



County of Fairfax, Virginia

ADDENDUM

DATE: October 17, 2016

ADDENDUM NO. 2

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS
REFERENCE: RFP2000002010
TITLE: Next Generation Core Services Solution (NGCS)
DUE DATE/TIME: November 30, 2016 / 2:00 P.M. EST (Revised)

The referenced request for proposal is amended as follows:

1. The due date/time has changed to November 30, 2016 at 2:00 P.M. EST.
2. Reference page 1 of Appendix C, Section 1 Background and Project Scope, third paragraph, first sentence: Change to read "This Next Generation Core Services (NGCS) and ESInet procurement for the NCR consists of 13 primary, 7 secondary, and 10 backup public safety answering points (PSAPs) residing in the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia."
3. Reference page 7 of Appendix C, Section 4.2 Standards, second paragraph, second sentence: Change to read "Specifically, the Contractor's solution shall comply with new NGCS and ESInet industry standards within 18 months of ratification of applicable industry standards."
4. Reference page 16 of Appendix C, Section 4.8 Security, Paragraph 2: Delete the paragraph and replace it with "Respondent shall provide a compliance matrix, as outlined in NENA 75-502, NENA NG-SEC Audit Checklist, which identifies whether its proposed solution Complies (C), Does Not Comply (No), or Not Applicable (N/A) to the identified requirement(s) for each audit question, using the instructions provided in Section 3 of NENA 75-502. If N/A is provided, Respondent shall provide an explanation as to why the question is not applicable to the proposed solution.

- Complies
- Does Not Comply
- Not Applicable

Details to support the answer:"

5. Reference page 19 of Appendix C, Section 4.9.1 Security Monitoring and Management, Paragraph 4, first sentence: Change to read "Respondent shall provide details concerning how its proposed solution will provide for security monitoring and management."
6. Reference page 26 of Appendix C, Section 4.9.14 Operational Scenarios, Paragraph 2, second and third sentences: Change to read "On Monday at 12:17 A.M., one of the LNGs experiences a catastrophic failure and is unable to process any calls. In a review of Monday's logs, it is found that the surviving LNG processed only 14,000 calls."
7. Reference page 44 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.6 Location Validation Function (LVF), Paragraph 2, second sentence: Change to read "The LIS/LDB shall be allowed to periodically revalidate the civic location information against the GIS data contained within the LVF."
8. Reference page 45 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.7 Spatial Interface (SI), Paragraph 2, first sentence: Change to read "The SI shall convert the GIS data meeting these requirements into the format (data structure and projection) used by the ECRF and LVF. The SI shall provision the formatted data and perform incremental updates, in real-time or near real-time, using a Web feature service."
9. Reference pages 39 thru 40 of Appendix C, Section 4.10.4 Emergency Service Routing Proxy (ESRP) and Policy Routing Function (PRF): Replace the first column of Table 2 with the following. This updated column provides for the updated numbering schema.

Requirement
4.10.4,8.1 Overview
4.10.4,8.2 Call Queueing
4.10.4,8.3 Queue State Event Package
4.10.4,8.4 De-queue Registration Event Package
4.10.4,8.5 Policy Routing Function
4.10.4,8.6 ESRP Notify Event Package
4.10.4,8.7 INVITE Transaction Processing
4.10.4,8.8 BYE Transaction Processing
4.10.4,8.9 CANCEL Transaction Processing
4.10.4,8.10 OPTIONS Transaction Processing

Requirement
4.10.4,8.11 Upstream Call Interface
4.10.4,8.12 Downstream Call Interface
4.10.4,8.13 ECRF Interface
4.10.4,8.14 Location Information Server (LIS) Dereference Interface
4.10.4,8.15 Additional Data Interfaces
4.10.4,8.16 ESRP, PSAP, Call-Taker State Notification and Subscriptions
4.10.4,8.17 Time Interface
4.10.4,8.18 Logging Interface
4.10.4,8.19 Data Structures
4.10.4,8.20 Policy Elements
4.10.4,8.21 Provisioning

10. Reference page 69 of Appendix C, Attachment A: NCR PSAP Data for Proposed ESInet and NGCS: Delete Attachment A: NCR PSAP Data for Proposed ESInet and NGCS and replace it with Attachment 2 (revised version of Attachment A).
11. Reference page 78 of Appendix C, Attachment C: Requirements Compliance Summary: Delete Attachment C: Requirements Compliance Summary and replace it with Attachment 3 (revised version of Attachment C). The numbering schema has been updated and Sections 4.3,12 and 4.3,13 were updated to reflect their response type.
12. Refer to Attachment 1 for answers to questions received from September 20, 2016 through October 4, 2016.
13. Below are links to mandatory terms and conditions of Montgomery County, Maryland. These terms and conditions will apply to any contract being extended to Montgomery County, Maryland, upon completion of this solicitation process. These terms and conditions will not apply to the resultant contract between Fairfax County and the Contractor.

