

**Q&A's #3 to
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications System
RFP #060B9800036
September 09, 2008**

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:

93. Appendix 11: In some instances in Appendix 11, Tower Loading sheets do not seem to specify the quantity of antennas (DAPA 59210 Panel Antenna Array, DB858HV90 E-SX Panel Antenna), but identifies the number of lines. Please confirm the quantities of panel antennas and number of lines for cellular antennas is correct as listed in the table below:

Answer: Quantities are correct as stated.

Antenna ID	Panel Antenna Type	Number of panel antennas	Number of 1-5/8" lines
180' Self Supported Tower			
16	DAPA59210	6	24
17	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
330' Self supported Tower			
16	DAPA59210	6	24
17	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
21	DAPA59210	6	12
22	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
26	DB858HV90E-SX	6	2
27	DAPA59210	6	24
450' Self Supported Tower			
16	DAPA59210	6	24
17	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
21	DAPA59210	6	12
22	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
26	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
27	DAPA59210	6	24
31	DB858HV90E-SX	6	6
32	DAPA59210	6	24

94. Appendix 11: Antenna mounts were not specified in the antenna loading in Appendix 11. Should the Offerors use 6 ft side arms for LMR Omni, Fiberglass, Dipole antennas and 12 ft boom gate mounts for all Cellular/PCS panel antennas?

Answer: Generally speaking, your answer is correct relative to LMR antennae. However, there may be certain cases where a deviation in the LMR standard is required. The Contractor must determine the equipment to be used to meet the coverage requirements in the RFP and take full responsibility for the performance and safety of the design.

95. F2 Site Development: What wind and ice loading parameters should be used for providing the pricing for towers in Attachment F Price Sheets?

Answer: TIA 222-G standards should be used for wind and ice loading.

96. Pricing File- Tab F-5-Subscriber equipment tab: Are cells B5 through Q5; cells B14 through Q14; cell H13; and cell M13 intended to be blank cells that are not required to be filled in?

Answer: Correct, these fields are to be left blank.

97. Pricing file-Tab f-2-Site Development and Attachment F2: * The Instructions for Attachment F2; Site Development read that “The individual calculations for each row are: Col C x Col E = Col D. Then, the individual Column D totals are summed to arrive at a grand total.” Should that read “The individual calculations for each row are: Col C x Col D = Col E. Then, the individual Column E totals are summed to arrive at a grand total.”?

Answer: The correct calculation is column C x column D = column E. Then the individual column E totals are summed to arrive at a grand total. See Addendum #6, Item #3.

98. COMAR 21.07.03.02 - Tax Exemption: Please advise if the State is considered tax exempt for this procurement.

Answer: As stated in COMAR 21.07.03.02, “The State is generally exempt from federal excise taxes, Maryland sales and use taxes, District of Columbia sales taxes, and transportation taxes. Exemption certificates shall be completed upon request. Where a contractor is required to furnish and install material in the construction or improvement of real property in performance of a contract, the Contractor shall pay the Maryland sales tax and the exemption does not apply”.

99. 3.6.1 Warranty Services, Section 3.6.1 references Table 7-1, Minimum Warranty Period per Equipment Class: Where is Table 7-1?

Answer: This table has been eliminated, and this was addressed previously under Q&A #14.

100. 3.5.3.3 Materials, Equipment, and Spare Parts List: Need clarity between individual Region deliverables or overall System deliverable: Are the Materials, Equipment, and Spare Parts list for the region or the overall System?

Answer: Both. The materials, equipment and spare parts lists are to support both the region's equipment as well as equipment required to integrate the region with the statewide system as a whole.

101. 3.5.3.5 Revised 700 MHz Channel Plan: Need clarity between individual Region deliverables or overall System deliverable: Is the Revised 700 MHz Channel Plan for the region or the overall System?

Answer: The revised channel plan is representative of the overall system, and is offered as an example only. Offerors are to propose their own system channel plan as part of the RFP response.

102. 3.5.3.7 Interference Analysis Report: Need clarity between individual Region deliverables or overall System deliverable: Is the Interference Analysis Report for the region or the overall System, or by site?

Answer: The Interference Analysis Report will be on a site-by-site basis, with mitigation proposed on a site-by-site basis.

