

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

CORRECTED DRAFT: 1/20/16

NEXT GENERATION PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 9, 2015

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cusimano at 2:03 p.m. on December 9, 2015 at the Novato Fire Protection District's Administration Office – Heritage Conference Room, Novato, CA. 94945.

Next Generation Project Oversight Committee Members & Alternates Present:

Central Marin Police Authority	Todd Cusimano (Chair)
County of Marin Fire	Mark Brown (Vice-Chair), Jeremy Pierce (Alternate)
City of Novato	Jim Berg, Jamie Knox (Alternate)
Marin County Sheriff	Mike Ridgway (Alternate)
Novato Fire Protection District	Gerald McCarthy
Tiburon Fire Protection District	Richard Pearce
County of Marin	Matthew Hymel
City of Mill Valley	Jim McCann
Town of Ross	Tom Gaffney

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

Federal Engineering – Project Manager	Rajit Jhaver
Federal Engineering – Deputy Project Manager	Bob Simmons
Federal Engineering – Technical Lead	David Muniz

B. Approval of Minutes from October 28, 2015 Next Generation Project Oversight Committee Meeting

Anderson noted that Jamie Knox from the Novato Police Department was at the NGPOC meeting on October 28, 2015 and that the minutes should be amended to reflect that change.

M/S/P Berg/McCarthy to approve minutes from October 28, 2015 Next Generation Project Oversight Committee Meeting with suggested amendment.

AYES: All
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: Pearce
Motion Carried

C. Project Update (Jeffries/Jhaver)

Jeffries shared the updated Federal Engineering (FE) Communications Plan with the group, and also discussed a draft FE Monthly Report and revised Project Timeline. He noted that the Monthly Reports would be used to create a MERA Newsletter to share updates regarding the MERA Next Generation Project. He also noted the Project Timeline was based on best assumptions and that there may be unforeseeable circumstances that would require timeline adjustments as the project moves forward.

Pearce asked if the timeline represented a best case scenario. Echols responded that the timeline is accurate based on the best information available, but would need to be adjusted if, for example, site acquisition problems arose on some of the “greenfield” sites. Jeffries said that MERA may need to make decisions about site acquisitions in the future as they related to the overall implementation of the MERA Next Generation Project.

Jhaver stated that the dates that FE and MERA do have the most control of are the dates in the Timeline leading up to the issuance of the Vendor Request for Proposal, and that FE was firmly committed to reaching those goals.

Jeffries discussed the Frequency Workshop occurring the following day, and noted the Life Cycle document would be produced and available for review soon.

Simmons discussed visiting the potential sites for new towers for the MERA Next Generation Project. He noted that a couple of them were true “greenfield” sites which would require extra attention.

Cusimano asked for an explanation regarding the Coverage Workshop on coverage decisions MERA would ultimately have to make. Nelson answered that in the Feasibility Study, seven potential new sites were identified to increase coverage, and that four of the sites were identified as priorities. She stated that all seven sites would be analyzed in the

Coverage Workshop so that MERA had as much information as possible to make decisions about new tower placement. She also noted that if we used only the existing sites, we would have relatively the same coverage with the Next Gen system as we do with the existing system.

Pearce asked about partnering with the San Francisco emergency communication system to possibly share tower space. Simmons replied that Golden Gate toll plaza site bridge site, meant to overlook the Marin Headlands, might be covered by another tower being developed by the San Francisco system and that the option was included in the list to explore.

C. Coverage Workshop

Jeffries discussed the importance of getting representatives from each of MERA's twenty-five member agencies to the Coverage Workshop on January 26, 2016 so that all of them had input during the coverage analysis. He said that MERA staff would be reaching out to the various MERA Boards to encourage the member agencies to send a representative to the workshop.

Echols and Jhaver discussed the details regarding the Coverage Workshop, noting that the meeting could last all day, depending on the number of questions from attendees.

Jeffries said that Anderson would be developing the attendee list for the Coverage Workshop.

D. Discussion of Alternates for NGPOC Members

Jeffries discussed the alternate process for NGPOC members. He noted that there have been challenges in the past getting a quorum for NGPOC meetings, so the idea was to allow members to send an alternate if they were unavailable to attend a NGPOC meeting.

Jeffries continued that three of the members had already given names of alternates, and requested that the rest of the members send him names for their alternates. Brown noted that he had brought his alternate to the meeting so that he could see how the Committee functioned. Jeffries confirmed that alternates had voting power at the meeting only if the primary member was not in attendance.

E. Review Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Jeffries said that the NGPOC currently had a meeting scheduled for January 27, 2016, noting that it would be held the day after the Coverage Workshop in order to discuss the results from the analysis. He said he believed that the NGPOC, at a subsequent meeting, would be reviewing the draft Vendor Request for Proposal, which would be an important milestone for the MERA Next Generation Project. Following the release of the Vendor RFP, meetings will likely be needed to be scheduled to review Vendor responses, which will require a large time commitment for some NGPOC members.

Jhaver discussed the evaluation process for the Vendor proposals, noting that FE will provide the structure for the process.

F. Other Information Items

None

G. Next Meeting

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 1/27/16 at 2:00 pm.

F. Open Time for Items Not on Agenda

Nelson asked for help getting more members for the MERA Operations Working Group, noting that the group plays a critical role in the review process for the implementation of the MERA Next Generation System.

H. Adjournment

Chair Cusimano adjourned the meeting at 2:28 pm.

Minutes prepared by:



Alex Anderson,
MERA Administrative Assistant – MERA Next Generation Project