

MARIN EMERGENCY RADIO AUTHORITY

c/o Novato Fire Protection District

95 Rowland Way, Novato, CA 94945

PHONE: (415) 878-2690 FAX: (415) 878-2660

www.meraonline.org

APPROVED: 6/24/15

GOVERNING BOARD

Minutes of May 13, 2015 Regular Meeting

Call to Order and Introductions:

The meeting was called to order by President Pearce on May 13, 2015 at 3:34 p.m. at the Novato Fire Protection District's Administration Office, Heritage Conference Room, 95 Rowland Way, Novato, CA 94945.

Self-introductions followed.

Governing Board Members & Alternates Present:

Town of Fairfax
City of Larkspur
City of Mill Valley
City of Novato
Town of Ross
Town of San Anselmo
County of Marin
City of Sausalito
Town of Tiburon
Bolin Fire Protection District
Inverness Public Utility District
Kentfield Fire Protection District
Marin Transit
Marin Municipal Water District
Novato Fire Protection District
Ross Valley Fire Service
Stinson Beach Fire Protection District
Tiburon Fire Protection District
Central Marin Police Authority

David Cron (Alternate)
Robert Sinnott
Jacqueline Graf-Reis (Alternate)
Jeanne MacLeamy
Tom Gaffney
Kay Coleman
Matthew Hymel
John Rohrbacher (Alternate)
David Hutton (Alternate)
Anita Tyrrell-Brown
Jim Fox
Paul Smith
Amy Van Doren
Bill Hogan
Brad Beedle
Richard Shortall
Kenny Stevens
Richard Pearce
Jim Shirk (Alternate)

Governing Board Member Agencies Absent:

City of Belvedere
Town of Corte Madera
City of San Rafael
Marin Community College District
Marinwood Community Services District
Southern Marin Fire Protection District

Staff Present:

NERA Executive Officer
NERA General Counsel
NERA Deputy E.O. – Next Gen Project
NERA Admin. Assistant – Next Gen Project
Communications Services Mgr. (DPW)
County Communications Engineer
Recording Secretary

Maureen Cassingham
Trisha Ortiz
Dave Jeffries
Alex Anderson
Shelly Nelson
Richard Chuck
Jennifer Schwarz

Guests Present:

Jim Gibbs, Martha Vujovich
Raul Rojas

Sperry Capital, Inc. Principals
County Public Works Director

A. Election of Officers for MERA Governing Board (President and Vice President)

Cassingham reported on the Executive Board's nominations of Pearce and Hymel for President and Vice President respectively. Both have served in these capacities since 2013 and have done tremendous jobs for MERA.

M/S/P MacLeamy/Sinnott to elect Pearce and Hymel as President and Vice President respectively.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

B. Consent Calendar

All matters on the Consent Calendar are to be approved with one motion unless a Member of the Governing Board or the public requests that a separate action be taken on a specific item.

1. Minutes from March 25, 2015 Governing Board Regular Meeting
2. Report #27 on Strategic Plan Implementation
3. Update on Bay Hill Tower and Site Sublease
4. Update on Measure A Validation Action
5. Proposed Revisions to MERA Public Records Administrative Policy
6. Confirmation of Monthly Regular Governing Board Meeting Dates: FY15-16

Cassingham commented on Item 6, noting there will need to be further discussion of the Governing Board's November meeting date at the next Governing Board meeting.

M/S/P Gaffney/Beedle to approve Consent Calendar Items 1-6 as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

C. Executive Officer's Report (Cassingham)

1) Report #3 on Next Gen Project Oversight Committee (NGPOC) – (Jeffries)

Jeffries report was distributed and summarized. He noted 6 proposals were submitted in response to the Wireless Communications Consultant RFP by the April 28 deadline. The May 7 proposal review date had to be rescheduled to May 21. Initial review of the proposed fees found them exceeding the fiscal authority of the Executive Board, necessitating a schedule change, to include Governing Board approval.

Jeffries said subsequent to proposal review and recommendation of vendors to be interviewed, the Selection Committee would conduct interviews and present the final ranking to the Next Gen Project Oversight Committee between June 18 and July 2. The Executive Board would receive the recommendation on July 8 and approve negotiations with the top vendor. DPW would conduct the negotiations and present the revised scope of services and contract to the Governing Board on August 26. The Board of Supervisors would award the contract in September. Jeffries confirmed for Gaffney that it is the Board of Supervisors who actually award the contract and administer it on behalf of MERA.

