
Addendum 03

TO: All Parties
FROM: Gaston County Schools
TODAY'S DATE: July 10, 2025
REGARDING IFB: Emergency Responder Communication Coverage System
ADDENDUM NO: 03

District Clarification:

As a clarification to the IFB on page 10 referencing a remote monitoring system setup with real-time access for the school district to monitor system performance, the district hereby clarifies that such monitoring may be included in the proposal as "optional" with associated costs also reflected as "optional."

Your attention is called to the following question(s) from one or more vendors:

Question 1:

Can I get a clarification on the passage below?

With 3 schools utilizing the Fire-Lite ES-1000 (IDA Rankin, WA Bess, WC Friday), is there a preference between City Fire & Safety vs. Coastal Security? Or is this going to be up to the winning bidder to decide which will be utilized?

Response 1:

The following clarification is issued per the GCS MEP Manager:

Fire-Lite ES-1000 at Ida Rankin Elementary School: Coastal Security

Fire-Lite ES-1000 at W.A. Bess Elementary School: City Fire & Safety

Fire-Lite ES-1000 at W.C. Friday Middle School: City Fire & Safety

Question 2:

Proposal Instructions Section 1, Page 10 States complete set of drawings of proposed system and should include propagation plans and donor details. Is this required full design detail required for every school to be fully designed and modeled as part of the proposal submittal or can this be a typical plan for all schools with full designs released if awarded?

Response 2:

No, it is not required, as part of the proposal submittal, to have a full design for every school. Yes, it can be a typical plan and not school specific until completed as part of the project.

Question 3:

Proposal Instructions Section 1, Page 10 Can ATP plan also be submitted as part of the final design file released for review prior to construction by the awarded vendor or does this plan need to be included for proposal submission?

Response 3:

It needs to be included for proposal submission per page 10 of the IFB.

Question 4:

Proposal Instructions Section 4, Page 10 Will GCS provide LAN connections for network access of the equipment to reach our NOC for remote access and monitoring or should we plan to include a modem and commercial wireless SIM for each school to provide remote access?

Response 4:

No, LAN connections/network access will not be provided as the ERCCS solution will not be on the school system's network. Each vendor shall plan accordingly per their respective proposed ERCCS solution.

Question 5:

Can we use existing fiber for the public safety solution?

Response 5:

No, the district's existing network and connectivity will not be available and will not be utilized for this project. Each vendor shall plan accordingly per their respective proposed ERCCS solution.

Question 6:

Do you have fiber connectivity between buildings at the same school?

Response 6:

This question is irrelevant because the district's existing network and connectivity will not be available and will not be utilized for this project. Each vendor shall plan accordingly per their respective proposed ERCCS solution.

Question 7:

Is the fiber Multi-Mode or Single Mode

Response 7:

This question is irrelevant because the district's existing network and connectivity will not be available and will not be utilized for this project. Each vendor shall plan accordingly per their respective proposed ERCCS solution.

Question 8:

With schools located on contiguous properties, is there fiber connectivity between them?

Response 8:

This question is irrelevant because the district's existing network and connectivity will not be available and will not be utilized for this project. Each vendor shall plan accordingly per their respective proposed ERCCS solution.

Question 9:

Can you provide a fire rating on each building or structure?

Response 9:

No, as confirmed with the district's MEP manager and due to various years of construction, additions, and so forth. See page 7 of the IFB for additional information.

Question 10:

Provide a list of schools that are fully sprinklered.

Response 10:

The following schools that are included in this project have a type of water-based fire suppression system:

Stuart W. Cramer High School, Belmont Middle School, Stanley Middle School, Pleasant Ridge Elementary School, Hawks Nest STEAM Academy, Forestview High School, Sadler Elementary School

Question 11:

There are new expansion/additions to the schools that are not indicated on the grid test; will that be handed at a separate time with the winning vendor?

Response 11:

No grid test was provided. If this question pertains to the floor plans that were provided, those floor plans should include each school campus's buildings. Each vendor visited the school campuses to conduct walkthroughs as needed in preparation for their proposal submittal. Proposals shall address the ERCCS needs for each school identified in the IFB.

Question 12:

Winning vendor grid test to validate old grid tests and new additions? Provide the cost in the quote?

Response 12:

No former/previous/old grid test was provided. Vendor is responsible for addressing the ERCCS needs at each school in their proposal which shall include costs per the IFB.

Question 13:

Can we contact the AHJ to receive feedback and thoughts?

Response 13:

Yes, certainly, as there are no restrictions on contacting the AHJ.

