Note: The following is a summary of what transpired at the May 9, 2006 meeting.

I. Call to Order: Sergeant Don Lafreniere, User Committee Co-Chair, calls the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Roll Call: Catherine Hanna, Pima County Sheriff’s Department

Quorum is established for the Technical Committee with a total of 10 members present. Quorum is not established for the User Committee with a total of 9 members present.

Members Present Technical Committee
Larry Sayers, Chair, Pima County Fleet Services
Scott Ferguson, Pima College Department of Public Safety
Harry Findysz, Mt. Lemmon Fire Department
Don Harrison, Tucson Airport Authority
Joseph Jakoby, Tucson Fire Department
Pat Joy, Pima County Sheriff’s Department
Ted Martin, PCSD IST
Gregory McNeal, City of Tucson
John Moffatt, Pima County Office of Strategic Planning
Anita Velasco, City of Tucson Communications

Members Present User Committee
Harry Findysz, Co-Chair, Mt. Lemmon Fire Department
Don Lafreniere, Co-Chair, Sahuarita Police Department
Matt Janton, Northwest Fire District
Charles Kmet, Tohono O’odham Fire Department
Dan Morelos, Tucson Airport Authority
Luis Puig, University of Arizona Police Department
Mike Sacco, Pima County Sheriff’s Department
Cheryl Smart, Pima College Department of Public Safety
Larry Stevens, Oro Valley Police Department

Members Not Present – Technical Committee
Ken Boynton, University of Arizona
Rick Brown, Marana Police Department
Gary Bynum, Drexel Heights Fire District
Steven Campbell, Drexel Heights Fire District
Tim Hoban, Tucson Airport Authority
Greg Lugo, Tucson Police Department
Kerry Reeve, PC Office of Emergency Management
Gary Schmitz, Oro Valley Police Department
Ben Standifer, Tohono O’odham Police Department

Members Not Present – User Committee
Patrick Abel, Golder Ranch Fire District
Larry Anderson, South Tucson Fire Department
Paul Ashcraft, Marana Police Department
Linda Basham-Gilbert, Tucson Police Department
Lee Bucklin, Rincon Valley Fire District
Jim Bush, Ajo/Gibson Volunteer Fire Department
Gary Bynum, Drexel Heights Fire District
James Craig, Helmet Peak Fire Department
Basilio Martinez, Pascua Pueblo Fire Department
Tilda Martinez, Elephant Head Volunteer Fire Department
Tom Nix, Avra Valley Fire District
Hector Olivo, Pascua Yaqui Police Department
Todd Pearson, Tucson Fire Department
Kerry Reeve, PC Office of Emergency Management
Ernie Robles, Picture Rocks Fire Department
Doug Roth, Corona de Tucson Fire Department
Kevin Shonk, Tohono O’odham Police Department
John Williams, Three Points Fire District
Chuck Wunder, Green Valley Fire District

Others Present
Manuel Amado, Pima College Department of Public Safety
Chris Anthis, Three Points Fire Department
David Bremson, M/A – Com
Carl Drescher, City of Tucson IT
Benny Gomez, Pima County OEM
Dale King, South Tucson Police Department
Christine O’Connor, City of Tucson
Paul Punske, Motorola
II. Approval of Minutes, Sgt. Don Lafreniere, User Committee Co-Chair

Sgt. Lafreniere asks members if there are any suggested changes for the April 20, 2006, joint meeting minutes. Pat Joy moves to accept and approve the minutes. Anita Velasco seconds the motion. Motion is unanimously carried.


