

**COLUMBIA 9-1-1 COMMUNICATIONS DISTRICT**  
**Minutes of the Advisory Committee Special Meeting**  
**June 14, 2022**

---

**Members Present:** Bruce Holsey, Mike Russell, Steven Lougal, Eric Smythe, Dustin King, Jeff Pricher, Steve Sharek, Shaun Brown, Joel Medina, Kelly Niles, Earl Smith, Joe Kaczynski, Rob Davis, Pete Manning, Jasen McCoy

**Staff Present:** Mike Fletcher, Nancy Edwards, Nathan Hughes, Dannell Hooper, Maryjo Beck, Chandra Egan

**Guests Present:** Greg Brody, Alex Rains, Tyler Miller

**10:01am Meeting called to order**

**Mike Russell 00:00**

Meeting of the 9-1-1 Communications District Advisory Committee to order. Thank you all for being here this morning. We could just go around the table real quick introduce ourselves, say who you are, agency you're with. I'd appreciate it. We'll start down at that end.

**Rob Davis 00:18**

Rob Davis, Operations Chief, Vernonia Fire.

**Joe Kaczynski 00:21**

Joe Kaczynski, fire Chief, Mist-Birkenfeld.

**Nathan Hughes 00:23**

Nathan Hughes, Columbia 9-1-1, Technical Manager.

**Dannell Hooper 00:29**

Dannell Hooper, Columbia 9-1-1, Operations Manager.

**Nancy Edwards 00:29**

Nancy Edwards, Columbia 9-1-1, Chief Financial Officer.

**Greg Brody 00:34**

Greg Brody, fire Chief, Westport Fire.

**Steven Lougal 00:34**

Steven Lougal, Chief, Scappoose PD.

**Maryjo Beck 00:38**

Maryjo Beck, Columbia 9-1-1 Office Support Specialist.

**Mike Fletcher 00:41**

Mike Fletcher, Director, 9-1-1.

**Mike Russell** 00:44

Mike Russell Columbia County Public Works.

**Bruce Holsey** 00:46

Bruce Holsey, Assistant Chief, Clatskanie Fire.

**Steve Sharek** 00:49

Steve Sharek, Clatskanie Fire District.

**Jasen McCoy** 00:52

Jason McCoy Oregon Department of Forestry, here in Columbia City.

**Kelly Niles** 00:54

Kelly Niles, Oregon Department of Forestry.

**Dustin King** 00:57

Dustin King, Corporal, St. Helens Police.

**Eric Smythe** 00:59

Eric Smythe, Columbia River Fire and Rescue, Deputy Chief.

**Joel Medina** 01:02

Joel Medina, Columbia River Fire and Rescue, fire Chief.

**Mike Russell** 01:04

Those of you online, would you like to introduce yourselves? I can't really see the names there. So...

**Nathan Hughes** 01:14

Chandra's...

**Pete Manning** 01:15

Pete Manning, Rainier Police Department.

**Mike Russell** 01:19

Thank you, Pete.

**Chandra Egan** 01:22

Chandra Egan, Columbia 9-1-1, CAD Specialist.

**Mike Russell** 01:25

Thanks, Chandra.

**Mike Fletcher** 01:26

Is that everybody, Nathan?

**Nathan Hughes** 01:30

Yep.

**Mike Fletcher** 01:30

Okay, thank you.

**Mike Russell** 01:32

Okay. And our guests. And our guests, please if you could introduce yourselves.

**Tyler Miller** 01:42

Tyler Miller, Scappoose City Council.

**Alex Rains** 01:45

Alex Rains, City Manager, City of Scappoose.

**Shaun Brown** 01:48

Shaun Brown, Columbia County Emergency Management.

**Mike Russell** 01:53

Thank you all for being here. Would you like introduce yourself, sir.

**Jeff Pricher** 01:59

Jeff Pricher, Scappoose Fire.

**Mike Fletcher** 02:04

We have one more online.

**Mike Russell** 02:08

Somebody just join us online. Please introduce yourself.

**Earl Smith** 02:11

Earl Smith, Vernonia Fire.

**Mike Russell** 02:17

Thank you, Earl. Well, thanks, everybody for being here. Just as a quick background, almost a year ago now that we were provided, presentations from Federal Engineering on their evaluation of the current system and recommendations for moving forward with a new system or a newer system. And we've kind of been spinning our wheels on which direction to go and how to proceed, not just the advisory committee, but I think the board as well has been struggling with the options going with our current system, upgrading it as needed, still an eight to \$10 million investment, or going to seven 800 either ourselves or with a partner, still a 20 \$25 million dollar investment. So there's just been, I think a struggle on weighing the options and going back and forth on you know, where we're at, I think we're divided as a group that can I can safely say that there are advantages and disadvantages for each option. And for those of you who weren't able to make counselor Miller's presentation on May 2, just quickly, and this is my interpretation of his presentation. I'm not putting words in his mouth, but you know, his presentation was a I thought a thorough discussion of did the existing sites still work best or will existing sites plus new sites work best? He presented in his work that he hired to have done regarding VHF versus seven 800 coverages the pros and cons, the interference with VHF becoming, has been a problem and getting more and more to be a problem. And the bandwidth needed as we add more partners talking about new sites where those might be, you know, a million dollars a site that adds up quickly. His, from my interpretation of his presentation, VHF is slightly better in coverage than the seven 800 but slightly. So there is a slight benefit to staying with VHF. And, and he did analyze using CRESA sites as an option. And,

you know, overall, I think, Mr. Miller, counselor Miller feels that maybe our own system is the better way to go. He indicated he has trouble supporting going on somebody else's system. So how can we do all that? So that's kind of just a quick overview, you're welcome to talk to Mr. Miller, one on one, counselor Miller sorry, if you want to. But that's just a brief overview of my interpretation of his presentation. And so here we are, we're still kind of spinning our wheels trying to decide what we want to do today's special meeting was called so that we can just start digging in as a group into this and try to come to maybe some concessions to consensus, there's some new information Director Fletcher wants to share with us, maybe that will help get us off dead center here. And I think I'm more interested in hearing the committee's desires about how to move forward. I'm hoping we can all agree that the system needs to be upgraded. It's just how do we go about doing that? So that's why we're here today. And it's totally focused on the next gen radio system. So we'll just go right into it in our agenda for today. We'll do public comment. And we'll allow 10 minutes for each commenter. And then we'll go into our regular meeting approval of the minutes. And then, oh, I guess I already did my opening comment. Sorry about that. I'm off the agenda already. And then we'll start covering the topics of concern. So anybody, any questions at this point? Okay, seeing none, I'd like to invite public comment. If you could stand, state your name. And provide your comments. You have 10 minutes? Second call public comments. Those of you in the room or online? Third, and final call, public comments. Seeing and hearing none, we'll move on. So yeah, gave my opening comments. That's kind of where we're at. And, you know, if we need to, after this discussion today, if we need to have another focused meeting, I'm willing to facilitate that, and, and keep us moving. But we'll we'll talk about that at the end depending on how this goes. So first up is the City of Scappoose offer. All of you should have received communication from Director Fletcher on Cities of Scappoose's offer to help the District. I'll just leave it to Mike to go into the detail on that and where we're at.

**Mike Fletcher 08:41**

At our last board meeting, which was held at the end of May, the City of Scappoose, in both a written format and oral testimony from the city manager, made an offer to the 9-1-1 District and to quote the letter to assist the 9-1-1 District by partnering on the planning, selection and implementation of a new public safety radio system. The city goes on to say that they had made contact with certain engineers and other public safety professionals who could complete a thorough engineering report that would assist with determining the best path forward for the 9-1-1 District. It continues with they estimate that the report and proposal would take four to six months to complete, and the process would include updates to the District and the stakeholders to ensure transparency inclusivity. The finished product would give all the Public Safety Agency stakeholders complete information to consider and answer many of the questions we are hearing from the various public safety agencies throughout the county. So this is still before the Board they took no action at the last Board meeting. They're still contemplating it. Part of this process today is to leverage the role that the Advisory Committee stands is to advise the District. And so the Board is seeking your advice on not only this offer, but also as we move to, as Mr. Russell spoke on, the next gen radio system. So, first order of business is seeking advice on the city's offer. I will follow that with one other thing is I asked some clarifying questions of the city. Based on their request to partner with this, I wanted to know what how we could assist the city in the selection process to find either an engineering firm or staff. If we were going to partner on an RFP or three bids and a quote, seeking how to qualify the firm's and or staff to provide that service. How would the 9-1-1 District participate in the development of the RFP and bidding process? What would the vision be for the scope of the study? What is the proposed statement of work? And what are the proposed project deliverables to consist of? I did get a reply from the city. It states, we are currently working on the details of the scope of work and plan to bring that to your next Board meeting. During the process of completing the engineering work, the 9-1-1 District would be included at key points, and obviously would receive a copy of the final results. The city is not planning to do an RFP for this work. So the District seeks your input.

