

FORM T
RFP ANSWER FORM

Answer Sheet 1 of 5 Sheets

No.	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Department Response
1.	Form E – Compliance Matrix	4	<p>For clarification purposes, please advise why the format for the Compliance Matrix was changed.</p> <p>The new compliance matrix has removed the comment/clarification column that would allow vendors to explain any “Do Not Comply” responses, if applicable. Given the Comply with Clarification column was also removed, the only column for written explanations is for Features Providing Added Value. Should vendors have any Do Not Comply responses, can the Features Providing Added Value column also be used to provide an explanation of the exception? In some cases it may not be a true Exception but also not meet the criteria for a Comply and a description would be useful in helping the Members understand the vendor’s position.</p>	<p>The requirements have been rewritten where necessary to provide direction as to what the NSRS wants/needs in the way of performance. There is no “kind of complies” category. If proposers had an issue with any particular requirement, they had an opportunity to ask for relief from that requirement or a broadening of the requirement so that they could comply and in doing so, the NSRS would have had an opportunity to determine whether such change to its requirements were acceptable before Proposals were received. To allow otherwise is unfair to other proposers. The Compliance Matrix was modified to achieve this specific requirement</p>
2.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 1.6.A, Page 19	2	<p>Are the 700 MHz frequencies referenced in this section, free and clear for use?</p>	<p>The State of Nevada holds the license for the statewide public safety portion of the 700 MHz band. There were no frequencies referenced in this section. Frequencies within the 700 MHz band will be coordinated as required to meet the needs of the new radio system where 700 MHz is concerned.</p>
3.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 1.6.A, Page 19	2	<p>Does the State of Nevada have agreements with anyone with respect to frequency use? If so, please provide frequency plan details.</p>	<p>Any frequencies provided or obtained by others operating on the system shall be by agreement and will belong to the system under the terms of such agreement. Agreement details will be discussed with the successful Proposer.</p>

FORM T
RFP ANSWER FORM

Answer Sheet 2 of 5 Sheets

No.	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Department Response
4.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 1.6.A, Page 19	2	Does the State of Nevada have agreements with neighboring states on State Border Channel Usage? Please provide agreement details.	Any agreements with neighboring States are coordinated through Nevada's Regional Coordinator for the appropriate frequency band as required. Agreement details will be discussed with the successful Proposer.
5.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 2.2 D, Page 28	3	Please provide the physical locations for the NVE and Washoe County NMT locations. This information is important in determining how the NMTs will access the network.	Physical locations were asked and answered in the previous round of questions (See #16 released July 11, 2017). How they connect into a network will remain the responsibility of the respective partner agency.
6.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 2.2.D, Page 28	3	Will there be there VPN access at the NMT locations listed?	If VPN access is required to the NMT locations, this access will be arranged through the appropriate transport provider.
7.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 3.4.A, page 32 (Question 89 from Q&A)	2	Two questions were asked about Attachment 1 – Scope of Services Section 3.4.A. In the answers, Contractors were directed to new Attachments 11 and 14. These attachments do not specifically address the conventional 700/800 MHz mutual aid and interoperability channels. Please clarify. Are the currently existing 800 MHz NCRN cross-band repeater sites (Table 2, page 33) also the sites for the existing conventional 700/800 MHz base stations supporting mutual aid and interoperability channels as referenced in 3.4.A? Are these 2 items one in the same?	Yes.
8.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 8.1, Item C	4	Are the annual on-site support costs for 7 years following warranty included in the Extended Warranty line items in Table B.13 of the Pricing Forms?	Yes.

FORM T
RFP ANSWER FORM

Answer Sheet 3 of 5 Sheets

No.	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Department Response
9.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 9 Table 7, Page 90	3	The quantity of consoles listed in the answer to Q&A #42 does not match the quantity listed in Table 7 in the Scope of Services document. Do the revised numbers in the Scope of Services document supersede the answer given to question 42?	Yes.
10.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 9, Table 7, Page 92	3	NVE console quantity for NP1 in the revised Scope of Services document is 18, however the console quantity shows 15. Please clarify.	The NVE console quantity for NP1 is 18.
11.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 9.8, Pages 101-102	2	Could the Console 30 Day Operational Burn-In period be combined with the System/Regional 30 Day Operational Burn-In period?	Yes, however the two are independent in the successful completion of each aspect.
12.	Attachment 1, Scope of Services, Section 10	3	Please provide the locations of the Control Station/Desksets listed in Table 8, and the number at each location.	Locations of these Desktop stations are statewide and the quantity at each location is dependent upon the operations for each location. For the purposes of Proposals, any interconnection will be determined during final design with the successful proposer.
13.	Attachment 2, Existing and Candidate Sites Part 1, Page 3	2	Three sites listed as under construction have NDOT as the stakeholder. Per the answer received to question 90, only one site is currently under construction by NDOT (Painted Rock). Will NDOT still be responsible for developing the other 2 sites? Will shelters be placed at these sites by NDOT?	Jackpot site is constructed and building is in place. USA Parkway will have a building placed by others before system is implemented.

