



ADDENDUM #3

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS 2019-147

PUBLIC SAFETY RECORDS & JAIL RECORDS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

TO: All Respondents
FROM: Colby Wattling
CLOSING DATE: September 26, 2019 at 3:00 PM (UNCHANGED)
REF NO.: 2019-147 RFP
DATE: August 26, 2019

Provided below are questions and *answers* that were received during the open period ending on August 19, 2019. Additionally, the revised Appendix C mentioned will be available online using the following link: <https://www.kitsapgov.com/das/Pages/Online-Bids.aspx>

- QUESTION 1. RFP page 1: The RFP states that proposals are due Thursday, September 5. Given the following factors, will the County extend the submission deadline to Friday, September 27? Such an extension will allow all vendors to prepare full and adequate responses for the County to make an informed decision for this critical project. We respectfully request the County's timely response to help us determine our ability to submit a proposal for this RFP.
- The proposal is due the week of a national holiday. As a result, we anticipate a number of scheduling conflicts with subject matter experts in the preparation of a response, which limits their ability to provide detailed answers to the questions posed within the RFP.
 - The RFP is also notably extensive, with more than 150 open-ended questions asking for described approaches, processes, and technical information. As such, considerable time is required to prepare adequate responses.

ANSWER: To have this project considered for this 2020 budget year, the departments must submit to the board of county commissioners an approximate cost proposal for the project at the beginning of September or the project will not be funded. As this is the second request for an extension, the County has agreed to extend the submission deadline, but is requiring that offerors each submit a completed Appendix C (Cost Proposal) at the original due date and time of September 5, with the final complete proposal submitted at a later date as provided below. The County will use the average price of the cost proposals

received for budget purposes, recognizing that a budget adjustment (up or down) may be required when the contract is awarded. The cost proposals submitted on September 5, 2018 will be considered final and may not be withdrawn after submission.

Failure to submit Appendix C (Cost Proposal) by 3:00 pm on September 5, 2019 will disqualify an Offeror from further consideration in this process. Also please note that the time frame for demonstrations has been extended to January to accommodate the holidays during the time frame provided.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS	DATE/LOCATION
WRITTEN QUESTIONS DUE	Monday, August 19, 2019 by 4:30 p.m. (Pacific Time)
ADDENDUM ISSUED	Monday, August 26, 2019
APPENDIX C (COST PROPOSAL) DUE	Thursday, <u>September 5, 2019</u> by 3:00 P.M. (Pacific Time)
COMPLETE PROPOSAL DUE DATE	Thursday, <u>September 26, 2019</u> by 3:00 P.M. (Pacific Time)
DEMONSTRATIONS	November-<u>January</u> 2019 Dates, times, and location TBD

QUESTION 2. Do Offerors need to send 8 copies of Appendix C (Cost Proposal) when responding to the September 5, due date?

ANSWER: Yes, but the CD or USB only needs to be provided with the submission of the complete proposal on September 26.

QUESTION 3. Can you explain what we meant by specs for the current RMS workstations?

ANSWER: We are interested in knowing what specifications are required by Offeror's system.

QUESTION 4. Can the cost proposal change after the September 5 proposal submittal?

ANSWER: The price submitted on September 5th is to be the same price submitted on September 26 when the complete proposal packet is submitted and should include another copy of the cost proposal as previously submitted.

QUESTION 5. RFP page 11: The RFP states that "Proposals that meet the minimum requirements will be evaluated in the categories below." Please clarify what the minimum requirements are for this project.

ANSWER: See RFP Instructions.

QUESTION 6. RFP, p. 77, Section J. Data Conversion states, “The Offeror is required to provide a mechanism for converting data from existing legacy systems that contain vital historical information and making that information available to System users.” Please respond to the following questions to provide responding vendors with an understanding of the intended scope of data conversion.

Scope: Which product suites do you want to convert?

- Names, Vehicles, Property
- CAD
- Records
- Evidence
- Jail

ANSWER: The current legacy system contains names, vehicles, property, records and jail data as well as a subset of CAD and Evidence data. All information currently contained in the existing legacy system is expected to be converted into the new System. Conversion of evidence and CAD data, other than what is contained in I/Leads, is outside the scope of this project.

QUESTION 7. RFP, p. 77, Section J. Data Conversion. Do you want to convert Images and/or File Attachments? If yes, are these files stored in a separate location? For example, a separate database or system?

ANSWER: Yes, file attachments and images are stored separately in a file system.

QUESTION 8. RFP, p. 77, Section J. Data Conversion. Quantity: How many years of data do you want to convert?

