

**CITY COUNCIL OF CORDOVA
E-911 REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2011 @ 6:00 PM
CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM
MINUTES**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman *Dick Groff* called the E-911 Review Committee meeting to order at 6:03 pm on February 8, 2011 at the City Hall Conference Room.

B. ROLL CALL

Present were Chairman *Dick Groff*, Committee Members *David Allison*, *Robert Baty*, *Oscar Delpino*, *Gary Graham* and *Bret Bradford*. Absent was *Mike Hicks*. Also present was Deputy City Clerk *Robyn Kincaid*.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M/Allison S/Bradford to approve the agenda

Vote on motion: 6 yeas, 0 nays, 1 absent (Hicks). Motion carried.

D. AUDIENCE COMMENTS - None

E. NEW & MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

1. Review of E-911 RFP'S

Groff explained that the committee had three RFP's to review that were received in a timely manner. *Groff* suggested they first start by seeing if the responses complied with the RFP. *Graham* offered that he had never done an RFP before. He took some notes from an RFP of *Tom Cohenour's* and received no negative comments from those that reviewed it. The committee opened RFP's from ARTiCOM, REVL Communications and Systems and Procom. *Bradford* asked how many RFP's were sent out. *Baty* responded that 9 were sent out and 1 was solicited so a total of 10 parties have had the RFP in front of them. The committee discussed how they will be rating the proposals. *Bradford* stated he was expecting there to be more proposals but with there only being three he didn't see why they couldn't review them together as a committee. *Baty* stated that the idea behind the committee reviewing the proposals together was that it could be done quickly so a recommendation can be brought to the next Council meeting. The committee decided to have a copy of each proposal for each member to review.

The committee took a recess at 6:12 PM to allow for time to make copies of the proposals.

Meeting reconvened at 6:40 PM

The committee took some time to review the Proposals. *Allison* stated that there is no price for ARTiCOM or REVL. *Kincaid* pointed out that the RFP itself does not request any numbers so the committee cannot disqualify an RFP for not including numbers. *Groff* pointed out that ARTiCOM and REVL are very similar. *Bradford* stated that they both use the Zetron system. So it looks like we choose a service then they will give us the numbers. *Bradford* went on to say that he knows a guy, *George Mulson*, who used to work for GCI but is now retired and does some consulting. He knows a lot about E-911 and helps smaller communities figure out what they need in an E-911 system. If the committee would like to contact him he might be able to manage the process or at least help the committee know the right questions to ask. *Graham* pointed out that both ARTiCOM and REVL do not include Reverse 911. Neither took the time to look at our equipment. If they had they might have been able to offer us better proposals. All this looks like is a copy of their sales brochure. *Baty* stated that REVL at least broke it down; ARTiCOM's proposal really is just a copy of a sales brochure. *Bradford* stated that ARTiCOM didn't follow the proposal format requested in the RFP. REVL talks about their experience

