



CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Event Number: RFI_CISS-25-001

For

Artificial Intelligence Solutions for Public Safety Communications

ADDENDUM/QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS



Table of Contents

1	Addenda	3
2	Questions & Answers	3



Request for Information

1 Addenda

1.1 Addendum No. 1 – Revision to Attachment B

- The CHP has revised Attachment B – Questionnaire, to correct an error in the Roman numeral section numbering used throughout the document. The revision has replaced the original Attachment B on Cal eProcure. This revision is administrative in nature and is intended solely to improve organization and readability. No changes have been made to the substance, intent, scope, or content of the questionnaire items as a result of this correction.

Respondents should use the revised version of Attachment B – Questionnaire when preparing and submitting their RFI responses.

1.2 Addendum No. 2 – Revision to RFI Response Page Limit

- The CHP hereby revises the response page limit identified in Section 7, RFI Response Instructions. The following sentence:

“RFI responses may not exceed fifty (50) pages in length. Submissions that exceed this length may not be reviewed in its entirety. Responses must be thorough and concise.”

is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“RFI responses may not exceed seventy-five (75) pages in length. Submissions that exceed this length may not be reviewed in their entirety. Responses must be thorough and concise. The seventy-five (75) page limit includes the cover letter and all required attachments submitted as part of the RFI response.”

All other terms, conditions, instructions, and requirements of the RFI remain unchanged.

2 Questions & Answers

2.1 What was the annual spend under the previous contract for these services?

- The CHP has no prior contracts for AI Solutions.

2.2 If this is a new contract, what is the estimated annual budget?

- The CHP does not have an estimated annual budget set for this project. At this time, CHP is only gathering information for planning purposes and evaluating existing product costs.

2.3 Is the agency open to a hybrid delivery model utilizing a combination of onshore and offshore resources?

- The CHP will consider information related to hybrid delivery models utilizing a combination of onshore and offshore resources as part of this RFI. However, respondents should be aware that any future procurement resulting from this effort may include specific requirements related to data residency, personnel



access, criminal justice information, and compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. Vendors should clearly identify any offshore components of their proposed approach and describe the safeguards in place to protect sensitive information.

2.4 Will the work be performed onsite, remotely, or through a hybrid arrangement?

- The CHP has not established a required work arrangement at this time. Respondents may propose onsite, remote, or hybrid approaches based on their recommended implementation and support model.

2.5 Would it be possible to consider a 1-2-week extension to the proposal submission deadline?

- The CHP does not anticipate granting an extension to the RFI response submission deadline. Respondents should submit responses by the date and time identified in the RFI Key Action Dates.

2.6 Is this contract intended for a single vendor or for multiple vendors?

- The CHP has not made a determination regarding whether a future procurement resulting from this RFI would result in an award to a single vendor or multiple vendors. As part of this market research effort, CHP is seeking information on the range of solutions and delivery models currently available in the marketplace.

2.7 Who is the current or previous incumbent vendor for these services?

- The CHP does not currently have an incumbent vendor providing the AI-enabled capabilities contemplated within this RFI. This RFI is being issued as part of CHP's market research efforts to better understand the technologies, solutions, and service models currently available in the marketplace.

2.8 Are there any challenges, gaps, or pain points with the current solution or contractor that the agency is looking to address through this procurement?

- The CHP does not currently have an incumbent AI solution related to the scope of this RFI. This effort is intended to identify and evaluate capabilities available in the marketplace.

2.9 Is there a projected contract award date and anticipated start date?

- The CHP has not established a projected contract award date or implementation date at this time. Information obtained through this RFI will be used to inform future planning, procurement strategy, and project timelines.



2.10 Attachment D (SIMM 5305-F – Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment) was not included with the RFI materials. We have obtained a copy from the California Department of Technology website (copy attached) can you please confirm that this is the correct version to complete for this response? Additionally, should the entire document be submitted, or only specific sections/pages?

- Attachment D was included in the Event Package when the RFI files were posted on Cal eProcure June 1st, 2026. It is Attached File 6 on the webpage. Please fill in as many of the controls and pieces of information that you are able to supply as possible.

2.11 Attachment B (Questionnaire), Section II appears twice, once as “Non-emergency Call Handling and Triage” and again as “Assistive Call Taking Capabilities.” Could you please confirm whether this duplication is intentional, or if a revised/updated version of the questionnaire will be issued?

- The duplication of Section II was not intentional. This has been addressed in Addendum No. 1. A revised version of Attachment B has been uploaded to Cal eProcure to correct the Roman numeral numbering. The administrative correction does not affect the content of the questionnaire.

2.12 RFI Section 7: Response Instructions: We would like to confirm the application of the 50-page response limit. Specifically, can you please clarify which documents are included in the 50-page maximum? For example, does the limit apply only to the narrative response, or does it also include the required attachments (Attachments A-D), the cover letter, and any supplementary materials?

- The CHP has revised the RFI response page limit through Addendum No. 2. The RFI responses may not exceed seventy-five (75) pages in length. The seventy-five (75) page limit includes the cover letter and all required attachments submitted as part of the RFI response, including the completed questionnaire and ROM information.