**Rob Davis** 12:01

My question is, the 9-1-1 District is its own district. And we have multiple players that are part of this. So why would we partner with one city or one other entity, when all of us sitting in this room have a viable seat at this table? That seems to cut the rest of the districts and cities out of that process completely?

**Joel Medina** 12:30

How much have we already spent on the current assessment study that that was sent out?

**Mike Fletcher** 12:37

So the District hired Federal Engineering to conduct a review of the current system, evaluate it, review the RFI process that we published in 2018, validate that they reviewed the four submissions or potential solutions to a new system, and then gave a recommendation to the District and a realistic budgetary estimate for all four solutions. And we're right about, just shy of \$100,000.

**Joel Medina** 13:10

So we've already spent \$100,000 on doing this.

**Mike Fletcher** 13:13

Correct.

**Joel Medina** 13:14

So is this purpose, does this have anything to do with the fact that we're kind of like in limbo and haven't made a decision as to which direction that we're going that we're trying to find the direction or, I don't understand the purpose of doing this study again?

**Mike Fletcher** 13:30

I don't know. All I have is what the, the city offered as their proposal.

**Joel Medina** 13:35

Okay, thank you.

**Dustin King** 13:39

Chief Greenway, apologizes he can't be here today. He's got a budget meeting because I think the City of St. Helens is broke or something. So we, I'm here on his behalf. He'd like me to pass on that our agency, I'll read this directly, supports the Federal Engineering study. We have, with the current system, we have some serious problems, officer safety issues in the city, with our officers calling for cover, not getting out, dispatchers well aware of the radios we're in and our administration's concern is that if we conduct a second study, we're going to push this project out even further with getting the ball rolling forward in the right direction is, time is of the essence.

**Mike Fletcher** 14:28

Thank you. Any other input?

**Mike Russell** 14:33

Well, I think one thing that maybe has been missing is actual empirical measurement of the coverage of our current system. And so I think Federal Engineering did the best they could but it was, what'd they call it, they had a term for it, calculated coverage. So I think, you know, if that's something that would help us to just get a baseline of what our current coverage looks like, and the city's willing to help us with that. I don't know what the

scope of work is. So that's, but I know that's something in all that I've looked at, that's something that's kind of a question in my mind, what really is the current system coverage?

**Jeff Pricher 15:33**

So if I understand correctly, with the projects that have been completed, basically had a bunch of vendors come in and say - well, this is what we want to do for you. We haven't really had or have anything, based on your last comment, we don't really have anything that says - this is what's going to be best for our county, in terms of a tower here a tower there, like the best coverage. We don't really have anything that speaks to that, in terms of all these studies and engineering reports. Is that correct?

**Mike Russell 16:08**

Yeah. And yes, and my, my experience is that you do kind of the options analysis first. And then you get in, okay, once you decided what type of system you're going to go for, then you actually get into the design. And that's where you get into the details of coverage, and tower sites and all of that. So we're kind of we're, we're at this point, we're not even there yet. We're trying to decide what kind of system we want. And then we can start talking about the actual system design and tower placement and coverages and all that kind of stuff. That makes sense?

**Jeff Pricher 16:48**

Yeah. And then based on what the city submitted, I'm understanding that the plan is to kind of give us an overview of that coverage that hasn't really been explored yet. Other than a vendor saying my product is better than yours, and this is what I think you should do.

**Mike Fletcher 17:12**

So you're not you're not wrong, Chief. Because what we have before us is really apples and oranges. So we have three different vendors offering three different solutions, and different flavors of solutions. So VHF propagates differently than 700/800. And so where are you have your sights makes a difference on VHF versus seven 800. So, you're right, we have a mixed match of solutions, and opinions, and even Federal Engineering, that was their challenge as well as if we as a group decide on a band 700/800 Basically the same thing. And or VHF, if you want to put in low band, you know, if you want to do the mid UHF, 400s, you know, like the old med nets, that's all different stuff. So we need as a group, we need to decide which band we want to actually do some research and a coverage study. I don't want to interrupt I have another point, but Chief, I saw your hand up there.

**Eric Smythe 18:25**

Yeah, so the only point I'm wanted to bring in is to speak to one of the points that Chief Davis brought up. I've been here 10 years, and in 10 years, and I've heard that you know, CCOMs gonna upgrade their system. And again, this has been going on for the entire time I've been here. Since you came on Mike, it seems to have sped up a little bit. We continue to delay. I'm looking at all the fire departments sitting at the table here. And obviously law enforcement in St. Helens is broke [INAUDIBLE \*overlapping speech\*], but the fact is our radios, most of our radios are 20 or 25 years old, most of our mobiles are 20 or 25 years old. And we're talking about officer safety. These guys work by themselves. We go out as crews so we have a little more safety on our, on our side, but our stuffs failing and we and what I see is and what I feel is we just keep kicking the can down the road. At some point, and we discussed this yesterday at Fire Defense Board was our recommendation by the fire districts from what we're going to give the Advisory Board today. The fire chiefs we're gonna advise where we, where we think we need to go. Hope it's along the same lines as law enforcement, but ultimately, I see that as a detriment if we just keep it and we wait another study now we're into 2023 and then we, then we got start building system or start agreeing to it. The point I was gonna agree with what Chief Davis is, I read what

Scappoose city was offering. And they want to be in the decision making process, they want to have some say in it. And I, why one place versus everybody in the county? I mean, this is, this is a group problem for all of us in the county and we need to move forward together. And one person went no no, we're gonna go this way - what if they give a study and Scappoose wants to go, and I'm just using Scappoose as an example, but they want to go one direction, but the rest of the committee doesn't, what does that mean? So there's a lot of things I didn't understand in that. And I get they want to bring more information to us. More information is fantastic, but we're just kicking the can down the road again. And my stuff's getting older by the day, I'm having to strip radios off of other vehicles to make our guys be able to function on scene. And that's not even speaking to what law enforcement has to do when they go out in the sticks. And those guys are out there by themselves. So I just see as this is a, this is a county issue and I would like to see us move forward at some point, and that'd be my advice to the Chief.

**Joel Medina** 20:28

I mean, I understand exactly what Scappoose is, well, I'm guessing what in their position to I would be like, well, there's no decision being made, perhaps, there's no decision being made, because we don't have enough data. I think that once we make some kind of decision and move into a general direction that benefits the greater amount of agencies, then they'll put some of that to the rest because we've actually taken action. But up until this point, we've been meeting to discuss it, just so that we can meet to discuss it again. And again, you know, we're having failures, I'm having to take the, we might have to take the radio out of my vehicle to put it in another vehicle. I mean, we just can't keep doing that. We have to make a decision as a group and move forward into the best interest of the county.

**Mike Russell** 21:20

Agreed.

**Rob Davis** 21:24

We're at a point where we don't have enough radios left on apparatus for every seat. And we are in a holding pattern of trying to decide do we continue to buy something that may not work in the future? Or can this group come together and make a decision so that we can move forward as one united front and start spending the appropriate money on good things that are going to work in the future? I mean, our, literally our stuff that we have left is at least 20 years old, outside of one brand new rig that we built, our stuff is falling apart, and we've got to make a decision, and we got to move forward so that we can buy the right stuff. I think both the chiefs are right, this this, we've been talking about this for a year, it is time to make a decision and move forward. And I think adding another study adding another, another stakeholder that, that is buying into a decision making process is the wrong direction.

**Mike Russell** 22:16

Chief Pricher.

