

# Memorandum



**Date:** December 1, 2021

Agenda Item No. 8(F)(4)

**To:** Honorable Chairman Jose "Pepe" Diaz  
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

**From:** Daniella Levine Cava  
Mayor

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Daniella Levine Cava".

**Subject:** Recommendation for Approval to Reject: Computer Aided Dispatch Solution

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners (Board) approve the rejection of all proposals received for *Solicitation No. RFP-00589, Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Solution* for the Information Technology Department (ITD) on behalf of Miami-Dade Fire Rescue (MDFR) and the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD). When the process for this procurement first began, available technology was very different and has developed rapidly over the course of the procurement. As a result, the scope of work originally advertised in the RFP has changed significantly, necessitating a new solicitation that reflects the updated scope to ensure fair and open competition for the project.

The County provides 911 services for the unincorporated areas of the County and over 30 municipalities. Computer aided dispatch software allows 911 dispatchers to prioritize calls received, properly route calls to all of the necessary agencies, and track and report on call details. In many cases, a single emergency call will require different agencies to respond to an incident with coordinated action.

On June 1, 2017, the County issued a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) to obtain proposals from qualified firms to provide a turnkey CAD Solution to replace the existing system in order to modernize the technology environment and provide enhanced functionality, such as text to 911 to meet the state-wide initiative, automatic vehicle location for closest unit dispatch, as well as other features designed to enhance situational awareness before arrival on-site, increase officer safety and decrease response times with improvements to public safety.

Six responses were received in response to the RFP, including one "No Bid" and one proposal that was deemed non-responsive by the County's Attorney's Office (Attachment 1). The evaluation process was highly technical and complex in nature, including extensive technical evaluation meetings and multiple system demonstrations that were five days in duration each. As a result of the RFP process, Intergraph Corporation dba Hexagon Safety & Infrastructure was deemed to be the highest ranked proposer by a significant margin.

However, rapid development in CAD technology over the course of the negotiation process resulted in significant changes to the scope originally advertised in the RFP to meet MDFR and MDPD's operational needs. Accordingly, the requirements for the CAD Solution no longer conformed to the competitively advertised RFP. As they have continued to review their departmental requirements, MDFR and MDPD recommend an updated solicitation to meet the County's current public safety needs. And on June 23, 2021 the Office of the Inspector General also released a memorandum recommending that the RFP be withdrawn due to scope changes, and a new solicitation with revised scope of work be issued to ensure fair and open competition (Attachment 2).

Therefore, the rejection of all proposals received in response to the solicitation is being recommended. The County's existing system was deployed in August 2005 and will continue to be utilized jointly by the Departments to ensure continuity of operations. The new solicitation is anticipated to be advertised during the spring of 2022.

**Scope**

The scope of this item would have been countywide in nature.

**Delegated Authority**

There is no delegated authority for this rejection.

**Fiscal Impact/Funding Source**

There is no fiscal impact to the County with the rejection of all proposals.

**Track Record/Monitor**

Sade Chaney of the Internal Services Department is the Procurement Contracting Manager.

**Vendor Recommended for Award**

None.

**Vendors Not Recommended for Award or Did Not Bid**

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Local Address</b>	<b>Reason for Not Recommending</b>
Intergraph Corporation dba Hexagon Safety & Infrastructure	No	Rejection of all proposals.
Infor Public Sector, Inc.	No	
Superion, LLC	No	
TriTech Software Systems, Inc.	No	
Motorola Solutions, Inc.	No	
MitiNet, Inc.	No	No Bid*

\*A "No Bid" means the vendor responded indicating that it will not be providing an offer.

**Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures**

- The two percent User Access Program provision would have applied.
- The Small Business Enterprise Selection Factor and Local Preference were included in the solicitation.
- The Living Wage would not have applied.

Attachments




\_\_\_\_\_  
JD Patterson  
Chief Public Safety Officer

# Memorandum



**Date:** September 27, 2017

**To:** Fred Simmons, Jr.  
Chief Negotiator  
Internal Services Department

**From:** Miguel A. Gonzalez  
Assistant County Attorney 

**Subject:** Request for Responsiveness Determination on RFP-0058 – Computer Aided Dispatch (the “Solicitation”)

I am in receipt of your memorandum dated August 31, 2017, in which you request a responsiveness determination as to five (5) proposals received in connection with the Solicitation. I have reviewed the memorandum and the accompanying materials, which include the solicitation document and the pertinent parts of each of the proposals in question: (1) Motorola Solutions (“Motorola”); (2) Superior; (3) Tri Tech Solutions (“Tri Tech”); (4) Infor Public Sector, Inc. (“Infor”); and (5) Intergraph Hexagon (“Intergraph”). If there are additional materials or facts that I should consider, please advise me as additional materials or facts may alter these responsiveness determinations.

