

COMMENT REVIEW AND RESPONSE

File:		Submittal:		
Revision Action Code: A-Will Revise to Comply; B-No Revisions Are Recommended		Review Comments		
Item No.	Page No.	Review Comments	Responses	Revision Action
1a	1	The Draft RFP is not dated	Issuance date will be added	A
1b	1	and no author is listed.	Authorized by Department of Public Works.	B
	1	The RFP cover page should include due date and time.	Will add	A
	2	Table of Contents should include page numbers.	Will add	A
3	3, 4, 9	RFP terminology references - "Consultant", "Contractor" and "Program Manager" beginning with Section 1 - Introduction - should be consistent throughout in terminology if this is one in the same person or firm.	"Contractor" will be changed to "Consultant." Program Manager refers to the staff member, Consultant to the firm. Program Manager will remain.	A
4	3	MERA's budget for consulting services for the vendor RFP is provided, which could result in full expenditure of the budgeted amount or an under-budget fee proposal that could result in fees for extra work that exceed the budget.	The information referenced is public information on the MERA website.	B
5	3	The Program Manager's primary scope of work is to develop a Vendor RFP and assist with vendor selection and initial detailed design review. The RFP then appears to phase the Program Manager into System implementation and a Project Manager role who will oversee the vendor. Whether this is the best approach should be decided with MERA's input.	The approach in the RFP is consistent with the approach outlined to the Governing Board.	B
6	3	Scope of Work states that County staff will approve the Consultant's work products without reference to MERA approvals. (See your 12/10/14 memo to MERA Governing Board.)	Location of comment is unclear. In general, contract is with the County, County must be the entity to have final acceptance of all deliverables and authorize payments of contractor's invoices. County will follow a review process acceptable to MERA.	B

Comments on
Draft County of Marin RFP for Wireless Communications Consulting
Program Manager for MERA Next Generation Communications
System

7a	4	Phase I System Procurement - The Project kickoff meeting and other Communications Plan activities do not include representation of MERA by MERA's Deputy Executive Officer for Next Gen System.	RFP is not intended to include a list of all attendees at meetings.	B	
7b	4	and does not require the Program Manager to attend Next Gen POC (NGPOC) or Operations Working Group meetings. (See 12-10-14 MERA Deputy E.O. Scope of Duties Next Gen Project interface.)	Attendance at these two meetings by the Program Manager will be added.	A	
7c	4	Clarify who is the "Agency"	"Agency" in Task 1.2 will be changed to "County," in Task 1.3 to "MERA."	A	
7d	4	Agency's "Project Manager"	County's "Project Manager" is MERA Operations Officer or designee.	B	
7e	4	and "Contractor's Project Manager".	Will be changed to "Program Manager"	A	
8a	4	Task 1.2 references the "County's Radio Project Team". Clarify who is on the County's Radio Project Team".	The County's team will be those designated by the Operation Officer. Those involved over time could change depending on the project stage.	B	
8b	4	Is there a requirement for the Consultant reporting to the NGPOC and to the Operations Working Group?	See 7b above.	B	
8c	4	Likewise, clarify who is on the "Project Team".	See 8a.	B	
9	4	The proposed role of Program Manager with project frequencies needs clarification given DPW staff work with frequencies on MERA's behalf and the vendor's role with same.	The existing frequency work is summarized in the Feasibility Study and Appendices incorporated by reference to the RFP. The original frequency package was done several years ago and needs to be updated.	B	
10	5	Vendor Task 1.4, Item 5, "benefits" should be cited first before "risks."	We believe this is in reference to Item 4, will make the change.	A	
11		System implementation communications do not provide for MERA's Deputy Executive Officer representation of MERA.	Unclear where the RFP excludes opportunities to represent MERA. This level of detail is not typically included in a RFP.	B	

Draft County of Marin RFP for Wireless Communications Consulting Program Manager for MERA Next Generation Communications System.

