Request for Information No. II

RFP 18/19-01IT VoIP Telecommunications System
November 20, 2018

Response to Proposers' Questions

2.1. **Question:** The RFP mentions support for Enhanced 911 (E911). We'd like to confirm whether IUSD expects E911 location down to the classroom level, building/floor level, or just the school's address. In addition, are e-mail alerts going to be required to notify staff at school sites that a 911 call was placed (and from where)?

   Answer: Please see Section 5.2 P2.12 of the RFP.

2.2. **Question:** Do the Cisco ISR 4451 routers have any FXO/FXS cards installed?

   Answer: No.

2.3. **Question:** Do the Cisco ISR 4451 routers have any DSP resources (i.e. PVDM) installed?

   Answer: No.

2.4. **Question:** Do the Cisco ISR 4451 routers have the Cisco Unified Communications license installed?

   Answer: No.

2.5. **Question:** Is the broadcast/paging solution expected to be able to broadcast/page to all phones district wide at the same time? Or will broadcast/paging be limited to phones at the district office and school sites? It is understood that a school site would be able to page to all of its phones, we just want to confirm whether a district wide page/broadcast (to all phones) is to be supported.

   Answer: No. The District already has a number of ways to communicate District-wide with all locations.

2.6. **Question:** Please clarify "Alarm Indication on Attendant Console". What type of alarm should the attendant console indicate?

   Answer: Section 5.2 P2.10.1 and P2.10.5 refer to the "Alarm Indication on Attendant Console". Operationally, the District would like this feature to provide an alarm to the console locations indicating a system fault or outage.

2.7. **Question:** Is it preferred to have all locations under a single domain, or all on their own separate domains?

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Answer: IUSD has a single Active Directory domain and each location has its own Organization Unit (OU). All locations can be under single domain but each location needs to be organized under its own directory or OU.

2.8. **Question:** What type of phones are desired? Polycom, Yealink, Grandstream?

Answer: IUSD does not have a specific type of preferred telephone. Vendors should propose phones they feel will best meet the specifications in Section 5.2 P2.8 of the RFP. Vendors should review those requirements and propose phones of the highest quality, best value, and best fit of the products that they sell for the District.

2.9. **Question:** What type of headsets?

Answer: IUSD currently uses Plantronic headsets. Vendors should specify if proposed handsets are compatible with Plantronic headsets in Section 5.2 P2.8.14 (as added in Amendment No. 2). The District may purchase new headsets with this procurement. At this time, the requirements of the headsets have only be defined as Wireless. Vendors should provide examples of the best wireless headsets for consideration that they can sell in Section 5.2 P2.8.11.

2.10. **Question:** Alarm Notification – System must provide for an alarm system that notifies both the remote maintenance center and the District if certain District-programmed system performance thresholds are exceeded - Does this notification need to be visual or audible?

Answer: At a minimum the District would like this notification to be visual, but would prefer the ability for the notification to be both visual and audible.

2.11. **Question:** P 1.1.7 "Address of the location nearest to the District"
Would it be satisfactory to leverage the manufacturer for local Engineering and hardware resources as required?

Answer: If Vendors plan on leveraging manufacturers for local Engineering and hardware resources they should refer to this in Section 5.2 P1.10 Subcontractors. Section 5.2P1.17 refers to the address of the Vendor closest to the District Office to provide service and support.

2.12. **Question:** P1.6 "Describe Vendor's relationship with the manufacturer of the proposed system. Vendor must have a primary full dealership status with the proposed manufacture. Vendors who are dependent on secondary distributor arrangements to obtain product and direct access to manufacturer level engineers are not acceptable"
If the vendor has direct access to the manufacturer, but chooses to use distribution to obtain product to provide benefits to the customer, will that be accepted?

Answer: Vendor must have a primary full dealership status with the proposed manufacturer. Vendors are required to provide information on the Level of Partner certification with the proposed manufacturer (e.g. Basic Dealer, Silver, Gold, etc. levels.). If the local partner responding to this RFP is an approved dealer of the proposed system manufacturer, but plans to obtain the manufacturers products from sources other than directly from the proposed system

manufacturers normal distribution channels, vendors are required to disclose this information in the proposal.