but they both include the same Zetron sales brochure. **Delpino** agreed that both ARTiCOM and REVL recommend the Zetron system. REVL gave us more detail and tried to answer some of our questions from the RFP. **Graham** stated that he hasn't seen in either ARTiCOM or REVL anything dealing with Reverse 911 and expressed a concern that neither of them took the time to come look at Cordova's equipment. **Baty** stated that ARTiCOM doesn't meet the RFP requirements. REVL did try to include the information requested in the RFP. **Bradford** stated that they can't really give a quote until they look at Cordova's current equipment. He asked the committee what they felt about calling **George Mulson**. **Baty** stated that initially they were just looking to see which one met the criteria. **Graham** informed the committee that the 2007 quote was over \$600K and there are no grants available for E-911 systems. **Delpino** suggested it might be able to be funded if it was broken down. **Baty** informed the committee that the USDA is looking at something to address the needs in rural Alaska and the Troopers are working on something too. **Graham** stated that Federal money gets divided up between the states and Alaska doesn't have in place what is required to get that money thus far. Part of the issue could also be that there is a patent on the name Reverse 911 so these entities may not be allowed to use it. **Delpino** pointed out that ARTiCOM does not refer to what State contracts they have. **Bradford** pointed out that REVL did Juneau, Hoonah, the Anchorage School District, and have a contract with Alyeska. **Delpino** said he would be interested to know how long ago they did Juneau because at the last Fire conference they were saying Juneau was going to have to redo it because the last company didn't do a good job. **Graham** stated that REVL called early on and communication was really good for a while then completely stopped until the RFP went out. **Bradford** stated that REVL does a lot of work on the slope. **Baty** asked the committee if they had seen if any of the companies address GIS capabilities. **Bradford** stated that it was in detail on the RFP and he can't imagine them not being compatible with GIS. **Graham** stated that Reverse 911 is important. It will call 20 numbers at a time for any kind of incident like tsunami warnings. **Baty** added that he has also heard that it could be used for billing. **Bradford** stated that E-911 texting is available and wondered how much it would take to get our equipment ready to handle that. **Delpino** stated that Juneau currently has texting capabilities. He asked where the server would go. **Graham** answered that it would go upstairs next to the radio racks. **Bradford** stated that it sounded to him like consensus that ARTiCOM is out of the running. **Baty** stated that Procom proposed \$366K. These guys are the ones installing the ALMR so they know our system. Their price may be low because they might be backing it up with ALMR. **Bradford** pointed out that Procom has Revers E-911. **Delpino** stated that Procom has the State certificate.

Mike Hicks joined the meeting at 7:31 PM

Hicks added that REVL used to do work in Cordova in the 80's but there is a new owner now. **Delpino** asked if Procom has all the GIS systems we need. **Baty** responded in the affirmative. **Groff** pointed out that the quote includes one-year of Reverse 911, which must refer to a subscription that will need to be maintained. **Graham** stated that the whole system will have to have a maintenance contract of some kind. He added that Procom sent two guys down and did a site inspection on their dime. **Graham** pointed out that Procom includes mapstar training for up to 12 dispatchers. **Delpino** added that their reverse 911 is a lot more than just the reverse 911, it could be used for a remote locate. **Graham** pointed out that it will tie into ALMR. He added that it also has a call log recorder which the department has been without for years. **Allison** pointed out that the reverse 911 and warranty would be \$35K a year. **Bradford** stated that the proposal is actually using Motorola through Procom and added that he was not sure Council would go for \$30-40K a year for the extended warranty. **Graham** replied that the warranty and maintenance is what the \$2 fee is being collected for. **Delpino** pointed out that they do not have to purchase the warranty. **Baty** stated that unfortunately they don't have the numbers back from the fee to know the amount it will generate. **Delpino** said that he works with Procom sometimes and their

