



miamidade.gov

**INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES**
111 NW 1ST Street • Suite 1300
Miami, Florida 33128 - 1974
Telephone: 305-375-5289
Fax: (305) 375-4407 or (305) 372-6128

**RFI
ADDENDUM NO. 1**

Date: February 9, 2015

To: ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS

Subject: RFI

SOCIAL SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This Addendum No. 1 becomes a part of Request for Information (RFI) entitled:
SOCIAL SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Q1. Which vendor provides the current CMS?

A1. Bowman Systems

Q2. Approximately when was the contract executed?

A2. The contract was executed on September 17, 2008.

Q3. How will the Department acquire the CMS?

A.3. Through an open competitive solicitation Process.

Q4 Estimated time frame in which the CMS will be acquired?

A4. We are currently unable to answer this question. We hope to be able to address it at the teleconference with vendors on Tuesday February 10th.

Q5. How will the Department fund the CMS effort?

A5. General / Federal Funding.

Q6. Estimated cost of the CMS effort?

A6. This is something we are hoping to ascertain through this RFI.

Q7. Technical contact / project manager for the CMS effort?

A7 Jay Alvarez de la Campa





miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade County

Dakota Thompson

Dakota Thompson
Procurement Contracting Officer 2
Procurement Management Services
Internal Services Department



- Q1.** Sec 2.3, pg. 7, West Lot CPCC - Will all 4 garage locations still maintain a remote parking office with equipment listed on General Notes in addition to the CPCC?
A.
- Q2.** Does the county have the intention to use the remote parking offices' equipment for back up operation in case of communication failure between the garage and CPCC?
A.
- Q3.** Sec. 2.4.1, #15, pg.9 - Will the after-hours remote location (Stephen P. Clarke Center) require complete equipment monitoring and control in addition to video and audio feeds?
A.
- Q.4** Sec 2.4.1, pg.10, #24 - Is it acceptable to have the solution devices programmed remotely through the central system instead of the detachable control unit for local programming?
A.
- Q5.** Sec 2.3, pg.8, #f - How many CCTV images per monitor is acceptable by the County? Is there any monitor size requirements?
A.
- Q6.** How many attendants will be utilizing monitors for the two way video? And how many cameras in the CPCC will be required for 2 way video communication?
A.
- Q.7** Sec 2.3, pg. 8, #f - Is the two-way video intended to present the parking attendant's image to the patron, or it's only necessary to have patron's image being streamed to CPCC's attendant?
A.
- Q.8** Will the county consider a complete replacement of the West Lot Garage equipment if it provides a better seamless solution?
A.
- Q.9** Sec 2.7c, pg.13 - Does the county requires full functionality for both parking systems being executed under one unique dashboard / console, or it's acceptable to have two separate consoles?
A.
- Q10.** As each vendor's solution offers different features, what are the functionalities the County requires for an interoperable solution in line to avoid any PCI violation?
A.

- Q11.** Sec 2.4, Is the exit device (Pay in lane) intent to accept payments via credit cards only, or does it have to accept cash and coins as well?
- A.**
- Q12.** Sec 2.4.1, #10-ix, pg. 9 – Please describe how does the county want to apply the discount (no fee) for transient parkers using disabled spaces?
- A.**
- Q13.** Does the County want to have an interface to automatically control the overhead doors?
- A.**
- Q14.** The General Notes calls for Facial Recognition cameras. What application the County is going to use and under which conditions the cameras will be utilized?
- A.**
- Q15.** Is there a requirement for lane UPS?
- A.**
- Q16.** Is the existing parking system’s intercom also to be fully integrated with the new solution?
- A.**
- Q17.** Does the new vendor have to install a two-way video communication on the existing parking equipment at West Lot?
- A.**
- Q18.** Per Section 2.4.1 “Following minimum requirements shall be provided within the proposed Solution”
“Solution software shall be interfaced with the existing Federal APD system in place within the West Lot Garage and Provide FUMD with transaction history and information.” Please note that this requirement is listed in additional locations within the RFP document particularly on page 13; section C. “West Lot Garage System interface Requirements.”
- Will an addendum to the RFP be issued that eliminates the need to interface to the existing Federal APD system?
- A.**
- Q19.** Will Miami-Dade County extend the bid date to April 23, 2013 instead of the current due date of April 9, 2013?
- A.**