

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

2026 CAD MDS and LERMS Software Hardware and Services

Addenda # 2

RFP # C00226

To: All Potential Offerors
Date: March 26, 2026
Subject: Addendum #2 to RFP #C00226 dated March 9, 2026
Title: 2026 CAD MDS and LERMS Software Hardware and Services

Questions & Answers

The following clarifications are hereby incorporated into the above-referenced Request for Proposal. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Addendum #2 is issued to address the following **Questions & Answers**:

1. How many career/sworn firefighters are in the 3 Fire/EMS agencies?

Agency	Career/Sworn	Notes
Staunton FD	37 Career/19 Part-time	
Staunton-Augusta Rescue Squad	54 Career/14 Volunteer	A volunteer rescue squad structured as a nonprofit EMS agency, not a municipal department
Augusta County FD	126 Career	Mutual Aid partner for the City of Staunton

2. What system does the City use currently for Fire Records?

The City utilizes FirstDue for Fire RMS, which receives CAD data via an interface.

3. Would the City please provide a breakout of the number of law enforcement and fire mobile units? Out of the 50 units shown on the pricing workbook, how many are LE? How many are fire?

The City utilizes 37 Law Enforcement mobile units and 0 Fire mobile units.

4. How many field reporting users (rather than clients) does the City have?

The city has 36 field reporting users, all of them are Law Enforcement.

5. **Do you want vendors to propose an eCitations platform or to interface with your current platform? Where do you want to submit citations and crash info from?**

Citations and crash data are currently entered into the legacy LERMS system, and the City's preference is that the proposed system include eCitation functionality. Currently, citation data is interfaced with the courts from the legacy LERMS system, whereas Crash data is integrated into the State of Virginia TREDs system. It is expected that Crash reports will include integration into TREDs in any proposal.

The City utilizes a standalone parking ticket application that interfaces with the Tyler Technology Munis system.

The reference to the product Quicket in the Interface Functional Matrix is incorrect and should be ignored. The City does not currently use this product.

6. **5.2.6 System Architecture Compliance (p. 65) – This item asks for a response to Section 2.18 of the RFP. Should this instead be Section 2.15?**

Reference to Section 2.18 is a typo. Responses to Section 5.2.6 should be in reference to Section 2.15 – System Architecture.

7. **5.2.9 Interrogatories (p. 66) – This item asks for a section-by-section response to Section 4 Interrogatories and then also asks for a section-by-section response to Section 9 Interrogatories, but Section 9 is Procurement Guidelines. Would the City please clarify if the reference to section 9 is an error?**

The reference to Section 9 is incorrect. All responses to the Interrogatories should be limited to those listed in Section 4.

8. **6.3.B Project Goals (page 71) – This item indicates scoring for addressing each goal in the Project Goals section. Would the City please provide the Project Goals section?**

Section 6.3 references the Project Goals section to evaluate how well the proposed solution aligns with the City's desired outcomes. While a standalone section titled "Project Goals" is not separately enumerated, these goals are reflected throughout the RFP, including the Scope of Services and Functional Specification Workbooks.

Vendors should interpret "Project Goals" as the City's desired operational outcomes and respond based on how their solution supports the requirements, workflows, and capabilities described in the RFP.

The City will evaluate responses based on alignment with these documented needs and priorities.

9. **On p. 74, the City indicates that vendors should limit the response to 75 pages, 30 of which are "exhibits, appendices, resumes, letters, attachments, and enclosures." It appears that at least 53 pages of the RFP document require detailed responses to narratives, as well as several attachments (RFP**

exhibits, sample statement of work, sample project timeline, sample training plan, copy of service agreement, etc.). These required attachments alone are more than 300 pages. Providing the detailed responses required throughout the RFP and providing the completed exhibits is not possible in 75 pages. Would the City consider revising or removing this constraint?

The City has reviewed and determined to remove any limitations on page length. All proposals will be reviewed, regardless of page length.

10. 7.1.G. Upload the required workbook (p. 74) – What does this refer to?

Section 7.1.G is referencing the following workbooks that were included in the RFP release –

- Exhibit A-1 – CAD Functional Specifications
- Exhibit A-2 – Infrastructure Functional Specifications
- Exhibit A-3 – Law Enforcement Records Functional Specifications
- Exhibit A-4 – Interfaces Functional Specifications
- Exhibit B – Cost Proposal

Instructions for submission of the Functional Specifications are detailed in Section 5.2.10. Instructions for submission of the Cost Proposal Workbook are detailed in Section 5.2.12.

11. 7.3.9 Response Time Cont. (p. 75) – Would the City please clarify what information is needed for this response item?

Section 7.3.9 referenced a requirement that has been removed from the RFP. Therefore, Section 7.3.9 is no longer applicable, and Offerors are not required to provide a response.

12. The RFP indicates a requirement to utilize existing hardware for e-citation (e.g., printers, scanners, etc.). Would the City provide the make, model, and quantities of these devices to ensure compatibility and accurate planning?

Most units have the Brother PocketJet722/723. Oldest units have Brother PocketJet 6, while the newest units have the Brother PocketJet 822.

13. Would the City confirm the total number of eCitation licenses required? Our understanding is that 37 licenses may be needed—please advise if this is correct.

37 is the total number of eCitation licenses that may be needed.

14. In addition, could the City clarify whether any iOS or Android-based eCitation licenses are requested? While 37 appears to align with MDT usage, some requirements reference both Android and iOS platforms. Does the City have a confirmation on the expected device types and licensing needs related to these platforms?

The City uses Android devices exclusively. If the proposal includes a smartphone-based eCitation solution, the number of licenses needed may vary between 37 and 50.

Note: A signed acknowledgement of this addendum must be received by this office prior to the due date and time, or must be attached to your proposal. Signature on this addendum does not constitute signature on the original proposal documents. The original proposal documents must also be signed per proposal instructions.

Company Name: _____

Signature: _____

Type/Print Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____