customer service can be over the top. He added that a recording can be made for during an emergency that people can call to get shelter information etc. **Baty** asked if the Reverse 911 could be used for on-site or a combination so that we could do the call-out ourselves and not the computer. **Groff** asked the committee what they thought about the three responders. **Baty** answered that he thought ARTiCOM can be eliminated and REVL also wasn't the best but he would keep them as an option for a competitive bid process. **Allison** stated that it's tough to compare without prices. Procom's proposal is much more complete but he would like to get some more information and prices from REVL to see if it is compatible with our current system and also if it does have the Reverse 911. **Delpino** agreed that Reverse 911 is needed. **Graham** stated that the old system did one call at a time but a new one could do 20 at a time. **Bradford** stated he would like to give REVL a chance to bid. **Delpino** pointed out that warranty and service are two different things. **Bradford** agreed with **Delpino** and added that they need to get quotes on both. **Baty** asked if they have to get the extended warranty or could they just get a 5-year warranty with the package. **Delpino** thought not. **Graham** stated that for service they have a very organized system, we set the priority and they are good on their warranty. **Groff** suggested making a list of questions to ask the bidders. **Graham** suggested a phone call or an invite to a future meeting. **Groff** stated that the committee needs to make a judgment on the other two proposals. **Baty** stated that Procom and REVL have different kinds of systems and asked how to compare the systems. **Allison** replied that they are the professionals. They are supposed to tell us what we need. **Bradford** stated that Procom and REVL would work for what the RFP is asking even if REVL's response isn't as complete. **Graham** stated that Procom worked hard for this proposal whereas the others did not make an effort. The committee discussed the difference between the 3200 and the 3300 models and decided that the main difference was data and NG-911. NG included the texting and internet capabilities that were discussed earlier in the meeting. **Bradford** asked if NG is needed. **Baty** stated that Feds are trying to get NG compliant in the next 4-years. We should get the best we can now. **Bradford** asked if they could go with the 3200 and then upgrade to the 3300. **Baty** stated that an upgrade later on may cost more and may be outside of a future budget. **Baty** pointed out that they have set a mechanism in place to pay back the loan so we should get the best we can now. **Bradford** asked if we will be utilizing the full program or can we get them incrementally. The committee discussed the different versions of GIS and decided to ask REVL if they are ESRI GIS compliant, as that is the specific version the City currently utilizes.

M/Groff S/Bradford to recess at 8:20 PM

Vote on motion: 7 yeas, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Meeting reconvened at 8:30 PM

The committee reviewed the list of questions to ask REVL and Procom. **Hicks** stated that they need pricing information before a decision can be made. **Allison** suggested they get more information from REVL then fill out the score sheets, rank them, then vote. He asked the committee who will make the calls. **Baty** offered that the Police Department can make the calls or they could make the calls as a committee now. Council agreed to make the call to Procom to get some of the questions answered as **Gary Peters**, from Procom/Motorola, had offered to be near the phone during the meeting in case of questions. **Baty** asked the questions and **Peters** explained that the City would purchase the software and then pay for services every year. There is a new subscription every year if you choose to continue the service. The cost of the software would include maintenance and 24/7 service and support just like the system. **Bradford** asked if the City could manage the software ourselves or do we have to have it hosted by subscription. **Peters** replied that he is not sure, he has only ever seen it hosted, and he will have to ask the developers. **Peters** asked to call the committee back in a few minutes after he calls the developers. The committee decided that there is the option to not get the warranty and pay minute by minute for service if that's the route Council decides to go.

M/Baty S/Bradford to recess at 9:05 PM until *Gary Peters* can call back.

Vote on motion: 7 yeas, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Meeting reconvened at 9:10 PM

Peters called back and informed the committee that he was unable to reach the developers but could discuss the details in the pricing with the committee. The annual fee would be \$2210 for Reverse 911 hosting service. Warranty is separate and is an additional \$464 for on call service for the Server, \$110 for IP circuit router maintenance and response, plus the expense for three required licenses totaling \$2958 per year. The City would own the software for the Reverse 911 and the 1st year includes on-site maintenance and warranty. *Peters* explained that there is help 24/7 a.s.a.p. and dispatch has access to a help line 24/7. Then *Baty* asked how long their response time for service calls is. *Peters* responded that it depends on the next flight, there is a parts list included in the proposal to expedite responses for on-site maintenance, since it is a remote location. If an on-site is not available a walk through is possible. *Baty* asked if our budget doesn't allow for parts are they available in Anchorage? *Peters* responded that they do not keep parts for clients but they could look into that possibility for the future to make spare parts or advance replacement parts available per budget. He said they understand budgets and if they need to cut down the proposal based on need and budget that can be done. He said he would like to earn Cordova's business and they will be as flexible as possible to gain it. *Bradford* asked about call out rates in case the City decides to opt out of the warranty service. *Peters* responded that it's \$500 a call out, plus \$125 per hour, \$187.50 per hour for overtime for weekends or holidays. *Bradford* asked about over the phone tech support without warranty. *Peters* responded the \$500 rate for a telephone call for the first 2 hours. *Bradford* asked if the warranty and call out rates are standard. *Peters* responded that they are consistent across the country. *Baty* asked if we need NG911 and if our system is compatible. *Peters* responded that there would have to be upgrades. NG911 is still in its development stages. Much of the capabilities will depend on the carriers in Cordova and their equipment. He stated that the proposal could be changed to be a pure IP base but that would force the carriers to change their equipment which he doesn't think they will be willing to do. He opined that E-911 is long overdue in Cordova. *Baty* asked if there is another product available if we decided not to do the NG911 system. *Peters* replied that there is not. It is the only one that has been refined, perfected, and improved. The committee thanked *Peters* for his time and the call was ended. *Bradford* stated that he is a fan of preventive maintenance but is concerned that the surcharge isn't going to cover the warranty. *Hicks* stated that if no preventive maintenance is done then we will incur more cost in replacing. *Baty* stated that there will be a back-up so if a repair has to wait a bit it can.

