



ADDENDUM V

SUBJECT: Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal, Electronic Visual Information Display System, (RFCSP 21-047; 6100013796), Scheduled to Open: August 6, 2021. Date of Issue: May 28, 2021.

FROM: Jennifer Johnson
Procurement Administrator

DATE: July 30, 2021

THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. V TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS

A. THE ABOVE MENTIONED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Change:** RFCSP Attachment B, Pricing Schedule, is deleted in its entirety and replaced with RFCSP Attachment B, Pricing Schedule – Revised, attached to this Addendum V.
2. **Change:** RFCSP Section 003 Background, Preferred Qualifications, third bullet is revised to read as follows:
"• be registered with the Texas Secretary of State to do business in Texas."
3. **Change:** RFCSP Attachment A, Part Three, Proposed Plan, Item 1.a., is revised to read as follows:
"1. Requirements Matrix
a. Complete the Requirements Matrix (attached as separate document)"
4. **Change:** RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), Sheet AV.2.2.04, is replaced with RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), SHEET AV.2.2.04 REPLACEMENT, attached to this Addendum V.
5. **Change:** RFCSP Exhibit 2-EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), Sheet AV.8.0.01, is replaced with RFCSP Exhibit 2-EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), SHEET AV.8.0.01 REPLACEMENT, attached to this Addendum V.

B. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH RFCSP SECTION 008, SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS:

Below is a list of questions that were asked in accordance with RFCSP Restrictions on Communication. The City's official response to questions asked is as follows:

Question 1: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.1.04, can you specify the size for the Delta BSO DD-1-4-35? It is listed as TBD on the monitor installation schedule.

Response: 43"

- Question 2: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.05, the device locations for DD-2-501 thru Dd-2-5-04 show a TBD next to the size. Can you clarify the correct size?
- Response: 49”
- Question 3: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.1.04, devices DD-1-4-11 is listed as a 43” monitor, but a 70” monitor was pointed out on the walk thru. Which size is accurate?
- Response: 65”
- Question 4: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.01, devices DD-2-1-03 thru DD-2-1-06, the FIDS monitors are listed as 43” monitors on the installation schedule, but during the walk thru 49”s were shown. Which one needs to be quoted?
- Response: 43”
- Question 5: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.02, devices DD-2-2-03 thru DD-2-1-06, the FIDS monitors are listed as 43” monitors on the installation schedule, but during the walk thru 49”s were shown. Which one needs to be quoted?
- Response: 43”
- Question 6: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.03, devices DD-2-3-08 thru DD-2-3-11, the FIDS monitors are listed as 43” monitors on the installation schedule, but during the walk thru 49”s were shown. Which one needs to be quoted?
- Response: 43”
- Question 7: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.05, devices DD-2-5-05 thru DD-2-5-08, the FIDS monitors are listed as 43” monitors on the installation schedule, but during the walk thru 49”s were shown. Which one needs to be quoted?
- Response: 43”
- Question 8: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.2.2.06, devices DD-2—6-02 thru DD-2-6-05, the FIDS monitors are listed as 43” monitors on the installation schedule, but during the walk thru 49”s were shown. Which one needs to be quoted?
- Response: 43”
- Question 9: Does the monitor above the escalator entering Terminal A Baggage Claim need to be replaced? If so, what size? This monitor was pointed out on the walk thru but is not on the prints or the monitor installation schedule.
- Response: Yes, this is indicated in the plans as DD-2-4-31 on Sheet AV.2.2.04 and is a 55”.
- Question 10: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.02.A.1, customer-provided VMare environment, Windows server 2016 and SQL 2016 are specifically mentioned. Can your virtual environment support Server 2019?
- Response: Windows Server 2019 version is the current CoSA provided environment. Anything required beyond the existing provided environment is the responsibility of the Respondent to include in the proposal. Also see response to Question #2 in Addendum III.
- Question 11: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.1 and RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), existing DDCs-Terminals A and B, the SAIA recommendation in RFCSP Exhibit 1 is to reuse the Terminal B DDCs and Displays as much as possible. Would SAIA please address the following?
- a. What is the condition of the DDCs mentioned in the drawings as “replace as required”? Are these the units SAIA is recommending to reuse?

- b. What is the existing OS license? If not Windows 10 Pro, will SAIA require such licenses?
- c. Will SAIA be responsible for parts/unit replacement in case of a hardware failure?
- d. In case units fail during the deployment of the new EVIDS, is it correct to assume SAIA will provide a replacement of those units by equivalent models?
- e. Will the same principle and assumptions above apply to the display and display mountings that are stated for the provider to “keep” or “replace as required”?

Response: Clarification – SAIA’s *preference* is to retain the DDCs as they were installed in 2020.

