

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

DRAFT: 5/24/2016

NEXT GENERATION PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2016

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cusimano at 2:31 p.m. on March 23, 2016 at the Novato Fire Protection District – Heritage Room, Novato, CA.

Committee Members Present:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Central Marin Police Authority | Todd Cusimano (Chair) |
| Tiburon Fire Protection District | Richard Pearce |
| County of Marin Fire | Mark Brown |
| Town of Ross | Tom Gaffney |
| County of Marin | Dan Eilerman (Alternate) |

Committee Members Absent:

City of Mill Valley
City of Novato
Marin County Sheriff

Staff Present:

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| MERA Executive Officer | Maureen Cassingham |
| MERA Deputy Exec. Officer – Next Gen. Project | Dave Jeffries |
| MERA Admin. Assistant – Next Gen. Project | Alex Anderson |
| MERA Operations Officer | Pat Echols |
| Marin Department of Public Works | Shelly Nelson |
| County Communications Engineer | Richard Chuck |

Guests Present:

| | |
|----------|------------------|
| Motorola | Rodney Hughes |
| Motorola | Micah Applewhite |

B. Approval of Minutes from January 27, 2016 Next Generation Project Oversight Committee Meeting

M/S/P Pearce/Gaffney to approve minutes from January 27, 2016 Next Generation Project Oversight Committee Meeting as presented.

AYES: All
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
Motion Carried

C. Discussion of Comments to the Draft Request for Proposal (comment sheet attached)

Jeffries began by noting that MERA staff had received comments and questions regarding the Draft Request for Proposal for vendors for the Next Generation System. He said that the comments and questions were compiled in a slideshow which he presented to the group as part of a power point presentation.

Jeffries gave an overview of the Draft Request for Proposal and feedback, stating that the focus of the Next Generation Project Oversight Committee (NGPOC) was to discuss the most important questions and comments from MERA board members to provide clear feedback to MERA staff and Federal Engineering to refine and improve the Draft Request for Proposal. He said that MERA staff would be meeting with Department of Public Works staff to go over the feedback from the NGPOC meeting and compile changes to the proposal to send to Federal Engineering.

Jeffries noted that the proposal was distributed for feedback to the MERA Executive Board, the MERA Next Generation Project Oversight Committee, the Operations Working Group, MERA Staff and Marin DPW staff. A total of sixteen sets of comments were received, including five from Marin DPW, two from MERA staff, four from West Marin County representatives, one from Marin County Fire, two from Novato Police Department, one from Novato Fire Protection District, and one from San Rafael Police Department.

Jeffries led the group through a power point discussion regarding the Draft Request for Proposal feedback. The discussion included questions and comments regarding contracting for equipment; defining regional operability; life cycle recommendations; vendor responsibilities for site surveys and development; GPS and paging elements; how change orders are dealt with, and more. A list of the comments reviewed is attached.

Jeffries discussed the Request for Proposal timeline, noting that he expected that MERA would be receiving responses in early to middle of July. Echols said he anticipated reviewing the proposals from the end of July to the end of August, and planned on interviews being scheduled for early October. Contract negotiations would then begin in November.

C. Marin Voice Article in Marin IJ

Jeffries shared that MERA staff and membership worked on a Marin Voice article to provide the community with an update on the status and progress of the Next Generation Project.

D. Next Meeting

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for the middle to end of July.

E. Open Time for Items Not on Agenda

None

F. Adjournment

Chair Cusimano adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

Minutes prepared by:



Alex Anderson,

MERA Administrative Assistant – MERA Next Generation Project

Comments

| | |
|-----|--|
| 18 | "a loop configuration" should reference multiple loop configuration |
| 19 | What exactly does "future data implementations" mean; mobile data, LAN/WAN transport and for which systems beyond voice? If we are asking for future data implementations we will need to give some idea of how much data and from where to where as it will have a large effect on system backbone. |
| 21 | Take out the word "to" in "700/800 MHz bands to for the required transition" Line 21, 22, 23 - "700/800 MHz bands to for the required transition from UHF T-Band operation" - This doesn't make sense. All radios we are buying will be 700/800 MHz and they will not have any effect on the transition from UHF-T Band. This sentence is left over from the last agency FE used this RFP for (800 MHz, EDACS, P25, turnkey, tech spec). |
| 31 | Why is Larkspur specifically noted here. I understand why the jail is, but there are many other areas in Marin with in building coverage issues, but why limit by limit ourselves by listing specific locations. Just say we need in building coverage and we may need DAS s and BDAs. Add hospital Emergency Departments for potential DAS or BDA deployments. Agencies Larkspur and jail complexes needs to be changed to the existing Marin County Jail and Cal-Park tunnel BDA's. |
| 32 | Cost for these BDA's needs to be included in initial system cost since if we wait to see "if necessary" the money will be spent and not available. |
| 42 | Change 1997 to 1998 |
| 53 | Remove the word regional as the present system does not tie into any Bay Area regional systems. |
| 57 | We have 25 member agencies. Please add Tiburon Fire Protection District and Central Marin Police Authority. Please correct Kentfield Fire District to Kentfield Fire Protection District, Correct Ross Valley Fire to Ross Valley Fire Services, Correct Community College District to Marin Community College District, correct Marin Municipal Water to Marin Municipal Water District, correct Marin Community Services District to Marinwood Community Services District, correct Marin County Transit to Marin Transit. |
| 60 | Seven (not 6 transmit sites) plus two receive sites |
| 66 | MERA & Marin County 18 microwave sites? More like 14 plus Novato EOF (NPD Microwave link to Big Rock is not a MERA link.) |
| 70 | MERA does not provide mobile data services and there are no plans to include mobile data in this project. Can this section be deleted? |
| 71 | SRPD uses Verizon for mobile computing. Can other companies be used? |
| 89 | I don't think we are specifying minimum and maximum specifications for system and subscriber units. We are specifying minimum only. |
| 90 | The word maximum should come out. |
| 93 | perhaps rename 'Site Development Requirements (surveying, environmental review, permitting)' |
| 94 | change to 'Construction Specifications (including towers, shelters, utility/access infrastructure, fencing, etc.)' |
| 102 | Lines 102, 103 and 104 - What does this sentence mean? Once again this sentence is from another system. It has no meaning in this procurement. Section 1.2.3 title needs to be consistent through out the RFP. In other places you state it as "gateways" |
| 104 | The word regional will lead others to think "beyond Marin County Op area" maybe use "wide-area communications" like you have in other places with in the RFP |