M/Graham S/Baty to declare ARTiCOM as non-compliant with the RFP and is therefore disqualified.

Vote on motion: 7 yeas, 0 nays. Motion carried.

M/Baty S/Allison to appoint Robert Baty to contact REVL with the list of questions prepared in the meeting and that he bring the information back to the Clerk for disbursement to the committee.

Vote on motion: 7 yeas, 0 nays. Motion carried.

The committee discussed a future meeting to discuss the response from REVL. The committee decided to recess the meeting until Thursday at 12:30 PM after audience comments.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Clay Koplín stated that he was unaware of the surcharge and it's a lot of money and that more public information would be nice. He agreed with the committee going to the bidders with questions but cautioned that they make sure they have back-up for disqualifying bidders from the process. He suggested a performance contract be included in the contract negotiations. He asked if there are dates for the completion of the installation of this new system and what the costs would be. *Groff* responded that

the committees' task was to choose an RFP and give it to the Council to debate the funding and implementation. **Koplin** raised the concern with bringing in an advanced system when we don't have consistent addressing yet. **Delpino** responded that the City is developing sign standardization currently.

Joanie Berhends agreed with **Koplin** that there was not enough public information on the surcharge and it has created some discontent. **Hicks** responded that the City Council initiated the surcharge and they need to hear this feedback.

M/Bradford S/Allison to recess the meeting until Thursday February 10, 2011 at 12:30 pm.

Vote on motion: 7 yeas, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Meeting recessed at 10:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER on Thursday February 10, 2011

Chairman **Dick Groff** brought the E-911 RFP Review Committee meeting out of recess at 12:29 pm on February 10, 2011 at the City Hall Conference Room.

ROLL CALL

Present were Chairman **Dick Groff**, Committee Members **David Allison**, **Robert Baty**, **Oscar Delpino**, and **Bret Bradford**. Absent were **Mike Hicks** and **Gary Graham**. Also present was Deputy City Clerk **Robyn Kincaid**.

Groff asked **Chief Baty** to refresh the committee with the questions that were posed to REVL. **Baty** responded that the RFP requested Reverse 911 and NG911 capabilities and that it be compatible with GIS. REVL's proposal didn't address these items other than that they do have "mapstar".

