**CITY OF CORONA**
**CAD, RMS, AND MOBILE REPLACEMENT PROJECT**
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) 17-032CG**
**ADDENDUM No. 2**

**March 2, 2017**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Administrative Services Department - Purchasing Division** | **Contact:  Carlos Garcia** |
| **400 S. Vicentia Ave., Ste. 320** | Carlos.Garcia@ci.corona.us.gov |
| **Corona, CA  92882** | **Telephone:  (951) 279-3567** |

Addendum No. 2 to CAD, RMS, and Mobile Replacement Project, RFP 17-032CG is issued to respond to "Requests for Information" as submitted by consultants via written requests as well as to clarify sections of the RFP.

By this reference, all provisions and attachments to this Addendum No. 2 are hereby incorporated into RFP  17-032CG. Prospective contractors shall account for all provisions pursuant to this Addendum No. 2 in  submitting their proposal.  Each contractor shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2 in their proposal in the  spaces provided therein.

---

**A.  Questions and Answers:**

1.  Question:
   "For item #68 of the General Requirements page of the Functional Matrix (shown below):  to be sure we have a thorough understanding of what data is to be displayed and what actions cause that information to be displayed; can the City provide an example scenario where this functionality comes into play and why?"

   Answer:
   In the event an employee of the department is reviewing a record that requires the need to view information related to another employee found to be referenced in the record, that employees name shall be associated with some form of link to enable the reviewer to access the employees records without having to exit the record being reviewed to locate the information by another means.

2.    Question:

"Can the City provide an unlocked version of the Functional Matrix Excel Workbook? A locked workbook makes it very difficult for multiple people to work on the response and for anyone to find specific and/or related items. We need the ability to highlight, search and copy requirements at least."

Answer:

To preserve the integrity of the workbook, the City requires the submitting consultant to submit the original protected workbook only. For ease of use in completing the work required by the consultant, an unprotected version has been placed on the City's website for download at http://discovercorona.com/City-Departments/Finance/Current-Bid-Opportunities.aspx.

To reiterate, the City *will not* accept the unprotected version of the workbook for the final submittal.

3.    Question:

"Item #230 of the CAD sheet (shown below) asks if the vendor's system is "…capable of interfacing with the County of Riverside's ReddiNet Hospital Alerting system…" By this requirement is the city asking that this interface be proposed and priced?"

Answer:

The City Fire Department relies on the information exchanged on the ReddiNet® Emergency Medical Communication Network to share time-sensitive information among the County's hospitals, EMS agencies, paramedics and public health officials. The City Fire Department desires to interface with the ReddiNet® system primarily to obtain and disseminate hospital availability to field units treating and transporting EMS patients. The proposed solution must provide the ability to interface with ReddiNet®.

4.    Question:

"Items 404 – 410 of the CAD and Mobile sheet specify an interface to LEDS (Oregon). Is the City asking for a direct connect to Oregon, or a connection via a national switch such as NLETS?"

Answer:

The City is linked directly to the California Department of Justice CLETS. The proposed solution must be capable of initiating an action that will result in the appropriate transaction with LEDS.

5.      Question (Introduction):

"Items 513 and 514 in the CAD and Mobile sheet appear to require the CAD mapping system to display a location with an accuracy of +/- 150 centimeters 95% of the time.  We have the following questions:"

5.1. Question:

Are the GPS receivers in the vehicles and hand held radios capable of providing this calculating this level of accuracy 95% of the time?

Answer:

The City's intent behind the requirement is for the proposed solution to pinpoint the location of a GPS enabled device interfaced with the CAD system within the closest proximity of the device down to within meters and not to the nearest attribute associated on a map, I.e., and address, an intersection, etc.  The intent is to provide assisting resources the ability to locate the GPS device in the event a public safety officer or firefighter is in need of assistance.  The City understands that GPS accuracy is dependent on several factors as reference at the following link;

http://www.gps.gov/systems/gps/performance/accuracy/.

5.2. Question:

"Is GIS data provided by the City accurate enough to enable a plot to that level of accuracy at all zoom levels?"

Answer:

Yes

5.3. Question:

"How will this accuracy be monitored?"

Answer:

The City requires the consultant to provide testing of the proposed solution to ensure accuracy of the location of the GPS device on the CAD or Mobile mapping display.   This is a matter of acceptance by way of testing vs on-going monitoring.

6.      Question:

"Item #62 of the RMS sheet specifies "The system should provide an electronic method to submit and accept data to a Live Scan system."  Is this item requiring an interface be proposed and priced?"

Answer:

Yes, the City is requesting consultants to provide an interface as part of their proposed solution.

