ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 18-07

Permitting, Licensing, and Land Management Technology Replacement

Due Date: February 9, 2018 by 2:00 p.m. (local time)

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Permitting, Licensing, and Land Management Technology Replacement, RFP No. 18-07, on which proposals will be received on/or before the date and time listed above.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes seven (7) pages.**

The Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document must be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment C – Declaration of Compliance Non-Discrimination Ordinance**
- **Attachment D - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment E - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening will be rejected as non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Offerors are directed to take note in their review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1:   How many total users will require access to the system?
Answer 1:   There are approximately 175 active users in the current system. 35 to 50 users are typically logged in concurrently during business hours. There are approximately 1500 registered users of the existing public web portal that have accessed the system within the last calendar year.

Question 2:   How many users are involved in managing/processing business licenses and/or contractor licenses?
Answer 2:   10

Question 3:   How many inspectors/code enforcement officers will require mobile access?
Answer 3:   20

Question 4:   How many named users are involved in the Electronic Plans Review process?
Answer 4:   Approximately 35

Question 5:   How many total users need trained?
Answer 5:   Approximately 50 to 75.

Question 6:   How many total business processes (types of permits, licenses, entitlements, planning cases, enforcement/violations, etc.) are in scope?
Answer 6:   Per the system functional and technical requirements, the system administrators should be able to create new record types as needed without programming. The current system has the following number of types:
Permit types: 45
Project types: 25
Code violation types: 12
License types: 12

Question 7   Does the City have any workflow/process diagrams for these processes that can be provided to vendors?
Answer 7:   Documentation is available for major workflow processes/record types. Some processes may be subject to revision or review.

Question 8:   How many inspections does the City process annually?
Answer 8:   Approximately 32,000 per year based on the last two calendar years.

Question 9   How many permit applications does the City process annually?
Answer 9:   Approximately 20,000 per year based on the last two calendar years.

Question 10 How many license applications/renewals does the City process annually?
Answer 10: Approximately 2,000 per year based on the last two calendar years

Question 11 How many different types of reports does the City require the new system to generate?
Answer 11: Per the system functional and technical requirements, the system administrators should be able to create ad hoc reports as needed. The number of reports for the new system has not been determined.

Question 12: I see mention of Public Safety. Is the city interested in tracking Work Orders?
Answer 12: No, the City uses CityWorks for tracking Work Orders.

Question 13: Do any of the applications require intelligent or interactive data fields, or are simple data collection fields sufficient? If yes, how many?
Answer 13: Assuming this is in reference to permit applications on the web portal, yes, interactive fields would be preferred.

Question 14: Does the City have a preference for a hosted or on-premise solution?
Answer 14: The City has no preference between a hosted or an on premise solution and will look to the expertise of the winning vendor to guide us in the direction that makes the most sense.

Question 15: If the City would like the vendor to host, are you most interested in a hosted solution where you own the licensing or a SaaS solution (subscription option with no licensing?)
Answer 15: Please see Answer 14. This would be explored during the vendor demonstration phase.

Question 16: Our premise-based solution (hosted by the City) is a concurrent license offering. How many concurrent user licenses are needed?
Answer 16: Please see Answer 14. This would be explored during the vendor demonstration phase.

Question 17: If the SaaS option is the preferred, how many named users do you need (i.e., number of users with login credentials and individual permissions)?
Answer 17: Please see Answer 1

Question 18: What is the City's current GIS environment? Do you have ArcGIS Server 10.1 or higher? Please provide version you are currently using.
Answer 18: The City currently uses ESRI ArcGIS Server 10.5

Question 19: Are all fee payments to be processed through New World Cashiering?
Answer 19: The City currently uses New World as its finance and accounting system. New World Cashiering is the preferred solution, however other systems may be considered.

Question 20: What does the City currently use for on-line payments?
Answer 20: The City does not currently accept online payments for permits, projects, or licenses but would like to do so in the future. The City uses Invoice Cloud for online utility bill payment and Chase Payconnexions for online property tax, invoice, and alarm registration payments. It would be preferable if the vendor integrated with Invoice Cloud and/or Payconnexions. The City is open to considering another payment processor provided approval by the City Treasurer.

Question 21: What is the current budget for this project?
Answer 21: There is no published budget for this project. Vendors are encouraged to submit a cost proposal reflective of the cost of the proposed platform and the effort required for the system to meet the project's objectives.

