



LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RMS) REPLACEMENT

RFP 2023-03-CS

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Answers to Respondent Questions

1. We respectfully request a 2-week extension of the due date from July 14th to July 28th. The RFI from 2021 allowed 3 months to respond and this RFP is even larger than that as far as content and complexity.

South Sound 911 will not be extending the due date.

2. Please confirm that you would like proposals to be valid for a period of 180 days.

Proposals submitted shall remain valid for a period of 180 days from the due date.

3. What is the objective or takeaway participants should have as part of the Executive-level Overview?

The Executive level overview should provide a quick overview and key components for the Proposal.

4. Is it the desire to have each participating agency be able to provide their own workflows and rules, or will there be shared workflows across the board, administered by a single agency?

Yes, each participating agency will have agency-specific workflows. South Sound 911 plans to administer workflows and rules on behalf of each participating agency.

5. For the agencies that use the in-house evidence room, do they all share retention rules and configurations, or is the desire to have them be able to set their own based on their individual agency needs?

The desire is for each evidence room to set its own retention rules & configurations.

6. Please provide the vendor name for your Jail Management System(s).

The Jail Management System is a custom system written and maintained by Pierce County's Information Technology section.

7. Does SS911 plan to use SECTOR for primary citation and accident data collection, or does SS911 require agencies to write citations and accident reports within RMS? To elaborate on the question: does SS911 plan to use SECTOR for primary citation and accident data collection, or does SS911 require agencies to write citations and accident reports within RMS? If the latter, could you please provide state and/or local requirements.

All law enforcement agencies use and will continue to use the SECTOR eCitation application for issuing traffic tickets. An interface is required to receive a copy of those citations from SECTOR and upload them into RMS.

Some agencies currently use the SECTOR Crash application for preparing traffic collision reports; others use the existing RMS for preparing and submitting crash reports to WSP (SECTOR). No decision will be made about a strategy for writing collision reports going forward until South Sound 911 evaluates the crash reporting capabilities of each proposed RMS. In all scenarios, all crash reports must be submitted to WSP and all crash reports need to be included in RMS irrespective of the application used to write the original report. Contact information for technical specifications is at <https://www.waspc.org/sector-training-information>

8. What is the current functionality of the ACCESS Message switch in the incumbent records management system? Does this interact with the CAD message switch connection in any way?

The South Sound 911 RMS interacts with an ACCESS Message switch to transmit and retrieve responses to:

- *Warrant entries & edits from a form-based submission;*
- *Protection Order entries & edits from a form-based submission;*
- *National Instant Background Check System (NICS) entries & edits from a form-based submission;*
- *Automated and ad-hoc Concealed Pistol License background check queries from a workflow-based submission;*
- *Automated Pawn Article/Gun entries & edits from a workflow-based submission;*
- *Employee Background Check queries from a batch submission;*
- *Ad-hoc queries and edits of Stolen Property/Vehicles, Wanted Persons, Missing Persons, Recoveries, Vehicle Impounds, Driver Licenses, Criminal Histories, etc. from form-based and free-form submissions*

The RMS ACCESS message switch does not interact with the CAD ACCESS message switch in any way.

9. How many sworn officers do you have in total (not including civilian personnel)? Addendum 1 does list the sworn/civilian counts by agency. Please provide totals of total sworn members overall, and total number of sworn officers in the 20 South Sound 911 Consortium Member Agencies as a subset of the total sworn and civilian counts, and a further, non-combined breakdown of sworn vs. civilian.

Approximate number of RMS Users - Sworn and Civilian (totals may differ from those obtained by subtracting RFP table 4 from Corrected table of "Agency Size (Sworn and Civilian)" in RFP Addendum No. 1 dated June 14, 2023):

	Sworn	Civilian	Total
Bonney Lake PD	36	7	43
Buckley PD	10	5	15
Dupont PD	14	1	15
Eatonville PD	7	1	8
Fife PD	56	2	58
Fircrest PD	16	1	17
Gig Harbor PD	37	2	39
Lakewood PD	101	36	137
Milton PD	22	2	24
Orting PD	11	1	12
Pierce County Sheriff	609	86	695
Pierce Transit	16	3	19
Puyallup PD	65	23	88
Roy PD	3	1	4
Ruston PD	12	2	14
South Sound 911	0	270	270
Steilacoom Public Safety	12	1	13
Sumner PD	32	3	35
Tacoma PD	356	74	430
Total	1,415	521	1,936

10. In the interface table (Section 3.1.A, Table 1) EvidenceOnQ is listed as a "consumer" interface (inbound to proposed RMS system), in the details of the interface in 14.1 it is listed as a bi-directional. Please clarify if EvidenceOnQ is to be an inbound or bi-directional interface.

