

MARIN EMERGENCY RADIO AUTHORITY

c/o Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925
Phone: 415.927.5050

WWW.MERAONLINE.ORG

DRAFT 12/01/2019

NEXT GEN PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF AUGUST 28, 2019

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Cusimano at 2:00 p.m. on August 28, 2019 at the Novato Fire Protection District Heritage Room, Novato, CA.

Committee Members Present:

Town of Corte Madera
County of Marin Fire
Tiburon Fire Protection District
Novato Fire Protection District
County of Marin

Todd Cusimano
Mark Brown
Richard Pearce
Gerald McCarthy
Matthew Hymel

Committee Members Absent:

Marin County Sheriff
City of Novato
Town of Ross

Staff Present:

MERA Executive Officer
MERA Deputy Exec. Officer – Next Gen Project
MERA Admin Assistant – Next Gen Project
MERA Operations Officer

Maureen Cassingham
Dave Jeffries
Maura Griffin
Ernest Klock

Guests Present:

David Mortimer
Ethan Simpson
Betsy Swenerton

DPW
DPW Communications
DPW

- A. Approval of Minutes from June 26, 2019 Meeting of the Next Generation Project Oversight Committee

M/S/P Pearce/Hymel to approve minutes from June 26, 2019 Next Gen Project Oversight Committee Meeting as presented.'

AYES: All
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
Motion Carried

B. Field Survey

Griffin updates the Committee that the Field Survey is still in progress and moving forward smoothly.

C. Update of First and Proposed Second Amendments to Next Gen Radio System Implementation Agreement Between Marin Emergency Radio Authority and the County of Marin

Cassingham refers to Cusimano and Pearce for more insight, mentioning they have been working more directly with the County on this issue. Cusimano agrees and elaborates that there has been progress made and Klock, Hymel, Pearce, Rojas, and himself met recently and seem to be close to having something on an upcoming agenda.

D. Operations Working Group Attendance – Proposed Plan to Increase Member Agency Participation in Operations Working Group

Klock refers to the staff report, showing attendance to be slightly increasing. They have been doing outreach for the members including blanket emails, etc. He provided a copy to the Governing Board Members in efforts to ensure their representation. They will continue to hold monthly meetings, ramping up considering CEQA is coming to a close. Pearce mentions he sees the increase in participation also

E. CEQA Process and Schedule Update – Next Gen Project

Klock announces that he expects to receive the final CEQA document that afternoon. They will be advertising the release of the Notice of Completion for the CEQA document as scheduled on Sept 6, 2019. Klock does not see an issue with that timetable. There will be hard copies of this document at every Marin County Library and the Sonoma County Library Main Branch.

15 USB thumb drives containing the document along with the appropriate submittal sheets will be sent to Sacramento next Friday (9/6/19) morning and that will begin the timestamp for the 45-day review period. The Public Hearing in that notice is scheduled for October 10th, 2019 at the Marin County Board Chambers from

6:00pm – 8:00pm. Klock emphasizes the importance of attendance at this Public Hearing to the Committee, clarifying that this will be the only opportunity and forum for verbal comment to be made. October 21st is the closing of the Public Comment Period and will then move on to address those comments at that time.

F. Project Management – Next Gen Project Staffing Update

Klock wanted to start by introducing the County DPW Project Manager Betsy Swenerton. Klock wants her to attend the meetings to get up to speed on the project. Her previous skill set is from the Capital Group where she has done many building improvements projects and he thinks she will be a great resource for the MERA Next Gen Project. He mentioned that there is another new project member that will be introduced at the next available meeting. Cusimano asks if there are any expected changes in contracts regarding adding personnel? Klock says that this is being funded from the implementation monies budget, and they will know more once they proceed with CEQA and get a more formal schedule from Motorola, but he is optimistic.

G. Update on Motorola Change Order #8: Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) for Microwave Network

Klock explains that there have been minor adjustments made in this report. To note, he added a recent APCO site hardening recommendation, opening to the fact that many of the services and monitoring programs can be added across the microwave background with MPLS, but not with the Layer-2 System as was discussed previously.

Klock proceeds to go through the options outlined in the Summary Table on pgs. 3-5 of the Staff Report. Beginning with Option 0: stay with the Layer-2 System as was originally proposed, however losing the ability to have the full-service functions and room for additional services. Klock recalls the Committee agreeing to remove Option 1 from the discussion, but he left it on the table considering the data that Options 4b, 4c and 4d present. It is turning out like Option 1 is the best deal in terms of getting MPLS and required services implemented, so he is keeping it on the spreadsheet. The main change to development of Option 1 is a \$413,000 credit for a Layer-2 Network refresh.