**Jeff Pricher** 22:19

So, a couple of thoughts. There were two things brought up by the chiefs in the room here in the last two minutes. But we're still talking about the study. Is there any harm in the city pursuing this study without stopping the process that hopefully will be continued as a result of this meeting? If this board, or sorry, if this user group provides direction to the Board on where we should be headed, is there any reason that the city can't continue doing their study? Especially knowing that it's not going to cost any of the users in this room, any dollars any money, and it's not going to cost the 9-1-1 District any money? We're talking about information, which could be beneficial to whatever project we end up doing down the road.



**Mike Russell** 23:23

On the other hand, it could muddy the waters more. So yeah, there's no reason the city can't, you know, they're their own entity, they can do what they feel they need to do. But the risk would be that it contradicts maybe what the District wants to move forward with and, and it just muddies the water.

**Jeff Pricher** 23:43

And I also echo the frustration on the fire side about inaction on this particular project. As a result of inaction, we had to go out and buy new radios, we couldn't wait any longer. So that is unfortunate.

**Mike Russell** 24:01

Yeah, agreed. I it's time, it's time to move.

**Joel Medina** 24:04

I agree with what Chief Pricher, he makes some very valid points. We don't want to spend money and you know, not knowing. And and I see the point to that you're making, sir is that, you know, we really can't stop an individual agency from doing anything. My question I would have is this, regardless of what any other agency decides to do, is that going to slow down? I mean, we're still gonna make a decision and move forward, right? I mean, we're not going to not make a decision to wait for six months until another project is done right. We're going to decide something based on the information that we have now that we that we believe is in the best interest. I just want to make sure we're gonna do that and not wait.

**Mike Russell** 24:46

I'd like to get there, yes.

**Joel Medina** 24:49

So if we're going to do that, I mean, anybody can do any kind of study they - I could personally do my own study if I wanted to open my own money to do it; not that I would, but I could. But you know, I mean, which could be something that I decided to do. But I don't think that it's fair for all of us to expect that we have to wait for another study to get done before we can sit down and make a decision when I think we have enough information in front of us to make a good, clear and educated decision with the information that we have; sure we can always have more information and more information isn't necessarily bad But this isn't a situation where no decision is a decision. We've been kicking the can down the road. We all know what we need. We all know the problems. Its starting to feel like we're the UN, you know, stop? Or I'll say stop again? I mean, it's just we need to make a decision stand together as a group, and just go. I mean, I think we're there.

**Mike Russell** 25:47

Agreed. So I want to give people online an opportunity. I don't see any raised hands, but I want to make sure you guys have an opportunity to comment if you have any.

**Greg Brody** 25:56

I have a comment.

**Mike Russell** 25:59

Just hold on, just a sec. Okay, hearing none, go ahead chief.

**Greg Brody** 26:05

I, I'm not convinced that doing another study is not going to present a problem and that it doesn't cost any money. There, it's gonna require staff time here at 9-1-1 to get them the data that they require, the engineering



firm, they're going to be contacting, or they're going to be taking up, asking questions and doing things. So I don't believe it's just harmless, it might, in fact, cause more problems with staff trying to move forward one project yet happened to provide information on another project. So I think there's more at play here.

**Mike Russell** 26:34

Chief Smythe. You mentioned the Fire Defense Board, that you have a recommendation specifically about the city's offer, or is it?

**Eric Smythe** 26:41

No we, well yesterday, sorry sir, yesterday, we discussed at Fire Defense Board and Chief Kaczynski brought up and I let him speak to it. But basically, from the fire department standpoint, where do we want to go? And we came up with a tentative agreement that we'd advise the Advisory group, what the fire department would think would be the best course action moving forward, the fire districts, all of us together.

**Mike Russell** 27:00

For the radio system?

**Eric Smythe** 27:01

Yes. For the radio system.

**Mike Russell** 27:02

Okay, well, we'll get there, though. Okay.

**Mike Fletcher** 27:06

So I'm gonna jump in here for just a little bit. That's still sitting on the table. And we can continue to discuss that. But there's some things that I want to just put out on the table. I did meet with the Fire Defense Board yesterday, and we had a good, robust conversation about everything we're talking about here. And we spent a lot a bit, quite a bit of time talking about our current system. And there are some asks from this body. And there's asks from the Board for an attempt to answer some of the questions of what we have today with our system. Because it is a valid point, because one of the options on the table for a solution is to just rebuild a brand new VHF system. Okay, so what I have been tasked to do, and I'm continuing, I had conversations seven o'clock this morning, I'm trying to gather quotes from, there's several firms out there across the country that can do a detailed study, and this is what I'm asking for. I'm asking for a non vendor specific firm to come out here and evaluate our system, the current system performance. So because VHF is prone to interference, we know that. And so what I'm asking for is a firm to come out here to place their equipment to basically monitor our system today. Today, we do monthly PMs at all of our sites, and we do receive meter readings of each site. My, my concern with that is these are just snapshots at one specific moment in time. So it's 1030, Tuesday morning, and if Day Wireless is out here and doing a meter reading, it's going to show what it is at 1030, Tuesday morning. Yay. We all know that the radio systems performance changes throughout the day, and certainly between day and night. And what I want to know is place your equipment at this site for 48/72 hours. So we can see that wave of performance over day and night, potentially over several days. And that we would move that equipment to every single site in the District. And we would get a report of the performance of the system that's more realistic than a single snapshot at any one site. We could take that information and have it read by again, another party that's independent and can tell us what we're currently seeing. And then you can project a little bit into the future. Because whatever we do if we're staying on VHF is going to last the next 15/20 years. That's education. Really my intent for that purpose is actually to remove an option from the table. Because we have those three options own and operate or partner VHF, or a seven 800. system. So that was my intent. In the meantime, there's a perception, I'll say that, because I hear this is that we're doing

nothing with our current system. We're just letting it flounder and we're using duct tape and baling wire to keep it going. Kind of, and kind of not. Just for education for everybody in this room and online is the District actually does perform monthly PMs and it's not a small investment; we spend over \$15,000 every month \$15,606 and change, doing PMs on our current system. That's a, that's just PM that's not call outs for problems. Whether it's the St. Helens is reporting an issue in downtown that's on our dime for time and materials to fix whatever it is. So the PMs are done at every single site. That's just shy of 180 \$190,000 a year that we invest to do that. On top of that, we actually have been working on system improvements, since I got here. So in 2019, we started and there's a document that I shared with Fire Defense Board, and it's on the front table there; it's the Advisory Committee for today. And I outlined every step that we've taken with our backhaul system, that's the sub system of our land, mobile radio system, microwave system. It's microwave, that's just radio, it's not putting popcorn in the microwave. And this is part of the subsystem of our system' of our overall system. And it's agnostic. So the monies that we're investing in that system are going to be used in whatever new system. All told, we've invested around \$2.2 million in the last three years to upgrade our current system that will be able to be passed on to the new system and we're continuing that. This month I'm going before the Board and I'm asking for somewhere around 700,000. For the next three hops, one two three of microwave. And also on the table is upgrading our radio consoles, the radio systems that our dispatchers actually use inside of dispatch. That's not a small investment either. That's another \$450,000-\$500,000 investment that we're committed to make. So we are doing things progressively and positively to maintain our current system. And we're doing it wisely, that those investments can be utilized for the next generation of system.

**Mike Russell** 33:16

That's good to know. I appreciate that.

**Mike Fletcher** 33:18

Chief.

**Rob Davis** 33:19

Mike, I hear what you're saying with trying to do some more studies and getting the data right of the system we have now. I guess my question is, why would we keep throwing money at looking at what we currently have? When what we currently have has to be upgraded, it literally makes no difference. Even if we, even if we buy a brand new VHF, we're throwing money at a, at a test to gather some data for what? We're going to replace it all, even if we decided, which I don't think that's the direction most of us are feeling, but if we're buying new systems, why are we throwing money at gathering data from a system that we already know doesn't work, right? That is outdated, it's not supported, it's getting too old, like you're wasting your money on something that has no relevance for us.

**Mike Russell** 34:11

Other than being able to compare it to a new system.

**Rob Davis** 34:13

But it's not comparable, right? What we get now today is not going to be comparable to what we have that was put into this county, how many years ago; your apples and oranges. We're gathering data on an outdated system that doesn't work. And we're looking to purchase and install a new system that meets the needs of the user agencies that are sitting in this room. So we're throwing money at a system that is broke. And it should not make a difference in where, in the direction we're going. We're pouring money into something that doesn't make sense.