MacLeamy asked if Jeffries was pleased with the list of vendors. He responded that he was pleased with having 6 responders. 3 have prior experience in working with MERA. There is a significant range in services and fees to be considered. Rojas said for the narrow focus and specialized services we are seeking, 6 is not bad. AECOM, for example, is one of the largest firms in the world providing these services. The others are smaller but known to him. Pearce asked Rojas if the 5-week negotiations timeline could be compressed. Rojas said it depends on the turnaround timeline for both parties and time required to finalize scope of services. Pearce added that the timeline for this as well as the budget for the fees is critical to MERA and the Project. He added that the Governing Board approved \$90,000 for this contract and proposals are coming much higher. We need to be very watchful going forward with these costs. Nelson said the \$90,000 was to refresh the vendor RFP and that project management was another contract. Cassingham said Phase I costs were budgeted at \$90,000 and project management was Phase II. Nelson concurred. Cassingham added that the JPA specifies the spending authorities of both Boards and when over \$100,000, this puts the Governing Board back into the schedule. She asked Ortiz to review these authorizations to see if we can compress the approval schedule without compromising MERA's requirements or practices.

This would include more Governing Board delegation to the Executive Board. Cassingham and Jeffries noted we have already had delays with RFP development and proposal review.

Smith asked Jeffries, beyond the calendar challenges, if he saw anything else that might need Governing Board attention. Jeffries said finalizing the consultant scope of services and related costs could be one of those matters. This may all be a preview of what we could experience with vendor proposals.

Cassingham inquired if the consultant proposals could become stale dated. Nelson said we could ask for extensions. Jeffries added that negotiations could result in increased costs due to scoping which would, in effect, stale date a proposal. Nelson said at that point, we could turn to another vendor.

Pearce noted that to compress the schedule, he would appreciate Governing Board acceptance of special meetings if needed. He expressed the need for our process and concern for initial service cost estimates as being too low which may become an issue for the Project budget. MacLeamy asked why, if the RFP defined the scope, were vendors coming in with different scopes. Jeffries said it's a matter of creating mutual understanding of scope issues with the consultant to reflect our needs along with considering optional approaches from them in response to the RFP. Nelson said there are inconsistencies in at least one of the proposals that would need clarifying during negotiations. This period is important to finalizing the details set forth in the RFP. Rojas added that most scopes are more general and are finalized during final contract negotiations. Vendors can make assumptions that both parties need to resolve in writing them down. MacLeamy summarized that what the proposers give you is a bid and general response to the RFP that needs to be finalized. Rojas added that it is like a menu of offerings that require negotiation.

Gaffney said what can really drive the price up is the number of client meetings. MacLeamy asked about video conferencing to reduce costs and time. Rojas said this can be done. Pearce confirmed this report was informational only.

2) Report on Measure A Citizens Oversight Committee (COC)

Cassingham summarized the appointment process to the COC. She thanked the COC Subcommittee of Tyrell-Brown, Gaffney and Shortall for all their formative work and the Interview Subcommittee of Pearce and Stutsman, with input from Gray, for their efforts to generate appointment recommendations. She announced the recommendations as follows: District 1 – Liz Greenberg, District 2 – Bill Levinson, District 3 – Chuck Reite, District 4 – Larry Luckham, and District 5 – Paul Herrerias. She provided their applications for reference. Pearce said it was amazing to have the depth and breadth of our applicants. He is looking forward to working with them. Cassingham said Board appointments would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for confirmation in June followed by the first meeting of the COC before June 30.

M/S/P Gaffney/MacLeamy to appoint the reported recommended applicants as presented to the MERA Measure A Citizens Oversight Committee.

AYES: ALL
NAYS: NONE
ABSTENTIONS: NONE
Motion carried.

3) Proposed MERA Surety Substitution for 2010 Refunding Revenue Bonds Reserve

Cassingham noted the Executive Board's recommendation on May 6 of Governing Board adoption of the proposed Resolution that would approve a Reserve Fund Surety Substitution and appoint consultants to assist with this process. The Executive Board on March 11 directed Gaffney and Cassingham to identify the most cost-effective surety policy for substitution of the current bond reserve to address FY15-16 cash flow needs of \$3.5M for the Next Gen Project. Gaffney estimated the cost of financial advisory services to be \$10,000. Bond Counsel's estimated costs are \$5,000. Proposals were solicited from two very qualified firms, namely PFM and Sperry Capital. Gaffney and Cassingham recommended Sperry Capital to undertake the work at a fee of \$5,000. PFM submitted at \$18,000.