Comments

| | |
|-----|--|
| 108 | Change VHF Low Band systems from 2 to 3 |
| 110 | Change VHF High Band systems from 12 to 26 |
| 112 | Change UHF Conventional systems from 6 to 19 |
| 114 | Change 700/800 MHz Digital Systems from 2 to read 700/800 MHz systems (6) |
| 116 | Delete |
| 117 | Delete |
| 119 | Change Alerting System to read Alerting and Siren control system. Because this section is about connecting to legacy equipment and we know they can't connect the present FSA and Knox as is, should we say that they have to provide a solution? |
| 120 | Change XX equipment to read "a Motorola SCADA system used for fire station alerting and siren control system" Relm |
| 127 | 127 and 128 - Remote gate operation is currently controlled on a simplex UHF channel by a timed carrier signal. No signalling is involved. |
| 133 | change state to state, federal, etc. |
| 150 | Existing backhaul connectivity should be used only if it is current generation equipment and fully supportive of the all IP network proposed. |
| 154 | delete '(Optional)' |
| 156 | perhaps use 'specifications' rather than 'requirements' |
| 157 | UPS equipment needs to be changed to UPS and DC battery plant also this section should address and site remodels/ upgrades not just new sites. add 'access infrastructure, drainage |
| 182 | change system equipment to read all equipment provided by any provider |
| 183 | Preparing FCC license forms and any coordination forms, engineering and maps due to site and antenna changes from initial estimates used for preliminary coordination. |
| 192 | Beyond 3 years, what are the longer term system support options and different levels of support? |
| 193 | Decommissioning/removal of legacy equipment should include removal of existing frequency and trunking parameters including encryption codes. |
| 195 | furnishing a complete and fully functional system. |
| 201 | delete '(OPTIONAL)' |
| 203 | Portable, Mobile, Pagers, Control Station radios, Station alerting equipment at all fire stations and siren locations, mobile and portable accessories. |
| 212 | VENDOR's or sub-contractor's errors or omissions |
| 214 | "Equipment shall be provided in new condition". I strongly suggest subscriber equipment is latest available model with at least 14 years of formal production and support availability. This would eliminate the issue we encountered with MERA-1 and radio sitting in boxes for five years. |
| 219 | What does "at or near the end of their respective lifecycles" mean - 1,2, or 3 years? |

Comments

| | |
|-----|--|
| 221 | Can this be raised to 10 years? 7 years after installation should be changed to 7 years after complete system acceptance |
| 227 | Are we considering leasing a system? |
| 232 | Is there a period of time on this pricing offer or for the life of the system? |
| 234 | This says we want a complete turn-key solution for all systems, subsystems and components - should we break out site development from this? |
| 236 | should we change "communications capabilities across the county" to reference our desired coverage areas. |
| 242 | The words OPTION or OPTIONAL refers to features or equipment, should we include sites in this as well? |
| 286 | Add Marin County Code |
| 297 | Redundant with Section G? If not clarify. |
| 352 | Need to add coordination maps and engineering as well since it will change due to antenna and site differences from original estimate. |
| 370 | Should the Vender Project Manager definition of duties be described here or at least under definitions. |
| 374 | MERA/Marin County project team should be defined to also include Consultant project manager for Phase 2 of the project. |
| 377 | Add Monthly Status Reports, similar to the FE monthly reports currently being provided. |
| 380 | Do we really need to specify "Microsoft Project" or just say they need provide a project timeline and management platform. If MERA/Marin will be receiving MS Project files, then we need to ensure we can open files. If we can use PDF versions, then that issue is lessened, but we need detailed features. |
| 424 | Should also include Consultant project manager |
| 456 | SELETED VENDOR and all sub-contractors |
| 521 | add project consultant |
| 528 | Should also include proposed sites and site details. |
| 551 | This should be expanded to including new site development construction plans and specifications. Also require that there be at least 2 if not 3 design-level submittals (30%, 70%, 95%) |
| 557 | Does the vendor have any control over when MERA/Marin approve the final FATP? and testing shall start no later than 5 days following approval. "Shall be approved no later than" is too restrictive wording for MERA committies. |
| 570 | 15 business days may not be enough for detailed design approval |
| 582 | Who will provide barcode readers? |
| 585 | What about the requirement for all equipment to be shipped immediately prior to installation? |
| 592 | The County terms and conditions calls for a \$100 per day penalty for delays, should that be mentioned here? |
| 598 | Is MERA/Marin reviewing or approving the SATP? |
| 610 | documentation should also include all measurable levels for audio, power etc. Including test point levels as required in factory service manuals. |
| 613 | Complete date |

