

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP

## #09-003

### Amendment #3

## Responses to Vendor Questions

- 1. Page 16, Section 4.2:** This section requires that “proposing parties shall include with its proposal an implementation timeline showing expected major milestones and completion dates for a participating city.” Please clarify this requirement. Does the Alliance want a timeline for each participating city or just a sample single city timeline? Please clarify where this timeline should be located within the technical proposal and if it is excluded for the page limitations. The logical location for this document would be Section 10; however, this section is limited to no more than three (3) pages.

**Answer:** Provide one sample timeline and place it in Section 10. The three page limit will not include the timeline. The timeline should not be more than one page (two at the most).

- 2. Page 19, Section 6, Item 3:** This section states that privately held companies are not required to disclose financial information in proposals. Please confirm that this exclusion also pertains to the request for financial information listed on the Company Information and Qualifications questionnaire.

**Answer:** Privately held companies are not required to disclose financial information in their proposals, and do not need to complete the financial information requested in the Company Information and Qualifications questionnaire (you should note why you didn't provide the information, though). In Section 3 of your proposal you are required to provide a signed statement regarding how you will provide us with financial information that will assure us of your viability.

- 3. Page 11, Section 3.6:** How many named back office users do you expect to use the new system (please identify number of named users by system component):

**Answer:**

For the hosting option where eCityGov Alliance would host the system for various subscriber jurisdictions, there are no subscribers at this point, and, consequently, no users. Users would be added as entities subscribe to the hosting solution.

**Kirkland:** In addition to the numbers listed below, Kirkland maybe adding staff if an annexation goes through – we will know in the next month or so.

**Sammamish:** This seems like an unnecessary question – the cities should be able to add or eliminate licenses for these items as needed. The number likely fluctuates over time. The answer should not affect the design of the permitting system (seems like an information gathering question rather than a design question).

- a. Land/Permit Management

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Answer:

Responder	Answer
eCityGov Alliance	Not applicable for MBP.com; counts are unknown for the hosted alternative.
Bothell	80
Issaquah	50- 60 user range
Kirkland	80 (this not in addition to our original numbers but is a more accurate count)
Redmond	Redmond has approximately 140 users. We don't break down them down by module. Most users have data entry capability and all users would need access to GIS information.
Renton	Roughly 30 to 40
Sammamish	50

- b. Licensing and Case management (please also indicate if this number is in addition to the stated named users in the RFP)

Answer:

Responder	Answer
eCityGov Alliance	Not applicable for MBP.com; counts are unknown for the hosted alternative.
Bothell	30
Issaquah	50- 60 user range
Kirkland	25 (again, this not in addition to our original numbers but is a more accurate count)
Redmond	See answer in a. above
Renton	Roughly 10 to 15
Sammamish	50

- c. GIS (all users needing to access GIS information)

Answer:

Responder	Answer
eCityGov Alliance	Not applicable for MBP.com; counts are unknown for the hosted alternative.
Bothell	80
Issaquah	50- 60 user range
Kirkland	All users should have GIS functionality.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Redmond	See answer in a. above
Renton	120 or more
Sammamish	50

4. **Page 13, Section 4.1, forth bullet under the Alternative/Option heading:** Can the alliance clarify its expectation regarding the pricing model that vendors must include within its proposal?

**Answer:** Page 14, Responding to the Alliance Hosting Alternative

"The proposer should outline a Hosting proposal based on the considerations outlined above. The proposer is free to add other considerations and solutions to the proposal. The proposer shall also complete the pricing form for the eCityGov Alliance contained in this RFP."

5. **Item 29 of the Functional Requirements Document:** Regarding the list of third party application systems that may be integrated with the new system:

- a. This section requires vendors to describe experience and/or ability to interface. Should all, some or none of these interfaces be included in the proposed price?
- b. Which interfaces will be required vs. important as part of this proposal/price response?
- c. What additional information can you provide on each of these third party systems?
- d. Is the desired interface uni- or bi-directional?
- e. What is frequency of interface (batch or real time), and can these systems use web services?

**Answer:** We will provide this information, as needed, with the finalist vendors. With the information that we have provided you in the RFP we would like you to provide the following in your response on Line Item #29 on the Functional Requirements form in Attachment A of the RFP:

- 1. If you currently have interfaces developed with the systems we noted.
- 2. If so, what those interfaces look like and what they cost\*.
- 3. If you don't have those interfaces today, we would like to know that, and what your approach to developing the interfaces would be with some estimate for what that might cost\*.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

\* There is also a line item for integration and customization costs on the Price Proposal form for each City and eCityGov Alliance in Attachment B of the RFP that you can expand on to show integration or customization costs for each of the interfaces.

6. Please further describe the requirement for bi-directional integration (#18 in functional requirement doc) with Microsoft Word, Access, and Excel. Under what circumstances would the new Regional Permit System be required to integrate with Word and Excel in the "Word to Application" direction scenario?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; this is not a specific requirement for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Mail merge at the least. Perhaps having the ability to import from Excel to the database or application
<b>Issaquah</b>	Bi directional to us means that we can share files in two directions.
<b>Kirkland</b>	<p>Word – No. We would however, like to see "Excel to Application" integration. There are spreadsheets, both attached to a permit and not, that are used to calculate such things as the amount of security on a project and how much water and sewer main were installed by development.</p> <p>Another example of Office integration is the ability to directly attach emails to a permit within the permitting software.</p>
<b>Redmond</b>	<p>Same question as 48, 65 &amp; 91. Redmond would really like to see bi-directional integration between the Permitting system and MS Outlook/Calendar (i.e....events that get scheduled in the Permit system such as an inspection, can be reflected in an Outlook Calendar, and an event scheduled in a pre-defined Outlook calendar such as a pre-construction meeting related to a permit, would make its way into the permitting system). We don't have any pre-defined requirement for bi-directional integration with other Microsoft Office products. However, as integration among products is becoming more commonplace, we would like to see if any of the vendors have addressed this integration, and if so, how it's achieved. Redmond currently uses many "Application to Word" functions where a Word template can extract data from the permitting database to create a final document. We don't want to lose this functionality.</p>

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Renton</b>	Repeated question throughout. Need to be able to move information easily between software applications. Large number of applications possible.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Bi-directional would normally mean that information can be cut, pasted, and transferred from one document to another using the standard Windows short cut keys or options.

7. Regarding the ESRI ArcGIS integration:  
a. What specific ESRI licenses does each city own?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	ArcSDE, ArcGIS-ArcInfo, ArcView, ArcEditor
<b>Issaquah</b>	2 – ArcGIS Desktop, ArcEditor Concurrent-use 7 – ArcGIS Desktop, ArcView Single-use ArcGIS Server Standard Enterprise (utilize both the map server and SDE)
<b>Kirkland</b>	ESRI Small Municipal and County ELA” for Kirkland. It includes all ESRI server and desktop software except certain extensions and special packaged ESRI software solutions defined in ELA.
<b>Redmond</b>	The City has a site license with ESRI that gives us access to unlimited licenses of their entire software suite. We are currently using ArcGIS Server Enterprise Standard with a SQL Server SDE database for our backend and using the ArcGIS Desktop Suite (ArcView, ArcEditor and ArcInfo) for the desktop. We also are currently using Spatial Analyst and 3D Analyst.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	ArcGIS

- b. What version is each city using?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Currently 9.3, Looking at 9.4 in the near future.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Issaquah</b>	Currently 9.3.1; Issaquah keeps pace with ESRI's release of new versions although we are not "zero day" adopters. The GIS Coordinator schedules updates to keep all of the installed licenses in sync. Given ESRI's stated release date of Summer 2010 for version 9.4, Issaquah expects to have migrated to the new version by the end of 2010.
<b>Kirkland</b>	ArcGIS v9.3
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond is currently running 9.3.1
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Unknown

c. How many defined Layers does each city have?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Many, many layers.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah has identified over 100 data layers for its enterprise GIS. Not all are currently built and many are not relevant or appropriate for the permitting process.
<b>Kirkland</b>	No sure what it means by "defined". Kirkland has 80+ production GIS feature classes in Enterprise Geodatabase (ArcSDE 9.3 for SQL server 2005).
<b>Redmond</b>	We have over 100 feature classes covering things such as water/stormwater/sewer utilities, zoning, sensitive areas, parcels, etc.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	This seems like an unnecessary question – the cities should be able to add or eliminate licenses / layers and update versions for these items as needed. The number likely fluctuates over time. The answer should not affect the design of the permitting system (seems like an information gathering question rather than a design question).