FORM T
RFP ANSWER FORM

Answer Sheet 4 of 5 Sheets

No.	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Department Response
14.	Attachment 2, Existing and Candidate Sites, Part 2	3	Only three sites identify the stakeholder for the site (NDOT). For pricing purposes, how do you suggest stakeholders be assigned to other candidate sites that may be used in the system design?	For purposes of assigning a stakeholder, consider the following in your response: <u>NDOT</u> : Angora Lookout, Benton, Clark County FS, Garden Pass, Humboldt County, Meeks Bay, NDOT Yard (Indian Springs) Tempiute <u>NV Energy</u> : 49 Mtn., Gunsite, Mt. Charleston Site 03, Red Rock, S. of White River, Shurz Stockpile, Smokey Quartz, Spring Mtn Ranch State Park, Visitor Center (VOF), Yellow Peak. <u>Washoe County</u> : Moses Rock
15.	Attachment 11 – Cross Band Freq	4	Is there a significant meaning for the colored text in column C? Please provide a legend for this spreadsheet?	There is no significance to the colored text in Attachment 11, this was a working document for tracking purposes.
16.	NSRS Q and A, Question 85	4	As a follow-up to this answer, can vendors safely use assumptions whereby there is an expectation or presumption that a condition may or may not exist as part of vendors' responses to technical requirements? As an example, if a particular level of power would need to be present at a site, the response may be "Vendor assumes that customer will supply x, y or z power at the site, etc." Or "Vendor assumes that the customer will provide facilities for mobile vehicle installations at customer locations."	Proposers shall not make assumptions on anything not clearly identified within these requirements. Proposers shall rely on industry standard conditions. As part of the final negotiations and system design, these adjustments will be made according to each of the affected items.
17.	RFP 697-16-016 Questions and Answers Submitted by NDOT 7/11/2017, Question #17	4	In the answer to question #17, you've indicated RTU equipment shall be provided only for new microwave-only site(s) that the proposer is including in their new system design. Should the word "microwave-only" be replaced with "RF-only?" We ask because the Proposers are not proposing any microwave sites/equipment.	Replace "microwave-only" with "RF-only" in the answer to Question #17 provided 7/11/2017.

FORM T
RFP ANSWER FORM

Answer Sheet 5 of 5 Sheets

18.	RFP 697-16-016 Addendum 3, Page 8 RE: Form T RFP Answer Form – Sheet 11: Question 35	2	<p>The revised answer states the vendor is responsible for programming new and existing P25 Ph2 compatible radios and assuring the currently owned P25 Ph2 radios can operate on the new system.</p> <p>In question 36 of Form T, submitted 6-2-2017, we asked if you could provide a breakdown of the quantities of existing radios that need to be replaced; quantities that need to be upgraded to P25; and quantities that are currently equipped with P25 capability. In your answer, you declined to provide the information.</p> <p>In order to assess the scope and cost of ensuring existing radios can be used on the new system, we respectfully request a breakdown of the 6,983 units cited in the RFP in terms of the quantities of radios that are P25 capable (i.e. compatible but need an upgrade), P25 equipped (i.e. compatible, not in need of an upgrade), and radios that will need to be replaced.</p> <p>We feel this level of detail will support your request in Addendum 3, Form T, Question 35; and will ensure an apples to apples comparison of the overall scope and price in your evaluation and scoring of the Price Proposals submitted by multiple vendors.</p>	<p>In responding to this item, consider the quantity of radios that need to have P25 upgrades as indicated below, based upon the total quantities stated in Table 8 and Table 9 of Section 10 of the RFP.</p> <p>All State (NDOT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radios to be upgraded - 1044 • Radios to be Replaced - 5653 <p>NV Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radios to be upgraded - 0 • Radios to be replaced - 1250 <p>Washoe County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radios to be upgraded - 2276 • Radios to be replaced - 4707
19.	RFP 697-16-016 Addendum 3, Page 8 RE: Form T RFP Answer Form – Sheet 11: Question 35	2	Who will provide the upgrades to the existing P25 capable and/or P25 equipped radios owned by NDOT, Washoe County, and NV Energy?	Proposers shall include the feature upgrade to P25 Phase 2 for those radios capable of such upgrade, and the replacement of those radios not capable of upgrade within their proposal based upon the quantities listed in the response to question 18 above.