ADDENDUM NO. THREE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RMS AND CAD SOFTWARE REPLACEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT NO. 101-26

CITY OF THORNTON, CO

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: January 28, 2026

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. All answers from Thornton in response to Vendor submitted questions have been provided below.

Question No. 1: We do not see a cooperative purchasing vehicle identified in the RFP materials. Can the City please confirm whether this procurement will be awarded solely under this RFP and the terms to be finalized following award, or if the City anticipates utilizing an existing cooperative contract (e.g., OMNIA, Sourcewell) for any resulting award? If the City elects to use a cooperative purchasing contract (e.g., OMNIA, Sourcewell) for this procurement, can you please confirm whether the terms and conditions of that cooperative contract may serve as the primary governing terms for any resulting award, with the understanding that any non-waivable State statutes and mandatory State terms would still be incorporated as required by law?

Answer No. 1: Thornton intends on awarding solely off of this RFP, with the finalized set of terms and conditions being completed using Thornton's sample Technology Master Service Agreement ("MSA") as the central set of agreement terms and conditions for the final agreement.

Question No. 2: Could Thornton please confirm that vendor redlines are acceptable for the City of Thornton's sample agreement (Appendix Number 5 - Technology Master Service Agreement) as noted in Section E.6.6 and F.1?

Answer No. 2: Proposing Vendors may submit redlines to Thornton's sample Technology MSA document as part of their proposal. Proposing Vendors are to note that should the Vendor have additional terms and conditions documents that may be requested to incorporate into a final agreement (see Appendix No. 2 – Proposal

Questions, Question No. II.E.1 – Vendor Agreements or Additional Terms and Conditions), then the proposing Vendor must include those as part of their final submittal for Thornton's review. The proposing Vendor should expect Thornton's Legal Department to review those additional documents as part of a contracting process, which may include redlines to the Vendor's documents. Thornton's standard process is to incorporate any acceptable Vendor terms and conditions documents (e.g., EULA, SLA, privacy policy, etc.) into a final Thornton Technology MSA as Exhibits A-1 – A-(#).

Should the proposing Vendor receive an Intent to Award for their proposal, that award shall be contingent upon a final agreement being reached by Thornton and the proposing Vendor.

Question No. 3: Does Thornton currently have an enterprise ESRI license? If so, what is the version of ESRI that Thornton is currently on for their public safety teams?

Answer No. 3: Thornton has an Enterprise ESRI License. ARCPro 3.4.5 desktop, ARCGIS Server 11.4.

Question No. 4: The RFP indicates that vendors can submit proposals for both CAD and RMS, or for each part individually (CAD or RMS). If a vendor submits both CAD and RMS but is only eligible for one of the two, will they still be considered for the part they are eligible for?

Answer No. 4: Thornton has set the award process for this RFP to be based on an award per group. Proposing Vendors will be evaluated on the group they propose and Thornton's intent is to award this RFP based on the best operationally and financially prudent value to Thornton.

Please refer to Section B.3 – Thornton Groups for Vendors to Propose on for additional information on these groups.

Question No. 5: Does the City use a cloud provider, and if so, who?

Answer No. 5: Thornton does not have a preferred cloud provider for the Vendor to host the data (e.g., Azure vs. AWS vs. RedHat vs. etc.). As the proposing Vendor, please state which cloud provider you may use for the hosting and storage of Thornton's data.

Question No. 6: Does the City of Thornton want the vendor to conduct the training for all CAD and RMS personnel or to utilize the "train the trainer format"?

Answer No. 6: Thornton expects there to be training provided by the Vendor in at least some capacity. Proposing Vendors should be detailed in their response to Proposal Questions asked by Thornton.

Question No. 7: Does the City of Thornton use iPad, iPhone, and android devices? If so, how many devices for Police, Dispatch, and Fire, with amounts broken out by each Department?

Answer No. 7: <u>Fire Response</u>: Fire uses IPads, IPhones and android phones. Only I-Pads are connected to CAD with currently thirty (30) in use. We have approximately two hundred (200) phones between personnel and city that are set up to receive text pages from CAD. The rest of the device use does not connect to CAD in any way. They are used for third party applications and software.

<u>Police Response</u>: All police officers have a city provided phone and should have the ability to write citations. They are not all on shift at the same time and some may never write a citation but should have the ability if needed. They do not use these devices for RMS or CAD editing purposes.

Question No. 8: What is the active sworn count for Police, Dispatch, and Fire Departments?

Answer No. 8: For Police and Dispatch – This has already been answered in a previous addendum that was published as Dispatch is included within the Police Department.

For the Fire Department, there are one hundred and seventy-five (175) sworn and ten (10) non-sworn personnel.

