



**MISSOULA COUNTY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM**

RFP NAME: Missoula County Emergency Communication and Mass Notification System RFP

DUE DATE: July 7, 2026 @ Midnight Mountain Time

ADDENDUM NUMBER: [06-2026-02-A](#)

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the County's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Proposal" remain as previously stated.

Acknowledgment of Addendum:

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the same time as the proposal or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. [06-2026-02-A](#)

Signed: _____

Company Name: _____

Date: _____

**Missoula County Emergency Communication & Mass Notification System
RFP Responses to Written Questions**

1. HipLink currently has an established deployment within Missoula County supporting public safety notification workflows.

The existing deployment can be expanded to support the broader employee notification requirements described in the RFP through additional receiver licenses and applicable modules.

For purposes of responding, would the County prefer that HipLink price the proposed solution as an expansion of the existing County deployment, including the additional receiver licenses and modules needed to support the employee and public notification requirements?

Or, should we provide pricing as though the County is acquiring an entirely new, standalone system?

If helpful to the County's evaluation, we can also provide both an incremental expansion option and a full replacement option for comparison.

Response: The County welcomes a pricing proposal that identifies any cost savings or efficiencies associated with expanding the existing HipLink deployment rather than implementing a new standalone system.

2. Separately, to help us size the employee and citizen opt-in notification components appropriately, can you clarify the anticipated frequency and intended use of each platform?

Specifically, does the County anticipate using either platform for routine operational notifications in addition to emergency alerts, or primarily for emergency and incident-related communications? Any estimate of expected message volume, or anticipated use cases would also be helpful.

Response: The County anticipates primarily using the employee notification platform for emergency and incident-related communications such as severe weather, evacuations, shelter-in-place, active threat incidents, facility closures, accountability, and emergency exercises. The County may also utilize the platform for limited operational communications when rapid notification of employees is necessary.

If a public notification component is proposed, the County anticipates using it primarily for emergency management and public safety communications rather than routine operational messaging. Message volume will vary depending on incident activity and cannot be accurately estimated at this time. Vendors should assume periodic testing, exercises, and emergency notifications consistent with a city/county government emergency communication program.

3. Given the time constraint and notice of the RFP release today, we would like to request a one-week extension to the due date. Are you able to accommodate an extension?

Response: Given the implementation timeline, Missoula County cannot accommodate an extension. Proposals remain due as specified in the RFP.

4. Since Missoula County is a participating agency with Sourcewell, where multiple product solutions are available that satisfy this RFP via contract vehicle, would you like pricing responses to adhere to that existing contract pricing?

Response: Vendors should provide pricing in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFP. Vendors may reference existing cooperative purchasing contracts, including Sourcewell, but should clearly identify any pricing, discounts, or terms being proposed to the County as part of their response.

5. Workday HCM Integration (Section 3 – Employee Data Integration): Can the County provide the current Workday HCM version, required data fields beyond basic employee information (name, position, department, supervisor, contact details), preferred integration method (REST API or other), and timeline for sandbox/test tenant access to support

Response: Missoula County implemented Workday's most current version of its HCM application on June 21, 2026. Workday requires its customers to update twice per year (September/March) which means all Workday clients are operating the same platform. Missoula County would like the following data fields included in the integration: employee name, job position, location (this is department within our Workday HCM environment), supervisor, and contact details). Missoula County does not have a preferred integration method; rather, we are asking for assurance that the application offered for mass notification is capable of integrating with Workday HCM. Vendors should describe their standard Workday integration approach.

Additional implementation details, including testing environments will be finalized during contract negotiations and implementation planning, with the intention of having the system functional by September 25, 2026.

6. Building Automation System Details (Section 3 – Building Automation System Integration): What specific building automation platforms are deployed across the 25 campuses, and what are the preferred or available trigger methods (API, email, or physical contacts) for initiating panic alarms and building lockdown alerts?

Response: A Delta Controls system with Red5 series hardware is currently in place and serving the lockdown and panic alarm hardware inputs in the related buildings. While API, email or physical contact are available triggers that the Delta Controls System can generate for the purpose of integrating with a mass notification system, the County’s order of preference would be email, physical contacts, then API.

7. 911 Center Interface (Section 3 – Communication Capabilities): What protocols or systems does the 911 Center use for receiving emergency reports, and what is the expected scope and technical method for enabling “direct communication with 911 through the application” (e.g., voice, text, escalation workflow)?

Reporting emergencies should always be via a 9-1-1 call or text. Missoula County Office of Emergency Management will not have the capability to monitor chats through the application other than through an open 9-1-1 call or text thread.

