

Public Safety System: CAD-RMS

Through the RFI phase of the procurement process, the City narrowed the list of potential CAD-RMS vendors to the following:

- Intergraph
- SunGard

Note: the City required that each vendor propose Firehouse to accommodate the functionality needed by the City's Fire Department.

Functional Lead and End-User Feedback

The Core Team requested input functional leads and end users of the current CAD-RMS applications. The tables below summarize the meetings that took place as well as the specific functionality reviewed:

Functionality Requirements Reviewed	Attendees (in addition to the Core Team)	Date
Fire		July 7, 2015
Queries / Non-functional	Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Jail	Sgt. Ken Thurman; CDT Chuck Beach; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Records	Jo Ann Osberg; Christy Davis; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Special Operations (SOG)	Lt. Mike Doerzaph; Trent Byrne; William Sullivan	July 7, 2015
Evidence	Sgt. Kim Groom; Maria Frausto-Lee; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Investigations	Sgt. Matt Thomas; Inv. Lorenza Hernandez; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Intelligence	Lt. Rick Robertson; Nancy Smith; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 7, 2015
Mobile	Sgt. Jack Pavlinec; Ofc. Doug Rashkow; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 8, 2015
CAD	Dan Wennmaker; Laurie Davis; Lt. Mike Doerzaph	July 8, 2015

Public Safety		
	SunGard	Intergraph
Overall	78.6	91.0
CAD	75.0	93.3
Evidence	82.5	95.0
Fire	80.0	92.5
Intelligence	82.0	87.0
Investigations	71.3	88.8
Jail	87.2	90.0
Mobile	74.0	92.2
Core	75.6	88.8
Records	75.0	91.7
SOG	81.0	93.6

In addition to requesting feedback on functional requirement responses, the City asked the functional leads and end users for feedback on technical requirements and software demonstrations.

Core Team Review

The Core Team conducted meetings to discuss the following items:

- Technical Requirements
- Project Management Methodologies
- Software Demonstrations
- Scalability
- Costs

The meetings took place as follows:

Material Reviewed	Date of Review
Technical Proposal	June 22, 2015
IT Functional Requirements	July 9, 2015
Project management Methodologies	July 9, 2015
Scalability	July 9, 2015
Software Demonstrations	July 9, 2015
Cost Proposal	July 10, 2015
Resume Review	July 10, 2015

The team also solicited feedback from vendor references and clients in separate conference calls and email communications.

Scoring

After conducting the review sessions noted above and soliciting feedback from vendor references, the Core Team score each proposal. The tables below summarize the final scores for each vendor in each scoring category.

Intergraph			
Criteria	Weight	Average Score (out of 100)	Weighted Score
Fit to Functional Requirements	18.75%	94.33	17.69
Fit to Technical Requirements	18.75%	95.33	17.88
Cost	18.75%	92.33	17.31
Software Demonstrations	18.75%	92.67	17.38
Scalability	10.00%	96.00	9.60
Project Management Methodology	10.00%	95.00	9.50
Vendor References	5.00%	94.00	4.70
Total	100.00%		94.05

SunGard			
Criteria	Weight	Average Score (out of 100)	Weighted Score
Fit to Functional Requirements	18.75%	80.00	15.00
Fit to Technical Requirements	18.75%	82.50	15.47
Cost	18.75%	80.00	15.00
Software Demonstrations	18.75%	80.00	15.00
Scalability	10.00%	82.50	8.25
Project Management Methodology	10.00%	77.50	7.75
Vendor References	5.00%	82.50	4.13
Total	100.00%		80.59

As a result of the scores noted above, the City selected Intergraph.