rural versus downtown), and then there needs to be understanding in terms of load model building of where your traffic flow geographically is taking place so you have a feel for where to place transmitters and design your system. The committee agreed they understood what the consultant wants, but is not sure it can produce it; is the committee putting false information out there? Is it attempting to size the system without a needs analysis that helps structure that vision? It was suggested that the consultant must make clear that the data in the report is only showing where we are now and it should not drive where we're going to be in the years ahead; other things need to be taken into consideration. The committee agreed it's apparent that everyone did not answer the questionnaire the same way, and therefore the consultant's information is not accurate.

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Larry Sayers, and carried unanimously.

Motion: The committee will not attempt to build a load model; rather, it will try to build an accurate snapshot of where we are now by counting personnel and the number of radios we currently have; the committee will not attempt to define our traffic right now because of the inconsistencies as to how we use radios systems and, in fact, we may be using private systems such as cell phones to cover needs that we currently are using today. Future projections would only be of personnel.

Items for Next Agenda

- Approval of January 14, 2005 Minutes
- Change report name
- Bring back corrections to the consultant's erroneous information in their reports
- Follow up with Mike on his contact with other agencies
- Get feedback to consultants on counts
- Make recommendations to consultant on writing a new introduction to the report
- Discuss progression road map
- Next meeting

Call to the Audience

No audience present.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Approval of Minutes:


Chair, PCWIN Technical Committee

1/19/05
Date