ANSWER: All data in the legacy system is expected to be converted to the new System. The first record entered into the system was on 12/10/1999.

QUESTION 9. RFP, p. 77, Section J. Data Conversion. Duplicates: How many duplicate records are in your current system? Please rate the cleanliness of your data on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being very few duplicate records, and 5 being many duplicate records.

ANSWER: We do not have that information. As your question relates to cleanliness of data, we would rate the system as a 5 when it comes to master name records. With respect to all other records we would rate the system as a 1.

QUESTION 10. Data Standards: Provide a percentage breakdown of your current system’s use of pick-lists, code tables and drop-downs, and “free-text” entry fields.

ANSWER: That information is not available.

QUESTION 11. Would the county please provide a copy of the response requirements matrix in either a standard, unprotected MS Word Document or Excel spreadsheet?

ANSWER: See RFP instructions.

QUESTION 12. As part of section M. Performance (Active and Inactive Contracts) the County is requesting complete copies of contracts executed within the past 5 years with all customers. This is highly irregular as the company does not regularly publish executed contracts and provide for public review.

ANSWER: RFP Instruction number 16, subsection M (2) is amended to read as follows:

2. *Provide a list of all contracts in the U.S. in the past five years in which the Offeror has provided a system similar to the System to another public entity as requested in the RFP, include all contracts which are no longer active or operated under prior ownership or management.*

Offeror is expected to provide a complete (electronic) copy of contracts executed for a similar System for all Washington state agencies to the extent such information would be required in response to a public records request under the Washington State Public Records Act. A copy of the contract documents for other public entities outside Washington State should be provided to the extent those documents would be released in response to a public records request made under that states public records laws.

Submission of an electronic copy with the proposal is sufficient; a paper copy is not required.

QUESTION 13. Page 19 Interfaces – the JBRS interface appears to indicate that the data is provided to JBRS by VINES, from information that is extracted/provided to VINES from the JMS. Are there any requirements for the JMS to interface directly to JBRS?

ANSWER: There is no requirement for the JMS to interface directly with JBRS. The VINES extract satisfies the data extract for JBRS.

QUESTION 14. Page 20 Interfaces – LexisNexis Mapping. Does the agency wish to maintain the LexisNexis mapping system, or would the agency prefer to shift to an online citizen access mapping capability provided by the RMS/JMS vendor?

ANSWER: We would like to shift to an online citizen access mapping capability provided by the Offeror.

QUESTION 15. 5. Page 20 Interfaces – EvidenceOnQ – Evidence Tracking software – maintained separately by each agency. Do the users wish to maintain the

existing property and evidence systems, or would an integrated P & E system provided by the RMS/JMS vendor be preferred.? would an integrated P & E system provided by the RMS/JMS vendor be preferred?

ANSWER: Each agency intends to continue using EvidenceOnQ for Evidence Tracking. However, we would like the System to interface with our existing EvidenceOnQ systems.

QUESTION 16. Page 20 Interfaces – ImageWare – please confirm that the county is seeking to eliminate the existing 3rd party mugshot system and utilize an integrated mugshot component provided with the JMS.

ANSWER: Yes, we would like to eliminate the third-party party mugshot system. Please describe the options the Offeror's System is capable of providing.

QUESTION 17. Page 21 Interfaces – Offenderwatch – please confirm that an interface is possible to the system, in recent conversations with the state related to offender watch it was indicated that no interface was supported to county level applications.

ANSWER: We are not aware of any current interfaces and are not aware if there are restrictions to interfaces at the state level.

QUESTION 18. Page 35 Functional Requirements – E. Messaging and Chat. The requirements reference a set of system functions related to BOLO's and ATL direct messaging and broadcasts within the RMS. These features are traditionally provided through the CAD and mobile digital applications. Is this capability currently provided by the Integraph CAD system? Is there a need/desire to provide BOLO and ATL publication within the RMS?

ANSWER: We would like the ability to view BOLO and ATL information, as well as WACIC/NCIC returns in the System. Currently internal ATLS show as an alert in the name module of ILEADS.

QUESTION 19. Page 37 Functional Requirements – E. Names, Item 43. The requirement states “Can the System distinguish a biometrically name verified name from one that is entered based on information gathered in the field? Describe” What would qualify as a “biometrically name”, and how would the agency envision this function working within the RMS/JMS system?

ANSWER: Section 2.10 Core Integration A (Names) number 43 is amended to read as follows:

43. Can the System distinguish a biometrically ~~name~~-verified name from one that is entered based on information gathered in the field? Describe

QUESTION 20. Page 48 Functional Requirements – B. UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING. The set of requirements specified relate to UCR reporting, however the State of Washington requires WIBR reporting submission. Are there agencies within the system that would report UCR (such as the Suquamish Police Department)? Should we propose the system assuming a standard Washington IBR reporting method would be used by all agencies?

