#3178 PERMIT TRACKING & PLAN REVIEW SOFTWARE SOLUTION - ADDENDUM #2

Addendum #2 dated February 12, 2020 is issued to:

A) TO ANSWER QUESTIONS RECEIVED REGARDING THIS SOLICTIATON:

1. Will the City provide a rough estimate of the number of reports/outputs they expect to require for normal business functions? Is it expected that permits, receipts, notification letters, Certificates of Occupancy inspection results and all internal summary reports would be included?

   Answer: The City expects the Proposer to identify the standard forms and reports included with their proposal. See Exhibit E – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities, items #37 and #125 for desired functionality.

2. **Conversion/Data Migration**: Can the City elaborate on expectation to use reports to validate conversion? Will all the data need to be converted and if not, what information needs to be converted? As the City is re-engineering business processes as part of this deployment, is it expected that historical data and future state data definitions, names, etc., may change?

   Answer: At this time, the City does not expect to convert any legacy data. The legacy data will remain in EnerGov for future reference. Only projects that are expected to take longer than 3 months shall be manually entered by City Staff into the new software system. The City is aware that historical data and future state data, definition and names will change.

   For data migration:
   a. What is the current database type (DB2, SQL, Excel, Access, etc.)?
      Answer: The current database type is MS SQL server.

   b. Location of the database (desktop, local server, cloud, etc.)?
      Answer: The location of the database is a local server.

   c. How many records are on the database?
      Answer: The number of records on the database are as follows: Customers (32,227); Permits (70,780); Plans (17,569); Inspections (283,485), and Invoices (191,196).

   d. How many tables are on the database?
      Answer: There are 1,248 tables on the database.

   e. How many times has the data been converted?
      Answer: The data has been converted once and was imported into EnerGov in approximately 2012.

f. What is the timespan of the data?
    Answer: *The timespan of the data is 1996 to present.*

g. How clean is the data on a scale of 1-10 (1 being enormous clean-up needed, 10 being no clean-up needed)?
    Answer: *The data would be rated as a 1 – enormous clean-up needed.*

3. Does the City have any Key Performance Indicators and/or targets that further define "the system should significantly reduce…" and if so, what are they?

    Answer: The City is expecting the Proposer to demonstrate how their prior successful software implementations have reduced their client's permitting timelines.

4. Does the City have specific external reporting tools would the City like the solution to integrate with and if so, what are they?

    Answer: Refer to Section 2.1, Project Description, item C; 4.2 Organization and Assembly of Proposal, item #15 and Exhibit E, items #27, #96, #122 and #125.

5. Is the City open to a cloud-hosted solution?

    Answer: Refer to Section 2.3, New Permit Tracking Software, item B as well as Addendum #1.

6. Has the City seen any presentations of products related to this RFP in the last 12 months? If so, what products and/or systems have you seen?

    Answer: The City has not seen any product demonstrations.

7. Has the City had any external guidance on the creation of this RFP?

    Answer: The City has engaged Strategica, Inc. to assist with the creation of this RFP.

8. Will the City have staff or system champions available for this project?

    Answer: Refer to Section 2.4, City Provided Services/Resources. Also refer to Exhibit D, tab "City Project Team".

9. How many permit types do you have within each Department?

    Answer: The City currently has 32 permit types, each having varied applied work classes, totaling 111 possible combinations of permits and 140 possible plan variations, for which an application can be submitted.

10. Are you currently using a digital mark-up tool? Does the City of Lynnwood currently or plan to use electronic plan review mark-ups? If so, which vendors are being used, or planning to be used?

    Answer: The City currently uses Bluebeam as its digital mark-up tool. The City expects the Proposer to submit with their proposal an integrated plan review software solution.

11. Currently how is the address/data in the permitting system maintained and connected with GIS. Is the assessor data in sync properly with permitting in the current system?

    Answer: Currently, the EnerGov system is directed to the live Snohomish County GIS System for parcel information. Address data in EnerGov is directed to our internal ESRI GIS address layers.

12. How does City policy handle mixed-use and commercial property permit issuance? Is it tied to land address or individual units/assessor parcel numbers?

    Answer: The City handles mixed-used and commercial properties by tying the permit information to the site address.

13. Does City policy have any address zoning based financed fees? Example: 1 street is charged a higher fee rate as it is in X zone, but 2nd street is charged less as it is in Y zone.

    Answer: The City does not have any address-based zoning fees.

14. Does the City have/maintain a centralized public user database with SSO capabilities like oauth & OpenId connect for online portal or any other?

    Answer: Currently, the City offers a public portal via EnerGov for the self-service of permits and planning etc., The City does not offer SSO capabilities and requires a username and password to create an account.

15. Does the City already have accounts with PayPal/authorize.net for any other finance set up already?

    Answer: The City has a contract with BridgePay to provide a payment and technology gateway that is fully integrated into EnerGov and Munis by Tyler. Additionally, we have an established contract with Elevon for credit card processing with exchange rates.

16. How are the payments of permits collected internally? Is there a centralized cashiering system for permitting?

    Answer: The EnerGov platform is fully integrated with Tyler Cashiering Solution. Tyler Cashiering is a full Point of Sale (POS) cashiering solution that handles cashdrawers, check printers, credit cards etc. and syncs the data with Munis Financial system or accounting and centralized cashiering.

17. In the current online portal, which process are configured for online application? Can citizens pay fees, request inspections, make general inquiries in current online portal?

    Answer: The City's current online portal, allows the public to pay by credit card, request inspections and make general inquires. The City is seeking a software solution that includes an online citizen portal that includes such functions, along with the other desired functionality listed in the RFP.

18. Regarding Exhibit E, Section A, #9: "Ability to merge duplicate records while maintaining data integrity of associated permit and other records". Can a business case be provided for non-contact records – i.e. permit, plan cases?

    Answer: *The City is seeking a software solution that can merge duplicate records involving contacts, applicants, contractors, owners as well as documents, permits, cases and more.*

19. Regarding Exhibit E, Section A, #21: "Public portal can translate multiple languages for the applicant's use, such as Google Language". Would this be the ability of the software (CSS, Citizen Self Service) to integrate with browser add-on products such as Google Language or inherent software features for translation?

    Answer: *The City expects the Proposer to include in their proposal a solution that allows the public and staff to be able to read, submit and pay in their preferred language.*

20. Regarding Exhibit E, Section B, #27: "Ability to implement, add or change workflows by permit type/group and generate reports using a report writer like Exago. Would SSRS and/or Crystal Reports be an acceptable alternative?

    Answer: *The City's preference is a report writer that is easy to use by all staff and provides the ability to run reports and distribute them automatically.*

21. Regarding Exhibit E, Section B, #54: "Ability to insert new and revised pages into the complete document set, while retaining previous versions of replaced pages". Would this be required functionality in the plan review software (EnerGov) or the mark-up tools?

    Answer: *The City requires this functionality in the mark-up tool. The City's preference is for this functionality to be in both the plan review software and the mark-up tool.*

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Cathy Robinson, CPPO/CPPB
Procurement Manager
City of Lynnwood
19100 44th Ave W, Lynnwood, WA 98036
Office: 425-670-5166
Email: crobinson@lynnwoodwa.gov

Ginny Meads, PMP
Alternate Buyer, Procurement
City of Lynnwood
19100 44th Avenue W, Lynnwood, WA 98036
Office: 425-670-5149
Email: gmeads@lynnwoodwa.gov