7.   Question:

"Items 215 – 223 RMS sheet contain requirements for Civil Process.  Does Corona PD process and/or service civil paperwork?"

Answer:

We do not provide civil process service.

8.   Question:

"SECTION VI. PRICE FORM on page 2 specifies: "…This offer shall remain firm for 90 days from RFP close date".   However, the tentative schedule on page 1 of the RFP shows a proposal due date of March 2, 2017 and an award date of August 16.  That's a period of well over 100 days.  An adjustment might be necessary."

Answer:

The proposal due date is April 6, 2017 at 5:00 p.m. The offer shall remain firm for 150 days from the proposal due date and time. Please see amendment to the RFP in "City Clarifications" section below, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

9.   Question:

"Section 1.3.7.3 Reliability Test Period:  The first paragraph refers to a 30-day reliability test period.  In each of the detail paragraphs that follow (Severity Level descriptions), the test period is shown as 90 days.  The final paragraph returns to the 30-day period.  Can the City please reconcile?"

Answer:

The Reliability Test Period shall be 90 days. Please see amendment to the RFP in "City Clarifications" section below, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

10.   Question:

"The RFP's Section V, Paragraph c. Work Plan item (1) States; "…describe the approach to completing the tasks specified in the Scope of Work;". Can the City be more specific regarding what is expected here?    In other words, is the City expecting a point by point response to the RFP's attachment A or a different

approach?"

Answer:

It is up to the Consultant to determine how they want to present their solution. Ultimately, in evaluating the proposals the City will be determining if the proposed solution will adequately meet the needs of the City based on what is described in the proposal submitted by each consultant for the Scope of Work and Deliverables.

11.     Question:

"Reference is made to Items 2 and 3 in the Instructions for the Functional Requirements (Attachment C):  These instructions seemed to require that both notes and references be provided by the proposer for each and every line item.  Though it is our habit to be generous with our notes and references so that we are clearly understood, many items simply need neither.  Thus our question at today's meeting. We now assume, based on the verbal response that these columns are to be used to note only significant exceptions or alternatives when the desired requirement is not marked as EF (Existing Functionality).  Is this interpretation of the City's response correct?"

Answer:

To clarify, the instructions were intended for the consultant to add an explanation in response to ONLY line items whereas the proposed solution does not meet the specific requirement as written.  The City expects consultants to provide an explanation where the consultant feels it necessary to provide and explanation. Otherwise, the City will assume that no explanation indicates the proposed solution meets the requirement as written.

12.     Question:

"What is the estimated cost for this effort?"

Answer:

The City is requesting that Consultants provide pricing based on the scope of work and deliverables.

13.     Question:

"What funding source has been allocated for this effort?"

Answer:

A Capital Improvement project has been established to fund this project.

14.     Question:

"Have you had any external assistance preparing this RFP? If so, who?"

Answer:

Yes, as stated in the pre-proposal meeting, the City has retained the assistance of Winbourne Consulting, LLC to assist in the project.

15.     Question:

"The RFP instructs proposers to place confidential information is a separately sealed

envelope. Since proposals are being submitted electronically, would the City consider a separate redacted copy of each proposal?"

Answer:
Consultants may submit confidential information in a separate data file that is clearly labeled as "Confidential" in the file name and prominently marked as "Confidential" throughout the document. Please see the amendment to the RFP in "City Clarifications" section below, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

16.     Question:
"How does the City want the Consultant to submit confidential and proprietary information given that the RFP requests this information be placed in a sealed envelope."

Answer:
Please refer to the response to question 15.

17.     Question:
"Can you provide instructions for accessing the City's FTP site where the proposals will be submitted?"

Answer:
Instructions will be provided to all eligible consultants via email on or before March 10, 2017. These instructions will be sent to the contacts that registered for the Pre-Proposal Conference Call.

18.     Question:
"SOW Section 1.4.4. Please provide the City Technology Standards document. Attachment D that is referenced in this section as the Technology Standards is the City's GIS Standards."

Answer:
The City IS Technology Standards is Attachment B and can be downloaded on the City Website at http://discovercorona.com/City-Departments/Finance/Current-Bid-Opportunities.aspx.

19.     Question:
"Section 1.12.1 CAD Servers. On page 32 the SOW talks about power cords and Uninterruptible Power Supplies connected to two separate power circuits. Question: Does the City have the Uninterruptible Power Supplies already installed to which we would connect or are we required to supply them?"

Answer:
The City has the UPS already installed.