- a. They were installed as new in 2020 and are all functioning properly as of this addendum release.
- b. Windows 10 Pro.
- c. Yes, provided it is not due to Contractor negligence.
- d. Yes.
- e. Yes, provided it is not due to Contractor negligence.

Question 12: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04, Software Functional Requirements, Integration, would SAIA please clarify the following about the integration between EVIDS and Queue Wait Time Management?

- a. What is the data flow expected (one-way/two-way integration)?
- b. What data/info is expected to be exchanged between the two systems?
- c. What is the protocol and interface type expected for this integration?
- d. What displays will be involved with this integration and what is expected to be displayed on those monitors?
- e. What areas besides security checkpoints are expected to be involved with this integration?
- f. How often will the data be updated?
- g. What connectivity is expected between the systems if not the SAIA LAN?
- h. How does SAIA intend to secure the connectivity between the two systems/networks?

Response:

- a. One way.
- b. TSA Checkpoint wait times.
- c. Unknown at this time.
- d. All displays.
- e. The information must be capable of being shown on any display.
- f. As available.
- g. SAIA LAN.
- h. Proposer to include approach in response.

Question 13: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04, Software Functional Requirements, Integration, would SAIA please clarify the following about the integration between EVIDS and Public Address (IED):

- a. What is the data flow expected (one-way/two-way integration)?
- b. What data/info is expected to be exchanged between the two systems?
- c. What is the protocol and interface type expected for this integration?
- d. What displays will be involved with this integration and what is expected to be displayed on those monitors?
- e. What areas of the airport are expected to be involved with this integration?
- f. How often will the data be updated?
- g. What connectivity is expected between the systems if not the SAIA LAN?
- h. How does SAIA intend to secure the connectivity between the two systems/network?

Response:

- a. Two-way.
- b. Visual/audio paging.
- c. MSMQ to IED; UDP from IED.
- d. All displays, visual paging.

- e. All areas with a display.
- f. Upon availability of new data.
- g. SAIA LAN.
- h. Proposer to include approach in response.

Question 14: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04, Software Functional Requirements, Integration, would SAIA please clarify the following about the integration between EVIDS and Cell Phone Lot (Daktronics):

- a. What is the data flow expected (one-way/two-way integration)?
- b. What data/info is expected to be exchanged between the two systems?
- c. What is the protocol and interface type expected for this integration?
- d. What displays will be involved with this integration and what is expected to be displayed on those monitors?
- e. What areas of the airport are expected to be involved with this integration?
- f. How often will the data be updated?
- g. What connectivity is expected between the systems if not the SAIA LAN?
- h. How does SAIA intend to secure the connectivity between the two systems/network?

Response:

- a. One-way.
- b. Flight information to be displayed on the cell phone lot display.
- c. TCP.
- d. One (1) large factor outdoor LED display at the cell phone lot.
- e. One location: The cell phone lot.
- f. Data is expected to be updated in the same fashion as all other FIDS in the facility.
- g. It will be on the SAIA LAN.
- h. Proposer to include approach in response.

Question 15: RFCSP Section 014, General Terms and Conditions, Warranty, is the following language negotiable? Or does exception to this language result in automatic disqualification? REJECTION OF DISCLAIMERS OF WARRANTIES & LIMITATIONS OF LIABILITY. ANY TERM OR CONDITION IN ANY DOCUMENT FURNISHED BY VENDOR, DISCLAIMING THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR OF FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR ATTEMPTING TO LIMIT VENDOR'S LIABILITY SHALL BE OF NO FORCE OR EFFECT, AND SHALL BE STRICKEN FROM THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AS IF NEVER CONTAINED THEREIN.

Response: The City seeks to contract with a vendor under the terms and conditions specified in the RFCSP and Respondents have the opportunity to price their proposals accordingly. Also see response to Question 30 in Addendum III.

Question 16: Will SAIA grant a one-week extension on the proposal due date (to 7/30/2021)? This will allow respondents to provide updated proposals that meet SAIA's needs.

Response: Addendum II extended proposal due date to July 30, 2021. Addendum IV extended the proposal due date to August 6, 2021.

Question 17: RFCSP Section 003 Background, Preferred Qualifications, third bullet, what license are you referring to "Licensed in the State of Texas" as Texas does not require too many licenses to work in Texas?

Response: See Item #2 in Section A of this Addendum V.

Question 18: I do not see a bond requirement due at time of proposal submittal – is this correct?

Response: Yes. There is no Proposal Bond requirement.

