



County of Fairfax, Virginia

ADDENDUM

DATE: November 4, 2016

ADDENDUM NO. 3

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS
REFERENCE: RFP2000002010
TITLE: Next Generation Core Services Solution (NGCS)
DUE DATE/TIME: November 30, 2016 / 2:00 P.M.

The referenced request for proposal is amended as follows:

1. Reference Page 45 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.7 Spatial Interface (SI), Paragraph 1: Delete the first sentence and replace it with "The SI is responsible for provisioning and updating authoritative GIS data to the ECRF and LVF. It is anticipated that, in the future, the NCR will require the PSAP tactical map display, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems, and similar applications that consume GIS data will also receive updates via the SI. However, SI updates to these systems are not required at this time and this capability should not be priced in Respondent's cost proposal."
2. Reference Page 41 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.5 Emergency Call Routing Function, Paragraph 5: Delete the first and second sentences and replace them with "An origination network may use an ECRF, or a similar function within its own network and at its own cost, to determine an appropriate route—equivalent to what would be determined by the authoritative ECRF—to the correct ESInet for the emergency call. Respondent shall describe the functionality of such an ECRF equivalent and document where this functional element resides. The Contractor shall provide a Spatial Interface to authorized entities, such as Origination Networks, to provide for replication of the ECRF for Origination Networks to determine the appropriate ESInet to route calls."
3. Reference Page 42 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.5 Emergency Call Routing Function, Paragraph 9: Delete the "Location Error Correction" bullet point from the list of bullets.
4. Reference Attachment 2 to addendum #3: Contact Information for Site Diversity Investigations has been added to Appendix C (Technical Requirements) as Attachment E.

5. Reference Page 50 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.10 Event Logging and Management Information System (MIS), Paragraph 6, first sentence: Change to read "Contractor is responsible for any third-party software licensing costs and any other associated costs."
6. Reference Attachment A (with Addresses) of Appendix C: The address of Manassas City Police Communications PSAP has been corrected. Please send a request to ji.pun@fairfaxcounty.gov for the revised version of Attachment A with address information.
7. Refer to Attachment 1 for answers to questions received from October 5, 2016 through November 1, 2016.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.



Jamie Pun, VCO, CPPB
Contract Specialist II

THIS ADDENDUM IS ACKNOWLEDGED AND IS CONSIDERED A PART OF THE SUBJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL:

Name of Firm

(Signature)

(Date)

A SIGNED COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL OR RETURNED PRIOR TO DUE DATE/TIME.

Note: SIGNATURE ON THIS ADDENDUM DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR SIGNATURE ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT. THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT MUST BE SIGNED.

Attachment 1

Q1: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5,11

Question: Please define the meaning of “replicas” in this context.

A1: Replica means a replication of the GIS data layers provided by the Offeror’s Spatial Interface. Copies of the GIS data may be permitted by the Offeror’s SI to another authorized element, such as access/origination networks.

Q2: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5,12

Question: Please provide use cases where the state-level ECRF would need to become authoritative for the NoVA region.

A2: If the region’s ECRF received a query for a service URN of “urn:ena:service:responder.federal_police.pp” for the U.S. Park Police, it may need to refer or recur to a state-level ECRF for determining next-hop URI. Additional use cases may be found in Section 5.3.8 in NENA-STA-010.2-2016.

Q3: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5,12

Question: Are the terms “replica” and “higher level aggregation” used interchangeably in this instance? If not, please clarify each term.

A3: The aggregation of data at higher-level ECRFs would include aggregating replicas of GIS data sets provided by Spatial Interfaces from more than one regional data set. For example, the NCR’s SI replica aggregated with other regional Virginia replicas that are aggregated by a future, state-level ECRF.

Q4: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5,12

Question: To help understand the underlying issue to be resolved, please provide an example use case for overload and backup ECRF.

A4: If the region’s ECRF suffered a catastrophic failure, a long-term, future use case would be that a state-level ECRF could provide the next-hop URI as a backup to the regions failed ECRF.

Q5: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.7,1

Question: What tactical map display is each agency using?

A5: The referenced section has been updated to clarify that SI updates to tactical map displays is a future requirement that should not be priced at this time. For future reference, Offerors shall assume that the PSAP’s tactical map display shall be required to support a Spatial Interface (SI) per Appendix B of NENA-STA-010.2-2016 if it is to provision and update GIS data layers from the Offeror’s SI.