## I. Motorola

You advise that Motorola included information in the proposal that is designated confidential and propriety, including its price. Motorola did not sign the “Acknowledgement of Waiver” section of the submittal form, which in brief pertains to the proposer’s acknowledgement that any requests for the confidential treatment are waived. Motorola signed other portions of the solicitation submittal form, including the section in which Motorola agreed that its proposal “will be considered a good faith commitment . . . to negotiate a contract with the County.”

The section that Motorola failed to sign, includes language that “**By submitting a proposal to this solicitation, you agree that all such materials may be considered to be public records. Proposer shall not submit any information in response to this Solicitation which the Proposer considers to be a trade secret, proprietary or confidential.**” (emphasis in original). That section includes additional language establishing that any proposer signing “knowingly and expressly waives all claims” of confidentiality.

Instead of signing that section of the Solicitation, Motorola took exception to this requirement and reiterated that “[f]unctional system descriptions and portions of [t]echnical solutions summary document are [c]onfidential and [p]roprietary.”

Consistent with prior opinions on this topic, Motorola's proposal is not responsive. Among other things, Motorola's marking of its price proposal form as confidential deprives the County of the requisite assurance that a contract would be entered into. *See Glatstein v. City of Miami*, 399 So. 2d 1005, 1007-08 (Fla. 3d DCA 1981). In addition, Motorola incorporates portions of its Functional Systems Descriptions and Technical Solutions Summary documents, over which Motorola reasserted confidentiality in the "Acknowledgement of Waiver" section and which contain material details of its proposal that the County must be able to evaluate, into other sections of the proposal. Allowing Motorola to cure these deviations is not permitted, as it would provide Motorola with an unfair competitive advantage and an opportunity, not shared by other proposers, to opt out of the procurement altogether after proposal opening. *See Liberty Cnty. v. Baxter's Asphalt & Concrete, Inc.*, 421 So. 2d 505, 507 (Fla. 1982); *Harry Pepper & Assocs, Inc. v. City of Cape Coral*, 352 So. 2d 1190, 1193 (Fla. 2d DCA 1977); *City of Opa-Locka v. Trustees of Plumbing Indus. Promotion Fund*, 193 So. 2d 29, 32 (Fla. 3d DCA 1966); *see also Comptroller Gen. Ltr. To Heads of Depts., Independent Establishments, Agencies and Others Concerned*, 38 Comp. Gen. 532, 536 (Comp. Gen. Feb. 5, 1959).

## **II. Superior, Infor, and Intergraph**

Superion, Infor, and Intergraph present substantially the same issue. Each of these firms claimed some form of confidentiality, but all signed the "Acknowledgment of Waiver" form. Under these circumstances, each of these proposals is responsive to the Solicitation and may be evaluated without regard to the request for the confidential treatment of portions of their submission.

The "Acknowledgement of Waiver" form is an unequivocal waiver of any confidentiality. That section of the Solicitation unambiguously informs proposers that (1) "all materials submitted as a part of, or in support of, the proposal will be available for public inspection after opening of the proposals and may be considered by the County or a selection committee in public"; (2) in accordance with the above-quoted language, in bold and underline, all materials "may be considered to be public records" and no information shall be provided that the proposer "considers to be a trade secret, proprietary or confidential"; and (3) if any proposer submits information that the proposer claims is "confidential, proprietary or trade secret," said proposer "knowingly and expressly waives all claims made that the [p]roposal, or any part thereof no matter how indicated, is confidential proprietary or a trade secret." By signing that section, the proposers specifically "authorize[ ] the County to release such information to the public for any reason."