12	7	Under Phase 2 – Implementation – Is it necessary to have the Consultant involved in the training aspect? MERA and DPW have a current training plan and the transition from Gen I to Gen II should be a simpler process than from Pre-MERA to Gen I.	We would like to review their training proposal based on their experience with other systems.	B	
13	11	Section V. - Evaluation – Will the “Selection Committee” be the Consulting Services Contractor Selection Committee appointed by the NGPOC?	Yes.	B	
14a	12	Section VI. - Pre-Proposal – Should the year be included with the date of February 4?	Year will be added.	A	
14b	12	As this is for approval, the reference to Section ___ should be completed.	“VII” will be added.	A	
14c	12	Should the Contract Award section refer to MERA’s recommendation process for the Consultant to the County BOS?	Additional detail not typical in a RFP. DPW will follow the process approved by the Governing Board.	B	
14d	12	Pre-proposal conference does not provide for MERA’s Deputy Executive Officer’s representation of MERA.	RFP is not intended to include a list of all attendees at meetings.	B	
15	13	Section VII. Inquiries – Radio Replacement Project Team composition is missing and contact information is incomplete.	Contact person will be added.	B	
16	13	Section VIII – General Conditions – The RFP uses the term “Competition Consultant” for the first time. Who is this?	The term “competition” will be deleted. There is only one consultant.	A	
17	Attachment	Draft Professional Services Contract should reflect MERA’s role in this project.	Contract is with the County, this is the County’s standard form.	B	

**Comments on
Draft County of Marin RFP for Wireless Communications Consulting
Program Manager for MERA Next Generation Communications
System**

18	n/a	If the County has a list of potential consultants for development of the vendor RFP, it should be shared with MERA.	We plan to post the RFP on the County webpage and send a notice to the following firms. We would be glad to send notice to any additional firms identified by MERA. RCC Consultants, Inc. Federal Engineering AECOM IT RF Consulting TUSA Consulting Services L.R. Kimball Buford Goff & Associates Winbourne Consulting, LLC CitCom	B	
19	n/a	Richard Chuck, MERA Contract Communications Engineering Consultant, is not included in the distribution list for RFP comments. Is he a part of the DPW internal review group? In any event, he should be involved with the RFP review.	Richard Chuck works for County DPW. His comments were included during internal review prior to distribution.	B	
20	n/a	Governing Board members and MERA Staff have a total of four (4) business days to comment (1/8, 1/9, 1/12 and 1/13). Given the GB member may need to involve technical staff from their agency as part of their review, this timeline may need to be extended to insure adequate member input and time for final RFP review that includes their feedback. The Next Gen System is a MERA project and the County is our contractor and responsible for its supervision and implementation. As the owner, MERA however needs to be kept effectively and timely involved with the delivery of the new System.	We have not received any requests for more time. If more time is needed, please let us know.	B	
21	11	Will the engineering staff from different jurisdictions be looking at this and other proposals?	The Next Generation System Project Oversight Committee designate Committee and staff members who will serve on the Consulting Services consultant selection committee.	B	

Draft County of Marin RFP for Wireless Communications Consulting
 Program Manager for MERA Next Generation Communications
 System

22	4	Task 1.2 Shouldn't there be a day to day contact person for both teams?	Yes, the consultant will identify a Program Manager, and the County will designate a project manager.	B	
23	4	Task 1.3 "identify suitable frequency" Does this address the Citizen's for Sustainable Pensions question which I believe was about the frequency. I may be wrong, if so disregard.	Unclear on what question they raised. This work will provide appropriate frequencies for the Next Gen system.	B	
24	5	Task 1.4 Is it possible to have a "unit cost" for added frequencies and also for transmitter site locations or are they too unique especially the sites?	Each site and its configuration are unique. Until system design is complete we won't know what frequencies will be exactly at each site. Our approach will be to get fixed unit costs where possible.	B	
25	5	My only concern would be that MERA have 'radio coverage' in EVERY part of Marin County with no dead spots.	Increased coverage options will be evaluated during the design stage	B	