METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Feasibility & Cost Effectiveness Study for Regional Shared 9-1-1 PSAP Technology

DUE DATE:
JULY 24, 2026

ISSUED BY:
METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY SERVICES BOARD

The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) is soliciting proposals for professional and technical services to create a feasibility and cost effectiveness study for shared 9-1-1 technology for the 24 public safety answering points (PSAPs) in the ten-county Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan region.

The MESB was established by joint powers agreement for the purpose of overseeing the 9-1-1 system, the metro portion of the Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER) system, and EMS in the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. One of MESB's regional roles includes planning, coordinating, and supporting the public safety answering points (PSAPs) in the metro region on 9-1-1 system network and data matters. Under the MESB, the region is currently served by 18 primary PSAPs and 6 secondary PSAPs.

The ten-county MESB region participates in a statewide 9-1-1 system operated by Lumen as the 9-1-1 system integrator. The routing platform is an IP-selective router operated by Intrado, Inc., Lumen's vendor. The Ingress network is currently transitioning to TDM and SIP POIs for originating service provider connection to the 9-1-1 system. The ingress network is operated by Inteliquent for aggregation and protocol conversion to support NG9-1-1 core services once they are in place. The 9-1-1 traffic-only egress network currently consists of two physically diverse connections to each PSAP and region's PSAPs are connected via RFAI SIP. The metro regional Automatic Location Identification (ALI) telephone number record data is currently hosted by Intrado, Inc., Lumen's vendor. The region's Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) is coordinated regionally by the MESB and has transitioned to a GIS-based MSAG. MESB and its 9-1-1 and GIS partners have collaboratively prepared the region's geospatial data for use in NG9-1-1. As a result, significant synchronization of legacy 9-1-1 and NG9-1-1 data has been completed, and regionally aggregated road centerline, address point, PSAP, and response boundary datasets are publicly available.

Minnesota is a home-rule state. As such, each PSAP makes its own determination regarding what PSAP technology it chooses to use and its timeline for replacement. Some PSAPs have their own stand-alone call handling equipment (CHE) and computer-aided dispatch systems and loggers. Others participate in a seven-PSAP CHE consortium and others still in a shared, statewide software as a service (SaaS) CHE. Additionally, a few metro PSAPs use a local government information system member-drive consortium to obtain CAD, while another PSAP participates in a four-PSAP shared CAD with other PSAPs outside the metro region.

In 2023-24, the MESB underwent a cost study to determine the cost of providing emergency communications in the ten-county metropolitan region. Upon receiving the final report, board members began questioning whether there would be any cost savings if PSAPs shared 9-1-1 technology.

Additional information about the MESB and the metropolitan region 9-1-1 system may be found at www.mn-mesb.org.

Scope of work:

The MESB considers the commission of a study on the feasibility and cost effectiveness of shared 9-1-1 technology as critical to future success of the PSAPs in the region. Proposals shall include the professional and technical resources necessary to prepare the following deliverables, and may include additional deliverables the respondent believes are necessary for the success of the project:

The MESB will provide the consultant with all available current-state data and PSAP contact lists within two weeks of contract execution.

1. Current-State Assessment
    a. The consultant shall conduct (or leverage existing MESB data) a documented inventory and assessment of the current Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD), Call Handling Equipment (CHE), and 9-1-1 call logging systems in use across all 24 PSAPs. This assessment shall include, at a minimum: vendor/platform name and version, contract expiration/renewal dates, annual maintenance and support costs, hardware/software lifecycle status, integration capabilities with the existing Lumen/Intrado/Inteliquent 9-1-1 infrastructure, call volume and staffing data, and any PSAP-specific constraints or unique requirements that could affect shared-platform feasibility.

