

AT A JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY VIRGINIA, CITY OF LEXINGTON, AND CITY OF BUENA VISTA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2013 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN R.R.CAMPBELL
MEMBERS: J.M.HIGGINS, R.S.FORD, D.W.HINTY, JR., A.W.LEWIS, JR
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN

Call to Order

Chairman Campbell welcomed everyone to the joint meeting. He stated that it is not often that all three localities can get together for a meeting and was happy to see everyone. He then called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order and asked the City of Lexington and City of Buena Vista if they wished to do so as well.

The Cities of Lexington and Buena Vista called their meeting to order.

Chairman Campbell indicated that Mayor Elrod, Mayor Hogan and he had discussed how they should handle the meeting and they had agreed that he would chair the meeting and introduce the topic at hand.

He stated that the localities of Rockbridge County , the City of Lexington and the City of Buena Vista, have for some time, been pursuing improvements to our regional emergency communications system. He confirmed that proposals have been received from three vendors. Those proposals had been reviewed by the Communication's Board consultant, Federal Engineering and the Regional Emergency Communications center staff. Director of the Communications Center Craig Sheets subsequently ranked the proposals based on criteria contained in RFP and presented the rankings to the Regional Communications Board, which concurred with the ranking. He

stated that the purpose of the meeting is for all three participating localities to receive an overview from Mr. Sheets regarding the process so far. He reminded everyone that this is not a public hearing. He then turned the discussion over to Mr. Sheets.

Mr. Sheets presented the following information:

Rockbridge Radio System Project

System History

- October 1998 - Current system formed from the combined resources of VMI, Rockbridge County, Lexington City and Buena Vista City
- 2002 - Contracted study of the system recommended total replacement.
- 2007 - In conjunction with RC Fire and Rescue Study - a second radio study of the radio system recommended total overhaul of the system.
- 2011 - ECC Board contracted with Federal Engineering (FE) to assist in further study
 - Step 1 - 2011 - Complete system assessment. Results...
 - Current portable coverage \leq 30%
 - Current paging coverage \leq 49%
 - Step 2 - 2012 - RFP development, evaluation, negotiation, procurement
 - December 2012 - RFP published requesting 3 options
 - Analog conventional simulcast system
 - Digital conventional simulcast system
 - Digital P-25 Phase II trunked system

- All options would need to meet a 95% mobile coverage requirement

In addition, options for an alpha numeric paging system were requested.

o Step 3 - (March 29, 2013) - Initial proposals received and considered

- Proposals received from Motorola, Harris and Tait (3 options from each, as requested)
- ECC Board reviewed the 3 main system options, considering the following criteria
 - Coverage
 - Long term viability of systems
 - Reliability
 - Interoperability
 - Maximization of available bandwidth
 - Affordability
 - Compliance with existing and "promised" mandates

The following determinations were made:

- *Analog conventional simulcast*
 - Pros:
 - o Could reuse some existing equipment
 - o Meets coverage requirements
 - o Lowest cost option
 - Cons:

- o Would not meet future mandates (reducing system life)
 - o Would not maximize available bandwidth
 - o Would not qualify for federal grants
 - o Reuse of existing equipment could reduce reliability
 - o Not feasible for future capacity needs
- *Digital conventional Phase I simulcast*
 - Pros
 - o Qualifies for federal grants
 - o Meets coverage requirements
 - o New equipment would increase reliability/system life
 - Cons
 - o Does not reuse existing field subscriber equipment (cost)
 - o Does not maximize bandwidth
- *Digital Trunked Phase II simulcast*
 - Pros
 - o Meets all future mandates
 - o Qualifies for federal grants
 - o Meets coverage requirements
 - o Maximizes use of bandwidth
 - o Allows for wide-ranging interoperability options

- Cons
 - o Cost
 - o Does not reuse existing field-subscriber equipment (cost)

- The ECC Board considered all options and opted to go with Option 3 -Digital Trunked Phase II simulcast (for the reasons listed above).
- The three vendors were asked to resubmit their proposals with Option 3, with their best and final offer (BAFO). All complied.
- The new criteria included the modification of several requirements of each vendor:
 - o Removal of digital alpha-numeric paging
 - o Quote their high-tier subscriber units
 - o Provide financing options
 - o 100% microwave backhaul (no reliance on ground-based cabling/fiber)
 - o P-25 Phase 1 (Minimum) System

BAFOs were received from each vendor. The staff reviewed each proposal with guidance and input from FE. The Vendors were ranked using the following criteria:

- General Qualification of Vendor to complete the project

- Experience & Technical Qualifications
- RFP Compliance
- Coverage Guarantee
- Cost of System and Lifecycle Costs
- Unit cost of subscriber equipment
- Capability, Features and Functionality of the System
- Warranty, Maintenance and Support

ECC Board findings

- Based on all available information, and on input from Federal Engineering and the Director of the ECC, the ECC Board chose to accept the Director's recommendation:

- o Harris
- o Motorola
- o Tait

➤ Why Harris Communications?

Ranked highest in the ranking procedure

- All three vendors showed 95% coverage
- Harris provided many additional features and options at no additional costs.
- Harris addressed all of the areas of concern that we had with coverage in specific geographical locations
- Their proposal is geo-redundant, which means other sites can act as the "brain". With the Harris proposal, another site picks up the missing sites workload. Harris also

provided two separate locations as the P-25 controllers as well. BIG for continuity of operations

- They proposed the most conservative design. This improves our in building penetration as well as in the event of a site outage, a smaller area is impacted while repairs are being made. Less sites means larger areas without coverage in an outage or maintenance.
- Lowest Subscriber costs of the proposals at their "High Tier" level. Other vendors did not necessarily propose their "Top of the Line" radios and were more expensive.
- Lowest "per site" costs of the three.
- Best financing options, lowest interest rate, reducing the long term costs
- Service/Warranty work done direct from Lynchburg (the factory) not from a second party partner.
- Offered to install a P-25 Phase 2 system and subscribers at no additional costs. Making the system fully capable and ready at no additional cost to the localities for future mandates and requirements from the FCC. This allows us to not continue to have to come back and ask for additional funding when the next level of narrow banding mandates come out.

He noted, in closing, that the 9-1-1 Board requests approval from each locality to proceed with negotiations in the order of ranking: Harris #1, Motorola#2 and Tait #3. This will allow us

to negotiate the best possible package for the Rockbridge Region. At that point we will return to you with the final package offering and request approval to execute contracts.

Chairman Campbell asked the Mayor's of Lexington and Buena Vista if they had any comments.

Mayor Elrod noted that the report was well done.

Mayor Hogan asked when the County would be considering the ranking.

Chairman Campbell advised that it would be at the next meeting, on Tuesday, November 12, 2013. He also noted that it was his understanding that Buena Vista would be considering on Thursday, November 7, 2013.

Buena Vista City Manager Jay Scudder noted that Lexington would also be considering on November 7, 2013.

Chairman Campbell thanked Mr. Sheets for the presentation and asked for a motion to adjourn.

Supervisor Higgins moved to adjourn, seconded by Supervisor Hinty, and the motion carried by unanimous vote by the Board.