Comments

| | |
|-----|--|
| 620 | Complete RFP # not sure we will have/need a RFP # (?) |
| 621 | We need to start setting dates for the section and others. |
| 622 | Correct Communications Manager to Communications Division Manager |
| 628 | MERA/Marin needs to review the RFP Schedule dates prior to MERA approval. should be consistent with current FE project schedule milestone dates |
| 630 | Complete Date and Time see line 628 comment |
| 631 | Correct "will be held at the" to "will be held at" |
| 632 | Dates need to be set |
| 633 | Complete Date and Time What email address should be used for written correspondence? see line 628 comment |
| 634 | During the conference, replies should be addressed by FE and not MERA or County. |
| 636 | binding on MERA/Marin County |
| 638 | Complete RFP # not sure we will have/need a RFP # (?) |
| 640 | Correct Communications Manager to Communications Division Manager |
| 646 | Afforded the opportunity OR Required to attend? Prefer required to attend. again email address - Mera or FE or County. Dates need to be set |
| 648 | see line 628 comment |
| 649 | Should we have a proposed milestone payment schedule from each vendor as a basis for contract negotiations at award? We obviously want to weight this in our favor in later negotiations and hold back as much payment as we can through completion of work. |
| 672 | Is this optional or are we asking the vendor to provide VPI equipment upgrades or replacement. |
| 673 | Plus ability to monitor many other pieces of site equipment. |
| 677 | change to 'Site Development/Improvements (including utility infrastructure, site grading/stormwater management, access road, security |
| 683 | Concerning RF coverage, perhaps change the word predictions to capability. |
| 711 | Update and correct highlighted area. this is highlighted I think because of the X's but not sure - needs to be filled in. |
| 742 | Delete the words "/Marin County staff" Should just read "MERA" MERA/Marin County staff will not be the only ones conducting evaluations. This should read "panel" not "staff" |

Comments

| | |
|-----|---|
| 750 | Should the proposer's handling of Optional items be a line item in here? I would suggest reducing price score by 5 to 20 points and add those five points to Response to Scope of Work for a total of 55. Under Oral Presentation, change first line to: "At its sole discretion, the MERA Evaluation Committee may require....." Note - Scoring will be by a sub-committee of the MERA Next Gen Project Oversight Committee, although MERA and Marin DPW staff will be involved in the process and offering comments. Section "a" change P25 based to P25 Phase 2 based. Section "d" change to P25 Phase 2. Section "d iii" add UPS and Battery Plant. Section "j" what MERA/Marin County fiber is this referring to? Section "l" Fire station alerting and sirens. Oral presentatiions . On the equipment scoring (50 points) we should break this down. at least breakout the optional items from the manditory and weight them differently at least seperately. Response to Scope of Work section should be broken down into subcategories with subscores |
| 769 | Add MERA/Marin as follows: "best meets the needs of MERA/Marin County and" |
| 774 | Change County to MERA/County |
| 785 | correct RESPONDENT to RESPONDENT(S) |
| 794 | Are we replacing ALL dispatch consoles or only those that can't be used on the new system? |
| 804 | Add hospital Emergency Departments for potential DAS or BDA deployments |
| 805 | Same comment as before, why limit the DASs and BDAs to Larkspur and the jail? Larkspur? Marin County Jail and Cal-Park Tunnel |
| 806 | See coverage needs not just throughout the County |
| 822 | If we are mentioning ISSI, and Smart phones in this section should be then also mention FSA, Knox and Volunteer Fire Paging? |
| 843 | RESPONDENT shall describe the reduction in GOS should Phase 1 radios use the system. |
| 870 | Loss of a single channel due to interference signals or hardware should not cause the system to go into failure mode. |
| 872 | Loss of a single control channel will not put system into fallback. Only loss of all control channels should put system into fallback. |
| 873 | Loss of a single site controller should not put system into fallback. |
| 874 | Loss of a single router or switch shall not put system into fallback. |
| 876 | Loss of a single system controller should not put system into fallback. |
| 877 | Loss of a single site connectivity should not put system into fallback. |
| 878 | Loss of a single data storage media should not put system into fallback. |
| 885 | Delete "Where possible" |
| 903 | This equipment should be included in proposal |
| 919 | Multi-cell usage could easily be as much as 85 to 95% in Marin County!!!! |
| 934 | Change County to MERA/Marin County |
| 948 | change to 'and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review and documentation requirements (such as Environmental Impact Report if |
| 954 | Must verify not only tower space but space in building |
| 960 | Does this include at leased sites? |
| 972 | This implies that they will not be on the hook for upgrade but will give costs to MERA to foot the bill outside of the project. |

Comments

| | |
|------|--|
| 980 | cost should be included in proposal |
| 990 | Can we actually make them responsible for resolving any issues related to site permitting or zoning? |
| 1016 | is the website correct? |
| 1045 | Still referring to County-wide coverage. Is this accurate? 97% reliability within geographic boundaries? Or should it be within coverage area???? |
| 1046 | We should include a Phase 2 ber OF 2.5% not just DAQ which is subjective. |
| 1066 | Phase 2 BER of 2.5% |
| 1072 | Larkspur? Marin County Jail and Cal-Park Tunnel BDA's. |
| 1073 | Site walks available or required? When and where will pre-approval take place? We need to set this date also! |
| 1099 | DAQ 3.4 and BER of 2.5% Phase 2 |
| 1141 | Remove or other site as directed by MERA/County |
| 1146 | Correct MERA/County to MERA/Marin County change may be to is |
| 1148 | Support the P25 and other functional requirements as referred to in this RFP |
| 1155 | Remove the "primary" control equipment. |
| 1171 | add BER Phase 2 of 2.5% |
| 1183 | We do not have locations for secondary voting sites. |
| 1215 | Vendor needs to provide not just consider additional filters if required!!! |
| 1222 | including towers? |
| 1223 | Should towers be included in this section (including temporary towers needed during transition period)? |
| 1237 | Here we use "gateways", pg 10 we use "Interoperability with Legacy and adjacent systems" shouldn't we be consistant |
| 1244 | Provide an extra 20% gateway ports at all sites. |
| 1249 | Remove Project 25 |
| 1264 | Only provide UPS where needed. |
| 1289 | Earlier in RFP we asked for 8 hours runtime |
| 1349 | Number of potential dispatch control stations increased by at least 10 to account for growth - NPD would like install one additional console, San Rafael Police are considering 4 additonal consoles. Include pricing for these additional consoles. |
| 1351 | Only IP based consoles are to be used. Change to "existing IP based Console equipment, when applicable. " |
| 1356 | Lock-in pricing for potential new dispatch consoles with a guaranteed pricing period for future console purchases |
| 1358 | Number of potential dispatch control stations increased by at least 10 to account for growth - NPD would like install one additional console as does San Rafael PD, with the ability to add additional consoles later. |
| 1359 | Radio consoles to use COTS technology inlcuding CPUs, monitors, speakers, hard drives, video and sound cards, RAM etc. where applicable |
| 1363 | Ergonomic should include ability to change colors for individual resources for visual ease of use |