The County is interested in exploring solutions that comply with these requirements and support timely communication with emergency dispatch personnel. Vendors should describe available methods for facilitating communication between application users and the 911 Center.

8. Incumbent/Legacy System and Data Migration Support: What is the name or vendor of the current internal emergency communication system? Can the County facilitate a data export or knowledge-transfer session with the incumbent to support a low-risk parallel cutover and full operational deployment by September 25, 2026? Are there known data volume, quality, or custom configuration details from the existing environment?

Response: The County currently utilizes Rave Panic Button as its internal emergency communication platform. The current system has approximately 500 employee profiles, however, the County cannot confirm that the existing user population fully reflects all active employees. Missoula County employs approximately 1,000 employees.

The County’s current system, configuration, and utilization is relatively limited in scope and functionality compared to the capabilities sought through this

RFP. The County anticipates implementing a more comprehensive emergency communication and notification platform with expanded functionality, integrations, accountability features, and communication capabilities. Vendors should not assume that the proposed solution will be a direct replacement of the existing environment.

The County cannot guarantee the availability of knowledge-transfer sessions with the incumbent vendor. Vendors should assume that implementation and migration activities will primarily rely on information and resources provided by the County.

- 9. User Scale, Growth, and Access Scope (Section 3 – Project Overview):** Confirming approximately 1,000 employees; are contractors, temporaries, or partner agency personnel expected to require system access? What is the projected user growth or additional campuses over the 7-year contract term?

Response: The County currently employs approximately 1,000 employees. Access to the system’s mobile application may be optional for employees, while desktop-based is expected to be required for the majority of staff.

The proposed solution should support this user population and provide flexibility to accommodate organizational changes over the maximum contract term. The County’s primary focus is providing access to County employees and designated building partners. However, the County may also elect to extend access to partner agencies within close proximity. Vendors should describe any licensing, administrative, or technical considerations associated with supporting these user types.

The County cannot accurately project workforce growth, facility expansion, or the reduction of facilities and associated users over the maximum contract term. Vendors should describe the scalability and flexibility of their solution, including how the system accommodates increases or decreases in users, facilities, and organizational complexity over time.

- 10. Local Preference Application (Preferences Section and Resolution 2021-001):** How is the preference for firms based in Missoula County formally applied during Phase 1 scoring and overall best-value determination (specific points allocation, tie-breaker mechanism, or other weighting)?

Response: Resolution 2021-001 is applied in a tie-breaking situation.

- 11. Proposal Formatting and Page Limits (Instructions to Offerors):** Are there specific page limits, font/size requirements, margin specifications, or section length guidelines beyond consecutive numbering and following the prescribed format to avoid scoring deductions for deviations?

Response: Follow the formatting instructions in the RFP. There are no page limitations nor other formatting requirements.

- 12. Cost Proposal Format and Categories (Section 5 – Cost Proposal):** Is there a preferred structure, Excel template, or specific line-item categories (e.g., per-user licensing tiers, implementation phases, annual support tiers, training) the County expects in the separate cost proposal document to facilitate comparison?

Response: The County has not prescribed a specific cost proposal template or pricing format. Vendors may use their standard pricing format; however, proposals should clearly identify all costs associated with the proposed solution.

To facilitate evaluation and comparison, vendors should separately identify, as applicable, implementation costs, software licensing or subscription fees, user licensing assumptions, training costs, support and maintenance costs, optional modules or services, and any recurring annual costs. Vendors should also clearly identify any assumptions, pricing tiers, or volume-based pricing that may apply.

The County reserves the right to request clarification or additional pricing detail during the evaluation process.

- 13. Exhibit A Cloud-Based Solution Checklist and Supporting Evidence:** For checklist items requiring specific details (SOC 2 audit firm/date, encryption standards, insurance, DR site standards), should vendors attach certificates, reports, or policies with the proposal, or is completed narrative in the checklist sufficient at this stage? Any additional county-specific data residency or security requirements beyond the checklist?

Response: Completed narrative is sufficient.

- 14. Performance Metrics and Capacity (Section 3 – Minimum Technical Requirements):** Beyond the 99.9% uptime example, what are the County's target alert delivery times to reach 100% of targeted users? What expected peak concurrent users or message volumes should be planned for during county-wide events or drills? Any specific RTO/RPO objectives for disaster recovery scenarios?

Response: The County has not established specific alert delivery time requirements, peak messaging volume thresholds, or formal RTO/RPO objectives beyond those identified in the RFP. Vendors should describe the performance, scalability, reliability, and disaster recovery capabilities of their proposed solution.

