

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

**COMMENT REVIEW AND RESPONSE ON WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTING SERVICES RFP, VERSION 2
February 4, 2015**

| File: | | Submittal: | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|--|
| Revision Action Code: A-Revised to Comply; B-No Revisions Are Recommended C-No Action Required | | | | | | |
| Item No. | Page No. | Review Comments | Responses | Revision Action | | |
| 1 | 8 | Under the section related to Project Approach; delete "City" and insert County or MERA; | Change made | A | | |
| 2 | 11 | Insert a period after "provided"; 5 th bullet point under the Financial heading | Change made | A | | |
| 3 | 12 | VI – Pre-Proposal Conference section; delete the reference to "San Francisco" | Change made | A | | |
| 4 | 5 | I hope we are planning to design a system that can be used by radios manufactured by more than one firm. | Task 1.4 life cycle recommendations analysis revised to add request to provide discussion of systems that can be used by radios manufactured by more than one firm. | A | | |
| 5 | 6 | In addition to allowing for competitive bids for radios, we can break the project into several contracts and phase them to reduce financing costs. | Task 1.4 existing RFP refresh task added to review schedule milestones and proposal pricing summary form for opportunities to reduce MERA financing costs. | A | | |
| 6 | 3 | I. Introduction, second paragraph, shouldn't it read "...replacement of the current system." rather than "...upgrade...?" | Change made | A | | |
| 7 | 4 | Task 1.3, bottom of page, "...estimate based on current number of channels and sites." As I understand it, the next gen. system will require <i>more</i> sites. Should this be more specifically addressed? | Change made to reflect existing sites plus four | A | | |
| 7a | 4 | Same sentence, "frequencies" rather than "channels" | Revised to frequencies. Note that this is for estimating purposes, final system design will not mirror the existing frequency plan as it was developed due to licensing restrictions on T-Band. | A | | |
| 8 | 5 | Task 1.4, second paragraph, item 1. Does not seem to address the concept of an incrementally upgradable system, rather than a flat 15 year life. | Change made | A | | |
| 9 | 8 | 8 under the section related to Project Approach; delete "City" and insert County or MERA | Change made | A | | |
| 10 | 11 | insert a period after "provided"; 5 th bullet point under the Financial heading. | Change made | A | | |
| 11 | 12 | VI – Pre-Proposal Conference section; delete the reference to "San Francisco" | Change made | A | | |
| 12 | 1 | next iteration MUST have Draft #3 and the date of the distribution | Change made | A | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| 13 | 1 | delete Program Manager - should read: Wireless Communications Consulting Services (or Consultant) | Change made | A | | |
| 14 | 1 | per Craig's statement at the EB on 1/14, he developed this RFP, therefore it should read: Craig Tackabery, Chief Assistant Public Works - County of Marin 3501 Civic Center Drive - Room 304 - San Rafael, CA 94903 | Name and title not included. RFP is issued by the Department of Public Works | B | | |
| 15 | 3 | Replace Program Manager with Wireless Communications Consultant | Change made | A | | |
| 16 | 3 | Add MERA Project Manager language to MERA Ops Ofc | Change made to reflect MERA Operations Officer is Project Manager | A | | |
| 17 | 3 | Where is MERA within the Scope of Work? | References to MERA added | A | | |
| 18 | 4 | 1.1 County's Program Manager - define as CT? ADD:working with MERA's Deputy EO | Project Manager defined in Item 16. Added MERA staff. | A | | |
| 19 | 4 | 1.2 DEFINE or DELETE: County's radio project team ADD:MERA's Deputy EO | Changed to County and MERA staff | A | | |
| 20 | 4 | Replace Program Manager with Wireless Communications Consultant | Change made | A | | |
| 21 | 7 | Phase 2 - first paragraph...DEFINE or DELETE: County's project team | Changed to County and MERA project team. Individual staff are not being listed in the RFP. | A | | |
| 22 | 8 | IV. Proposal Submission Requirements - change due date to blank right now until the final version is approved and then I assume it would be 30 days thereafter | Change made | A | | |
| 23 | 8 | Project Approach....first line....change City to County | Change made | A | | |
| 24 | 11 | V...should specify the NGPOC appointed Selection Committee | Changed to MERA. Specifics are not being listed in the RFP. | A | | |
