

**PIMA COUNTY WIRELESS INTEGRATED NETWORK (PCWIN)
USER COMMITTEE MEETING**

Pima County Sheriff's Administration Building
1750 East Benson Highway, 3rd Floor
Thursday, March 3, 2005
1:30 p.m.

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Note: The following is a summary of what transpired at the March 3, 2005 meeting.

I. Call to Order: Matt Janton calls the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

Roll Call: Mr. Janton

Mr. Janton concludes roll call and announces quorum has not been reached. He advises the members who are present that they will give other members a few minutes to arrive.

Mr. Janton addresses Item# III on the agenda, Report on PCWIN Technical Committee Meeting, and asks Mr. Findysz to brief those present on the issues discussed at the Technical Committee meeting held on February 17, 2005.

Mr. Findysz advises the Technical Committee discussed the definition of interoperability, the trunked system, the need for more representation from dispatch center personnel and the security of the PCWIN Technical Requirements document being released and possibly split into two parts 1) general information and 2) frequencies, repeaters, etc. The information would not be released as public information, only to vendors when they do bids upon signed agreement not to release it. The committee discussed a progression road map for the radio project and the group agreed it would be best to split the committee into smaller subcommittees to address needs/issues. The committee discussed radio coverage, simplex repeaters needs of the outlined districts as compared to Central City of Tucson. The committee would like to get information on other plans from other areas that have done this conversion and any problems they may have encountered, so we do not repeat them.

Mr. Janton announces the arrival of Dan Morelos and Kevin Shonk and quorum is reached at 1:40 p.m.

Mr. Janton asks if there are any questions regarding the Technical Committee update. Mr. Findysz advised of the Motorola presentation made at the Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Janton asks if Motorola was going to make a presentation to the User Committee as well and if it should be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. Linda Basham-Gilbert asks if it would be best to combine the committees and have one presentation. Mr. Janton agrees.

Dan Morelos suggests adding Power Point to the website to view presentations and review them at a later time. A Motorola representative advises he will look into the possibility of creating a Power Point presentation and having it available on the website.

Mr. Janton asks the Motorola representative whether it would be possible to make presentation at April 7, 2005 User Committee meeting. He will discuss the details with Paul Punske.

Quorum is formed and roll call is concluded.

Members Present

- 1) Linda Basham-Gilbert, Tucson Police Department
- 2) Dale Bradshaw, Marana Police Department
- 3) Jim Cocklin, Arivaca Volunteer Fire Department
- 4) Harry Findysz, Mt. Lemmon Fire Department
- 5) Matt Janton, Co-chair, Northwest Fire Department
- 6) Don Lafreniere, Sahuarita Police Department
- 7) Basilio Martinez, Pascua Pueblo Fire Department
- 8) Dan Morelos, Tucson Airport Police Department
- 9) Tom Nix, Avra Valley Fire District
- 10) Todd Pearson, Tucson Fire Department
- 11) Doug Roth, Corona de Tucson Fire Department
- 12) Mike Sacco, Pima County Sheriff's Department
- 13) Kevin Shonk, Tohono O'Odham Police Department
- 14) Cheryl Smart, Pima College Department of Public Safety

Members Absent

Patrick Abel, Golder Ranch Fire District
Larry Anderson, South Tucson Fire Department
Lee Bucklin, Rincon Valley Fire District
Jim Bush, Ajo/Gibson Volunteer Fire Department
Douglas Chappell
James Craig, Helmet Peak Fire Department
Charles Kmet, Tohono O'Odham Fire Department
Luis Puig, University of Arizona Police Department
Larry Stevens, Co-chair, Oro Valley Police Department
John Williams, Three Points Fire District
Chuck Wunder, Green Valley Fire District

Others Present

Manny Barreras, Motorola
David Jones, City of Tucson-Communications
Pat Joy, Pima County Sheriff's Department
Jim Merten, City of Tucson-Communications
Paul Punske, Motorola
Gary Schmitz, Oro Valley Police Department
Daniel Simmons, Pima College Department of Public Safety
Andy Smith, Golder Ranch Fire District
Anita Velasco, City of Tucson
Maggie Williams, Oro Valley Police Department
Bill Winters, CCI

II. Review and Approval of Minutes; February 3, 2005 Meeting

Mr. Janton asks if there are any suggested changes of the minutes. Jim Conklin moves to accept and approve the minutes. Linda Basham-Gilbert seconds the motion. The motion is unanimously carried.