The proposed solution should be capable of supporting emergency notifications to the County's approximately 1,000 employees simultaneously during certain incidents or exercises.

The Proposed solution should be capable of supporting emergency notifications to large geographic areas simultaneously via phone, text and or e-mail. For purposes of this RFP, an estimated 120,000 county population should be presumed. Vendors should describe performance for this population size.

15. Training Scope and Delivery Preferences (Section 4 – Project Approach):

Approximately how many administrators or alert originators require in-depth training? How many department-level or end-users require mobile/desktop app training? Is there a preference for virtual delivery, in-person sessions, train-the-trainer model, or phased rollout? Any mandatory completion or competency requirements?

Response: The proposed solution should support a workforce of approximately 1,000 employees. The county anticipates that all employees will require end-user training on the system’s core functions. While mobile application participation may be optional, all users with access to the system should receive appropriate training for the features available to them. The County anticipates additional role-based training for personnel responsible for accountability and personal status tracking during evacuations or other events.

The County expects all employees to have the ability to initiate an emergency alert or emergency report through desktop or mobile application features. The number of personnel responsible for system administration, configuration, and management is expected to be relatively limited, although the exact number has not yet been confirmed.

The County is open to a combination of training approaches, including virtual training, in-person training, self-based learning resources, and train-the-trainer models. Vendors should describe their recommended training strategy, available training materials, onboarding support and ongoing training resources.

16. Locally Deployable versus SaaS Preference and Checklist Applicability (Section 3 – Minimum Technical Requirements): The RFP permits a “locally deployable OR Software as-a-Service (SaaS)” platform while making the Cloud-Based Solution Checklist mandatory for all offerors. If a vendor proposes a secure, modern locally deployable or hybrid option that meets all high-availability, disaster recovery, and integration requirements, how should Exhibit A be completed? Does the County have a preference for cloud/SaaS to minimize operational burden and long-term total cost of ownership?

Response: If the proposed solution is locally-deployable, completion of the Cloud Provider Checklist is not required. SaaS solutions still require the completion of the aforementioned document. The County does not have a preference for SaaS/cloud.

17. In your request you say you have 25 campus and some of those spaces are shared with other if there is no onsite systems for notifying staff and guests will you consider a complete eco system for both onsite and mobile notification from the leader in our industry?

Response: The County's preferred solution is an integrated platform that provides both desktop and mobile-based functionality. The system should enable users to initiate emergency notifications, integrate with 911 as described in the RFP, receive emergency notifications, access emergency plans and response information, and support employee accountability during emergency incidents.

18. Do you have existing PA systems or security solutions like camera, access control, or other solutions you would like the system to integrate into for launching or receiving messages?

Response: No, not at this time.

19. Do any of these campuses have a partially or fully deployed Public Announcement system that are working or not that use visual or audible notifications for those on the sites including visitors and employees?

Response: No, not at this time.

20. Do you have plans for the project available for the 25 campuses for us to review to help design the system so we can help with the specs?

Response: The County does not have finalized system design plans or detailed technical schematics available for all 25 campuses as part of this solicitation. Vendors should base their proposals on the functional requirements outlined in the RFP.

21. Does the county know what they want for audio, visual, on site in addition to their mobile notifications?

Response: No. The County has not fully defined specific requirements for audio, visual, or on-site notification devices beyond mobile and desktop-based alerting capabilities described in the RFP. The additional notifications listed in the question will not be evaluated as required functionality.

22. Have you seen the Valcom solution via a Webinar or On-Site demo? If no, would you like to set one up?

Response: As part of the evaluation process, if requested by the County, vendors will be asked to provide demonstrations of their proposed solutions.

23. Please provide a list of the equipment and features that you will want to use in the new system. Examples are paging, SMS text messaging, strobes, digital reader boards, telephone system integration, and screen pops.

Response: The County is seeking a compressive emergency communication platform capable of supporting several communication delivery methods; SMS/text messaging, push notifications, mobile application notifications, email notifications, and desktop alerts. The County does not have a predetermined list of required physical equipment or facility-based devices.

24. Do you want this system to integrated with your phone system so you can launch emergency notifications and updates in real time both on campus and off campus? What brand and model of phone system are you will be using? Do you have plans to upgrade or change out the phone system in the next year?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal. The County currently utilizes an Avaya PBX.

25. Do you want to interface into the phone system so they can make a live page, launch prerecorded emergency notification play lists, or initiate lockdowns?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal. The County currently utilizes an Avaya PBX.

26. What type of connection would you want, a C/O trunk, SIP integration was requested?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal. SIP-based integration is preferable.

