

MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT

INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

SUBJECT	PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR NEXT GENERATION 911	DATE POSTED	May 21 ²² , 2013 <i>Just</i>
PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE	Blair C. Getz, (941)749-3053	DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED	To be determined after Negotiation
DEPARTMENT	Public Safety	CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED	Delay in Services <i>Melissa M. Wendel</i>
SOLICITATION	Request for Proposals #12-3235BG	AUTHORIZED BY	Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO Purchasing Official
		DATE	May 21, 2013

ACTION DESIRED

Authorization to enter into negotiations with L.R. Kimball of , Ebensburg, PA to provide PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR NEXT GENERATION 911.

ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY

Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.)

Manatee County Code of Law

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

- The intent of this Request for Proposal is to provide Manatee County with a design and specification for the Next Generation 911 System. With the progress of IP-based telephony and the advancements in public network switching systems, old wire-type telephone systems have become obsolete. One of the last vestiges of the technology has been the public 911 network for delivering 911 calls to "public safety answering points" Public Safety Answering Position (PSAPs). Unlike conventional IP telephone systems the 911 network or "NextGen 911", architecture is unique to PSAPs and is uniquely complex in the way information about the caller is delivered to the PSAP.
- Continued next page.

SUMMARY

RESULTS Authorization to enter into negotiations.

ATTACHMENTS: (List in order as attached)

N/A

INSTRUCTIONS TO BOARD RECORDS:

N/A

COST

\$167,598 before negotiations

SOURCE (ACCT# & NAME) N/A

COMMENTS N/A

AMT./FREQ. OF RECURRING COSTS (ATTACH FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT) N/A

- The Request for Proposal was posted on DemandStar and the County website, Bradenton Herald and Tempo News, it was also provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its members. Eight (8) firms submitted proposals.

Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals include:

NONE.

Local Firms that submitted proposals include:

NONE.

Other (non-local) Firms that submitted proposals include:

Elert & Associates of Sillwater, MN
Essential Management Solutions, LLC of Pottsville, PA
Geo- Comm, Inc. of St Cloud, MN
Intertech & Associates of Freehold, NJ
L. R. Kimball of Ebenburg, PA
Mission Critical Partners of State College, PA
RCC Consultants, Inc. of Woodbridge, NJ
Telecommunications Development Corporation of Washington DC

- The Evaluation Committee Members consist of:

Ron Koper, Interim Director, Public Safety Department
Ron Hardy, Telecommunication Manager, Information Technology Department
Blair Getz, Contracts Negotiator, Purchasing Division, Financial Management Department

County support staff served the Committee in an advisory capacity as a non-voting member.

- The Evaluation Committee convened on (12/17/2012) and determined that certain proposers should provide oral interviews. Those firms, in alphabetical order, were:

Geo-Comm
L.R.Kimball
Mission Critical Partners, Inc.
RCC Consultants

- The Evaluation Committee convened on (2/1/13) to listen to the Oral Interview from each selected firm.
- The Evaluation Committee met immediately after the Oral Presentation to discuss the offers based on the stated requirements in the RFP and the Oral Presentations. There were two (2) firms that were considered to be the strongest of the four (4) presenting firms, L.R. Kimball and RCC Consultants, Inc., and the Committee voted to have these two (2) firms provide follow-up interviews, two (2) hours each. The Follow-up interviews took place on 3/8/13 with L.R. Kimball and RCC Consultants, Inc., after the interviews concluded the Committee adjourned and agreed to hold another meeting to take a final vote.
- The Evaluation Committee met on 3/27/13 for the purpose of final selection. A vote was conducted with the unanimous result for L.R. Kimball, the firm selected for which we ask for authorization to negotiate.
- The order of placement for the presenting firms is as follows, first to last:

L. R. Kimball ranked #1 as the top candidate for negotiating an Agreement. During their Oral Presentation their project manager and two technical consultants discussed their current project in Palm Beach County as well as their previous engagement working with the State of Florida re: State NG911 RFI. Their key team for our project was present and discussed their proposal from outline to detail based on the questions presented by the Evaluation Committee. They made important comparisons between the proposed work and their recent experience in this environment. They discussed the strength of their company as related to NG911 background supported by their larger parent corporation (CDI) involved in international communications. They indicated their commitment for helping counties such as Manatee with technical assistance in order to promote the greater goal of improved performance by Florida in general.

L. R. Kimball was invited to a follow up interview on 3/8/2013. During this meeting, their technical consultants further discussed their proposal in greater detail in terms of time frames and goals for a successful migration plan. Their process included specific deliverables which aligned with our expectations. Their regional offices are located in Palm Beach, FL.

RCC Consultants, Inc. ranked #2. During their Oral Presentation, their proposed project manager and two technical consultants discussed their standard methodology for developing NG911 solutions. They appeared to have strength in the area of project management with lesser technical experience. Although they have a regional office in Tallahassee, they discussed their most recent experience in the States of Massachusetts and Kentucky. Certain technical questions by the Evaluation Committee were answered with reference back to their project management instead of technical experience.

RCC was invited to a follow up interview on 3/8/2013. During this meeting, one of their technical consultants again discussed their standard model of project management. Although asked to comment in greater detail about the technical aspects of this project, their consultant responded in general terms about the project management script. They discussed their recent work in Leon County, FL however their primary NG911 experience has been in Massachusetts and Virginia. They discussed their strong experience in radio inter-operability projects in Florida. RCC represents a good second choice for this consulting project if necessary.

Mission Critical Partners (MCP) ranked #3. During their initial interview on 2/1/2013, their proposed project manager was not present; however three technical consultants discussed their understanding of our current operation. They appeared to be knowledgeable in the area of NG911 via work in other states, not Florida. The proposal by MCP represented the highest cost, including travel costs, although much of their proposed work would occur via conference call.

Geocomm ranked #4. During their initial interview on 2/1/2013, their proposed project manager was not present; however their account manager, a project manager, and a technical consultant discussed their proposal which highlighted their project management process, yet little technical experience. They did not cite any recent similar projects in the State of Florida.

- The remaining respondents, although well qualified, were not selected based on a comparison of capabilities of the selected firms.

Elert & Associates of Sillwater, MN
Essential Management Solutions, LLC of Pottsville, PA
Intertech & Associates of Freehold, NJ
Telecommunications Development Corporation of Washington DC

- Estimated Cost of Services: \$167,598 before negotiations

The above justifications are a generalized summary of major observations intended only to provide the County Administrator a sufficiently detailed overview of the main observations of a majority of Committee Members. Each Committee Member may have considered one or more facts or factors more or less important than the other Committee Members when voting, and this summary of the Evaluation Committee's decision is not an attempt to exhaustively describe each of the relevant factors which motivated each of the Committee Members to select the rankings described.

- The resulting Agreement will be managed by the Public Safety Department.