2.13.   **Question:** P1.7 "Make a written commitment to make available maintenance spares, trained personnel, and software support to fully maintain the system for a period of ten years from the date of cutover. If Vendor is other than the manufacturer, then a letter of similar commitment from the manufacturer must be included in the proposal"
Can you please provide us with your expectation regarding 10 years of support? Does the hardware and software proposed have to be supported for 10 years, or would newer, but similar in feature models and versions be considered for spares and replacements?

Answer: The District would like a commitment from the Dealer and Manufacturer to support the system, software, hardware, phones, etc. The District would prefer a 10-year commitment on the proposed software and system core. Please describe the level of commitment available by the local dealer and manufacturer.

2.14.   **Question:** P1.12 "Provide customer references for at least five (5) K-12 or government organizations of similar size to IUSD currently serviced by the Vendor. At least two (2) of the references must be for customers that have worked with the proposed project manager. At least three (3) of the references must have a similar installed system. Installations should be similar in scope, timeline and technical design to Vendor's Proposal for IUSD. All references must be for VoIP Enabled or VoIP system installations, multi-location customers, with a minimum of six hundred (600) telephone stations, and a centralized voicemail system. Each reference must include the following information:"
We have been actively investing in growing the experience of our engineering department by recruiting top talent from out of the state and relocating them here. Although we have a couple of customers similar in size our newest collaboration recruit, Paul Rittell, comes with experience in deploying systems for government agencies and several major universities. Paul also has deployed collaboration systems for nuclear power plants across the United States. The reports on the system testing and verification were examined by the Nuclear Regulatory Committee. Would you find it in the districts best interest to allow Paul's experience to count as qualifying for having at least five customers similar in scale and complexity?

Answer: Yes. Section P1.12 specifies "K-12 or government organizations", and Mr. Rittell's experience meets this qualification.

2.15.   **Question:** P2.42 "Vendor must allow the District to review internal and/or 3rd party audits."
Need to verify what this request is. Suggestions: Can you provide examples of what systems and/or processes you would be requesting to audit?

Answer: The District would like to be able to review the security review/audit findings for the system, whether they were produced internally by the selected vendor, or through the selected vendor's use of a 3rd party.

2.16.   **Question:** P2.43 "Vendor must certify that it employs and will continue to employ a dedicated Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP) certified security

manager or the equivalent in certification to test the system and run ongoing checks/improvements."
Does a CCNP of Security suffice as the equivalent of a CISSP?

    Answer: A CCNP of Security will suffice as an equivalent of a CISSP.

2.17.   **Question:** Are there any current features/requirements that are desired by Irvine USD that the existing, upgraded, solution does meet?

    Answer: The existing system is a combination of analog and VoIP technology. The goal of the RFP is to upgrade the entire system to one, uniform system. It is expected that vendors will propose upgraded systems providing the operational needs and requirements described in the RFP document.

2.18.   **Question:** How many PRI's at each site will be potentially connected to the system? Our equipment is universal (meaning you can use SIP trunks and PRI's on the same device, but we want to make sure we allocate the appropriate resources for PRI's for each location, unless the District will just utilize SIP. IF PRI's need to be quoted in the initial quote, please provide the quantities at each location.

    Answer: Section 5.2 P2.7 "System Configuration" lists the system required to allow the use of SIP services and Analog POTS lines. The SIP services are to be installed in the Data Center and District office. 150 talk paths for each of the 2 circuits. The District is not obtaining any carrier SIP service quotes with this RFP.

2.19.   **Question:** Can Irvine USD provide a copy of the vendor sign in sheet from the Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference?

    Answer: The District does not release sign-in sheets to Vendors. Vendors in attendance at the non-mandatory pre-proposal conference were: Encore, Blue Violet Net, Intelesys One, FTSI, Global CTI, Resilient, Avaya, Jive Logmein, Century Link, DI Technology, Strategy Cloud Advisor, CDWG, Nexogy, NetSync, 8x8, DTC, Mitel, AT&T, Frontier, Strategic Cloud Advisors, Packet Fusion, and TPx.

2.20.   **Question:** It seems that over the years the District has started upgrading their phone system, both on the back end equipment, as well as the phones, which appears to be around 1466 IP phones based on the addendum. The diagram on the RFP also shows the newer core Mitel equipment in place. Why now has the District decided to release an RFP for a phone system when it appears that they have already upgraded a majority of the equipment with the existing vendor, or Mitel, the manufacturer?