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

8. When does the Alliance anticipate its response to bidders' questions to be distributed?

**Answer:** October 30, 2009

9. How many cases, licenses, applications, and/or permit types/unique workflows will each city track and manage within the system? Of these, how many have similar workflow types?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Many
<b>Issaquah</b>	Case types 20 basic with 10 + sub-case types within each. Most have similar workflow. Our current program may have limitations so we do not want to use our current case types as a limitation factor.
<b>Kirkland</b>	<b>Cases:</b> We have 48 case/permit types. <b>Licenses:</b> We have 2 license/case/permit types. <b>Workflows:</b> Our estimate is that there would be a workflow per case/permit/license type, so 50. The large majority of these would be failure simple, the license cases a little more complicated and our main Building case, very complicated.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond has building permits (which include building, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and sign) which all have similar workflow. We also have several types of Planning/Land Use permits which have their own workflow (different from Building). We have several types of Fire permits which have their own workflow. Then there are Public Works permits which are currently not stored in Permits Plus but they also have a different workflow.
<b>Renton</b>	Unable to determine at this time, well over a dozen, with more potentially desired in the future for future needs
<b>Sammamish</b>	Sammamish tracks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four land use application types</li> <li>• Two building permit types</li> <li>• ROW use permit</li> <li>• Bonds</li> <li>• Code Enforcement</li> <li>• Pre-application meetings</li> <li>• Code / Comp Plan Amendments</li> <li>• Traffic Concurrency</li> </ul> There are not many similarities...

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

10. Do the cities have documented processes for each of the workflows? If not, will documentation of "As-Is" processes be included in the project scope?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	We do not have a workflow documented
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah does not have documented processes for each workflow. Also no "As Is" documentation will be included in the project scope.
<b>Kirkland</b>	No and No
<b>Redmond</b>	Many of Redmond's permit workflow processes will be handled by ProjectDox (electronic plan review). Others not covered by plan review will need to be documented and modeled as part of the permit system implementation.
<b>Renton</b>	No
<b>Sammamish</b>	Should be part of the proposal scope – likely varies by City

11. Which standard reporting tools are used by the participating cities (i.e. Crystal, SRS, Oracle, RTF, and XML)?

a. Please identify which tools are in place by each city.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Crystal
<b>Issaquah</b>	We use Crystal Reports on many software applications.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Crystal Reports
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond uses Permits Plus Report module, IDS Reports (vendor-provided Access reporting database), SQL Reporting Services, & Crystal reports. We also have several internally developed Access databases which are used for reporting against Permits Plus.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Crystal, CityView reports

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

- b. How many critical go live reports will each city require? (The definition of a report is any document emitted by the system including letters, notices, forms, certificates, permits, mailing labels, receipts, invoices, etc.)

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Many, many reports
<b>Issaquah</b>	We use Crystal Reports, Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Letters, Notices, Permits, Mailing labels, Receipts, Invoices in our daily operations.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We estimated about 350 reports
<b>Redmond</b>	Please see the answer to question 74.
<b>Renton</b>	Many
<b>Sammamish</b>	~30 – 50 reports

- c. Please describe each city's report writing resources.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	We have a few users on staff that are very good at Crystal
<b>Issaquah</b>	Software vendors support the majority of Crystal reports. The City of Issaquah develops our own Crystal reports. Software vendor support online help when we have issues.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Our permitting applications Systems Administrator is the primary report writer, with 2-3 departmental report writers.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond has IT resources on staff and several 'super users' in the business area.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Crystal Reports, CityView

- d. Do any cities, as part of the training protocol, want to be trained in report writing and development; and if so, what percentage of reports does each city wish the vendor to write as part of the implementation? (For example, vendor writes 20 reports, city is trained to write 30 reports.)

**Answer:**

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes. I would think how to write a basic report would be sufficient.
<b>Issaquah</b>	We prefer to be trained in report writing and development. Because man power is limited, we prefer to have the vendor write most of the reports about 80% to 90%, while we assist with the development of some portion of specific reports. We would like to know the code and internal setup for the reports, so that we can support our daily operation.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We would have a core group of people (5 to 10) that would want report writing and development, specific to that vendor's solution. We do not need general report writing and development training.
<b>Redmond</b>	If the report writer is a functionality included within the permitting system, then Redmond would need training on how to use the vendor's reporting tools.
<b>Renton</b>	Yes to training – vendor to write approx 10 reports.
<b>Sammamish</b>	City staff should be trained, but I would expect the vendor to write the bulk of the reports

- 12.** Does each city want to convert data from its existing system, or will they consider this an optional item/task? If data conversion is required:
- a.** How many data sources need to be converted? Please provide detail on the anticipated need regarding conversion – for example, what type of data, how many fields for each system, what the approximate size is, etc. For historical permit data conversion purposes, describe the data source(s) for each jurisdiction (Permits Plus, Tidemark, Municipity, etc.), including any Access databases or non-RDBMS data sources.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	The data source we have is Tidemark. This would need to be converted. The database is approximately a Gigabyte in size.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah will request this as an optional task, as this is too detailed for this response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Data conversion is required.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	One data source, Accela Advantage v3.5.6 with a SQL Server 2000 database. The conversion should carry over links to attached documents stored outside the database.
<b>Redmond</b>	In general, Redmond would need to convert address, parcel and permit historical data (such as inspection results, fees, people etc.) from Permits Plus. Additional details regarding specific data fields, size etc. to be determined later as part of implementation planning with the chosen vendor.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Current data in CityView should be retained/converted. Size should be part of the proposal.

- b.** Are data conversion resources available to participate in the conversion effort of moving legacy system data to the new system? Do the cities have resources to put the legacy data into a prescribed format, and then participate in the conversion process in the new system?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	As far as I know, there are no conversion resources available.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah will request this as an optional task, as this is too detailed for this response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We would aid with the conversion process but the primary responsibility would be with the vendor. We do not have the resources to put the data in a "prescribed" format.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond has technical resources on staff that could assist in this process of extracting legacy data into a prescribed format and would be happy to collaborate with the vendor in a conversion effort.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Limited resources

- 13.** Will any/all Cities have an Address, Parcel, and Owner (APO) periodical conversion?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	We do not understand the question

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Issaquah</b>	<p>Yes, we have saved the parcel, addresses owner's data from the county on a regular basis and we convert that to our internal databases.</p> <p>Also, Issaquah will be maintaining these data within the enterprise GIS. Ideally, software will consume these data directly from the GIS but periodic conversion will occur if necessary.</p>
<b>Kirkland</b>	We don't understand the term "periodical conversion" and therefore cannot answer the question. Our current system stores the Address, Parcel and Owner information in the database. We update this data periodically with County and GIS data.
<b>Redmond</b>	By periodic, we assume you mean on some pre-defined cycle. Redmond currently imports address owner, new parcel, and parcel address from the King County Assessor's office on a monthly basis. Redmond highly desires a more timely and more automated process if there is one.
<b>Renton</b>	Yes
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

14. Will any/all Cities have a License Professional periodical conversion?

Answer:

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	We do not understand the question
<b>Issaquah</b>	We have received the state license department data update on a regular basis and we process that into our database system.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Again, we don't understand the term "periodical conversion". Our current system stores a directory of people, including Licensed Professionals that has been built up by manual entry over time. We don't currently update this data from an external source. In the new system, we do want to be able to update this data from an external source (Washington State L&I).
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond imports state contractor license data monthly. By the time we get the data from the state (around the 21 <sup>st</sup> of the month for the previous month-end), it's already potentially out of date. Redmond desires a web service that can go out and get the state contractor license expiration date on demand as it's needed in the system, on a more real-time basis. We

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	assume this means the successful vendor would try to partner with the state to provide this functionality.
<b>Renton</b>	Probably yes.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Unknown

**15.** Does an Executive Steering Committee exist for this project, and if so, are there executive representatives from each city impacted by this project?

**Answer:**

eCityGov Alliance has a Steering Committee comprised of representatives from each of the Participating Cities and eCityGov Alliance. Each City will also be responsible for its own internal project governance structure.

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	The Alliance has a formal governing body
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes
<b>Issaquah</b>	Yes
<b>Kirkland</b>	Yes at both the eCityGov Alliance level and in-house, where we do have an IT Steering Team and a development services team.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond will create an Executive Steering Committee for the implementation of the selected system.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

**16.** What is the budget for this project?

**Answer:** We are not sharing budget information at this time.

**17.** Please clarify how the public portal pricing options (interfacing with the Alliance portal, and Redmond's deployment of a separate vendor-supplied portal) should be represented. Can these be presented on an additional cost sheet specific to the requirement, or should this be broken out across each city?