Q6: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.7,2

Question: Please confirm the intent is for the SI to provision GIS data to the ECRF/LVF for use when answering LoST requests and not that the intent is for the SI to convert GIS data into the LoST protocol itself.

A6: Addendum 2 updated the referenced requirement to address Q25. It now reads “The SI shall convert the GIS data meeting these requirements into the format (data structure and projection) used by the ECRF and LVF. The SI shall provision the formatted data and perform incremental updates, in real-time or near real-time, using a Web feature service.”

Attachment 1

- Q7: Ref. Appendix C, Attachment A
Question: Can you please complete Attachment A? It is incomplete. It is not possible to provide a proper bandwidth calculation without the current number of trunks. i.e. missing the # of trunks at many of the backup sites.
- A7: See updated Attachment A provided in Addendum 2.**
- Q8: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.4
Question: transfers include the ANI not ALI. A rebid is required for the ALI once transferred can you please clarify this?
- A8: Offerors shall describe how their solution supports the delivery of location and caller information when a call transfer is performed.**
- Q9: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.10, 6
Question: What third party does NCR envision potentially having third party verification fees? Can you please provide examples?
- A9: The third party fees might be items proposed by the offeror which Fairfax County does not currently have a license to utilize with its CPE or in its network environment. We are asking for clarity where this might be required. If the contractor is holding all the software license agreements for each of the participating jurisdictions (e.g., for a particular MIS logging tool or for licensing agreements for CISCO routers that will be provided to each jurisdiction) then no licensing agreement might be necessary for each jurisdiction to sign. See modification #5 above.**
- Q10: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.3,7
Question: this question is a bit confusing. IETF RFC 4103 describes carrying text as a payload through RTP, but does not describe the conversion of Baudot tones to real-time-text. Baudot tones will be converted to SIP by the LNG and will be delivered as such to the CPE or LPG
- A10: As an element of published standards, clarification may be found in NENA 08-003, or its recent update STA-010.2-2016.**
- Q11: Is it possible to provide an executive summary for this bid?
- A11: See Appendix C, Section 1 Background and Project Scope.**
- Q12: Ref. Addendum 1, A3
With respect to Addendum 1 as responded, A3, we understand that the master terms and conditions are being established through this RFP by way of Fairfax County as the procurement agency. While it is also noted that other jurisdictions will establish their own contract and negotiations, it is not clear as to how they will actually procure said services.
Question: Will each County procure from Fairfax County the NGCS as a service, essentially using this master agreement as a Frame Contract, or will each County purchase independently using this as a pre-defined rate card?
- A12: Each participating jurisdiction will procure services independently using the terms, conditions, and pricing established for the resultant contract. The resultant contract will be between Fairfax County and the Contractor. Each**

Attachment 1

participating jurisdiction will have an option of independently contracting with the contractor using the same terms, conditions, requirements and pricing of the resultant contract upon completion of this RFP process. Each participating jurisdiction will have an option of adding additional terms and conditions required by statute, ordinances, and regulations, to the extent that they do not conflict with the resultant contract's terms and conditions.

Q13: Ref. Addendum 1, A3

Question: Will each MWCOG member county be required to go through their own respective RFP process to procure from this Master Agreement?

A13: No, the competition requirement is being fulfilled by Fairfax County conducting this competitive procurement process on behalf of NCR. Participating jurisdictions of NCR have the option of riding the resultant contract, utilizing the same terms, conditions, specification, and pricing established during this RFP process to procure Next Generation Core Services Solution.

Q14: Ref. Addendum 1, A3

Question: Question #3: Assuming Fairfax County awards to successful bidder independently (i.e. no other MWCOG agencies participate from the start), is it the County's intent to offer its NGCS core as a service to other jurisdictions (fee for service)?

A14: No, each participating jurisdiction is responsible for procuring its services. Fairfax County does not intend to offer its NGCS as a service to other jurisdiction for a fee.

Q15: Ref. Addendum 1, A7

Question: As of the date of solicitation of this RFP, it is understood by bidders that such an agreement does not exist yet. If said MOU is being developed still and is specifically addressing NG9-1-1 procurements, how can bidders be assured that the Terms and Conditions or intent of the existing RFP are able to be extended to said MWCOG regional members? If an agreement for shared NG9-1-1 procurements is not yet in place, what assurance do bidders have that other agencies will in fact be able to utilize the awarded framework via Fairfax County at this stage?

