

ADDENDUM NO. 1
Request for Proposals (RFP) 17-0084
Comprehensive Land Management System
November 9, 2016

At the pre-proposal meeting, the following questions were asked and answered. Information regarding proprietary /confidential information was also discussed.

1. What is our current solution and why are we replacing it?
The County's current system is One Solutions which is at end of cycle. It is not comprehensive and we would like automation of applications. The current system is not flexible and can't handle our processes. We would like customer interaction as well as self-service.
2. Is the County looking for a hosted system?
County prefers a hosted system.
3. If a company can't provide a complete response, will partial responses be accepted.
The County is open to partial responses. Firms may collaborate to submit a complete package. Use the matrix to define what you are not able to provide.
4. Has the County solicited for any demos or RFIs.
No
5. What system is Environment Health currently using.
Decade is the name of the company that developed & marketed EnvisionConnect Software; however, Decade was purchased by Accela 2-3 years ago, so I would describe the "system Environmental Health uses" as EnvisionConnect Software.
6. Will the entire SunGard line be retired with the implementation of the new system?
SunGard will continue to be used within the public safety realm, but will be retired with regards to land development.
7. What is the total number of users for the new software?
Referred to the Stakeholder Organization Chart on page 14.
8. Can you provide any feedback on the software budgeted amount?
It was explained that we do not have a budgeted amount at the present time and the bid process will allow us to obtain a cost amount for budget purposes. It was stated that this was a capital project.
9. What is the implementation plan?
Bidders were instructed to include implementation plan in proposals.
10. Does all current data need to be migrated before any other implementation can take place and is the vendor responsible for data cleansing?
Directed that this question should be submitted in writing so that an answer can be formulated by the project team.

Note:

Please refer to section 2.6 –Trade Secret Confidentiality

You understand that by submitting your proposal to the County, it is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Please do not mark your entire proposal as confidential as this will cause your proposal to be rejected. We understand that some of the information submitted may be

proprietary/confidential and this will be respected; however, the entire proposal to include your price will not be considered confidential. Please use discretion when marking your information proprietar/confidential.

Questions received from vendors via email:

1. The response effort for this RFP is significant and given the proximity of the Thanksgiving holiday, to allow bidding vendors sufficient time to develop comprehensive bids, will the County please consider granting a 2-week extension to the Proposal Due Date? We do not ask this question lightly, as we understand the County's constraints with keeping to its planned schedule for this project. We hope the County can appreciate vendors have similar constraints as well. We want to present the County with the best possible proposal, so we would greatly appreciate the additional time.

The deadline date for proposals has changed from November 30th to December 14, 2016. Proposals are still due before 2pm.

2. Please provide the total # of users (i.e. County staff) who will need access to the system.

Please refer to the chart on page 13.

3. Of the total # of users provided above, how many will be working primarily in the field (i.e. building inspectors, code enforcement officers etc.)?

Please refer to the chart on page 13.

4. Please provide a current listing of the case or record types (i.e. permit types, planning & zoning types) administered by the County departments within the purview of this solicitation. Some examples would include: Residential / Commercial Building Permits, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Rezoning, Conditional use etc.).

Please refer to Section 3.4 and line items 150 in Appendix A.

5. Please provide a description of any and all data conversion requirements including the name of the source system and the type of data housed therein.

The proposer will be responsible for migrating required data from SunGard's ONESolution application to the new system.

6. Please provide a description of any and all interface requirements including the name of the source system and the expected behavior of each interface.

Refer to page 28 Section 3.5 Information Technology Requirements and Appendix A – Functional Requirements:

- a. Section 3.5.1 Minimum Requirements
- b. Section 3.5.2 GIS Requirements
- c. Line 225 – Bluebeam Revu 2015
- d. Line 350 – Firehouse RMS v7.16
- e. Line 401 – Microsoft Excel 2010-current

f. Line 519 – Tyler Technologies Munis

7. Does the County wish to receive pricing for BOTH on premise deployments as well as Vendor-hosted/SaaS OR does the County have a definitive preference?

We generally prefer a hosted solution; however, we will consider an on premise turn-key on-site solution.

8. If possible, please provide a formal listing of the output documents (i.e. Reports, Letters, Memorandums) currently generated by each department within the purview of this solicitation.

We are requesting ability for customizable reports and the ability to integrate with MS Word for producing project documents. See line items 28 and 71 in Appendix A.

9. Of the users listed in the RFP, can you confirm the total number of concurrent users we should include for?

Please refer to the chart on page 13.

10. Does the County currently use an IVR solution?

No

Please expand on the County's expectations on the below requirements:

11. Item 47 - Ability to modify system templates as needed to meet state mandated format. – does this refer to correspondence templates?

Yes & also permit documents.

12. Item 58 - Ability to have multiple qualifiers for one contractor.

A contractor may utilize more than one qualifier under their license.

13. Item 63 - Provide for receipt of applications, plans and supporting documents online, via phone call, and in-person with real time system updates. – how would you anticipate accepting plans via phone call?

