

**INTEROPERABILITY NETWORK OF THE SOUTH BAY
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2017, 10:00 AM
SOUTH BAY REGIONAL PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY
SECOND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
4440 W. BROADWAY, HAWTHORNE, CA**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **POSTING OF THE AGENDA**
4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - 4a. Approval of Minutes – November 8, 2016*
 - 4b. Approval of Minutes – March 14, 2017*
5. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - 5a. Discuss and Make Recommendations Re Motorola Proposal*
 - 5b. Discuss and Prioritize Shovel-Ready Projects**
6. **REPORTS**
7. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
8. **ADJOURNMENT**

*Written material distributed with the agenda.

**Written material to be distributed at the meeting.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
OF THE INTEROPERABILITY
NETWORK OF THE SOUTH BAY**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Technical Committee of the Interoperability Network of the South Bay (INSB) convened in a regular session at 10:05 AM on Tuesday, November 8, 2016, in the second floor conference room of the South Bay Regional Public Communications Authority, 4440 W. Broadway, Hawthorne, CA.

2. **ROLL CALL AND REPORT OF THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

Present: Member Josh Armstrong, City of Hawthorne
Member Jerry Edwards, City of Torrance
Member Debra Kochheim, City of Redondo Beach
Chairman Ralph Mailloux, Cities of Gardena, Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach

Absent: Member Chris Donovan, City of El Segundo.

Also Present: Mr. Victor Bowers, Commline
Mr. Mike Bravo, Motorola
Mr. Bruce Cobb, Bearcom
Mr. Jeff Fukasawa, Commline
Captain Mike Ishii, City of Hawthorne
Administration Manager John Krok, SBRPCA
Executive Director Ernest Gallo, INSB

3. **POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

Chairman Mailloux confirmed that the agenda for this meeting was posted according to Brown Act requirements.

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4a. **Approval of Minutes – October 18, 2016**

MOTION: Chairman Mailloux moved to approve the INSB Technical Committee meeting minutes of October 18, 2016. The motion was seconded by Member Armstrong and passed by unanimous voice vote, absent Member Donovan.

5. **ACTION ITEMS**

5a. **Discuss and Develop Recommendations on the List of Priorities for the INSB Governance Board's Approval**

1. Discuss status and identify SOW changes to last 5-site system proposal:

Member Edwards, City of Torrance, outlined changes as follows:

1. Make sure Motorola understands that Phase II, which included Palos Verdes states and Inglewood, will not be used going forward.
2. Motorola will take another look at the 12 channels for the frequencies that were chosen.
3. Motorola will revise all maps to show seven cities.

Mr. Bravo, Motorola, discussed revisions to Motorola's maintenance services. He advised that they have been revised into packages and the proposal resembles the Advanced Package. He pointed out that console support was not included in maintenance services and Motorola will revisit this item.

Member Edwards explained that, in an effort to improve communications, alternative sites could be explored.

Executive Director Gallo related his concern that proposing alternatives at this point could result in delays that would eliminate potential funding. He confirmed that the wind load test for Torrance has been completed and that Motorola was made aware that Redondo Beach was not part of Phase I. He noted the importance of determining the number of subscriber units needed in a timely manner.

Mr. Fukasawa, Commline, stated his intent to examine the battery options for the recommended radios. He will provide Torrance with radio options in order to prepare a quote.

Member Edwards suggested that an updated Statement of Work be presented for the Governance Board's consideration at their next meeting.

Mr. Fukasawa pointed out that some technical specifications still need to be addressed.

Chairman Mailloux recommended that discussion of the remaining priorities be continued to a future meeting. He offered the following motion:

MOTION: Chairman Mailloux moved to recommend that discussion of Agenda Item No. 5a, Nos. 2 – 5, and the remaining agenda items, be continued to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Member Edwards and passed by unanimous voice vote, absent Member Donovan.

Mr. Bravo advised that Motorola's revised proposal should be ready for review early in January 2017.

Mr. Fukasawa asked that Motorola's revised proposal include a price guarantee beyond 90 days.

2. Establish site preparation requirements and identify readiness:
3. Discuss and outline deployment plan options.
4. Define and set deadline for system inventory/audit report.
5. Discuss and prepare a list of “shovel ready” projects for funding.

Agenda Item No. 5a, 2 – 5 continued to the next meeting

5b. **Discuss Specifics of Each Priority, Provide Options and Develop Recommendations for the INSB Governance Board’s Approval**

1. Discuss status and identify SOW changes to last 5-site system proposal.
2. Establish site preparation requirements and identify readiness.
3. Discuss and outline deployment plan options.
4. Define and set deadline for system inventory/audit report.
5. Discuss and prepare a list of “shovel ready” projects for funding.

Agenda Item No. 5b continued to the next meeting.