**Answer:**

The public portal pricing option can be presented on an additional cost sheet specific to the requirement. It would be helpful to have the costs broken out across each city.

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com or the hosted alternative. MBP.com is and will continue to be the public portal for member cities.
<b>Bothell</b>	Broken out on a separate sheet

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Issaquah</b>	Presented on an additional cost sheet.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond would like to see pricing for a vendor supplied portal broken out. Our objective is to replace our existing portal with a vendor-supplied one.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	On the proposal. Vendor should decide how these are reflected.

**18.** Will the eCityGov Alliance require the use of a single merchant account provider? If so, please identify which is provided. If not, please identify the merchant account provider each city will use?

**eCityGov Alliance Answer:** Yes, Payflow Pro (owned by PayPal) is the Merchant Account Provider for the eCityGov Alliance web sites.

**Redmond Answer:** From Payment Server, payments go through Tender Retail, which uses our various merchant accounts (Parks, Permits etc.), to our bank account. The merchant accounts are set up with our bank, currently Bank of America.

**19.** The RFP refers to Sammamish as being the model configuration for the eCityGov Alliance system? Are there more specific details available such as the permit numbers and types, report numbers and types, interfaces, data conversion requirements, training methods, etc?

**Answer:** Since we do not have a specific city to point out for detailed background, we used Sammamish as an example of our functionality requirements. The vendor could either use the Sammamish details or document its own details for the purposes of responding to this alternative.

**20.** Is the Alliance open to a Train-the-Trainer approach? This approach would require that each city identify a qualified training resource to attend a multi-day Train-the-Trainer class and lead subsequent user training.

**Answer:** Yes.

**Kirkland:** We would want a combination of some vendor training and some Train-the-Trainer training. We should be able to combine some vendor training across multiple jurisdictions at once.

**Sammamish:** This should be an option under the proposal. (some Cities have resources to train, some may not)

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

21. Is the Alliance open to managing the System User Acceptance Testing process? This involves participating cities managing the development of a test plan and associated test scripts, as well as leading the execution of the plan.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative
<b>Bothell</b>	We would consider it
<b>Issaquah</b>	Not able to provide guidance on this question.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We will gladly help with test servers and set up and testing follow up, but we certainly hope for a vendor with good, clear test scripts.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond will manage user acceptance testing.
<b>Renton</b>	Yes, this is worth considering.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Not able to provide guidance on this question

22. Page 16 describes the functionality of the public portal options as: a full replacement of Redmond's Web portal or allow Redmond to use its own custom-developed Web portal for bi-directional access to the vendor's software. This includes but is not limited to the ability of citizens to use the Alliance or Redmond's portal to access the software to fill out a permit application, pay fees, submit plans, create a new permit case in the vendor's software and receive the new assigned permit case number from the software, get permit status, request an inspection and retrieve scheduling confirmation, and view payment and deposit status. This means that the vendor must be able to "expose" its software so that the Alliance can push data and transactions from its portal into the vendor's software.

- a. In order to appropriately and adequately price for these options, please confirm that this definition encompasses all functionality of the public portal. If any additional functionality and/or features are required, please provide as much detail as possible for these areas.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Existing and planned functionality for MyBuildingPermit.com: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• User accounts and contractor licensing verification</li> <li>• Permit submittal</li> <li>• Permit number assigned by permit system</li> <li>• Permit submittal payment, possibly querying permit</li> </ul>

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	<p>system for these fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attach and submit plan sets and other supporting documents</li> <li>• Permit status (currently data view)</li> <li>• Staff upload revised plans and documents to MBP.com</li> <li>• Staff download applicant plan and document revisions from MBP.com</li> <li>• Permit issuance</li> <li>• Inspection scheduling through MBP.com</li> </ul>
<b>Bothell</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Issaquah</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Kirkland</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Redmond</b>	<p>Clarification for Redmond: Redmond is not part of the Alliance and will not be using the Alliance's portal to conduct this type of business. Redmond's preference is to have the vendor's portal replace our existing portal. If the vendor's portal does not meet our needs, Redmond would retain and redesign its own portal and require that the vendor "expose" its software via open APIs or another method so that Redmond can push data and transactions from its portal into the vendor's software and retrieve information from the system.</p> <p>The current portal functionality includes the following which does not encompass all features desired (see requirements section of RFP for the additional functionality requirements):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Access the software to fill out a permit application</li> <li>b. Pay fees related to permits</li> <li>c. Get permit status</li> <li>d. Request an inspection and retrieve scheduling confirmation</li> <li>e. Get inspection results</li> <li>f. View list of all inspections scheduled for a given day</li> <li>g. View Plan review status</li> </ol>
<b>Renton</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See eCityGov answer above.

- b. Please provide integration details for both MyBuildingPermit.com as well as Redmond's own portal. Include the data that would need to be accepted from these portals into the new Regional Permit System and the type of functionality,

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

that is, create a new permit, update an existing permit, create a new <blank> license etc.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	The same requirements as Redmond outlines below with the exception that MBP.com is the established public facing transaction portal for the other five cities. Use of the proposing vendor's web portal is not an option for eCityGov Alliance.
<b>Bothell</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Issaquah</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Kirkland</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Redmond</b>	If Redmond must retain its portal, it would be modified to pass the data necessary to support all the permitting, inspection, payment processing, etc., that would be required if the information was entered into the vendor's system directly. Redmond would expect to work with the selected vendor to determine what data must be passed to the selected permit system and other modules implemented.
<b>Renton</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See eCityGov answer above.

- c. As a bi-directional interface(s), please confirm this would be real-time. Confirm whether the portal(s) have web services available.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Bi-directional interface must be real time. MyBuildingPermit.com has web services available.
<b>Bothell</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Issaquah</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Kirkland</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Redmond</b>	Bi-directional interface would need to be real time. Currently we have no web services.
<b>Renton</b>	See eCityGov answer above.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See eCityGov answer above.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP

## #09-003

### Amendment #3

## Responses to Vendor Questions

- d. Does the Alliance intend for [Vendor] to implement all of any add on cities/agencies, or will the Alliance want to be trained on implementing additional cities/agencies after the initial model?

**Answer:** The Alliance MBP.com portal is interfaced to many different vendor permit systems. The Alliance provides new member agencies with interface specifications and requirements. The agency is responsible for executing their side of the interface to their permit system. The Alliance would not desire training for vendor specific interface integrations.

23. Page 24 provides guidance regarding alternative proposals, stating that such information should be included in section 13 of the vendor's proposal. Page 15 ("Evaluation of Alternative Alliance Hosting Proposals") states that vendors who are interested in proposing a hosting solution may submit two technical and cost proposals. Please clarify how the Alliance would like options to be handled from the perspective of the proposal submittal. Should proposals for Alliance-hosted and Vendor-hosted options be submitted as completely separate submittals? Or should the description and pricing for a vendor hosted option be included in Section 13 of the vendor's proposal.

**Answer:**

Both the Alliance-hosted and Vendor-hosted options should be submitted in Section 13 as separate options (with separate worksheets).

24. What vendor systems has the Alliance seen or had demonstrated in the past year relative to this RFP?

**Answer:** Different people in the Alliance have seen systems by Accela, BasicGov, BitCo, BuilderRadius, CSDC, CRW, EdgeSoft, EnerGov, GovPartner, Harris, HdL Companies, Infor, Interlocking, Municipal Software, Municipity, New World, Praeses, SunGard, and Tyler Technologies

25. Please provide details regarding the Alliance and/or participating city staffing dedicated to the implementation of the Regional Permit system. Will there be a dedicated Project Manager, and if so, will this person be from the Alliance, a participating city, or an outside consultant? How many dedicated staff will be assigned to the duration of this system implementation?

**Answer:** If you are asking about the Alliance's hosted permit system solution, then the Alliance level of dedicated project management resource would be proportional to the size of the initial implementation (size and number of cities). We would need to develop a workable implementation and support plan with the vendor. There are far too many

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

variables to be able to predict with any level of certainty what project management and other dedicated resources would be required for a successful implementation.

**Kirkland:** Same answer – we don't know enough. However, we do not believe we would have ANY completely dedicated staff, but rather many staff with significant responsibilities.

26. What is the planned project implementation timeframe for all six agencies?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	There is not any set implementation timeframe for this alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Bothell would like to implement this project in 2010.
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are planning on a 2 year window.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We need to complete this work by the end of 2010 or we may not be able to start it until 2013. This is an aggressive schedule designed to complete this work before we perform a major annexation that is on this year's November ballot. If the ballot measure fails, then we will have a little more time, and could complete as late as the mid-2011.
<b>Redmond</b>	Current project timeline is to begin implementation in 2011 assuming project is funded in 2010 budget cycle.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	No planned timeframe.