Mike Hicks joined the meeting at 12:42 PM

Baty continued that the information in the packet is simply a log of the conversation with REVL. He stated that he does not feel that REVL met the basic outline of the RFP. They did not provide NG911 or Reverse 911 capabilities. They do have "mapstar" but it is not ESRI GIS (which is the specific version of GIS the City of Cordova utilizes). He said that he did not feel the correspondent knew the product. **Bradford** stated that if they really wanted our business he would have forwarded the questions on to Zetron. **Delpino** stated that Reverse 911 was very specifically requested in the RFP but the guy from REVL didn't know if it was even Reverse 911 capable. **Baty** stated that they asked for details and mostly received the answer that the guy they called didn't know. **Hicks** stated that the committee went the extra mile to try to make this proposal process competitive and give them a chance at gaining the City's business. **Allison** stated that if they can't give us a quote than maybe they haven't ever installed one. **Bradford** stated that he was disappointed that we didn't have more competition because Procom is expensive and continued that there is always the option to do the \$500 a call with Procom which would probably pencil out less expensive in the end. **Groff** asked the committee to listen to the voice mail from REVL before discussing further. **Delpino** played the message which said REVL was still in the process of getting in touch with Zetron and that he has some technical questions to ask Cordova's staff when it is convenient. **Bradford** stated that it was a dismal response to the RFP. **Groff** asked the committee if they wished to disqualify the proposal from REVL. **Bradford** replied that he thought it should be disqualified because there were too many things not addressed that were requirements in the RFP. Once Council hears that there was only 1 qualified response, they may choose to send it back out. **Baty** responded that they sent the RFP to the best list of entities they could find and does not think that sending the RFP back out would produce a different response.

M/Bradford S/Baty to disqualify REVL Communications and Systems because they did not address Reverse 911, NG911 or GIS issues in their proposal.

Vote on motion: 6 yeas, 0 nays, 1 absent (Graham). Motion carried.

2. Selection of the recommended E-911 Design and Installation Company

Groff stated that the committee now has a single vendor to review. **Delpino** said he would like to know if the Reverse 911 would work without having to pay for that service and if there are other options available. **Hicks** asked if perhaps we could get a stand-alone phone that would do all those multiple calls instead of the Reverse 911. **Delpino** stated that the Reverse 911 has other capabilities too. **Bradford** asked if the price on the Reverse 911 was annual or a monthly charge. The answer was that it was \$2000-\$2500 a year. **Hicks** thought that price wasn't bad. **Baty** said he thought that was do-able instead of the \$30-\$40K in a warranty. He added that warranties often times out-price the systems. **Hicks** stated that the call out and repairs cost a lot less than the warranty. **Baty** stated that the addressing can come together pretty quick for the GIS. **Allison** stated that he is comfortable with Procom being the only responsive RFP.

3. Discussion on recommendation report to City Council

Allison stated that Council will rely on staff for details and contracts. This is response enough to forward on to Council. All the committee needs to forward on will be the name of the proposer we think is best, they will have staff work out the details and contracts. **Groff** reminded the committee that Peters told them the other night that the price is negotiable. **Bradford** stated that Council is going to want a summary of the product with a budget summary of the final product when they are asked for the money. **Baty** stated that the proposal and money will go separately to Council. **Bradford** suggested that they request **Graham** to create a price breakdown/product benefit summary for Council. **Delpino** stated that what Procom has proposed is a wish list of what they want us to have and that we can downsize it. **Baty** added that Procom has already presented two proposals to the City and knows what we need but there is room for negotiations. **Bradford** stated that the committee is not qualified to negotiate details. **Allison** added that Council will direct staff to negotiate a contract. **Bradford** stated that they need to let Council know about the process the RFP's went through. **Groff** summarized that the City received three proposals and two were disqualified and that the proposal from Procom is not a final price but can be negotiated.

M/Bradford S/Delpino to select Procom to be the E-911 design and implementation company and recommends the City Council enter into contract negotiations with Procom.

Vote on motion: 6 yeas, 0 nays, 1 absent (Graham). Motion carried.

F. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION - None

G. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

H. ADJOURNMENT

M/Baty S/Bradford to adjourn the E-911 RFP review committee meeting

Vote on motion: 6 yeas, 0 nays, 1 absent (Graham). Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:25 PM

Approved: August 17, 2011

Attest:


Robyn Kincaid, Deputy City Clerk