2.13 RFI Section 3. Key Action Dates: In the event schedule, the last day to submit questions is listed as June 14th, which is a Sunday, can you provide a corrected date?

- The date listed in the RFI is correct and does not require revision. The CHP intentionally established the question period. Accordingly, questions must be submitted by Sunday, June 14, at the time specified in the RFI.

2.14 RFI Section 3: Key Action Dates: We respectfully request a two-week extension to the RFI submission deadline.

- The CHP does not anticipate granting an extension to the RFI response submission deadline. Respondents should submit responses by the date and time identified in the RFI Key Action Dates.



2.15 RFI Section 12. Project Description and Requirements: Can you identify the Records Management System(s) currently used by the CHP, and confirm your willingness to discuss potential integrations with those systems, in addition to the Central Square CAD referenced in the RFI?

- The CHP currently uses Mark43 for Evidence Management and Records Management.

2.16 General: Would you consider allowing one additional opportunity to submit clarifying questions after responses are provided?

- The CHP does not plan to offer a second question period. The RFI schedule and key action dates will remain unchanged.

2.17 Section 7 – 50 page restriction – please clarify if this limit encompasses the entirety of the RFI response – including the required cover letter, Attachments A through D, and any other supporting information – or if specific attachments or supporting documents are excluded from this total count.

- The CHP has revised the RFI response page limit through Addendum No. 2. The RFI responses may not exceed seventy-five (75) pages in length. The seventy-five (75) page limit includes the cover letter and all required attachments submitted as part of the RFI response, including the completed questionnaire and ROM information.

2.18 Attachment B – Discrepancy: We noticed a formatting duplication in “Attachment B – Questionnaire” on Page 2. Currently, there are two distinct topics sequentially labeled with the Roman numeral “II”: II. Non-emergency Call Handling and Triage. II. Assistive Call Taking Capabilities. *Question:* To ensure our response is clear and aligns with your review process, could you please clarify how respondents should reference these sections? Should we adjust the numbering to make “Assistive Call Taking capabilities” Section III (and renumber all subsequent sections accordingly), or would you prefer we maintain your current numbering and distinguish them in our response (for example, by labeling them II-1 and II-2. Please clarify.

- The duplication of Section II was not intentional. This has been addressed in Addendum No. 1. A revised version of Attachment B has been uploaded to Cal eProcure to correct the Roman numeral numbering. The administrative correction does not affect the content of the questionnaire.

2.19 Requesting clarification about section 9 – Pilot of Selected Products on page 8. How will success of a pilot be quantified or measured?

- The CHP has not established final pilot success measures at this time. Specific pilot objectives, performance measures, and success criteria will depend on the



selected solution, approved pilot scope, use case, technical approach, and operational environment.

At a minimum, CHP anticipates that pilot success may be evaluated based on factors similar to those used during the demonstration evaluation process, including operational fit, public safety use case alignment, call-handling or assistive call-taking abilities, integration feasibility, reliability and continuity, security and CJIS/CLETS considerations, data governance and privacy, responsible AI controls, usability, training needs, implementation feasibility, support requirements, and overall value to CHP.

2.20 How will CHP define pilot success and evaluate participating solutions during the demonstration and pilot phases? For example, will CHP assess solutions based on functional performance, operational impact, security/compliance, usability, training/adoption, scalability, or other criteria? A clear understanding of evaluation criteria will help vendors provide more targeted and comparable responses aligned to CHP's operational objectives and statewide deployment considerations. CHP indicates that demonstration and pilot participation will be driven by the completeness and relevance of responses, but the specific success measures are not yet defined.

- The CHP has not established final pilot success measures at this time. Specific pilot objectives, performance measures, and success criteria will depend on the selected solution, approved pilot scope, use case, technical approach, and operational environment.

At a minimum, CHP anticipates that pilot success may be evaluated based on factors similar to those used during the demonstration evaluation process, including operational fit, public safety use case alignment, call-handling or assistive call-taking abilities, integration feasibility, reliability and continuity, security and CJIS/CLETS considerations, data governance and privacy, responsible AI controls, usability, training needs, implementation feasibility, support requirements, and overall value to CHP.

2.21 What data types will be made available during the pilot, and what are CHP's expectations for data access, retention, transfer, and deletion? In addition, should vendors assume the pilot will use production data, non-production data, or a combination of both? This information will help vendors design an appropriate pilot approach, security model, and data-handling process that aligns with CHP's operational needs while minimizing implementation risk.

- The CHP has not yet determined the specific data sets that may be made available during any future pilot activities. The types of data provided, if any, will be dependent upon the pilot objectives, the selected use cases, and applicable security and legal considerations.

The CHP anticipates that any pilot would involve only the minimum data necessary to evaluate the proposed solution and may include operational data



such as call audio, call metadata, transcripts, and related information relevant to the approved pilot scope. Any access to CHP data would be subject to applicable State policies, security requirements, and criminal justice information protections.

The CHP expects to retain ownership of all CHP data and any data generated through the use of the solution. Vendors should describe their capabilities and standard practices related to data access, export and transfer methods, configurable retention periods, and the secure return or permanent deletion of CHP data upon completion of a pilot, contract termination, or expiration of services.

