

At a Regular Meeting of the 911 Communications Oversight Committee on Monday, July 11, 2022, at 1:30 p.m., in the Commission Chambers of City Hall located at 300 South 5th Street the following Committee members were present: Commissioner Carol Gault, Commissioner Eddie Jones, Jewel Jones, and Kevin Kauffeld (4). Dr. Irvin Smith listened via phone, but did not participate in the meeting (1). Chairperson Kevin Kauffeld presided.

City Clerk Lindsay Parish took the minutes of the meeting.

### **APPROVE MINUTES**

*Jewel Jones offered motion, seconded by Commissioner Carol Gault to adopt the Minutes of June 21, 2022. All in favor.*

### **Q & A WITH FEDERAL ENGINEERING**

David TerMorshuizen (Federal Engineering Senior Consultant) and Travis LePage (Federal Engineering Director) answered the following questions from the Committee:

1. ***Our understanding is that in a 5-tower model, the 3 current towers at Elmdale Road, Rice Springs, and the KET Tower would be utilized. Would we only have a controller at one of the towers, or would there be a controller at each tower site?***

***Federal Engineering Answer:*** If referring to a system controller or simulcast controller then only a single controller would be required. However, for redundancy purposes, a second system controller will be requested. A repeater, or radio base station, would need to be installed at each tower location.

Travis LePage elaborated with the additional information: There would be a primary controller and also a backup, which is typically located somewhere else. Control points could be distributed at any of the radio sites. The equipment physical space is a lot more compact than it use to be, so they do not take up as much space. It is likely that a controller would be located at the 911 center with the redundant controller located in the Cloud or at another tower site. If the system ends up being an extension of KSP, a redundant core would likely be used. Mr. LePage recommended that the specifics related to location of this be left up to the vendors to propose in the RFP process.

2. ***Is it possible to do an RFP that would allow for certain alternate bids? An example that was given is: Could the RFP be written so that a vendor could offer an option that would utilize 3 towers (let's say KET, Rice Spring Tower, and Elmdale) and then another option that would utilize those 3 towers, plus 2 more. What impact (if any) would allowing for multiple alternatives within the same RFP have on the: quality of proposals, Federal preparation services, the timeline, and the review process once bids are turned in.***

***Federal Engineering Answer:*** The RFP can be structured to allow for alternate options, provided the main proposal is compliant i.e. "meets all requirements"

We do not define the number of sites, rather we include them as candidates the vendor can consider for their own design, as they take responsibility for the coverage guarantee

Impact on:

1. Quality of proposals - no impact
2. Federal Engineering's preparation services - minimal, time is needed to define the alternate options, and to develop a scoring workbook that allows for alternate proposals
3. Cost/price of proposals. Requiring the use of specific tower sites could lead to increased cost/prices from the vendors. Should be preferred or desired.
4. Timeline - Minimal, so typical timelines will be recommended
5. Review process once bids are turned in - additional time will be needed to review the alternate proposal, estimated at ~50% extra of the time to review the initial proposal.

A vendor would be able submit a proposal showing that they could meet all of the requirements using less than 6 towers. Federal will assist with reviewing the proposals to compare them and show the strengths and weaknesses between the proposals.

Federal Engineering advised that the RFP should not dictate to vendors which site to use. Rather the RFP should provide a list of candidate towers and sites in the RFP and allow vendors to choose how to bid given their design and the requirements for coverage guarantee.

3. ***Will the RFP Establish coverage requirements or could we allow for alternate coverage proposals. Will 95% be the coverage guarantee for the whole county? Is it possible to write the RFP to request 95% coverage in certain population dense areas and less than that coverage percentage in areas that are not populated?***

***Federal Engineering Answer:*** There are options for setting varying coverage requirements in the RFP. The DAQ requirement could be lowered to 3.0 or the RFP could specify coverage requirements in certain areas using a GIS grid of the City and the County and produce tiles. You could set certain percentage requirements per tile. The public safety standard is 95% with 3.4 DAQ, but if the City and County do not feel that coverage is necessary in certain areas, the RFP could be written to reflect such.

4. ***It has been brought up that the system is running on Windows XP which is past end of life and needs to be upgraded. Page 60 of the updated report from Federal Engineering has a table related to the Dispatch System. Is this system related to Windows XP? If not, can you point out where the Windows XP update falls within the report?***

***Federal Engineering Answer:*** The dispatch terminals will be provided with an updated/current operating system. The new system will be provided with all new computer and networking equipment running currently supported operating systems. Anything connected to the system will be updated.

