



Request for Proposals 2024-087

Record Management System

ADDENDUM No. 1

ISSUE DATE: June 6, 2024

Responding offerors on this project are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be made a part of the above named RFP document.

The following items add to, modify, and/or clarify the RFP documents and shall have the full force and effect of the original Documents. This Addendum shall be acknowledged by the Offeror in the RFP document.

A. Question/Answer Section

1. Question: RFP Reference: Integration with Superior (Sungard-OSSI) CAD System

Could Union County specify whether the RMS integration with the Superior CAD system should support synchronous real-time data updates for critical incident responses, such as live updates of incident and resource status, or are asynchronous batch updates during non-critical periods sufficient?

Answer: Asynchronous batch updates during non-critical periods are sufficient.

2. Question: RFP Reference: NFIRS and NERIS Compliance

A. Could Union County clarify if the RMS should be configured to automatically integrate updates and changes from NFIRS and NERIS as they are mandated? For instance, would the system need to automatically adapt to modifications in data reporting standards or procedural updates without manual intervention, ensuring compliance continuity?

Answer: It should be configured to automatically adapt to modification from NFIRS and/or NERIS.

B. What is Union County's preferred method for submitting data to NFIRS and NERIS? Are submissions expected to be automated directly from the RMS, processed through intermediary software, or entered manually? Are there particular security protocols, such as encryption standards or secure data transmission methods, that must be adhered to during the data submission process?

Answer: Typically, we've done quarterly submissions where once reports are reviewed, then we hit the submit button and it emails to the state, you can also select other persons to notify that a submission has been sent.

3. Question: Reference: Hosting Requirements for the RMS

Could Union County specify any particular data residency preferences or redundancy requirements for the hosted RMS? For example, are there stipulations regarding the physical location of data centers, such as within state boundaries, or specific redundancy protocols like multi-region data replication to ensure system resilience and data availability during emergencies?

Answer: We do not have any.

4. Question: RFP Reference: Custom Reporting Component

What specific key performance indicators (KPIs) or data points does Union County require in the custom reporting components of the RMS for EMS calls and other critical services? Are there particular metrics, such as response times, patient outcomes, or resource utilization rates, that need to be dynamically generated and visualized through the system?

Answer: Typical metrics would include response times and patient outcomes.

5. Question: RFP Reference: Third-party Integration for Scheduling and Personnel

Could Union County provide a comprehensive list of the third-party scheduling and personnel systems that the RMS is expected to integrate with? Are there preferred protocols or specific APIs, such as RESTful services or SOAP, that should be used for these integrations to ensure seamless data synchronization and interoperability?

Answer: The county uses Aladtec and IOPS360. Refer to section 6.2.7 item #6.

6. Question: RFP Reference: Data Analytics Capabilities

Does Union County require the incorporation of predictive analytics within the RMS data analytics capabilities? If so, what specific types of predictive outcomes are considered vital for enhancing operational efficiency, such as forecasting resource demands, predicting incident hotspots, or estimating response times based on historical data?

Answer: At a minimum, we would like the analytics to be able to forecast resource demands, predict incident hotspots and estimate response times based on historical data

7. Question: RFP Reference: Building Inspection Program

What are the required digital formats for on-site data capture in Union County's building inspection program? Specifically, does the county necessitate capabilities for capturing high-resolution images, HD video recordings, or audio annotations directly within the RMS, and how should these media be tagged and stored within the system to ensure easy retrieval and compliance with data management policies?

Answer: There are no required digital formats, we would like the ability to upload photos from inspections into the program.

8. Question: RFP Reference: Fire Hydrant Maintenance and Inspection

Could Union County detail the expected workflow for fire hydrant maintenance and inspection processes? Are there particular mobile capabilities that field personnel must have to efficiently log inspections, such as GPS tagging, real-time data entry, or access to hydrant repair histories and parts inventory directly from mobile devices

Answer: We have a separate piece for fire hydrant maintenance and inspection through Union County Water that does workflow for maintenance and inspection.

9. Question: RFP Reference: Historical Data Transfer

Could Union County provide details on the total volume of historical data that needs to be transferred to the new RMS in terms of gigabytes? What are the current data storage formats (such as CSV, XML, SQL databases) and are there specific requirements for data cleansing or transformation during the migration process?

Answer: We cannot provide the total volume of historical data. All of the departments are on stand-a-lone systems with the county paying for them all. All departments do not utilize the system to its full extent, while others do. We have been on ER for 5 years, so a minimum of the 5 years of data housed in ER. Incident reports, training, maintenance are critical elements of data that need to be transferred.

10. Question: RFP Reference: EMS Module Integration

For the integration of the EMS module with Union EMS, does the county require adherence to specific data exchange formats or communication standards? For instance, should the integration support HL7 for health data interoperability, or are there other protocols like FHIR or EDI that need to be implemented to facilitate seamless data synchronization between systems?

Answer: The integration should support HL7.

11. Question: RFP Reference: Customizable User Interface

Could Union County clarify the extent of customization required for the RMS user interface? Specifically, are there needs for theme skinning, layout modifications, or the creation of user-configurable dashboards that support drag-and-drop functionality? How critical is the ability for end-users to personalize their interaction with the system according to their specific roles and preferences?

Answer: We would like the ability to have configurable dashboard.

12. Question: RFP Reference: Real-time Data Exchange with CAD

In implementing real-time data exchange between the RMS and the CAD system, does Union County require built-in redundancy mechanisms, such as automatic failover to a backup server or data mirroring, to ensure system availability during downtimes? What specific failover strategies would the county prefer to maintain operational continuity?

Answer: Automatic failover to a backup server.

