August 15, 2018

رمي

2210 San Joaquin Street, Fresno, CA 93721 | P: 844.479.4759

County of Fresno Gary E. Cornuelle, Purchasing Manager 4525 East Hamilton Avenue, 2nd Floor Fresno, CA 93702-4599

RE: RFP 18-011 Appeal

Dear Gary:

Hedgerow Software US, Inc. (Hedgerow) submitted a response to the County of Fresno's Request for Proposal (RFP) Number 18-011 for a Data Management System for the Department of Public Health on November 15, 2017, and was selected to participate in an onsite vendor evaluation demonstration at County offices on April 9, 2018. On April 26, 2018, we received a Tentative Award Notice from the County.

While the Bid Instructions on RFP page 9 of 37 state an appeal must be submitted in writing within seven (7) working days after notification of proposed recommendations for award, Hedgerow believes seven (7) days was an insufficient amount of time to prepare our case for an appeal.

The RFP scoresheets document provided by the County is 443 pages, which needed to be studied. In addition, upon learning of the award to CSDC Systems, we have spent a significant amount of time researching this vendor. For these reasons, and via this letter, Hedgerow is seeking approval to file an appeal at this time.

It is our opinion that Fresno County's process for selecting a vendor to provide software for the Environmental Health Department (EHD) was hampered by inadequate information and flawed in several areas. The attached report addresses these.

Sincerely,

John W. Dodson

Hedgerow Software US, Inc. 2210 San Joaquin Street

Fresno, CA 93631

.4.3.44

1. Costs

20

In the Award Recommendation memo dated April 23, 2018, the second to last paragraph on page 4 suggests that while Hedgerow's cost proposal was "the least expensive out of the top three vendors, it was only approximately \$600,000 less over the potential five-year term than CSDC, the second least-expensive cost proposal." When did \$600,000 in a \$1 - \$2 million purchase become an "only"?

\$600,000 over a 5-year term is a substantial difference. It is our belief that the selection committee failed to account for the internal resources that will be required to adapt CSDC Systems' Amanda solution to meet the requirements of the Environmental Health Department (EHD). We have learned from agencies that use, or have attempted to use, CSDC Systems' Amanda solution that internal IT resources will be needed to adapt CSDC Systems' Amanda solution to environmental health. The cost of this resource(s) could easily exceed \$100,000 per year, which is an additional \$500,000 over 5 years, and continuing thereafter.

Hedgerow provides a configurable, comprehensive environmental health data management solution. Hedgehog will not require any County IT resources to make our proposed Hedgehog solution adapt to the County's environmental health programs or processes. Hedgerow's only business is supporting environmental health agencies which we have been doing for twenty-five years.

2. Software Deficiencies

In the Award Recommendation memo dated April 23, 2018, the County selection committee noted that there were two (2) unfinished features that resulted in Hedgerow not receiving the recommendation: the Hedgehog portal and billing components.

Hedgehog currently includes an integrated billing component that is being enhanced to accommodate the needs of our U.S. clients. Hedgerow's enhanced billing system is currently being configured for Pima County, Arizona (population 1 million), and will be used for billing in September, 2018.

Hedgerow can provide the County with our billing enhancement Systems Requirements Specification (SRS) document to illustrate all of the billing changes that are coming and close to completion. We are confident that upon examination of this document, and monitoring our delivery progress with Pima County, the selection committee will be satisfied that this requirement will be met prior to the Fresno County EHD's readiness for it.

Regarding the Hedgehog Portal, it is not only on track for year-end delivery, but the Portal framework already exists and is being used in production by one of our clients for online self-assessments. We are in the process of building out its feature set. Functionality to be delivered in the year-end iteration of the Portal includes online fee payments, online public records requests, and online application submission with routing and notification for review and approval. Our portal enhancements are being developed by our senior development team with portal building experience, in Fresno.

Lastly, it is important to note Hedgerow's significant advantage over CSDC Systems for the environmental health program unique to California, CUPA. As the County understands, administering the Unified Program is complex as is the data management associated with it. A vendor such as CSDC

Systems that is unfamiliar with CUPA, its six sub-programs, and the data elements that are captured and reported for each, has a significant challenge.