ANSWER: NIBRS is a type of Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The traditional UCR reporting was called Summary Based Reporting. We are no longer doing Summary Based Reporting. We are reporting based on the Washington State Uniform Crime Reporting Program, National Incident-Based Reporting System. Offerors proposal should assume a standard Washington State NIBRS reporting method will be used by all agencies.

QUESTION 21. Page 71 Functional Requirements –A. WACIC AND NCIC. There are multiple references to capability provided in CAD and MDC's throughout this section. Since CAD and MDC's are not a CentralSquare Technologies kindly requests clarification regarding RFP 2019-147 for Public Safety Records and Jail Management System:

ANSWER: The County is not requesting the replacement of the CAD or MDC's in the RFP. When responding to a question, identify the limitations of Offeror's system.

QUESTION 22. Does the County have a target Go Live date?

ANSWER: The target go live date is June 2021.

QUESTION 23. How many beds will be available for use at the jail facility?

ANSWER: The jail has the capacity for 544 beds.

QUESTION 24. Regarding RFP Section 2.3: please describe the interface requirements the County is seeking.

ANSWER: Please identify the integrations the Offeror's system is capable of providing.

QUESTION 25. Regarding RFP Section 2.12, Mobile Computer Terminal, Section D, Smartphone and Tablet Interface, Item #6: Please clarify the agency-defined data partitioning security parameters.

ANSWER: For Smart Phone and tablet interfaces (apps) - Data: The installed application is capable of segregating data from the underlying device storage to ensure compliance with CJI, HIPAA and sensitive (PII) content handling as

well as controlled access through authentication. Any data stored/cached on the device is encrypted as well as the transport. Functionality: The application/interface can work with multifactor authentication mechanisms and/or VPN security compliant technologies. The application/interface is capable of being managed through remote management tools.

QUESTION 26. What data sources other than I/Leads need to be converted?

ANSWER: The only data source that needs to be converted is iLeads. If the Offeror can replace any of our third-party applications with their own, there may be a need to convert some of the third-party application's data to the extent it is not already in our RMS/JMS system.

QUESTION 27. Will the County Sheriff's Office please clarify the desired data exchange and format requirements between the RMS and Compas third party system (export, import, bi-directional)?

ANSWER: Ideally, the Offeror would have an objective jail classification system that meets or exceeds the recommendations of the National Institute of Corrections, so the County can eliminate the need for a third-party provider. The County's current interface with Compas is a one directional (iLeads to Compas) in-house custom .NET application that utilizes the Assessment, Case, Classification, Offender, and Secondary Screening Classes of the Compas API.

QUESTION 28. Will the County Sheriff's Office please clarify the desired data exchange and format requirements between the RMS and GovQA third party system (export, import, bi-directional)?

ANSWER: The County would like the ability to do a direct drag and drop of files into GovQA.

QUESTION 29. Will the County Sheriff's Office please clarify the Section 8.1 – 8.7 references in the RFP Appendix C Cost Proposal worksheets? These do not seem to correspond with the numbered sections in the main RFP.

ANSWER: See revised Appendix C for corrected narrative.

QUESTION 30. Please clarify what hardware vendors are expected to quote (e.g. server, SAN, rack, workstation, mobile, etc.) and if vendors are expected to quote operating software and database licenses in their responses.

ANSWER: The County is currently operating on the Microsoft platform (Windows server and SQL Server) using licenses purchased directly. The County would like the Offeror's quote to be based on optimum performance for their systems.

QUESTION 31. RFP section 2.29 (page 87) and Appendix C Cost Proposal Worksheets C-2 and C-3 include requests for these; however, the Appendix C worksheet C-1 references sections 8.1 and 8.2 for hardware and operating software respectively, which do not correspond with the numbered sections in the main RFP.

ANSWER: See revised Appendix C for corrected narrative.

QUESTION 32. How many RMS workstations?

ANSWER: Approximately 250

QUESTION 33. What is your total number of mobile units for Field-Based Reporting?

ANSWER: There are 239 MCTs used for Field-Based Reporting.

QUESTION 34. For Civil Serve, how many field deputies do you have? How many civil clerks do you have?

ANSWER: There are three civil clerks.

QUESTION 35. The proposal format begins on p. 6 of the RFP. In what section of the response do you want vendors to include the information requested on pages 26-88?

ANSWER: See page 10, paragraph 17, Deliverables.

There are no other changes to the original specifications other than what is addressed by Addendum 3.