A15: The mentioned MOU is not a governing document for this RFP process. This RFP process is being conducted in accordance with Virginia Public Procurement Act which permits any public body to participate in, sponsor, conduct or administer a joint procurement agreement on behalf of or in conjunction with one or more other public bodies or public agencies or institutions or localities of the United States or its territories for the purpose of combing requirements to increase efficiency or reduce administrative expenses in any acquisition of goods, services, or construction (ref. VPPA, Section 2.2-4304). Also reference Section 28 (Use of Contract by Other Public Bodies) of Special Provisions.

Q16: Ref. Addendum 1, A8

Question: While intent is clear, are these agencies in fact able to participate in a shared NG9-1-1 procurement if the MOU has not yet been agreed upon by MWCOG members?

A16: See A15.

Attachment 1

Q17: Ref. Addendum 1, A14

Question: With respect to Addendum 1, A14, it is understood as to there being no stated or pre-defined timeline for deployment of the NGCS solution. As the majority of the NCR is served by Verizon currently via their 9-1-1 network assets and it is widely known that any serving site containing a DMS-100 EOL, there is a possibility that certain PSAPs in the region could be impacted by an end of service / end of support date. Are any of the Verizon serving locations (Tandem or Central Offices) utilizing said DMS-100's and, if so, are any of the NCR PSAPs on an EOL / EOS deadline?

A17: Yes, Verizon operates DMS-100 selective routers in the NCR. Verizon has not provided an end-of-life or end-of-service notice to any PSAPs within the NCR.

Q18: Ref. Attachment A

Question: Will the County provide bidders with current (2015) call volume information for inbound call traffic, including 9-1-1 and administrative calls, for all PSAPs in the NCR?

A18: 9-1-1 call volume was verified and/or updated in Attachment A provided in Addendum 2. The NGCS and ESInet will not be managing administrative calls, therefore this call volume has not been provided in Attachment A.

Q19: With respect to the existing SI (Spatial Interface) project discussed at the pre-bid conference, it is understood that this project will have substantive impact on the NGCS project bid herein. As this project is being led by GDIT (who is also the current CPE service provider in Fairfax County) and was in attendance at the pre-bid per Addendum 1 sign in sheet, there could be a perceived inequitable advantage held by said firm with respect to leveraging existing deployments and technologies in the region. Will the County amend the RFP to require any incumbent provider of NG9-1-1 service elements to disclose these in their respective pricing submissions, with instructions to the evaluation team to evaluate costs for all providers from a position of "cost neutrality"? This will ensure all bidders (including incumbents) are given equal stakes and not erroneously scored based on any existing project overlaps which should not pertain to this RFP.

A19: No. Amending the RFP is not necessary. The end result of the current SI project is that each of the individual jurisdiction's GIS data will utilize a common, standards-based GIS data model with highly accurate data layers that is ready for integration with the selected NGCS vendor's solution. As a standards-based data model, the current SI vendor has no competitive advantage over potential Offerors to this RFP. The evaluation team will conduct a fair, thorough, and balanced evaluation of the submitted proposals in accordance with all procurement guidelines and the stated evaluation criteria.

Q20: With respect to the above and the fact that all bidders require accurate details as to incoming call volumes as stated in Question #7 [Q18], and that the County has stated there is no urgent pressing date to complete deployment for this project, it is in the best interests of all to have ample time to design and cost once said information is received. In lieu of the aforementioned, will the County grant a three (3) week extension to the proposal due date so bidders can capture the call volumes and details critical to their solution and most favorable pricing options to the region?

