



LAKE COUNTY FLORIDA

OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES
315 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 441
PO BOX 7800
TAVARES FL 32778-7800

PHONE: (352) 343-9839
FAX: (352) 343-9473

www.lakegovernment.com

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: August 29, 2013
Request for Proposals (RFP) 13-0221

WIRELESS CONNECTIVITY TO COUNTY FIRE STATIONS

It is the vendor's responsibility to ensure their receipt of all addenda, and to clearly acknowledge all addenda within their initial bid or proposal response. Acknowledgement may be confirmed either by inclusion of a signed copy of this addendum with the initial bid or proposal response, or by completion and return of the addendum acknowledgement section of the solicitation. Failure to acknowledge each addendum may prevent the bid or proposal from being considered for award.

This addendum X does change the date for receipt of bids or proposals. The proposal due date is hereby revised to be October 2, 2013

The purpose of this addendum is to provide confirming information to all potential responding vendors in association with the cited RFP. The information provided herein summarizes discussions at the recommended pre-proposal meeting, and responds to questions asked during, and after, the meeting. A list of the vendors that attended that meeting is provided on the County website for this solicitation. The pre-proposal meeting commenced with a general review of the RFP with specific emphasis paid to various specific terms and conditions including:

- the evaluation criteria in RFP Section 1.3,
- the five year contract term with annual CPI adjustment being available as stated in the RFP,
- the completion of work at each tower site on a fund-available basis during the contract term,
- the proposal response directions in Section 1.14 of the RFP,
- the use of the specified and attached spreadsheet for pricing input, and
- the fact that the vendor would be responsible for payment of sales tax on all materials purchased by the vendor for inclusion in the project,

Attention then turned to the technical specifications with County personnel providing an overview of

the technical requirements and detail in regards to completion of the pricing table. The information and confirmations set forth below are in response to vendor questions raised during, and subsequent to, the pre-proposal meeting. Any information *printed in bold italics* reflects a revision to the RFP:

Question 1: What is the anticipated budget or projected dollar value for the work (question previously submitted in writing)?

Answer 1: The County currently has \$198,000 budgeted for the project with an estimated average work value of \$18,000 per site. The County expects to transfer currently budgeted T-1 funding to support the balance of the work requirements as the initial work efforts are completed.

Question 2: What type of licensing is required?

Answer 2: General contractor licensing is required to ensure the vendor provides full turnkey effort to include acquisition of all required permits. The County specifically confirmed that the selected vendor would be responsible for pulling any and all required permits, and complying with any requirements mandated by the County building department.

Question 3: Please confirm timing of work efforts in terms of start and completion requirements.

Answer 3: The County stressed that there would be flexibility in this regard given the nature of the project and the five year term associated with the resulting contract. It was stated that the technical assessment attached to the RFP provided the scope of work for each individual site and that the assessment was based on visual lines of sight.

Question 4: Please confirm testing requirements.

Answer 4: The County confirmed that evidence of provision of full duplex 10 megabyte capacity with three or four fire stations being serviced simultaneously needed to be provided.

Question 5: Would the County be open to alternate solutions?

Answer 5: The County will consider fully documented product substitutions submitted in conjunction with initial vendor responses.

Question 6: Was the County looking for, or specifying, increased future capacities on a percentage basis?

Answer 6: Although not specifying an absolute percentage growth capacity, the County did state that it expected the installed systems and components to support anticipated future uses.

Question 7: Is the County specifying any set of installation standards.

Answer 7: Systems and components are to be installed in compliance with Motorola installation standards (R56) and industry-standard grounding practices. Standard hangers are to be used when securing system components to tower structures.

Question 8: Does the County have, and can the County provide, current site drawings as such data would support certain technical proposal response requirements to include wind load considerations?

Answer 8: *The County has added electronic copies of the site drawings to the website for the solicitation. This information is listed on the County webpage for this specific solicitation under the title “Wireless Connectivity to Fire Stations Document Packet”.*

Question 9: *Will the County provide for a two week extension to support accurate and complete technical responses?*

Answer 9: *yes, see the first page of this addendum 2.*

Question 10: *The warranty requirements seem to be unusually extensive. Is revision possible?*

Answer 10: *The requirements stated in the RFP are hereby modified to provide for a five year warranty period starting at the time full installation at a given tower site is accepted in full by the County.*

Question 11: Is the vendor responsible for, or does the project effort involve, any zoning considerations?

Answer 11: No

Question 12: The grounding statements appear indefinite, would the County please clarify?

Answer 12: The RFP is amended to reflect that all grounding effort shall meet or exceed NEC standards.

Question 13: What safety standards are to be applied in regards to tower effort?

Answer 13: Such effort is to be performed in compliance with all related OSHA, ComTrain, or equivalent standards.

Question 14: Why is a BICSI RCDD certified technician required?

Answer 14: To help ensure compliance to all related industry practices.

Question 15: Is any DC power plant infrastructure involved at the tower sites?