2.22 What specific security, compliance, and data-handling requirements must a proposed solution satisfy for demonstration and pilot participation (for example, CJIS, cloud security requirements, encryption, logging auditability, or other State standards)? Clear security and compliance requirements will allow vendors to propose solutions that are appropriately aligned to CHP's environment and avoid unnecessary rework or assumptions.

- The CHP anticipates that any proposed solution selected for demonstration or pilot participation will be expected to align with applicable State of California security, privacy, and criminal justice requirements. At a minimum, respondents should be prepared to describe how their solution addresses the following areas:
 - Compliance with applicable CJIS Security Policy requirements.
 - Encryption of data in transit and at rest using industry-standard practices.
 - Authentication and access control capabilities, including support for Active Directory integration and multi-factor authentication, where applicable.
 - Audit logging and accountability controls capable of recording user access and activity associated with criminal justice information and other sensitive data.
 - Secure data retention, transfer, export, and deletion processes.
 - Protection against unauthorized access, malware, and other cybersecurity threats through established security policies and patch management practices.
 - Data segregation and safeguards to ensure CHP information remains private and isolated from other customers or tenants.
 - Compliance with applicable State information technology requirements, including the State's Information Technology General Provisions and Cloud Computing General Provisions, as applicable to the proposed solution.
- Respondents should clearly identify any assumptions, dependencies, or limitations associated with meeting these requirements. Additional security,



compliance, and data handling requirements may be established if a future solicitation is issued or prior to initiation of any pilot activities.

2.23 Which specific systems (along with tech stack), interfaces, and technical environments will be required for the pilot, and what level of access will vendors receive for integration, testing, and validation? This will help vendors scope the pilot realistically and propose solutions that fit CHP's technical environment.

- The CHP has not finalized the specific technical architecture, interfaces, or integration requirements that may be utilized during any future pilot activities. The systems and environments involved in a pilot will depend on the selected use case, pilot objectives, and the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Respondents should anticipate that a pilot may require interaction with existing CHP communications technologies, including, but not limited to, the Central Square CAD system, Motorola Vesta 9-1-1 call handling platform, Rapid Deploy Text-to-9-1-1 solution, InterTalk radio consoles, and applicable network infrastructure. Vendors should describe the methods by which their solution integrates with these or similar systems, including the use of Application Programming Interfaces, middleware, event streaming, file exchange, telephony integration, or other interoperability approaches.

Vendors should not assume unrestricted access to CHP systems, networks, or criminal justice information. Access provided for integration, testing, and validation activities will be limited to the minimum necessary to support approved pilot objectives and will be subject to applicable State security requirements, CJIS requirements, and CHP approval processes.

2.24 What level of CHP participation and vendor staffing does CHP anticipate during the 90-day pilot, including technical coordination onboarding, training issue resolution, and operational support? This will help vendors propose a pilot approach that is practical for CHP staff and appropriately supported throughout the pilot period.

- The CHP anticipates that pilot activities will require coordination between CHP and the selected vendor; however, specific staffing levels have not yet been finalized and may vary based on the proposed solution and pilot objectives.

Vendors should be prepared to provide appropriate staffing and support for technical coordination, onboarding, configuration, testing, training, issue resolution, and operational support throughout the 90-day pilot. The CHP will identify appropriate operational, technical, and project stakeholders to support pilot activities as needed.

Respondents should clearly identify their recommended staffing model, expected CHP resource needs, support approach, and any assumptions or dependencies necessary to conduct a successful pilot.



2.25 Would CHP consider working with the selected vendors to refine pilot scope, sequencing, and initial use cases based on technical feasibility, system access, and operational priorities identified during the demonstration process?

- Yes, CHP is open to working with selected vendors to further refine pilot scope, sequencing, and initial use cases based on information learned during the demonstration process, technical feasibility, system access considerations, and CHP's operational priorities. Finally pilot parameters will be determined by CHP.

2.26 Given the short interval between the anticipated release of responses to questions and/or addenda and the current RFI response due date, would CHP consider extending the response deadline by 21 days to allow vendors sufficient time to incorporate clarifications into complete and responsive submissions? Additional time may improve the quality, completeness, and comparability of vendor responses, which would better support CHP's market research objectives.

- The CHP does not anticipate granting an extension to the RFI response submission deadline. Respondents should submit responses by the date and time identified in the RFI Key Action Dates.

2.27 To facilitate small business teaming agreements and modular software design, will the State allow or look favorably upon responses submitted by a prime contractor that natively integrates a specialized subcontractor's AI/ML microservices stack?

- The CHP is open to receiving information regarding prime contractor and subcontractor teaming arrangements, including solutions that integrate specialized AI/ML microservices or other third-party components.

The CHP has not established a preference for any specific contracting model, teaming structure, or solution architecture at this time.

2.28 Will the CHP or the selected prime contractor provide the necessary SDKs, API documentation, or sandbox environments to sub-tier developers to build the required low-level systems interfaces during the 90-day pilot phase? Could you provide details on the platforms?

- The CHP has not finalized the specific technical documentation, SDKs, API access, interface documentation, or sandbox environments that may be available during any future pilot. The technical resources required for pilot participation will depend on the selected use case, proposed solution, existing system capabilities, third-party system limitations, and applicable security requirements.