III. User Needs Assessment Reports Draft Report Review
Capt. Paul Wilson, Pima County Sheriff’s Department

Captain Wilson explains that the meeting will focus on discussions regarding the User Needs Assessment Draft Report provided by CTA Communications (CTA). He adds that he encourages the Committee to voice their comments, questions, and concerns collectively and forward those comments to CTA. The User Needs Assessment process falls under the Business Architecture Planning Review deliverable of the project. Existing communications system data (previously produced reports and information) collected from participating agencies including local, state, and federal agencies, was reviewed by CTA and a draft report was produced as a result. Captain Wilson provides the Committee with a presentation on what the draft report includes:

**PCWIN Planning Process**

Topics discussed:

• Business Architecture Planning
• Legacy Systems Characterization Report
• Systems Alternatives & Recommendations
• Comments
• Draft User Needs Assessment
  • Section 1 – Introduction
  • Section 2 – Voice and Mobile Data Radio System Capabilities (Agency Specific)
  • Section 3 – Communications/EOC
  • Section 4 – PCWIN Communications Network Attributes

Captain Wilson gives the Committee an overview of each section of the draft report. He stresses the importance of reviewing the report, making necessary changes, and asks each agency’s representative to contact CTA, via email at [PCWIN@ctacommunications.com](mailto:PCWIN@ctacommunications.com), following their review, whether changes are made or not. Captain Wilson states that draft reports were distributed to each agency on May 2, 2006, with a target completion date of May 15, 2006. Participating agencies are encouraged to make necessary changes prior to the target date to give CTA ample time to produce the *final* report, scheduled for Tuesday, May 16, 2006.

Captain Wilson commends the Committee on their efforts to return their agency’s survey instruments, adding that return rates average 90%, increasing considerably since April’s meeting.

Captain Wilson reminds the Committee that this project continues to be a “building block” process and no one should expect a finished product at this time.
Captain Wilson begins his overview of the User Needs Assessment Draft Report, Section 1, Introduction. Captain Wilson explains that Section 1 briefly describes what the PCWIN Bond Project is about, player’s involved, key goals, what assessment methodologies were used to produce the report, and provides a community profile to give the public an overview of what the project entails. Captain Wilson offers the Committee opportunity to comment on Section 1.

Chief Kmet asks if each agency would have the opportunity to review their draft report a second time following previous changes and/or comments. Captain Wilson explains that each agency will have one (1) opportunity to make changes and/or comments before a final report is produced by CTA.

Captain Wilson opens a discussion into Legacy Systems confidentiality. He recommends that although confidentiality for the User Needs Assessment Report may not be necessary, the Committee should consider keeping the next report (Legacy Systems Characterization Report) confidential due to existing communications system sensitivity. Captain Wilson adds that the release of documentation to partners in the bond project should include a non-disclosure agreement. He refers to the Committee for discussion on the topic, and adds that no motion is necessary for this decision. There was general consensus that confidentiality should be maintained.

Captain Wilson refers to Section 2, Voice and Mobile Data Radio System Capabilities, of the report. He reminds the Committee that this portion, although agency specific, is a compilation of survey instruments, in-person interviews, and supporting documentation each agency has provided since February 2006. In this section, CTA tried to best describe each agency’s current environment, from an interoperability, functional, and technical standpoint. CTA describes each agency’s positive attributes of their current communications system environment, desires and needs for a future system, and attached supporting documentation previously submitted.

Captain Wilson asks that changes to the report be submitted to CTA and the document will be updated. He refers to the Committee for discussions on Section 2. Anita Velasco explains that she attempted to make changes on the report sent to her, but was unable to change her Voice & Data Attributes Rankings on the report, itself. Captain Wilson explains that the report sent to the agencies may have contained a locked table and suggests that comments, concerns, and/or changes be sent on a new document.

Captain Wilson refers to Section 3, Communications/EOC, of the report. CTA Communications interviewed and surveyed each dispatch center, and collected information in an attempt to characterize information by surveying the current environment, documenting positive and desired attributes, and supporting documentation submitted by each agency. Captain Wilson refers to the Committee for discussions on Section 3. Luis Puig states that when CTA visited the University of Arizona Police Department, they didn’t seem interested in surveying the University’s fiber and network systems. Captain Wilson explains that the purpose of the survey was narrowly defined to gather information about antenna sites. Captain Wilson offered to speak with CTA to determine if more detailed information about the University network needs to be collected and to follow up with Mr. Puig.