**Mike Russell** 34:46

Chief Pricher.

**Jeff Pricher** 34:48

I understand what you're saying. But I think the point that's being missed is even if there's a direction that is put out today and tomorrow the Board's like, yup, we're going 800. It's going to take five years or longer to build out. We still need to be able to communicate, we need to know what's wrong.

**Rob Davis** 35:04

But I don't I don't think...

**Jeff Pricher** 35:05

That's stuff we don't know right now. Like, that's, that's one of the things that Mike was talking about is having the vendors go out there, look at some of these components and find out, like, is this thing going to fall apart today? Or tomorrow? And is there something we can do to limp this along with a little bit more baling wire, and duct tape until the new system gets put in.

**Rob Davis** 35:27

Well wouldn't we want to do that with our vendor that's servicing, I mean, we're looking at third party companies to give us a non biased opinion. And if we're going a different direction, let's get the guys that worked on it to say, hey, we need you to piece this together for the next however long it's gonna take for design and implementation. This has to work until we get to a new system. Instead of going through another process to source more vendors to get some other opinion, that doesn't matter. Let's figure out whatever we need to do today to keep this system functional for the next two to three years, from go time, instead of just throwing money at data that isn't fixing the problem. Let's identify the problems and fix what we have to fix now to keep it running and move for a new solution.

**Dustin King** 36:19

I'm looking around the room. I've got some some of you guys that I started with a long time ago. I've been using this system since June 2003. When it like, I think it's when it went online right? Right around then, 2004? Somewhere in there. It's no better today than it was then, it just hasn't changed. So I'm a, I agree with Chief I'm of the opinion, I'm not sure that we really need to know how bad it is. We already know. It's bad. And I don't know that any kind of data is going to help us know that.

**Rob Davis** 36:52

I'd rather see you put whatever money you're going to put into this study into fixing what we have now to keep it running until we get something new.

**Mike Russell** 37:01

So I want to refocus, appreciate

**Mike Fletcher** 37:03

This is all good input.

**Mike Russell** 37:04

Yeah. I want to refocus back on the city's offer. I have not heard any support for it yet. Is there anybody who would like to speak in support of it, I just want to make sure that if there is somebody who feels strongly about that, that they have opportunity to speak. That's pretty definitive. Okay, so I will, I think the Board is looking, the

Board of the District, is looking for some advice from us. And to that end, I'd like to entertain a motion to the effect that we don't think the Board should take the city's offer.

**Rob Davis** 37:51

I'll make a motion. I believe that the 9-1-1 District needs to continue on the path with the studies that we already have and that we don't entertain a motion to interject another study into this program.

**Mike Russell** 38:07

Need a second.

**Joel Medina** 38:11

I'll second.

**Mike Russell** 38:11

It's been moved and seconded to have the District move forward and that the offer from the city not be taken up by the Board? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor please say aye.

**Group** 38:34

Aye.

**Mike Russell** 38:36

All those opposed, same sign? Hearing none. All, any who abstain, sorry, any who abstain?

**Jeff Pricher** 38:46

Yes.

**Steven Lougal** 38:47

Yes.

**Mike Russell** 38:49

Two abstentions? Motion passes.

**Mike Fletcher** 38:54

Okay.

**Mike Russell** 38:54

So that is the official recommendation from the committee.

**Mike Fletcher** 38:57

Thank you sir.

**Mike Russell** 38:59

All right, let's move on to, we've already been talking about it, but the current overview of the Advisory Committee and Board of Directors position which is as I characterized before, divided. Maybe this is where you want to provide the fire...

**Mike Fletcher** 39:23

I think there's some more information that I'd like to share with the greater group here.

**Mike Russell** 39:31

Ok, go ahead Mike.

**Mike Fletcher** 39:31

So there are opportunities knocking at the door here. And there are steps that we are taking from the District's perspective for the new system. And we talked about briefly the one, which is the microwave system. That's going to be an investment that we're making, that's good dollars going towards a new system. And we're going to continue that process through this, this next fiscal year. The other thing that has come to our attention, so we, I think everybody's aware that both Clackamas County and Washington County and actually portions of Northern Marion and Yamhill County are on the single radio system, the WCN system. And over the last several years, they have worked on upgrading a heavy forklift of their system. They've invested 150 plus million dollars to upgrade that system.

**Mike Russell** 40:29

Just to be clear, Mike, that's not WCCCA, right?

**Mike Fletcher** 40:32

That is WCCCA, Clackamas, Newburg... Yep, so it's the WCCCA system, WCN. In that process, there are opportunities to grab surplus equipment. So right now on the table, I have for sure, eight towers available to us and a possible ninth. And over the last month, we've gotten down to brass tacks on those towers. Those agencies, those those two entities, Clackamas County and Washington County, are obligated to decommission these old sites. There's nothing wrong with the sites, it's just that they have a heavier loading requirements on their towers than we do. And so, but they're obligated to decommission the sites and trash everything if they want. But they understand that we are in the process of upgrading our system. And we've all assumed that we need new sites. So towers, if I were to go out today to Valmont or somebody, some some manufacturer and need towers, we're going to spend six figures easy, per site, maybe 260, they go up, it all depends on how big how tall all that stuff, but a lot of money. And we have an opportunity to pay, but I want to clarify what we're paying for. We're paying for purposeful dismantling of these towers. And so they can be tagged. So we can, they're like erector sets, as long as we have the tags of every part, we can reassemble them on our locations in the near future. So we're in negotiations to take the pick of the crop of these towers for very little money. We would pay for the dismantling, we'd pay for the storage, or the transport out here; I'm working with the county to help us with storage site to secure these towers. And it's probably going to be an investment, maybe 30,000 maybe on the crazy outside 40,000 per tower to dismantle, pack, transport out here and store. So that's an investment. There's no reason not to do this, these are perfectly good towers. And like I said, we're looking at that. Part of our... sorry, Shawn?

**Mike Russell** 40:36

Okay.

**Shaun Brown** 43:07

Do the towers come with any antennas or receivers or anything or just the towers only?

**Mike Fletcher** 43:12

Just the towers, and they you know, to be clear, whatever we get has to be reengineered for wherever we're going to put it. And so, you know, we have to build our own foundations. Those would be engineered spec'd, and we'd have to have some new hardware, like the bolts; you don't reuse the bolts. But for the most part, but some of the towers do have the mounts for antennas, whether they're sticks, or microwave antennas, the dishes; those are already included. And if they're serviceable, we'll use those. Chief?

**Jeff Pricher** 43:44

Are the towers new enough to where the foundation components of the base of the tower are still available?

**Mike Fletcher** 43:55

So the mounts for the concrete we would put in new ones.

**Jeff Pricher** 44:00

Right. But generally the manufacturers have things that go into the concrete.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:05

Yes.

**Jeff Pricher** 44:06

And the question I'm asking is, are the towers new enough to where you would be able to go out and buy those?

**Mike Fletcher** 44:11

Yes.

**Jeff Pricher** 44:11

Okay.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:12

Yep. Chief?

**Joel Medina** 44:14

You said that there might be nine towers available? How many towers would we actually need? We wouldn't need all nine, would we?

**Mike Fletcher** 44:21

I don't think so. And you're correct. We, we know that there's some but again, it goes back to that apples, or the chicken and the egg, we need to know what type of system we want to build and then we identify. We know what we have today our, our current sites.

**Joel Medina** 44:36

So out of the nine let's say we need four or five.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:39

Correct.

**Joel Medina** 44:40

So if you spend \$30,000 for four it's \$120,000.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:45

Yep.

**Joel Medina** 44:45

So you're talking about for the towers alone, you'd be spending less than you would spend if we had to buy one tower.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:51

Correct.

**Joel Medina** 44:52

That seems like a no brainer.