2.29 For real-time transcription and assistive call-taking, will the CHP telephony environment support active SIPREC (SIP Recording) server mirroring, or must the overlay rely on processing audio post-facto via API pushes from logging/recording solutions?

- The CHP has not finalized the specific audio integration method that may be used for real-time transcription or assistive call-taking during any future pilot.

Respondents should describe the audio integration methods supported by their solution, including SIPREC, audio mirroring, call handling system integration, logging/recording system integration, PI-based audio delivery, or other approaches.

The CHP will evaluate feasible integration options during the demonstration and pilot planning process.

2.30 To maintain strict compliance with state CJIS requirements, does the CHP require Generative AI and LLM orchestration components to run entirely on-premises on local hardware, or is the use of a fed-ramp/CJIS-certified sovereign cloud environment permissible? If the cloud environment is permissible, is the target deployment AWS GovCloud or Azure Government?

- On-premises, cloud-based, or hybrid deployment models contained in the U.S. may be considered provided the proposed solution satisfies applicable State of California security requirements, CJIS requirements, data protection requirements, and CHP approval processes.

The CHP has not identified a preferred cloud platform for purposes of this RFI.

2.31 In the event of a catastrophic WAN or cloud network disruption, what is the expectation for “offline or degraded-mode operation” regarding the local AI caching and processing capacity at individual PSAP facilities?

- The CHP expects any proposed solution to avoid disruption to mission-critical public safety operations. Vendors should clearly identify which functions would remain available, which functions would be unavailable or delayed, how data would be protected during a disruption, and how data synchronization would occur once connectivity is restored.

2.32 To guarantee absolute data privacy, does the CHP require an entirely single-tenant, physically isolated deployment of the LLM orchestration and vector database layers, or is logically isolated multi-tenancy within a secure sovereign cloud environment acceptable?

- The CHP has not established a specific requirement for an entirely single-tenant or physically isolated deployment at this time. Respondents may propose multi-tenant, cloud-based, on-premises, or hybrid architectures.



2.33 Does the CHP require real-time translation processing to occur entirely locally within the CJIS-compliant boundary using self-hosted translation models, or can the solution leverage certified public sector cloud translation APIs?

- The CHP has not established specific requirements for translation processing at this time. Respondents may propose a variety of approaches, provided the proposed solution satisfies applicable State of California security requirements, CJIS requirements, data protection requirements, and CHP approval processes.

2.34 Does the CHP intend to evaluate a single integrated platform that performs both live caller-facing call handling AND back-end assistive functions (transcription, QA, analytics), or is the CHP open to responses that address only one of these capability areas?

- The CHP is open to responses that address only one of these capability areas.

2.35 Is integration with Real-Time Crime Centers and the specific “data sharing platforms” referenced in Attachment B (Section on Integration) expected in the initial scope, and if so, which platforms?

- Integration with Real-Time Crime Centers and data sharing platforms is not currently established as a required component of the initial pilot scope. Attachment B requests information regarding these integration capabilities to help CHP understand available marketplace functionality and potential future use cases.

Pilot scope and integration requirements will depend on the selected use case, technical feasibility, system access, security considerations, and CHP operational priorities.

2.36 For ROM purposes, should pricing assume all 24 communications centers and up to 1,500 users from day one, or a phased rollout? If phased, is there a preferred sequence or pilot-to-production cadence?

- For ROM purposes, respondents should provide cost estimates for deployment of their recommended AI solution implementation across CHP’s full operational environment, including all 24 communications centers and up to 1,500 users.

The CHP does not anticipate implementing a production solution at all 24 communications centers simultaneously. Respondents can describe their recommended phased rollout approach in the Answers and Assumptions section of the ROM.

The CHP has not established a preferred rollout sequence or production implementation cadence at this time.



2.37 Over what period should ongoing maintenance and operations costs be estimated – the three-year period referenced for the Demonstration Day pricing discussion, or a longer term?

- For ROM purposes, respondents should provide the estimated annual ongoing maintenance or subscription fee.

For demonstration day planning purposes, respondents can use the three-year period.

2.38 Approximately what call volume or user concurrency should the AI capabilities (e.g., transcription, scoring) be sized to process – all calls, or a defined subset?

- The AI capabilities should be sized to process one hundred (100) concurrent inbound calls (administrative, toll-free, and/or 9-1-1 calls) across all CHP PSAPs. If focusing on one PSAP instead of all 24, the AI capabilities should be sized to process 50 concurrent inbound calls.

2.39 For the 90-day pilots, will the selected communications center provide a live or near-live connection to CAD, 9-1-1 call handling, and radio console systems, and what is the security accreditation process and timeline a vendor must complete before connecting?

- Depending on the solution chosen for the pilot activities, CHP anticipates potential connectivity to live systems and applicable network infrastructure.

Vendors should not assume unrestricted access to CHP systems or data. Any connection to CHP systems or networks will be subject to applicable State security requirements, CJIS requirements, CHP security review, and any required approvals prior to implementation.

The specific security review process, documentation requirements, and timeline will be determined during pilot planning with the selector vendor(s).

