



## ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

DATE: 10/02/2014  
TO: Interested Responders to RFP# 943-15  
FROM: Jeff Reble, Radio System Project Manager  
SUBJECT: Addendum to Request for Proposal # 943-15

Pursuant to Section 1.5.5 of the RFP 943-15 (Public Safety Radio System), this document is intended as an Addendum to the RFP. The Proposer is reminded that only information contained in the RFP or official addenda should be considered in preparation of a proposal. No verbal communications with the City or its agents shall be binding.

The following is a listing of additional questions with the City's official response.

**Questions are in italics, answers are in bold.**

*Q1. The RFP specifies the use of TSB-88-C. The most recent version of TSB-88 is revision D. We respectfully request that all references to TSB-88-C be changed to TSB-88-D.*

**A1. Revision C of TS-88 was referenced in error. All references to TSB-88-C should be replaced with TSB-88-D.**

*Q2. The City's RFP indicates the following requirements: "The P25 radio system shall provide DAQ 3.4 performance to handheld portable radios throughout 95% of the Asheville city limits and ETJ's presented in Attachment 1." and "95% of all accessible grids within the designated service area must be declared "Pass" to comply with the coverage requirements." Please confirm that the City's coverage requirement is for the total service area (consisting of the Asheville city limits and ETJs) to be segmented into test tiles, and a minimum of 95% of the test tiles will yield a Delivered Audio Quality of at least DAQ 3.4. It is understood that only accessible tiles will count toward coverage acceptance. However, if multiple vendors offer coverage guarantees based on accessible tiles only, it may be difficult for the City to perform a like-for-like comparison of the designs due to differing assumptions regarding tile accessibility.*

**A2. The system coverage requirements are specified for the total service area (bounded-area reliability) as defined in RFP Section 3.6.4. Coverage predictions shall demonstrate compliance of the proposed design. As described in RFP Section 3.6.5.2, the intent is to divide the two bounded service areas into uniform test grids for coverage verification. The exclusion of inaccessible test grids is based upon practical limits of the testing process but is not intended to reduce the overall coverage requirements. Vendors shall not design their coverage to specifically exclude test grids that are not anticipated to have public accessible roads. The City is responsible for providing access to test grids and reserves the right to provide such access to any test grid whether public roads exist or not.**

*Q3. Is it the City's desire to have the Console equipment software license enabled for P25 AES encryption at all consoles positions?*

**A3. If P25 AES capability is licensed per console position and/or per talkgroup, please provide AES licensing cost for consoles as an option.**

*Q4. For the optional logging recorder described in RFP Section 3.16.2, is it the City's desire that all of the 48 P25 talkgroups, identified to be recorded, could be P25 AES encrypted talkgroups?*

**A4. Please assume that up to four (4) total talkgroups that will be recorded could utilize P25-compliant AES.**

*Q5. For RFP Section 3.9.4.4b, could the City further clarify what is intended by the term "emergency message" in the last sentence?*

**A5. The last sentence of RFP Section 3.9.4.4 b) is hereby removed from the requirements. This section now reads:**

**"b) Different talkgroup: The new emergency shall be declared and both emergency conditions shall remain active. Both modules shall be red. The declaring alias shall be displayed in the appropriate call history display."**

*Q6. Are any console I/O connections needed for opening doors, Sally Port etc If so, how many, and which locations?*

**A6. The proposed console system shall provide the capability of supporting bi-directional auxiliary I/O functions. However, there are no specific I/O connections in use at this time and none are anticipated during implementation of the proposed system.**

*Q7. Can the city provide a structural analysis of existing towers?*

**A7. Per RFP Section 3.7.2, the City's third-party structural analysis firm has advised that the Vendor must propose one-for-one replacement of existing antenna systems at their present location on the tower with similar weight**

**and wind load. Proposed equipment weight cannot exceed current equipment weight by more than 5%. Likewise, wind load of proposed equipment cannot exceed existing wind load by more than 10%. Weight and wind load calculations shall be based upon the final site configuration after removal of obsolete devices. The proposal should be based upon these assumptions. The City will work with the selected Vendor (i.e. the awardee) to develop site improvement (if needed), implementation, and cutover plans for each tower site.**

**End of Addendum 2**