PMMD 45 – General Conditions of Contract Between County & Contractor (for Montgomery County, MD)

<https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/PRO/Resources/Files/General/PMMD-45.pdf>

PMMD 91 - Minority-Owned Business Addendum to General Conditions of Contract Between County and Contractor (for Montgomery County, MD)

www.montgomerycountymd.gov/PRO/Resources/Files/SolForm/PMMD-91.pdf

PMMD 65 – Montgomery County, Maryland, Minority, Female, Disabled Person Subcontractor Performance Plan

www.montgomerycountymd.gov/PRO/Resources/Files/SolForm/PMMD-65.pdf

Mandatory Insurance Requirements (for Montgomery County Maryland)

<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/POL/Resources/Files/PDF/Informal/MANDATORY%20MINIMUM%20INSURANCE%20REQUIREMENTS%20Next%20Generation%20Core%20Services.pdf>

All other terms and conditions remain the same.



Jamie Pun, VCO, CPPB
Contract Specialist II

THIS ADDENDUM IS ACKNOWLEDGED AND IS CONSIDERED A PART OF THE SUBJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL:

Name of Firm

(Signature)

(Date)

A SIGNED COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL OR RETURNED PRIOR TO DUE DATE/TIME.

Note: SIGNATURE ON THIS ADDENDUM DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR SIGNATURE ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT. THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL DOCUMENT MUST BE SIGNED.

Attachment 1

Q1: Can you please grant an extension for this bid?

A1: The RFP due date has been extended to November 30, 2016. See RFP Amendments above.

Q2: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.3 Border Control Function (BCF)

Question: For [paragraphs] #7 and #11 below, these are confusing questions can you please clarify?

7. The Contractor's BCF solution shall support transcoding of Baudot tones to real-time text, as described in IETF RFC 4103.

11. The Respondent shall provide details on how its proposed SBC shall be capable of populating the Layer 3 headers, based on call/session type (e.g., 9-1-1 calls) in order to facilitate priority routing of the packets.

A2: As elements of published standards, clarification may be found in NENA 08-003, or its recent update STA-010.2.

Q3: For this question 4.11.1 we do not have the current call volume we only have dispatched calls which is different can you please provide?

A3: Call volume, workstation and trunk data has been updated and/or verified in Attachment A to Appendix C.

Q4: Please confirm the call volumes in Attachment A. Are these call volumes monthly or annual?

A4: See A3.

Q5: Can you please provide the number of originating service provider trunks for the PSAPS in each phase?

A5: The NCR requested this data from its 9-1-1 Service Provider and was informed that this information cannot be made available to the jurisdictions.

Offerors should exercise their experience in ESInet/NGCS deployments of similar size (population per PSAP, positions, CAMA trunks, etc.) to design their solution provided the information in Attachment A of Appendix C.

Q6: Please provide the number of primary and secondary psaps for each of the sites listed for Part and part B. (We have the total counts of these in Attachment A but are unable to associate which PSAPs are associated to which others.)

A6: See updated Attachment A. Secondary PSAPs now have their Primary PSAP listed after the Secondary PSAP's name. Offerors should take note that Secondary PSAPs with "Remote off [x] County" are served by CPE hosted by the named county. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet.

Additionally, while listed as Secondary PSAPs, Manassas City and Manassas Park receive some wireline calls directly. These two PSAPs have wireless calls transferred to them by Fairfax County, Prince William County, and potentially others. Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority also only receives wireless 911 calls through transfers.

