

**Q&A #14 to
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications System
RFP #060B9800036
October 29, 2009**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

The Department of Information Technology received the following question by e-mail for the above referenced RFP, and it is answered below for all Offerors:

Question 172 (from Q&A Set #13): Mayberry (Carroll County) appears in Appendix 10 and in Appendix 22. However it does not appear in Appendix 7. Should Mayberry be in Appendix 7?

Answer: There is not a State microwave system at Mayberry and therefore, Mayberry does not appear in Appendix 7.

Question 175: RFP Section 3.4.3 listed four (4) standard shelter configurations: One 2-room configuration in which to house a generator and three 1-room configurations with no generator. RFP Section 3.2.13.5 required sites developed by the contractor to be backed up by emergency generators and thus, left only the 12 x 38 x 10 two-room configuration as the only viable option in which to house a greenfield site (and required generator). Addendum #17 now provides a 10 x 12 x 10 shelter for the installation of the required generator to be used with the smaller 1-room shelter configurations. Do we understand these requirements correctly?

Answer: Yes, you understand these requirements correctly.

Question 176: One of the questions from the State noted the following:
Section 4.4.5.1 page 64 – 12 x 14 x 9 proposed shelters will not be acceptable for most sites as they will not provide sufficient space for other equipment. Please provide a design that utilizes the state standard shelters.

If vendors are to select between the four standard shelter configurations and still provide sufficient space for other equipment above what they are quoting, can the State identify just how much additional space vendors should account for?

Answer: No, the state cannot specifically identify how much additional space may be required from site to site. Interoperability needs and colocation requirements will vary from site to site. For planning purposes a minimum of 4 racks would be the minimum additional space needed at any given site.

Question 177: Please provide a legend for the Appendix 22 map that was provided with Addendum 5.

Answer: The State is providing the following Color Key:

Green= Public Safety microwave system,

**Yellow= Network Maryland microwave system,
Orange= Howard County microwave system,
Blue= Anne Arundel County microwave system, Baltimore County microwave System (existing), Carroll County microwave system
Purple= Maryland First Project (Patient Tracking) microwave system (we have 1 DS3 on these links)
Red= planned or in process for Public Safety microwave system (some of these have been constructed and some are unlicensed)**

Question 178: Since the Nice Bridge site has been reclassified in Appendix 10 version 2 to be a “Potential” site and thus not suitable for use in the Public Service design option, does the State have a temporary or alternate site for providing coverage in the Nice Bridge area (as defined in Region 1A) or is the requirement for coverage at Nice Bridge waived?

Answer: The coverage requirement is not waived for the Nice Bridge. There are currently no tower structures at the Nice Bridge complex. Coverage should be engineered based on using the existing buildings at the Nice Bridge toll complex, and nearby towers that have been identified as available.

Question 179: In the Second Set of Clarification Questions, Question number 4 appears to contradict Addendum 13 Item 1. Does this question indicate that conventional networks for air to ground communications are no longer permitted and if so will a further addendum be forthcoming, or does the Addendum 13 modification take precedence over the newer Clarification Question?

Answer: RFP Section 3.1.4 states, “system architecture must allow for multiple band operations or overlay systems where desired by user agencies.” (emphasis added). An Offeror had proposed an overlay system for a Region that proffered a system operating in a band other than 700/800 MHz. Unless an overlay system is specified, e.g. “desired” by a user agency, any proposal to build an overlay network is contrary to the RFP. Accordingly, a proactive statement proposing to construct an overlay network in a band other than 700 or 800 MHz absent the directive of a State “user agency” is contrary to the RFP and unacceptable. Separately and unrelated to the error of an Offeror in proposing a non-700/800 MHz overlay network, the State clarified in Addendum 13 that air-to-ground communications through a conventional 700 MHz base station communicating with an aircraft would not be considered an overlay network and in fact would be acceptable to the State.

Question 180: Will the state provide an addendum with technical specifications and a revised pricing sheet in order to submit the requested pricing for a Cell On Wheels?

Answer: The State will not issue an addendum with technical specifications and a revised pricing sheet for a Cell on Wheels. Offerors should propose a Cell on Wheels solution as specified in Section 3.2.9.4 of the RFP. The Cell on Wheels is an optional component, and should be designed to operate within the overall proposed

system design offered by the offeror. Offerors should determine the specifications they need based on their design parameters.

For pricing: Optional components are not part of the pricing sheet and are not part of the financial evaluation. Offerors should submit pricing in the format they desire for optional items. This pricing should be clear, concise and understandable.

Question 181: For the 4000 required console positions please provide the count of console positions required by region and their locations so that they may be included in our F2 pricing?

Answer: Dispatch points and existing console capacities have already been provided in Appendix 6 of the RFP. Additional console locations and numbers of consoles have not been identified at this time. The intent is to be able to provide additional console capacity based on individual agency needs in the future and cannot be identified with any particular region at this time.

Question 182: Will the State be providing technical and operational specifications for the desired LTE network in a forthcoming addendum?

Answer: Addendum 15 Item #7 states:

“Section 3.3.7.11 Optional High Speed Mobile Data

Based upon recent actions by the FCC regarding 700 MHz broadband spectrum, the State would consider a high speed mobile data system design based upon Long Term Evolution (LTE) technology.

Please consider submitting an LTE mobile data system design as part of your technical proposal.”

Please note that the Addendum recognizes the changing nature of 700 MHz broadband technology and the proposed adoption of the Long Term Evolution (“LTE”) technology. The State acknowledges that the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) has only recently received initial comments in response to Docket PS 06-229 and DA 09-1819 and that Reply Comments are not due until early November. The State believes that certain synergies will evolve in the future if LTE is adopted by the FCC and/or the Public Safety Spectrum Trust (“PSST”) as the desired 700 MHz broadband standard. The purpose of Addendum 15 was to convey to Offerors the strong interest of the State in the LTE technology as a tool for public safety broadband communications. The statement, “Please consider submitting an LTE mobile data system design as part of your technical proposal” should be interpreted as a desired, not mandatory requirement of the RFP. Notwithstanding the desire of the State to consider LTE for 700 MHz broadband communications, we recognize that the industry will be guided by actions of the FCC and issues related to the adoption of LTE may remain unclear before this project is finalized. As such, it may be impractical for an Offeror to address LTE requirements during the

pendency of this RFP, and if that is the case, Offerors may be unable to provide any information or products.

Question 183: In Appendix #17, Item number 16, the system design criteria was changed from a 95% CPC Area Reliability basis to a 95% Bounded Area Percent Coverage basis. Items 14 and 15 have indicated that the BAPC is defined by a specified tile reliability of 97%. Does the State want to see the revised coverage maps presented on the basis of a BAPC tile reliability analysis or using the original Area Reliability method?

Answer: YES, the state would like coverage presented as Bounded Area Percent Coverage with the bounded area as defined in Appendix 2, with a reliability of 97%.

Question 184: In the event that the State wishes to see coverage analysis based on the BAPC tile reliability analysis, will the State be specifying any excluded tiles in accordance with the provisions of TSB-88.1-C section 5.3.6?

Answer: NO, at this time the State has not identified any tiles that should be excluded from the analysis.

Question 185: Does the State require submission of revised coverage maps for all of the originally defined levels of detail (statewide, regional, and county) for each of the two design versions?

Answer: Yes, the State does want revised coverage maps. Please provide seven (7) copies in the same format as specified in the original proposal.