    Answer: IUSD desires to have one standard platform throughout the District. The District is interested in obtaining the best overall value for the end-result solution and has determined that a competitive proposal process is the best approach for the District.

2.21.   **Question:** Is there a dollar amount that requires the Irvine USD to go through the RFP process for consideration by the board?

Answer: IUSD is governed by Public Contracts Code section 20111. The current bid threshold requiring a competitive bid is $90,200.00. This includes the full amount of expenditures during the contract period (estimated to be 5 years, in this case). This amount will be adjusted for inflation on January 1, 2019.

2.22.   **Question:** In regards to question # *(2.20)* above (the previous upgrades), if it's the policy of the District to go to an RFP for this, why did the District upgrade so much equipment, including phones, prior to an RFP in the past?

Answer: The District has added new school sites to account for increasing enrollment. New school sites have been built with updated telecommunications technology. Additional upgrades have been conducted on an as-needed basis to existing sites. The current telecommunications system integrates a variety of technologies, and the District desires to upgrade to one, uniform system.

2.23.   **Question:** Considering 40% of the weighting process of the RFP will be based on price, how can the District adequately, and fairly, compare solutions when a majority of the existing Mitel system has already been upgraded to their newer equipment? Based on the upgraded IP phones and newer core Mitel equipment, the existing vendor/solution in place could potentially have an advantage in price estimated around 4-5 hundred thousand dollars. In most cases, this equipment can only be reutilized by that specific Mitel product which will create a considerable difference in price with all other solutions. The equipment that will have to be replaced, practically the entire existing phone system infrastructure, will create a drastic difference in price between the existing vendor and any competitors, which alone, could cause an elimination/disqualification based on the weighting scale. Please explain and clarify how other solutions can be objectively considered when the existing equipment already upgraded could exceed and the 40% difference between proposals?

Answer: IUSD desires to have one standard platform throughout the District, and welcomes Proposals from all qualifying telecommunications vendors. The District is open to upgrades to the existing platform and complete replacement of the existing systems. The District is open to premise, cloud, hosted, or hybrid approaches. Vendors may choose to utilize current equipment or offer a trade-in or credit option, if desired.

2.24.   **Question:** Addendum 1 - P.A./Bell System – The locations that have Atlas IP paging, are there VoIP Paging servers in place to interface to?

Answer: There is one server located at data center that handles all Atlas IP paging sites. Locations that have Atlas paging do NOT have an individual server at the site.

2.25.   **Question:** P2.7 System Configuration – The site totals do not add to values in the table. Do you want vendors to quote to the actual total than what is provided? Or will Irvine USD provide an updated table?

School site	Station - Type 1 Analog Port	Station - Type 2 Admin-DO Staff	Station - Type 3 Teacher/ Classroom	Station - Type 4 Side-Car	Station - Type 5 Conf Room Phone	Paging Access	SIP	Analog Trunks/ POTS
Total	94	387	2830	1	62	41	300	103
Actual Total	98	402	2948	1	66	44	300	113

Answer: The District desires a quote based on the actual totals. An Addendum will be released reflecting the correct totals.

2.26. **Question:** Is your current paging system tied into your phone system?

Answer: The District has paging systems installed in each location. They are all connected to the existing telecommunications system through an analog or IP connection. Please see Section 1, page 7 of the RFP.

2.27. **Question:** While reviewing your RFP and our solutions, we wanted to see if IUSD would be open to a Hosted VOIP solution that includes a network as our hosted VOIP solutions include the dial tone in the seat price and cannot be removed.

Answer: Please see RFI 1, Question 1.1. The District will review all vendor proposals to determine the best solution for the District.

2.28. **Question:** Will the existing dial plan stay intact or is IUSD looking to implement a new dial plan design as part of the migration to VoIP? Developing a new dial plan design assumes that extension/phone numbers will change during the migration to VoIP.

Answer: The District will be retaining the existing DID numbers. The existing DID ranges will be reused as they are now. The District will be changing the trunk access to a Dial 3 or 4. The District plans to move to a 5-digit extension plan District-wide.

2.29. **Question:** How many voice ports on the existing NuPoint Unified Messaging Platform?

Answer: There are 48 ports.

2.30. **Question:** How many voice mailboxes programmed on the existing NuPoint Unified Messaging Platform?

Answer: Section 5, Part 2, P2.15 "Voicemail System" of the RFP reviews the required users for the voicemail system. The existing NuPoint system has approximately 3,500 boxes programmed.