5c. **Discuss Scope of Work with Motorola Representatives, Clarify the Area G Mission and Develop Recommendations for the INSB Governance Board’s Approval**

Agenda Item No. 5c continued to the next meeting.

6. **REPORTS**

None.

7. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 AM.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE INSB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Interoperability Network of the South Bay (INSB) Technical Committee convened in a joint session at 10:05 AM on Tuesday, March 14, 2017, in the second floor conference room of the South Bay Regional Public Communications Authority, 4440 W. Broadway, Hawthorne, CA.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Member Chris Donovan, City of El Segundo
Member Jerry Edwards, City of Torrance
Member Debra Kochheim, City of Redondo Beach
Chairman Ralph Mailloux, SBRPCA-Cities of Gardena, Hawthorne and
Manhattan Beach

Absent: Member Milton McKinnon, City of Hermosa Beach
Member Josh Armstrong, City of Hawthorne

Also Present: Victor Bowers, Comcline
Bruce Cobb, Bearcom
Dennis Faro, City of Torrance
Jeff Fukasawa, Comcline
Ernest Gallo, City of Torrance
John Krok, SBRPCA

3. **POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

Mr. Mailloux confirmed that the agenda for this meeting was posted according to Brown Act requirements.

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4a. **Approval of INSB Technical Committee Minutes – November 8, 2016**

MOTION: Chief Donovan moved to approve the INSB Technical Committee minutes of November 8, 2016 as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Edwards and passed by unanimous voice vote, absent Mr. Armstrong, City of Hawthorne, and Chief McKinnon, City of Hermosa Beach.

4b. **Approval of Minutes – February 14, 2017**

Continued to the next meeting.

5. **ACTION ITEMS**

5a. Discuss and Make Recommendations on Updated Motorola Proposal – Five Site System

Referring to the “Questions Regarding the Motorola Proposal dated January 25th 2017” included in the agenda packet, Mr. Mailloux reported that he and Mr. Edwards reviewed Motorola’s updated proposal and the Motorola contract should be received for signature in the near future. Mr. Mailloux indicated that the \$5,000,000 grant for the Interoperability Network of the South Bay (INSB) should be awarded to the Authority in April 2017 and that the Authority’s member cities plan to reconfirm their commitment to pre-fund the grant.

Mr. Edwards discussed concerns that Motorola is denying they selected the recommended frequencies, that they would now like to charge for a load study and that they would like to select the frequencies “post-contract.” He posed the question as to how Motorola determined the twelve recommended frequencies if they never did a load study and noted that there is no assurance the recommended frequencies will be the ones used. Mr. Edwards pointed out that the INSB did not choose the frequencies, nor did the INSB determine if they would be sufficient to handle the loading.

Mr. Mailloux suggested that he and Mr. Edwards run point on the questions for Motorola, as well as others that arise. He noted the importance of addressing the proposed contract issues in a timely manner and invited others to participate in this process should they so desire.

Mr. Edwards explained that a load study was included in the original scope of work and Motorola was supposed to do one to design the system. He pointed out that, if Motorola has not done a load study, the project will be held up.

Mr. Fukasawa advised that Motorola was given a list of frequencies from which they chose the recommended ones. He related his impression that they picked the channels out of convenience without studying them much technically and noted that Motorola now wants to charge \$50,000 to \$100,000 for a load study, which would only take a few days.

Mr. Gallo questioned how Motorola came up with the twelve recommended channels. He stated his impression that they apparently took the cheap route and are liable.

Commenting that choosing frequencies “post contract” does not seem like the best way to move forward, Chief Donovan related his discomfort with Motorola at this time. He said that the questions, to him, are what the exposure will be to get the project off the ground and what it will take to eliminate the problems and get the questions answered.

In answer to a question from Chief Donovan, Mr. Edwards explained an additional concern pertaining to Motorola’s proposal to reduce the “talk in” sites from five to three for the Torrance area.

Mr. Fukasawa related his skepticism with the idea of going from a conventional system to portable radios due to coverage concerns.

Mr. Gallo stated his understanding that acceptance testing is included in Motorola’s proposed contract.

Mr. Mailloux suggested that he contact Mike Bravo at Motorola to discuss the questions and concerns.

Mr. Gallo confirmed that the Technical Committee could create an ad hoc subcommittee to talk to the vendor.

The Technical Committee appointed Mr. Mailloux and Mr. Edwards to an INSB Technical Committee ad hoc subcommittee to talk to Motorola.

- 5b. Discuss and Make Recommendations on Shovel-Ready Projects and
- 5c. Discuss Additional Infrastructure Costs

Mr. Mailloux and Mr. Edwards reviewed the list of shovel-ready projects. Mr. Mailloux noted that the SBRPCA does not need an upgrade and whether Torrance or Redondo Beach should get a grant to come into the network should be discussed. He advised that some of the items on the list will not be paid for by the INSB and recommended that the list of shovel-ready projects be forwarded to the INSB Finance Committee for consideration.