Cassingham said Sperry subsequently has been working with Bond Counsel, BNY Trustee, Standard & Poor's, Gaffney and Cassingham to confirm the substitution option and next steps. The Surety will free up \$2+M for expenditure on system improvements. The current reserve is earning .75%, while foregoing it will postpone bond financing interest which is estimated at \$2M. Consideration of this option permitted the completion of the Validation Action and permits time to confirm parcel tax proceeds for FY15-16. Both will permit more favorable responses from the bond financing community at a later date. She added, to effect the surety substitution, an amendment to the Indenture would be required. Bids will be solicited from insurers subsequent to Governing Board approval of the Resolution. Estimated cost of the policy is \$18,000. Upon award of bid and purchase of the surety, the Trustee can liquidate Reserve investments and the funds will be accessible for Next Gen expenses; either administered by the Trustee or MERA, which is still being confirmed.

Cassingham reported there have been prior discussions on how the Reserve might be used upon retirement of the 2010 Bonds; however, the Finance Committee and Executive Board are recommending the surety substitution in the best interests of the Authority and its members and the Next Gen Project. Gaffney said when the original bonds were sold, a Reserve of \$2M was created as security to pay the debt service. We are paying 4%+ interest on the bonds and earning .75% on the Reserve, so in effect we are losing 3.25%. A surety policy with a AA+ rated insurance company frees up \$2M for initial Project costs which will come back to us later via the parcel tax, therefore the least expensive way for us to do this.

Gaffney credited Gibbs with presentation of this opportunity and asked him to comment. Gibbs said the bid package would be released on May 14 with Governing Board approval to two AA rated specialty insurance companies do nothing but municipal bond work, with a tentative award of bid on June 2 and closing on June 10.

Gibbs and Gaffney acknowledged that the Trustee is required to retain 10% of the principal amount of the outstanding bonds which is currently \$1,276,500. The difference between the

requirement and what is being held is \$781,906 and does not require insurance. Generally the Trustee forwards the difference to the issuer. However, leaving the entire amount in the Reserve is of benefit to MERA at this time. Pearce thanked them for their hard work on identifying and presenting this option to MERA.

M/S/P Gaffney/MacLeamy to adopt the Resolution Approving a Reserve Fund Surety and Appointing Consultants in Connection Therewith.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

4) Proposed Agreement By and Between Marin Emergency Radio Authority and County of Marin Regarding Measure A

Cassingham presented the Agreement which fulfills the commitments made in the Next Gen Planning MOU between MERA and the County pertaining to the transfer of tax proceeds and annual tax administration services. She said the Agreement will sunset when bonds are issued for the Project and superceded by another agreement at that time. Parcel tax administration will be performed by NBS on MERA's behalf via a previously approved contract. Ortiz clarified that this Agreement would be subordinate once bonds are issued and there is a pledge of parcel taxes for payment of the bonds. Any residuals would be available to MERA for other Next Gen expenses.

M/S/P Tyrell-Brown/Fox to approve the Agreement By and Between the Marin Emergency Radio Authority and the County of Marin Regarding Measure A.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

5) Proposed System Analysis Agreement Between MERA and the County of Marin – Non-Next Gen System Projects: FY15/16 – FY17/18

Cassingham presented the 3-year Agreement noting three FY15-16 Projects totaling \$93,000 for the Tomales Site (\$8,000), Martha Site (\$10,000) and Bay Hill Tower Project (\$75,000). She noted the Agreement language is the same as current agreement and that other Board projects can be added under it.

M/S/P Sinnott/Coleman to approve the System Analysis Agreement between MERA and the County of Marin Non-Next Gen System Projects: FY15/16 – FY17/18 as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

6) Proposed Emergency Communications Systems Maintenance Agreement Between MERA and the County of Marin – FY15/16 – FY17/18

Cassingham presented the 3-year Agreement for System Maintenance commencing July 1, 2015, at a total annual cost of \$529,866 including preventive and corrective maintenance, and parts/materials and factory repairs.