Attachment 1

Q7: Please provide the number of concurrent calls allowable per site in part a and part b.
A7: **The number of concurrent calls allowable per site is provided in the updated Attachment A of Appendix C provided in this addendum.**

Q8: In requirement 4.8. SECURITY It states:
"2. Respondent shall provide a compliance matrix, as outlined in NENA 75-502, NENA NG- SEC Audit Checklist, which identifies whether its proposed solution Complies (C), Complies Partially (CP), Complies with Future Capability (CFC) or Does Not Comply (DNC) to the identified requirement(s) for each audit question, using the instructions provided in Section 3 of NENA 75-502."

In the section 3 instructions for NENA 75-502 and in the matrix itself, the user is given the following three choices: C for "comply," No for "does not comply" or not applicable (N/A).

Do you want responders to use the responses as given in 4.8.2 or those in NENA 75-502 section 3 and the matrix?

A8: **The RFP requirement has been updated to require offerors to provide Complies, Does Not Comply (No), or Not Applicable (N/A). See RFP amendments above.**

Q9: In regards to question 4.9.1, 4 which reads "Respondent shall provide details concerning how it provides security monitoring and management for similar solutions. Respondent shall provide details, including drawings, which explain how its proposed solution meets or exceeds the above requirements."

Is it your intent for the responder to explain security monitoring and management for the solution that is being offered in this response – an ESInet solution? Or is it your intention to have the respondent explain that detail for a different "similar" solution?

A9: **The RFP requirement has been updated to require offerors to provide details how it will provide security monitoring and management for its proposed solution. See RFP amendments above.**

Q10: Ref. RFP Section 5.4.3

Question: Could the NCR identify which specific forms/documents are required in response to this requirement?

A10: **Offeror's forms or agreements such as SLA (Service Level Agreement), SOW (Scope/Statement of Work), Maintenance Agreements, Software Agreements, Change Order forms, etc., as applicable and modified to comply with terms and conditions of the RFP, which the offeror will require the County to accept and agree to prior to completion of negotiations, if the offeror is selected to move forward to the negotiations phase.**

Q11: Ref. Appendix A, Section 33 Termination of Contract for Clause

Question: It is unusual for there not to be a cure period before a termination for cause is issued to the Contractor. Will the NCR consider a reasonable period of time for the Contractor to cure the problem(s) that is causing the concern?

A11: **If an exception needs to be taken to this provision, please clearly identify it and state the reason for taking the exception in a separate section in the proposal. The County will consider it during negotiations, if the offeror taking the exception is selected to move forward to the negotiations phase. Please note that Appendix A contains general terms and conditions specific to Fairfax County only. Other participating**

Attachment 1

jurisdictions may have differing mandatory terms and conditions required by statute, ordinances, and regulations that may apply to contracts being extended to those participating jurisdictions of NCR upon completion of this RFP process.

Q12: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.2 Standards

Question: It is possible that as a standard becomes ratified there are no technical vendor solutions available within the 12-month timeline. Would the NCR consider revising this statement to allow time for hardware and software solutions to become available?

A12: Attachment C has been amended to an 18-month timeframe. The NCR seeks to contract with a vendor partner who will be contributing to and shaping industry standards as they are being developed. This should position such a partner to meet an 18-month timeline for solution delivery. Offerors may suggest alternative solutions in their proposals.

Q13: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.3.13 Network

Question: Could the NCR please provide detailed performance, capacity and utilization information on each PSAP as applied to this requirement?

A13: Offerors should exercise their experience in ESInet/NGCS deployments of similar size (population per PSAP, positions, call volume, CAMA trunks, etc.) to design their solution provided the information in Attachment A of Appendix C.

Q14: Ref. Appendix C, Sections 4.7.1.1 Data Center Locations, 4.7.2 Data Center Requirements, and 4.7.3 Cabinets and Power Distribution

Question: These requirements appear oriented to mandating the physical design, location and capabilities of the Data Centers including sizing and performance and usage. Is it sufficient to meet the requirements if the Respondent's Data Centers meet Tier 3 standards?

A14: No. Offerors should note that the NCR is not mandating the location of the data centers, but do state their desires. Q14 does not fulfill the NCR's requirements for functionality such as power distribution monitoring requirements (e.g., SNMP).

Q15: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.9.1.1 Security Monitoring and Management,

Question: Does the NCR have specific "public safety network security guidelines" that Contractors should reference (e.g. NIST, CSA, NENA)? If so, please provide.

A15: No. Offerors are encouraged to describe their solution and the security standards and best practices to which they adhere.