2. Technical Feasibility Assessment
    a. The consultant shall provide a documented assessment of the technical feasibility of 24 PSAPs sharing CHE, CAD, and a 9-1-1 call logging solution on the same platform. The assessment shall include:
        i. Capabilities of current and emerging vendors to support 24 PSAPs of varying sizes on a single multi-tenant platform (including segmentation, performance, redundancy, and scalability).
        ii. Compatibility with Minnesota's ongoing NG9-1-1 deployment, i3 standards, ESInet, and multimedia (text, video, sensor) handling.
        iii. Identification of technical, operational, cybersecurity, data privacy, and liability risks, along with recommended mitigation strategies and lessons learned from comparable multi-PSAP shared systems in other states.

3. A documented assessment of the cost effectiveness of transitioning to shared 9-1-1 technology in the ten-county metropolitan region. The assessment must include:
    a. An evaluation of realistic timelines for each of the 24 PSAPs to migrate to the three 9-1-1 technologies.
    b. An analysis of the cost of operations, the cost of capital, the amount of costs paid by property taxes, and what costs, if any, are bond eligible (eligible for debt to be issued).
    c. A discussion of at what point in the future will the shared technology systems be financially cost effective, if at all.
    d. A discussion of whether the shared technology systems provide benefits (operational, public safety expectations, gained efficiencies, improved response) which could balance any financial concerns.

4. Identify the types of agreements PSAPs and their overarching governing bodies, if applicable, may need to execute to facilitate shared technology projects such as those discussed in this study.

Submission Requirements:

1. Experience of respondent organization in relation to creation and implementation of PSAP technology projects, cost analysis, and feasibility.
2. Identity and qualifications of the person, or persons, the respondent organization would assign to the project.

3. A project timeline from the contract award to the presentation to the MESB of respondent's draft deliverables.
4. A list of three references from similar projects.
5. Known potential conflicts, if any.
6. Submissions shall not exceed ten pages and be submitted either as .pdf files.
7. Project pricing must be submitted in a separate .pdf file from the main proposal.

All questions and correspondence must be in writing and directed to Jill Rohret, Executive Director, at jrohret@mn-mesb.org. Questions regarding the RFP must be received by 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 15, 2026. All questions and their responses will be posted on the Current RFPs page on the MESB's website on Friday, July 17, 2026. Contact with MESB personnel other than Jill Rohret regarding this RFP may be grounds for elimination from the selection process.

Proposals shall be accepted via email only and are due by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, July 24, 2026, delivered to: Jill Rohret, Executive Director, at jrohret@mn-mesb.org. Pricing must be submitted in a separate file from the main proposal.

Selection Process:

Proposals will be scored by an evaluation team, which will evaluate the responses on such things as technical merit, the proposed plan, the vendor's experience, and pricing.

Proposals will be scored by an evaluation team according to the following criteria:

a. Relevant experience and qualifications (30%)
b. Understanding of the project and proposed approach/methodology (30%)
c. Project team and timeline (20%)
d. Pricing (20%)

The evaluation team will make a recommendation to the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board. The final decision of the selection of the organization to prepare the feasibility and cost effectiveness study deliverables will be made by the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board. The final agreement will be in the form of a written contract between the successful respondent and the MESB. MESB, at its sole discretion, may pursue services under this request. The MESB reserves the right to select one, some, all, or none of the items outlined in a respondent's pricing submission. The MESB reserves the right to reject any, or all, proposals, and to request additional information from all proposers. All proposals become the property of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board.

PUBLIC DATA

Proposals submitted will become a matter of public record. Information supplied by any proposer is subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Sections 13.01 et seq.

Public Record: Under Minnesota law, data submitted by a business to a government entity in response to a request for proposal are private or nonpublic until the responses are opened. Once the responses are opened, the name of the proposer becomes public. All other data in a proposer's response to a request for proposal are private or nonpublic data until completion of the evaluation process. Completion of the evaluation process means that the government entity has completed negotiating the contract with the selected proposer. After a government entity

has completed the evaluation process, all remaining data submitted by all proposers are public with the exception of trade secret data as defined and classified in Minn. Stat. Section 13.37. A statement by a proposer that submitted data are copyrighted or otherwise protected does not prevent public access to the data contained in the response if such data does not qualify as trade secret data.