Annual costs are subject to increase based on CPI. She said the current annual budget for these services is \$511,500. Pearce confirmed that any cost increases would be CPI only.

M/S/P Smith/Stevens to approve the Emergency Communications System Maintenance Agreement between MERA and the County of Marin FY15/16 – FY16/17 as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

7) Proposed FY15-16 Technical Services Agreement Between MERA and the County of Marin

Cassingham said this is the standard agreement for training, technical services and administrative costs. Current year costs are \$291,375 and proposed FY15-16 costs are \$297,507.

M/S/P Beedle/VanDoren to approve the FY15/16 Technical Services Agreement between MERA and the County of Marin.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

8) Proposed Communications Engineering Services Agreement Between MERA and the County of Marin

Cassingham noted the revised scope of services for Chuck's services, including the commitment of one FTE Senior Communications Engineer, attendance at MERA meetings where engineering matters are discussed and regular statistical reports to MERA's Boards. Current year cost is \$195,378 and proposed FY15/16 cost is \$201,630 which reflects a CPI increase.

M/S/P Gaffney/Sinnott to approve the FY15-16 Communications Engineering Services Agreement between MERA and the County of Marin.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE
Motion carried.

9) Proposed Amendment to MERA Reserve Funds Policy and Approval of Interfund Transfer

Cassingham said the source of funds for MERA's strategic planning efforts and Next Gen Project implementation to date has been the Replacement Fund. Those expenditures have significantly decreased that Fund balance. As discussed with the Executive Board, a short-term option for Next Gen cash flow, in addition to the surety substitution for the bond reserve, would be to permit a short-term transfer from the Emergency Fund to the Replacement Fund. This would require Governing Board approval of amending the Reserves Policy to permit this if needed. It would also permit reduction of required minimum fund balance. The proposed \$300,000 transfer would be presented for Executive Board approval.

Van Doren asked what conditions would trigger the transfer. Cassingham said any additional Next Project costs that occur before the flow of the reserves proceeds and parcel tax that cannot be covered by the Replacement Fund balance would trigger a transfer. Gaffney confirmed that if a transfer is needed, the Emergency Fund would be replenished by other Next Gen revenues.

MacLeamy asked for further explanation as to why the Replacement Fund was depleted. Cassingham said this Fund was charged all the expenditures since 2010 when strategic planning began through Next Gen implementation to date, including the Board's latest allocation of \$207,000 for consultant and DPW services to refresh the System Vendor RFP and begin the system vendor selection process. Reimbursement of these expenses from the Fund from the freed-up bond reserve and parcel tax is estimated at \$1M plus. The priority of reimbursement, while addressing Next Gen costs, will be discussed with the MERA Boards. Gaffney added this was a suitable use of the Replacement Fund for Next Gen which is a replacement Project. Cassingham noted the Governing Board approved replenishment of the Fund via Reimbursement Resolution using parcel tax or other proceeds.

M/S/P Coleman/Hymel to approve presentation of Proposed Amendments to the MERA Reserve Fund Policy to permit an Interfund Transfer and Reduction of Minimum Fund Balance and authorize a transfer of \$300,000 from the Emergency Fund to the Replacement Fund with Executive Board approval.

AYES: ALL
NAYS: NONE
ABSTENTIONS: NONE
Motion carried.

10) Other Information Items

None.

D. Public Hearings

Pearce opened the Public Hearings for Items D1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. Cassingham said all these Items were associated with FY14/15 and FY15/16 Budgets and Expenditures.

1) Proposed Resolution Confirming MERA FY14-15 Capital Project Budgets and Expenditures from Reserves: Fund 70032 (New Project Financing) and Fund 70036 (Replacement)

Cassingham said the Resolution is responsive to the Auditor's requirement to identify and capture in one document MERA Governing and Executive Board-approved capital project budgets and expenditures from Funds 70032 and 70036 that occur throughout the fiscal year.

Pearce confirmed there was no public comment and closed the public hearing on this matter.

M/S/P Hogan/Stevens to approve the Resolution of the MERA Governing Board Confirming FY14-15 Capital Project Budgets and Expenditures for Funds 70032 (New Project Financing) and 70036 (Replacement).

