



State of Delaware  
800 MHz Next Generation Meeting Minutes  
April 20, 2004

---

**Attendees:**

Baker, Bryant – DTI	Marsh, Dan – DTI
Cabaud, Phil – Governor’s Office	McDaniel, Chip – DNREC
Carrow, William – DSP	Patterson, Greg – Governor’s Office
DeLuca, Al – Courts	Reynolds, Richard – DTI
Dempsey, Richard – Kent County	Roberts, David – New Castle County
Domorod, Jim – DHSS	Scoglietti, Burt – Budget Office
Donaldson, Gene – DeIDOT	Seifert, Sharon – DTI
Ford, James – Homeland Security	Short, Richard – Sussex 911
Gates, Robert – Div of Comm	Sipple, Kevin – Kent 911
Gause, Colleen – DTI	Starkey, Elayne – DTI
Hersey-Miller, Lynn – DTI	Streets, Bill – New Castle County
Lazzaro, Tony – DTI	Turner, Jamie – DEMA

**Welcome – Greg Patterson**

**Goals:**

- Prioritization Process Overview
- Add and/or Subtract Consideration Factors
- Weighting Process

**Agenda:**

- |                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| ▪ Prioritization Process      | Bryant Baker   |
| ▪ Factors for Prioritization  | Bryant Baker   |
| ▪ Weighting and Input Process | Bryant Baker   |
| ▪ Summary and Next Meeting    | Greg Patterson |

**Project Prioritization**

- Agree on a set of criteria
- Apply weights – most- to least-important
- List the projects proposed by the Prime Contractor
- Fill in the data for each project
- Review the scoring
- Make our recommendations via the Governor’s Report

## **Agree on a set of Criteria**

### Existing Trouble Spots:

- Will the project provide improved in-street coverage for known trouble spots?
- Data: Yes/No
  - Based upon DivComm data and trouble reports
- Committee concurrence – no discussion – accepted criteria

### Cooperative Funding Availability:

- Is there a municipality or agency that is known to be willing to commit to partial funding?
- Data: Percentage of committed funding
- Committee concurrence – The committee accepted this criteria. A list of projects should be available after 4/30, when bids are reviewed. Should an agency or municipality commit to partial funding, it should be in writing.

### Population Density/Number of Citizens Affected:

- What is the potential population positively effected by the project?
- Data: Percentage of total population effected
- Committee concurrence – after much discussion the committee revised this criteria to:
  - The number of calls over a 2 year period
  - If a critical asset is affected (without defining asset or number of assets involved - for security reasons)
  - Future growth (data from the Planning Commission over the next ten years)
  - Personnel safety

### Dependency on Other Projects:

- Does another project require at least partial completion prior to initiating the project under consideration?
- Committee concurrence – The committee accepted this criteria based on the determination of two factors:
  - 1) Projects (identified by the evaluation committee) scored in two groups
    - Projects over which we have control
    - Projects over which we have no control
  - 2) If a project is scored very high, then the supporting projects will also score high on the dependency factor

### Political Impact:

- Subjective
  - Which of the projects have the highest political value to the Governor, Legislators?
  - Which initiative will the News Journal most likely report if it is not considered for the first years' projects?
  - Data: Scale of 1-5, 5 being highest value, 1 being lowest
  - Committee concurrence – The committee did not accept this criteria. The evaluation of the committee will be based solely on public safety.

#### Project Period:

- Shorter projects have statistically higher success rates in terms of meeting quality, cost, and schedule
- Data: “5” for < 3 months; “3” for 3 – <6 months; “1” for 6 – 9 months
  - Requirement – all projects 12 months or less
- Committee concurrence – The committee did not accept this criteria.

#### Individual Project Risk:

- Lower risk projects (in areas of cost, schedule, meeting requirements) initially more attractive:
  - “Good press” solicits increased cooperation for future project success;
  - May increase likelihood of next-cycle funding;
  - Working relationships with Prime reduces risk for future projects.
- Data: 1-5, where 5 is lowest risk, and 1 is highest risk
  - Rely on RCC’s assessments of risk for projects proposed.
- Committee concurrence – The committee did not accept this criteria.

#### Current Equipment Condition/Lifecycle Status:

- Give more consideration for projects replacing equipment:
  - Coming close to having support ended by the vendor;
  - Presently have a high maintenance cost, replacement reducing DivComm’s costs.
- Data: Time to obsolescence
  - Rely on DivComm’s data
- Committee concurrence – The committee agreed that current equipment condition and lifecycle will be criteria.

#### Other Considerations

- Name of consideration and impact needed
- Need data format – can be yes/no, a scale, a percentage, etc.
- Committee concurrence – The committee agreed that the number of critical buildings covered will be additional criteria.

#### **Process – by May 1, send your weight values to Bryant Baker**

- Bryant Baker will email the final list of consideration factors with background on impact by COB this Thursday, April 22, 2004
- Each Committee member will then rate each of the factors on a scale of 1 – 5, 5 being most important, and 1 being least
- Bryant Baker will assign the mean of the weights received, and post the spreadsheet tool on the 800MHz website during the first week of May
- Will review weight data and obtain Committee concurrence at the next meeting

Next Meeting – Wednesday, May 5, 2004 at 10:00 am in the Governor’s Conference Room located in the Tatnall Building.