20.     Question:
"SOW Section 1.9.1.3 calls for a Kronos interface to CAD for fire. Requirements Matrix row 274 calls for a Telestaff interface to RMS Personnel. Please confirm that

interfaces are required to both CAD and RMS."
Answer:
The City Fire and Police Department both utilize Kronos® Workforce TeleStaff™ to maintain a daily schedule of personnel assigned to each apparatus for the Fire department and each radio call sign for the Police Department. The proposed solution must provide the ability to interface with Kronos® Workforce TeleStaff™ for the purpose of maintaining synchronization of daily schedules near real time in the CAD's roster or schedule functionality.

21. Question:
"Please provide additional information regarding the radio console (vendor, model, etc.)."

Answer:
The City's radio console is the MCC 7500 IP Dispatch Console from Motorola.

22. Question:
"The RMS Requirements row 56 talks about capturing photos of the individual. The City also uses the DataWorks Digital PhotoManager systems for housing mugshots. Is it the City's intent to have two sources of photos, namely from the RMS system as well as the DataWorks Digital PhotoManager system?"

Answer:
The intent is to enable the addition of unlimited, or a high number of photos to be a record independent of the DataWorks Digital Photo Manager.

23. Question:
"Please provide additional information involving the number of users on the system for server configuration."

Answer:
Total City Users: 790
Total CAD/RMS Users: ~40
Total RMS Users: ~200

24. Question:
"How many users access the RMS at the same time?"

Answer:
The City anticipates up to 100 of concurrent users accessing the RMS system at peak.

25. Question:
How many workstations is the RMS deployed on today?

Answer:
Section 1.1.2, Sizing Information Summary of the RFP provides this information. However, the City requests that the Consultant to provide pricing as a site license or a concurrent user basis.

26.    Question:
       How many mobile computers are deployed in police department vehicles?

       Answer:
       Please refer to response for question 25.

27.    Question:
       "Typically how many patrol officers access the RMS/Field Reporting at the same
       time?"

       Answer:
       The City anticipates up to 40 of concurrent users accessing the RMS system from the
       field at peak.

28.    Question:
       "How many mobile computers are deployed in fire department vehicles?"

       Answer:
       Section 1.1.2, Sizing Information Summary of the RFP provides this information.

## B. City Clarifications:

1. Section VI. "Price Form", is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with Exhibit 1
   attached hereto and incorporated herein.

2. Section 1.3.7.3, "Reliability Test Period" in Attachment A, "Scope of Work and
   Deliverables shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

**1.3.7.3 Reliability Test Period**

After the successful completion of the cutover period, there shall be a minimum of ninety
(90) day reliability testing during which the newly installed system will be in production
and its performance monitored. During this period, the system must perform fully without
degradation of any kind for the Reliability Test to be satisfied. If any major defects or
numerous minor defects are discovered, the Reliability Test period shall be terminated and
the Consultant shall resolve all issues. Once all issues have been addressed, the Consultant
will recommence the Reliability Test process, in its entirety, from the beginning as may be
required by the City.

The severity levels pertaining to the system are defined as:

    Severity Level 1 (S1) ─ Critical system errors, which are defined as: Loss of Data,
    Corruption of Data, or Loss of Productive Use of the System. In the event this type of
    error occurs, the City will immediately notify Consultant and the ninety (90) day

Reliability period will be cancelled. Consultant personnel shall promptly resolve the problem at no additional cost and a new ninety (90) day Reliability period will begin. Once the system operates for 90 consecutive days without a Severity Level 1, the ninety (90) day Reliability test will be completed.

Severity Level 2 (S2) ─ Critical errors exist when the primary purpose of the Consultant's CAD/Mobile software is compromised and productive use of the system is significantly impacted. A procedural workaround is either not immediately or readily available or has been proposed and has been found to be unacceptable by the City. In the event this type of error occurs, the City will immediately notify the Consultant and the thirty (90) day Reliability period will be suspended. The Consultant's personnel shall promptly resolve the problem at no additional cost to the City, and the ninety (90) day Reliability period will re-commence at the point where it was suspended.

Severity Level 3 (S3) ─ Non-critical errors which are defined as incomplete operation of system where a procedural workaround is readily and immediately available, and productive use of the system is not significantly impacted on software or operations. In the event this type of error occurs, the City will immediately notify the Consultant, but the ninety (90) day Reliability period will continue. If possible, the Consultant shall resolve the problem during the ninety (90) day Reliability period, but if necessary, resolve in a future bug fixes release of the product.

Severity Level 4 (S4) ─ Cosmetic errors which are defined as configuration issues that can be corrected by the City, data integrity issues that must be addressed by the City, Help File documentation errors, or enhancements that can be made in the future to the presently installed system. Severity level 4 defects will be remedied within a future software fixes release.