Answer 15: No. If quoted in a DC configuration, new DC power plants must be quoted as well to support the configuration.

Question 16: In your request for Proposal for wireless connectivity to county fire stations we see where the “Statement of work, number 15” states that the hardware should be capable of working on multiple frequency bands. Unfortunately, there is not a product on the market that can handle dual bands. Cambium offers a PMP400 that offers high performance in the 4.9 GHZ band as the PMP450 operates in the 5.4 or 5.8 GHZ bands. Please clarify that you will accept PMP400.

Answer 16: The PMP400 is 4.9GHz with a 10MH channel which limits it to a max speed of 20MB per manufacturer’s specifications found here ([PMP-400](#)). While this is an acceptable connectivity solution, thinking long term, we would review and compare other proposals which may include capabilities like the PMP-450 which is 5.4 or 5.8GHZ with a larger channel and up to 90MB ([PMP-450](#)). Additionally, the management application used will need to support equipment in multiple bands, ie we have gear in 4.9 and 5.8 and do not desire to have separate management applications or related issues.

Question 17: Additional questions pertaining to the Juniper requirements:

1. Do you need POE ports on SRX?
2. Wall or Rack mount SRX?
3. Are you going to require dynamic VPN Client; if so how many 5,10 or 25 users?
4. Are you going to require firewall features: Kaspersky or Sophos antivirus, IDP, Websense Web filtering, Sophos antispam?

Answer 17: The SRX210 units we have been using at fire stations are the 210H-POE model.

1. Yes, POE is required
2. Wall Mount
3. No additional client needed
4. No AV client required

Question 18: Does the County have current structural reports for the towers?

Answer 18: Refer to Question/Answer # 8

Question 19: Under Section 2; Statement of Work; Warranty; Item 2 it states that the lifecycles of the products are to be five years from the end of date of manufacture[r] warranty period, which is stipulated to be 3 years. This is a five year contract. Theoretically, the manufacturer could discontinue a radio the day after the contract is signed. If an order is placed for the discontinued radio on the final day of the contract is the expectation that the product be available for 13 years?

Answer 19: See q/a # 10

Questions 20:

1. Will geotechnical surveys be required? **Response:** This is a Building Department question and was discussed on site. Additional time was allotted due the necessary coordination for permitting with your proposed design.
2. Do you have the pole specification papers? **Response:** Hapco model 16400, info available from Hapco
3. The ground wire estimates listed in the wireless assessment appear to be short. Will Rapid Systems be allowed to make modifications to these estimates in order to pass Motorola grounding standards? **Response:** This is permissible.
4. Will the County require megger testing? **Response:** Yes, R56 is 10ohms or less.
5. Is there a recommended UPS we should be sourcing? Does the County wish to include network management cards? **Response:** No recommendation. Lake currently uses/prefers APC or Tripplite, with software or hardware alarming as an option.
6. Will Country provided staging facilities for equipment be available? Or will the County require Rapid Systems to provide those facilities? **Response:** We would use Communications Technologies Offices located at 20415 Independence Blvd. in Groveland for all staging as necessary.
7. 15 Remotes Site *may* require a large pole than what's specified in the RFP. Does the RFP takes into account the percentage of the pole that needs to be buried into the ground? (Typically around 15% give or take twist and sway criteria under rev G). **Response:** It is noted that the vendor listed the following 15 sites on a chart: Range, LCFR 78, LCFR110, LCFR 111, LCFR 19, LCFR70, LCFR 20, LCFR 59, LCFR 53, LCFR 52, LCFR 76, LCFR

27, LCFR 21, LCFR 39, and LCFR 11. Concrete pole information is from Durastress in Eustis, FL. Up to a 10' tenon can be added to the top of the pole for additional height.

Question 21: Is Presidio Networks and /or sister companies allowed to bid on the project?

Answer 21: Presidio is restricted from responding as a prime vendor under this solicitation.

Question 22: Is there any existing networking equipment (ie Cisco, Juniper) to be traded in?

Answer 22: No trade in from the existing network.

Question 23: Does the County have an existing GPS timing clock? Model?

Answer 23: All proposals should assume we do not if clocking is necessary.

Question 24: Is the requested Juniper equipment to be rack mounted? Is there rack space available?

Answer 24: Wall mounts for SRX210

Question 25: Is the requested UPS equipment to be rack mounted? Is there rack space available?

Answer 25: No racks exist at the fire stations, UPS to be floor model located near the SRX and PC

Question 26: Page 89 of the Assessment document states that outdoor rated Cat6 cable, grounding cable and weatherproofing material will be provided. Page 12 item 3 states that the contractor is to provide as part of bid. Please confirm who is to provide this material.

Answer 26: For clarification “will be provided” was referencing the requirements of the Contractor. The awarded contractor to supply all project materials, to include, but not be limited to, all required cabling, grounding, and weather proofing. These materials and related costs should be included in the proposals.

Acknowledgement of addendum receipt and consideration:

Firm Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Title: _____

Typed/Printed Name: _____