Comments

| | |
|------|--|
| 1371 | Require speed performance values for boot time, software loading, and new configuration updates - current consoles slow to load configs |
| 1378 | Each dispatch center shall have access to database so they can control their own alias management. No other functionality shall be allowed at these terminals. |
| 1383 | Should also indicate if encryption is capable for each talkgroup, unless all talkgroups will be encryption capable, which we may not want. |
| 1385 | display alias and ID |
| 1389 | Integration to E911 for what purposes? Radio/phone interconnect, IRR, IRR over air playback, single integrated workstation? |
| 1397 | What does that mean? MERA does not directly support the CAD systems, but if there is to be an interface, it should be to both InterGraph and SunRidge to support all MERA users. What type of CAD integration are we asking for? Is the cost for intergration into their new system a MERA cost or each agency whom uses it, or a shared cost? |
| 1401 | I think we need to specify type integration, i.e. push-to-talk device IDs, fire station alerting, radio emergency button, etc. |
| 1418 | Delete trunked system with radio ID's" |
| 1427 | Will these private calls affect system load? We intentionally avoided private calls on the current system. |
| 1434 | Minimum of 3 patches per position |
| 1436 | Multi-select also only requires a single resource? |
| 1447 | IP control should also be available. |
| 1452 | up to 16 channels per resource, not 16 resources. |
| 1463 | Add this language to 1432 |
| 1466 | County does not have a "paging system". Two-tone paging is generated by consoles. |
| 1467 | needs to generated not just support paging. This will depend on paging solution provided in RFP. |
| 1475 | This is essentially a "permanent patch" and its functionality will be required in the new system |
| 1477 | delete alias database program. |
| 1483 | Demarc or interface to station PA system for selected radio talk group |
| 1489 | Keyboards and mice at EOF are remoted with PC's in backroom. |
| 1493 | Gooseneck microphones need to be optional. |
| 1503 | per operator position |
| 1513 | Radio consoles to use COTS technology including CPUs, monitors, speakers, hard drives, video and sound cards, RAM etc. where applicable |
| 1517 | Vendor should identify a path for patches, service pack installs, and version upgrades to the operating system on PCs |
| 1519 | MERA should specify spare hard drives with images of all required OS and software - solid state drives die and are unrecoverable |
| 1537 | Backup control stations should be full function remotes. |

Comments

| | |
|------|---|
| 1538 | Individual agencies including Novato PD record local talk groups via analog feed demarc or interface provide to those dispatch centers. Does this requirement include the Vendor responsibility to provide feeds for the local agency voice loggers? |
| 1544 | Existing VPI is located at EOF |
| 1553 | NMS and NMT will integrate with County's Microsoft Active Directory infrastructure |
| 1555 | Vendor will install and integrate the following into already-existing County systems: * Network Configuration Manager system * Network Monitoring Manager system * SysLog Manager * Wireshark P25 extension/filter |
| 1561 | NMS and NMT will integrate with County network infrastructure |
| 1563 | Proposed system will permit remote access through County network DMZ |
| 1565 | Proposed system will include regular and periodic automatic software updates and upgrades |
| 1566 | Proposed system, updates and upgrades will be compatible with County-standard server & PC software & operating systems. |
| 1567 | Updates should be free; upgrades can incur costs. |
| 1579 | email and existing pager interface |
| 1592 | Terminals are to be provided at each dispatch center for independent alias management |
| 1645 | While I am curious about the interface to smart phones for voice, we are not building a data system and those refernces should be deleted. |
| 1647 | This should be for voice only |
| 1676 | Following this section, should there be another on GPS as an option? GPS will require GPS capability in the field, as well as processing that data into interfaces with the two CAD systems (InterGraph and SunRidge) by the vendor, if this option were to be selected, so this becomes a hardware and backbone issue as well as potential impacts on data flow. |
| 1678 | existing IP digital |
| 1688 | Correct County to MERA/Marin County |
| 1726 | MERA/Marin County |
| 1782 | Number of potential dispatch control stations increased by at least 10 to account for growth - NPD would like install one additional console. San Rafael Police also looking at one additional console now, with the potential to add additional consoles later. |
| 1794 | Is simplex operation available along with talk around? What are the limitations per band. |
| 1798 | all radios shall be field tuned/aligned with automated test equipment approved by MERA/Marin County |
| 1800 | List must be provided to MERA/County of all radios!!! |
| 1829 | Currently, the radios the fire departments are using are submersible to one meter. I don't see any language asking for a similar option. MCFD would like to continue with that option. |
| 1837 | 14 character display is desired |
| 1848 | As an additional Option, each radio model capable of GPS tracking shall have the feature quoted and costed, including interface costs to both CAD systems (InterGraph and Sun Ridge) |