2.31. **Question:** From section 1.3 – "Vendors may propose an upgrade/update to the existing Mitel systems if there are reasonable upgrade approaches. Vendors proposing an upgrade that

assumes the use of any existing Mitel hardware, software or phones must provide detailed information regarding the specific equipment that will be reused/retained. It is the responsibility of Vendors to perform any needed inventory or system review."
Will the IUSD assist with access to each of the existing Mitel sites for purposes or inventorying licenses and determining hardware variants? Only your current Mitel vendor will have access to this information which creates a disadvantage for other Mitel vendors.

Answer: IUSD provided a list with equipment counts in Addendum No. 1. Upon award the selected Vendor will be provided with access to sites to obtain further details.

2.32.   **Question:** From section 2.4.10 – "Integration with Clock/Bell/Loudspeaker: The proposed system shall integrate with the current clock/bell/loudspeaker system (outlined in Section1.3). If the proposed system requires any changes to the current setup list each required change and provide the corresponding cost."
Can the IUSD provide the type of interface used for each of the Clock/Bell/Loudspeakers outlined in Section 1.3?

Answer: Please refer to Addendum 1, P.A./Bell System Information List.

2.33.   **Question:** Due to the problematic nature of faxing over SIP trunks and the fact that fax over SIP is completely dependent on the SIP provider, will a vendor be deemed non-compliant if they cannot guarantee delivery of faxes over the SIP service that IUSD ultimately chooses? Will IUSD accept fax services over traditional network services (Analog or ISDN PRI)?

Answer: No. The District will review each vendor proposal to determine the best solution for the District. The District will review all proposed options and concerns related to the operation of Fax services through SIP. The District is open to retaining a PRI for fax services, but has not decided on the final solution.

2.34.   **Question:** What system is controlling the ATLAS IP speakers?

Answer: SA-Announce.

2.35.   **Question:** Are you using the IP speakers to act as bells?

Answer: Yes.

2.36.   **Question:** Please provide a list of paging devices using the paging systems at each site?

Answer: Please see Section 1.3 "Paging Systems" in the RFP.

2.37.   **Question:** What power supplies are in your Cisco 2960-Xs? Are the switches support POE only or POE plus?

Answer: This information can be communicated to the selected vendor. As stated in the RFP document "Vendors should assume the District's data network will provide the needed POE and QOS capabilities for VoIP Deployment".

2.38. **Question:** For remote failover in a WAN outage, do the desk phones need access to the analog POTS lines, or can specific spare phones be used?

Answer: Section 5.2 P2.7 in the RFP lists the configuration of the system. All stations within each District location, must be able to access the analog lines. The District would be open to the use of Wireless connections vs. traditional copper based POTS service. Specific spares cannot be used.

2.39. **Question:** For item P1.20 it is often advisable to keep the existing system in place for a week after the conversion for reference, is the district open to adjusting the one day timeframe?

Answer: Section 5.2 P1.20 in the RFP references that the awarded Vendor shall replace existing hardware with new equipment within one day of the removal of old equipment. Vendors should propose the timeframe they recommend the previous system be kept in place in their general implementation outline in Section 5.2 P1.15.

2.40. **Question:** Section 2.12.1 references West Safety Services, does the district currently utilize this platform and do they plan to keep doing so with the new system? If yes can we get the software version and product license details?

Answer: West (Intrado) is a subscription service. The District keeps its own database and communicates changes to West.

2.41. **Question:** As SIP has been identified not being part of this RFP process, should we assume that we either use the existing PRI's at go-live or deliver an AT&T CalNet3 SIP pricing option?

Answer: No, Vendors should assume that the District will procure the needed SIP services under a separate selection process.

2.42. **Question:** Should SIP service simply be a capability of the system or would the district like the licensing and any needed components installed at go-live to handle the identified SIP count?

Answer: The District plans to implement SIP with the selected telecommunications solution. The required SIP Locations are shown in Section 5.2 P2.7 in the RFP. The SIP locations are the Data Center and District Office. 1 SIP Circuit will be installed in each of these 2 locations. Each SIP Circuit will be configured to carry 150 simultaneous calls for a total of 300 calls. The proposed system should include the needed equipment, software and licensing for the District to connect these SIP lines to the selected system.