2.40 The RFI states pilots are provided at no cost to the State. Are vendors expected to provide all infrastructure, licensing, and on-site support for the full 13 weeks at no charge, including any third-party (e.g., cloud or AI) consumption costs?

- Yes. As stated in the RFI, any pilot provided by a selected respondent must be provided at no cost to the State. Respondents should assume they are responsible for all costs necessary to conduct their proposed 13-week pilot, including any required infrastructure, licensing, configuration, implementation support, training, onsite or remote support, and third-party costs such as cloud, AI, or usage-based consumption fees.

2.41 Is the respondent expected to complete Part 1 (which is designated as completed by the State CIO)?

- The CHP is asking respondents to fill in as many of the controls and pieces of information that the respondent is able to supply as possible.



2.42 Given the 50-page limit, do the four attachments (A-D), the cover letter, and any supporting materials count toward the page count, or only the questionnaire responses?

- The CHP has revised the RFI response page limit through Addendum No. 2. The RFI responses may not exceed seventy-five (75) pages in length. The seventy-five (75) page limit includes the cover letter and all required attachments submitted as part of the RFI response, including the completed questionnaire and ROM information.

2.43 The RFI instructs respondents not to include proprietary information because submissions are public records. How should vendors handle security-architecture detail that is sensitive but necessary to demonstrate CJIS compliance?

- Respondents shall respond as they feel necessary to convey the information that has been requested. The public records information is to advise submissions may be subject to disclosure through the California Public Records Act (Government Code section 7920.000 et seq.).

2.44 Does the 50-page response limit include Attachments A through D, the signed cover letter, and appendices such as the examples of event and administrative reports requested in Attachment B, Section VIII? Attachment D (SIMM 5305-F) is 28 pages on its own.

- The CHP has revised the RFI response page limit through Addendum No. 2. The RFI responses may not exceed seventy-five (75) pages in length. The seventy-five (75) page limit includes the cover letter and all required attachments submitted as part of the RFI response, including the completed questionnaire and ROM information.

2.45 SIMM 5305-F states that Risk Assessment Parts 1 and 2 are completed by the state entity's CIO/ISO and AIO/AISO. Which sections of attachment D are vendors expected to complete versus provide as input?

- The CHP is asking respondents to fill in as many of the controls and pieces of information that the respondent is able to supply as possible.

2.46 Is the referenced SIMM 5310-C Privacy Threshold/Impact Assessment also required from vendors at this stage?

- No. The SIMM 5310-C Privacy Threshold/Impact Assessment is not required from respondents at this RFI stage. If applicable, privacy assessment requirements may be addressed by CHP during the future planning, pilot preparation, or a subsequent solicitation process.



2.47 Should one SIMM 5305-F be submitted for the overall solution, or one per product/use case (non-emergency intake, assistive call-taking, radio)?

- One SIMM 5305-F should be submitted for the overall solution.

2.48 Responses become public records subject to CPRA, and vendors are instructed not to include proprietary information – yet Attachment B requests detailed pricing, security architecture, and AI safeguards, and Attachment D requests underlying model and version details. How should vendors provide confidential or CJIS-sensitive details (e.g., a separately marked annex, under NDA, or at Demonstration Day)?

- Respondents shall respond as they feel necessary to convey the information that has been requested. The public records information is to advise submissions may be subject to disclosure through the California Public Records Act (Government Code section 7920.000 et seq.).

2.49 Section 12.2 lists several capabilities – non-emergency call intake, contacting rotational tows, entering data into CLETS, transcription and summarization of calls and radio traffic, and translation. For an initial deployment, does CHP have a priority order or relative emphasis among these, and will the capability areas be assessed independently?

- The CHP has not established a priority order among the capability areas at this time. The purpose of the RFI is to better understand the maturity, feasibility, risks, and implementation considerations associated with each capability area.

For purposes of respondent submissions, CHP is interested in understanding which capabilities are available as part of the proposed solution, which may be implemented independently, and which may require sequencing, additional integrations, or operational dependencies.

2.50 Will CHP consider solutions that address a subset of the capabilities listed in Section 12.2, or only responses covering the full scope?

- Yes, CHP will consider responses that address a subset of the capabilities listed in Section 12.2.

2.51 What is the approximate annual volume of non-emergency/administrative calls across CHP's 24 communications centers, and what percentage of total call volume is non-emergency or administrative? Is the toll-free information line (included in the 893,000 administrative and toll-free calls) within scope for automation?

- Below is a table using 2025's call data showing the approximate annual volume of non-emergency/administrative calls and what percentage of total call volume they constituted across all 24 CCs.



California Highway Patrol (CHP)
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
Event Number: **RFI_CISS-25-001**

- Yes, the toll-free line is within the scope for automation. Please note the only non-emergency calls the Capitol Communications Center receives are on the toll-free line.