As a CUPA, we believe the County should consider the fact that Hedgehog already includes all Title 27 data elements, violation libraries, chemical inventories, inspections models, and custom form models that are required to automate and report on all six UPA sub-programs a major advantage. Proof of Hedgerow's CUPA development is the trial database that was distributed to four (4) CUPA agencies for evaluation and testing in November 2017. Until the release of the County's RFP, when he was forced to stop participating, Fresno County's CUPA Program Supervisor was a key member of the Hedgerow consortium dedicated to guiding specifications for Hedgerow's CUPA development.

Hedgerow's remaining CUPA development effort is the bi-directional CERS integration which will be led by an individual who is already familiar with CERS and its six endpoints as he developed a bi-directional CERS interface that is used by more than 80% of UPAs throughout the State. This will make Hedgerow's CERS interface development effort faster, and present less risk, as we know the potential pitfalls from previous experience.

It is our belief, given they have no California clients, that CSDC Systems has not completed this significant requirement, and this should be considered a disqualifying deficiency.

3. Vendor Vetting

1.

In the County-provided RFP scoresheets on the "Vendor Company Data" section, several County evaluators noted that the awarded vendor had 400 clients with 15,000 users using "the software". While this might be true for the total number of CSDS Systems' clients and users, this does not reflect the number of environmental health departments using their proposed Amanda "environmental health software". Had the question specified environmental health departments using Amanda, the answer would have likely been fewer than 10 agencies.

The 400 agencies using CSDC Systems' solutions would include all their software products. In addition to land use and permitting, CSDC Systems' products include grant writing, courts and justice, higher education and management, and more, none of which are applicable to environmental health.

Other software vendors in the same space as CSDC Systems, such as Accela, provide software for land planning and permitting departments. Evaluators, not familiar with the unique requirements of environmental health, assume that software that provides for permitting, compliance and licensing can be used for environmental health. Agencies who made a software selection on this premise are sorry they did so. There are significant structural differences in the way code must be built to serve an environmental health agency that makes it difficult to adapt land use inspecting and permitting software to environmental health.

We can find no evidence that the selection committee did reference checking. Hedgerow has confirmed that the references we provided in the RFP were not contacted. It is our belief that if CSDC Systems could provide five (5) references that currently use Amanda in their environmental health departments, the County would be hard pressed to find any environmental health department successfully/happily using the proposed Amanda solution in production.

In our research, and knowledge of the environmental health community, we found the following environmental health departments that use and/or replaced CSDC Systems' Amanda solution:

1. Toronto

When informed that CSDC Systems' Amanda solution was selected by Fresno County, an Environmental Health manager from Toronto replied: "Give them a year and they will hate it. We've spent millions trying to make it work, and it's still difficult to use."

Toronto was forced to use Amanda because the land use and permitting departments were using Amanda. Toronto has an expensive IT staff continuously supporting and trying to make Amanda work for environmental health.

CSDC System's website lists numerous clients in the province of Ontario, Canada. Except for Toronto, their home town, no other Ontario agency uses Amanda for environmental health. Of the 36 environmental health agencies in Ontario, 30 use Hedgehog.

2. Austin, Texas

In January, 2017 CSDC Systems was purchased by BuildGroup, a private equity firm headquartered in Austin, Texas. Hedgerow contacted an environmental health staff member at the Austin/Travis County Environmental Health Services Division to ask if they are using Amanda. Their answer was, "we tried to make it accommodate environmental health, but it hasn't worked so we are replacing it with another software solution in October."

3. New Brunswick, Canada

New Brunswick EHD was encouraged to use Amanda because most of the other New Brunswick provincial departments use Amanda. However, the province has 11 fulltime IT staff supporting Amanda, and is understaffed, so more Amanda expert staff, which are difficult to find, will be needed to support EHD. New Brunswick EHD has selected Hedgehog for their purposes.

4. Local Vendor

The USA headquarters for Hedgerow is in Fresno, California. We have a vested interest in the local community and the success of the program. Current local staff in Fresno includes Hedgerow's Chief Financial Officer and Country Manager, Director of Business Development, Development Manager, and a senior developer. Hedgerow will be growing its development team in Fresno, and senior developers with experience in environmental health software development are available to us locally. Also, when it comes time, we will expand our Client Services' team to include a dedicated California support team in Fresno. If the County were to become Hedgerow's client, they will have significant design influence, especially in CERS integration.

If the County reconsiders its decision, and selects Hedgerow, moneys will remain in Fresno, a unique opportunity for both the County and Hedgerow.