Q16: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.9.13 Third-Party Management,

Question: It is not clear what responsibility Third-Party NOC/SOC will have or what level of support they will be providing.

- a. Will Third-Party NOC/SOC providers be held liable for SLA compliance?
- b. What contractual relationship is envisioned between the Prime Contractor and Third-Party NOC/SOC?

A16: a. No.

b. If the NCR elects to procure services from a third-party NOC/SOC, then the NCR anticipates that there would only be a contractual relationship between the NCR and the third-party NOC/SOC.

Attachment 1

- Q17: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.9.14,2 Operational Scenarios
Questions: A) When did the LNG experience a catastrophic failure? B) One could assume that the surviving LNG did not process 6,000 active calls entering the NCR ESInet. Is this the proper assumption?
- A17: **A) The referenced operational scenario has been amended to read “On Monday at 12:17 A.M., one of the LNGs experiences a catastrophic failure and is unable to process any calls. In a review of Monday’s logs, it is found that the surviving LNG processed only 14,000 calls.”**
B) Offerors shall make and state their own assumptions.
- Q18: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.9.14,3 Operational Scenarios
Question: Should it be assumed the change to the centerline data has been uploaded to the LDB?
- A18: **Offerors shall make and state their own assumptions.**
- Q19: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.8.1 Location Database (LDB)
Question: The RFP indicates the LDB is to provide a NG9-1-1 HELD interface, as well as two other interfaces: legacy ALI and ALI Query Service (AQS). A) Is the AQS interface intended to support legacy CPE? As all CPE can support a legacy ALI interface, it seems unnecessary to support the additional interface. B) As such, is it possible that the legacy interface be provided to this CPE using only the legacy ALI interface and not AQS? C) If AQS is required, please provide a use case.
- A19: **A) No. Within the LDB, the AQS allows for support of different query keys, such as SIP URL, allowing query keys beyond "NPA NXX TN". AQS is used in several LDB functions, including mapping of fields between legacy formats and NG formats, as documented in Appendix A of the recently released NENA-STA-010.2-2016.**
B) No. AQS is used for other functions beyond “support of legacy CPE”. AQS allows querying for location of reference, such as an MCP or VPC, and allows location information to be used in a mixed NG9-1-1 and E9-1-1 environment.
C) Transitional Data Element Use Cases may be found in Appendix A of the recently released NENA-STA-010.2-2016 and in the NENA NG9-1-1 Transition Plan Considerations Information Document, NENA-INF-008.2-2013.
- Q20: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.10.12.1 Applications and Alarm Integration
Questions: Will all alarm and sensor data be IP-based? If not, what format will be used? And with what protocols?
- A20: **The NCR anticipates that initial support for alarms will be provided through similar methods used today (e.g., 10-digit emergency line). However, it is the desire that the NCR’s NGCS and ESInet will provide for IP-based non-human initiated calls via standards-based interfaces and protocols.**
- Q21: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.11.1 System Capabilities and Performance,
Question: Would the NCR please provide detailed existing utilization and performance figures on all the necessary points to fulfill this requirement?
- A21: **Offerors should exercise their experience in ESInet/NGCS deployments of similar size (population per PSAP, positions, call volume, CAMA trunks, etc.) to design their solution provided the information in Attachment A of Appendix C.**

Attachment 1

Q22: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.11.7 Incident Severity Level 1 and 2 Violation Damages

Question: Does the NCR have a definition of Severity 1 and 2, or are you looking to the vendor to define?

A22: The NCR is looking for Offerors to propose Severity Levels.

Q23: Ref. Appendix C, Attachment A

Question: For the remote PSAPs indicated in the RFP can you please clarify: 1.) Is the Host CPE for the remotes capable of transitional SIP and/or i3 protocol Traffic? If not, 2.) Do the CAMA Trunks that serve the remote PSAP terminate at the Host CPE Site, or the Remote CPE site

A23: The Host CPE is capable of supporting SIP and other i3 protocols.

Q24: Ref. Appendix C, Section 4.3,3

Question: In order to meet the requirement to indicate if facility construction is required, we will need to perform site surveys. Can the NCR arrange for site visits?

A24: In a future addendum, the NCR will provide a PSAP contact name, phone number and email for each of the sites so that Respondents may work with their networking partners to assess path diversity into each PSAP location.

Q25: [Please provide] the local contact name, number and email for each of the sites that are in scope for the Fairfax ESInet project.