CHP Comms Center	Non-emergency calls (approximate)	Percentage of Total Call Volume
Capitol	137,000	87%
Ukiah	8,000	48%
Susanville	16,000	45%
Humboldt	25,000	40%
Yreka	10,000	37%
Redding	30,000	36%
Bishop	15,000	36%
Fresno	60,000	28%
El Centro	7,000	26%
San Luis Obispo	20,000	24%
Barstow	25,000	22%
Merced	35,000	20%
Bakersfield	25,000	20%
Chico	25,000	20%
Stockton	30,000	18%
Monterey	30,000	18%
Sacramento	70,000	17%
Ventura	20,000	16%
Orange County	40,000	15%
Indio	14,000	14%
Border	55,000	14%
Inland	48,000	13%
Golden Gate	70,000	11%
Los Angeles	78,000	8%
Total	893,000	18%



2.52 Is real-time transcription and summarization of radio traffic a core requirement for the initial solution, or a desired future capability?

- Real-time transcription and summarization of radio traffic is an area of interest; however, CHP has not established it as a required core capability. The purpose of the RFI is to understand available marketplace capabilities.

2.53 For AI-supported entry of persons, vehicles, or property into CLETS databases: What interface does CHP envision (direct CLETS access, via CAD, or message switch); what level of human review or confirmation is required before an AI-initiated entry is committed, and is such entry permissible under current CLETS policies?

- The CHP has not finalized the technical interface or authorization model for any AI-supported entry into CLETS related systems. At this stage, CHP is interested in understanding whether vendors can support assistive workflows that may help gather, validate, format, analyze or present information for review.

2.54 Regarding contacting rotational tows: is the rotation list managed within the Central Square CAD or a separate system, and does CHP expect the solution to place outbound calls to tow operators?

- The tow rotation list is managed within the Central Square CAD application. The CHP has no expectations for functionality at this time, tow rotation automation is an area of interest and CHP is interested in understanding whether vendors can support the assisted workflow.

2.55 Section 12.3 lists quality-assurance/automated call review, or is the QA need limited to role-based access to records and reports?

- Section 12.3 identifies quality assurance personnel as one of several ancillary user groups that may require role-based access to the solution. The CHP is also interested in understanding whether respondents offer automated quality assurance or automated call review capabilities.

2.56 Does CHP's Central Square CAD deployment span all 24 communications centers, or are there facilities on different CAD platforms? Please confirm the specific Central Square product and version(s).

- The CHP communications centers utilize Central Square version 22.3.13 for their CAD platform, which is all housed on premises, and no changes are being considered at this time.

2.57 What version of Motorola Vesta 9-1-1 is currently deployed, and are all facilities on the same version?

- All CHP communications utilize Motorola Vesta version 7.4.146.227 for their call handling equipment, and no changes are being considered at this time. The ANI/ALI spill from the Motorola Vesta is available via a serial cable connection, and is presented in Format 04.



2.58 Which call logging/recording (voice recorder) platform(s) does CHP use across its centers (e.g., NICE, Eventide, Verint), and will the AI solution be expected to deliver call audio to that recorder – for example, via SIPREC?

- The CHP uses NICE Inform across all 24 communications centers. However, CHP has not established a requirement at this time for the AI solution to deliver call audio to the voice recorder.

Respondents should describe any integrations their solution supports with NICE Inform, including SIPREC, API-based integrations, audio export, metadata exchange, or other supported methods.

2.59 Is the Rapid Deploy Text-to-9-1-1 platform in scope for integration or automation?

- Rapid Deploy Text-to-9-1-1 is part of CHP's current communications technology environment; however, CHP has not established a specific requirement at this time for integration or automation of the platform.

Respondents should describe any capabilities their solution supports related to Text-to-9-1-1 workflows.

2.60 What telephony connectivity will be made available to the piloted solution (e.g., SIP trunking, ESI net access, redirection of administrative lines)?

- Dependent upon the solution presented, CHP may elect to give access to the administrative/non-emergency lines and/or the 9-1-1 lines that are in use in CHP's communications centers. The non-emergency/administrative lines are currently delivered to the call handling equipment via Primary Rate ISDN (PRI) service and out 9-1-1 lines are delivered on CAMA trunks. The Next Generation 9-1-1/ESI net in California may be ready for use at some time during the pilot program period.

2.61 To assess radio-console and radio-traffic integration, can CHP describe the technical landscape of its radio system, including: the land-mobile-radio platform(s) and frequency bands in use (e.g., VHF low-band, 700/800 MHz); radio make/model and firmware/software versions; the InterTalk console product and version; encryption in use (e.g., AES-256/P25 keying) and key-management approach; available integration interfaces for capturing radio audio (e.g., P25 CSSI/DFSI, console logging feeds, SIP/RoIP); and any in-progress modernization (e.g., the Enhanced Radio System) that would affect integration during the contract term? Please also share any other aspects of the radio environment that may be relevant to integration but are not specifically listed above.

- CHP has not finalized the specific technical architecture, interfaces, or integration requirements that may be utilized during any future pilot activities or operational



deployments. The systems, environments, and integration methods involved will depend on the selected use case, pilot objectives, security requirements, and capabilities of the proposed solution.

Respondents should anticipate that a pilot may require interaction with existing CHP communications technologies and infrastructure, which may include, but are not limited to, land-mobile-radio (LMR) systems (primarily VHF low-band 39-45MHz with some 700-800MHz), InterTalk radio console environments, NICE radio logging/recording interfaces, dispatch communications platforms, network infrastructure, and other applicable public safety communications systems.