- Question 19: I do not see any insurance required at time of proposal submittal – is that correct?
Response: As part of their proposal, all Respondents are required to submit Proof of Insurability as described in RFCSP Section 007, Proposal Requirements. Insurance requirements to be met by the selected Respondent, upon award, are stated in RFCSP Section 013 Supplemental Terms & Conditions, Insurance. Respondent shall also submit a copy of their current insurance certificate. See also Section 013 – Supplemental Terms & Conditions, Insurance: Respondent is required to furnish copies of all required endorsements and an original completed Certificate(s) of Insurance to the City prior to the commencement of any work under this Agreement.
- Question 20: Where would I find the Traceability Matrix?
Response: See Item #2 in Section A to this Addendum V. Requirements Traceability Matrix has been changed to Requirements Matrix. RFCSP Attachment A, Part Four – Requirements Matrix is attached to RFX 6100013796 in SAePS.
- Question 21: RFCSP Attachment A, Part Three, Proposed Plan, Item 11.a., references a pre-production and production environment. Are both required? If so, please provide additional details about the requirements for a pre-production lab (i.e. how many displays, what types?).
Response: No. The vendor shall include in their response a proposal of how updates to the software will be performed while minimizing impact to operations.
- Question 22: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item C.1., please describe the Southwest interface at SAIA in as much detail as possible. Is it an http or similar connection, or is it a hardware-based interface using one or more Lantronix (or similar) serial device?
Response: Hardware based – Lantronix UDS100.
- Question 23: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.1., please provide details about the Collins Aerospace system. Specifically,
a. what are the interface capabilities that Collins can provide? (API? HTTP? XML, Etc.?) and
b. what is the use case for the interface?
Response:
a. Interface capabilities are unknown at this time.
b. This interface requirement is related to a “Common Use” use case at common use ticketing counters. Common Use monitors must display the respective airline.
- Question 24: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.2., please provide details about the Infax Queue Measurement system. Specifically, what are the interface capabilities that Infax can provide? (API? HTTP? XML, Etc.?).
Response: Unknown at this time. Also see response to Question 12c above.
- Question 25: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.4., please provide details about the Daktroics cell phone lot display, specifically what is the video interface?
Response: TCP. Also see response to Question 14 above.
- Question 26: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.4., please describe functionality of the cell lot display. For example, does it have a countdown timer or rules/triggers that govern when flights or messages are posted and removed? Also, what fields of data being displayed?
Response: The respondent will include a proposed solution to use the existing cell lot display for flight information. Included within the proposal should be cost to review and determine business rules with the Owner.

- Question 27: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.D., please confirm that the mass notification system described in this section does not yet exist, therefore does not require an interface at this time.
- Response: Mass notification is in existence. It is provided by Everbridge and is required to interface as part of this project.
- Question 28: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.10, is it acceptable to turn over existing displays, DDCs and related electronics to the airport for disposal upon decommissioning?
- Response: It is required to turn over the existing equipment to the airport for disposal.
- Question 29: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 3.08.C.1., states "Assume a maintenance period of 1 year to start at the same time as the warranty period." and RFCSP Section 013 Supplemental Terms & Conditions, states that the contract will terminate after 5 years. Please conform the desired terms for Warranty, Maintenance and Support.
- Response: A warranty period of 1 year is to be included as part of the base bid. Base bid maintenance and support for years 2 through 5, as well as optional years 6 and 7, are to be included as part of the response.
- Question 30: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.A.2.b., please provide the age and specifications of the existing displays in terminal which are to be reused including, manufacturer, model, native resolution, video inputs. etc.
- Response: 2020 installation – LGSM5KE
- Question 31: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.1., please provide the specifications for the existing DDCs in terminal B including OS, processor, graphics, RAM, storage, video output, etc.
- Response: Controller: nowmicro DMPN-7i3; Model 250N. Processor: Intel Core i5-7300U 2.6-3.5GHz Dual Core. OS: Windows 10 Pro/Windows 10 IoT Enterprise. Graphics: Intel HD 620. Monitors Supported: 1 or 2. Connectivity: Gigabit LAN (Wi-Fi Optional) Audio: Up to 7.1 Surround Sound audio via HDMI.
- Question 32: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.4., requirement reads, "Video output that supports no less than 3840x2160 resolution, Dual outputs (HDMI or Display Port)". Please confirm that new DDCs shall be dual video ports, both of which support ultra-high definition (UHD).
- Response: Single video port supporting UHD is acceptable.
- Question 33: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.4., requirement reads, "DDC architecture will be a 1:1 ratio of DDC: monitor location." To clarify the meaning of "monitor location", is a bank of 6 FIDS displays one monitor location or 6 monitor locations?
- Response: 6 monitor locations (i.e... 6 monitors in that specific facility location)
- Question 34: Please provide specifications (manufacturer, model, OS, etc.) for the three Tugman Input Devices that will be reused.
- Response: Unknown at this time.
- Question 35: Does the airport intend to provide all required Windows Server and SQL database licenses?
- Response: Yes