Question 14:

Can we get copies of the data from the walks that were previously completed?

Response 14:

This question was previously addressed at the mandatory pre-bid meeting. No prior data is to be shared. As part of this process, per the IFB, each vendor is to make its own determinations regarding ERCCS coverage needs at each school listed in the IFB and provide the district with its proposed solution.

Question 15:

Can we get floor plans of each of the 28 schools?

Response 15:

The floor plans that the district had available to share were previously provided to each vendor that attended the mandatory pre-bid meeting.

Question 16:

In buildings where asbestos is present, are there cable pathways available that will not require any asbestos abatement?

Response 16:

Each school has cable pathways. It is desired that existing cable pathways be utilized to the greatest extent possible until the point of building egress/penetration. Depending on each school's point(s) of penetration, there may or may not be abatement requirements that would have to be determined at that time based on the vendor's desired penetration location(s).

Question 17:

Can the district confirm that all bidding integrators will be required to demonstrate abilities to monitor and verify uplink noise interference, including mitigation of issues as they arise?

Response 17:

Vendors who submit complete proposals will have demonstrated any required abilities or requirements per the IFB.

Question 18:

In the event that an improperly installed ERRC system causes uplink interference or other FCC violations impacting the Countywide Radio public safety network, who within the district or among its contractors will assume liability, and what remediation process is in place to address potential fines, shutdowns, or required system deactivations?

Response 18:

This question implies that the district would have liability for an improperly installed system. Instead, the vendor shall have liability for its proposed and installed system.

Question 19:

Will the final contract be allowable for redlines for mutually agreeable terms?

Response 19:

See Item # 33 in Attachment A, Standard Terms and Conditions, included with the posted IFB.

Question 20:

We've observed that some integrators in their proposals have bypassed the 2018 NC Fire Code requirement for 2-hour fire-rated cabling in non-sprinklered buildings by obtaining variances from the AHJ. Can the GCS clarify its position on allowing such variances for ERCES installations, particularly when they may compromise system survivability during a fire event and deviate from the 2018 national fire code standards?

Response 20:

The district assumes that the vendor asking this question must be referencing other projects, other proposals, and other vendors as this project's proposals are still being developed by interested vendors. With that clarification having been stated, see page 4 of the IFB under the Scope of Work which states "Although existing buildings are exempt from the minimum coverage levels mandate in the 2018 version of section 510 of the NC Fire Code, it is the intent of this IFB for these 28 schools to adhere to the same standards as the NC Fire Code retroactively."

Question 21:

North Carolina in their amended 2018 NC Fire protection code requires a minimum of 12 hour battery back up. The RFP calls for 24 hours of battery back up. Would GCS consider 12 hour battery back which would still meet 2018 Fire Protection Code requirements and help provide a more affordable solution?

Response 21:

The district would consider a 12-hour battery backup solution should a vendor wish to offer this as an alternative including price comparisons between a 24-hour battery backup solution and a 12-hour battery backup solution.

Question 22:

Will GCS require a formal RF noise floor test and signal propagation study before and after system installation to ensure that ERCES solutions do not introduce harmful interference to the Countywide infrastructure?

Response 22:

No, this is not a requirement. It is expected that technicians from UASI and VIPER will monitor these conditions during site turn-up.

Question 23:

Does GCS require system integrators to provide a signed letter from the local fire code official or AHJ confirming acceptance of system performance and code compliance before final payment is released?

Response 23:

The district will expect that the vendor obtains confirmation of any necessary or required acceptance from any entity related to the successful implementation of this project including but not limited to UASI, VIPER, Gaston County Building Inspections, Fire Marshal's Office, etc.

Question 24:

What measures will GCS take to ensure that vendors using the lowest-cost labor or materials are still meeting minimum standards of code compliance and public safety performance expectations?

Response 24:

It is the district's reasonable expectation that a responsible and successful bidder shall comply with all code compliance and public safety performance expectations per the IFB.

Question 25:

Does GCS have a policy or allowance for price adjustments in the event federally imposed tariffs substantially affect the cost of materials after bid submission

Response 25:

No, vendors shall take into consideration any such variables as they deem appropriate or necessary in their proposal submission.

Question 26:

Will Vendors be permitted to provide clarifications to the RFP terms and conditions and include necessary product specific terms and conditions?

Response 26:

Vendors were permitted until June 26, 2025 by 2:00 pm to submit any questions in writing to which the district will issue written responses no later than July 10, 2025 by 2:00 pm.

END OF ADDENDUM 03