Given the conclusive waiver of confidentiality, the proposals received from Superior, Infor, and Intergraph are responsive and may be evaluated in accordance with the County's regular process, without regard to any assertion of confidentiality. *See Cubic Transp. Sys., Inc. v. Miami-Dade Cnty.*, 899 So. 2d 453, 454 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005) (requiring the production of alleged trade secrets where the firm seeking the protection of the records "failed adequately to protect an alleged trade secrets claim from the effect of the Public Records Act"); *Sepero Corp. v. Fla. Dep't of Environ. Protection*, 839 So. 2d 781, 783 (Fla. 1st DCA 2003) (providing in a case concerning the protection of trade secrets that it is the policy of the State of Florida "that all state, county, and municipal records shall be open for inspection by any person").

### **III. Tri Tech**

Finally, you advise that Tri Tech signed the “Acknowledgement of Waiver.” Tri Tech, however, sought confidential treatment of its pricing and certain screenshots included within its proposal. For the same reasons set forth in Section II of this memorandum, Tri Tech waived confidentiality as to those matters. *See Cubic*, 899 So. 2d at 454; *Sepero*, 839 So. 2d at 783.

You also advise that Tri Tech requested that the County execute a Non-Disclosure Agreement (“NDA”) before providing references to the County. Tri Tech’s failure to provide references with its proposal is not a matter of responsiveness, rather it goes to the County’s ability to fully evaluate Tri Tech’s proposal and its ability to provide the services solicited. Specifically, the Competitive Selection Committee may account for the absence of the references in allocation the 100 points available under the “Technical Criteria” section of the Solicitation, in which the Competitive Selection Committee will consider Tri Tech’s “relevant experience and qualifications.”

The County, however, may not execute the requested NDA, as such an action would be inconsistent with the “Acknowledgement of Waiver” requested by the County, Florida’s government-in-the-sunshine laws, and would give Tri Tech an unfair competitive advantage that is not enjoyed by other respondents to the Solicitation.

### **IV. Conclusion**

For each of the reasons set forth above, the proposals received from Superion, Infor, Intergraph, and Tri Tech are responsive and may be evaluated in accordance with the terms of the Solicitation, notwithstanding any request for confidentiality. Motorola’s refusal to waive asserted confidentiality in its proposal, however, is fatal and renders its proposal not responsive.

If you have any questions about the foregoing, or if you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.




# Memorandum



Miami-Dade County Office of the Inspector General  
A State of Florida Commission on Law Enforcement Accredited Agency  
601 NW 1<sup>st</sup> Court ♦ South Tower, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor ♦ Miami, Florida 33136  
Phone: (305) 375-1946 ♦ Fax: (305) 579-2656  
Visit our website at: [www.miamidadelg.org](http://www.miamidadelg.org)

To: Alex Muñoz, Director, Internal Services Department  
Namita Uppal, Chief Procurement Officer

From: Felix Jimenez, Inspector General 

Date: June 23, 2021

Subject: OIG Assessment of the Procurement Process for a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Solution RFP-00589, IG Ref: 21-0005-O

---

At the request of the Internal Services Department's Chief Procurement Officer, the OIG has been reviewing the procurement history of the above-captioned RFP. OIG Contract Oversight staff has also had informal discussions with procurement and user department staff regarding the procurement process to date, operational needs, and possible go-forward options to procure a new CAD solution. Based on the materials reviewed and our understanding of the procurement options to move this project forward, attached please find an assessment prepared by OIG staff.

We appreciate ISD contacting the OIG to review and monitor this procurement. Regardless of what path ISD takes, the OIG will continue to monitor this procurement process.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Peter Liu at 305-519-6393 or [peter.liu@miamidade.gov](mailto:peter.liu@miamidade.gov) if you have any questions regarding this assessment.

Attachment





# Memorandum



Miami-Dade County Office of the Inspector General  
A State of Florida Commission on Law Enforcement Accredited Agency  
601 NW 1<sup>st</sup> Court ♦ South Tower, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor ♦ Miami, Florida 33136  
Phone: (305) 375-1946 ♦ Fax: (305) 579-2656  
Visit our website at: www.miamidadelg.org

To: Felix Jimenez, Inspector General

Via: Patra Liu, Deputy Inspector General 

From: Peter Liu, Contract Oversight Specialist 

Date: June 23, 2021

Subject: Review of the Procurement Process for a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Solution – RFP-00589; IG Ref. 21-0007-O

---

On May 3, 2021, the OIG was contacted by Namita Uppal, Chief Procurement Officer (CPO), regarding the stalled procurement for a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Solution pursuant to RFP-00589, which was initiated in 2017. The procurement process resulted in negotiations with Intergraph Corp dba Hexagon Corp (Intergraph), the top-ranked responsive proposer, that took two years to complete. Because the final negotiated scope exceeded that which was contained in the original RFP, the award would need to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) as a "Designated Purchase<sup>1</sup>." Consequently, the Mayor's draft memorandum to the BCC recommending award specifies a "Designated Purchase" requiring a two-thirds majority vote for approval.

