

**MINUTES**  
**PCWIN Technical Committee Meeting**  
**January 27, 2005**  
**1:00 p.m.**

**Pima Community College – Administration**  
**4905D E. Broadway, Bldg. D, Rm. 227**  
**Tucson, Arizona 85709**  
Submitted by Kari Price

**Members present:**

Anita Velasco, Don Harrison, Gary Bynum, Greg Lugo, Harry Findysz, Jim Perry - CHAIR, John Moffatt, Joseph Jakoby, Larry Sayers - SECRETARY, Patsy Joy, Richard Hughes, Scott Ferguson, Theodore G. Martin, Tim Hoban

**Members absent:**

Ben Standifer, Gary Schmit, Kerry Reeve

**Others present:**

Alex Vavages – Tohono O’Odham PD, Daniel Simmons – Pima Community College DPS, Kari Price – City of Tucson I.T., Mike Sacco – Pima County Sheriff’s Dept., Richard Pasqua – Northrop Grumman, Tom Nix – Avra Valley Fire Dist., Woody Dyche – Northrop Grumman

---

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Jim Perry called the meeting to order after reaching quorum at 1:05 p.m.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

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

*Motion: That the minutes of January 14, 2005 be approved.*

**III. Corrections to the PCWIN Technical Requirements Document**

Committee members discussed corrections that needed to be made to the draft document such as radio counts and personnel data. Some members had a completed list of their required changes, others were still gathering more information. Jim Perry directed members to turn over to him any changes they currently had with the understanding that they could turn in the rest when completed.

**IV. Proposed Name Change to the Technical Requirements Document**

Jim Perry asked the committee to discuss a name change for the document that would more accurately describe what the document contained.

The following motion was made by Larry Sayers, seconded by Gary Bynum, and carried unanimously.

*Motion: Rename the Technical Requirements Document as follows: "PCWIN 2004 Technical Assessment"*

#### **V. Proposed Introduction for the Technical Requirements Document**

Jim Perry asked the committee to discuss a change to the introduction of the document that would more accurately describe what the document contained.

The following motion was made by Daniel Simmons, seconded by Scott Ferguson, and carried unanimously.

*Motion: Strike the first paragraph under "Document Scope."*

The following motion was made by John Moffatt, seconded by Anita Velasco, and carried unanimously.

*Motion: Consultant shall be directed to restate in the document that it's an assessment of current status and it is to serve as a baseline.*

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Don Harrison, and carried unanimously.

*Motion: Following the introduction, the committee would like the consultant to clearly state that the technical specifications be used as guidelines in designing an integrated system.*

#### **VI. Discuss a Progression Road Map for the Radio Project**

Jim Perry lead in a discussion about what order of events needed to take place for the design and development of the regional radio project. He explained that the progression road map would be used by the Project Manager and reviewed by the Executive Committee. He suggested that the next step for the committee might be to flag certain preliminary information to share with the Executive Committee such as available resources (after inventory is complete and verified) and personnel issues regarding analyzing dispatching loads. He added that the consultant would be responsible for creating the time line. Tim Hoban asked if some agencies would get excluded if they experienced a budget shortfall; he asked what their options would be if they couldn't implement 100% of their plan; and if the committee needed to discuss a "who gets what" plan. Jim Perry suggested creating a benchmark for pricing and to do a decision matrix of what would happen before an RFP was produced. Ted Martin said that a needs assessment needed to be done first in order to define the scope, then the costs could be considered; the needs analysis should be based on what the Executive Committee wanted. John Moffatt said he agreed that a needs assessment from the users was necessary. He said that this technical committee needed to define standards for the Executive Committee. He added that the committee needed a process to educate

itself on the newest technology and how they could interrelate on what their needs were so that the Technical Committee could be in a better position to advise the Executive Committee. Jim Perry suggested having the Mesa and Phoenix engineers come out to discuss their projects with the Technical Committee; they base theirs mostly on Project 25. He added that vendors such as Motorola and M/A-COM could also be invited to do presentations or teleconferences. He said everyone may not have understood exactly what was meant by terms such as “interoperability” and “nonproprietary,” and it was important to be clear on the terms; the committee needed to be able to describe accurately what it would be looking for. Regarding development of the RFP, Anita Velasco asked where the line was drawn between the User Group and the Technical Group, and whether the committee could start a bullet-point list of what they wanted the consultant to do. Mike Sacco said that Project Manager, Paul Wilson, would rely heavily on the consultant’s document with input from the Technical Committee to put together the RFP; the Executive Committee would have final say on the RFP. The Technical Committee agreed that Jim Perry should share at the next Executive Meeting that the progression road map is a continuing process that the Technical Committee would keep working on, and that it needed to be involved with working on the RFP and the design of the network itself. Jim summarized the committee’s desire for interaction between it and the User Committee in order to exchange information possibly on a quarterly basis.

The following motion was made by Jim Perry, seconded by Gary Bynum, and carried unanimously.

*Motion: It is the wrong time now to do a progression road map, and the committee will address it later.*

## **VII. Discussion on Committee Providing Corrected Information to Consultant**

Jim Perry lead in a discussion on how the committee would like to communicate recommended changes to the consultant who developed the draft of the Technical Requirements Document. Mike Sacco requested that the committee turn all changes over to him by February 3<sup>rd</sup>.

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

*Motion: Before the consultant presents the final draft to the Executive Committee, the Technical Committee recommends one last review of the draft with adequate time to review and comment.*

## **VIII. New Business**

Members proposed the following be added to the agenda for the next meeting:

- The wisdom of the release of sensitive information in the PCWIN 2004 Technical Assessment; e.g. radio frequencies, repeater locations, etc. Should some of the report be kept confidential?
- An update by the Technical Committee Chair of what happened at the previous Executive Committee meeting.
- Progression Road Map

- Report by Mike Sacco on progress made by the User Committee
- A brief presentation from vendors Motorola, M/A-COM, and others regarding standards (not a sales pitch) arranged by Jim Perry

**IX. Call to the Public**

- In reference to a progression road map, Woody Dyche suggested that regarding interoperability issues, the Technical Committee could define the boundary for the consultant. He said to consider Santa Clara California who has a major interoperable system, and also Arlington Virginia.
- Richard Pasqua said that regarding security, only a summary is released to the public, and only pre-qualified vendors may see the details.

**X. Date-Time-Location of Next Meeting(s)**

The next Technical Committee meeting will be Thursday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, from 9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m. at the Copper Room at Randolph Golf Course Clubhouse (final confirmation pending).

**XI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

---

**Approval of Minutes:**

  
Chair, PCWIN Technical Committee

1/31/05  
Date