27. We are a SaaS provider and thus do not have an establishment in Washington state and therefore would not normally be required to have a business license in any jurisdiction in the state. Is this a requirement as long as we meet all the legal requirements of the various jurisdictions in the state?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com. For the hosted alternative, business licensing will depend on local requirements. A successful vendor will be required to obtain a state business

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	license.
<b>Bothell</b>	A business license would be required
<b>Issaquah</b>	If you meet the definition of doing business in Issaquah a business license will be required. We prefer to determine this with more specific detail.
<b>Kirkland</b>	A business license would still be required of the vendor and most likely would be required by all agencies on the contract. The contract can include the cost of the business license.
<b>Redmond</b>	If the vendor's software is selected as the City of Redmond's new permitting system and if they would be providing on-site training and/or support they would be required to obtain a City of Redmond business license and a Washington State tax id number.
<b>Renton</b>	May need business license.
<b>Sammamish</b>	May need business license.

**28.** We have workers compensation insurance in all jurisdictions in which we have employees. This does not include Washington State. Is it a requirement to have Washington State WCB?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	See Redmond's response below.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are not able to answer questions regarding state requirements.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We don't know this answer. Washington State may be able to clear it up.
<b>Redmond</b>	Yes, we use language in all of our City contracts, drafted by the City Attorney, requiring in general that "all insurance shall be obtained from an insurance company authorized to do business in the State of Washington....", specific to workers' compensation, we require "Worker's compensation and employer's liability insurance as required by the State of Washington;..."
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	We are not able to answer questions regarding state requirements

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

29. There is a mandatory requirement that source code be placed in escrow. A SaaS solution is a cloud computing application (application name omitted) running on a cloud computing platform (platform name omitted); in traditional accounting software the equivalent might be a software application (Quicken) running on an operating system (Windows XP). Please confirm that "source code in escrow" requirement would only apply to the cloud computing application code and not to the platform code.

**Answer:**

The escrow requirement pertains to the application code because we must be able to use and maintain the Software if the vendor goes out of business or no longer sells or maintains the software. If the vendor becomes a finalist, we would need to determine if the cloud computing application is an operating system (in this case, it is the vehicle which would allow a user to use the software) or application code (functionality in the software that is used by the users or the proposed software; in which case it would also need to be placed into escrow).

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	The escrow requirement only pertains to the application code.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	Not able to provide guidance on this.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Yes
<b>Redmond</b>	We would just want the application source code unless the platform is proprietary.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Not able to provide guidance on this.

30. We are an equal opportunity employer however some of the rules listed do not make sense given the fact that we do not have any employees in Washington state i.e.: posting employment ads in Seattle newspapers.

**Answer:**

The RFP included the guidelines used by the city of Bellevue because that is where the eCityGov Alliance office is located. Specific rules may vary a little by city. Discussions may take place in the future with the finalist vendor to ensure compliance with equal opportunity guidelines for each City.

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are not able to answer questions regarding state requirements.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We have no requirement that anybody ever has to advertise in

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	newspapers. If the Alliance has this requirement, they can answer. What an old-fashioned way to hire!
<b>Redmond</b>	I'm not sure I understand the question, are you looking for competitive bidding requirements notification of postings? If so, we use the posting of RFPs, RFQs on our website (the Internet) in lieu of placing notices in the newspaper, also the State of Washington (WEBS) Internet portal could be used (this changed back in 2004, House Bill 2615).
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	We are not able to answer questions regarding state requirements

31. Some of our modules will need revisions to meet the RFP specifications. What is the time frame for the implementation of these revisions?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	By the time the software is implemented
<b>Issaquah</b>	These should be assumed ready at the time of contract signing unless otherwise agreed upon.
<b>Kirkland</b>	It depends on the module. For critical revisions they would need to be in by the time we begin testing the system for implementation. Some changes may be acceptable at a later time.
<b>Redmond</b>	This will have to be determined based on the individual City's timeframe.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	By the time the software is implemented

32. Page eleven breaks down the users as Total # of named users as well as # of field users. For example, it says that Bothell has 92 named users. Is this the number of people who will be using [the application] on a daily basis?

**Answer:**

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	No, for Bothell, this is the number of users in the system. The daily user count is much lower.
<b>Issaquah</b>	The actual determination of field vs. named users from our point of view relates more to your user charges and how you break those down. Traditionally we have daily active users who access the program on a daily basis and those who occasionally to seldom access the program. If you have variables based on frequency of users we are more interested in that.
<b>Kirkland</b>	75% of the named users would use the application on a daily basis; the remaining ones are occasional users.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond estimates a total of approx 140 users, with 40 concurrent users now. This number is expected to increase if we choose a system that integrates business license, code enforcement, fire inspections and Public Works.
<b>Renton</b>	Probably not, many are sporadic users.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Named users include office and field users

33. Are the field users in addition to the named users or are they part of the named user groups?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	I would think they would be part of the named user group.
<b>Issaquah</b>	The actual determination of field vs. named users from our point of view relates more to your user charges and how you break those down. Traditionally we have daily active users who access the program on a daily basis and those who occasionally to seldom access the program. If you have variables based on frequency of users we are more interested in that.
<b>Kirkland</b>	They are included in the named users count.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond's field users (currently about 20 but expected to grow) are included in the total.
<b>Renton</b>	In addition
<b>Sammamish</b>	Named users include office and field users

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

34. What is the data base behind the MyBuildingPermit portal?

**Answer:** Currently running on Microsoft SQL Server 2005 today and will be migrating to Microsoft SQL Server 2008 in early 2010.

35. Would you be able to provide us with a data so we can get a better picture of what the integration looks like?

**Answer:** We will provide this information, as needed, with the finalist vendors.

36. We would like to confirm that anything we mark as 'confidential' will not be public.

**Answer:** Please see the **Public Disclosure Notice** on Page 3.

37. Do the Cities included in the Alliance have a budget for purposes of this RFP? If so, what are the individual cities' budgets?

**Answer:** The Cities have a budget for this RFP, but some will need to get funding approved. We are not sharing budget information at this time.

38. For each city in the alliance, what existing systems will require data conversion? How many files will need to be converted?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	For Bothell, our Tidemark would need to be converted.
<b>Issaquah</b>	The existing permit plan data base will need to be converted or bridged over to the new data so that there is continuity in historic information. For other existing systems and applications such as GIS applications and Eden we need to be sure there is compatibility in the sharing of information.
<b>Kirkland</b>	One data source, Accela Advantage v3.5.6 with a SQL Server 2000 database. The conversion should carry over links to attached documents stored outside the database.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond cannot provide this level of detail at this time. See the answer to question 12.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown

**eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP  
#09-003  
Amendment #3  
Responses to Vendor Questions**

<b>Sammamish</b>	All permit and finance files
------------------	------------------------------

**39.** Is it required to fill out the hosted pricing model within the Pricing Forms provided in Attachment B for each agency, if our company does not offer this model? We plan to submit the pricing based on the License Pricing model.

**Answer:** If you do not offer a hosted pricing model you do not need to complete the hosted pricing form for each agency, but should note that you do not provide a hosted solution option.

**40.** Some areas of the proposal have page limits. Does front and back of one sheet count as 1 page or 2? Additionally, Section 5 requires that we summarize our Scope of Work/System Overview into 4 pages it will be difficult to summarize this information into 4 pages. We kindly request this page limit be increased.

**Answer:** Page limits refer to one page of information. If information is written on the front and back of a sheet of paper, it counts as two pages.

For Section 5, the Scope of Services, we agree to extend the page limit from four pages to eight pages. Please keep in mind that we are looking for concise information and are not interested in lots of "salesmanship" verbiage.

**41.** Attachment H – Equal Opportunity Requirements states that when the contractor intends to recruit they must publically notify women and minority organizations. We plan to use our current employees for purposes of the project implementation and do not intend to subcontract work. Is it necessary that we seek out women/minority organizations to work with us on this project to be in compliance?

**Answer:** If you plan to use your current employees for this project, it is not necessary for you to seek out women/minority organizations to work with you on this project in order to be in compliance.

**42.** What is the approved budget for this eGov Alliance project?

**Answer:** The Cities have a budget for this RFP, but some will need to get funding approved. We are not sharing budget information at this time.

**43.** When responding to the Alliance Hosting alternative, will the software, services and maintenance contracts be only between the vendor and the eGov Alliance?