27. Do you want to dial a single code, or can you dial into the pager server with one code and then dial a second code for the event launch or live page request?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal.

28. Do you want analog back up phones so live pages can still be made if the phone system goes down?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal.

29. How many back up calling stations would you want and in how many different buildings would you want them to go in?

Response: The County has not defined specific telephone requirements as part of this solicitation. Vendors may describe the full range of available capabilities for integrating with phone systems. Phone system/PBX integration functionality should be documented in your proposal.

30. Do you want to be able to launch both onsite and our mobile application prerecorded emergency playlists using panic buttons, the ability to call in from a cell phone on the playground?

Response: Vendors should describe available capabilities for initiating emergency notifications through mobile applications and desktop systems.

31. You want the ability to launch messages or execute Emergency Notification from the desktops of computers or tablets, we do that as well. How do you see yourselves using this and would we notify outside organizations in some situations?

Response: The County anticipates the need for tiered alerting based on incident type and severity. For example, higher-severity incidents such as fire or active threat events may require notification to all employees and users, while other incident types such as medical or panic-related events, may be targeted to specific groups, roles or locations.

32. Do you want, have, or plan to add IP Help Points, Emergency Towers, Emergency Call boxes around the campus/facility?

Response: IP Help Points, Emergency Towers, Emergency Call boxes, LED signage, and exterior notification infrastructure are beyond the scope of this solicitation as currently defined.

The County is focused on evaluating emergency communication and notification platforms as described in the RFP. Infrastructure is not a required component of this procurement.

33. Do you need LED signs for hearing impaired and intelligible instruction?

Response: IP Help Points, Emergency Towers, Emergency Call boxes, LED signage, and exterior notification infrastructure are beyond the scope of this solicitation as currently defined.

The County is focused on evaluating emergency communication and notification platforms as described in the RFP. Infrastructure is not a required component of this procurement.

- 34. Do you need notification on the exterior, garages, public walking areas?**

Response: IP Help Points, Emergency Towers, Emergency Call boxes, LED signage, and exterior notification infrastructure are beyond the scope of this solicitation as currently defined.

The County is focused on evaluating emergency communication and notification platforms as described in the RFP. Infrastructure is not a required component of this procurement.

- 35. Do you have existing exterior speakers or infrastructure in place that you want to reuse, or would you add if needed on this project?**

Response: IP Help Points, Emergency Towers, Emergency Call boxes, LED signage, and exterior notification infrastructure are beyond the scope of this solicitation as currently defined.

The County is focused on evaluating emergency communication and notification platforms as described in the RFP. Infrastructure is not a required component of this procurement.

- 36. Do you want emergencies to screen pop on certain computers and laptops?**

Response: Yes. There may be certain job positions where the County will not require this desktop function, however, the majority of employee's computers and laptops will require the desktop function. Deployment or installation functionality is not desired.

- 37. How many computer devices would need the desktop alerting feature?**

Response: We have approximately 900 computer endpoints. Deployment or installation functionality is not desired.

- 38. Is there an existing service in place today? If so, could you provide the company and product, and the related annual cost or budget for this service?**

Response: The County currently utilizes Rave Mobile Safety and Rave Alert, both solutions are part of Motorola Solutions.

At this time, the County is not including detailed annual cost or budget information for these services as part of this response. Vendors should propose pricing based on the requirements outlined in the RFP.

- 39.** For our electronic submission, is there a maximum file size per email? Can you also confirm you are able to accept zip files.

Response: The Procurement Officer for this RFP can accept a ZIP file. 25 MB is the maximum attachment size for the County's email infrastructure.

- 40.** Page 7, Bullet point #7 on Project Overview: "secure storage and retrieval of emergency plans, procedures and related documents". The rest of the RFP does not breakdown further functionality requirements regarding these features. Should they be included as required functionality or can they be treated as preferred functionality (the way public communication is)?

Response: It is required. The system shall offer secure storage and retrieval of emergency plans, procedures and related documents that are immediately accessible during an emergency. These documents may include but are not limited to active threat response guidance, evacuation procedures, lockdown protocols, and other emergency action instructions.

- 41.** Would it be possible to do a presentation for your board or your stake holders on this project. Mass notification is so much more than just mobile notification, you have campuses with employees and visitors on site that also need to be part of that notification group. You will also need integration into security, access controls and so much more. We would like to open up a dialog with you to go over the infrastructure needed to implement a complete solution. Do you think something like this might be possible ?

Response: Missoula County is following established procurement policies through a formal RFP process. Vendors who advance to the next stage may be invited to participate in demonstrations and interviews as part of the evaluation process.