We anticipate the ability to have a customer view of the online portal to better communicate instructions for customers to complete these task from the online portal.

14. Item 71 - Ability to integrate MS Word processing for entry comment, conditions and to produce project summary documents and notifications.

We would like the ability to evaluate our continued functionality of being able to edit documents using MS Word within the system.

15. Item 131 - Provide for a customer queue to track walk in customers and notify next available staff to assist.

Walk in customers are currently being tracked using a SharePoint list, we would like the ability to track customers within the System.

16. Item 255 - Ability to change project number after initial project number is assigned. – why would you want to change this?

Sometimes permit numbers have to change or reference another permit.

17. Item 312 - Ability to calculate acreage of permitted area.

Ability to record acreage of a permitted area and access fees according to fee schedule.

18. Item 340 - Ability to have multiple inspections on same inspection record.

To clarify, the term record should be permit. Example: plumbing, mechanical, zoning inspections all under the same permit number.

19. Item 354 - Ability to accept documents in electronic fillable form onsite.

We would like to have the ability for a citizen, if onsite with the inspector to have the ability to access forms on their mobile device to submit in real-time.

20. Item 418 - Ability for all workflows to ask questions.

Currently we cannot start a workflow based on a decision point and we would like the ability to have workflows that can include a decision point for both plan review and permitting workflows.

21. Item 420 - Ability for workflows to be initialized by constraints in GIS layer and fields within software.

Please refer to page 28 Section 3.5.2 GIS requirements and line items 102, 103 and 104 in Appendix A.

22. Item 426 - Ability to start workflows with a question.

Currently we cannot start a workflow based on a decision point and we would like the ability to have workflows that can include a decision point for both plan review and permitting workflows.

23. The RFP including Appendix A do not appear to include all requirements of a Health Department operating in the State of North Carolina. Is the proposed system intended to “be available” to the health department for the EH components of Land Management (e.g., Septic Plan Review) -or- is the proposed system intended to be the system-of-record for the health department, replacing its current system for day-to-day operations? If it is the latter, please confirm that all health department requirements are included.

Septic system & well records will be completely documented, permitted, issued (established & archived) in the System. EnvisionConnect software will not be used for these records once the System becomes fully operational.

Food service, institutions, lodging & public swimming pools – we will work with these type facilities in the System until Certificate of Occupancies are issued whereupon, we will actually issue these operation permits in the EnvisionConnect software, not the System.

24. Have Mobile devices been identified for the agencies involved in this procurement?

No

25. Of the number of users detailed in the RFP, how many of those users will require mobile or field access?

Please refer to the chart on page 13.

26. Other than SunGard and Decade, what other sources of data, if any will be required as part of the data conversion effort?

Refer to page 28 Section 3.5.2 GIS Requirements, and line item 401 in Appendix A (Excel).

27. Does the County prefer a solution that will be hosted on site or hosted by the vendor?
We generally prefer a hosted solution; however, we can support a turn-key on-site solution.
28. Is the County under a tight timeline for implementation?
Please refer to pages 29 and 30, Section 4.3 Implementation Plan.
29. Has the County received any quote on the timeline for the implementation for this project?
No
30. Can the county identify all of the systems that "the system" will integrate with? JC - I am a little confused about the accounting and tax system interface but we can discuss that later.
Refer to question #2 above.
31. Will ALL data need to be moved from the ONESolution system into the new system before go-live?
The proposer will be responsible for migrating any data deemed necessary from the project's subject matter experts.
32. Will the proposer be responsible for any data cleansing?
The proposer will be responsible for migrating existing data from SunGard's ONESolution application to the new system. The need to clean-up data may be dependent upon the system selected. Please include consideration for data cleansing in your proposal.
33. In reading over the RFP I noticed that you are wanting persons to be able to query permit information for permits issued within the entire County, including municipalities (page 26). Is the County issuing building permits within the municipalities, or does this only refer to those permits issued by the County?
New Hanover County does issue some permits within the municipalities.
34. Also, I assume that Wilmington Fire is mostly if not entirely within the City of Wilmington. (page 26) Is it the County's intent to bring in the City of W... permits into the County system? If not, how would Wilmington Fire comment on City permits in the County system?
City Fire currently completes plan review and records final inspections in the system. It is not the current workflow to issue fire permits in the system but this workflow may be evaluated in the future.
35. Is New Hanover County requiring on premise solution providers to include estimated hardware costs over time with their proposal?
Yes; Please include recurring or anticipated costs over the next 3-5 years.

36. Can New Hanover County speak to any companies they would like the new land management system provider to integrate with?

Refer to question #2 above.

37. Could you speak to the amount of available **New Hanover County** resources to assist with data conversion?

Subject matter experts from each of the impacted departments have been identified as resources to this project, as well as (2) Information Systems Analysts, (1) BI & GIS Administrator, and (1) Network Administrator.

38. Did any outside parties (contractors or non-**New Hanover County** employees) assist in the development of this RFP?

No