The OIG was advised that a contributing factor for the increased scope was that the RFP specified implementation in a single-phase; however, during negotiations, Miami-Dade Fire Rescue determined that due to logistical issues and its operational needs, the system needed to be implemented in two-phases.

Subsequently, TriTech Software Systems (TriTech), the second ranked proposer, expressed concern over the negotiated scope because it significantly exceeded the original published scope in the RFP. TriTech suggested that the "fair" thing to do would be either issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) to the top two proposers or withdraw the current RFP and issue a new RFP with the expanded scope.

The CPO advised the OIG that ISD would be reviewing the process to determine the best course of action to address this situation and requested that the OIG review, monitor, or comment on the process. While the CPO stated that they (staff) would review the two options of issuing a BAFO or issuing a new RFP, the OIG recognizes that a proposed Recommendation to Award has been drafted and may also be

---

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 2-8.1(b)(3) *Procedures for purchases when competitive procedures are not practicable.*

considered for advancement to the BCC. As such, there appears to be three options for consideration.

- Option 1 To continue the current process and present the negotiated contract as a "Designated Purchase" for BCC approval.
- Option 2 To issue a BAFO with a revised scope include the enhancements. The BAFO could be limited to the top two proposers that made oral presentations or could be issued to all five proposers that submitted proposals. (This would include the one proposer who was deemed non-responsive.)
- Option 3 To withdraw RFP-00589 and to issue a new RFP.

ISD Procurement has made all its files on this procurement available to the OIG for review. Also reviewed was COE Investigative Report K19-36, which was closed on November 25, 2019. This report addressed an allegation that a key member from ITD may have improperly interfered in an on-going procurement raising the concern whether there was a violation of the County's "reverse-2-year-rule." The report concluded that "The evidence adduced did not show that [the individual] violated the 'reverse two-year rule.' Neither did the investigation show that [the individual] as seeking to exploit his official position in any way to benefit Motorola."

Moreover, ISD has also provided this Contract Oversight Specialist (COS) with its recently drafted procedures for the proposed BAFO—should ISD go with that option.

Below in the chronology for this procurement:

- 06/01/17 RFP-00589 issued for Computer Aided Dispatch Solution
- 08/11/17 Six proposals were received including one "no-bid." Of the five remaining proposals, one proposal (submitted by the incumbent provider, Motorola Solutions, Inc.) was determined to be non-responsive.
- 09/27/17 Competitive Selection Committee (CSC) Kick-off meeting. Evaluation and scoring of four remaining proposals. Top two proposals advance for oral presentations.
- 04/20/18 Oral presentations and product demonstrations begin
- 05/24/18 Oral presentations and product demonstrations end
- 07/09/18 CSC final scoring, as illustrated in the July 31, 2018 CSC Chairperson's Report is shown in the table on the following page



Post-Oral Presentations/Product Demonstrations						
Proposer	Technical Score	Selection Factor Score	Price Score	Local Certified VBE Pref.	Total Combined Score	Price/Cost Submitted
	(Max. 7600)	(Max. 760)	(Max. 400)	(Max. 380)	(Max. 9140)	
1. Intergraph/Hexagon Safety & Infrastructure	6099	0	295	0	6394	\$10,355,965
2. TriTech Software Systems	4735	0	277	0	5012	\$10,797,677

\* The scoring includes a 10% (of Technical Score) Selection Factor Score for Certified Small Business Enterprises and a 5% (of Technical Score) preference for Local Certified Veteran Business Enterprise for which neither the top two (2) proposers were eligible.

Negotiations with the top ranked firm, Intergraph, was authorized. Negotiations were conducted over a two (2) year period.

