Addendum # 3
RFP # 16-15AA
Public Safety Records Management System

1) Responses to the questions submitted after the Pre-proposal Conference held on August 12, 2016 are attached.

2) PLEASE NOTE – the System Requirements Excel spreadsheet has been updated and is available on the City website.

Please acknowledge this Addendum by submitting a copy of this page of the Addendum with your proposal.

Posted: August 29, 2016
ADDENDUM 3

Responses to Questions Submitted After the Pre-Proposal Conference

1. Would the City please clarify the total number of agencies that will be running off of this RMS system?
   As discussed in the preconference meeting, this number is unknown.
   a. Would the City please clarify how many mobiles will be needed per agency (please list the agency and the number of mobiles)?
      We do not know the total number at this time. Please provide range based pricing in accordance with your pricing model.
      EXAMPLE:
      0-50
      51-200
   b. Would the City please clarify the number of employees and the number of sworn officers per agency?
      Same as above. This number is unknown. Please provide range based pricing in accordance with your pricing model.
   c. Would the City please list the in car printers currently being used by each agency (make/model)?
      Brother Pentax Pocket Jet Six/Three
   d. Would the City please list the driver’s license scanners currently being used by each agency (make/model)?
      Magtek Swipe reader-magnetic card reader Part #21040102

2. Would the City be willing to accept a server/premise-based system?
   Yes
   a. Does the City require virtualization?
      Yes
   b. Does the City require warm standby servers to be quoted for redundancy?
      No, as long as solution has virtual redundant capabilities

3. Would the City describe the integration which it needs to have with the Department of Vehicle Services to satisfy General requirement 134?
   The ideal solution would have the ability to integrate directly via BCA security requirements with the Department of Vehicle Services system for inquiry purposes directly from the records management solution.

4. Would the City describe the integration which it needs to have with NEMESIS Shield to satisfy General requirement 137? Will integration be needed with the RMS of each member of NEMESIS, regardless of the particular RMS which that agency may decide to use?
   The ideal solution would have the ability to integrate directly via BCA security requirements with Nemesis Shield for inquiry purposes directly from the records management solution.

5. Would the City describe the integration which it needs to have with NEMESIS JMS to satisfy General requirement 138? Will integration be needed with the JMS of each member of NEMESIS, regardless of the particular JMS which that agency may decide to use?
The ideal solution would have the ability to integrate directly via BCA security requirements with Nemesis JMS for inquiry purposes directly from the records management solution.

6. Seeing that the City has not included the JMS in this project, and General requirement 140 is dependent on the JMS, would the City please describe how this requirement is to be met?
   The MN Department of Corrections operates a MN Statewide Supervision System, which is an independent web-based application that we would like to query from within the records management solution.

7. Would the City describe the integration which it needs to have with SLC Jail Authority to Detail to satisfy General requirement 159?
   *Correction: SLC Jail Authority to Detain Form
   This form should be included and accessible via the RMS and field based mobile solutions.

8. Would the City list the video systems and the types of integration which will be needed with them to satisfy General requirement 166?
   a. Ocularis - City wide camera system
   b. Taser - Body camera
   c. L3 - In car
   d. I-Record - Interview rooms

9. Would the City consider a Crime Analysis solution other than BAIR which provides the functionality listed on the Crime Analysis tab?
   Yes

10. Would the agency consider replacing TicketWriter with a vendor-supplied and integrated eCitations solution to satisfy Additional Functionality requirements 6 through 19?
     Yes - Dependent upon additional costs necessary for licensing or hardware.

11. Would the agency detail the information which would be passed to or received from the EFS system from Records to satisfy Warrants requirement 61?
     The ability to interface is not available yet - we are eagerly awaiting the courts to let us know when that feature would be available.

12. Would the City describe how the PD plans to use the Civil module? Will that module be used directly by the PD, or will the PD only need access to Civil to retrieve civil process information from other agencies on the system?
     PD use of the civil module will be for inquiry only. However, if counties become agency partners, they would actively input and retrieve information.

13. Would the City describe its existing/legacy database, including the type and size?
     The Nemesis Shield database is on an Oracle platform and we have previously provided the database size information which includes all Nemesis Shield partners.

14. General Tab, Req 32: Please describe how the current RMS is "automatically" updated with MN CJRS/CRS changes.
     Through the MN defined reporting system set up with the BCA. Please contact the BCA if additional information is required.

15. General Tab, Req 158: Please indicate the current Pawn system and describe the desired exchange of data as it relates to the interface.
     MN Automated Pawn System is an independent web-based application that we would like to query from within the records management solution.
16. Dept. Training Tab: Does the current SHIELD RMS provide a training management module as well? If not, please indicate the current system in place
   No - LEA Database

17. Field Based Reporting Tab, Req 2: "[RMS Client] should be template driven with customization capabilities..." Please elaborate on what the City means by customization. The ability to develop and create custom forms that meet our Departments’ needs and are adaptable as our needs change.

18. Additional Functionality Tab: Given the City explained that some of the modules within the Additional Functionality tab are anticipatory since the City doesn't yet know which agencies will participate in this RMS, we request that the City clearly delineate which functions/modules within the Additional Functionality are mandatory versus desired. Because partner agencies are unknown at this time, we cannot specify requirements. Clearly define in each area what you have the capabilities to do, and whether a 3rd party application will be necessary to accomplish any item.

19. Additional Functionality Tab, Req 110: What is JLEC
   JLEC refers to a specific system used by another agency, and should not be referenced in this requirement. Please disregard the JLEC reference and indicate whether the system has the capability to set an alert based on tow activity entered.

20. Additional Functionality Tab, Req 115: To clarify, does the "Ability to flag gun permit holders in the MNI" require an interface between the MNI and RMS to be built? Gun permit data is supposed to go into a state and federal database. Duluth is unsure if an interface already exists.

21. For pricing purposes, please clearly list each system from which data conversion is required. Outlined in "Data Migration" tab, lines 1-6.

22. If the City doesn't yet know which agencies will participate in this RMS, we recommend the City outline a Most Likely, Likely, Not Likely scenario of aggregate #sworn/#concurrent users per agency involved to more easily compare various vendors' Price Proposals. The alternative of requesting vendors to list a pricing formula would make price comparisons more difficult for the City.
   As discussed in the preconference meeting, this number is unknown. Please provide range based pricing in accordance with your pricing model.
   EXAMPLE:
   0-50
   51-200