

City of Hayward
RFP #1704-092016 Permitting Software
Pre-Bidder Questions and Answers

1. **Question:** In the City's RFP, you state you have a 120 Named Users for the Community Development products. Our licensing is for concurrent licenses. Can you please advise as to how many of your 120 named users would you consider to be necessary under a concurrent licensing model for initial pricing proposal?
Answer: 95 concurrent users.
2. **Question:** For one of our Electronic Plan Review solutions, we have a named user licensing model. How many named users would you need (not including invited reviewers to a project for review/approval but full time reviewers, etc.)
Answer: 10 named users.
3. **Question:** Would integration to Tyler/Munis General Ledger be sufficient with a batch update, or will the City require real-time integration?
Answer: The City is open to either approach.
4. **Question:** The RFP states that the Tyler Central Cashiering will remain and you want integration/interfacing? Would this mean you prefer to take in payments from our software through the Tyler Cashiering solution? Or that the payments posted against our software can be pulled in to Tyler Central Cashiering (in batch? real-time?) solution? If so, then would the integration to Tyler/Munis financials be required?
Answer: The City is open to your recommended approach.
5. **Question:** Has the City hired a Consultant for this RFP? If so, can you disclose which one?
Answer: Yes, SoftResources.
6. **Question:** Please clarify if questions/responses should be addressed to Stacey Bristow and/or David Rizk. There are some discrepancies on page 1, 3 and 10 of the RFP.
Answer: Stacey Bristow, Stacey.Bristow@hayward-ca.gov
7. **Question:** On page 13, we are instructed to use and return a MS Word document "REQUIREMENTS.DOCX" with no modifications. Can you please provide this?
Answer: Attached.
8. **Question:** How many named users are you expecting to be on the new system?
Answer: See page 27 of the RFP.
9. **Question:** Of those named users, how many will be mobile users?
Answer: See page 27 of the RFP.
10. **Question:** Page 5, Current Systems: The Table provided clearly states that the permitting system also needs to address "Land Management" as the Munis 10.5 will be replaced. Can you please confirm that all of the "Land Management" requirements that the City currently has are listed in Items 55 through 81 of the "Community Services Requirements" document?

Answer: Those are the items that we will be evaluating to identify a Short List of vendors to be elevated to the next level of our evaluation process.

11. **Question:** Page 5, Platform: The RFP states that the City prefers a solution that runs in a Microsoft Windows environment. The system we will be proposing to the City is Linux-based and is still able to meet all of the key requirements of the RFP, including the ability to integrate with Microsoft Active Directory and Office365. Can you please confirm that solutions not based on a Linux environment will be judged in the same category as those in a Microsoft Windows environment?

Answer: The City has a preference for a solution that runs in a Microsoft environment.

12. **Question: Page 16, Item 32G:** Does the solution need to integrate with Accela GOV Outreach? It states in the table on Page 5 that Accela GOV Outreach will be replaced and that integration would not be required. Please clarify.

Answer: The City is open to considering options to either integrate/interface with or replace Accela GOV Outreach.

13. **Question:** Page 16, Item 49: This appears to be a rather far-reaching requirement. Is the intent for items altered within the City's solution to be seen throughout the City's solution only, or is the desire for the solution to also update other systems such as the County's parcel information discussed on Page 6.

Answer: There is not a requirement to update other systems. The requirement is to update records within the product suite you are offering.

14. **Question:** Sample Services Contract: Page 10 of the Sample Services Contract has a section entitled "Copyright". Can you please clarify that the documents referred to do not include the actual code or software and are simply referring to notes, training materials, help guides, etc. that are created for use by the City and users of the system to understand how to use the solution?

Answer: City to answer.

15. **Question:** Does the City envision Hayward employees configuring its own forms and workflow, or does the City prefer a vendor configured solution?

Answer: The City is open to evaluating both options.

16. **Question:** Is there a minimum number of Esri integrations the City expects the vendor to have completed in its past?

Answer: No, however the City's preference is to select a system that has integrated with Esri with other customers.

17. **Question:** Does the City have a budget approved for the project? If so, can the City please disclose the budget?

Answer: The City does have a budget for the project but is not willing to disclose it at this time.

18. **Question:** Does the City already have its own payment processor it would like for the vendor to integrate with for online payments?