Mr. Fukasawa discussed fluctuating project costs, both increasing and decreasing.

Mr. Gallo stated his preference to use the highest price points when estimating costs. He indicated that the cost documentation will include both the current and forecasted budgets and which costs will and will not be shared.

Chief Donovan questioned how costs can be better formatted; recommended a running tally of costs with review dates; and asked that subscriber unit on-going maintenance and capital costs be submitted.

Mr. Gallo related plans to present proposed budget sheets for the INSB Governance Board's consideration on March 28th.

6. REPORTS

None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

7a. Mr. Mailloux confirmed for Mr. Gallo that the completed sole source documents were returned to Mr. Ray Edey.

Mr. Gallo highlighted the need to contact Mr. Edey to discuss what the decision makers are looking for when awarding grants.

7b. Mr. Mailloux announced that Mr. John Krok will serve as the SBRPCA's alternate member to the INSB Technical Committee.

Mr. Edwards announced that Mr. Dennis Faro will serve as the City of Torrance's alternate member to the INSB Technical Committee.

Mr. Gallo advised that, in the absence of the chairman, the vice-chairman will run the INSB Technical Committee meetings.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 AM.

**QUESTIONS REGARDING
THE MOTOROLA PROPOSAL
DATED JANUARY 25, 2017**

1. Will all 12 frequency pairs have the end-end encryption feature available?

1. The Base Radios (and channels) are agnostic to encryption. Encryption is only a feature of the subscriber radios and dispatch consoles.

2. Motorola's proposal shows a long list of features that will not be available using the CSSI 8000 gateway used to interface the RCC consoles. These features include end-end encryption, Alias information and many other critical features.

a. Will the 5 cities being dispatched by the RCC have end-end encryption capabilities?

b. Will the lack of Unified Alias cause any issues with our INSB sites and the master site, roaming radios etc.?

2a. Motorola's CSSI gateway will pass the encrypted audio over to the Avtec consoles. How the Avtec consoles handle the encryption after that point is unknown to Motorola. We are uncertain at what point the Avtec Console encrypts and decrypts audio traffic. On Motorola Consoles, audio is encrypted/decrypted at our Voice Processing Module (VPM) directly at the dispatch position. We recommend you check with your Avtec supplier to confirm where this process occurs.

2b. The impact will be operational. You will have to update radio aliases in both the ICI system and in the Avtec consoles.

3. Currently the City of Torrance is using 5 “Talk-In” sites to provide proper coverage for our portables. This proposal reduces that to 3 sites for the Torrance area. I have some concerns that we may have some issues. Redondo and the RCC cities may have similar reductions.
 - a. Will we be able to add receive-only sites to the system in the future without upgrading any equipment at the prime site other than wireless connectivity?
 - b. If yes, what is the estimated cost of a receive-only site excluding the wireless connectivity?

3. *The new RF equipment and APX subscribers feature massive improvements in technology. Based on a factor of reasons the entire industry has almost completely moved away from needed RX only sites. However, if after implementation it is determined that it is 100% necessary to add in RX only sites it can be done. The cost will be similar to the cost of a transceiver site. The equipment and amount of effort is almost the same.*

4. Based on the original SOW, Motorola asked for a complete list of available frequencies from all participating agencies. Within the original proposal it appears that Motorola selected the 12 frequencies that fit best for this project. We need to make sure prior to any frequency coordination (costly) that we’re using the frequencies that Motorola engineering is using for their system design and coverage maps. When will this selection be completed?

4. *The 12 frequencies provided in the proposal are the frequencies we are planning on using. This can be modified if desired but may result in a change in coverage design and implementation costs.*

5. Were the Redondo Beach frequencies ever considered?

5. The frequencies selected were based on the pool of channels provided to Motorola by INSB (originally Area G). If the Redondo Beach channels were not provided, then they were not considered.

6. The original SOW required a load study to ensure the correct quantity of frequency pairs were used to design the system for proper loading. Motorola was given the subscriber unit quantities from all participating agencies. If Motorola did not complete any load study, how did Motorola determine that 11-1 frequency pairs would handle our loading capabilities?

(The issue addressed in Questions 4-6 needs to get resolved. Nobody within the INSB group selected the 12 channel pairs and determined it was sufficient for loading this project.)

6. Motorola conducted a traffic loading study back when the project was initially a "Sole-Source RFP" for the Area G agencies. This is how we were able to determine 11-Channels would be adequate.

7. The coverage maps indicated an APX 4000 portable radio, which has a better front end than the proposed APX multi-band portable used for the calculation. How will this affect the accuracy of the coverage maps?

7. At the initial INSB (Area G) design, the APX 8000 radio was not available for purchase. The APX 4000 was selected as a middle ground radio because at the time it was not determined which APX radio the INSB members were planning on migrating to. All of the APX radios will have similar performance expectations.