Attachment 1

- A20: Addendum 2 extended the due date from November 4, 2016 to November 30, 2016. No additional extension is being considered at this time.**
- Q21: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.5
Although the text refers to an MPLS handoff, it is our understanding that the network connections (circuits) are not required as we have been asked to provide a one-time fee.
A) Is this understanding correct? B) Is the requirement for the interface and interoperability testing only?
- A21: A) No. The Contractor will be required to provide MPLS network connectivity to West's Miami, Florida, and Englewood, Colorado data centers. Any potential monthly recurring fees should be rolled into a one-time fee. B) The requirement is to mutually establish network connectivity with West, mutually develop an interoperability specification, mutually conduct interoperability testing, and maintain the interface and connection for production call transfers as the system demands for the term of the services.**
- Q22: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5 Emergency Call Routing Function, Paragraph 5.
Question: The ECRF utilized by the Origination Network would typically set outside of the ESInet serving the NCR. Does the question suggest that the vendor must supply access to the NCR ECRF or stand up a separate ECRF for Origination Networks to access for the purpose of introducing calls into the NCR ESInet? Can you please include a use case to help clarify the request?
- A22: The referenced requirement has been amended as documented in this Addendum above. The Contractor shall provide a Spatial Interface to authorized entities, such as Origination Networks, to provide for replication of the ECRF for Origination Networks to determine the appropriate ESInet to route calls.**
- Q23: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.5 Emergency Call Routing Function, Paragraph 9.
Question: What is meant by "Location Error Correction"? Data corrections would be accepted via the Spatial Interface. The ECRF supports Gap/Overlap detection and reporting, but would not be expected to correct errors with the locations themselves. That should always flow from the authoritative GIS provider.
- A23: The referenced requirement has been updated to delete "Location Error Correction" from the list of bullets.**
- Q24: In order to properly provision an ESInet and NG Core Services to manage the call volumes of Fairfax County and the National Capital Region, it is necessary to understand the expected call volumes and the peak load periods. Based on this, can Fairfax County provide the monthly call volumes of each PSAP that is a part of this procurement, at a minimum for the last year, best case scenario over the last three years?
- A24: Offerors shall use the information provided in Attachment A to Appendix C to design its bandwidth requirements for their proposed solutions.**

Attachment 1

Q25: Ref. Appendix A, Section 59 Partial Payments

Question: The clause states that up to 5% of the value of the entire order may be retained until completion of the contract. Should this apply under an as-a-service type contract? If so, how would the retainage be withheld?

A25: During the negotiations phase, a mutually agreed-upon payment schedule may be established to specify frequency and/or the dates of the payments. The issue of partial payments will be addressed during the negotiations phase.

Q26: Ref. Addendum 2, Attachment 1 Questions and Answers.

Question: Your answer to Question 11 instructs bidders to identify and state the reason for taking a particular exception in a separate section in the proposal, and states that the County will consider it during negotiations. Does this answer pertain only to Question 11 or is it acceptable to identify and state the reason for taking exception to other provisions? Will taking exception(s) have any effect on the consideration of offers?

A26: Whether or not to take an exception to a requirement of a RFP is a decision to be made by the offeror responding to the RFP. Exceptions to specifications or requirements that have been categorized into any of the evaluation criteria may negatively impact the score for that criteria. Exceptions to general terms and conditions contained in Appendix A most likely will not affect the initial evaluations (which will be based on the evaluation criteria and weighting specified in paragraph 15.6.c, Special Provisions) and will not come into play until the negotiations phase.

Q27: Ref. Special Provisions, Section 7.1 -Part A

Question: Counties have indicated a limitation of grant funding of \$400,000. Does that mean that \$400,000 is the maximum amount the Part A Counties have in total for Non-Recurring Cost(NRC) and that any amount above that needs to be calculated into the Monthly recurring cost? Or does that just mean that the \$400,000 is the portion coming from grant funding and that the vendor should bid the appropriate NRC by county and that any amount above the \$400,000 for the Virginia Counties will come from other funding sources.

A27: The \$400,000 is provided as information on the grant funding available for payment of non-recurring fees for Part A. Offerors should propose the total non-recurring fees regardless if they are less than or surpass the \$400,000 in grant funding.

Q28: Ref. Special Provisions Section 7.3

- a) What other counties and/ or states is the contractor to consider when supplying prices by population or by PSAP beyond Virginia and Maryland?
- b) Based on the fact that there are multiple variables (legacy network/CPE and operational differences) for each state or region, can the NCR recommended pricing structure that can be used by these additional locales?

A28: a) Offerors should only consider Maryland and Virginia.

b) The NCR requests that pricing structures be provided as monthly recurring fees based on population per primary PSAP for NGCS. Understanding that there are undefined variables that affect ESInet connectivity, the NCR requests that a high/low range for monthly recurring fee of MPLS connectivity is provided. Similarly, the NCR requests a high/low range for non-recurring fees per PSAP.

Attachment 1

Q29: Ref. Special Provisions, Section 7.1 -Part A

Question: Please clarify if the \$400,000 up-front funding is available to be **spread across / divided by** the 9 Part A PSAPs (\$44,444.44) or is it **available for each** Part A PSAP (9 x 400,000 = \$3,600,000)?