This COS notes that in the aforementioned COE Investigative Report, there were observations from some members of the negotiating team where they believed that another member of the negotiating team was attempting to undermine successful negotiations with the top-ranked proposer. Apparently, this situation was troubling enough that ISD felt it necessary to assign a co-negotiator (ISD's Chief Negotiator) to ensure the fairness of negotiations.

- 09/27/20 Mayor's draft memorandum recommending "Designated Purchase"
- 11/20/20 Letter from Llorente & Heckler, P.A. representing TriTech
- 12/09/20 Letter from Intergraph
- 05/03/21 OIG is contacted by CPO

Continued below is this COS's observation and comments based on a review of this procurement.<sup>2</sup>

- RFP-00589 was issued in June 1, 2017—four years ago—with a scope that has since been determined to be inadequate. The Mayor's draft memorandum recommending award, states:

<sup>2</sup> So as to not complicate this discussion about the procurement, operational issues relating to the current support system for the computer-aided dispatch function are not included in this memorandum.

Police, Fire and ITD, took additional time during the negotiation phase to ensure all the requirements within the functional matrix were included in the vendors scope of work, resulting in an elongated process. During the course of the negotiations, the County identified and requested additional functionality and services. As a result of the enhanced scope of work and the expressed need of the Fire department to acquire enhanced functionality as soon as possible, a two phased deployment plan was requested by the County for operational needs. This deviates from the approach original sought in the RFP, which requested a single implementation, and has resulted in a significant increase in the total project costs. In addition to the base product cost of approximately \$12,748,000, further additional analysis of technical and operational needs resulted in scope enhancements such as:

That memorandum continued to list the components of added enhancements not included in the original specifications as:

Enhancements	Amount
• Increased Software	\$3.8 million
• Increased and Enhanced Services	\$8.1 million
• Increased and Enhanced Maintenance and Support	\$8.9 million
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$20.1 million</u>

The total award amount would now be \$32,848,000, which represents a 258% increase over the base amount of \$12,748,000.

Regarding the options available to ISD, this COS offers the following observations:

- **Option 1** - To continue the current process and to present the negotiated contract as a "Designated Purchase" for BCC approval.
  - PROS
    - The evaluation, selection, and negotiation processes are already complete. The draft recommendation for a "Designated Purchase" is awaiting the Mayor's approval and signature for placement in the BCC approval process. BCC approval for award could be achieved in two months.
    - The significant difference in final scores between the two top ranked proposals, after Tier II oral presentations and product demonstrations, demonstrates that the CSC believed one product, that met most of the expectations, to be superior to the other which met only a few of the expectations.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The July 31, 2018 CSC Chairperson's Report provided information on the scorings for Tier I and Tier II. In that report, it is noted that after Tier II oral presentations, Intergraph's technical score increased by 189 points from 5,910 to 6,099. Conversely, Tri-Tech's technical score decreased by 771 points from 5,506 to 4,735 following Tier II oral presentations, thus widening the point gap between the two proposers.

- Intergraph – 6099 or 80% of a possible 7,600 points for the technical score. (According to the County's scoring guidelines, a score between 70-89% indicates that **most** of the expectations are met.)
- TriTech – 4735 or 62% of a possible 7,600 points for the technical score. (According to the County scoring guidelines, a score between 50-69% indicates that **few** of the expectations are demonstrated to be met.)
- Perceptions about undermining the negotiations were addressed by assigning a co-negotiator, Ms. Beth Goldsmith, ISD's Chief Negotiator, to the negotiating team.
- CONS
  - It has been four years since the RFP was originally issued with specifications that may have been state-of-the-art at the time but may be now outdated. It is unknown what advances in technology are now available. The County may be purchasing a system that could be soon obsolete or require upgrades sooner than anticipated.
  - Given the significantly enlarged scope of the resulting proposed contract award, the procurement process may be subject to criticism and allegations of unfairness in that the other proposers were not able to present a proposal based on a two-phase implementation approach including all the enhancements that were eventually incorporated into the negotiated agreement.
- **Option 2 – To issue a BAFO with a revised scope to include the enhancements.** This BAFO could be limited to the two top ranked proposers or all responsive proposers. It could also be issued to all responding proposers.