13. Question: RFP Reference: Reporting and Analytics

A. Could Union County specify which external systems the RMS should be capable of exporting reports and analytics to? Are there particular municipal or state systems, such as emergency management databases or public safety networks, that require direct integration for data sharing?

Answer: We do need to be able to submit incident reports to NC OSFM.

B. Are there preferred formats or protocols for these data exports, such as XML feeds, API integrations, or automated email reports?

Answer: No

14. Question: RFP Reference: System Scalability?

As Union County anticipates growth, what are the essential scalability features for the RMS? Could you outline the expected increase in data volumes and user numbers, and specify whether capabilities like cloud-based scaling, modular architecture, or load balancing are required to manage this growth efficiently?

Answer: Refer to Section 5.9 Maintenance of the RFP.

15. Question: RFP Reference: User Access and Security

Could Union County provide specifics on the various levels of user access needed for the RMS, especially regarding external partners or agencies? For instance, are there particular roles or permissions that need to be established for collaborators outside the immediate emergency services, such as municipal authorities or neighboring response units, to access or contribute to system data?

Answer: For example, Administrators, Officers, Training Staff, Firefighters/EMT's. Neighboring response units for sending incident information to the initial responding department.

16. Question: RFP Reference: Long-term Data Archiving

A. What specific requirements does Union County have for long-term data archiving within the RMS? Are there preferences regarding the use of cloud-based versus physical data storage solutions?

Answer: We would prefer to utilize cloud-based storage. Refer to Section 5.1 Methodology / Operations item #6.

B. Could the county clarify if there are regulatory compliance needs or data retention periods that should be considered when implementing these archiving solutions?

Answer: We follow the State of North Carolina retention schedule.

17. Question: RFP Reference: Access Control and Security Features

Could Union County specify the detailed access control and security features required for the RMS to safeguard data integrity and confidentiality? For instance, does the county require multi-factor authentication, role-based access controls, data encryption at rest and in transit, or audit trails for user actions? Are there specific compliance standards, such as HIPAA for medical information or CJIS for criminal justice information, that the RMS must adhere to?

Answer: Role-based access controls. HIPAA compliance is required.

18. Question: RFP 2024-087 section 5.10 EMS states that "the RMS shall integrate with RMS (ESO) solutions". The ESO website indicates they currently provide RMS services. What additional services is RFP 2024-087 expected to deliver? Is the intent of the RFP to replace the services ESO is currently providing?

Answer: It is the intent of the RFP to replace the services ESO is currently providing.

19. **Question:** The RFP indicates 10 code enforcement officers. Will the contracted other (17) departments also be considered users?

Answer: Between the City of Monroe and Union County, there are 10 persons in the Fire Marshal's Offices. All other contracted fire departments and the City of Monroe Fire Department will be considered users.

20. **Question:** Does the County require operations teams to conduct engine company inspections and/or code enforcement?

Answer: Union County Fire Marshal's Office provides code enforcement for all of Union County with the exception of the City of Monroe and the Town of Waxhaw. The City of Monroe Fire Department Fire Marshal's Division does code enforcement inside the City of Monroe, Monroe Fire Department does have a company inspection program as well.

21. **Question:** Section 5.11 Modules not covered. Payroll is mentioned. Is the county searching for a payroll solution as well or just a Personnel Time Management module that could be integrated to a payroll solution?

Answer: Each department has a 3rd party vendor for payroll.

22. **Question:** What level of EMS do your agencies provide? How many annual ePCRs?

Answer: All departments provide BLS level of EMS care. 14,831 total EMS calls for 2023. Not every call is a ePCR completed. We do not have a total number for that.

23. **Question:** Who is your current RMS ePCR provider?

Answer: ESO

24. **Question:** Will you need an integration with a cardiac monitor? If so, which one?

Answer: No

25. **Question:** Out of 974 employees how many are volunteers?

Answer: 464 volunteers

26. **Question:** Regarding requirement 5.5 – Supplies/Logistics: Please provide the total number of apparatus per department.

Answer: Allens Crossroads – 5, Bakers – 5, Beaver Lane – 7, Fairview – 3, Griffith Road – 4, Hemby Bridge – 7, Jackson – 10, Lanes Creek – 7, Mineral Springs – 6, New Salem – 14, Stack Road – 3, Stallings – 5, Unionville – 12, Waxhaw – 12, Wesley Chapel – 16, Wingate – 9, Monroe – 11, Sandy Ridge – 7.

27. **Question:** Regarding requirement 5.10 – EMS: Do the departments need/want a full NEMSIS-compliant documentation tool?

Answer: Yes

a. Does this apply to all departments?

Answer: Yes

b. If not, please identify which departments require a NEMSIS-compliant solution.

Answer: All Department

28. **Question:** Except for Inspections, which are identified in the RFP, will each fire department have the same configuration? This includes integrations and modules.

a. Or, can the system be configured to the individual needs of each department?

Answer: All departments need to have the same configuration.

29. **Question:** Is the vendor required to be on site for any portion of the contract term? Section 5.2 Reporting Is OSSI/Onesolution CAD Central Square's CAL solution?

Answer: We would expect the vendor to be on-site for some training as well as offer virtual training. That is correct on the CAD.

30. **Question:** Regarding the Cost Proposal, line item 6 requests “Cost of integration for third-party software vendors such as Target Solutions, IOPS 360, ADP Payroll, Paychecks Payroll, Aladtec Scheduling Software.” Typically this cost is dependent on the size of the department, its needs, and the vendor. Would the County prefer a single API integration cost, regardless of the department or third-party vendor? Or would you prefer variable costs based on department size, etc.?

Answer: We would prefer a single API integration cost.

End of Addendum No. 1