

**ADDENDUM NO. TWO**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**TECHNOLOGY CONSULTANT FOR PUBLIC SAFETY**  
**PROJECT NO. 155-23**  
**CITY OF THORNTON, CO**

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: July 24, 2023

PURPOSE: To provide additional information and clarification to the solicitation documents for the above-referenced Project.

1. The following questions and answers are provided for additional clarification to the RFP.

Question 1: In Section B.2, can Thornton please clarify if the awarded Vendor from RFP # 155-23 will/will not be required to develop requirements or recommendations for the new RMS/CAD solution? Our understanding is that this would be optional/future work.

**Answer 1: This would be optional/future work to have the awarded Vendor from this RFP on for Scope of Work, including Vendor selection and implementation of a new system.**

**The awarded Vendor from this RFP would be required to develop requirements/recommendations for a new RMS/CAD solution if it was decided the TPD's current software/system was insufficient for our current and future needs.**

Question 2: Can Thornton please confirm that only tasks in Section B.3 are required and not the requirements listed in B.4 for pricing?

**Answer 2: Please refer to Section D.3 – Pricing.**

Question 3: In Section B.4, will the consultant selected for award from RFP # 155-23 be automatically awarded the next phase of the project (i.e., optional future tasks) or will the City be issuing a separate RFP for those tasks?

**Answer 3: The anticipation from Thornton is that, yes, the Vendor who is awarded from this RFP # 155-23 would be the same consultant who would assist Thornton with our potential pursuit of a new RMS and/or CAD system.**

Question 4: From Section # B.7, can Thornton please confirm whether every software product/system listed in appendix no. 1 is to be assessed with a comprehensive assessment report (total of approximately 85 systems)? Can the individual assessments be included as one comprehensive report or does Thornton require individual assessment reports?

**Answer 4: Thornton's would require an assessment report for each individual software/system tool with evaluation of each tool being assessed for functionality, capabilities, how Thornton is currently using it, and recommendations on if the TPD should continue to use it or if there is an overlap with other existing tools being used by Thornton.**

**A single comprehensive report will not be acceptable to Thornton.**

Question 5: In Section B.11 and within the Proposal Questions, Thornton mentions submissions of previous work done by the consultant for other clients. The other work done with other clients is confidential and may contain sensitive documents that are not appropriate for release as public records. Can a Vendor mark these as confidential?

**Answer 5: Yes, please mark all items that require it as confidential.**

Question 6: From Proposal Question # C.2.b, does Thornton want the responsibilities for the project team roles for the immediate scope of work, the potential future scope of work, or both?

**Answer 6: Thornton is seeking the roles, responsibilities, and estimated hours for each Thornton individual that the Vendor recommends for this project based on the listed Scope of Work.**

Question 7: From Proposal Question C.2.c, can Thornton expand on whether the estimated hours should be listed for each team member of the Thornton Project team that we are suggesting, or if you would prefer an overall total bank of estimated hours?

**Answer 7: Please refer to answer # 6.**

Question 8: Can Thornton please clarify what "implementation" means in Proposal Question # C.2.c?

**Answer 8: The term "implementation" for this project may not align with the standard thought of implementation of software. The term "implementation" for this project (RFP No. 155-23) refers to your firm's execution of the Scope of Work and the completion of the project.**

Question 9: From Proposal Question # C.3.a, can Thornton clarify what it means by implementation? Also, are the Vendors to assume that contract negotiations have already been completed or are contract negotiations part of the implementation?

**Answer 9: Please refer to answer # 8 for implementation definition. The contract negotiations will have been completed prior to any project's success and acceptance criteria.**

Question 10: From Proposal Question # C.3.a, can Thornton clarify if it wants to know how a consultant would determine if the immediate project is successful or if a potential (technology) future project is successful, or something else?

**Answer 10: This refers to the immediate project Scope of Work only and does not include any potential/future technology.**

Question 11: From Proposal Question # E.1, can Thornton provide any guidance regarding how assertive the proposed project schedule should be? There are many factors on Thornton's end that are unknown, including bandwidth of City SME personnel, "normal" operating conditions, availability of required information, black-out dates, etc.

**Answer 11: Vendors are to use their best judgement on what a realistic project schedule should be for this project based on the Scope of Work listed within this RFP and the abilities of the Vendor, along with their answers provided to the Proposal Questions.**

Question 12: From Proposal Question # E.2, can Thornton please clarify what it means by "implementation" for all proposed milestones? Does this refer to the immediate scope of work or a future software implementation?

**Answer 12: Please refer to answer # 10.**

Question 13: From Proposal Question # E.2.a.vi.1, Thornton has a proposed milestone/deliverable of "Providing alternative systems recommendations for a new RMS and/or CAD system". System recommendations are typically provided following finalization of user requirements and RMS/CAD product demos are typically conducted by short-listed Vendors as part of the procurement process, which are both listed under optional tasks in this RFP. This milestone seems to conflict with the project goal listed as # 4 of Section B.3. Can Thornton please clarify what their desired goal is from this proposed milestone?

**Answer 13: The awarded Vendor from this RFP shall be able to provide requirements/recommendations for a new RMS/CAD solution if it was decided the TPD's current software was insufficient. This**

process may include product/sales demonstrations from potential viable RMS/CAD Vendors. The awarded Vendor shall also provide a short list of which vendors they may think could accommodate the TPD's needs.

These demonstrations are separate from a more in-depth demonstration that would be required of a potential RMS/CAD Vendor, which would occur during that separate RFP process and would be considered as optional/future work from the Vendor who is awarded from this RFP. It would be optional/future work to have the awarded Vendor from this RFP on for in-depth demos, Q&A with possible Vendors, Scope of Work, Vendor selection and implementation of a new system.

The awarded Vendor should leave Thornton with a complete picture of where the TPD stands and what needs to be improved upon so Thornton could go to the next step of looking for and implementation if Thornton should need to go that route.

2. All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged except as provided by this Addendum. Proposing firms must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their Proposal.

***END OF ADDENDUM NO. TWO***

---

Megan deGrood, CPPB Purchasing Manager	Date
---	------