A29: The \$400,000 grant funding is the total amount available for all Part A PSAPs and it would be divided between each jurisdiction. Please see A27 for additional information.

Q30: Ref. Appendix D Cost Proposal

Question: There are 2 Secondary PSAPs on the cost worksheet. However, there are 5 other secondary PSAP's that are not on the worksheet (Total of 7 Secondary PSAPs). All Secondary PSAP's are clearly noted in their relation to respective Primary PSAPs. However, why are 2 Secondary PSAP's on the Cost Worksheet, and the other 5 Secondary PSAP's not on the cost worksheet? What is the difference in these 2 secondary PSAP's and reason for being on the Cost Worksheet?

A30: The two secondary PSAPs listed in the Cost Proposal are their own jurisdiction and will be responsible for their own costs. The other five secondary PSAPs fall under the jurisdiction of a Primary PSAP that will be responsible for the costs of their respective secondary PSAPs. Offerors should take note that the secondary PSAPs of Fairfax Police Communications, Herndon Police Communications, Vienna Police Communications, and Takoma Park Police are served by CPE hosted by the county in which they reside and as shown in Attachment A. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet. The Cost Proposal has been updated to indicate that the backup and secondary PSAP costs should be rolled into its jurisdiction's cost line items.

Q31: Please provide a definition to determine the difference between a "Secondary PSAP" and a "Back Up PSAP" in terms of the type of equipment and/or connections that are required and differentiate the two classifications.

A31: Per [NENA Glossary](#) a secondary PSAP is "a PSAP to which 9-1-1 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP." Secondary PSAPs have their own CPE or are hosted by a primary PSAP's CPE as noted in Attachment A and in A30. A backup PSAP is the site that takes the calls destined for the primary PSAP when they are unable to answer calls at the primary PSAP due to an evacuation or a system issue. In the NCR, backup PSAPs are currently not typically staffed unless an issue arises, but they are exercised on a regular basis. Backup PSAPs have their own CPE as noted in Attachment A.

Q32: Is the respondent responsible for providing the circuit Connections between the Primary and Secondary and/or Back Up PSAPs? Who is responsible for installing, managing and monitoring the circuit connections between the Primary and/or Secondary PSAP's.

A32: Individual jurisdictions are responsible for the network connectivity for host and remote CPE configurations. For example, Fairfax County's primary and backup sites have connectivity to Fairfax City, Herndon and Vienna. Similarly, Montgomery County's primary and backup locations have existing connectivity to Takoma Park. Offerors shall install, manage and monitor network connectivity to:

Attachment 1

- Alexandria Police Department
- Alexandria PD Backup
- Arlington County ECC
- Arlington County ECC Backup
- Falls Church PC
- Fairfax County PSCC
- Fairfax County PSCC Alternate
- Fauquier County 9-1-1
- Manassas City PC
- Manassas Park PC
- Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority
- Prince William County PSC
- Prince William County PSC Backup
- Stafford County Sheriffs Communications
- Calvert County
- Calvert County Backup
- Charles County 9-1-1
- Charles County 9-1-1 Backup
- Frederick County EOC
- Frederick County EOC Backup
- Montgomery County PCC
- Montgomery County PCC Backup
- Prince George's County ECC
- Prince George's County ECC Backup
- St. Mary's County
- St. Mary's County Backup

Q33: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.9 Discrepancy Reporting

Question: You reference Section 4.9 of NENA 08-003. That does not exist. Could it be Section 4.7 "Discrepancy Reporting?" Please confirm.

A33: Section 4.9 of NENA 08-003 is Discrepancy Reporting. Discrepancy Reporting is found in Section 4.7 of NENA-STA-010.2.

Q34: Ref. Special Provisions, Section 5.4 Statement of Qualifications, paragraph (d) and Appendix C, Section 6 Project Management and On-going Client Management Services, paragraph 3

Question: Special Provisions Section 5.4 states the following: "A staffing plan is required which describes the Offeror's proposed staff distribution to accomplish this work. "

Attachment 1

In Paragraph #3 of section 6 of Appendix C it states the following: “3. Respondent shall provide a description of each team member’s role and their anticipated amount of time dedicated to the project. Respondent shall describe key team members’ experience in managing and implementing projects of similar size and scope.”

Please confirm if paragraph #3 of section 6 in the RFP will satisfy the “staffing plan” requirement in the special provisions section of RFP 2000002010.

A34: No, paragraph 3 of Section 6 will not satisfy the staffing plan. While similar, the referenced requirements have unique characteristics and remain as written.

