

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: JULY 17, 2012

ITEM NUMBER: NB-3

- **SUBJECT:** RECEIVE AND FILE THE EMERGENCY SERVICES EQUIPMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
- **DATE:** APRIL 3, 2012

FROM: POLICE DEPARTMENT – SUPPORT SERVICES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU

PRESENTATION TOM GAZSI, CHIEF OF POLICE

BY:

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: BRYAN GLASS, LIEUTENANT – 714.754.5603

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council:

- 1. Receive and file the Emergency Services Equipment Request for Proposal (RFP);
- 2. Reject all bids for Emergency Services Equipment Services;
- 3. Direct staff to continue to explore shared service models with nearby communities;
- 4. Authorize staff to rescind layoff notices that were distributed to Police Department personnel.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with Council Policy 100-6, an Emergency Services Equipment Contracting Committee was formed to evaluate the potential for the contracting of ongoing City services. On September 12, 2011, the committee met to discuss the duties and responsibilities of the City's Emergency Services Equipment program. Based on detailed review of all the alternatives, it was concluded that the most viable alternative is to retain the existing service level, but at a lower cost through a public entity or a private company. In order to evaluate Emergency Services Equipment options, staff prepared a draft Request for Proposal (RFP), which was reviewed and finalized by the Emergency Services Equipment Evaluation Committee.

On October 18, 2011, at the City Council meeting, the alternatives for Emergency Services Equipment were presented to the City Council with a staff recommendation of releasing the RFP. The City Council directed staff to release the RFP based on staff input.

On October 19, 2011, the Emergency Services Equipment RFP was released with the following schedule:

Release of RFP	October 19, 2011
 Deadline for Written Questions 	November 3, 2011
 Responses to Questions Posted on Web 	November 10, 2017

1

Proposals Due

ANALYSIS:

In response to the City's RFP, a proposal was received from only one agency – ComSerCo, Inc. The County of Orange did not respond to the RFP.

The proposal provided by ComSerCo represents the service already being received by the City and does not address the full scope of service identified in the RFP. The Telecommunications Bureau currently outsources services to ComSerCo on a "time & material" basis for the repair and service of communications equipment. ComSerCo is able to provide this service for the communications equipment associated with the County's 800 MHz system and the Motorola products utilized by the City. This service is based on an on-call basis and coordinated through the Police Department's Telecommunications Bureau. The County of Orange is also used by the City for 800 MHz repair and reprogramming service needs.

The service provided by ComSerCo is limited and does not address the full scope of the Emergency Services Equipment RFP. For example, ComSerCo does not provide service for the City's phone system, public address system, dispatch console system, L-3 mobile video system, and vehicle change over needs. Additionally, the normal and routine service received by ComSerCo must be pre-planned and/or scheduled. Emergency call-out after hour service is available at a substantial cost. This method of delivery removes any on sight staff to provide service and does not meet the City's operational needs.

As was the case with the Dispatch Services Report, the Emergency Services Equipment RFP has been the subject of discussions with neighboring communities who are also looking toward a shared service solution with other public agencies in order to achieve cost efficiencies. The Police Department has also held preliminary discussions with Orange County Communications (a division within the Orange County Sheriff's Department) to develop a scope of work that would help the City achieve many of the goals contained in the RFP. Based on the type of functions the County could perform, which would be more comprehensive than the proposal from ComSerCo, some sort of hybrid plan may be the best option in the long term.

Currently, the Police Department's Telecommunication Bureau has two positions assigned to the Emergency Services Equipment function, although one position has remained vacant for quite some time. The remaining employee handles an array of services in addition to the emergency services duties, including telephone installations. This is likely a function best maintained by the City.

FISCAL REVIEW:

The City's FY 12-13 budget for Emergency Services Equipment (Technical Services) is \$463,519 (Salary & Benefits costs- \$213,300 and Maintenance & Operations costs - \$250,219). This includes the City staffing of two full-time employees, who provide the city-wide service of Technical Services.

The service offered by ComSerCo is based on a "time & material" basis. ComSerCo did not provide a cost of service with its submitted proposal. The overall annual cost of

utilizing ComSerCo cannot readily be determined and will be dependent upon the overall level of service required by the City.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

The City Council may decide not to accept staff's recommendations and opt to reopen the RFP and/or independently seek another service provider. Staff believes there is an opportunity to evaluate a shared services alternative with the County of Orange or neighboring communities. The City Council may direct staff to continue to pursue this consideration and the possibility of a shared services alternative.

LEGAL REVIEW:

A legal review is not required on this item.

CONCLUSION:

Based upon the submitted proposal, staff recommends that the City Council receive and file the Emergency Services Equipment RFP, maintain the City's existing delivery of service and rescind the layoff notices previously served on these employees. Further, staff recommends that the Council direct staff to continue to explore other service sharing opportunities with other public agencies.

TOM GAZSI Chief of Police

BRYAN GLASS Lieutenant

ATTACHMENTS: 1 RFP Determination Book