103. 3.5.4.2 Operations, Maintenance, and Service Manuals: Need clarity between individual Region deliverables or overall System deliverable: Are the Operations, Maintenance, and Service Manuals for the region or the overall System?

Answer: Both. The operations, maintenance and service manuals are to support both the region's equipment as well as equipment required to integrate the region with the statewide system as a whole.

104. 3.5.4.3 Maintenance Plan and Procedures Manual: Need clarity between individual Region deliverables or overall System deliverable: Are the Maintenance Plan and Procedures Manual for the region or the overall System?

Answer: Both. The maintenance plan and procedures manuals are to support both the region's equipment as well as equipment required to integrate the region with the statewide system as a whole.

105. 3.5.6.2 APCO Project 25 Operational Performance Test, 3.5.3.4 , App 16, 9.2 30-Day Operations Test: Need clarity on operational testing requirements: Does the APCO Operational Performance Test defined in 3.5.6.2 use the Operational Performance Test plan called out in 3.5.3.4, and is the APCO Operational Performance Test defined in 3.5.6.2 the same as the Operational Performance Testing which is part of the SAT 30-Day Operation Test defined in Appendix 16, 9.2, or separate from it?

Answer: They are two separate requirements. The APCO operational performance tests are tests of the equipment and the various P25 feature sets by radio and manufacturer whereas the 30-day operational test is a proof of performance test. It is exactly what it states; operating the system for a 30-day period as if the system were live.

106. General Question: How much time should be allocated in the schedule for state response, approval, and/or acceptance of documents and deliverables that are predecessors to proposer's next action/activity, and therefore, the overall schedule?

Answer: This question cannot be specifically answered. Offerors should make reasonable assumptions based on their experience. This will be addressed during the detailed design review stage of the project.

107. General Question: Clarity on “days” throughout the RFP Are “days after” throughout the RFP all calendar days or work days?

Answer: Calendar days.

108. Attachment F1, Page 138, Bullet 5: The preference calculation will be made by the State and the preference will be given to the dollar value of the project minus mercury content products: Based on the formulas, it appears that bidders with a greater amount of mercury products will be given preference. Please clarify and advise.

Answer: As stated in Attachment F1, Page 138, Bullet 5; the preference will be given to the dollar value of the project minus mercury content products. Therefore, if the mercury content is a greater amount, the preference will be less.

109. Regarding question and answer below (from Q&A set #1, question # 12).
Section 3.3.7, Attachment F, Page 58:

The RFP states that the contractor must provide radios from at least three different manufacturers. This approach will result in the State purchasing third party radios at an additional mark-up over buying those radios directly from the manufacturer.

In lieu of requiring bidders to provide pricing for third party radios, would the State allow bidders to certify that their radio networks are compliant with the Project 25 open architecture and require bidders provide specific system references that demonstrate radios from multiple manufacturers in actual use on their deployed systems?

In addition, with the upcoming release of the NIST and SAFECOM endorsed Project 25 Compliance Assessment Program (CAP), each vendor’s equipment can be independently certified to be Project 25 compliant and interoperable with other manufacturers radios..

The following link provides additional information about the CAP program:

<http://www.safecomprogram.gov/SAFECOM/currentprojects/project25cap/>

Finally, as a vehicle for procuring third party interoperable radios, the State can use the existing PO RFP process under the state’s existing radio contract ("Mobile Radio Equipment Communication Consoles; Install, Repair and Maintenance Services). This contract provides the State with the pricing discounts from each radio manufacturer without any additional mark up.

Answer: Certifying compliance of third party subscriber radios with the P-25 Phase 2 standard does not meet the requirements of this RFP.

Will the State of MD develop their own “MD Subscriber Unit Certification Program” after contract award? This will allow the state to purchase compliant radios from other manufacturers that may not have compliant radio today for the system chosen. This will also not lock the State of MD into only three manufacturers subscriber units and more importantly a price that will be considerably higher today as opposed to three years from now when ten radio manufacturers have developed compliant radios.

Answer: See response to Q&A set #1, question #12.

110. Section 1.17 – Multiple or Alternate Proposals: This Article states that an alternate proposal may be submitted and considered. Will that state consider an alternate proposal from an Offeror that is also being proposed as a subcontractor?

Answer: Yes, the State will consider an alternate proposal from an Offeror that is also being proposed as a subcontractor.