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

2) Proposed FY15-16 MERA Operating Budget and Zero-Rate Fee Schedule for Non-Member Users

Cassingham presented the Executive Board recommended FY15-16 Operating Budget and proposed continuation of the Zero-Rate Fee Schedule for Non-Members, subject to further review by the Executive Board Subcommittee of System usage. The proposed Budget is \$1,811,251 which represents a 6% increase over prior year. The Service Agreements previously approved at this meeting are reflected in the proposed Budget. Regarding the proposed Fee Schedule which has been periodically reviewed in prior years, it will be revisited again in anticipation of addressing mutual aid and automatic backup agency use of the Next Gen System.

In responses to Coleman, Cassingham clarified that to date, mutual aid and automatic backup users of the MERA System have only paid for their radios and training and have not paid a buy-in share toward the system backbone or for operations. Pearce said examples of these users are private ambulances operating under County contracts, CHP, GGNRA, Humane Society and others of mutual benefit to MERA members.

Pearce noted there were no public comments and closed the public hearing on this item.

M/S/P Beedle/Tyrell-Brown to approve the FY15-16 Operating Budget as presented and a Zero-Rate Fee Schedule subject to further review of their system usage by Executive Board Subcommittee and staff.

AYES: ALL
NAYS: NONE
ABSTENTIONS: NONE
Motion carried.

3) Proposed FY15-16 Equipment Replacement Requests

Nelson reported the Governing Board approved on May 14, 2014 repair of the propane tanks at San Pedro Ridge, Big Rock Ridge, Bay Hill and Point Reyes. Bay Hill and Point Reyes are complete. Preliminary work on San Pedro and Big Rock is underway and expected to continue into Summer 2015. Approved replacement of the UPS Master/Prime Site batteries is complete.

In response to the DPW recommendation to replace the San Pedro and Big Rock generators, the Board requested a review of buildings to protect the generators from weather. On September 10, 2014 DPW reported to the Executive Board on shelter options. It was agreed shelters would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. They are recommending that shelters not be provided at San Pedro and Big Rock in favor of manufacturer weather-protective enclosures. Work will extend into FY15-16. On April 2, 2015 DPW, in consultation with the Executive Officer, undertook an emergency project to replace the failed Prime Site Uninterruptable Power Supply (UPS). Work is completed at a cost of \$50,000.

Nelson reviewed proposed replacements in FY15-16. DPW is recommending five generator replacements, at Mt. Tiburon, Dollar Hill, Forbes, Sonoma Mt. and Mt. Barnabe, for an estimated cost of \$52,000 each for a total of \$260,000. Each generator will come with its own enclosure. She provided a photo of the enclosure with its special protective coating specified by DPW. Also on the schedule, at basically the same sites, is propane tank servicing or replacement. If refurbishing is possible, cost will be \$5,000 per site. A total recommended budget is \$57,000; however, she noted DPW will refurbish wherever possible. As projects are completed, Nelson is seeking authorization to surplus the replaced assets at no cost to MERA. Stevens confirmed with Nelson MERA owns the propane tanks.

Pearce confirmed there were no public comments and closed the public hearing on this item.

Gaffney confirmed total replacement costs in FY15-16 to be \$444,500 including those not completed last year.

M/S/P MacLeamy/Smith to approve the FY14-15 Generator Replacement recommendation not including shelters, additional repair of the Prime Site UPS and FY15-16 Equipment Replacements for an estimated cost of \$317,500 and authorize disposition of certain MERA assets as described.

AYES: ALL
NAYS: NONE
ABSTENTIONS: NONE
Motion carried.

4) Proposed FY15-16 System Analysis Capital Projects – Non-Next Gen System

Nelson presented the non-Next Gen Capital Projects for FY15-16 in the amount of \$93,000, as well as a status of the Tomales Site documents. She expects the final lease with the property owner, access road maintenance agreement and MALT easement will be presented to the Governing Board in the near future. \$8,000 is budgeted for Tomales in the coming fiscal year. DPW will come back before commencing any design or construction.

The Martha Development Proposal continues to be monitored through the development review process; \$10,000 is budgeted for FY15-16. The Bay Hill Tower has been budgeted at \$75,000 pending approval of the sublease for the tower site. The Next Gen System Feasibility Study and outreach support are completed. DPW support for the Next Gen System Project Wireless Communications Consultant Services RFP is covered under a separate agreement.

Pearce confirmed there were no public comments and closed the public hearing on this item,

M/S/P Hymel/Beadle to approve the FY15-16 System Analysis Projects (Non Next Gen System) as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

5) This Item was previously removed from the Agenda for future presentation.