2.43. **Question:** Is the district able to move towards an eFax solution or do you need to retain physical fax machines for some locations? If physical machines are needed, would the district be open to retaining a PRI with a fax server in the end solution given SIP and faxing are not reliable end to end?

Answer: The District will be open to all solutions including the retention of a PRI for fax use.

2.44. **Question:** Can the proposed solution leverage the existing Cisco ISR 4K routers in place at each campus for survivability?

2.44.1. If so, can IUSD provide a breakdown of model by location and confirm whether the routers are already licensed for Cisco Unified Communications and SRST?

2.44.2. Can IUSD provide the available network interface module real estate available and PVDM cards within the router?

2.44.3. Does IUSD have any voice modules in the Cisco 4K ISR's today and if so, can IUSD provide a breakdown of modules by location?

Answer: 2.44 Yes, Cisco ISR 4451-X can be used at each campus for survivability.

2.44.1 Every site has Cisco ISR 4451-X model router. Routers do NOT have Cisco Unified Communication or SRST license installed.

2.44.2 Routers do NOT have any network interface modules (NIM) or PVDM cards installed. All the interfaces are free and available for use.

2.44.3 There are NO voice modules in any of Cisco ISR 4451-X routers.

2.45. **Question:** Is IUSD requiring proposer to remove legacy telecommunications systems? Is IUSD wanting to keep the legacy telecommunications system or IUSD OK with the proposer removing the legacy system and disposing of that hardware?

Answer: The District would like the selected vendor to coordinate the removal of the existing systems with the District IT staff and the existing vendor. The District is open to a trade in or credit for the existing telecommunications systems and phones.

2.46. **Question:** Is the intention of IUSD to purchase all hardware at once?

Answer: Yes.

2.47. **Question:** Is eFax required as part of the proposed solution? If so, can IUSD provide:

2.47.1. Amount of users requiring service?

2.47.2. Estimate on: Faxes sent/received monthly?

Answer: 2.47 Please see Questions 2.33 and 2.43

2.47.1 The District currently has approximately 107 fax lines.

2.47.2 The District does not currently have consolidated reporting on the numbers of faxes sent and received.

2.48. **Question:** Will IUSD consider a phone trade-in? If so, what are the phone models and associated quantities to be traded in?

Answer: The District will consider a trade-in. The District currently has the following VoIP phone models: 6920, 5320e, 5330, 5330e, 5312, 5313, 5201. The District currently has the following digital phones: Superset 420, Superset 410, 4025. The District currently has Teledex analog phones.

2.49.   **Question:** Per 2.8.2 and 2.8.3; RFP states "plus 8 programmable features"; Can IUSD clarify if they are looking for 8 programmable line/feature buttons?

  Answer: Yes, plus 8 programmable line or feature buttons.

2.50.   **Question:** Is IUSD requesting the proposer to include call recording licensing for all phones? If so, can IUSD provide an estimate of the following:
2.50.1. Number of calls recorded a day?
2.50.2. Average length of call?
2.50.3. Retention period for storing the recorded call?

  Answer: 2.50   The District does not record calls in this manner now. There are no statistics available to provide. For budgetary purposes please assume the Following:
           5 recording phones per location
2.50.1   25 calls recorded per day
2.50.2   3 minute call average
2.50.3   Retention of calls for 12 months.

2.51.   **Question:** Can IUSD provide the total employee or knowledge worker for IUSD? Knowledge worker is anyone that would use a computer, mobile device, desk phone, soft phone, instant messaging client, or have voicemail.

  Answer: Section 5.2 P2.7 in the RFP provides a table of total number of telephone stations for the system. All phones are used by District staff. Section 5.2 P2.15 in the RFP requires the voicemail system to be equipped with 3,500 voicemail boxes.

2.52.   **Question:** Is IUSD requesting managed and NOC monitoring services as part of the proposal?

  Answer: Vendors should specify in Section 5.2 P1.48 (add in Addendum No. 2) if managed and NOC monitoring services are included in the system maintenance and support contract. If not included in the contract, vendors should describe the managed and NOC monitoring services and include pricing in the Annual Recurring Costs pricing table in Appendix C of the RFP.

2.53.   **Question:** Can IUSD clarify the use of "Consoles"? Does IUSD require button expansion modules to add onto phones or a software-based attendant console? If so, how many?

  Answer: The station hardware needed for the system is listed in Section 5.2 P2.7 in the RFP. The existing system has a traditional attendant console. The District plans to use telephones to replace this console equipment.

