



## ADDENDUM NO. 1

**DATE:** June 21, 2017  
**FROM:** City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division  
**TO:** All Offerors  
**RE:** 9-1-1 PHONE SOLUTION RFI-4382-17-SH

Interested parties responding to the above referenced solicitation are hereby instructed that the requirements have been clarified, modified, superseded and supplemented as to this date as hereinafter described.

Please make note of the following information:

**Question 1:** Will there be any kind of pre-response meeting?

**Response:** The general consensus from the committee is that a pre-response meeting is not necessary at this time.

**Question 2:** How will site surveys be scheduled?

**Response:** Please include your suggestion for a survey schedule in your response to the RFI.

**Question 3:** What is the cutoff date for submitting questions prior to the due date?

**Response:** The cutoff date for questions can be found in Section 9.1. The cutoff is June 16 at noon. A formal Addendum will be issue to respond to all questions by June 21, 2017.

**Question 4:** Funding source that will be used to acquire the phone solution?

**Response:** Funding source/s will vary, but should not affect the information responses.

**Question 5:** Anticipated cost of the solution?

**Response:** The cost/budget will not be shared at this time.

**Question 6:** Who is the project manager within GJRCC?

**Answer:** This will be determined at a later date.

**Question 7:** Who is the project manager within GarCO?

**Answer:** This will be determined at a later date.

**Question 8:** Please indicate which systems will integrate/interface with the Solution and provide incumbent vendor information for each.

**Answer:** Please see Section 4 of the RFI document.

**Question 9:** Please list out all previous related procurements that may have taken place as well as incumbent vendor.

**Answer:** There are no previous related procurements.

**Question 10:** Please provide a time line and procurement method for ANY procurements that may take place in the future that are a part of or related to the 911 Solution, including systems that will need to integrate/interface with the Solution.

**Answer:** The goal is for the respondents to the RFI to provide their timeline based on the information included in the RFI document.

**Question 11:** Please provide incumbent information and future replacement schedules for the following related equipment for both GJRCC and GARCO:

- ANI/ALI
- Call Function Routing Switch
- Dispatch consoles
- Logging recorders
- CAD integration software
- Servers

**Answer:** Section 4 covers what pertains to the phone system replacement. The information provided is sufficient for vendors who work in the 911 phone system industry. Please provide your own details based on your unique solution to the RFI.

**Question 12:** “Is it possible to schedule a site visit prior to the due date”?

**Answer:** It has been determined that a site visit at this time is premature. It is possible that there will be site visits prior to Best and Final Offers (BAFO).

**Question 13:** “[Our firm] respectfully requests a thirty-day extension of the response due date and a two-week extension of the questions due date.”

**Answer:** The committee has reviewed the request and has chosen not to extend the time line.

**Question 14:** “Would you consider a RFI response deadline extension of July 13”?

**Answer:** Please see Question 13.

**Question 15:** “Do the county’s wish to have the system functionality which allows for the call-taking agents to re-locate from one dispatcher center to another and receive their respective 911 calls?”

**Answer:** Yes, please see Section 2.13. Please provide information about how your proposed system can utilize call takers located in a geographically separated PSAPs.

**Question 16:** “Which vendor(s) to GJRCC and GARCO currently use for their 9-1-1 solution?”

**Answer:** The current system is the Airbus Patriot Solution.

**Question 17:** “Given the potential need for expansion in the future, which vendor(s) do the agencies listed in Attachment A use and in which year were they implemented?”

**Answer:** The current agencies are Airbus Patriot/Vesta. Installation dates vary by agency, but all were installed after 2012.

**Question 18:** “Does GJRCC and GARCO have an approved budget for this project?”

**Answer:** Please see Question 5.

**Question 19:** “What are the specific evaluation criteria for vendors to proceed to the Vendor Interviews stage and beyond as stated in Section 9.0?”

**Answer:** The committee will review responses and evaluate based in Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. References (Section 11) will also be contacted if the committee feels it necessary. From that point a “short list” will be created if there are two or three top contenders, at which point Best and Final Offers (BAFO) will be requested.