**Answer:** Yes. However, in the future, it is possible that a Participating City might want to use its System to provide services to another entity such as a city.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

**Kirkland:** Probably. I can imagine a case where the software licensing is with the eCityGov Alliance, but a city has a specific professional service that it pays for. For example, if Kirkland chose to go with an Alliance hosted permit system and we needed an interface built to our financial system which is unique to us, we might hold that professional services contract with the vendor.

**44.**What cross-jurisdictional functions are required? For example, should each city be able to verify whether a contractor has outstanding violations in neighboring cities or perhaps that there are unpaid fees in one or more cities that have not been resolved?

**Answer:** Cross-jurisdictional data and functionality is limited to that provided by MBP.com. The vendor’s system will provide cross-jurisdictional functionality by accepting and providing data with MBP.com.

**Sammamish:** Cross jurisdiction information functions generally are likely limited – contractor information is maintained by the state. I do not believe the City would be interested (or that it’s legal) in limiting permits based upon unpaid fees in another jurisdiction.

**45.**Will train-the-trainer model be used for this project?

**Answer:** Not determined, but certainly a possibility.

**Kirkland:** We would want a combination of some vendor training and some Train-the-Trainer training. We should be able to combine some vendor training across multiple jurisdictions at once. Our internal resources for the Train-the-Trainer approach are very limited.

**46.**Will the project team include staff from every City participating in the project?

**Answer:**

There is an eCityGov Alliance Steering Committee comprised of representatives from each Participating City and eCityGov Alliance. This Steering Committee is the project team responsible for evaluating the Software.

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Yes for both MBP.com and the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	I believe so.
<b>Issaquah</b>	We anticipate being part of the project team.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Yes

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond's project will only include staff from Redmond (or consultants hired by Redmond to assist if deemed necessary).
<b>Renton</b>	Yes
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

**47.** Will the eGov Alliance identify a single Project Manager responsible for the implementation of the new system?

**Answer:** Yes. If individual cities implement their own system, then each city would have its own Project Manager.

**48.** Permit System Requirements (Question #18) – Please define “bi-directional” with regards to MS Office tools.

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Mail merge at the least. Perhaps having the ability to import from Excel to the database or application
<b>Issaquah</b>	Bi directional to us means that we can share files in two directions.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Example of “Excel to Application” integration. We have spreadsheets, both attached to a permit and not, that are used to calculate such things as the amount of security on a project and how much water and sewer main were installed by development. Being able to pull a calculate value from the spreadsheet.  Another example of Office integration is the ability to directly attach emails to a permit within the permitting software.
<b>Redmond</b>	See Redmond's answer to question 6.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Kirkland's answer

**49.** Planning/Zoning (Question #75) – Please provide more detail on concurrency and what specifically the desired features are.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Answer:

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	Tracking concurrency issues is similar to tracking another land use component. Traffic concurrency for example means determination of traffic volumes created by a new project and how those impacts are mitigated for. Sometimes fees are paid to mitigate. We need to track those reviews, approvals, determinations, other agency involvement etc.
<b>Kirkland</b>	The main thing we have to track with concurrency is timelines – the applicant has a deadline by which to submit a traffic report. Also, the concurrency approval has an expiration date, and that needs to be tracked so that we can notify the applicant that their approval is about to expire.
<b>Redmond</b>	REDMOND: "Concurrency," refers to the tracking that the City does to show that new development fits within the transportation planning for the city, in terms of "mobility units." See page four of the <i>2009 Report Card</i> for more information: <a href="http://redmond.gov/ConnectingRedmond/pdfs/2009ReportCard.pdf">http://redmond.gov/ConnectingRedmond/pdfs/2009ReportCard.pdf</a> Zoning information should be associated with the parcel data, each parcel falls within at least one zoning designation. It makes sense to provide the zoning data that affects a parcel associated with a permit in both the views/forms and in a map format. We saw some GIS interfaces (maps) that related, or overlaid, parcels with other kinds of GIS layers, like zoning. This, of course, is highly desirable. Redmond's zoning information is maintained and stored in our existing GIS layer.
<b>Renton</b>	Renton only needs as simple field to check off for concurrency
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah's response

50. Integration experience (Question #29) – Are the functional requirements the same for all like systems (finance, IVR, etc.)? In other words, will the functional requirement be the same for integrating with Springbrook and Eden? Of course the technical requirements will differ based on the underlying technologies of the systems.

- a. Will we be required to provide a budget estimate for integration without a defined scope?

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Answer:

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are asking in #29 what level of experience you have with integration with those systems. If your system has specific designed solutions we would be interested in that. We are not interested in what you would charge us to design such a solution as other vendors may have that solution built in.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We suspect the functional requirements will be similar but certainly not the same. So yes, you basically need to provide budget estimates with an incomplete scope. You may provide ranges or qualified answers, and we recognize this is something we will have to pin down later.
<b>Redmond</b>	As for providing a budget estimate, vendor should provide information based on their previous experience doing integration or provide an hourly rate.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah's response

51. Data Conversion – Is it expected that we provide a budget estimate or hourly/daily rate for data conversion without a defined scope?

Answer:

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes. We would need a very good close estimate at least.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Budget estimate and/or hourly/daily rate for conversion.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Yes, you basically need to provide budget estimates with an incomplete scope. You may provide ranges or qualified answers, and we recognize this is something we will have to pin down later.
<b>Redmond</b>	Details of conversion will be determined and negotiated with successful vendor. Redmond would like to see a daily or hourly rate for conversion services.
<b>Renton</b>	Prefer both

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP

## #09-003

### Amendment #3

## Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Sammamish</b>	Prefer both
------------------	-------------

**52.** Is it expected that this will be one large project, or individual projects that will proceed at their own pace?

**Answer:** It is expected that there will be individual projects that will proceed at their own pace.

**53.** Is pricing information to be included in the core submittal, or submitted separately?

**Answer:** A pricing form for each City needs to be completed and submitted in Section 9 of your proposal.

**54.** Do each of the member agencies have a defined budget for this project, or do they expect to fund the project from eCityGov Alliance fees?

**Answer:** The Cities have a budget for this RFP, but some will need to get funding approved. The Cities will not be funding the project from eCityGov Alliance fees, but it is likely that the eCityGov Alliance hosting alternative would be funded from eCityGov Alliance fees. We are not sharing budget information at this time.

**55.** With regards to the mybuildingpermit portal.

a. Will we be required to set up (configure) the portal with the appropriate permits?

**Answer:** The vendor will not have any configuration, customization or content responsibilities for eCityGov Alliance's MyBuildingPermit.com ("MBP.com").

b. If the City chooses to make changes to their permit (fees, reviewers, inspections, etc.) who will manage the changes in the portal?

**Answer:** The vendor will not have any configuration, customization or content responsibilities for MBP.com.

**56.** Are you able to share the budget for this initiative (for the Alliance and by city)? Is the budget available categorized by software, support/maintenance, and implementation services?

**Answer:** We are not sharing budget information at this time.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

57. Is the eCityGov Alliance a legal entity that can execute a contract?

**Answer:** Yes.

58. What is an "Application [Alliance] Warrant" that was referenced in the Professional Services Agreement?

**Answer:** A bank check. The Professional Service Agreement in the RFP is a sample agreement. The final agreement(s) will be between the individual city and the vendor.

59. On Page 11, in Section 3.6, City of Redmond is the only city with Electronic Plan review noted in the background information. Are there plans or needs from other cities for electronic plan review and if so, has a vendor been selected for future implementation?

**Answer:** MBP.com will have the capability to accept, review and issue all types of permits in the future. No vendors have been selected or are involved in this work at this time.

**Sammamish:** Sammamish intends to go to electronic plan review in the future. Timing is unknown.

60. On Page 11, in Section 3.6, are all users included in the number of Named Users and Concurrent Users those that need data entry capability? Or are "read only" users included in those counts? Can you please clarify the number of users that need data entry capability in each of those categories?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	We would have to still explore how many read only users we would have.
<b>Issaquah</b>	The actual determination of named users from our point of view relates more to your user charges and how you break those down. Traditionally we have daily active users who access the program on a daily basis and those who occasionally to seldom access the program. If you have cost variables based on frequency of users we are more interested in that.
<b>Kirkland</b>	The large majority (90%) are "data entry" capable users, the rest of "read only."
<b>Redmond</b>	See the answers to questions 3 and 32.
<b>Renton</b>	About 50% are read only users

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Sammamish</b>	75% data entry, 25% read only
------------------	-------------------------------

61. On page 15, in Section 4.2, we have the following questions about the Key Modules for the Participating Cities:

- a. Does the functionality named currently exist for each city or will some of the functionality be new for some of the cities?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Some would be new.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Some functionality could be new.
<b>Kirkland</b>	All Kirkland functionality marked "R" for Required exists in our current application. The one item mark "E" for Explore for Kirkland is currently done in another system.
<b>Redmond</b>	Planning/Zoning, permitting, building inspections, cash receipting, project tracking, property history, report writer and financial tracking. Redmond does not currently have integrated business licensing, code enforcement or Fire inspection modules.
<b>Renton</b>	Most exist
<b>Sammamish</b>	Some functionality could be new.

