

## Fax Cover Letter

**To:** Phillip Vasquez **From:** Kristine Starr

---

**Attr:** **Pages:** 7 (plus cover)

---

**Fax:** 214 653-~~7445~~ 7818 **Date:** July 28, 2004

---

**Re:** Selection committee document **CC:**

---

Urgent     For Review     Please Comment     Please Reply     Please Recycle

---

Phillip,

Attached is the revised document from yesterday's meeting with the attachments. Please call me if you have any changes.

Thank you,

Kristine

817 689-3948 cell

GOVERNMENT  
EXHIBIT NO.  
**213**  
3:14-CR-293-M

*Confidential – Not for Distribution*

July 28, 2004

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court  
FROM: Selection Committee for RFP #2004-064-1485  
SUBJECT: Susceptible Vendor Recommendation for RFP #2004-064-1485  
Recording, Indexing and Imaging System

**Background:**

The Dallas County selection committee attended vendor demonstrations from June 14-June 23, 2004 for the following vendors: ACS, AmCad, BearingPoint, and LanData.

On June 24, 2004 the selection committee met to discuss results of vendor demonstrations and determined that, prior to the completing and reassessment of vendor susceptibility, additional financial statement information was required from all vendors.

The selection committee has received and reviewed the additional financial statement information provided by the vendors and met on July 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss the findings from the financial statement review and re-assess vendor susceptibility.

**Results and Recommendations:**

As a result of the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, the selection committee voted unanimously to rendering AmCad and LanData *susceptible* to advance to Stage 3 of the RFP process. The remaining vendors, ACS and BearingPoint, were rendered *non-susceptible* to advance in the RFP process by a nearly unanimous 5:1 majority vote of the Selection Committee. These votes represent a strong disparity in abilities between those companies found to be susceptible and those found to be non-susceptible. The two vendors found to be non-susceptible were also the lowest ranked in the functional and technical areas evaluated.

It is therefore recommended that the Dallas County Commissioners Court accept the recommendation of the selection committee as outlined in a briefing dated July 27, 2004.

The following attachments provide background information that supports the selection committee's recommendation:

- Attachment A: Summary of Rationale
- Attachment B: Cost Analysis
- Attachment C: Scoring Summary from RFP Analysis
- Attachment D: Vendor Demonstration Script

Attachments

*Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.*

**CONFIDENTIAL** – Not for distribution.

Page 1 of 7

SBP-1A-162-0099-01-40752

*Confidential – Not for Distribution*

**Attachment A: Summary of Rationale**

The following is a summary of the selection committee's rationale for vendor susceptibility recommendations. This information is not intended to be all inclusive, but rather highlights some major points of discussion. In addition, the points below are not listed in order of priority.

*Proposed Susceptible Vendors*

**LanData**

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system is in alignment with County's stated functional and technical requirements – representing a 93% fit. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that this is a true representation of the fit and that the system meets or exceeds this level. (Refer to Attachment D for the vendor demonstration script that all vendors were required to follow)
- System offers significant functionality above and beyond RFP requirements
- Lowest cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal (see Attachment B)
- Robust data extraction capabilities
- User-friendly, streamlined system with few exceptions
- Potential quick transition time and experience with aggressive implementations
- Proven ability to implement system in satellite offices
- Demonstrated commitment to the title industry and business model is in alignment with the County Clerk's goals
- Actively marketing adoption of eRecording to title companies
- Noteworthy references
- No major negative concerns

Result: Unanimous vote that LanData be rendered *susceptible* to continue in RFP process

**AmCad**

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system is in alignment with County's stated functional and technical requirements – representing a 94% fit. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that this is a true representation of the fit and that the system meets or exceeds this level.
- User-friendly, streamlined system
- System offers significant functionality above and beyond RFP requirements
- "Can do" attitude with assurances that any modifications will be completed at no additional cost to the County
- The system is currently implemented in several large counties with transaction volumes exceeding 6,000 documents per day (note: in comparison, Dallas County's volumes exceed 2,500 documents per day).
- Detailed audit trail capabilities
- Higher eRecording volumes than other vendors representing proven experience in this area
- Low cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal (see Attachment B)
- Level of experience within the company
- Successful track record with large counties in multiple states
- No major negative concerns