The interface is best categorized as bi-directional; however, some proposers may consider the actual interface to only be uni-directional (consume) given that the other requirements is for the ability to query EvidenceOnQ from within the RMS environment. Other than the query function, the only function of the interface is to send evidence intake information from EvidenceOnQ to RMS.

11. For the 7 agencies using EvidenceOnQ, are they true separate instances of the system, thus needing 7 different interfaces or will a singular interface suffice, with separation of agencies by way of agency identification/names?

There are seven separate instances of EvidenceOnQ used by seven different law enforcement agencies. Depending on the method employed for exchanging data (e.g., file transfers), it is conceivable that a single interface could be used to support all seven systems. That is a detail that needs to be discussed with FileOnQ, the EvidenceOnQ vendor.

12. Table 5 of the RFP, South Sound 911 RMS Interfaces, includes the interface "Washington State Sheriff's Association". Is this interface the same as the WASPC Sex Crime Case Repository and WASPC Statement Jail Booking and Reporting system listed in Appendix D?

The Table 5 interface of "Washington State Sheriff's Association" is the same as the "WASPC Sex Crime Case Repository" listed in Appendix D.

13. Table 5 of the RFP, South Sound 911 RMS Interfaces, includes the interface "Fuel Management System." However, that interface is not listed in Appendix D or Exhibit C. Is this interface required?

A Fuel Management System interface is not required.

14. RFP Section 7.1.b states "If the Proposer takes exception to any Proposal language, specification, or requirement, they must include an explanation as to why they took that exception." Does that include marking any requirement in the Appendices as "Cannot Comply" or "Does Not Comply"? Are explanations required for those response codes?

Refer to Section 7.1 #6a. Any exception to the Proposal language, specification, or requirement must explain why the Proposer is taking exception. For the Appendices, the following alternatives are offered:

- *Partially Complies: A comment is required to identify the alternate solution proposed to indicate how the alternate benefits South Sound 911 over what was requested in the specification.*
- *Alternate: A comment is required to identify the discrepancy between the specification and the Proposer's solution.*
- *Does Not Comply/Cannot Comply: A comment is required to explain the reason the Proposer's is not offering the specified feature or deliverable.*

15. Should both 7.3 and 7.4 be answered under SECTION 3 - Corporate Information?

Yes, both Section 7.3 - Corporate Information and Section 7.4 - Proof of Experience should be answered in the Proposal section identified as "Corporate Information" per Section 7.1 #4.

16. Which of the 12 sections should the questions in Section 7.4 Proof of Experience on page 37 of the RFP belong to (if at all)? It is not specified in the instructions on page 33 of the RFP but reads as if it needs to be included.

The reference to 7.1 in Section 7.4 #3 is intended to convey the need for Proof of Experience to encompass the project's overall scope for the Proposer's experience. The relationship to the 12 sections is the content/information requested in each section.

In short, Proposers shall include with their Proposal a list of all comparable implementations and locations where the system, including the software elements being solicited in this RFP, has been in use, the number of years in use, the software and various modules in use and any other pertinent data to demonstrate the deployment serves as an acceptable comparable reference location.

17. Please confirm 2 or 3 references for 7.5 Client References: #1. Each Proposer is to provide three (2) references for projects that meet the following criteria...

Section 7.5 #1 correctly reflects that three (3) references meeting the criteria are required.

18. Should Section 7.5 be labeled as Mandatory Forms, or as Client References?

The title for Section 7.5 is "Client References". The reference in Section 7.1 #4 should be "Client References" instead of "Mandatory Forms". Use of either "Mandatory Forms" or "Client References" in identifying this section of a Proposal is acceptable. South Sound 911 has reserved the right to waive minor deviations or irregularities such as this.

19. In the "South Sound 911 RFP 2023-03-CS Exhibit A Functional Requirements Workbook" tab "Case Management", several spec IDs refer to tracking and calculating solvability. Is this functionality currently provided within South Sound's solution? If so, can you provide the process and workflow for quantifying solvability?

South Sound 911's RMS does not quantify solvability. Solvability factors such as crime type, offenders, and dollar amount of property are displayed for interpretation by Investigation Supervisors.

20. In the "South Sound 911 RFP 2023-03-CS Exhibit A Functional Requirements Workbook" tab "General", Lgen-1, "The system provides the ability for users to validate that local business rules have been completed or applied." Can you please provide context for this requirement? What are the local business rules?

The context for validating that local business rules are satisfied (completed or applied) is at or prior to the user submitting their report.

Local business rules must be satisfied (completed or applied) in order for a report to be valid. The RMS prevents submission of invalid reports. The report form displays instructions for correcting validation errors and assists the reporting user in navigating to the fields requiring correction.

Local business rules refer to non-IBRS reporting standards such as "South Sound 911-added field X is required", "when field X selected value is 'Other', then field 'Other Description' becomes visible and is required", "when field X has any value, then field Y is required".

