



Manchester-Boston Regional Airport  
One Airport Road, Suite-300  
Manchester, New Hampshire 03103

## Addendum No. Two

Date: May 14, 2024

RFP No: FY24-805-58 A.I.T. Portable Personnel Scanner System

This Addendum # 2 to Request for Bids for A.I.T. Portable Personnel Scanner System contains the following clarifications and changes to the RFP document:

### BIDDER INQUIRY RESPONSES:

- 1) Section 1.3.1 "All regulators, including TSA, typically follow strict cyber security requirements and do not allow wireless connectivity. What do you mean by "wireless networking components" ?"
  - a) The Airport's "general" description of potential system components intent is to not limit the equipment functionality options if components might have wireless connectivity capabilities between/within the individual system components or to the local operator monitoring station, or to have the future option for potential wireless connectivity of components of the system on the Airport's protected wireless network at their discretion. The Airport's current intent is for hardwired LAN connectivity when and where necessary.
  
- 2) Section 1.4.1 "(i) We appreciate the fact that the portability requirement is driven by cost factors. However, training teams to know how to safely disconnect a system, move it around and set it up in a new area is time-consuming and will incur cost. Will MHT consider non-portable systems if the overall cost is comparable? (ii) MMW technology (all frequencies) cannot classify objects. It is possible to eliminate certain objects that look like "X", but it is impossible to determine if object "Y" is obscured by object "X". Please confirm that the requirement means that the software should ignore certain objects if they look like object "X", without actually classifying the objects."
  - a) (i) MHT's AWIP program does not require continuous full time scanning inspections therefore time is available for portable equipment relocations. The equipment performance requirements set general parameters for portability including reasonable set-up time which is attainable in the MHT AWIP program during the regular shifts for inspectors. Additionally, if the locations and/or quantity of portals changes either temporarily or longer-term at the Airport's discretion then the portable equipment can be deployed to those alternate locations in a timely and seamless manner, on short as-needed notice, and without the increased cost of removal/reinstallation of fixed equipment, or purchase of additional equipment. As noted at the Pre-Bid Meeting, the Airport has ten (10) designated inspection locations. Based on the Airport's limited

market analysis, it is not reasonably anticipated that (10) non-portable systems can be provided at a comparable cost to three (3) portable systems. Notwithstanding the above, if the prospective Bidder feels that ten (10) fixed units can be provided for approximately the same cost as three (3) portable units then that statement with detail explanation should be / have been submitted in writing as part of the RFI.

(ii) Any anomaly or object not fully recognized or identified should alarm the system to the operator for divestiture of the customer.

- 3) Section 3.3.1 "Are there specific performance requirements? Are they similar to aviation requirements?"
  - a) The MHT AWIP program has a list of prohibited items that is considered Sensitive Security Information (SSI) at this point in time. Some are listed in the specification; further reading is suggested. Yes, they are similar to aviation requirements. The MHT AWIP list of prohibited items is anticipated to change over time based on new threats that may develop.
  
- 4) Section 3.3.7 "We realize that some manufacturers offer a system that is not able to screen a person from all directions/angles and, thus, requires an S-setup or a "walk-stop-turn" configuration. However, what is the motivation for demanding compliance with these unusual configurations vs. requiring a "natural walk-through providing view of all directions" OR an S-setup OR a "walk-stop-turn" configuration?"
  - a) A natural walk-through configuration if achievable in a compact portable unit could be an option if the equipment is able to be setup and operated in the very limited space available at some locations as defined. The two different specified configurations typically require different footprint envelopes and some of the areas designated for the inspections have very limited space available while others have more available space. Inspection locations may change temporally or permanently, on short notice, or increase in number over time, and the Airport's intent is to have the flexibility to adapt to as many situations as possible at any given location at their discretion based on performance or preferences and without need for additional architectural modifications which may not be feasible for short notice or temporary deployments.
  
- 5) Section 3.3.7 "What is the purpose of requiring two configurations that add additional space and queuing time for passengers? Would the Owner (Airport) accept a proposed PPS System that was designed to provide a full-body 360° Millimeter wave scan image without requiring the extraneous walking queue space and additional walk time through a scanning field time for passengers to be fully scanned?"
  - a) See answer above (Inquiry #4). The Airport is a small hub, and the MHT AWIP program estimates the volume of workers to be scanned will be generally low as compared with the capacity of these systems in either configuration and that

extraneous walking que space will not be required. Passengers will not be scanned by this equipment.

6) Section (Not Cited) “(i) Will MHT consider alternatives for portability in return for improved CONOPs? (ii) Will MHT consider alternatives in order to achieve better detection performance? For example, if the option of "walk-stop-turn" is acceptable, will MHT consider divestment? (iii) Will MHT consider a leasing program in return for having checkpoints in all 10 locations? (iv) How much weight is given to the company's financial status and track record? (v) How much weight is given to the company's ability to provide a 10-year support commitment? (vi) How much weight is given to the company's ability to offer future upgrades? ”

- a) (i) MHT's AWIP program CONOPs includes portability. If bidder would like to offer detailed alternatives to portability with pricing, please do so.
- (ii) ""walk-stop-turn"" is acceptable, as well as S-turn configuration. MHT's AWIP program requires divestment upon any anomaly detected.
- (iii) The Airport's intent is to purchase the equipment. If a Bidder believes that a leasing program could be competitive in cost for having fixed equipment checkpoints in all 10 locations, with built-in flexibility and cost coverage to adjust locations on short notice and/or for temporary circumstances, and include costs for modifying potentially space-restricted areas that require very limited inspection times, then the bidder should have presented a specific case demonstrating such in the RFI.
- (iv) The Airport's standard bidder qualifications statements are included in the Bid Documents and the required proposal submittals.
- (v) The Airport's maintenance and service / support requirement is defined in the Bid Documents.
- (vi) The specifications include a five-year period of software and algorithm updates. Hardware upgrades would be evaluated in the future on an as-needed / as-available basis dependent on funding limitations. Information regarding a bidder's ""ability to offer future upgrades"" can be provided as part of the additional information allowed to accompany the bidder qualifications package to be submitted with their proposal.

7) Section (Not Cited) “Would MHT consider the possibility of purchasing one system for the main entry point that would not be moved?”

- a) A single consolidated point of entry will not work for the Airport's AWIP program.
- b) If bidder would like to offer detailed alternatives with pricing, please do so.

8) Section (Not Cited) “Is there concern that TSA may end up requiring a TSA Certified solution that is on the TSA Qualified Products List?”

- a) Not at this time.

- 9) Section 1.3.1 Do you have any type of metrics as far as False Alarm Rates, throughput, accurate detection rates of "identify and differentiate non-threat benign items such as cellphones, wallets, or keys, etc."?
- a) The bidder may submit their product information including metrics as part of the additional information allowed to accompany the bidder qualifications package to be submitted with their proposal.