- b. How many case/application/permit types are there currently in each of the Key Modules?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Many
<b>Issaquah</b>	We have about 20 total cast types at this time based on our current system. This could certainly change with a new program.
<b>Kirkland</b>	50 case/application/permit types

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	Planning/Zoning: 17 Permits: 30 Licensing: 2 Inspections: Not specific to permit/case type Cash Receipting: Not in our current system Project Tracking: Not specific to permit/case type Code Enforcement: 1 Property History: Related to parcels, not permits Financial Tracking: 35 Report Writer: 50
<b>Redmond</b>	
<b>Renton</b>	Lots
<b>Sammamish</b>	Capacity to handle 1,000 per year

- c. How many different data sources are involved with the functionality currently that would need to be considered for data conversion? What type of data will be converted from each source e.g. addresses, permits, cases, contacts, etc. Are there any known issues with any of the data sources that would require additional time and effort for data scrubbing?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes. Our data is ugly.
<b>Issaquah</b>	This is too detailed of a question for adequate response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.
<b>Kirkland</b>	
<b>Redmond</b>	Refer to question 12.
<b>Renton</b>	Known
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah's response

62. On page 16 in the fourth bullet point of the RFP it states *"In the event that one instance of the software is used to support multiple jurisdictions, the software must be able to partition the data, case types, rules, configuration, etc. for each jurisdiction so that they are independent of each other, including how security and administration is handled for each jurisdiction."* Is one instance the preferred direction of the Alliance? If so, is the objective of this for cost sharing or for process alignment? Have the participating cities

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

agreed to share common data such as address, contact, parcel information? Other than partitioning the case types and configuration, are there other agency specific security rules that must be adhered to?

**Answer:**

The referenced bullet you asked about was to meet the requirements for the hosting option for eCityGov Alliance. For the individual Participating Cities, while they may standardize on one vendor, they may decide to have their own instance of the software on their own server.

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	<p>Single Instance - The Alliance does not have a preferred architecture for the hosted solution. The language is intended to call out the need to provide secure separation between agency specific data and business processes for whatever hosted solution is proposed.</p> <p>Cost sharing and process alignment – It is hoped that a hosted solution can achieve cost sharing and take advantage of some level of process alignment.</p> <p>Share common data – Certainly a possibility.</p> <p>Other agency specific security rules – Unknown at this time.</p>
<b>Bothell</b>	Bothell would rather have its own server in house.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Not able to provide guidance on this question.
<b>Kirkland</b>	One instance is not our expected direction, although we are open to being convinced by a foolproof case.
<b>Redmond</b>	Does not apply to Redmond.
<b>Renton</b>	No agreement on this issue
<b>Sammamish</b>	No agreement on this issue. Agencies permit process differently which result in different tracking needs

**63.** In the Pricing section, pricing is requested for the Alliance but user counts and product functions were not specified. Please provide a breakdown of modules and users anticipated for the Alliance.

**Answer:** Because the hosted alternative does not have a representative agency at this time, the vendor will need to provide sample user counts, module information and pricing options.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

**64.**In the Pricing section, can the pricing format for each agency be changed to illustrate different pricing alternatives based on # of named and concurrent users?

**Answer:** Yes. The cities might be interested in seeing different options.

**65.# 18.** Bi-directional integration with Microsoft Word, Access, and Excel.

Question: What do the cities envision “bi-directional integration” with Word, Access, and Excel to mean? Most systems have the ability to export information generated by the system into Word, Access, and Excel, but we are puzzled about what business functions are envisioned going from Word, Access, and Excel back into the system.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Mail merge at the least. Perhaps having the ability to import from Excel to the database or application
<b>Issaquah</b>	Bi directional to us means that we can share files in two directions.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Word – No. We would however, like to see “Excel to Application” and “Access to Application” integration. There are spreadsheets, both attached to a permit and not, that are used to calculate such things as the amount of security on a project and how much water and sewer main were installed by development.  Another example of Office integration is the ability to directly attach emails to a permit.
<b>Redmond</b>	See Redmond's answer to question 6.
<b>Renton</b>	Need to export information
<b>Sammamish</b>	See previous question

**66.#25:** Microsoft SharePoint integration.

Question: Please elaborate or describe what kind of integration is required. What are you looking for the permitting system to integrate with?

**Answer:**

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	We do not have SharePoint at the moment, but we are looking at it. I can't give a valid response at the moment
<b>Issaquah</b>	SharePoint is both a data storage bank for documents to be actively shared, (i.e. opened, edited, reviewed etc) by groups of users. If your system can share files or allow active editing of files shared by a number of users and documents in SharePoint for instance then list what those are. If your system is not designed to interact with SharePoint then note that.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We use Share Point as our Intranet and many of our systems are linked to it and/or are searchable from the SharePoint search function. We don't anticipate a tight integration with SharePoint at this time.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond does not <u>require</u> SharePoint integration. Redmond is exploring the use of SharePoint as a secure document storage & retrieval system. It is in this context that we are interested in seeing integration between SharePoint and a permit management system.
<b>Renton</b>	Repeat question
<b>Sammamish</b>	Not used at this time

**67.#27:** Scan documents into the system. Briefly describe your scanning capabilities.

Question: Are looking for scanning software as part of the permitting system, or just the ability to attach a scanned image.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Both
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are interested in what your system has to offer with regard to scanning. Please list all your capabilities. If your system can

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	scan, edit, catalog, transfer, etc. please list those. If reading scanned images is all your system can do then just list that.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We have some dedicated scanners, and our multifunction devices generally all scan documents as well. We are really only looking for the ability to EASILY attach a scanned image.
<b>Redmond</b>	We want to insure that any document we might scan in can be attached to a permit system record.
<b>Renton</b>	Ability to attach
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah's response

**68.#51.** Provide optimal driving route (e.g. to do inspections or to investigate complaints received).

Question: Are driving directions required?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	No
<b>Issaquah</b>	Nice to have but no.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Our ArcGIS software has the ability to do some routing. We have not implemented this capability at this time, but if we do want driving direction and vehicle routing, we assume we would use our GIS system as the primary tool for that and access it through the GIS integration between the permits software and our GIS.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond does not expect a MapQuest like amount of detail. We have seen systems that were capable of displaying inspection locations on a map and suggesting a logical sequence to accomplish the work. If the software could line up my inspections/field/site visits for the day, it could then print a map that included all of these sites and the best (shortest) route between them.
<b>Renton</b>	No
<b>Sammamish</b>	No

**69.#56.** Global updates: ability to pick a field where update should be made and have that field update across all like records.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

Question: Please provide an example of the type of global data that will need to be updated.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Address Change
<b>Issaquah</b>	Example: address changes...our expectation would be for a change in address to be implemented changing the address in all similar records using that address.
<b>Kirkland</b>	This is a Redmond requirement. The ability to change the status on block permits would be very useful.
<b>Redmond</b>	One example would be where an address or parcel number was entered incorrectly in the central repository. We would want to correct the mistake in one and only place, and then have the correction displayed everywhere. A well designed normalized database will provide this functionality; we just want to insure that your software can do it. Another example would be inspection item numbers or descriptions related to inspections that could potentially change.
<b>Renton</b>	Change in property ownership.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Example provided after vendor selection

**70.# 64.** Central Master Address repository for all modules: Permits, Business License, etc. with capability to unit-level addressing (e.g. condos, apartments, suites, etc.). Integrate with Kirkland Master Address Database (KMAD) or other GIS address database.

Question: Do all agencies need to have this interface?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah prefers this capability.
<b>Kirkland</b>	This is a requirement for Kirkland.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond wants the vendor's application to provide a central address repository which we would populate with existing parcel

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	and address data. Our GIS system is parcel-based. We do not need to integrate with Kirkland's KMAD.
<b>Renton</b>	Yes
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

**71.#71.** Discuss your archival capabilities to meet Washington state records retention requirements.

Question: Please elaborate on the records retention requirements.