Comments

| | |
|------|---|
| 1914 | Price for headset interfacing shall be provided. Not just hardware. |
| 1959 | Number of potential dispatch control stations increased by at least 10 to account for growth - NPD would like install one additional console, as would San Rafael PD, with the potential to add more later. |
| 1967 | What are the distance limitations? |
| 1972 | Add separate radio/telephone 6-wire headset jacks for control station - at least price as an option |
| 1999 | Include Sirens with fire station alerting |
| 2006 | Simplex UHF operation by carrier timing. |
| 2009 | Fire station and siren alerting Remove: Fire Station Alerting - The details we would like to add pertain only to the Volunteer Paging System |
| 2010 | Add after "today". Functions shall include but are not limited to: 1. Alert Tone and Voice Paging (Paging utilizing cellular signal is unacceptable) 2. Continuous monitoring of dispatch talk group 3. System shall be able to send signal to a belt worn, analog, receive only pager. 4. All equipment proposed shall be at the beginning of the products lifecycle and be fully supported and available for a minimum of 7 years after installation. |
| 2014 | remove '(OPTIONAL)' |
| 2054 | Isn't some of the "site work" being handled under a separate RFP? not sure what the intent is here, but site work should be more specifically defined so as not to include construction of site improvements, which will be bid separately |
| 2057 | Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP? |
| 2059 | Coordinate with MERA also on utilities |
| 2068 | Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP? this seems a bit too specific for an RFP. Vendor is to develop specifications (|
| 2069 | MERA/County project engineer or consultant project manager |
| 2073 | Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP? |
| 2079 | Include modifications to existing towers? |
| 2094 | Need to reference 120 MPH wind and conditions at this latitude and longitude |
| 2162 | Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP? |
| 2196 | Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP? |
| 2266 | Minimum of 10 extra breakers to be provided at each location. |
| 2371 | Can't we re-use some of the existing generators? |
| 2432 | no natural gas is allowed!!! |
| 2506 | EPA emission standards for Marin county |
| 2573 | Can't we re-use some of the existing tanks? |
| 2577 | In the past, 500 gallon tanks were used due to distance requirements from building for 1,000 gallon tanks. |
| 2578 | Does this meet code for 1000 gallon tanks? |

Comments

| | |
|------|--|
| 2692 | Isn't this site work being handled under a separate RFP? Vendor is not performing site construction work, but is preparing plans and specifications for this work that MERA/County will bid separately per Public Contract Code (Design-Bid-Build method). Accordingly, all references to vendor performing these tasks need to be amended to indicate that contractor will actually be performing the site construction work. |
| 2702 | add 'and permanent' after 'Temporary' |
| 2703 | add new line '10. New utility connections' |
| 2704 | replace with reference to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements |
| 2771 | delete 'and minimal', add 'control (in accordance with NPDES Phase II permit requirements where applicable)' after 'erosion' |
| 2772 | Is fencing a responsibility of the system vendor or the separate RFP for construction? |
| 2841 | All training is train the trainer except Technical training |
| 2855 | Why list two specific locations now for the training. I suggest stating that the training locations will be selected by MERA/Marin County. This leaves it open for us to pick different locations that may be better than the locations listed. Technician Training only would be held at the Communications Division |
| 2860 | For Dispatch and Field personnel, vendor should assist in training trainers, rather than end users. This will also likely reduce vendor costs in this area. |
| 2863 | Vendor should provide DRAFT training materials to MERA/Marin County for customization prior to duplication. |
| 2869 | Training material should be provided in editable soft copy form that can be tailored to actual operational needs by MERA |
| 2874 | Operator training should be training the trainer as well. Operator training should ONLY be train the trainer. |
| 2884 | Structured as Train the Trainer |
| 2885 | Structured as Train the Trainer |
| 2905 | Fleet mapping should be part of a larger operational discussion as well with input from public safety users. System backups, NMS programming, alerting and alarm system adding new units |
| 2913 | The Vendor should also provide monthly update reports similar to the current FE monthly reports. |
| 2919 | and with minimal impact on current space constraints at the dispatch centers and existing facilities. |
| 2944 | Scan groups, paging, private call, Mutual aid operation, Hospital paging, etc. |
| 2945 | Maybe semantics, but the talkgroup templates should be developed by MERA/Marin County and provided to the Vendor as should any radio alias scheme. |
| 2954 | Fleet mapping should be part of a larger operational discussion as well with input from public safety users |
| 3000 | recently factory trained on the equipment they will be installing |
| 3046 | Do we need to define what failures will initiate a restart of the testing period clock? |
| 3095 | Isn't this what we need? |
| 3105 | Phase 2 |
| 3111 | Not just Marin County service area |

Comments

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 3225 | correct Vender to Vendor |
| 3231 | correct Vender to Vendor |
| 3233 | Weekly at most, we want to be notified of every service request!! |
| 3311 | I understand that replacement hardware can't be available for the life of the system, but how did we come up with 7 years? |
| 3322 | Is this where we request service monitors, data test sets, network analyzers, phasing test equipment, etc. |
| 3411 | Add MERA as an additional insured party in additon to the County of Marin |
| 3485 | Isn't this a duplication of line# 3554? |
| 3604 | This section references Purchase Order. It appears FE used County's standard Requirements for Contractors dcoument as template. This is usually used where the PO is the contract. In this case, we will have a contract. |
| 3714 | Assumption that these costs do not list accessories and options? If they do, are all vendors pricing the same options that we may or may not choose? |
| 3717 | Should OPTIONAL items be listed seperately or at least clearly identified and not included in total costs? Add GPS tracking or portables with interfaces to both CAD systems. If this should be on line 3733, then there are some optional items here that should be removed as they are on line 3733 as well. |
| 3735 | Same as a previous comment, MCFD would like to see a one meter submersible option. Is GPS only available on the dual band? The bulk of the radios that would be tracked are mid-tier. |
| 3740 | Post warranty cost years 4-15 or just year 4? |
| 3748 | Just some nomenclature things - "Aircraft/SAR Emergency" should read "Air Guard" and there should be a VFIRE 21. Perhaps that was the intent for "OES Fire", but there is such a channel. This tables are confusing with Mt Barnabe listed twice on the top descriptions and only being able to see channels at more than one location by scolling the entire list rather than showing, for instance, Sheriff Primary at Mt. Barnabe (2nd listing) (pg 194) and at Sonoma Mountain (pg 196). Shouldn't both installations be listed on a singe line? What is "Second Deck"? |
| 3750 | Is there a difference between Barnabe and Mt. Barnabe as they are listed seperately. Is there a difference between Sonoma and Sonoma Mt.? |
| General Comments: | |
| Other | I didn't read the respondents and their contractors need to be DIR registrants? |
| Other | The Redwood Landfill site was shown to provide inadequate coverage along the HWY 101 corridor and San Antonio Rd in Northern Novato. The proposed Corda site demonstrated better coverage over a much larger geographic area. Should the Redwood Landfill site be removed from consideration? |
| Other | Can you identify where and how we have described the language to drive the initial proposal design past where they normally would be? This should be identified when we provide this to the Governing Board for approval. This was a specific desire of MERA to reduce changes and price fluxuations later in the process. |

