

Finance

January 18, 2022
Permitting/Planning/Licensing Software
BID# 2022-004
ADDENDUM NO.1

The due date for proposal submissions has been hereby extended to Tuesday, February 8th, 2:00p.m. Provide your firm's proposal form, software requirements paperwork. And sufficient detail to explain your proposal and bid.

This Addendum #1 hereby makes the following clarifications and additions:

Q&A

Question: How many users does Lewiston have on their present system?

Answer: Forty (40)

Question: Does the City have a preferred payment gateway? If so, which one?

Answer: The City currently accepts online credit card payments via InforME.

Question: Are we integrating with any other programs? Please explain.

Answer: Yes, Munis and IAS World would be a start. We are going to Tyler for all tax this season as well. Tyler is also installing cashiering that will be the interface for charging people at the windows.

Question: Are you looking for Outlook integration?

Answer: Integration with Outlook will be ideal, if not specifically covered in the scope of the RFP.

Question: Are you interested in Plan Review Markup?

Answer: Possibly, depending on what this will include.

Question: How many users will we be training?

Answer: Key Staff within Code, City Clerks, IT, etc. (representing the 40 users in Energov currently used for permitting.

Question: Will the City consider a proposal that would include third party implementation?

Answer: Yes. The bidding firm will need to note that throughout their presentation that it's a joint proposal with the third party they partner with for our consideration.

Question: How many departments will require read-only users?

Answer: Unsure, do you have price points for this option based on number of departments you could provide us based on numbers of departments (0-5, 10+, 20+ etc.)?

Question: What GIS system is the City currently using?

Answer: The City of Lewiston is currently an ESRI customer for our GIS systems.

Question: Are you interested in our Code Enforcement module?

Answer: Yes. Our Director of Code Enforcement was not sure if it would be included in the permitting software or a separate module not knowing each provider. However, as the RFP is written at present, it should not be in the consideration for the base bid if it is a separate module. Firms should provide all additional information on other potential modules in their proposal content including the additional costs.

Question: Are we integrating with any document management program such as Laserfich?

Answer: At present the City does not have a document management program. The department has potential funding for scanning, but it remains unclear how we are going to approach this. Again if your firm offers a solution, provide the specifics including costs as an addition to the base proposal submitted.

Question: Would the City be willing to push the due date out by 2 weeks due to the tight turnaround between the Question Due Date and RFP Due Date?

Answer: the due date has been extended to February 8, as stated above.

Question: How long have you been using the current Energov Solution?

Answer: Approximately 10 years.

Question: Who is currently supporting the current system and are you satisfied with the level of support?

Answer: Energov has identified limitations identified in the RFP requested scope.

Question: What would you change about your current support situation?

Answer: Not a discussion point for RFP.

Question: What are some of the challenges you are experiencing with the current solution?

Answer: Challenges include, but not limited to software that has same functionality in the field as office; remote access for public; user friendly interface; better integration with GIS; ability auto populate letters; data base that is easier to edit; report interface that is easier manage; integrates with email and outlook calendar for scheduling, reminders, deadlines, etc.

Question: Where is the new system to be hosted, or is hosting to be provided by the vendor? If so, are there any preferences such as Microsoft Azure or AWS? Please describe.

Answer: Hosted locally with an AWS web frontend, if secure to our liking no problem.

Question: What costs has the City incurred for the initial set up, ongoing maintenance, hosting, software licensing, support, and enhancements (i.e., “change orders”) over the current systems’ lifetime?

Answer: This question is not relevant to RFP and City’s request for five (5) Year project costs for this RFP.

Question: What presentations, software demonstrations and/or estimates/quotes has the City received related to Licensure software and from whom?

Answer: The City saw demos of MyGov, OpenGov software for options to Energov and content of this RFP.

Question: When it comes to the Licensure process, what are the goals and KPIs the City would like to achieve compared to the current process?

Answer: The City has no issues with licensing now.

Question: How does The City currently manage enforcement activities such as complaints, investigations, inspections and/or compliance?

Answer: All activities are entered into Energov. MS-Word used for all correspondence. Outlook used to manage all inspection activity.

Question: Does The City track any continuing education (CE) for the individuals regulated, CE Providers, and/or courses? If so, what audits are performed and how does CE impact renewals? Please elaborate.

Answer: No, but we currently have the ability to now.

Question: Is the City looking for a custom developed solution that performs specific requirements, or, is the City open to partnering with an established regulatory management software provider who has a solution that can be configured?

Answer: Software needs to meet the specifications of the RFP and meet the needs of all departments involved.

Question: When ideally does the City want to have this system “go live”?