Result: Unanimous vote that AmCad be rendered *susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

*Note. Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.*

---



---

*Proposed Non-Susceptible Vendors*

**BearingPoint**

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system represents a 91% fit with County's stated functional and technical requirements. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that this is a true representation of the fit and that the system meets or exceeds this level.
- Prime contractor has no experience with County Clerk Recorder functions
- The software subcontractor's financial statements revealed trends that raised concerns regarding the ability to perform through the duration of the contract
- Highest cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal including costly marketing proposal (see Attachment B)
- Reference check issues
- Concerns regarding the coordination of six companies to provide the services proposed
- Unproven business model
- Inability to justify financial proposals and models

Result: 5:1 vote that BearingPoint be rendered *non-susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

**ACS**

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system represents a 91% fit with County's stated functional and technical requirements. However, following the vendor's full day software demonstration, there was unanimous consensus of the selection committee that the software was the least functional and least user-friendly of all of the systems evaluated. Thus, the selection committee would rate the actual fit significantly lower than that reported by the vendor in their RFP response.
- Software demonstration was unsuccessful in demonstrating the benefits to the selection committee. In addition, the system crashed several times during the software demonstration which did not occur during any of the other software demonstrations.
- Proposed system reflects stale application technology and processes and a more labor-intensive system
- During the software demonstration, the vendor was not receptive to suggestions from the selection committee for software changes or modifications to the proposed process flow of documents
- Turnover in the "Technical Project Leader" position, rendering uncertainty with necessary technology
- Cumbersome adjustment/accounting/audit processes
- Incomplete audit trail capabilities
- Reference check issues
- A minimum of 25% of the proposed solution was unclear with regard to the experience level and roles of personnel
- Restricted data extraction functionality, hampering use of public data

Result: 5:1 vote that ACS be rendered *non-susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

*Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.*

Confidential - Not for Distribution

Attachment B: Cost Analysis

	Landata	AmCAD	ACS	Bearing Point
<b>Hardware</b>				
Purchase Price	\$ 528,209	\$ 470,553	\$ 750,000	\$ 589,052
First Year Maintenance	21,128	38,344	25,000	55,336
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 549,337</b>	<b>\$ 508,897</b>	<b>\$ 775,000</b>	<b>\$ 644,388</b>
<b>Software</b>				
Purchase Price	\$ 217,500	\$ 443,600	\$ 675,000	\$ 565,643
First Year Maintenance	39,150	111,300	195,000	134,275
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 256,650</b>	<b>\$ 554,900</b>	<b>\$ 870,000</b>	<b>\$ 699,918</b>
<b>Implementation</b>				
Service Costs	\$ 77,800	\$ 965,410	\$ 150,000	\$ 745,500
Travel	25,200	25,000	-	39,797
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 103,000</b>	<b>\$ 990,410</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 785,297</b>
<b>Required Options</b>				
Custom Programming	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
One Large Doc Scanner Printer		\$ 49,500		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 49,500</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>First Year Total</b>	<b>\$ 908,987</b>	<b>\$ 2,103,707</b>	<b>\$ 1,795,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,129,603</b>
<b>Annual Maintenance</b>				
Hardware	\$ 21,128	\$ 42,799	\$ 26,314	\$ 55,336
Software	39,150	111,300	220,625	149,968
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 60,278</b>	<b>\$ 154,099</b>	<b>\$ 246,939</b>	<b>\$ 205,304</b>
<b>Ongoing Annual Cost</b>	<b>\$ 60,278</b>	<b>\$ 154,099</b>	<b>\$ 246,939</b>	<b>\$ 205,304</b>
<b>On-site Support (5 years)</b>	<b>\$ 450,000</b>			
<b>Total 5-Year Cost</b>	<b>\$ 1,600,101</b>	<b>\$ 2,720,103</b>	<b>\$ 2,782,756</b>	<b>\$ 2,950,820</b>
<b>Cost Ranking</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided in the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.

CONFIDENTIAL - Not for distribution

Page 4 of 7

SBP-1A-162-0099-01-40755