Captain Wilson reiterates that due to the number of participating agencies and the amount of information gathered items may have been missed. He encourages Committee members to feel free to identify missing information.
Anita Velasco explains that the communications center for the City of Tucson required two (2) separate interviews, but the second interview did not make it into the User Needs Assessment Report. Captain Wilson asks if the second interview was included in the Tucson Fire Department’s assessment and Ms. Velasco explains that she did not see the second interview under that report. Captain Wilson will follow up with CTA.

Cheryl Smart inquires about antenna site utilization between participating agencies and whether CTA will facilitate necessary agreements. Captain Wilson explains that CTA has not been tasked with that responsibility. He adds that he expects a separate process to include negotiations between the County and those agencies, but CTA has not been tasked with that request at this time.

Captain Wilson refers to Section 4, PCWIN Network Attributes, of the report. This section focuses on defining each agency’s network attributes for voice, radio, and mobile data, AVL, and communications/EOC. Captain Wilson explains that the City of Tucson made recommendations regarding the attribute ranking and how the attributes were going to be used in the project. Captain Wilson states that those recommendations were forwarded to CTA and they will re-characterize that information. He adds that in regards to the interoperability tables, he will propose that a section should be added which summarizes the information for all agencies.

Captain Wilson refers to the Committee for questions and receives no response. He adds that each agency be specific, critical, and make changes as needed when reviewing the report.

Anita Velasco asks why one agency cannot review another agency’s documentation. Captain Wilson explains that separate folders were created to maintain an individual agency’s privacy. In a few cases, folder consolidation has been done (Tucson Airport Authority), but upon requesting the consolidation with the City of Tucson, it was denied by the fire department representative.

Luis Puig asks if CTA’s dispatch center interviews in March 2006 were more specific to radio systems or CAD systems. Captain Wilson explains that CTA’s dispatch center interviews focused on radio systems and adds that each agency’s section in the draft report contains documentation on their interoperability with other agencies today, and what the agency would like to see in the future. Captain Wilson adds that CTA Communications is currently reviewing CAD system components for a future communications center and recommendations on how best to achieve that goal will be presented in future meetings.

Larry Sayers asks if Private Personnel Paging (4.1.3.34) is being considered as a part of the communications system because the idea was never previously discussed. Captain Wilson explains that the paging system idea was discussed for Ajo, where pagers are used to dispatch the volunteer fire departments and the Tucson Fire Department, as a point of communication with senior command staff. Captain Wilson adds that although this paging system wasn’t a necessity for the Tucson area, it may be a necessity for Ajo. Captain Wilson reminds the Committee that attribute rankings will change before the final report is complete and original numbers viewed were based on only 14 agency’s responses. With the increase of surveys returned, the rankings will change.

Materials provide: User Assessment Review PowerPoint (Captain Wilson); CTA Communications’ PCWIN User Needs Assessment Draft Report, Section 1 and Section 4; Returned Surveys, Interview Records, and Documentation Log.
IV. New Business, Sgt. Don Lafreniere, User Committee Co-Chair, Sahuarita Police Department

Chief Kmet inquires about the ACU1000 interoperability item discussed several months ago. Captain Wilson explains that due to the rapid movement of the bond project, ACU1000 discussion has been delayed, although the item remains open. Lt. Sacco explains that the Committee can place the ACU1000 item on next meetings agenda for discussion and Captain Wilson agrees.

Captain Wilson explains that CTA Communications will release the Legacy Systems Characterization Report around May 24, 2006. He suggests the Committee meet in early June to discuss that report.

VII. Call to the Public, Sgt. Don Lafreniere, User Committee Co-Chair, Sahuarita Police Department

Sgt. Lafreniere asks if anyone from the public would like to address the Committees. He receives no response.

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

A joint meeting is suggested and the next meeting is scheduled for:

Monday, June 5, 2006, at 10:00 a.m.
Northwest Marana Urgent Care Center Conference Room
8333 N. Silverbell Road (Continental Reserve), Tucson, Arizona

IX. Adjournment

Captain Janton motions to adjourn the meeting and Chief Kmet seconds the motion. Motion carries unanimously and the meeting is adjourned.