6) Proposed FY15-16 MERA New Project Financing and Revenue Bonds Budgets

Cassingham presented the 2007 Citizen Bank Loan Note and 2010 Bonds Budgets for FY15-16. The Governing Board directed the Note payment remain level through the term of the Note which is \$225,000. Attached to the Staff report is the breakdown of the member contributions toward this amount. The Bond annual debt service, for which there is no discretion in the amount, is \$2,122,025. Member allocations are also attached to the report.

Pearce confirmed there were no public comments and closed the public hearing on this matter.

M/S/P Gaffney/Stevens to approve the FY15-16 New Project Financing – 2007 Bank Note and MERA 2010 Refunding Revenue Bonds Debt Services Budgets as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

7) Proposed Resolution Adopting the FY15-16 Operating New Project Financing and Revenue Bonds and Reserves Budgets

Cassingham said the Proposed Resolution memorializes the previous Governing Board fiscal actions at this meeting. She noted the extensive proposed expenditures in the coming fiscal year against the Replacement Fund and earlier discussion during this meeting about the urgency of its replenishment via either the short-term interfund transfer, freed up bond reserve, parcel tax proceeds or a combination thereof.

Pearce confirmed there were no public comments and closed the public hearing on this item.

M/S/P MacLeamy/Coleman to approve Resolution No. 2015-05 adopting the Proposed FY15-16 Operating, New Project Financing, Revenue Bonds and Reserves Budgets as presented.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: NONE

ABSTENTIONS: NONE

Motion carried.

E. Operations Reports (Tackabery)

1. Update/Report on Current System Coverage Dead Spots

Nelson reported on the request at the last Governing Board meeting for an update on current coverage issues. In May 2013, a report was provided on the meetings of the Coverage Committee of Pearce and Gray. There were 3 areas of focus then: Southern Marin, Inverness Fire coverage, and Stinson Beach Fire coverage. Since that report, DPW offered alignment and tuning for each of the areas. Some work was completed for Southern Marin with no additional issues or options brought forward to investigate other than MERA Next Gen opportunities. With Inverness, some tuning and aligning was performed on most of their equipment. No additional options have been brought forward. In Stinson Beach, some alignment and tuning was performed and the MERA base antenna was replaced and raised above to clear their solar panels, which resulted in coverage and signal clarity improvement. This did not eliminate the canyon dead spot. No other opportunities were presented.

Gaffney inquired of Stevens if DPW's actions helped coverage. Stevens confirmed they did and pagers may have spots for improvement. Nelson confirmed this is the low band system and not the MERA system. Stevens said the MERA system is working as good as can be expected considering the conditions there. Beedle inquired about North County coverage improvements and spots like the Narrows. Nelson said there was considerable improvement when MERA did the expansion at Sonoma, along with some tuning. She said part of the tasking with Next Gen is we would need another site. Pearce added that Southern Marin benefitted from the tuning and direction but Tiburon still had its dead spot. Pearce said Stinson would be a Next Gen fix. Coleman said the public needs to know these coverage areas will be addressed with the Next Gen System. Pearce confirmed this was a big part of MERA's public education effort.

2. Status /Work Statistics Reports (Chuck)

Chuck presented the December 2014, January and February 2015 monthly system usage reports plus the 2014 Annual System Report. December had 772 hours of on air time and 10+ minutes of busies. The busies reflected the need to replace a system controller. January had 740 hours call time with zero seconds busies. February had 718 hours call time and zero seconds busies. The typical month reflects Law usage at 70%, Fire at 17%, Public Works at 11% and non-MERA users at under 1%.

Chuck said 2014 Annual usage reflected 9,000 hours plus on air time and 11 minutes of busies, 10 minutes of which was due to controller outage. MERA System usage from 2006 to 2014 reflected a decrease in call hours in 2013 which has gone up in 2014 due to additional users and other factors.

His final chart reflects busy seconds history from 2006 to 2014 and the spike with the 2008 Storm which prompted additional channels. Smith said he appreciated all the efforts to reduce busies which greatly helped users on the streets.

3. Other Information Items

None.

F. Open Time for Items Not on Agenda

None.

G. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Cassingham
Executive Officer and Secretary

Next: MERA Governing Board Regular Meeting
Wednesday – June 24, 2015 – 3:30pm