IV. Phoenix Fire Safety Report

The authors of the report are making a presentation at the next Technical Committee meeting to be held on March 17, 2005. Mr. Sacco advises the authors of the report are scheduled to make a presentation at the next Executive Management Committee meeting on March 10, 2005.

Mr. Pearson advises he perused the first four pages of the report and would like to know if there is anyone present with technical expertise that read it and if they could resolve the issues identified in the report.

Mr. Findysz and Mr. Sacco begin a discussion reference digital versus analog and trunked versus conventional. Mr. Sacco discusses the trunked environment, fire ground situation communications and radio-to-radio simplex. Mr. Janton comments on fire ground communications and operations' needs to be conducted simplex and does not see a lot of difference in the law enforcement arena with a link back to the dispatch center. It would require a lot of sites for 100% coverage in Pima County and the bond would probably not cover the whole county.

Mr. Sacco advises the report is very relevant to the regional system being developed by Pima County in terms of how the issues will be mitigated. He addresses comments from the report pertaining to an overall concept of dispatch monitoring those transmissions on the fire ground and having them allocate additional resources without being asked. Committee members feel this is not a good thing. Mr. Janton advises of discussion at the City Communications Center about having a fire command officer assigned to the Communications Center. He feels dispatchers can prepare to order additional resources pending a request from the on-scene commander.

Mr. Morelos mentions a drill his agency held the night before. They activated the Gateway Radio System. He advises the airport operates conventional at this time and it works fine (police and fire are separate). He feels the report indicates Phoenix Fire is trying to come up with the best of both worlds, which some of it would make sense. Mr. Janton advises it makes perfect sense to have a trunked system with a simplex feature and that's the good thing about Project 25 radios, they have the capability to do all of it. Gateway only has one channel and allows only one conversation at a time and it would have been nice to have two channels. The trunked system will not broadcast the next message until traffic is clear. Trunking will also prevent talk-overs. There are also ways to accomplish everything that is needed in regards to recording at the scene, without the additional expense.

Mr. Janton reminds the members about the presentation being made at the Executive Management Committee meeting next Thursday.

V. Defining Interoperability: What do we see as a good working definition?

Mr. Janton asks members how they would define interoperability. Ms. Basham-Gilbert states she would like to see every user able to talk to other users, agency to agency, with whoever is working the incident having control of the frequency. Discussion follows in reference to the talk group capabilities and combining frequencies. Ms. Basham-Gilbert advises when combining more than two frequencies it causes delays. The dispatchers' role in redirecting to other groups is discussed.

Mr. Sacco asks Mr. Findsyz if the Technical Committee had come up with a definition for interoperability. Mr. Findsyz advises no, it was an item on the next agenda. The Technical Committee was going to agree on a definition and then pass it on to the User Committee.

Mr. Janton reads a definition to the members provided by Mr. Sacco (Attachment A). Mr. Sacco advises the regional system does not include Public Works at this time. Ms. Basham-Gilbert expresses concerns with Public Works not being included. Mr. Sacco advises that as much as Public Works is wanted/needed in the system, they are not included under this umbrella. Mr. Janton advises that although Public Works is not included in the system, they can be patched in if they are brought into a communications center. Mr. Sacco advises there are ways to bring them in, but the way the system as it is designed at this time, does not include Public Works, other counties or federal agencies. Mr. Morelos would like to see Public Works included in system. Mr. Sacco advises in large situations they would be utilizing NIMS and under NIMS there would be representatives from Public Works. Ms. Basham-Gilbert also expresses concerns of Public Works not being included and feels it must be explored. Mr. Morelos asks how could they get Public Works involved in the project and have accessible talk groups for them and should it be recommended to the Executive Management Committee? There is brief discussion reference an "add-on system."

Mr. Janton asks the members if there are any objections to submitting the definition of interoperability provided by Mr. Sacco, to the Executive Management Committee and Technical Committee so all three committees can agree on one definition. He asks if the words "Public Works" should be included or just leave as is. Mr. Sacco advises he feels leaving it as "others" is sufficient to cover that eventuality. Mr. Janton advises he will forward the definition to the Executive Management Committee for further action.

Materials provided by Mike Sacco: Proposed definition for Interoperability/SAFECOM – Attachment A

VI. Concept of Operations: Establish the roadmap for developing a concept of operations, Matt Janton, Co-chair

Mr. Janton turns the meeting over to Mr. Sacco. The Concept of Operations was designed to very specifically define how we need to use the radio system and how the users want to use the dispatch environment out on the streets, in the trucks and in the cars. It was also designed to provide not only a written definition, but also pictures to minimize confusion between the builder and the users of the system. Mr. Sacco suggests this issue not be addressed today since there was already a lot to cover in today's meeting, but he would like to start looking at day-to-day operations, task force operations and mutual aid operations from a scenario based perspective. The end product should be

very clear and definable for whoever builds the system. Mr. Sacco suggests the committee members bring some actual scenarios to the table to be evaluated.