Q35: Ref. Appendix C, Attachment A

Question: In the Amendment, two PSAPs on version 1 and 2 no longer appear. They are Alexandria Fire Communications and Frederick PD. Can you please explain why or how would you like us to respond?

A35: The amended Attachment A provides an accurate list of PSAPs participating in this project. The referenced PSAPs are no longer to be considered a part of this project.

Attachment 2

Attachment E: Contact Information for Site Diversity Investigations

PSAP	Contact Name	Contact Phone	Contact Email
Alexandria Police Department	Bob Bloom	703.746.1891	Robert.bloom@alexandriava.gov
Alexandria PD Backup PSAP	Bob Bloom	703.746.1891	Robert.bloom@alexandriava.gov
Arlington County Emergency Communications Center	Jeff Horwitz	571-238-1369	jhorwitz@arlingtonva.us
Arlington County ECC Backup PSAP	Jeff Horwitz	571-238-1369	jhorwitz@arlingtonva.us
Falls Church Police Communications (Associated with Arlington County)	Jamal Mathews	703-248-5413	jmathews@fallschurchva.gov
Fairfax County Public Safety Communications Center	Steve McMurrer	(571) 350-1779	Steve.mcmurrer@fairfaxcounty.gov
Fairfax County PSCC Alternate PSAP	Steve McMurrer	(571) 350-1779	Steve.mcmurrer@fairfaxcounty.gov
Fairfax City Police Communications (Associated with Fairfax County)	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax
Herndon Police Communications (Associated with Fairfax County)	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax
Vienna Police Communications (Associated with Fairfax County)	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax	Not Applicable; See Fairfax
Fauquier County 9-1-1 Dispatch Center	Joell Kight	540-422-8643	joell.kight@fauquiercounty.gov
Manassas City Police Communications (Associated with Prince William County)	Brent Heilman		bheilman@ci.manassas.va.us
Manassas Park Police Communications (Associated with Prince William County)	Donald Spady	703-335-0027	d.spady@manassasparkva.gov
Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority	Rodger Spahr	703-572-8369	rodger.spahr@mwa.com
Prince William County Public Safety Communications	James (Jimmy) Scanlon Or Michele Surdam	Jimmy: 540-840-8533 or Michele: 703-209-3111	James.scanlo@motorolasolutions.com Or Msurdam@pwcgov.org
Prince William County Public Safety Communications Backup PSAP	James (Jimmy) Scanlon Or Michele Surdam	Jimmy: 540-840-8533 or Michele: 703-209-3111	James.scanlo@motorolasolutions.com Or Msurdam@pwcgov.org
Stafford County Sheriffs Communications	Capt. Ray Davis	540-658-4962	raydavis@staffordcountyva.gov
Calvert County PSAP	Yvette Myers	410.535.3491	myersya@co.cal.md.us
Calvert County Backup PSAP	Yvette Myers	410.535.3491	myersya@co.cal.md.us
Charles County 9-1-1 Communications Center	Tony Rose	301-609-3550	roset@charlescountymd.gov
Charles County 9-1-1 Communications Backup PSAP	Tony Rose	301-609-3550	La Plata
Frederick County Emergency Operations Center	Greg Orr	301-600-1670	gorr@frederickcountymd.gov
Frederick County Emergency Operations Center Backup PSAP	Greg Orr	301-600-1670	gorr@frederickcountymd.gov
Montgomery County Police Communications Center	Charlie Schwab	(240) 773-7025	Charles.Schwab@montgomerycountymd.gov

Attachment 2

PSAP	Contact Name	Contact Phone	Contact Email
Montgomery County Police Communications Center Backup PSAP	Charlie Schwab	(240) 773-7025	Charles.Schwab@montgomerycountymd.gov
Takoma Park Police (Associated with Montgomery County)	Not Applicable; see above	Not Applicable; see above	Not Applicable; see above
Prince Georges County Emergency Communications Center	Joe Armentrout	301-352-2006	gchv87@motorolasolutions.com
Prince Georges County Emergency Communications Center Backup PSAP	Joe Armentrout	301-352-2006	gchv87@motorolasolutions.com
St. Mary's County	Bob Kelly	301-475-4200 X1013	bob.kelly@stmarysmd.com
St. Mary's County Backup PSAP	Bob Kelly	301-475-4200 X1013	bob.kelly@stmarysmd.com