Question 22: Has the City seen any demonstrations for a Permitting, Licensing, and Land Management solution in the past two (2) years? If so, what vendors have provided demos?
Answer 22: Yes, the City has seen demonstrations from BS&A, CityWorks, Superion, and Tyler within the past two years.

Question 23: Is the City interested in tracking issues, i.e., abandoned vehicles, pot holes, etc.? If so, please provide the number of issue types.
Answer 23: The City currently uses SeeClickFix for this type of tracking.

Question 24: Is the City interested in a mobile application that allows your citizens to submit an issue, pay a bill, communicate with staff, and more?
Answer 24: The City currently uses SeeClickFix for this mobile issue submission.

Question 25: The RFP mentions the City is interested in electronic plan review. Does the City currently own any Bluebeam licenses? If so, how many licenses does the City have? If not, how many named Bluebeam user licenses would you need?
Answer 25: The City currently does not use electronic plan review and does not have any Bluebeam licenses. Please see Question 4 regarding the number of plan reviewers.

Question 26: Is the City interested in scheduling inspections and obtaining inspection information via touch tone phone with interactive voice response (IVR)?
Answer 26: The City retired its IVR system approximately three years ago and currently does not have any plans to resume using IVR.

Question 27: Is the City interested in reporting capabilities that work across solutions and is not just limited to the Permitting, Licensing, and Land Management solution?
Answer 27: The City is interested in reporting across solutions and is currently undergoing vendor selection for a business intelligence solution that aggregates datasets from different business applications into an enterprise view of an activity or performance.

Question 28: Will the City consider a one (1) week extension to the proposal due date to give

vendors sufficient time to provide an accurate response?
Answer 28: The City is committed to the existing schedule based on competing resource requirements farther along the project schedule.

Question 29: Page 21 – The instructions for completing Attachments A1 and A2 state to describe how the requirement is met in the description field. Is the City expecting a description for every requirement including those that could be answered with yes or no?
Answer 29: A response in the description field is at the discretion of the respondent. If the requirement is indicated as provided, it is not necessary to elaborate in the attachments.

Question 30: Section III, E. Fee Proposal – This section mentions a Total Fee Summary table. The table appears to have been omitted from the RFP. Can you provide a copy?
Answer 30: A Total Fee Summary table is being provided herein.

Question 31: Can you provide some examples of both Reviewer and Inspector specific "Conditions".
Answer 31: These may be stipulations that a certain action must be taken for temporary approval.

Question 32: Do records have to be completely deleted/erased from the database or is removing their visibility from users sufficient. Does the City have a records retention requirement on any records being maintained in this system?
Answer 32: No, the records do not have to be completely deleted, but the option to do so must exist possibly thru permission settings.
No. If addresses are removed from the GIS they have to manually be removed from the current CDSP (Community Development Software Property). The CDSP data will maintain the historical data as AD 3.07 requires.

Question 33: Is the intent of this requirement to have a "Contact" record that is separate from a permit, project, code enforcement case etc…something similar to Contacts in Outlook?
Answer 33: That is correct. The contact would be its own record, of a certain type or type/subtype that could be associated with one or more records. For example, a Property Agent contact may manage several rental properties, each with their own rental certification process.

Question 34: Is the intent the ability to associate a unique contact record with an individual fee item or with all fees associated with a record/application. Is this a feature you would like for citizens/contractors to be able to accomplish during the application process or is this strictly a feature for City staff.
Answer 34: A contact would not be associated directly with a fee. The association of all fees to a single contact may vary by record type but the majority of records have a single contact that is billed all fees.

Question 35: Are contacts recorded with an appointment or walk-in also related to an existing permit, project, code case etc.? If not are you anticipating storing this information on the contact record for future use?
Answer 35: Yes a contact may also be related to one or more record types. For example, an electrical contractor working on multiple permits or projects in the City.

Question 36: Do records have to be completely deleted/erased from the database or is removing their visibility from users sufficient.
Answer 36: Please see Question 32.

Question 37: Will shape based locations need to be merged with GIS data?
Answer 37: No. Any non-address locational data created in the CDSP (Community Development Software Property) would be a separate layer(s) in the GIS.