Question No. 9: For the CAD and RMS interfaces, Thornton has listed a few within the RFP and RTM documents. Please elaborate on the following:

- For each CAD interface, what is the:
    - Vendor name;
    - Software version;
    - Direction (inbound, outbound, or bi-directional) flow of data; and
    - Desired functionality.

- For each RMS interface, what is the:
    - Vendor name;
    - Software version;
    - Direction (inbound, outbound, or bi-directional) flow of data; and
    - Desired functionality.

Answer No. 9: Thornton has provided the answers to this question in a supplemental Excel document that is under separate cover as part of this Addendum. The answers that Thornton has provided for this question are Thornton's best estimate of needs and proposing Vendors are to note that there may be additional items uncovered by Thornton and/or the awarded Vendor(s) during the Discovery and Planning phase of this Project in the future.

Question No. 10: RFP Appendix No. 2 mentions a minimum of two (2) tenants (testing and production). However, Requirement 1.A.03 in the RTM System Requirements tab references a test, production, backup, and training environment. How many environments would you like to have included in the solution?

Reference: RFP Appendix No. 2; RFP Appendix No. 1 – RTM (System Requirements Tab, Req ID 1.A.03).

Answer No. 10: Test, Development, and Production environments will be required. A data redundancy environment for production is desirable but not required and may not be adopted by Thornton should it exceed project costs.

Question No. 11: The RTM provides specific dropdown choices for "Requirement Compliance" (e.g., Out-of-the-Box, With Configurations, etc.). In cases where the vendor may need to call out specific exclusions to a requirement, or explain how their products may "partially or mostly meet" the specification as written, which "Requirement Compliance" selection should be used?

Reference: RFP Appendix No. 1 – RTM.

Answer No. 11: That will be dependent upon the Vendor's solution and how the Vendor best feels their solution matches that list of options from the drop-down menu. Thornton has also provided a cell titled "Vendor Explanation" for each requirement from the RTM for a proposing Vendor to further explain their solution.

Question No. 12: In Requirement 11.A.01, you ask about the potential ability to transfer warrants from a Municipal Court system into RMS. Would you like an interface included in the proposal? If so, can you describe the desired functionality and the warrants system vendor?

Reference: RFP Appendix No. 1 – RTM (RMS Tab, 11.A.01, Warrants Module).

Answer No. 12: Currently, we are seeking information on the potential ability to transfer warrants from a Municipal Court system into the RMS. Please include an optional interface in the proposal and describe their general approach and capabilities. The desired functionality would theoretically include electronic receipt and updating of warrant records, name, date of birth to the status management (new and quashed warrants), data validation, and auditing verification. The warrant software is FullCourt and the vendor is Neumo (formerly Avenu Insights).

Question No. 13: In your Mobile Functional Matrix Item 14.a.09, you are requesting that the Mobile solution "should have" an Incident Command solution that would support and integrate police, fire, and EMS. You also mention that your Fire Department uses Tablet Command. Would this replace the Tablet Command solution for the Fire Department? Can you please clarify?

Answer No. 13: Fire is not currently looking to replace Tablet Command. However, it would be nice to have an overall solution for large incidents that include ALL Thornton agencies on a single window.

Question No. 14: In your Mobile Functional Matrix Item 14.8, you are asking whether our Mobile solution "should have" a diagramming solution. Does your police department currently utilize one today and if so which one?

Answer No. 14: Yes, the TPD currently uses Faro. We would like to have a crash diagramming app within the mobile application. Our current application is not integrated with the RMS system.

Question No. 15: With regards to the RFP's Appendix No. 1 – RTM, are Group 1 proposers (RMS) required to complete the Mobile tab of the RTM to be considered for evaluation by Thornton?

Answer No. 15: Mobile would be for CAD connection and/or RMS field-based reporting if that option exists on your platform.

Whether it is an application or URL, Thornton will require the ability to modify RMS and CAD records via Mobile devices. If you are only providing CAD products, the Police RMS System client requirement would not apply.

Question No. 16: With regards to the RFP's Appendix No. 1 – RTM, for requirements categorized as "Must Have", it states that if even one "Must Have" requirement is not included, the project delivery could be considered a failure. If a vendor marks a requirement as "Future Release," "Out-of-the-Box," "With Configuration," or "With Custom Programming," will this still be considered as meeting the "Must Have" requirement?

Answer No. 16: Answering with one of these four (4) options may be considered by Thornton as having met the requirement. Thornton's intention is to review all proposal submission answers by a Vendor to the RTM.

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. THREE

_____
Andrew Miskell, CPPB   Date
Purchasing Manager