A25: See A24.

Attachment 2

Attachment A: NCR PSAP Data for Proposed ESInet and NGCS

PSAP	PSAP Type*	Street Address	City	ST	ZIP	NPA-NXX	2014 Population	Annual Call 9-1-1 Volume	# of Concurrent Calls	Wire-line Trunks	Wire-less Trunks	# of Work-stations	SR	ALI	CPE
Alexandria Police Department	Pri		Alexandria	VA	22304	703-746	150,575	144,248	23	12	16	23	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS Sentinel 3.1
Alexandria PD Backup PSAP	Bckp		Alexandria	VA	22304	703-739	n/a		11	6	6	11	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	
Arlington County Emergency Communications Center	Pri		Arlington	VA	22201	703-228	229,164	115,991	30	32 (includes 16 VoIP)	16	30	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA Meridian 2.2 (SP- 4)
Arlington County ECC Backup PSAP	Bckp		Arlington	VA	22201	703-228	n/a		13	16 (includes 8 VoIP)	8	13	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 2.2 SP 4 1000E
Falls Church Police Communications (Associated with Arlington County)	Sec		Falls Church	VA	22046	703-248	n/a	5,288	2	4		2	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus VESTA 4.0
Fairfax County Public Safety Communications Center	Pri (Side A geodiversion)		Fairfax	VA	22030	571-350	1,137,538	414,065	39 (Includes Fairfax, Herndon, Vienna and Backup)	14 (includes 4 VoIP)	14	57	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus VESTA 6.1
Fairfax County PSCC Alternate PSAP	Bckp (Side B geodiversion)		Annandale	VA	22003	703-280	n/a		39 (Includes Fairfax, Herndon, Vienna and Primary)	14 (includes 4 VoIP)	14	21	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus VESTA 6.1
Fairfax City Police Communications (Associated with	Sec		Fairfax	VA	22030	703-385	n/a	4,580		4		4	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Remote off Fairfax County

Respondents should take note that Secondary PSAPs with "Remote off [x] County" are served by CPE hosted by the named county. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet. Additionally, while listed as Secondary PSAPs, Manassas City and Manassas Park receive some wireline calls directly. These two PSAPs have wireless calls transferred to them by Fairfax County, Prince William County, and potentially others. Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority also only receives wireless 911 calls through transfers.

Attachment 2

PSAP	PSAP Type*	Street Address	City	ST	ZIP	NPA-NXX	2014 Population	Annual Call 9-1-1 Volume	# of Concurrent Calls	Wire-line Trunks	Wire-less Trunks	# of Work-stations	SR	ALI	CPE
Fairfax County)															
Herndon Police Communications (Associated with Fairfax County)	Sec		Herndon	VA	20170	703-435	n/a	2,629		4		4	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Remote off Fairfax County
Vienna Police Communications (Associated with Fairfax County)	Sec		Vienna	VA	22180	703-255	n/a	1,337		4		3	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Remote off Fairfax County
Fauquier County 9-1-1 Dispatch Center	Pri		Warrenton	VA	20186	540-347	68,248	25,380	7	8	6	7	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria and Fredericksburg /Winchester	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA
Manassas City Police Communications (Associated with Prince William County)	Sec		Manassas	VA	20110	703-257	42,081	7,855	5	5	0	5			
Manassas Park Police Communications (Associated with Prince William County)	Sec		Manassas Park	VA	20111	703-361	15,174	21,974	3	4	0	3	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 2.6
Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority	Pri		Sterling	VA	20166	703-417	120,548	9,235	12	6		12	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Private ALI and Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus Vesta
Prince William County Public Safety Communications	Pri		Lake Ridge	VA	22192	703-792	446,094	381,865	15	5	5	15	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	West VIPER A9C 4.0
Prince William County Public Safety Communications Backup PSAP	Bckp		Manassas	VA	20110	703-368	n/a		8	5	5	8	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	West VIPER A9C 4.0
Stafford County Sheriffs Communications	Pri		Stafford	VA	22554	540-659	139,992	50,447	18	8	10	25	Verizon Fairfax/Alexandria and Fredericksburg /Winchester	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Emergency Call Works

Respondents should take note that Secondary PSAPs with "Remote off [x] County" are served by CPE hosted by the named county. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet. Additionally, while listed as Secondary PSAPs, Manassas City and Manassas Park receive some wireline calls directly. These two PSAPs have wireless calls transferred to them by Fairfax County, Prince William County, and potentially others. Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority also only receives wireless 911 calls through transfers.