- Question 36: Please confirm that the Pricing Evaluation Form will not be subject to future FOIA-related requests.
Response: See Section 008 – Submission of Proposals, Confidential or Proprietary Information: Any information deemed to be confidential by Respondent should be clearly noted; however, City cannot guarantee that it will not be compelled to disclose all or part of any public record under the Texas Public Information Act, since information deemed to be confidential by Respondent may not be considered confidential under Texas law, or pursuant to a Court order..
- Question 37: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AV.8.0.01, Monitor Schedule Monitor size TBD: Have the sizes of monitors DD-1-4-35, DD-2-5-01 through DD-1-5-04 been determined?
Response: Yes, and this is addressed in Addendum IV drawing updates.
- Question 38: RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheets AV.2.2.04 and AV.8.0.01, both drawings list two monitors labeled DD-2-4-06. Should there be one monitor labeled DD-2-4-06 or should there be one monitor each for the two locations labeled DD-2-4-06?
Response: One monitor each for the two locations.
- Question 39: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.03, is this intended for Smartphone sized devices or Tablet devices? In general, what is the use case for the mobile client or type or data what will be input in this way?
Response: Smartphones and tablets are desirable. Flight updates are a minimum. Respondent’s proposal shall include all mobile capabilities.
- Question 40: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04, what reporting software is currently utilized by SAIA? Examples include Microsoft SSRS and Microsoft Power BI.
Response: Microsoft Power BI
- Question 41: RFCSP Attachment A, Part Three, Item 1.a., is there a separate document for the Traceability Matrix? Or is it the same as the Requirements Matrix?
Response: See Item #2 in Section A to this Addendum V. “Requirements Traceability Matrix” has been changed to “Requirements Matrix”.
- Question 42: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.1., integrate with the following existing systems – Common Use (Collins): What is the desired outcome of integration with the Collins Common Use system?
Response: Displaying airline information on respective Common Use ticketing counter and Common Use gate monitors.
- Question 43: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.04.B.2., integrate with the following existing systems – Queue Wait Time Management - Infax: What is the desired outcome of integration with the Queue Wait Time Management – Infax?
Response: The ability to display wait times on any monitor within this project and future deployments of new monitors.
- Question 44: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.02.A.1., CoSA is providing the virtual environment: Will CoSA be providing all third-party software for the virtual environment?
Response: Correct
- Question 45: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.02.A.1., CoSA is providing the switches: Is CoSA providing all of the network infrastructure?
Response: Correct

Question 46: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.1. states to reuse the DDCs in [Terminal] B.
RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AC.2.2.08 states to replace the [Terminal B] DDCs.

a. Should DDCs be reused in Terminal B as the specification in RFCSP Exhibit 1 states [OR] replaced as RFCSP Exhibit 2 (Drawings) state?

Response: Vendor's question indicates incomplete understanding of what City is requesting. For clarification, CoSA offers the following for vendor's review:

- RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B.1. states, with respect to Terminal B, "...preference of CoSA is to reuse these devices."
- RFCSP Exhibit 2, EVID System Upgrade (Drawings), sheet AC.2.2.08 more specifically states "...to reuse the DDCs in Terminal B ***as required.***"

CoSA's Response to Question 46a is: If vendor's proposed system is compatible with the existing Terminal B DDCs, then there is no requirement to replace it.

Question 47: For any DDCs to be reused, what are the specifications for the devices?

Response: Please see response to Question 31 above. Nowmicro DDC controller DMPN-7i5: Model 250N

Question 48: With the pricing for the solution being directly associated with the answers to the proposed questions, and anticipating the number of potential questions, would SAT allow an extension of an additional week to the proposal deadline?

Response: RFCSP Addendum II extended the proposal due date to July 30, 2021. Addendum IV extended the proposal due date to August 6, 2021.

Question 49: RFCSP Exhibit 1, Functional & Technical Requirements, Item 2.07.B., Display Device Controllers (DDC), if our system supports using one DDC player to drive two monitors, may we propose this as a cost saving measure in some areas?

Response: This solution is not desired at this time.



Jennifer Johnson
Procurement Administrator
Finance Department – Purchasing Division

Date _____

Company Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip Code _____

Signature

RFCSP ATTACHMENT B
PRICE SCHEDULE - REVISED

(Posted as a separate document)

RFCSP EXHIBIT 2
EVID SYSTEM UPGRADE (DRAWINGS)
SHEET AV.2.2.04 REPLACEMENT

(Attached a separate document)

RFCSP EXHIBIT 2
EVID SYSTEM UPGRADE (DRAWINGS)
SHEET AV.8.0.01 REPLACEMENT

(Attached a separate document)