2.54.   **Question:** Per 2.4.10, what features are required with integration with the existing Clock/Bell/Loudspeaker?

  Answer: The District requires the proposed telecommunications system to be able to allow access to the paging systems through the telephones by dialing a paging access code.

2.55.　　**Question:** Per 2.8.5, IUSD requested that the conference phone speaker is wireless. Would a wired conference phone with wireless mics be acceptable?

　　Answer: The District is open to reviewing vendor options related to the conference room phones.

2.56.　　**Question:** Should PRI interfaces be included with the proposal? If so, how many by location?

　　Answer: No.

2.57.　　**Question:** How many voicemail licenses does IUSD require?

　　Answer: The District requires approximately 3,500 voicemail licenses.

2.58.　　**Question:** To what level does IUSD require E911 location identification? Campus, building, floor, hall, room, etc.? If station-level is required, does IUSD have a spare direct-inward-dial for each phone?

　　Answer: Please see Section 5.2 P2.12 of the RFP.

2.59.　　**Question:** Can IUSD provide a wire map detailing what room to which each network switch's switchport connects?

　　Answer: Yes, The District will work with the selected vendor to provide this information.

2.60.　　**Question:** Does IUSD have spare PRI interfaces to integrate with the new solution in order to support a migration from the legacy telephony system to the new? Does IUSD's existing telephony system support SIP integration with the proposed solution?

　　Answer: To the District's knowledge there are no spare PRI interfaces. The newer systems may have the ability to support SIP integration. The District will work with the selected vendor to determine the best implementation and integration approach.

2.61.　　**Question:** Can IUSD clarify "Alarm indication on Attendant Console"?

　　Answer: IUSD requested quotes for "Alarm indication on Attendant Console" in Section 5.2 P 2.10.1 and P 1.20.5 in the RFP. Operationally, the District would like this feature to provide an alarm to the console locations indicating a system fault or outage.

2.62.　　**Question:** Does the PSTN provider provide E911 capabilities?

　　Answer: It is anticipated that the selected SIP provider, along with West Safety Services (Intrado), will provide E911 services as well as the selected telecommunications system.

2.62.1. **Question:** Does the following include the requirements for paging? Paging from phone to phones. Paging from phone to external paging system.

Answer: The District desires a paging system with phone-to-intercom capabilities.

2.63. **Question:** As a VoIP vendor without any network configuration control, how will the District identify the cause of possible system outage vendor penalties, is indicated in the RFP?

Answer: The District will negotiate these conditions with the finalist vendor.

2.64. **Question:** Liquidated Damages are referenced in the RFP. What are the specific LD liabilities to the vendor?

Answer: The District will negotiate these conditions with the finalist vendor.

2.65. **Question:** What are the specific required parameters (departments, number of stations) for call recording as required in the RFP?

Answer: Please see Question 2.50.

2.66. **Question:** What specific Call Accounting detail specs and report types are required?

Answer: The District will review each Proposal to determine the best solution for the District. As a minimum the proposed system should meet the specifications in Section 5.2 P2.10.13 in the RFP.

2.67. **Question:** Is Emergency Response notification required down to each individual station (cubicle) level?

Answer: Please see Section 5.2 P2.12 of the RFP.

2.68. **Question:** Does the District plan to buy all parts for the initial implementation at one time?

Answer: Please see Question 2.46.

2.69. **Question:** Are there any specific phone type/feature requirements (color LCD, Gb, etc.) that we should adhere to?

Answer: Please see Section 5.2 Part 2 in the RFP.

2.70. **Question:** Is the 1 year "no cost" warranty (P2.24) period to begin upon the final acceptance of all District sites?

Answer: Yes.

2.71. **Question:** Are all current analog fax lines being maintained for District fax machines?

Answer: Yes.

2.72.   **Question:** There is reference to various bonds that may be required (6.1.21). What are the specific bond requirements?

Answer: Please see the answer to Question 1.2 in RFI No. 1.

2.73.   **Question:** Due to overlap with Thanksgiving Holiday/Vacations, has the district considered extending the due date at this time?

Answer: The total timeframe between the release of the RFP and the due date for Proposals allows Vendors almost six weeks to respond to the RFP. The District's timeline has been carefully created with Board meeting dates and other requirements in mind. The District is not considering extending the due date for Proposals.