If, during the ninety (90) day Reliability period, the system is deemed non-operational because of S1 or S2 errors, the Warranty Period will cease. The City may choose to stop use or use whatever operational portion may be available. The Warranty Period will restart upon the resolution of the S1 or S2 error.

Any cost for the Reliability Testing phase shall be broken out separately on the Price Workbook.

3.  Section II.L "Public Records" shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

L.      **Public Records**

Responses (proposals) to this Request for Proposal (RFP) and the documents constituting any contract entered into thereafter become the exclusive property of the City of Corona and shall be subject to the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250 et seq.). The City of Corona's use and disclosure of its records are governed by this Act.

Those elements in each proposal which proposer considers to be trade secrets, as that term is defined in Civil Code Section 3426.1(d), or otherwise exempt by law from disclosure, should be prominently marked as "TRADE SECRET", "CONFIDENTIAL", or "PROPRIETARY" by proposer. The City of Corona will use its best efforts to inform proposer of any request for disclosure of any such document. The City of Corona, shall not in any way, be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such records including, without limitation; those so marked if disclosure is deemed to be required by law or by an order of the Court.

In the event of litigation concerning disclosure of information the proposer considers exempt from disclosure, the City of Corona will act as a stakeholder only, holding the information until otherwise ordered by a court or other legal process. If the City of Corona is required to defend an action arising out of a Public Records Act request for any of the contents of a proposer's proposal marked "Confidential", "Proprietary", or "Trade Secret", proposer shall defend and indemnify the City of Corona from all liability, damages, costs, and expense, including attorneys' fees, in any action or proceeding arising under the Public Records Act.

To ensure confidentiality, proposers are instructed to enclose all "Confidential," "Proprietary," or "Trade Secret" data in separate data file, which are then included with the proposal documents. Because the proposal documents are available for review by any person after award of a contract resulting from an RFP, the City of Corona shall not in any way be held responsible for disclosure of any "Confidential," "Proprietary," or "Trade Secret" documents that are not contained in a separate data file and prominently marked in the file name and throughout the document.

Thank you,

Carlos Garcia
Purchasing Specialist II
City of Corona
Administrative Services Department, Purchasing Division
400 S. Vicentia Ave., Suite 320
Corona, CA 92882
951-279-3567
Carlos.Garcia@ci.corona.ca.us.

## **Exhibit 1**

## **PRICE FORM**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:     RFP No. 17-032CG _____

DESCRIPTION OF WORK:      CAD, RMS, and Mobile Replacement Project

CONSULTANT'S NAME/ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

_____

NAME/TELEPHONE NO. OF
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE  _____

_____

## **Price Workbook**

Please complete Attachment "F" in its entirety to identify all costs as itemized in the Price Workbook. The Price Workbook will be provided to Consultants that attend the **Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference Call.**

Are there any other additional or incidental costs which will be required by your firm in order to meet the requirements of the Technical Specifications?     Yes  /  No     (circle one).

If you answered "Yes", please provide detail of said additional costs: _____

_____

_____

Please indicate any elements of the Technical Specifications which cannot be met by your firm.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Have you included in your proposal all requested informational items and forms? Yes / No (circle one). If you answered "No", please explain:

This offer shall remain firm for 150 days from RFP close date.

Terms and conditions as set forth in this RFP apply to this proposal.

Cash discount allowable _____%_____ days. Unless otherwise stated, payment terms are: Net forty-five (45) days.

In signing this proposal, Consultant warrants that all certifications and documents requested herein are attached and properly completed and signed.

From time to time, the City may issue one or more addenda to this RFP. Below, please indicate all Addenda to this RFP received by your firm, and the date said Addenda was/were received. It is the Consultant's responsibility to ensure that all addendums are received. Failure to acknowledge receipt of addenda may cause the City to reject the proposal as non-responsive.

Verification of Addenda Received

Addenda No: _____ Received on: _____
Addenda No: _____ Received on: _____
Addenda No: _____ Received on: _____

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: _____

PRINT SIGNER'S NAME AND TITLE: _____

_____

DATE SIGNED: _____

COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

PHONE:_____ FAX:_____

**IF NOT SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL, PLEASE STATE REASON(S) BELOW:**

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment "A"       Scope of Services and Deliverables
Attachment "B"       City IS Technology Standards
Attachment "C"       Functionality Matrix (MS Excel Workbook)
Attachment "D"       City GIS Services
Attachment "E"       Acronyms
Attachment "F"       Price Workbook (MS Excel Workbook)