Comments

| | |
|-------|--|
| Other | From NGPOC Minutes of 01/27/16: Pearce asked about the potential sharing of sites at the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza and Sutro Tower sites. Rajit responded that those options would be included in the Request for Proposal to the vendors. |
| Other | Add MERA Logo to cover page |
| Other | I would just encourage the group to invest a significant amount of time and funding for training. Can funding for training be including in the RFP to encourage department to spend the time needed for the training? We continue to have issues with the current system due to lack of training and failure to comply with MERA policies. |

03/23/2016

MERA: *WHEN SECONDS SAVE LIVES*

RFP Comment Discussion for the Next
Generation Project Oversight Committee



Overview



- The Draft RFP was received on 03/01/2016 and distributed on 03/02/2016 to the Executive Board, Next Gen Project Oversight Committee, Operations Working Group, MERA and Marin DPW staff for review.
- Comments were requested no later than 03/20/16.
- The following set of items for your discussion are based on those comments. They do not address all comments, but focus on areas that seemed ripe for your discussion and input.
- We received comments on behalf of 16 people.
(5 – Marin DPW, 2 – MERA Staff, 4 – West County, 1 – County Fire, 2 – Novato PD, 1 – Novato Fire, 1 – San Rafael PD)

RFP Line 19

RFP Text

- 3. Deploy a new microwave system to support an all-IP backbone and Ethernet traffic in a loop configuration to enhance availability and provide the scalability to support P25 voice, and potentially, future data implementations

Comments

- What exactly does "future data implementations" mean; mobile data, LAN/WAN transport and for which systems beyond voice? If we are asking for future data implementations we will need to give some idea of how much data and from where to where as it will have a large effect on system backbone.

RFP Line 31

RFP Text

- 3. Deploy a radio system providing in-building coverage to support the MERA Agencies Larkspur and jail complexes utilizing a distributed antenna systems (DAS) or bi-directional amplifiers (BDA), if necessary

Comments

- Why is Larkspur specifically noted here. I understand why the jail is, but there are many other areas in Marin with in building coverage issues, but why limit by limit ourselves by listing specific locations. Just say we need in building coverage and we may need DAS s and BDAs.
- Add hospital Emergency Departments for potential DAS or BDA deployments. Agencies Larkspur and jail complexes needs to be changed to the existing Marin County Jail and Cal-Park tunnel BDA's.

RFP Lines 70-71

RFP Text

- Marin County Mobile Data System: The County's 1,500 mobile data users utilize AT&T wireless air cards. At this time, Marin County does not intend to construct a private mobile data system.

Comments

- MERA does not provide mobile data services and there are no plans to include mobile data in this project. Can this section be deleted?
- SRPD uses Verizon for mobile computing. Can other companies be used?

RFP Lines 102-104

RFP Text

- A. MERA/Marin County seeks to leverage existing systems to create a multi-tiered regional communications network for both strategic and tactical communications in support of mutual aid and coordination of incident response. System designs and migration plans should acknowledge and integrate interoperability with existing legacy systems within the County, which may remain in service; these systems include:

Comments

- Lines 102, 103 and 104 - What does this sentence mean? Once again this sentence is from another system. It has no meaning in this procurement. Section 1.2.3 title needs to be consistent through out the RFP. In other places you state it as "gateways" The word regional will lead others to think "beyond Marin County Op area" maybe use "wide-area communications" like you have in other places with in the RFP

RFP Lines 118-120

RFP Text

- 6. Other Alerting Systems and over the air operations a. FIRESCAD is a fire station ring-down and alerting system, which is currently, deployed using XX equipment on an analog talkgroup on the MERA trunked network.

Comments

- Change Alerting System to read Alerting and Siren control system. Because this section is about connecting to legacy equipment and we know they can't connect the present FSA and Knox as is, should we say that they have to provide a solution? Change XX equipment to read "a Motorola SCADA system used for fire station alerting and siren control system" Relm

RFP Lines 214 - 217

RFP Text

- F. All equipment shall be provided in new condition and covered by a full manufacturer's warranty and support services for not less than 3 years. Warranty of all equipment supplied shall not commence until after full system acceptance as defined in this RFP.

Comments

- "Equipment shall be provided in new condition". I strongly suggest subscriber equipment is latest available model with at least 14 years of formal production and support availability. This would eliminate the issue we encountered with MERA-1 and radio sitting in boxes for five years.

RFP Lines 234 - 240

RFP Text

- “Equipment shall be provided in new condition”. I strongly suggest subscriber equipment is latest available model with at least 14 years of formal production and support availability. This would eliminate the issue we encountered with MERA-1 and radio sitting in boxes for five years.

Comments

- This says we want a complete turn-key solution for all systems, subsystems and components - should we break out site development from this? should we change "communications capabilities across the county" to reference our desired coverage areas.

RFP Lines 583 - 585

RFP Text

- The SELECTED VENDOR shall be responsible for storage of equipment. At the MERA/Marin County's discretion and if available, MERA/Marin County may provide storage space.