○ PROS

- This option would re-open the procurement to include the enhanced requirements as part of the required scope.
- Should all proposers be allowed to respond to the BAFO, this option may be perceived as providing fair and equal treatment to all proposers.
- Restricting the BAFO to the top two proposers should reduce the time required to evaluate the proposals; however, the full length of

time to evaluate the two BAFO responses will depend on the extent of the Tier II evaluations, how many proposers will be invited to make product demonstrations, and whether additional negotiations would be necessary.

- If the new specifications are considered “complete and up-to-date,” then the time required to negotiate the final contract should also be significantly reduced from the two years required for the current proposed agreement that included the necessary enhancements. This time savings from negotiations would also apply to Option 3 if that option were to be selected.
- Because the issuance of the BAFO would not require Board approval, there will be continuity of this procurement and the Cone of Silence remains in place.

○ CONS

- BAFOs are commonly used to request final prices and not material changes in scope.
- The material changes in scope would necessitate a full evaluation of BAFO responses, whether issued to the top two proposers or to all six original proposers.
  - The draft BAFO proposes a full evaluation and scoring process similar to that of an RFP; i.e., there would be Tier 1 and Tier 2 Evaluations.
  - In the current procurement, the evaluation process took approximately 10 months; there is no reason to believe that this evaluation would be any shorter.
  - It is unclear whether the evaluation would be performed by the same CSC or another group. If the BAFO alternative is intended to expedite a new evaluation process, then it would be necessary to have committee members with familiarity with the product and services to be acquired. The availability of the original members would need to be known.
- Due to the changes in scope from that which was originally contained in the RFP, this contract award would still need to be classified as a “Designated Purchase” requiring a two-thirds majority vote of the BCC.
  - The scope change in the BAFO would unfairly limit competition to those invited. There may be other proposers

that may have declined to submit a proposal based on the original scope in the advertised RFP. This would be an unknown.

- Technology improvements advance at a more rapid pace than this procurement process. Limiting the BAFO to in-house knowledge may deprive the County of industry advances.
  - Should the BCC not approve this award by the required two-thirds majority, the procurement would suffer another significant delay.
- Because the Cone of Silence remains in place, open and candid discussions concerning any perceived problems concerning this procurement between certain parties and county stakeholders may be impacted.
- **Option 3 - To withdraw RFP-00589 and issue a new RFP.**
    - PROS
      - MDPD and MDFR have already or are currently reviewing the revised specifications that would be included as part of the BAFO. There should be no additional delays in issuing a new RFP, i.e., the work is about the same.
      - ISD could provide an opportunity for an “Industry Day” to obtain feedback from potential vendors so that the County may learn the latest advances in technology and capabilities. Industry feedback on any proposed implementation would also be beneficial.
      - A new RFP provides an opportunity for inclusion of the Administration’s new community procurement requirements.

As previously depicted in the chart on page 3 of this memorandum, this RFP’s scoring criteria included a Selection Factor of 10% (of the technical score) for Certified Small Business Enterprises and a 5% preference (of the technical score) for Local Certified Veteran Business Enterprise, for which neither the top two proposers were eligible.

- A new RFP provides for full open and transparent competition based on a new set of specifications.
- A new RFP provides opportunity for additional vendors to consider submitting proposals.

- The resulting negotiated contract would be a regular contract awarded requiring only a simple majority vote of the BCC.
- CONS
  - Withdrawing RFP-00589 and starting over may provide another example of the County's indecisive or politically influenced procurement process, which may discourage vendors from submitting proposals to County requests.
  - Withdrawing RFP-00589 and issuing a new RFP will further delay implementation of a new CAD system, albeit the OIG notes that new specifications are already being developed that could be used in either a BAFO or a new RFP issuance. A new RFP process will necessitate complete Tier I and Tier II evaluations and subsequent negotiations with the top-ranked proposer.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

This COS has considered recent discussions, comments, and concerns expressed by the BCC regarding the withdrawal contract award recommendations, especially where there have been scope changes. In addition, the Administration has recently articulated several community goals that it wishes to be incorporated into new procurements.

As part of the OIG's responsibilities, "The Office shall have the power to report and/or recommend to the Board of County Commissioners whether a particular project, program, contract or transaction is or was necessary and, if deemed necessary, whether the method used for implementing the project or program is or was efficient both financially and operationally. Any review of a proposed project or program shall be performed in such a manner as to assist the Board of County Commissioners in determining whether the project or program is the most feasible solution to a particular need or problem." Section 2-1076(d)4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County. Further, Section 2-1076(d)8 includes "procurement process including, but not limited to, project design, [and the] establishment of bid specifications" as areas that the OIG is charged to oversee, inspect and review.