| 25 | 12 | VI...ADD: who will be participating in the Pre-Proposal Conference, which needs to include the Deputy EO | Changed to County and MERA staff. Individual staff are not being listed in the RFP. | A | | |
| 26 | 12 | VII...for inclusion in the next revision - draft #3: ADD: specify who the contact will be for inquiries | Will be added prior to formal release of RFP, after review of staff availability during the response period. Most likely Operations Officer or designee. | B | | |
| 27 | | The GB and EB should be asked for their suggestions of other qualified firms to be sent the RFP notice. Included in this request of the GB and EB, they should be given the names of the firms Craig included in his 5-page "Errata" distributed on 1/14/15. | Any suggestions welcome. We recommend we distribute a link to the posted final RFP to the GB and EB so that they can forward to any potential consultants. | C | | |
| 28 | | Even though Craig stated that Richard is a County employee, MERA pays for him (this year \$195,378) and he should be involved as requested by MERA. Once again he was not "cc'd" on the email distribution of this draft... | Richard is involved directly in preparation of the RFP. | C | | |
| 29 | Attachment | Contract Updates? | Requested contract changes reviewed by counsel. Changes made. | A | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---|--|---|--|--|
| 30 | | Reviewed and looks great and thanks for all the effort you are putting into this! | | C | | |
| 31 | | There is not a great deal of clarity in how the governance of the project will occur. A number of committees and technical groups are referred to and I suspect it will be unclear to the RFP respondents as to how decisions will be made, and approvals required that will influence their work and timelines. Having not been involved in this process, perhaps it is clearer to the member agencies as to how the referenced committees and groups will interact, the make-up of the committees, and what hierarchy is moving forward. | Agree that approvals are potentially complex with numerous MERA committees. The Scope of Work requests the consultant to outline the responsibilities of the County on behalf of MERA, and to work with County and MERA staff to develop next steps to implement replacement. Those next steps will identify the decision making entity. | C | | |
| 32 | 3 | The consultant contract will be broken into two phases, I think that's wise. However, it is not clearly stated what the performance expectations are, or who makes that call. | Additional clarity added to first paragraph of scope of work regarding performance, particularly schedule, quality, and staying within budget. | A | | |
| 33 | various | References to the various members of the project team need to be consistent throughout the document. | Changed to County and MERA project team. | A | | |
| 34 | 4 | Scope of Work, Task 1.1 It's odd to ask a consultant to reach a mutual understanding of the future vision and plans for the communications system. It would be more appropriate to say MERA hired a consultant, acquired a feasibility study, and MERA selected a specific system based on that study to now implement. The RFP needs to clearly state what MERA's vision for the system is. | This will be a design build system by the System Vendor. While MERA has determined the type of system, each vendor will likely have a different approach to meeting the system performance objectives that will be included in the System Vendor RFP. Agree that future vision is too broad a framework for this consultant RFP, edited to be more specific to next steps. | A | | |
| 35 | 4, 9 | Scope of Work, Task 1.2 I would suggest an expectation be added to have the consultant describe their use of project management. Scheduling software to track the documentation and progress of the project, and how it will facilitate regular progress meetings. | Added to Task 1.2 and to Project Approach. | A | | |
| 36a | 4 | Scope of Work, Task 1.3: The scope of work outlined under <i>FCC Regulatory Efforts</i> includes what appears to be specific site design analysis for "new or modified facilities ", but nowhere is there any indication of what the expectation is for the development of new sites versus the reuse or modification of existing sites. By not being more specific, or referring to specifics in the Feasibility Study there is a great deal of room for interpretation, scope creep, or "that wasn't in our proposal "type issues down the road. The last paragraph on Page 4 clearly reflects this lack of definition of the project scope | Until the design is complete by the Vendor and accepted by MERA, the Consultant is not able to know the number of sites or frequencies. This is intended to provide a unit of measurement for estimating purposes. The final system design will not mirror the existing frequency plan as it was developed due to licensing restrictions on T-Band. | B | | |