Vendors should consider that the environment may include a combination of radio technologies, frequency bands, console systems, and integration methods that vary based on operational requirements, geographic deployment, and modernization efforts. Vendors should describe the methods by which their proposed solution integrates with radio and communications environments, including, as applicable:

- Analog-based low-band interfaces
- P25-related interfaces (including CSSI, DFSI, or equivalent integration methods)
- Console-based audio or logging feeds
- Radio-over-IP (RoIP) or network-based audio interfaces
- SIP/telephony-based integration approaches
- APIs, middleware, event streaming, file exchange, or other interoperability methods
- Support for radio metadata such as talkgroup/channel information, radio identifiers, timestamps, or other associated event data

Vendors should also describe compatibility considerations related to encrypted radio environments, including support for public safety encryption standards such as AES-based P25 encryption, key-management dependencies, and whether any direct access to encryption keys or key-management infrastructure is required. Vendors should not assume access to CHP encryption materials, key-management systems, or protected communications environments. Vendors should not assume unrestricted access to CHP systems, networks, radio infrastructure, or criminal justice information. Any access provided for integration, testing, validation, or pilot activities will be limited to the minimum necessary to support approved objectives and will be subject to CHP approval processes, applicable State security requirements, cybersecurity requirements, and CJIS requirements. Vendors should identify any additional technical, operational, security, or infrastructure considerations required to successfully integrate with a public safety radio environment that have not been specifically addressed above.



2.62 Can CHP provide a representative sample of historical non-emergency call recordings or call-type/disposition data – either with the RFI answers, during Demonstration Day preparation, or prior to pilot start – to support data-driven configuration and realistic performance projections? If so, what approvals or agreements would be required?

- The CHP may consider providing sanitized examples of non-emergency calls or call-type/disposition data, if determined necessary to support pilot planning.

Any release of CHP data, including call recordings, transcripts, metadata, or call-type/disposition information, would be subject to CHP approval and applicable legal, privacy, CJIS, data security, records retention, and operational requirements.

2.63 Does CHP anticipate deploying to all 24 centers simultaneously following a successful pilot, or on a rolling basis?

- If CHP proceeds with a future procurement and implementation. CHP anticipates that deployment would occur on a rolling or phased basis.

The specific rollout sequence, timing, number of centers per phase, and implementation approach have not been determined and would be addressed as part of future planning or a subsequent solicitation, if issued.

2.64 Does CHP envision a single statewide instance/tenant across all 24 centers, or per-center instances?

- The CHP has not determined whether a future production solution would utilize a single statewide instance/tenant, per-center instances, or another architecture. However, CHP would like centralized access to the solution for administrative purposes, as well as redundancy in the proposed product solution. Respondents should describe their recommended deployment model.

2.65 Will pilots #1, #2, and #3 run sequentially at the same facility, or at different CHP communications centers?

- The CHP anticipates all pilots to be conducted at the same CHP communications centers, if operationally and technically feasible. Conducting the pilots at the same location is intended to support consistency in evaluation, site conditions, user feedback, and operational comparison across selected solutions.

2.66 What constitutes a successful pilot outcome, and will that criteria be defined before pilots begin?

- The CHP has not established final pilot success measures at this time. Specific pilot objectives, performance measures, and success criteria will depend on the selected solution, approved pilot scope, use case, technical approach, and operational environment.

At a minimum, CHP anticipates that pilot success may be evaluated based on factors similar to those used during the demonstration evaluation process, including operational fit, public safety use case alignment, call-handling or assistive call-taking abilities, integration feasibility, reliability and continuity,



security and CJIS/CLETS considerations, data governance and privacy, responsible AI controls, usability, training needs, implementation feasibility, support requirements, and overall value to CHP.

2.67 Section 9.1.C requires the piloted software to interface with CAD, 9-1-1 call handling, and the radio console system. Is radio console integration mandatory for pilot participation, or may a pilot be scoped to call-handling capabilities only?

- Radio console integration is not mandatory for pilot participation. While Section 9.1.C identifies CAD, 9-1-1 call handling, radio console systems, and the CHP network as systems that may be connected to or interfaced with during a pilot, the specific systems required for the pilots will depend on the selected use case, proposed solution, technical feasibility, and CHP's operational priorities.

2.68 The pilot is to be provided at no cost to the State. Does this extend to third-party integration fees (e.g., CAD vendor API or licensing costs), and will CHP facilitate access and cooperation from incumbent vendors (Central Square, Motorola) during the pilot?

- Yes. As stated in the RFI, any pilot provided by a selected Respondent must be provided at no cost to the State. Respondents should assume they are responsible for all costs necessary to conduct their proposed pilot, including any required third-party costs, integration fees, licensing, cloud or AI consumption costs, or other expenses associated with their proposed solution.

The CHP may facilitate reasonable coordination with incumbent system vendors, such as Central Square and Motorola, as needed to support approved pilot activities; however, respondents should not assume that third-party vendor access, interfaces, APIs, licensing, or support will be available at no cost or without limitation. Respondents should clearly identify any required third-party dependencies, access needs, integration assumptions, fees, or limitations associated with their proposed pilot approach.