Comments

- What about the requirement for all equipment to be shipped immediately prior to installation?

RFP Lines 646 - 648

RFP Text

- RESPONDENT will be afforded the opportunity to survey existing MERA/Marin County sites and dispatch facilities. Site visits will be conducted between MONTH/DATE/2016 and MONTH/DATE/2016.

Comments

- Afforded the opportunity OR Required to attend? Prefer required to attend. again email address - MERA or FE or County.
- Dates need to be set
- should be consistent with current FE project schedule milestone dates

RFP Lines 649

RFP Text

- 3.4 Proposal Format

Comments

- Should we have a proposed milestone payment schedule from each vendor as a basis for contract negotiations at award? We obviously want to weight this in our favor in later negotiations and hold back as much payment as we can through completion of work.

RFP Lines 737 - 742

RFP Text

- A. MERA/Marin County's selection of a vendor to supply and install a Project 25 Phase 2 radio system shall be based upon the demonstrated competence and qualifications of the RESPONDENT to provide and install a communications system and ancillary equipment that best fits the needs of the MERA/Marin County. Each proposal will be evaluated and scored through a process conducted by MERA/Marin County staff.

Comments

- Delete the words "/Marin County staff" Should just read "MERA"
MERA/Marin County staff will not be the only ones conducting evaluations. This should read "panel" not "staff"

RFP Lines 750

RFP Text

- Table 1 – RFP Evaluation Criteria

Comments

Should the proposer's handling of Optional items be a line item in here? I would suggest reducing price score by 5 to 20 points and add those five points to Response to Scope of Work for a total of 55. Under Oral Presentation, change first line to: "At its sole discretion, the MERA Evaluation Committee may require....." Note - Scoring will be by a sub-committee of the MERA Next Gen Project Oversight Committee, although MERA and Marin DPW staff will be involved in the process and offering comments. Section "a" change P25 based to P25 Phase 2 based. Section "d" change to P25 Phase 2. Section "d iii" add UPS and Battery Plant. Section "j" what MERA/Marin County fiber is this referring to? Section "l" Fire station alerting and sirens. Oral presentations . On the equipment scoring (50 points) we should break this down. at least breakout the optional items from the mandatory and weight them differently at least separately. Response to Scope of Work section should be broken down into subcategories with sub scores.

Evaluation Criteria

Table 1 – RFP Evaluation Criteria

| RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA | Scoring Value Maximum Points |
|--|------------------------------|
| <p>Respondent Qualifications and Experience</p> <p>a. History of the company including the number of years in business providing P25 based radio systems as specified in this solicitation including descriptions of qualifications.</p> <p>b. Qualifications of organizational personnel and staff responsibilities including resumes of key project staff.</p> <p>c. Supplemental information demonstrating qualifications and experience.</p> <p>d. Five references from organizations for which your company is currently providing P25 based radio systems similar to the specifications of this solicitation on the Bidder's Qualifications Sheets. Provided the following information for each reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Name of the system ii. Description of system and services provided iii. Location iv. Contact person v. Contact telephone number | 10 |

| RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA | Scoring Value Maximum Points |
|---|------------------------------|
| <p>Response to Scope of Work</p> <p>a. Adherence to Compliance Matrix</p> <p>b. Radio Communications System Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. P25 systems compliance (with feature table) ii. Expansion Capabilities (scalability) iii. Site Selections iv. Existing Site Development <p>c. Coverage -</p> <p>d. Site Equipment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Core(s) ii. Simulcast Control iii. Remote sites, UPS, Antenna Systems, Interoperability Gateways <p>e. Dispatch Console Systems – features, functions, capabilities</p> <p>f. Voice Logging Recorder and interface</p> <p>g. Network Management Systems features, functions, capabilities</p> <p>h. Smartphone Interface features, functions, capabilities</p> <p>i. ISSI – External P25 system interfaces</p> <p>j. Backhaul systems including digital microwave and integration of MERA/Marin County fiber</p> <p>k. Subscriber equipment features, functions and capabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mobiles ii. Portables iii. Control Stations <p>l. Fire Station Alerting</p> <p>m. Volunteer Fire Paging</p> <p>n. Training plans</p> | 50 |
| <p>Project Plans and Schedules</p> <p>Preliminary project schedule with detailed Gantt chart, Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) plan, acceptance test plans (including coverage)</p> | 5 |

Evaluation Criteria - Continued

| RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA | Scoring Value Maximum Points |
|--|---|
| Warranty, Support, and Maintenance Plans System, subsystem, software, and subscriber warranty, support, and maintenance plans. | 10 |
| Pricing Costs provided on the pricing sheets, which is a separate Excel spreadsheet. This form must be submitted in a separate sealed package. | 25 |
| MAXIMUM SCORING POINTS TOTAL | 100 |
| Oral Presentation - At its sole discretion, the Evaluation Committee made up of MERA/Marin County employees may require an interview/presentation before the final selection and award to a Firm. Submittal of material and information during an interview/presentation could add up to 15 additional points to the total score of the Respondent. | 15 (possible additional points if an oral presentation is requested) |
| The following Scoring Formula will determine Scoring Value Maximum Points for the categories above: | |
| Excellent | .75 - 1.00 |
| Good | .50 - .74 |
| Fair | .25 - .49 |
| Poor | 0 - .24 |
| Multiply scoring formula by possible scoring value maximum point allotment. <i>Example:</i> If a firm is scored as .6 (Good) on Respondent Qualifications and Experience then this is multiplied by the maximum scoring points, e.g. $.6 \times 10$ (maximum scoring points), which would then equal 6 points. | |
| SPECIAL NOTE - The Cost Proposal will be evaluated as follows: | |
| Lowest Conforming Proposal | 25 points |
| Proposals within 5% of Low Proposal | 20 points |
| Proposals within 7% of Low Proposal | 15 points |
| All others | 5 points |

RFP Lines 990 - 992

RFP Text

- The **SELECTED** **VENDOR** shall be responsible for any issues related to site selection and will be responsible for resolving any issues related to site permitting or zoning.