21. In the "South Sound 911 RFP 2023-03-CS Exhibit A Functional Requirements Workbook" tab "Collisions", do any of the South Sound 911 agencies use a 3rd party accident application? Is SECTOR the accident application?

Agencies that do not use the South Sound 911 RMS for accident reporting use the SECTOR program, which is effectively a 3rd-party accident application. The South Sound 911 RMS transmits accident reports written in the RMS to the SECTOR program via the Washington State JINDEX message switch.

22. In the "South Sound 911 RFP 2023-03-CS Exhibit A Functional Requirements Workbook" tab "Case Management", Lcmgt-67 and Lcmgt-68, how many individuals will be responsible for providing electronic case files to the judicial partners?

Supervisors, Investigators and Records users have a responsibility to initiate a workflow that causes delivery of electronic case files to judicial partners. There are, in total, about 375 Supervisors, Investigators, and Records users in the South Sound 911 RMS.

All agency workflows for Arrest Reports have a responsibility to cause delivery of electronic case files to judicial partners with a programmable API to their prosecution management system, and notification of intended distribution to judicial partners that do not have a programmable API.

23. Appendix D - Interfaces - CityProtect, Section 10: How many agencies are currently using CityProtect? Are additional agencies planning the use City Protect in the future?

Only Lakewood Police incidents are transmitted to CityProtect. No other agencies have provided South Sound 911 with plans to use CityProtect services.

24. Appendix D, Sections 21, 22, and 32 are listed as Optional, but the first sentence of each section indicates "Responses to these requirements are not considered in the evaluation of Proposals." This statement is generally found on Informational interfaces. Are these interfaces Optional or Informational? They are listed as Optional in Exhibit C Cost Proposal Workbook.

South Sound 911 is seeking optional pricing for these interfaces. Vendor responses to these interface specifications are not being factored into the evaluation of the Proposals.

Formatting

25. In reference to Section 2.5 Proposal Submittal (page 7 and 8) of the RFP, are we able to choose whether to select EITHER a Hardcopy or Email submission, or do we need to submit BOTH a Hardcopy and Email copy?

Please confirm the Agency no longer requires a hard copy submission.

Either an Email submission OR Hard Copy is sufficient. Proposers are not being asked to submit both. Electronic documents are preferred.

26. In Section 7.1 and 7.1.1 (page 33 and 34) of the RFP, it states that proposers should submit electronic copies of their response in PDF and native Excel format.

However, in Section 7.1.1, #3 (page 35) it states that proposals must be submitted in Word and Excel format.

Please confirm that ALL electronic documents can be submitted in PDF format, except for Exhibits A, B & C which will be in Excel format.

Proposers must add their responses directly into Microsoft Excel Exhibits A, B & C. Save and submit completed Exhibit A, B & C responses in both Microsoft Excel and Portable Document Format (PDF).

Save and submit completed Appendix A through E responses as PDF; submission of Appendix responses as Microsoft Word documents is optional.

27. Please confirm: I understand that the Cost Proposal can be provided to you as a separate Email submission and does NOT have to be printed and shipped in a separate sealed envelope. (per 7.1 General, #8).

Per 7.1 General #8, submit Exhibit C, Cost Proposal Workbook in a separate email or separately sealed envelope. Electronic file submissions must include both native Microsoft Excel and also Portable Document Format (PDF).

Either an Email submission OR Hard Copy is sufficient. Proposers are not being asked to submit both. Electronic documents are preferred.

28. Section 2.5 of the RFP indicates the proposal must be printable on 8 1/2 by 11 in. paper, including electronic copies. May attachments such as exhibits, charts, graphs, etc. exceed this page size limitation as needed for increased readability?

Attachments that do not print on 8 1/2 by 11-inch paper will not be accepted or considered.

29. RFP section 7.1.1, may headers and footers have information such as company name, RFP number, logos, and page numbers outside the 1-inch margins?

Yes, provided all content is visible when printed on 8 1/2 by 11-inch paper.

30. RFP section 7.1.1., may some text (such as image captions or section headers) be larger or smaller than the 11-point font requirement? Is the 11-point font requirement for body text only, or all text?

All substantive information, including text within tables created as part of the response, must meet the 11-point font requirement. See South Sound 911 response to question # 13 for exceptions.

31. Some of the Proposer Response and Comment sections of the Appendices are defaulted to 12-point font. Should that be reduced to 11-point font per RFP section 7.1.1, or can they be left at 12?

Proposer Response and Comment sections of Appendices that are defaulted as 12-point font can be left as 12-point font. South Sound 911 has reserved the right to waive minor deviations or irregularities such as this. In no case shall substantive Proposer response text be smaller than 11-point font.