| 36b | 4, 9 | The consultant should be required to clearly demonstrate how additional services will be handled. | Added to Project Approach. | A | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 37 | 5 | Scope of Work, Task 1.4: Second bullet point near the bottom of the page refers to "additional coverage sites". Do we know if these affect Novato? Is the extent of radio coverage in town in question? This is an area where future budget constraints may cause value engineering to occur that may affect the extent of radio coverage in communities. | The Feasibility Study referenced and linked to the RFP identified priorities for additional coverage: 1. Tomales 2. Tiburon 3. Wolfback Ridge 4. Muir Beach/Stinson Beach 5. 101/Redwood Landfill 6. East Marshall 7. Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza The project budget was based on adding four additional sites. | A | | |
| 38 | 6 | Scope of Work, Task 1.4: The deliverables under Task 1.4 should include a description of minimum required testing programs, acceptance programs, and conditions of switching over from old system to new system. | Task added to specifically review the Quality Assurance/Quality Control Program requirements in the existing Request for Proposal. | A | | |
| 39a | 6 | Scope of Work, Task 1.5: The description of what is expected of the consultant is vague, i.e. use of terms like "shall be available" and "augment the County's | Text clarified that the Consultant will support evaluation of responses and will facilitate planning and execution of the purchase. | A | | |
| 39b | 6, 10 | the RFP needs to request an estimate of hours based on the consultant's experience on other similar projects and include "x" hours to cover the anticipated scope of work. | Estimate of hours included in Fee Proposal. | B | | |
| 40 | 7 | Phase 2, System Implementation: The RFP references "construction management and oversight", does this include construction inspection? quality control testing? geotechnical testing? Weld inspections? More detail is needed here to delineate what's needed. There is no reference to allocating any funds within the scope of work for addressing potential processing or responding to contractor claims at the end of construction. | Tasks added | A | | |
| 41 | 9 | Proposal Submission Requirements, Firm Qualifications. Define what the specific grant funding qualifications criteria is. It's unfair to say consultant must qualify for payment under any "DHS, federal, state, or local" grant funding requirements if they're not specified. | Intent is to leverage local funds if possible with grants. No grants are currently secured. Changed to have Consultant to identify if they are under any restrictions or barred. | A | | |
| 42 | 10 | Proposal Submission Requirements, Firm Qualifications: The first solid bullet point is a repeated paragraph from earlier in the document. | Deleted from Project Approach. | A | | |
| 43 | 11 | Proposal Submission Requirements, Fee Proposal: Add bullet point for including "Cost for Specified Deliverables". | Added | A | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|--|--|---|--|--|
| 44 | 5,6,13,14 | The proposed RFP is difficult to follow | Additional formatting added in Section III and VIII. | A | | |
| 45 | | there should be clear delineation between MERA and the County as our contractor for this procurement, while providing safeguards for both. MERA counsel should be incorporated in the process to ensure these safeguards are appropriate and sufficient. | The RFP was provided to MERA counsel. No comments were received. Performance bonds or liquidated damages are not typically used in consultant contracts. | B | | |
| 47 | 3 | Add (MERA) after Marin Emergency Radio Authority | Change made | A | | |
| 47 | 5,6 | Change system life to 20 years | Change made to 15 to 20 years. | A | | |
| 48 | 8 | Add searchable to the PDF proposal submission requirements | Change made | A | | |
| 49 | 10 | Is it possible to have 10 years' experience in 700/800 MHz, P25? | Yes, 700 MHz has been around for 6 to 10 years, 800 MHz for 20 years, P25 for 20 years | B | | |
| | | | | | | |