Mr. Janton asks the committee to provide any actual scenarios they feel will assist in determining what works and how it can be improved.

Mr. Sacco suggests they include an agenda item for the next meeting, to evaluate a couple of actual scenarios, beginning with day-to-day operations using the radios. Mr. Janton suggests the issue be placed on the next agenda and asks members to share any actual scenarios from their agencies.

Mr. Findsyz asks Mr. Janton if there should be subcommittees formed for individuals who do not understand the police side of the business, maybe a bullet-point list of pursuits and everything they deal with and other agencies (fire, SWAT, operations, etc.) do the same to help educate other members who are not familiar with procedures of other departments. Mr. Janton adds he would like to determine when the functions actually become the same. Mr. Sacco states it's important for each department to understand the needs of other departments/agencies. Mr. Sacco would also like to have a committee discussion on the radio features available to each agency sometime in the future.

VII. HIPAA – Establish a workgroup of users to research the impact on PCWIN operations.

Mr. Sacco advises a workgroup should be established to deal with HIPAA since it is still fairly new to the agencies. The User and Technical Committees both discussed the restrictive requirements from HIPAA regarding communications and whether or not you can dispatch over a non-encrypted channel. Mr. Sacco advised that Paul Wilson asked the Public Safety Communications Commission to ask the Attorney General to provide an opinion regarding HIPAA. We will have attorneys and possibly a workgroup talk to legal advisors and find out what HIPAA means for the regional radio system.

There are also concerns regarding releasing data reference patients' conditions. Mr. Janton asks if anyone has any experience with HIPAA agreements or requirements as they relate to communications. Mr. Sacco advises the Department of Human and Health Services are not taking the position that everything has to be encrypted and secured. All they are saying is that agencies need to take reasonable steps to prevent medical information from being disseminated outside the requirements of HIPAA. He advises whoever is on the workgroup would be asked to get a written legal opinion from their agency's legal advisor, regarding communications.

Mr. Janton asks for volunteers to obtain legal opinions from their agencies. The question is asked whether there will need to be an Intergovernmental Agreement between agencies. Mr. Janton advises the purpose is to develop questions to hand to them so they can work on it, rather than just tell them they have to work on it. A couple of individuals from different agencies need to sit down together and create a formal document with specific questions regarding patient/hospital communications and encryption questions regarding data transmission for the Executive Management Committee to distribute to the attorneys. Mr. Pearson volunteers to work on the document with assistance from Ms. Velasco. Mr. Sacco also volunteers.

Mr. Janton asks that questions be generated for discussion at next User Committee meeting.

VIII. Encourage User Agencies to invite appropriate staff members to attend and participate in Committee meetings, Matt Janton, Co-chair

Mr. Janton stresses the importance of non-members and non-users attending the User Committee meetings from the different agencies, especially from the dispatchers' arena. Attendance and participation in discussions is encouraged.

Mr. Janton also mentions the possibility of increasing the number of User Committee members. Members would have to be recommended to the Executive Management Committee by the User Committee and then appointed by the Executive Management Committee.

The question is raised whether the By-Laws can be amended and how that would be accomplished.

Mr. Janton advises they could draft a recommendation for the Executive Committee to increase the membership of the User Committee. Mr. Sacco advises the By-Laws state the Executive Management Committee appoints members to the User and Technical Committees. Mr. Janton would like to add this issue to the next agenda.

IX. New Business

Mr. Janton asks if there are any proposed agenda items for the next meeting. Agenda items already suggested:

- 1) Evaluation of incident reports and different scenarios to determine how current radio procedures can be improved.**
- 2) Additional members to be appointed to the User Committee.**
- 3) Motorola presentation (educational, not a sales pitch).**

Identify a member to coordinate presentations with other vendors. Mr. Sacco volunteers to follow-up.

Mr. Punske advises the presentation they made to the Technical Committee was about interoperability and the different levels of interoperability, it was not specific to any type of technology but it was about different ways to achieve interoperability and the definitions of different levels of interoperability. Mr. Sacco asks if information regarding secure transmissions and encryption were included. Mr. Punske advises it was not, but they could easily supplement the subject matter with encryption techniques and encryption options. The committee shows interest in including both issues in the presentation.

X. Call to the Public

Mr. Janton asks if there is anyone who would like to address the committee. He receives no response.