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBPP.com. As stated below for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	We need to be able to apply the appropriate retention to records
<b>Issaquah</b>	Vendors need to research WA State records requirements on their own. We will determine if the solution provided meets our needs.
<b>Kirkland</b>	The Washington State records Retention Requirements can be looked up online. We need to be able to apply the appropriate retention to records, and to destroy records once that retention date has passed.
<b>Redmond</b>	See Issaquah & Kirkland responses above.
<b>Renton</b>	As stated, per Washington requirements.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Kirkland, Issaquah response

**72.#75.** Track and manage concurrency; issue certificate of concurrency. E.g. for a major multi-use development, do pre-application review of whether the city has the capacity to support the development (transportation infrastructure, ability to handle water and wastewater, etc.)

Question: How is this process currently handled?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are interested in how your program tracks and manages

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	concurrency issues not how we are currently doing it.
<b>Kirkland</b>	The main thing we have to track with concurrency is timelines – the applicant has a deadline by which to submit a traffic report. Also, the concurrency approval has an expiration date, and that needs to be tracked so that we can notify the applicant that their approval is about to expire. We currently track this manually.
<b>Redmond</b>	Developer submits an application for concurrency for the project. The application identifies the net new “mobility units” demanded by the project based on a “look-up” table provided by the City. If the mobility unit demand equals, or is less than 25, no certificate is required. If demand is greater than 25, staff confirms that sufficient mobility unit supply is available, if so, certificate is issued. A balance sheet/ledger of mobility unit supply and demand is maintained by the City.
<b>Renton</b>	Not an issue for Renton, just need field to check off when completed.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah

**73.#100.** Right-of-way permitting. (E.g. Permit for sewer line spanning the right of way in front of 3 parcels.) Prefer method to capture right-of-way location and right-of-way as the “owner” of the permit rather than the parcels.

Question: Is data related to the asset also to be stored in the system?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	Yes
<b>Kirkland</b>	The data related to assets are generally stored in our asset management system (Infor/Hansen).
<b>Redmond</b>	Sewer and water assets are tracked in GIS. We need to be able to issue a permit to one of these points instead of to a parcel (at times). Our current permit system does not allow this capability and so, the result is that a permit can get issued to the closest address or parcel instead. This will be critical functionality once we bring Public Works on board.
<b>Renton</b>	Prefer to attach to adjacent property or properties.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

**74.#102.** Support various required reports and formats. E.g. monthly summary report for County Assessor and performance report on how long it has taken the city to process permits.

Question: Can additional information and/or a number and complexity of desired reports be provided? It is difficult to estimate a cost a possibly unlimited amount of reporting needs.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	How about flexibility of creating reports, so we can do it on the fly.
<b>Issaquah</b>	We are interested to know what reporting functions are available in your software and how flexible querying of data is. What parameters are used to set up report?
<b>Kirkland</b>	We currently have 350 reports that are integrated (run able from) in our current permitting application. Some, probably 30% are out of box reports that came with the system. There are also an unknown number of reports written and run outside of our permitting system by the various departments. An additional 50 would be a good estimate.
<b>Redmond</b>	Vendor should provide information on what reports are delivered standard with the application, and an hourly rate to develop additional as would be identified during implementation planning.
<b>Renton</b>	Need flexibility in creating future reports. The example report for processing time is a good one.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Vendor should provide some reports based upon proposal. Staff to be trained to create and generate additional reports as needed

**75.#104.** Bond tracking capabilities.

Question: Please describe capabilities needed.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Unknown
<b>Issaquah</b>	Ability to track intake, due dates, inspections and bond release. Integration with Eden for financial tracking.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Need security holder, security or bonding company, contact info; which permit the security is associated with, purpose of the security, form of payment, amount, reduction amounts (if any), trigger notice of coming expiration, generate letters and attach correspondence.  Need to have user security so that confidential fields are blocked from view except for certain users.
<b>Redmond</b>	Planning and Public Works receive bonds for a variety of different needs related to a permit. We want a central place within the permitting system to track the capture and release of monies. Bonds come to us from different sources (i.e. cash, check, bank account, bonding/surety company) and can be incrementally released. A bond can outlive the permit cycle.
<b>Renton</b>	Dates, amount, contacts, purpose, reports.
<b>Sammamish</b>	

**76.#** 135 Drill from central cash receipting into external cash systems (e.g. Parks and Recreation Class software) to view transaction details.

Question: Please provide additional information about the desired cash receipting interfaces that will be required.

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Eden
<b>Issaquah</b>	All cash transactions require receipting capabilities if requested by the applicant or other departments. Cash transactions normally include intake of cash for permit review deposit, penalty fees for such things as re-inspection fees, fees for special meetings, cash bonding, purchase of materials etc.
<b>Kirkland</b>	We don't care about this.
<b>Redmond</b>	If the permit system has its own cash receipting component that is auditable, then ideally having an automated process that doesn't require action by staff to get the information into the

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

	financial system is preferred. However, the minimum is being able to interface once a day with the financial system. As a caveat for this question, if the permit system is implemented prior to Dynamics (Redmond is in the process of replacing their financials), then there will be a need to have an interface into Quadrant but hopefully we will be done with the Dynamics implementation before replacing the permit system.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	Springbrook

**77.#130.** When the permit case has been “finaled” (completed), automatically convert the permit case to a fire inspection case and carryover the permit case information and records.

Question: Are the Fire Inspectors included in the estimated license total provided on page 15?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	I believe so.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Yes
<b>Kirkland</b>	Yes
<b>Redmond</b>	Yes
<b>Renton</b>	Yes
<b>Sammamish</b>	Yes

**78.#131.** Discuss experience interfacing with Springbrook and IFAS Cashiering modules. What information is ‘owned’ by the financial system vs. the permitting system?

Question: What information do you want the financial system to own?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	No experience with Springbrook
<b>Issaquah</b>	No experience with Springbrook....currently we use an Accela cashiering module to interface with our financial system Eden.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Kirkland</b>	Kirkland currently uses Springbrook for central cashiering which interfaces with IFAS daily. IFAS owns all financial data and will continue to own the financial data. IFAS currently does not contain any specifics, details with regard to permits or license information and does not currently interface.
<b>Redmond</b>	We don't see the financial system "owning" any of the data. Rather, the permit system maintains and owns the source data. The financial system's role would simply be a mechanism to bring multiple systems financial data together for reporting/budgeting. Now if the permit system is not auditable (i.e. it doesn't track changes made to permits for example), then the financial system would have to own all the data.
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown
<b>Sammamish</b>	As long as security is maintained around financial access Sammamish can be flexible in where data is stored.

**79.139-142.** Tight integration with [financial system].

Question: Because each city will be requiring "tight integration" with its existing financial system, it would be helpful to have more detail about what each jurisdiction means by "tight". Is there a common definition of tightness, or will each city be the judge of the required level of integration into its system?

**Answer:**

We would like to minimize the amount of manual effort currently needed to get data into the financial system from the permit system, and to be able to import data from the financial system.

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Our definition of "tight" would be the ability to integrate financial information without error
<b>Issaquah</b>	Our definition of "tight" would be the ability to integrate financial information without error. Ultimately we would be the judge of the required level of integration.
<b>Kirkland</b>	The term "tight integration" is not familiar - Unable to answer.
<b>Redmond</b>	There is not a commonly known definition of "tight integration". Redmond would prefer to be the judge of the financial integration based on the vendor's responses, prior experience and demonstrations.
<b>Renton</b>	Probably defined by each City

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Sammamish</b>	Probably no common definition. For Sammamish tight integration would entail financial system and permit tracking system updating records in real time. Financial records available through each system.
------------------	---

**80.# 167.** Synchronize project information contained in permit system with project as it is set up in the financial system's project accounting for data sharing and invoice generation.

Question: Please provide additional information about the project data currently stored in the financial applications.

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	None at the moment, this would have to be defined.
<b>Issaquah</b>	General financial information for tracking and accounting purposes related to fees collected, type of payment, fees paid , owed, bonds posted etc. Also ability to track electronic payment.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Kirkland does not currently have project information in our financial system.
<b>Redmond</b>	We currently do not have project accounting data maintained in our financial system. We do have a job cost system that is utilized somewhat by Public Works.
<b>Renton</b>	Not able to provide answer.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Issaquah

**81.# 168.** Alerts for completion of work for permits resulting in signal to begin billing (e.g. surface water, sewer, backflow devices for fire, hydrants, right-of-ways, etc.).