Attachment 2

PSAP	PSAP Type*	Street Address	City	ST	ZIP	NPA-NXX	2014 Population	Annual Call 9-1-1 Volume	# of Concurrent Calls	Wire-line Trunks	Wire-less Trunks	# of Work-stations	SR	ALI	CPE
Calvert County PSAP	Pri		Prince Frederick	MD	20678	410-535	90,613	34,072	15	6	6	15	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA
Calvert County Backup PSAP	Bckp		Prince Frederick	MD	20678	410-535			9	6	6	9	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA
Charles County 9-1-1 Communications Center	Pri		La Plata	MD	20646	301-609	154,747	35,607	8**	4	4	16	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 2.2
Charles County 9-1-1 Communications Backup PSAP	Bckp		La Plata	MD	20646	301-934	n/a		4**	4	2	4	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 2.2
Frederick County Emergency Operations Center	Pri		Frederick	MD	21701	301-600	243,675	126,185	20	8	12	28	Verizon Pikesville/Ellicott City	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus VESTA 6.0
Frederick County Emergency Operations Center Backup PSAP	Bckp		Frederick	MD	21701	301-662	n/a		20	8	12	18	Verizon Pikesville/Ellicott City	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	
Montgomery County Police Communications Center	Pri		Gaithersburg	MD	20878	301-869	1,030,447	551,873	60	18	20	56	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville Verizon Southwest/Anacostia	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Intrado VIPER ICC/Power911
Montgomery County Police Communications Center Backup PSAP	Bckp		Rockville	MD	20850	301-217	n/a		60	19	20	39	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville Verizon Southwest/Anacostia	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Intrado VIPER ICC/Power911
Takoma Park Police (Associated with Montgomery County)	Sec		Takoma Park	MD	20912	301-270	n/a		Incorporated in Montgomery number	4		3			Remote off Montgomery County
Prince Georges County Emergency Communications	Pri		Bowie	MD	20715	301-333	904,430	1,367,591	37	17	20	77	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 6.0

Respondents should take note that Secondary PSAPs with "Remote off [x] County" are served by CPE hosted by the named county. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet. Additionally, while listed as Secondary PSAPs, Manassas City and Manassas Park receive some wireline calls directly. These two PSAPs have wireless calls transferred to them by Fairfax County, Prince William County, and potentially others. Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority also only receives wireless 911 calls through transfers.

Attachment 2

PSAP	PSAP Type*	Street Address	City	ST	ZIP	NPA-NXX	2014 Population	Annual Call 9-1-1 Volume	# of Concurrent Calls	Wire-line Trunks	Wire-less Trunks	# of Work-stations	SR	ALI	CPE
Center															
Prince Georges County Emergency Communications Center Backup PSAP	Bckp		Landover	MD	20785	301-324	n/a		23	13	20	43	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	Airbus DS VESTA 6.0
St. Mary's County	Pri		Leonardtown	MD	20650	301-475	110,382	15,650	14	8**	8**	14	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	VESTA 2.2
St. Mary's County Backup PSAP	Bckp		Leonardtown	MD	20650	301-475			8	4**	4**	8**	Verizon Hyattsville/Rockville	Verizon Richardson/Longmont	

* PSAP TYPE LEGEND: Pri = Primary; Bckp = Backup; Sec = Secondary

** Unverified data. In process of being confirmed.

Respondents should take note that Secondary PSAPs with "Remote off [x] County" are served by CPE hosted by the named county. These secondary PSAPs would not be directly connected to the ESInet. Additionally, while listed as Secondary PSAPs, Manassas City and Manassas Park receive some wireline calls directly. These two PSAPs have wireless calls transferred to them by Fairfax County, Prince William County, and potentially others. Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority also only receives wireless 911 calls through transfers.

