

**Q&A #21 to  
Request for Proposals (RFP)  
Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications System  
RFP #060B9800036  
January 28, 2010**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

The Department of Information Technology received the following questions by e-mail for the above referenced RFP, and they are answered below for all Offerors:

209. Regarding the contract for subject referenced RFP, is it the state's intent to subject the Contractor to unlimited liability through the exclusion of a Limitation of Liability clause typically found in other state contracts? If not, will the state include limited liability terms that are consistent with other state contracts?

**Answer:** The State is not going to change the terms of its contract. As previously stated, if you are the most advantageous Offeror, you will be offered the contract as the recommended awardee. You will be given one business week to sign the State's contract. If you fail to sign the contract in that time, the State will withdraw its recommended award to you and offer its recommended award to the second most advantageous Offeror.

210. Per Q&A #20, question 206 referencing the pricing of Tier 2 and 3 radios without encryption, does the state desire the vendor to also price these units without OTAR as this feature is only used when encryption is enabled? Further, does the state wish the vendor to price other advanced features (AVL, GPS, etc.) separately? Finally, where should this separate pricing be located in the provided pricing forms?

**Answer:** Per RFP Section 3.1.4.1 #11, OTAR "capability" is required. Section 3.2.10.7 states, "The system must provide the ability to use Over-The-Air Re-keying (OTAR) for the management of encryption keys, and to allow their change without need to recall or physically connect up to 10,000 subscriber radios". OTAR is required on certain mobile radios as noted in RFP Section 3.3.7.10.1.2 #7. AVL requirements are defined in RFP Section 3.2.11.4. Section 3.2.11.4.1 states that AVL "shall be offered as an option for Tier II and Tier III portables and mobiles".

Offerors are only to include the features required in the RFP in Price Sheets F-1 thru F-10. Optional features can be listed on additional sheets after Price Sheets F-1 thru F-10. However, only your submission in Price Sheets F-1 thru F-10 will be evaluated as your financial proposal (BAFO) to the State. Again, Offerors are not to list any exceptions, notes, assumptions, etc. as part of their financial proposal (BAFO) to the State.

211. **Reference Q&A #20, Question 3.** (State note: #3 should be #208)

The State's response to the question states, "Yes, the State wants 100 technicians trained in each region".

However, RFP Section 3.5.3.9 Training Schedule states that “The Contractor shall provide two training sessions for each course identified in the training curriculum for each of the five regions.”

Is the State directing that 50 technicians should be trained in each of the two classes, which may be very ineffective considering the very technical and detailed nature of the Maintenance Technician training, or, is the State directing a change in the number of classes for this course?

Additionally, price sheet F1A indicates 200 students will be trained in the Console Equipment Operator & Supervisor Training course. Similar to the technician training concern, is the State directing that 100 students should be trained in each of the two classes, which may be very ineffective or impossible due to the number of collocated consoles required for the training, or, is the State directing a change in the number of classes for this course?

**Answer:** Under RFP Section 3.5.3.9, the Contractor shall provide a minimum of two training sessions for each course identified in the training curriculum for each of the five regions. The State recognizes the need for flexibility in the scheduling, as well as the provision, of training services. Accordingly, the State provided flexibility in the RFP for Offerors to propose additional training or an enhanced schedule to optimize training activities. Offerors have submitted their training plan in their technical proposals which the State has already evaluated.

Price sheet F1A pertains to the financial proposal. Price sheet F1A was added to the Price Sheets in Addenda #4 & #7 to give the State an apples-to-apples comparison of training costs from each of the offerors. These training costs on F1A are to be carried forward to the corresponding training cells on F1.