In consideration of all the foregoing, it is this COS's belief and opinion that in order to ensure fair open competition and to ensure that the County will obtain the best product for the safety and security of our community, that RFP-00589 be withdrawn and a new RFP be issued.

However, in making this recommendation, this COS would also suggest that ISD consider the following:

- Upon lifting of the Cone of Silence, staff should openly conduct market research by contacting firms that had responded to RFP-00589 to learn about their new products and advancements in technology.
- The inclusion of an Industry Day, wherein the vendor community would be invited to provide feedback on the proposed specifications contained in a draft RFP. This would be similar to that which was provided during the Automated Traffic Management System (ATMS) procurement.
- ITD, MDPD, and MDFR each should conduct thorough and comprehensive review of the scope of services to ensure that their needs and requirements will be met.
- That the RFP be issued for open competition and on an expedited basis, similar to the expedited re-procurement of the helicopters for MDFR.
- Due to the importance and urgency of this procurement, CSC members should be identified and appointed from the onset. CSC members and Negotiating Team members are encouraged to provide the time required to be able to complete the process in a timely manner.


Regardless of what approach is taken, this COS will continue to monitor this procurement and any subsequent iteration for a CAD system.



**MEMORANDUM**  
(Revised)

**TO:** Honorable Chairman Jose "Pepe" Diaz  
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

**DATE:** December 1, 2021

**FROM:**   
Gen Bonzon-Keenan  
County Attorney

**SUBJECT:** Agenda Item No. 8(F)(4)

Please note any items checked.

- "3-Day Rule" for committees applicable if raised
- 6 weeks required between first reading and public hearing
- 4 weeks notification to municipal officials required prior to public hearing
- Decreases revenues or increases expenditures without balancing budget
- Budget required
- Statement of fiscal impact required
- Statement of social equity required
- Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Mayor's report for public hearing
- No committee review
- Applicable legislation requires more than a majority vote (i.e., 2/3's present \_\_\_\_, 2/3 membership \_\_\_\_, 3/5's \_\_\_\_, unanimous \_\_\_\_, CDMP 7 vote requirement per 2-116.1(3)(h) or (4)(c) \_\_\_\_, CDMP 2/3 vote requirement per 2-116.1(3)(h) or (4)(c) \_\_\_\_, or CDMP 9 vote requirement per 2-116.1(4)(c)(2) \_\_\_\_ ) to approve
- Current information regarding funding source, index code and available balance, and available capacity (if debt is contemplated) required



Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Mayor  
Veto \_\_\_\_\_  
Override \_\_\_\_\_

Agenda Item No. 8(F)(4)  
12-1-21

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

RESOLUTION REJECTING ALL PROPOSALS RECEIVED IN  
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. RFP-00589  
FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH  
SOLUTION FOR THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
DEPARTMENT

**WHEREAS**, this Board desires to accomplish the purposes outlined in the accompanying memorandum, a copy of which is incorporated herein by reference,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**, that this Board rejects all proposals received in response to Request for Proposal No. RFP-00589 for the purchase of computer aided dispatch solution for the Information Technology Department. A copy of the solicitation document and the proposals received in response are on file with and available upon request from the Internal Services Department, Strategic Procurement Division.

The foregoing resolution was offered by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Jose "Pepe" Diaz, Chairman	
Oliver G. Gilbert, III, Vice-Chairman	
Sen. René García	Keon Hardemon
Sally A. Heyman	Danielle Cohen Higgins
Eileen Higgins	Joe A. Martinez
Kionne L. McGhee	Jean Monestime
Raquel A. Regalado	Rebeca Sosa
Sen. Javier D. Souto	

The Chairperson thereupon declared this resolution duly passed and adopted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021. This resolution shall become effective upon the earlier of (1) 10 days after the date of its adoption unless vetoed by the County Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board, or (2) approval by the County Mayor of this resolution and the filing of this approval with the Clerk of the Board.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA  
BY ITS BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

HARVEY RUVIN, CLERK

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Clerk

Approved by County Attorney  
as to form and legal sufficiency.



Oren Rosenthal