2.69 Sections 2.G and 9.1.D require deletion of data after the pilot concludes. Does this requirement extend to system logs and operational telemetry, and what is the expected process for the data transfer to the State and for certification of deletion?

- The CHP expects all CHP data collected, generated, processed, or stored during a pilot to be transferred to the State and deleted from the respondent's environment at the conclusion of the pilot. This includes, but is not limited to, call audio, transcripts, metadata, summaries, AI-generated outputs, and other operational data associated with the pilot.

System logs and operational telemetry should also be deleted to the extent they contain CHP data, sensitive operational information, CJIS-related information, personally identifiable information, or information that could be used to identify CHP systems, personnel, callers, or incidents. If certain logs or telemetry must be retained for legal, security, audit, backup, or operational purposes,



respondents should clearly identify what is retained, why it is retained, how long it is retained, and how it is protected.

The specific data transfer format, method, timing, and deletion certification process will be determined during pilot planning. Respondents should describe their standard process for exporting CHP data, securely transferring it to the State, deleting data from production, backup, subcontractor, and third-party environments, and providing written certification or other verification of deletion.

2.70 Given the fixed 90-day pilot windows, will CJIS-related vendor personnel vetting (background checks, fingerprinting) and any required CJIS Security Addendum need to be completed prior to pilot start, and what lead time should vendors plan for?

- Any CJIS-related personnel vetting, background checks, fingerprinting, security documentation, or required CJIS Security Addendum must be completed prior to any vendor personnel receiving access to CHP systems, networks, criminal justice information, or other sensitive data.

The specific requirements and timeline will depend on the proposed pilot scope, the level of access required, the vendor's staffing model, and applicable State, CJIS, and CHP approval processes.

Respondents should clearly identify which vendor or subcontractor personnel would require access, the type of access needed, and any assumptions regarding CJIS-related approvals or onboarding timelines.

2.71 For CJIS/CLETS data, does CHP require hosting in a government cloud environment (e.g., Azure Government), or is a CJIS-compliant commercial cloud in U.S. regions acceptable?

- The CHP has not established a requirement that CJIS/CLETS data must be hosted in a government cloud or on-premises environment at this time. Respondents may propose on-premises, government cloud, commercial cloud in U.S. regions, or hybrid deployment models, provided the proposed solution satisfies applicable CJIS, CLETS, State of California security, data protection, and CHP security approval requirements.

2.72 Beyond the FBI CJIS Security Policy, are there California DOJ/CLETS-specific security requirements or addenda (e.g., the CLETS policies, Practices & Procedures) that vendors must meet, and is a specific CJIS Security Policy version required?

- Yes. In addition to the FBI CJIS Security Policy, any solution that accesses, processes, stores, transmits, or interfaces with CJIS/CLETS-related data must comply with applicable California DOJ/CLETS requirements, CHP security requirements, and any required policies, procedures, agreements, or addenda, including those applicable to vendor access and handling of criminal justice information.

The CHP has not identified a specific CJIS Security Policy version for purposes of this RFI. Respondents should assume compliance with the current applicable version of the FBI CJIS Security Policy and any applicable California



DOJ/CLETS requirements in effect at the time of demonstration, pilot, future procurement, or implementation.

2.73 Attachment C expresses LOE in person-hours. For a cloud SaaS subscription with minimal on-side labor, should we use the “Vendor Defined” LOE designation and present the annual fee on the “Ongoing Yearly Maintenance or Subscription Fee” line, or does CHP prefer effort expressed another way?

- If the LOE categories in Attachment C do not accurately reflect the respondent’s proposed SaaS or cloud-based subscription model, the respondent may use the “Vendor Defined” LOE designation and clearly explain the basis for that designation.

Annual subscription, licensing, maintenance, hosting, cloud, or other recurring costs should be provided on the “Ongoing Yearly Maintenance or Subscription Fee” line.

2.74 Should the ROM reflect full statewide deployment across all 24 centers, a phased rollout, or a single-center pilot – and which call volumes should anchor the estimate?

- The ROM should reflect deployment of the respondent’s recommended AI solution implementation across CHP’s full operational environment, including all 24 communications centers and up to 1,500 users. The ROM should not be based on a single-center pilot.

CHP does not anticipate implementing a production solution at all 24 communications centers simultaneously. Respondents should assume a phased rollout and clearly describe their recommended implementation approach, including site sequencing, number of centers per phase, timeline, training, staffing, and any cost impacts associated with phased deployment.

For estimating purposes, respondents should consider the call volume information provided in the RFI, including approximately 2.9 million 9-1-1 calls and approximately 893,000 administrative and toll-free calls annually.

2.75 Demonstration Day requests a cost view over a three-year period while the ROM asks for an ongoing yearly maintenance/subscription fee. Please confirm the contract term CHP wants priced for planning purposes.

- For planning purposes, respondents should provide the estimated annual ongoing maintenance or subscription fee in Attachment C, as requested in the ROM worksheet.

The three-year period referenced for Demonstration Day is intended to support discussion of anticipated pricing structure and estimated costs over a multi-year planning horizon. The CHP has not established a final contract term at this RFI stage. Any final contract term, if applicable, would be identified in a future solicitation.