Question: What system(s) currently bill for those services for each Jurisdiction?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Bothell</b>	Eden
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah uses Eden for financial tracking.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Surface water is billed through King County as part of the property tax bill, sewer ins billed through Springbrook, Backflow devices are billed through Hansen, and we do not bill for hydrants or rights-of-way.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond's Utility billing system is Springbrook. Fire permits billing is handled via a custom interface to our financial system (which we would like replaced by the vendors accounting system interface).
<b>Renton</b>	Springbrook
<b>Sammamish</b>	Springbrook

**82.# 178.** Track status of properties for remodel with start and stop utility billing.

Question: Is an interface to each Jurisdictions Utility Billing product desired? If so, please specify the source systems.

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Yes I believe so.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah expects an interface with our Eden financial program.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Our source system is Springbrook.
<b>Redmond</b>	REDMOND is not sure what this means. Our Utility Billing is handled by Springbrook. We would like the permitting system to be able to send alerts (i.e. when a water permit is finalized) so that staff can handle utility billing setup and start functions without having to pass paper around.
<b>Renton</b>	Yes, Springbrook
<b>Sammamish</b>	Not applicable

**83.** (Page 9) Who is doing the expanded work on MBP?

**Answer:** Alliance staff and the MBP Management Committee

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

**84.** Are there any jurisdictions ready to proceed with procurement and deployment right away? If so, which ones?

**Answer:** Yes. See Question #26.

**85.** Will eCityGov issue a preferred vendor list as a result of this RFP? Or are results of this RFP strictly up to each individual jurisdiction?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Ideally the Participating Cities will consense on a preferred vendor list.
<b>Bothell</b>	Bothell will choose it's own preferred vendors
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah intends to work closely with other cities to select a compatible system that develops consistency between cities. Cost will be a big factor in what we end up with.
<b>Kirkland</b>	See eCityGov above
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond expects to choose their own preferred vendor based on RFP responses and software demonstrations.
<b>Renton</b>	Cities not locked into future commitments.
<b>Sammamish</b>	

**86.** (Page 20 and 27) Regarding "Scope of Services" will you increase the page limit to at least 6 pages for this section?

**Answer:** For Section 5, the Scope of Services, we agree to extend the page limit from four pages to eight pages. Please keep in mind that we are looking for concise information and are not interested in lots of "salesmanship" verbiage.

**87.** What is an alliance warrant which is mentioned in the Professional Service Agreement Sample? (see wording below)

a. 2. PAYMENT

A. The Alliance shall pay the Contractor for such services:

b. \_\_\_\_\_ but not more than a total of \$\_\_\_\_\_.

c. B. The Contractor shall maintain time and expense records and provide them not more frequently than monthly to the Alliance, along with monthly invoices in a format acceptable to the Alliance for work performed to the date of the invoice.

d. C. All invoices shall be paid by mailing an Alliance warrant within 45 days of receipt of a proper invoice after approval of the Contractor's completed tasks/deliverables to the date of the invoice or monthly report, as appropriate.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

**Answer:** A bank check. The Professional Service Agreement in the RFP is a sample agreement. The final agreement(s) will be between the individual city and the vendor.

**88.** Submission Requirements Section 8 states that 5 installations of the current product are required. The process management platform we will be proposing is new and does not have any installation currently. Our organization does meet all of the topic 5: Qualifications (Pg 17) and has over 20 years of experience in the municipal permitting and process management market-- will the Alliance permit our proposal?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com. Open to alternatives for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Bothell would have to see case by case
<b>Issaquah</b>	No.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Kirkland is fine with this, if the vendor means that a portion of the complete offering is new. If all parts of the response are referring to brand new software we would not choose to buy that.
<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond is not sure what 'process management platform' means. However, if the vendor cannot meet Submission Requirements, then it's unlikely Redmond would accept this vendor proposal without knowing which specific requirements are lacking.
<b>Renton</b>	Renton would consider offer accordingly.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See Renton

**89.** Several eCity.gov Alliance members are already our clients-- are we allowed to continue communicating with them in regards to our current contracts and support services, without resulting in disqualification?

**Answer:** You are allowed to continue communicating with your Alliance clients in regards to current contracts and support services on an as needed basis without getting disqualified from this RFP.

**90.** Is the Proposing Party allowed to list the Alliance members we currently service as Customer References, without jeopardizing our ability to respond to this RFP?

**Answer:** You may list Alliance members as customer references without jeopardizing your ability to respond to this RFP. Keep in mind that we are really looking for

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

references that currently have your proposed software implemented and are using a functionality “footprint” similar to what we have listed in this RFP.

91. Topic 18 – Would you clarify what you intended functionality in the statement of “Bi-directional integration with Microsoft Word, Access, and Excel”?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Bothell</b>	Mail merge at the least. Perhaps having the ability to import from Excel to the database or application
<b>Issaquah</b>	Bi directional to us means that we can share files in two directions.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Word – No. We would however, like to see “Excel to Application” integration. There are spreadsheets, both attached to a permit and not, that are used to calculate such things as the amount of security on a project and how much water and sewer main were installed by development.  Another example of Office integration is the ability to directly attach emails to a permit within the permitting software.
<b>Redmond</b>	See Redmond’s answer to question 6.
<b>Renton</b>	Repeat question
<b>Sammamish</b>	See previous answer

92. Topic 82 – How many types of permits are to be converted for each jurisdiction? Can screen and data structure samples be provided for each type to be converted?

**Answer:**

Responder	Answer
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	Not yet.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah will request this as an optional task, as this is too detailed for this response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.
<b>Kirkland</b>	50 permit/case types. Screen shots and data structure can be provided later.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Redmond</b>	Redmond cannot provide a detailed answer to this question at this time. Please see answers to questions 9 and 12. Redmond would be able to provide screen and data structure samples to the successful vendor.
<b>Renton</b>	Not at this time.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Not at this time.

93. The requirements do not specifically state how many reports are to be converted to the new system from existing systems, can this be provided?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	We have many reports. We create them on the fly in Crystal all the time.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah will request this as an optional task, as this is too detailed for this response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.
<b>Kirkland</b>	Roughly 350 Crystal Reports, depends somewhat on what reports come out of the box with each application.
<b>Redmond</b>	Same answer as question 74.
<b>Renton</b>	Lots, with more in the future.
<b>Sammamish</b>	See previous answer regarding reports. Approx. 50 required conversion and city staff need to be trained to create more reports as needed.

94. Can estimated size of the data to be converted to the new system be provided?

**Answer:**

<b>Responder</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>eCityGov Alliance</b>	Not applicable for MBP.com; unknown for the hosted alternative.
<b>Bothell</b>	The current DB is approx 1 gb at the moment.
<b>Issaquah</b>	Issaquah will request this as an optional task, as this is too detailed for this response. Vendor should provide some basic parameters for data conversion and cost.

# eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP #09-003 Amendment #3 Responses to Vendor Questions

<b>Kirkland</b>	Our current permitting system contains 165,800 cases/permits/licenses over 50 different case/permit/license types. There are 19,795 parcels in the city with an additional 3640 fake parcels (right of ways and other various items). There are 21,786 people in the directory of people. There are 4,405 activities/events that can be added to permits. There are 464 different fees (some calculated, some not). There are 2876 conditions.
<b>Redmond</b>	It's not possible to provide this amount of detail at this point. Vendor should provide daily or hourly rate for conversion services and speak to their prior experience in doing so (with Permits Plus specifically for Redmond).
<b>Renton</b>	Unknown.
<b>Sammamish</b>	Unknown.

**95.** Is it acceptable for a system integrator (SI) or value added reseller (VAR) to be the “prime respondent?” The SI would be the primary contact and will be responsible for delivery of the overall solution.

**Answer:** It is acceptable for an SI or VAR to be the “prime” respondent and primary contact for the proposal.

- However, it is very important that, as the primary contact, the SI/VAR would be able to quickly bring the needed resources/experts to the table to answer any questions that we have about the software (including its technology and its functionality) and your proposal.
- If selected, the Alliance expects that the RFP and proposal will be included in the Agreement, and that the “prime” takes full responsibility for the performance of the software and implementation success.
- Please note that even though the SI/VAR is the primary respondent, the RFP also gives the Alliance the right at its sole discretion to request a different implementation partner (SI) or to select a different implementation provider on its own.

**96.** Should the SI be the successful bidder, is it acceptable that the client would be asked to sign two agreements? One would be a contract with the SI for delivery of the services and the second is the software license agreement with the software vendor.

**Answer:** Yes.

**eCityGov Alliance Regional Permit System RFP  
#09-003  
Amendment #3  
Responses to Vendor Questions**

**97.** Attachment H – Other Requirements Do both the SI and the software vendor need to execute the forms in Attachment H? (i.e. you would receive one set of the 3 completed forms from the SI and one set from the software vendor.)

**Answer:** Yes. Both the SI/VAR and the software vendor must complete all three forms.