XI. Date-Time-Location of Next Meeting(s)

April 7, 2005 at 1:30 p.m.
Sheriff's Department SOC Conference Room
1750 East Benson Highway
Tucson, Arizona

XII. Adjournment

Mr. Janton asks for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Sacco moves to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Pearson seconds the motion. The motion is unanimously carried. Meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Minutes approved:

Michael Sacco

Mr. Mike Sacco
PCWIN User Committee Recorder

03/11/05

Date

Minutes prepared by: Annette Romero

Proposed definition for interoperability:

The ability of public safety service providers - law enforcement, firefighters, EMS, emergency management, and others - to establish voice communications with staff from other responding agencies on demand and in real time, and permitting exchange of data communications on a common data network.

SAFECOM

Feb. 2003 - National Task Force on Interoperability

What is interoperability?

Interoperability is the ability of public safety service and support providers - law enforcement, firefighters, EMS, emergency management, the public utilities, transportation, and others - to communicate with staff from other responding agencies; to exchange voice and/or data communications on demand and in real time. It is the term that describes how radio communications systems should operate between and among agencies and jurisdictions that respond to common emergencies.

SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum Brochure

What is communications interoperability?

In general, interoperability refers to the ability of public safety emergency responders to work seamlessly with other systems or products without any special effort.

Wireless communications interoperability, which is the focus of SAFECOM, specifically refers to the ability of public safety officials to share information via voice and data signals on demand, in real time, when needed, and as authorized. For example, when communications systems are interoperable, police and firefighters responding to a routine incident can talk to each other to coordinate efforts. Communications interoperability also makes it possible for public safety agencies responding to catastrophic accidents or disasters to work effectively together. Finally, it allows public safety personnel to maximize resources in planning for major predictable events such as the Super Bowl or an inauguration, or for disaster relief and recovery efforts.

What are the components of a truly interoperable communications system, and what are the barriers to creating one?

There are a variety of challenges to interoperability: some are technical, some financial, and some stem from human factors such as inadequate planning and lack of awareness of the real importance of interoperability.

According to a report published in February 2003 by the National Task Force on Interoperability, the public safety community views the following as the key issues hampering public safety wireless communications:

- Incompatible and aging communications equipment;
- Limited and fragmented budget cycles and funding;
- Limited and fragmented planning and coordination;
- Limited and fragmented radio spectrum;
- And limited equipment standards.

What is SAFECOM doing to help improve interoperability?

SAFECOM has taken steps on a variety of fronts to improve interoperability.

It is important to understand that the process of achieving national interoperability may take up to two decades, but important interim measures which move locales, states, and the nation toward that goal are already in place. They include:

- Creation of the Federal Interagency Coordination Council (FICC) to coordinate funding, technical assistance, standards development, and regulations affecting communications and interoperability across the federal government;
- Development of a Statement of Requirements (SoR) which, for the first time, defines what it will take to achieve full interoperability and provides industry requirements against which to map their product capabilities;
- Initiating a process for development of a national interoperability baseline;
- Initiating an effort to accelerate the development of critical standards for interoperability;
- Creation of a Grant Guidance document that has been used by FEMA, COPS, and ODP state block grant program to promote interoperability improvement efforts;
- Establishment of a task force with the Federal Communications Commission to consider spectrum and regulatory issues that can strengthen public safety interoperability;
- And creation of a model methodology for developing statewide communications plans.

What is SAFECOM doing to maintain momentum toward complete interoperability?

Over the next year, SAFECOM will develop a baseline measurement of the level of communications interoperability across the country. SAFECOM will also release updated versions of the Statement of Requirements (SoR) that will include performance numbers and specificity to quantify the functional requirements and architecture framework detailed in the first version. Following these updates will be interface specifications, a gap analysis, and ultimately, solution deployment. Achievements of each of these steps will make significant progress toward the long-term goal of nationwide interoperability.

SAFECOM also has developed the "Continuum Guide for Addressing the Interoperability Challenge" to help local, tribal, state, and federal policy makers.

The Continuum identifies five critical success factors – frequency of use, governance, standard operating procedures, technology, and training and exercises – that must be addressed to develop comprehensive interoperability solutions.

The Continuum not only shows how public safety agencies can progress in each of these five critical areas, but illustrates the interdependence of these factors. For example, if a locale procures new equipment (under the green band), it will need to conduct training and exercises before it can effectively use that equipment.

To learn more about the continuum and the key factors to improving communications interoperability, please click here to view the [Interoperability Continuum Brochure](#).