Klock directs to a summary table in the staff report on 3 of 5, outlining a detailed table that he proceeds to read over. He explains the necessity of having the SUA and overviews the coverage outlined in the table. Klock emphasized that it is important to see the differences in the services outlined as some of them are referenced in the other Options. Klock proceeds to review the slide of the table outlining the different SUA service coverage. Klock points out that Motorola has a lifespan on the equipment that is 5 years. Klock goes on to explain the 2 network refreshes in the current agreement, and the possibility to exchange one or both of those refreshes to offset the cost of the MPLS System upgrade.

Klock continues to overview Options 1, prefacing with the fact that this is an older agreement and would have to be re-negotiated with Motorola, however he feels confident it will be honored. For Option 4, the hardware will be installed for MPLS by Motorola, but the County “shopped around” for support and software services comparable to that which would be provided with the Motorola system. NASPO, a government agency that negotiates prices for all various services, was contacted and suggested Nokia service as an alternative to the Motorola services in the change order agreement. The prices quoted from Nokia for the comparable level of services currently agreed on by Motorola, was in range of \$2.6 million. Klock explains the team tried multiple avenues to reduce the cost number by adjusting services covered and this was outlined in Options 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d. Klock summarizes that when reviewing any of the Option 4’s, an equipment-only installation, eventually the services will have to be added at some point. Those services have the projected cost of \$1.35 million for the bare minimal level of support. Klock emphasizes that they did their best to reduce the pricing with NASPO, but Motorola contracts are at a much lower cost.

Pearce asks for clarification of Option 4a, and Klock explains that the costs outlined in the table are the current NASPO pricing as of today for the minimum services to run the MPLS System. This decision can be deferred until a later time, but Klock stresses that the support is vital to use the System.

Cusimano thanks Klock for his report, and comments that the numbers for MPLS are still high and he has questions he would like the Committee to consider. He likes the idea of putting monies aside to bank interest, but it is a risk to budget based on a future negotiation. He would like these questions to be addressed before sending to the Board. Klock responds that it will be more expensive if the services are added later.

Cusimano asks for a show of hands on which Option the Committee recommends. Pearce would like more clarification on the agreements made by Motorola for the original Layer-2 System. Klock responds that the Layer-2 System would be losing some functionalities, and it would not be sufficient moving forward. Cusimano responds that it was the expectation of Layer-2 from day one, so this high price of an upgrade to MPLS is troubling. Jeffries weighs in, mainly concerned with the variable price of the Options 4a, 4b & 4c and that Option 1 would at least be a final number. Regarding Option-0, they would have to review the services they need to see if it would be functional to stick with the Layer-2 System.

Jeffries recommends Option-1 but would like the Finance Committee to review in detail before moving forward. Klock agrees by leaning towards Option-1 as a prudent choice and addressing the need for these services by Simpson and the Radio Shop. Hymel mentions that there have been interest monies collected, so this could be budgeted while still maintaining a prudent reserve. Hymel recommends

Option-1 outlining that the System needs to be functional for the next 15 to 20 years. Pearce replies by reminding the Committee that it is a large amount to be taking from the Project without even beginning implementation. Mortimer says that majority of the Systems being implemented now are MPLS functional. McCarthy comments that the Layer-2 System seems to have too much liability moving forward, and Option-1 gives the ability to prepare effectively for functionality in the future. Jeffries suggest that they should make a recommendation and then submit to the Finance Committee for review, and based on the Finance Committee recommendation, they can present to the Governing Board. Brown weighs in that Option-0 and staying with the Layer-2 System is moving backwards. Option-1 offers more security and they should reflect on the fact that many sites are remote and the need for these additional services is essential regarding upkeep, troubleshooting, etc. Mortimer agrees and recommends the MPLS System.

Cusimano concludes that it seems the Committee would like to present both Option-1 and Option-4A to the Finance Committee for further review and then presented to the Governing Board.

M/S/P Pearce/McCarthy the Next Gen Project Oversight Committee supports the MPLS System to present Option-1 and Option 4A to the Finance Committee for further review as presented.'

AYES: All
NAYS: None
ABSTENATIONS: None
Motion Carried

H. New Business -

None.

I. Open Time -

None.

J. Adjournment –

Cusimano adjourned the meeting at 3:00pm.

Minutes prepared by:

Maura Griffin
MERA Administrative Assistant – MERA Next Gen Project