**Mike Fletcher** 44:53

Yeah, agreed. And so that's why we're and all of these towers, we have the art architectural drawings from the original build already. So it makes things very quick and efficient to, to gather these pieces of equipment, store it, and we can utilize it for whatever, whenever. So that's in play. One of our projects that we are currently doing today is a complete rebuild of one of our sites the Meisner, Meissner lookout site. And that is a surplus tower from Washington County that is a surplus shelter, generator, we're buying new fuel tanks for it. So that's already in play. And that's another thing that we are doing to help improve our current system that will be transferable to any new system. So that's going on. So that's a win, that's an opportunity. And this is very new information. So Friday, and this really is very fluid. So Maryjo, could I have you pass these out to our guests please? So I had a meeting Friday with folks from C800, and WCCCA. And our topic conversation was focused on the towers. We have the whole list of nine that we're going over all the pieces and parts, it's an erector set. And the conversation turned to how are we doing as a District with our radio system replacement project. And I'm upfront and honest with him saying we're stuck, we're spinning wheels in the mud because we as a group, both the users and the Board are stuck between really, whether we should stay on VHF or we should go to seven 800. There's the whole conversation should we own and operate our own system? Or should we partner with a neighbor? And the question was asked, why don't we give the users both? Meaning VHF and 700/800. So that's a hybrid system. Yeah. Yeah, I know that's technically possible, but it's expensive because really, you have two systems. And it's complicated, very technical complications. And they offered something that was pretty stunning. It's not really well known publicly, but it should be, the Clackamas portion of the C800 WCCCA system is built out, as is WCCCA's. And it went live brand new, just this past January. What has determined, what has come to light over the last couple of months is the C800, the Clackamas portion of the project is financially broke. They spent all of their bond money, and they overspent. So the project management, the project manager, kind of mismanaged kinda. They're somewhere between four and \$8 million upside down. Very painful. And so that's part of the reason why we got called in to help if we're interested in taking the load off of their decommissioning. So we can help with that if there's towers there that we're interested in, that helps cut some of their losses. Not much because really, we're talking \$30,000 is, you know, a rounding error at best, at eight million dollar deficit. So but we're, we're we're at the table. The other thing that they brought to our attention is they have made the painful decision not to finish building some of their sites that they had planned on, because they were still in construction. Winter weather caused a lot of delays and so they have sitting on the ground in warehouses, never opened out of the box, three full P25 800 megahertz ASR sites.

**Joel Medina** 49:22

Brand new completely never opened?

**Mike Fletcher** 49:23

Brand new, never, never broke the seal. So there's three for sure. And there's a potential fourth site that is available. And here's the offer on the table to us. We're first in line because we have extremely good relationships with Washington County and Clackamas County. Their offer is those sites, if you bought them



today, the way they are configured; there's eight channels and 10 channels, three out of the four are completely licensed ready to go plug and play, including services from Motorola for all the programming, standing them up, testing them, accepting them. If you, they have MPLS, so they can be monitored, and they are all alarmed for a site, they're ready to go. If you went out on the market today to buy that it's about 650,000 per site. These things were bought by contract, froze the the price in 2017. That 2017 price was about 500,000 per site. So the offer on the table is if we're interested, they would sell them to us at that 2017 price plus 40% discount. That drops those sites to a cash value of about 300,000. I made a technical error yesterday, a math error because I was doing it on the fly. It's about \$300,000 per site, all included.

**Rob Davis** 49:28

So you're basically getting a two for one.

**Mike Fletcher** 51:12

Exactly. So, well that's interesting, cheap.

**Jeff Pricher** 51:19

Quick question. With this incredible opportunity, does it lock us into one vendor? Meaning if through our process, we determined that we can only afford radios from a different manufacturer as opposed to Motorola. How would that work?

**Mike Fletcher** 51:49

So fair question. Good question. And I'm gonna get to it because there's different ways to answer your question. So if we're talking about transmitters, receivers, core versus subscriber radios, that's a different answer. There are different subscriber radios - your portables, your mobiles - that can talk on a Motorola core, Motorola system - Kenwood, BKs - there's all sorts of manufacturers of subscriber radios that can operate in that system. But for the sites and the core, that's a Motorola system. So on the table is, we don't know exactly how many, if we were going to go seven 800, I don't know exactly how many sites we need. But in reviewing the Federal report, reviewing the RFI submissions, it varies; four, five, six - it's somewhere in that, that ballpark of how many seven 800 sites we need. The kind of complicating thing we have to remember is the, the solution to partner with CRESA versus WCCCA - the only real difference between those two is CRESA had one more site that would help us, I think they had four sites, maybe five sites that provided some coverage in County for us on their system on their core, and WCCCA had either four or five, I can't remember but it was one less than the CRESA option. But they both have sites that impact us and help us for coverage. We're just talking about in County ourselves what we would have to build. And so again, if we looked at the Federal report versus the submissions of the RFI, that number varies depending on the manufacturer, whether it was Tate, or Motorola. What we didn't ask for in the RFI, what nobody provided a solution for in the RFI was a hybrid system. That wasn't I mean, we had a standalone VHF we had a standalone 700 and we had a solution to partner with neighboring eight hundreds, nobody suggested a hybrid system.

**Mike Russell** 54:23

And that was because of the cost? Just...way out of bounds

**Mike Fletcher** 54:26

It's usually out of bounds. That doesn't mean to say that they're not out there because they are they're all across the country. There's hybrid systems because they serve the purpose that what we're hearing about here is we have a core group of people mostly along the Highway 30 that could really benefit from a seven 800 system. They're going in and out of Multnomah and Washington County, on daily basis multiple times a day,

and they need interop with our neighbors to the East and the South, makes sense. We have a whole group that VHF is what they're used to and comfortable with and this provides both. So...

**Mike Russell** 54:42

How would that operate? I mean, how? So if you came into town, would you have to switch channels?

**Mike Fletcher** 55:17

No. So if, if we went to a hybrid system, there's a lot of ifs here, and I'm not the smartest person, I'm not an engineer. But, if you have a hybrid system, it can be tied together. So let's say this...

**Mike Russell** 55:33

So the tower, the tower knows where you are and switches you...

**Mike Fletcher** 55:33

and the brain of the system, the core would be patched to the VHF channel and the seven or 800 channel would be patched together. So it doesn't matter if you're on dispatch and missed and you're on VHF, it's going to simulcast broadcast on both VHF and the seven 800 system. Chief?

**Joel Medina** 55:55

Um, part of the concern I know that we had with the 700/800 was our communications with ODF. So I guess this question would be with for ODF. ODF uses VHF? Ok, is there any chance that, that ODF as a whole would ever change to 700 or 800 in the near future? Probably not because of the cost right?

**Jasen McCoy** 56:09

I think so...

**Mike Fletcher** 56:09

Correct.

**Jasen McCoy** 56:16

No, no.

**Joel Medina** 56:18

Because that was a concern. So if you go with a hybrid system, it would enhance our communication plus, we could still communicate with ODF clearly.

**Mike Fletcher** 56:24

Correct. Yeah, the proposal has always been from the District's perspective, if if this District decided to go to its own 700 or 800 system, or partnered, we would be supplying dual band subscriber radios, and so that you're seamless. That's okay. Yeah. So we were committed to maintain our relationship with ODF. And even, you know, Clatsop County, because West End interfaces with them and so we need that capability as well, regardless. So...

**Rob Davis** 57:09

I'm assuming this hybrid solution, is this kind of the C800s, what they had between like up in Hoodland, and Hoodlands Fire District where they were running VHF tied to the 800 system, that same concept?

**Mike Fletcher** 57:19

Yeah.

**Rob Davis** 57:20

That worked flawlessly for years there. Yeah.

**Mike Fletcher** 57:21

Yeah, for 20 years. Hoodland gave up finally and so did Colton. And they went to 800 this, this year, but...

Yeah, but it did work. Absolutely.

**Mike Russell** 57:32

I guess I'm concerned. One of the, one of the issues is equipment becoming obsolete and then hard to find or replace. Is that going to be an issue with our VHF system? If we do a hybrid? Will our VHF system continue to be patched? You know, we're doing the best we can with eBay or whatever... Is that going to be a problem?