5. ***What is the cost associated with the Windows XP upgrade? Is that something that could be upgraded immediately as we move through the RFP process, or does it have to be upgraded in conjunction with the larger upgrade?***

***Federal Engineering Answer:*** This would be very complicated. Motorola would need to

be contacted about whether or not this is a possibility. Because of the risks involved in upgrading Windows XP before the full upgrade, Federal Engineering recommends to continue forward with upgrading Windows XP as part of the larger upgrade if at all possible.

6. *Is the 700 MHZ Band reserved for the State Police?*

**Federal Engineering Answer:** No, the Region 17 (KY) Regional Planning Committee has assigned 28 - 700 MHz channels for use in McCracken County. The way this works is the FCC instituted regional planning committees in every state. They were instituted when the 800 was made available to public safety. Within the 700 band, the State does get state channels for their use only, however each County also has 700 band channels available. McCracken County has 28 – 700 MHz channels that we can use.

7. *Are there cost savings in working the Kentucky State Police to develop a radio network and would KSP respond to an RFP? The State Police is not going to compete for our RFP and they aren't going to give us a response to the RFP? Are there negative outcomes for the County & City in partnering with KSP? What potential cost savings could be realized if we partnered with KSP?*

**Federal Engineering Answer:** The State KSP is currently using a 700 system and also using the KET Tower. The State would not respond to an RFP, but Motorola would likely respond. Motorola has proposed that before, Federal Engineering reviewed and recommended that was not the right path. One thing the City & County would need to decide is whether giving up local control would be worth any cost savings. The City and County would need to decide if the KSP System is a good model operationally. Partnering with KSP would create a significant operational change. Additionally, you would need to consider that there would be a KSP core and a local core, so local upgrades would have to conform to the State upgrade schedule.

About \$1 million is the potential savings and for that cost savings, there would be a loss of local control and autonomy related to the system.

Federal Engineering recommends making the decision about whether or not to partner with KSP before releasing the RFP, however, an alternative could be included in the RFP to account for this potential outcome.

8. *Does the City tower have room at the top to add the new equipment that would be needed as part of an upgrade?*

**Federal Engineering Answer:** During site visits following the (mandatory) pre-bid meeting, the vendors will view the towers and identify possible heights for their antennas, and those heights will be used in their coverage design. Tower analyses are typically required to determine a towers ability to support new antennas, and will be included in the RFP.

**Q & A WITH FEDERAL ENGINEERING CONTINUED**

Chairperson Kauffeld noted that Brandon Marshall with the Kentucky State Police will participate in the next meeting of the Committee. Committee members can send questions to Lindsay Parish and she will compile those and send to Mr. Marshall.

**REVIEW WORKING GROUP PROGRESS**

Commissioner Jones commented that the sooner that he can share the RFP with County leaders, the better he will be able to participate in discussions.

**UPDATE ON FUNDING OPTIONS**

Chair Kauffeld noted that Stace Blankenship is working on a draft for the group related to funding options. The draft will be sent to Lindsay Parish to disperse to the group once completed.

**OTHER 911 DISCUSSION**

Mayor Bray Comments – Mayor Bray attended to support the discussion today. He has been in conversations with the Judge and others to understand how to move the process forward with greater sense of urgency. He encouraged the committee to continue asking questions, seeking out answers to questions, and moving forward with the process of developing a recommendation to the City and County. He noted that it is important to get all of the questions answers so that everything is contained within the RFP. Mayor Bray appreciates all of the hard work that is being put in by the Committee.

Kevin Kauffeld Comments – Stacey Blankenship will have a draft document related to governance in the coming weeks.

Judge Clymer Comments – Judge Clymer dispelled rumors that the County is not concerned with upgrading the 911 system. He reassured the group that he and the members of the McCracken County Fiscal Court believe that public safety and the 911 holds this project and public safety as a top priority. Though the Sports Complex will be a wonderful project for the community, public safety is the number one concern. He would like to see a recommendation before the end of the year and wants the City and County to work together toward a solution.

**ADJOURN**

*Eddie Jones offered motion, seconded by Jewell Jones to adjourn the meeting. All in favor.*

***TIME ADJOURNED: 2:58 p.m.***

ADOPTED: \_\_\_\_\_