Attachment 3

Attachment C: Requirements Compliance Summary

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
3.1.1,1						
3.1.1,2						
3.1.1,3						
3.2						
3.3						
3.5						
4.1,1						
4.1,2						
4.2						
4.3,1						
4.3,2						
4.3,3						
4.3,4						
4.3,5						
4.3,6						
4.3,7						
4.3,8						
4.3,9						
4.3,10						
4.3,11						
4.3,12						
4.3,13						
4.4,1						
4.4,2						
4.5						
4.6,1						
4.7						
4.7.1,1						
4.7.1,2						
4.7.2						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
4.7.3,1						
4.7.3,2						
4.7.4,1						
4.8,1						
4.8,2						
4.8,3						
4.8,4						
4.8,5						
4.8,6						
4.8.1,1						
4.8.1,2						
4.9,1						
4.9,2						
4.9.1,1						
4.9.1,2						
4.9.1,3						
4.9.1,4						
4.9.2						
4.9.3,1						
4.9.3,2						
4.9.4,1						
4.9.4,2						
4.9.5,1						
4.9.5,2						
4.9.5,3						
4.9.6,1						
4.9.6,2						
4.9.7						
4.9.8						
4.9.9						
4.9.10						
4.9.11						
4.9.12						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
4.9.13.1						
4.9.13.2						
4.9.13.3						
4.9.13.4						
4.9.13.5						
4.9.13.6						
4.9.14,1						
4.9.14,2						
4.9.14,3						
4.10						
4.10.1,1						
4.10.1,2						
4.10.1,3						
4.10.1,4						
4.10.1,5						
4.10.1,6						
4.10.1,7						
4.10.1,8						
4.10.1,9						
4.10.1,10						
4.10.1,11						
4.10.1,12						
4.10.2,1						
4.10.2,2						
4.10.2,3						
4.10.2,4						
4.10.2,5						
4.10.2,6						
4.10.2,7						
4.10.3,1						
4.10.3,2						
4.10.3,3						
4.10.3,4						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
4.10.3,5						
4.10.3,6						
4.10.3,7						
4.10.3,8						
4.10.3,9						
4.10.3,10						
4.10.3,11						
4.10.3,12						
4.10.3,13						
4.10.3,14						
4.10.4,1						
4.10.4,2						
4.10.4,3						
4.10.4,4						
4.10.4,5						
4.10.4,6						
4.10.4,7						
4.10.4,8						
4.10.4,8.1						
4.10.4,8.2						
4.10.4,8.3						
4.10.4,8.4						
4.10.4,8.5						
4.10.4,8.6						
4.10.4,8.7						
4.10.4,8.8						
4.10.4,8.9						
4.10.4,8.10						
4.10.4,8.11						
4.10.4,8.12						
4.10.4,8.13						
4.10.4,8.14						
4.10.4,8.15						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
4.10.4.8.16						
4.10.4.8.17						
4.10.4.8.18						
4.10.4.8.19						
4.10.4.8.20						
4.10.4.8.21						
4.10.5.1						
4.10.5.2						
4.10.5.3						
4.10.5.4						
4.10.5.5						
4.10.5.6						
4.10.5.7						
4.10.5.8						
4.10.5.9						
4.10.5.10						
4.10.5.11						
4.10.5.12						
4.10.6.1						
4.10.6.2						
4.10.6.3						
4.10.6.4						
4.10.6.5						
4.10.7.1						
4.10.7.2						
4.10.7.3						
4.10.7.4						
4.10.8.1						
4.10.8.2						
4.10.9						
4.10.10.1						
4.10.10.2						
4.10.10.3						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
4.10.10,4						
4.10.10,5						
4.10.10,6						
4.10.10,7						
4.10.11,1						
4.10.11,2						
4.10.12,1						
4.10.12,2						
4.10.13						
4.11.1						
4.11.2,1						
4.11.2,3						
4.11.2,4						
4.11.2,5						
4.11.2,6						
4.11.2,7						
4.11.2,8						
4.11.2,9						
4.11.2,10						
4.11.3						
4.11.4,1						
4.11.4,2						
4.11.4,3						
4.11.4,4						
4.11.4,5						
4.11.5						
4.11.6						
4.11.7						
4.12,1						
4.12,2						
4.12,3						
4.12,4						
5.1						

Attachment 3

Requirement	Understood	Complies	Complies Partially	Complies with Future Capability	Does Not Comply	Response Provided
5.2						
5.3						
5.4						
5.5						
6.1						
6.2						
6.3						
6.4						
6.5						
7.1						
7.2						
8						
9.1,1						
9.1,2						
9.2,1						
9.2,2						
9.2,3						
9.2,4						
10						