Comments

- Can we actually make them responsible for resolving any issues related to site permitting or zoning?

RFP Lines 1072 - 1074

RFP Text

- Site walks for each of these facilities will be available to pre-approved prospective RESPONDENT personnel after the pre-bid meeting.

Comments

- Site walks available or required? When and where will pre-approval take place? We need to set this date also!

RFP Lines 1397 - 1401

RFP Text

- The console system shall be integrated with MERA/Marin County's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system which is currently Intergraph® Version 9.3, Rev. MR 2, but which may be replaced in the future. RESPONDENT shall identify all CAD systems that the proposed system currently may be interfaced to, supported features, along with associated costs to interface.

Comments

- What does that mean? MERA does not directly support the CAD systems, but if there is to be an interface, it should be to both InterGraph and SunRidge to support all MERA users. What type of CAD integration are we asking for? Is the cost for integration into their new system a MERA cost or each agency whom uses it, or a shared cost? Is this part of the GPS option?

RFP Lines 1538 - 1550

RFP Text

4.11 Voice Logger Recorder

- The MERA/Marin County currently utilizes a Voice Print International VPI® EMPOWER 5.X logging recorder for recording and playback of radio and telephony audio.
- 1. VPI® EMPOWER 5.x
- 2. Runs on two Supermicro® servers (primary/redundant)
- 3. Each server configured with five, 24 port analog cards, 120 analog channels 1543 total
- A. The SELECTED VENDOR shall be responsible for integrating the proposed radio system to the existing VPI® EMPOWER recording system.
- B. The RESPONDENT shall detail the extent of integration between the proposed radio system and existing VPI® EMPOWER system.
- C. The SELECTED VENDOR shall be responsible for any cost associated with the 1549 integration of the VPI® EMPOWER system with the proposed radio system.

Comments

- Individual agencies including Novato PD record local talk groups via analog feed demarc or interface provide to those dispatch centers.
- Does this requirement include the Vendor responsibility to provide feeds for the local agency voice loggers?
- Existing VPI is located at EOF

RFP Lines 1645 - 1652

RFP Text

- 4.14 Smartphone Integration A. As an OPTION, RESPONDENT shall propose an interface to the proposed radio system that integrates voice and data communications between MERA/Marin County P25 radio system users and MERA/Marin County users with broadband devices and/or smartphone applications. This interface should generally support the services and capabilities described in the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council (NPSTC) Recommendations for PTT over LTE Requirements dated July 18, 2013.

Comments

- While I am curious about the interface to smart phones for voice, we are not building a data system and those references should be deleted. This should be for voice only

RFP Lines 1676

RFP Text

-

Comments

- Following this section, should there be another on GPS as an option? GPS will require GPS capability in the field, as well as processing that data into interfaces with the two CAD systems (InterGraph and SunRidge) by the vendor, if this option were to be selected, so this becomes a hardware and backbone issue as well as potential impacts on data flow.

RFP Lines 2008 - 2010

RFP Text

- The SELECTED VENDOR shall be responsible for providing and implementing an 2008 over-the-air Volunteer Fire Voice Paging and Fire Station Alerting System that 2009 provides, at least the same level of features and functionality utilized today.

Comments

- Fire station and siren alerting
Remove: Fire Station Alerting -
The details we would like to add pertain only to the Volunteer Paging System. Add after "today".
Functions shall include but are not limited to: 1. Alert Tone and Voice Paging (Paging utilizing cellular signal is unacceptable) 2. Continuous monitoring of dispatch talk group 3. System shall be able to send signal to a belt worn, analog, receive only pager. 4. All equipment proposed shall be at the beginning of the products lifecycle and be fully supported and available for a minimum of 7 years after installation.

RFP Lines 2054, 2068, 2073, 2162, 2196, 2692

RFP Text

- 6. All site work required

Comments

Vendor is not performing site construction work, but is preparing plans and specifications for this work that MERA/County will bid separately per Public Contract Code (Design-Bid-Build method). Accordingly, all references to vendor performing these tasks need to be amended to indicate that contractor will actually be performing the site construction work.

Comments

- Isn't this being handled under a separate RFP?
- not sure what the intent is here, but site work should be more specifically defined so as not to include construction of site improvements, which will be bid separately (2054)
- this seems a bit too specific for an RFP. Vendor is to develop specifications (2068)

RFP Lines 3411 - 3412

RFP Text

- The County of Marin shall be named as additionally insured on the 3411 commercial general liability policy.

Comments

- Add MERA as an additional insured party in addition to the County of Marin

RFP Lines 3716 - 3717

RFP Text

- Table C.2 – Proposal Pricing Form (System Components Cost)

Comments

- Should OPTIONAL items be listed separately or at least clearly identified and not included in total costs? Add GPS tracking or portables with interfaces to both CAD systems. If this should be on line 3733, then there are some optional items here that should be removed as they are on line 3733 as well.

RFP General Comments

- The Redwood Landfill site was shown to provide inadequate coverage along the HWY 101 corridor and San Antonio Rd in Northern Novato. The proposed Corda site demonstrated better coverage over a much larger geographic area. Should the Redwood Landfill site be removed from consideration?
- Can you identify where and how we have described the language to drive the initial proposal design past where they normally would be? This should be identified when we provide this to the Governing Board for approval. This was a specific desire of MERA to reduce changes and price fluctuations later in the process.

RFP General Comments

- From NGPOC Minutes of 01/27/16: Pearce asked about the potential sharing of sites at the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza and Sutro Tower sites. Rajit responded that those options would be included in the Request for Proposal to the vendors.



MERA: SECONDS SAVE LIVES

See

www.MERAonline.org

for more information