Question 38: Are these existing parcels in ESRI without addresses that are either now being addressed, or is the address changing. Is this intended to both update ESRI data and Community Development Software Property data?
Answer 38: There are non-addressed parcels in the GIS. Those parcels are given an address as needed and are referenced by their parcel ID. Once a parcel is assigned an address the GIS will be updated and that data uploaded into the CDSP (Community Development Software Property) database.

Question 39: Please define Parcel Name and give an example
Answer 39: Some parcels are identified by staff using a custom or common name such as the owner name or project name. 413 E Huron St is commonly known as the "Foundry Lofts" site which is the building name.

Question 40: Can you give an example of a permit type defined by a jurisdictional boundary? Is this boundary defined in ESRI?
Answer 40: These would be Annexations, Floodplain and Historic District types. Each of these types could trigger other activity due to custom regulations and procedures that may need to be followed. The current CDSP has to rely on the end user to know if these conditions exist. Those boundaries are in the GIS.

Question 41: Are all valid City addresses stored in ESRI or is the "City addressing system" a separate application?
Answer 41: The valid City addresses are stored in the GIS, there is not a separate application.

Question 42: Is the intent with Inspection types and subtypes to group inspections (e.g., Plumbing (inspection type) Rough Plumbing and Final Plumbing (subtypes) with all the data actually on the subtypes.
Answer 42: The intent is for the system administrators to have the ability to recreate new inspection types as needed without programming. The ability to associate inspection types or results as part of a workflow that affects the scheduling of related inspections or the issuance of permits. For example, a Plumbing Final inspection may not be scheduled until the result of a Plumbing Rough inspection has passed. A Certificate of Occupancy permit for a property may not be approved until all prerequisite trade permits and inspections have been approved.

Question 43: Is the intent to be able to assign a unique number to an inspection that denotes priority, for example 1 is low priority and 5 is high priority based on the inspection type?
Answer 43: The ability to specify priority is preferred but not mandatory.

Question 44: Are Rental Housing units defined in GIS?
Answer 44: They are not defined in GIS. This is not a mandatory requirement however the City is interested in best practices for better managing inspections, code violations, and reporting related to rental properties.

Question 45: Does the LandUse process require Escrow tracking and Employee Time Accountability?
Answer 45: Yes, the escrow is required for many project types. Time accountability has not been identified as a functional requirement priority.

Question 46: I see mention of Public Safety. Is the city interested in tracking Work Orders?
Answer 45: Please see Answer 12.The City uses CityWorks for tracking Work Orders.

Question 47: When you reference mobile compatibility, are you requiring a mobile app?
Answer 47: Yes. A mobile application is Highly Preferred Requirement needed to achieve project objectives Please see the Inspection, Rental Housings, Code Compliance, and Record Processing sections of the Functional Requirements Specification for detail.

Question 48: Will all vendor questions/responses be shared?
Answer 47: Yes.

Question 49: Please provide a link to the existing list of questions.
Answer 49: All questions received are provided herein.

Question 50: If the responses to the Functional/Technical requirements spreadsheets are included in the narrative of our proposal, do you require that same information be duplicated in the Description box of the Functional/Technical spreadsheet? If yes, are we limited to the existing size of the textbox or can we expand it? Additionally, do the Functional/Technical requirements spreadsheets need to be printed and attached to Section B of our proposal or just included as digital copy on the flash drive?
Answer 50: Per the Instructions tab on the Functional and Technical Requirements attachments, For each of the system requirements, the City has specified the priority of the requirement in the Importance column and an item number. Each item contains columns for specifying the respondents ability to meet the requirement (Provided, Modified, Next Release, Not Provided). For each requirement place an "X" in the appropriate column. Blank responses will be consider as "Not Provided". In the description field, describe how the requirement is met. If there is not enough room to fully respond to a requirement, information may be included in a separate document. Provide a reference for any supporting documentation and reference the item number from the worksheet. Note that the review team does not guarantee to review all supporting documentation, so provide as much information as possible in this spreadsheet.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.

RFP No. 18-07 - Permitting, Licensing, and Land Management Technology Replacement

Total Fee Summary Table

Item Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Total Hardware Cost						
Total Software Cost						
Total Implementation Services Cost						
Total Hosting Service Cost (if applicable)						
Total Options Cost						
Total Options Service Cost						
Annual Maintenance Cost						
Additional Costs						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
Grand Total						