**Mike Fletcher** 57:54

Right. So if, if the decision is at least to research, the hybrid system, the intent would be well, this is a great deal, everybody agrees that's a screaming deal for those, those three, four sites that are available to us. And if we're going to do the hybrid, then we would basically absolutely rebuild brand new VHF system. That would be an underlayer of the, the high band seven 800 over the top. So then it comes down to well, do we want to own and operate our own hybrid system, utilizing these either three or four Tom Peterson, low cost deals? There's, there's two points on that. I need to backup because you had asked a question. Talk about obsolete, these, these things are technically I think they're two, two years old. They were purchased contracted in 17. But they weren't manufactured and delivered, I think until 19 or 20. And then they've been sitting in storage. So they're technically, I think, two years old. Are we getting used equipment that we have to uplift, upgrade? The answer is no, maybe. So this is, this is the next question is, if we partnered with specifically the WCN system, then the answer is no, no risk at all because they have a guaranteed system upgrade agreement with Motorola and that, that system is a continual annual upgrade of the entire system servers, radios - this is the core stuff not subscriber radios. That the system is brand spankin new for a 10 year period because Motorola upgrades it every single year. So it's always the latest greatest freshest releases of the entire system for a 10 year period. So these three or four positions would be included in that. And so they would be brought up to brand new standards as soon as we say go. If we choose not to partner and we do a standalone, is that still an option? Sure, we could purchase a Motorola core, we could purchase an SUA, and that system would then be upgraded as well. There's a cost to that, if we're doing a standalone. There's a cost if we build our own core, versus just joining onto a system that already has a core. So it's really value. But these are all good questions, but they need to be, I mean, I could sit here for the next two hours and talk off the top of my head, but I suspect we'd want concrete answers from the experts whether that's WCN, or CRESA, or Motorola. Shaun.

**Shaun Brown** 1:01:10

Yeah, if you have the hybrid and you have both bands, does it increase your redundancy? So if you lose 800 the VHF sites still work and vice versa?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:01:22

So there is, there's a potential of some redundancy. And also there's, there's a question within that question and an answer. It depends on the level of redundancy. So a Motorola core is redundant, internally. It's got two brains inside of the system, kind of like your server can have two power supplies, two motherboards it can do that. And the Motorola comes internally redundant. So one core is actually two systems. An advantage of the WCN system is they actually own two complete cores. So it's four times redundant. So there's two cores at the

new WCCCA, there's two cores at Clackamas 9-1-1. And those systems are tied together. So it's four times redundant. The, the VHF would live in that same core. So I'd have to do some brain thinking, it would certainly be redundant within the one core, but I don't know if it'd be actually living in both. But that's a fair question to ask, I don't know. Chief?

**Jeff Pricher** 1:02:33

Isn't there some inherent redundancy anyway, with VHF in that if we lost towers in our great subduction earthquake that is forecasted, VHF carries better than 800.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:02:48

So, again, there's multiple answers to that. So yes, well, it's better, it's just different I would say. It propagates different than seven 800. And whether that's good or bad, it depends on your perspective. VHF is great, because it transmits a long ways. It can hear for a long ways. The bad news about VHF, it transmits a long ways and it can hear a long ways. And that's part of our current problem. I can be in Clatskanie's fire station and listen to Tacoma fire being dispatched today. That's a problem. That's the beauty and the pain of VHF. So... Shaun?

**Shaun Brown** 1:03:44

The hybrid VHF, that would be a digital VHF.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:03:47

Yes, it'd be P25. So you know, there's, I have a million questions myself, I'm sure you do.

**Mike Russell** 1:04:00

So are we, your proposal is to maybe make a recommendation to investigate a hybrid system, do what's necessary to investigate a hybrid system?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:04:14

I want to listen to what my boss's say.

**Joel Medina** 1:04:22

I would, I would be happy to make a motion to direct...

**Mike Russell** 1:04:28

Are we ready to do that? Do you want to have some discussion? Okay. I'd hate for it to go down in flames because we're not ready yet. So hold, hold on to that.

**Dustin King** 1:04:38

So I'm circling back to the time delay thing. If we go back and do, we have options on the table already, right? We have standalone 700/800, standalone VHF, own/operate and partnership. So we're already looking at that. We've, we've been talking about this at nauseam for a year. The question that I have and again, I don't work out in the county, I used to and so I was used to string and a can standing up on one to try to get my VHF radio to work. Okay, so I, just based on I'm not an engineer, but based on my experience being out in the county, I'm not convinced that VHF is really going to work that much better out in the hinterlands. So is there some data from the Federal Engineering study that says that this is necessary? Or are we looking at a hybrid thing just to kind of make the ball move forward?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:05:26

Yes, to both of those. So there is interest for VHF amongst this group, amongst the Board. So that solves that problem. But at a cost, right, because which is really better? And I don't, I'm not smart enough to say because to Chief Pricher, it's different. They just propagate differently. And so it's neither right or wrong, good or bad. It's just different.

**Mike Russell** 1:05:52

But with more sites, it's going to be better. Right? As we add sites.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:05:57

It depends on where you add those sites.

**Mike Russell** 1:05:59

Well, yeah.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:05:59

All that stuff is true.

**Dustin King** 1:06:01

My, my concern is Mike is if it were, if what I'm hearing is correct and we spend a bunch more money to build a hybrid system, because some of us in the room think VHF is better, versus some of us think 700/800 is better. And none of us are engineers, when the Federal Engineering report says, go to 700/800, get off VHF - that's what my opinion is, trust the study and if that's what it says, then we don't spend that much more money just to get... it seems redundant.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:06:31

Can I jump in there? So to your point, this morning, on my way, this is so new, I mean, literally Friday night, eight o'clock, we're working this deal. Yesterday, I spent the morning with the Fire Defense Board, and I'm working trying to answer questions that I knew this group is going to have. Seven o'clock this morning. I'm on the phone with our PM from Federal Engineering. Hey, newsflash, look what I have. What do you think? At that price point? Totally valid. Totally. It is a screaming deal. It's complicated. So can it be done? Absolutely, positively. But it's a new study, because nobody looked at that RF coverage for a hybrid, but it's worth the look, is that what they said. The other thing they wanted to talk about was if we bought all this stuff, yay, deep discount and we built our own hybrid? Yes, you can do that, too. There are built in advantages to partnering that you don't have to spend, you would have to spend if you did it yourself. The other issue is, okay, what if we partnered with them and we get all this stuff and then three years, five years, whatever, we decide, we really don't want this partnership, can we get a divorce and do it ourselves? Absolutely, you can. You can get a divorce. It's an expensive divorce, because now you're going to build your own core. Okay, you can do that. You're looking at a million or \$2 million for that investment. The services with that exponentially go up. And again, then you go back to third party vendor to maintain it. And it's a complicated system, so choose wisely.

**Rob Davis** 1:08:44

So my question is, if we buy these sites, these hybrid sites that are VHF and seven 800...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:08:52

The sites that are available for us are eight hundreds.

**Rob Davis** 1:08:55

The ones from C800 are only 800 sites? So if that is the direction we're going, regardless of whether we go seven 800, hybrid, whatever, why would we not be trying to get this deal? Because it is the system we will end up with, regardless of whether we buy these sites or we go buy some brand new ones at 600 and something \$1,000 a site. This is the direction I mean, this is the direction the Federal Engineering report said, I don't want to speak out of turn, but I mean, I think after the discussion that we had yesterday it doesn't matter what we're, whether we're building seven 800 or hybrid. This is a...

**Joel Medina** 1:09:41

We're gonna need equipment.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:09:43

Yep.

**Rob Davis** 1:09:43

We need the equipment and we can save hundreds and hundreds of 1000s...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:09:45

millions...

**Rob Davis** 1:09:45

by taking this deal.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:09:47

So I agree with Chief Davis. Based on what was initially proposed on the table for discussion, kind of went a bunch of different directions is, does the user board support the purchase of this equipment? And I think we do need to have somebody call that question if they're ready. I mean, I'll do it, I think we need to purchase the equipment. With respect to all these proposals VHF, 800, hybrid, I don't, I don't really think we should say what we want or what we don't want, because we don't know what the cost is.

**Mike Russell** 1:09:47

Chief.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:09:59

That's fact.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:10:34

And the important thing is moving forward with some of the direction that I think Mike is asking for so we can find those costs. The flaw with the Federal Engineering report, is the Federal Engineering report is based on our current sites...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:10:55

correct...

**Jeff Pricher** 1:10:55

not what we need, not what's going to work best for our system. What we have right now and what we're stuck with, that isn't necessarily going to be best for us moving forward. And I think part of an engineering study

moving forward will help us to understand the best location for towers regardless of whether it's VHF, or 800, or hybrid.