**Question 20:** “In Section 9.0 (4), the RFI asks for pricing by agency. Is this only for GJRCC and GARCO, or for all other agencies listed in Attachment A?”

**Answer:** The focus of this RFI is to provide a solution for GJRCC and GarCO as stated in Section 1.

**Question 21:** “RFP page 3, Section 2, Requirement 4.d read, “Redundancy options for Host to Host solution or Hos to Remote solution and width requirements at each location”. Please confirm this should read “bandwidth requirements”.”

**Answer:** Confirming the verbiage should read “bandwidth requirements”.

**Question 22:** “RFP page 3, Section 2, Requirement 4.e simply reads, “Security requirements.” Please provide more detail on the type of information vendors should provide in response to this requirement.”

**Answer:** The Owner is asking for any security requirements your system requires for the fully implemented solution.

**Question 23:** “Can we get a logical diagram of the current solution including trunks termination points and ALI circuits?”

**Answer:** This solicitation is asking for Information on system functionality. Specific information regarding system configuration can be provided later in the process.

**Question 24:** “Is there documentation available to identify all connectivity currently in place between the associated PSAPs and who provides it: County owned, state, telco, etc.?”

**Answer:** There is connectivity currently in place between Grand Junction and Garfield County. However, the connectivity requirements for the new system are going to be based on the vendor solution proposed. Specific system configuration can be provided later in the process during the BAFO phase.

**Question 25:** “Will the City accept RFI responses.and future RFP proposal options for 911 solution that provide for network needs without proposing the network pricing?”

**Answer:** No. Pricing is required in your response.

**Question 26:** “In order to conduct site surveys and information gathering will the City consider an extension to the July 6<sup>th</sup> due date?”

**Answer:** No extension will be granted at this time. Site surveys will be considered during the BAFO period.

**Question 27:** “Part question:

a) Grand Junction & Garfield are listed as owners for the RFI, will they be the first two agencies initially deployed with Pitkin and Vail migrating later?

- b) Or will all 4 PSAP's participate from the start of the project?
- c) If they migrate later, what is the expected migration schedule?"

**Answer:** a) Yes.

b) Please see paragraph 6 of Section 1, "the focus of this response should be to provide a solution for GJRCC and GarCO."

c) The beginning of paragraph 6 states, "over the next five years it is the intent to expand connectivity to other PSAPs in western Colorado".

**Question 28:** "Can the customer please provide a logical diagram of the current network in place for each involved PSAP, identifying where 911 trunks and ALI circuits are terminated at this time? In addition, a description and/or illustration of all existing inter-PSAP connectivity would be appreciated."

**Answer:** Please see Answers to Questions 23 and 24.

**Question 29:** "Is Garfield County currently connected to GJRCC via ESINet or high speed MPLS connectivity?"

**Answer:** Currently there is connectivity between Grand Junction and Garfield County. The connectivity requirements will be based on the vendor solution offered and will be discussed later in the project.

**Question 30:** "Are the two sites, Garfield and GJRCC, currently connected and share 911 data and back-up each other? Are these two sites currently considered geo-diverse?"

**Answer:** They are currently connected via a Geo Diverse Solution, configured to back up each other.

**Question 31:** "As part of the RFI response, do you desire to have pricing for GJRCC and Garfield with optional pricing for Vail and Pitkin Co?"

**Answer:** Yes, please see Question and Answer for 27. The request is for information for Grand Junction and Garfield County, with potential for additional agencies in the future.

**Question 32:** "Of the listed consoles at GJRCC and Garfield County, how many of the positions are staffed full time vs limited use or training positions? Are the laptop positions listed for Garfield County considered limited use position for Emergency Operations?"

**Answer:** All console positions are configured the same, so please consider them all staffed full time. The laptop positions for Garfield County are limited use positions.

The original solicitation for the project noted above is amended as noted.

All other conditions of subject solicitation remain the same.

Respectfully,

Susan Hyatt, Purchasing Division  
City of Grand Junction, Colorado