Answer: RFP notes July 1, but is flexible for the right software. Must happen 2022.

Question: Is the City looking for a custom developed solution that performs specific requirements or is the agency open to partnering with an established regulatory management software provider who has a solution that can be configured to support these permitting processes?

Answer: Software needs to meet the specifications of the RFP and meet the needs of all departments involved.

Question: What is the City’s budget for the new solution and what does the budget intend to cover?

Answer: All aspects of this project is budgeted at \$65,000

Question: Is the budget to include full implementation of the new system?

Answer: Yes

Question: What, if any, amount of the budget is subject to expire by a certain timeframe and when? Please elaborate.

Answer: Recovery act money expires in 2024. Well before implementation of City project.

Question: Please provide an approximate number of standard email/letter templates that will be used by the City that are to be integrated and automated by the system.

Answer: Approximately 40. The specific list will be provided to the awarded firm.

Question: How many different or distinct permit application types will be supported in this solution? Please provide a list.

Answer: Approximately 100. The specific list will be provided to the awarded firm.

Question: What other systems would the new solution need to integrate with (i.e. payment processor, other systems such as financial, GIS, etc.) along with an inventory of which interfaces will need to be wither a one-way (import or export) or two-way data exchange?

Answer: Munis for financials, IASWorld for assessing, ESRI for GIS two way if possible

Question: Will there be a data conversion component for the new system? If yes, can you provide the size and format of the current data set and confirm if the vendor will be migrating all this data into the new solution?

Answer: We don't want to lose any of the details of our legacy data, including notes, attachments, and contacts. The selected vendor will migrate the data.

Question: Please provide the annual number of applications/renewals processed by the City.

Answer: Approximately 400 licenses, 500 rental registrations. Code issues between 1,600 and 1,700 permit a year

Question: Is the City expecting the vendor to incorporate a payment processor within the proposal, or provide recommendations?

Answer: No

Question: Please provide a breakdown of the number City employees that will be using the new solution by Department.

Answer: Currently 40 Users between Code and City Clerk.

Question: Does the City already have an online portal for Licensure, or, will the vendor provide the portal?

Answer: InforME

Question: We price read-only subscriptions by department; each department pays for one subscription that an unlimited number of department users can use for read-only functions. For example, the City may need 1 read only subscription for the Economic & Community Development Department that all users for this department use, another read-only subscription for the Planning & Code Enforcement Department that all users for this department use, etc. How many departments will require read-only users?

Answer: Approx.12 departments may want read-only.

Question: What is the projected approval date for this bid?

Answer: Not determined given the need to review bids and proposals as well as potentially view product demos. Final award will be made through the City of Lewiston's Finance Committee.

Question: Will the city accept electronic submittals of the RFP response?

Answer: No, electronic bids will not be considered.

Question: On page 7 RFP indicates unlimited users, please confirm if this is internal users or public users.

Answer: I assume this to be public users as at present there are 40 internal users. This also may mean read-only users versus staff actually inputting data. Read-only may/should be more with an easy/user interface.

Question: On page 9 RFP indicates "System provides a markup tool for plans". Is Electronic Document Review intended to be part of the proposal or does the City currently use an EDR solution?

Answer: System needs to provide a markup tool for plans. EDR is not a feature we currently utilize and may be considered, but costs for it must be outside base bid costs.

Question: Confirm the number of data sources where the data currently resides that will be converted to the new system. RFP indicates Tyler Energov with iG Enforce and iG Inspect. This should be 1 database for conversion.

Answer: Correct.

Question: How many users will need to markup/review plans?

Answer: Proposals will be reviewed by Code, City Clerk, MIS, and Treasury staff.

Question: How many different permit application types does the city have?

Answer: Approximately 30. Currently Code, City Clerk, but there is potential for other departments Fire, etc.

Question: How many workflows does the city anticipate being created by vendor?

Answer: Likely depends on software. This process holds true for online access, too. Ideally would incorporate development review process, too.

Question: Does the city prefer onsite or remote training?

Answer: Onsite training is preferred.

Question: Are you looking for a fully configured project or something more out of the box?

Answer: Proposed software meeting the bid specifications.

Question: How many references would you like us to provide in our proposal response?

Answer: We do not have a specific number. I suggest enough to meet the criteria for similar sized communities in New England.

Question: The following question from the Functional matrix: System supports secondary addresses. Can you provide clarification on secondary address? Would this be a correspondence address that is secondary to the City's physical address, within the jurisdiction?

Answer: Physical address may be different than mailing address. Also, physical address may have more than one address for corner lots. Another example may be mobile home parks, commercial subdivisions, etc. may have multiple addresses.