**Rob Davis** 1:11:21

But I believe that comes in the design phase, if I remember correctly from the information we got, is that we will get those prime sites with our coverage based on the design phase...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:11:31

based on the...

**Jeff Pricher** 1:11:33

But the challenge is, we don't know what the cost is right now. And if we wait for that engineering report, once we've picked the system, we're basically pigeon holing ourselves into an expense, without truly understanding all of the costs. That is an issue. I support, whatever this board goes for, whether it's 800, hybrid, or VHF, but I'll tell you, my issue with, with representing our agency of Scappoose Fire is cost. If we're going for a 30, 40, \$50 million bond to build out a brand new radio system, I'm probably not going to support that because there are things that I need to do via bond in my own district. I can't make a decision until I know what the cost is. So, you know, to hopefully kick things along, I support what Chief Davis is saying, let's purchase the equipment, because regardless, we need it. And if we don't need it, we go whatever direction we go, we can still sell it. So hopefully we can move on to the next topic.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:12:50

Well, I want to jump on that Chief. In the conversations that I had Friday night, again this morning with Federal, and over the last couple of days, I've reread portions of all of the submissions from the RFI, and there are some assumptions in there that are no longer valid. And that's kind of what I started off with is what the District has been doing over the last three years has a fiscal impact on that bottom line cost of whatever system we're going to, because we have invested a couple million dollars already in the backhaul. And in those solutions that were presented to us in the RFI, and even in the solutions that Federal Engineering reported, it includes a complete refresh of the backhaul system, which that's done, or will be done soon. So take that off the table. They all talked about new radio consoles, that's a half million dollar investment. We can take that off the table, because we're paying for cash with that today, relatively. So and we are making incremental improvements that down spends those quotes already. And so, to your point, Rob is absolutely true, it's an offer, it's a great offer, but we need more information. And that, part of that is asking in this case, because this is Motorola equipment, it does pigeon you hole, if we're buying that, it does kind of point, paint you in a corner. Okay. Well it is what it is. Let's ask what a true performance design, following the same parameters that we have already established, which is 95% coverage, 3.4 at the hip, etc, etc. based on these four sites - how many more, because what, do we need more than these four for 800? I don't know. Let's ask the question. And then with the VHF overlay or underlay, how many sites and where those sites need to be based on a hybrid Motorola system? Sorry, Chief.

**Joel Medina** 1:15:09

I agree with the fire chief from Scappoose, he makes some valid points. And the issue though is that, you know, I mean, we have a beer budget.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:15:20

Yep.



**Joel Medina** 1:15:22

We can't have champagne taste. So if we have a beer budget, then we are going to get pigeonholed into a certain, only certain areas that we can afford. I mean, I'd love to have a Mercedes. But you know, we can afford a Kia. I mean, I can't get a Mercedes for what a Kia costs.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:15:42

Right.

**Joel Medina** 1:15:42

So I'm locked into Kia, I mean, that's just the same thing it's going to happen. If we're gonna get such a great deal on these towers and the towers are proprietary to Motorola, then we're going to have to get pigeonholed to Motorola because the savings outweighs what, what happens. Now, are they going to know that, that we're had to go in that direction and maybe that impacts our bargaining? Yeah, but we still have to look at the fact that we're saving this kind of money because the cost is an, is an option to, is...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:16:12

a driver...

**Joel Medina** 1:16:12

impacts everybody.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:16:13

Absolutely.

**Joel Medina** 1:16:13

And then the Fire Defense Board meeting yesterday, the one thing that we were all in unison was, cost. I agree with, with Chief Pricher because I'm going to have to float a bond soon in the Columbia River District for certain needs that I have. And if CCOM beats me to the punch, I mean, whether you spend 5 million or 10 million the voters are going to look at that as, you already spent money, I come back with another bond, they're just gonna say no. If I go ahead of time and I get mine approved, then I'm going to jam CCOM. So I think we need to come up with a, with a, with a plan to keep moving forward. But if we decided that, I liked the idea, we could always sell the sites if we buy them. I mean, that's a significant amount of savings. Then maybe we could just vote to see if we can move forward with those sites, because we are going to need them no matter what. And I think that if we requested information about a hybrid site, it wouldn't take anywhere near as long as, it's not going to take like six or seven months, because...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:17:16

no...

**Joel Medina** 1:17:16

they have a lot of the information right now.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:17:18

Correct? They do. Sure.

**Mike Russell** 1:17:20

So, so Chief, did you have a pending motion related to that?

**Joel Medina** 1:17:25

Yes. So my, my motion would be that we look and request information for a hybrid site as, as an option. And then, that would be my first motion, then I guess, I think another motion to move forward with purchasing the equipment.

**Mike Russell** 1:17:43

Okay.

**Joel Medina** 1:17:43

Which motion should go first?

**Mike Russell** 1:17:44

Let's go with the first, your first motion.

**Joel Medina** 1:17:47

Which is the request for information for a hybrid site.

**Mike Russell** 1:17:51

Correct.

**Joel Medina** 1:17:51

That's the motion that I make on the table then.

**Mike Russell** 1:17:53

Do I have a second?

**Greg Brody** 1:17:54

I second that.

**Mike Russell** 1:17:55

It's been moved and seconded to get more information on the hybrid system, and that would be forwarded to the Board. Any discussion? Anybody online? Want to make sure I'm not forgetting you folks? Hearing no discussion, all those in favor say... Chief Pricher sorry.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:18:21

What's that gonna cost?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:18:24

Asking the question? It's free.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:18:26

Okay.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:18:27

Yep.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:18:30

Sorry, I just heard study and then questions. I just want to make sure because I know there are some agency partners in here that again, are concerned about time and cost.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:18:40

So...

**Jeff Pricher** 1:18:40

Just want to make sure everyone's clear.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:18:42

So for the discussion, so again, this is fast and furious information coming in, and it was started Friday night. And I want to verify the information, the dollar amounts that I've been quoted. So I'm dealing with really four people, the Board of C800, the two directors of two PSAPs that are helping do a forensic study of their financing. And they're the money people saying this is how much upside down we are. What are we as a Board willing to sell and at what cost? So I want to verify with those parties, which I have not done? And then I want to confirm because this is, Motorola is a player in this because they're the ones who are short the money. And so I want to talk to my rep and say is this real? Is this all the equipment as it's presented to me? I need verification of that. And then I can start asking serious questions about asking for them to go back and recalculate their coverage maps based on their equipment and what I'm hearing is a hybrid. So VHF with a seven 800 overlay. So...

**Mike Russell** 1:20:07

So to clarify the motion, it's to get more information?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:20:09

Yep.

**Joel Medina** 1:20:10

Yeah, to go get more information. And, it should go relatively faster because they have a lot of information already.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:20:15

Absolutely. And I can, I can ask I think for an updated budgetary number, a realistic one for us.

**Rob Davis** 1:20:24

With the new system.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:20:25

Yep.

**Rob Davis** 1:20:26

Okay.

**Mike Russell** 1:20:29

Any other discussion? All those in favor say aye.

**Group** 1:20:34

Aye.

**Mike Russell** 1:20:35

All those opposed, same sign. Any abstentions? Motion passes. Chief Medina, second motion.

**Joel Medina** 1:20:47

Okay. So the second motion is that we move forward with pursuing the provisions to purchasing the equipment that, that had been offered to us. And then we need to verify that those are the actual numbers?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:21:06

Correct.

**Joel Medina** 1:21:07

I guess that should be the motion, that we move forward and verify that the purchasing of the equipment is done under the guise of the numbers that we have preliminarily received. And I think that's the only motion we can make right now. To say, yes, that's what it's gonna cost us to make sure. And then this group has to then vote once we get something official to do it. So I think the only motion we can make right now is that one.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:21:33

That makes sense.

**Mike Russell** 1:21:35

So the motion is to verify the numbers. Generally, we're supportive of moving forward buying the equipment, but we need to verify.

**Rob Davis** 1:21:45

Second.

**Mike Russell** 1:21:46

There's this, we've moved and seconded. Any discussion? Chief Pricher.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:21:52

So just to get this out, I'm in support of purchasing the equipment or moving forward with this, but if I understand what Mike was saying, the equipment is broken into two categories. There's the towers, and then there's the radio cores. Unsure about the radio core, right? The Motorola equipment. But the towers that are being dismantled are completely separate from, from the other purchase.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:22:19

Correct. And just for clarification, towers is towers, the structures like out here. The radio equipment is not the core. It is site, site equipment. So transmitters, receivers, switches, licensing, MPLS, networking, alarms. Yeah.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:22:44

So again, just to clarify...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:22:46

That's the stuff that goes inside...

**Jeff Pricher** 1:22:48

The towers, to me seems like a no brainer. The other stuff we're waiting on, is there a way we can split or clarify the initial motion?

**Joel Medina** 1:22:57

Well we're not making any, any motion other than to find out that those numbers are accurate?

**Jeff Pricher** 1:23:02

Okay, sorry.

**Joel Medina** 1:23:02

And once we get a definition that the numbers are accurate, then this body can decide if we want to spend the money on those numbers...

**Eric Smythe** 1:23:09

or what's included in the price...

**Joel Medina** 1:23:10

or what's included in the price. Because you could say \$10. And it could be like, yeah, everything except for, you know, the top of the tower? Well, we need to know exactly the provisions of what they're talking about - what equipment to list and how much it's going to be. And then we can make a good educated decision as to how to move forward.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:23:28

Now were the towers, did you get an accurate number for that? Or was that still not an accurate number?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:23:33

So I have a list of the towers, their heights, that and the types of towers that they are, where they are, and there's different land use requirements, depending on where those towers are. So the bottom, the bottom line is...

**Jeff Pricher** 1:23:50

The ones that are being dismantled.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:23:51

Yep.

**Jeff Pricher** 1:23:51

They quoted us a price. My question is, is that price good? Or is that still a price that you're not sure about?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:23:58

It depends on the site locations because they have, where those are, have different land use requirements for reclamation? It's de minimis numbers. I mean, literally, it's going to be either \$15,000 to take it apart and grind down the foundation a couple of feet and throw gravel and dirt over the top or it's going to be 30,000. Or it's going to be 40,000. Depends on the tower and complications, but it's minor dollars, really. Thank you, you answered my question. Very good.

**Joel Medina** 1:24:32

Is it gonna cost Columbia River any money to do this kind of stuff?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:24:35

Zero.

**Joel Medina** 1:24:36

Okay, that's all I wanted to hear.

**Rob Davis** 1:24:37

Is motion on the table, we're talking that the tower systems, not the towers themselves?

**Joel Medina** 1:24:45

Talking about both.

**Mike Russell** 1:24:47

So the motion is to get more information and to clarify the cost for the equipment, both the towers and the site equipment, and come back at a later time to this to make a decision on whether or not to move forward and purchase. That's my understanding of the motion. Is that correct?

**Joel Medina** 1:25:04

Yes, that's correct.

**Rob Davis** 1:25:05

Perfect.

**Mike Russell** 1:25:08

Any other discussion?

**Nathan Hughes** 1:25:10

Last cut too, by the way. Out there.

**Mike Russell** 1:25:10

Any other discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

**Group** 1:25:21

Aye.

**Mike Russell** 1:25:23

All those opposed, same sign. Any abstentions? Motion passes.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:25:32

Understood.

**Mike Russell** 1:25:36

Is that it?

**Mike Fletcher** 1:25:37

That's all I have, I guess the next meeting is probably going to be dependent on how long it takes for me to get concrete answers.

**Mike Russell** 1:25:45

So that's my question to the group. Do you want to wait till our next quarterly meeting? Or do we want to push Mike and make, make a meeting for next month? Or what's the...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:25:58

pleasure of the board...

**Mike Russell** 1:25:59

Pleasure of the Advisory Committee? [INAUDIBLE \*overlapping speech\*]

**Rob Davis** 1:26:02

I think we need to keep this on the forefront and keep this vote moving forward.

**Mike Russell** 1:26:06

I completely agree, yes. [INAUDIBLE \*overlapping speech\*]

**Dustin King** 1:26:10

I have a question. Is the purpose of the next week to be whether we discuss partnerships owning and operating. I saw that on the agenda for today. Why don't we just leave that off and...

**Mike Fletcher** 1:26:18

I think we need more information about what we're potentially getting. And Maryjo reminded me that the next scheduled regular Advisory Committee meeting is the...

**Maryjo Beck** 1:26:28

July 26th.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:26:29

July 26th.

**Mike Russell** 1:26:30

Oh, ok. So that's coming right up.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:26:31

So that might work out.

**Rob Davis** 1:26:32

If you have information before that though, we'd be better suited to call another special meeting so that we are, that's almost a month and a half away. If you have information in two weeks, that is vital to this committee. I think it is worth all of our time to get together and continue pushing forward so that we can get this moving, versus waiting another six weeks to have meeting.



**Mike Russell** 1:26:54

Are you all open to meeting if it's within next two weeks? We'll do that. Let's just keep it open for now. But depending on what, how fast you find out, but it sounds like there's interest to keep going.

**Joel Medina** 1:27:08

A point of order.

**Mike Russell** 1:27:09

Yes sir.

**Joel Medina** 1:27:10

Should we then, for the officer of St. Helens for him to be able to bring back, should we table that, make a motion to table that decisions. Is that, would that be more official? Table the decisions as to whether we're going to go VHF, you know, own, operate, partnership, hybrid or whatever? Would it be appropriate? Do we need to do that?

**Mike Russell** 1:27:31

I don't think so. I think the decisions we made today have effectively done that.

**Rob Davis** 1:27:35

So then, do we also do, do we need to present the information from Fire Defence Board yesterday to this committee? In the discussion that we had in the direction as a Fire Defence Board? I think we should wait till, till we hear those numbers. Okay.

**Joel Medina** 1:27:51

That's my own personal feeling I don't know how anyone else feels about that. Unless, unless, unless you'd like to hear...

**Mike Russell** 1:27:58

If it would edify the discussion. I'm open to...

**Joel Medina** 1:28:01

Well I mean, I found that Chief Pricher and the fact that he's right though at the end of the day, we need to know how much things cost before we make decisions. So I think he's right in that, I think waiting would probably be the best way to go. Unless somebody feels differently.

**Dustin King** 1:28:16

I mean, out of morbid curiosity I'd like to know what they said, but that...

**Joel Medina** 1:28:25

Well we can, the Defense Board fire chief is here, he could do a quick briefing as to what we decided.

**Mike Russell** 1:28:30

Let's hear it, let's hear it.

**Eric Smythe** 1:28:32

Is that a thumbs up or you want to say?

**Joel Medina** 1:28:34

Yeah, thumbs up, go ahead.

**Eric Smythe** 1:28:35

So, so yesterday Mike, Mike came to the Fire Defence Board meeting and all of the fire chiefs were present, at the end of the day, and I'll make sure I don't misspeak for the group. So the district, the districts all agreed that seven 800 or the hybrid, if the hybrid is viable is optional. We'd like to see it owned by CCOM, or our own system. Worst case we still would like to see either the hybrid or seven 800 and the partnership probably with WCCCA. And that was the extent of all the fire districts came together and stated that so we were going to advise you if you wanted to know that today, but for the all five fire districts and then ODF just said yes, they didn't care. Kelly agreed for Jasen [INAUDIBLE] that, that parts not true, Kelly didn't do that Jasen don't worry about...

**Kelly Niles** 1:29:21

We'll talk about budget numbers later.

**Mike Russell** 1:29:24

You've been strangely quiet today. Are you feeling well?

**Jasen McCoy** 1:29:28

Yeah, I'm fine. I'm just taking it all in.

**Eric Smythe** 1:29:32

But as, but the Fire Defense Board we recognize that our that our system is antiquated. It needs to be upgraded and it needs to be upgraded county wide. And we want the best system possible, again within cost because as Chief Pricher and Chief Medina talked about, there are multiple districts that'll probably go for bonds over the next few years for infrastructure. And we're all going to be taking take a piece of the pie and our taxpayers will be the ones bearing the brunt of it.

**Mike Russell** 1:29:55

Any questions? Any questions? Seeing none, I think we're adjourned. Thank you all! Great meeting, thank you.

**Mike Fletcher** 1:30:11

Thank you.

11:31am      Adjourned.