Answer: City to answer.

19. **Question:** Please provide the current number of licenses the City issues each year.

Answer: City to answer.

20. **Question:** Please provide the current number of permits the City issues each year.

Answer: City to answer.

21. **Question:** It is stated here the desire for this project:

- a. The following table outlines key systems used by the City today, how they relate to this project, and whether they will be interfaced or integrated with the replacement Permitting system. You wish to replace the Code Enforcement below though under the Technology category of Section 6 Requirements you ask for integration with Accela GOV Outreach – Mobile Citizen app for Code Enforcement system?

Application - Vendor	Keep/Replace	Integrate/ Interface
Permitting, Land Management – Munis 10.5	Replace	N/A
GIS - Esri ArcGIS 10.4.1	Keep	Yes
IVR – Tele-Works	Keep	Yes
Financials and Payroll – Munis 10.5	Keep	Yes
Cashiering – Tyler Cashiering	Keep	Yes
Code Enforcement – Accela GOV Outreach	Replace	N/A
ePlan Review – PDF Editor	Keep?	Yes

Answer: See #12 above.

22. **Question:** It is believed the City might wish to convert the historical Munis permit data. Is that correct? Can you please list the information that is in the historical system to be converted (permit, inspection, payments) and it what format it can be provided?

Answer: City to answer. It is o.k. to say this has not yet been determined.

23. **Question:** Is the historical data clean and each record has Assessor's Parcel Number as the unique identifier for conversion?

Answer: City to answer. It is o.k. to say this has not yet been determined.

24. **Question:** Please provide the total number of permits and code cases (not tied to a permit) the City produces annually over the past 1-3 years. If possible please list by department.

25. **Answer:** City to answer.

26. **Question:** Will the City consider an extension of 10 days on the deadline for submission of this RFP?

Answer: Not at this time. We have allowed for 4 weeks response time.

27. **Question:** The RFP lists 120 named users for the new system- and in Exhibit A, the users are listed as: 100 users + 20 mobile users. Were those 20 mobile users included in the 100 named users? Or is the total number of user 120, with some of those 120 users having mobile capabilities?

Answer: Please use 100 named users and 20 mobile users in your pricing estimates. City to confirm should be 100 or 120?

28. **Question:** The RFP notes that the City would like to replace the Government Outreach system that the Code Enforcement Department is currently using, but later in the RFP it references wanting an interface/integration to the Government Outreach product. Please clarify whether the new system should replace the Government Outreach product, or interface to it.

Answer: See #12 above.

29. **Question:** Would the City like the new system to interface to the existing Laserfiche system that the City already has in place? If the proposed system has its own document management functionality, will the City also still want costing for an integration to Laserfiche?

Answer: The City is open to understanding what functionality can be provided within your solution.

30. **Question:** For Plan Review, would the City like vendors to propose an alternate plan review solution to replace the ePlanReview tool, or to just propose a price to interface to ePlanReview?

Answer: The City is open to exploring both options.

31. **Question:** What details would the City be interested in seeing about Business Licensing solutions from vendors? Should vendors provide price AND details regarding their business licensing solutions, or just details on the functionality of the product?

Answer: Pricing and a high level overview of the module. Detailed requirements are not necessary at this time.

32. **Question:** If vendors offer both cloud and on-premise solutions, would the City like to see pricing for both types of deployments and hosting methods by duplicating Exhibit A for their various hosting option price calculations?

Answer: Yes.

33. **Question:** Will the City consider responses that do not have two former customer references listed?

Answer: Yes.

34. **Question:** In regard to the Google Maps reference in the technical specifications, does the City require that all inspections for the day are displayed on Google Maps, or on a Google Maps-like interface? Or does the City want to be able to use Google Maps to route inspectors from their current location to the next scheduled inspections offering turn-by-turn directions and traffic updates?

Answer: This line item is not Required. We are only interested in understanding what options would be available.

35. **Question:** What is the proposed budget for this project? Where are the funds for this project coming from?

Answer: See #17 above.

36. **Question:** Would the City like for the new system to interface to the California State Licensing Board for contractor look-up?

Answer: The City is open to exploring this.

37. **Question:** What kind of mobile devices is the City considering using for mobile inspections and field work? Does the City have a preference on what type of device can be used for mobile work with the new system?

Answer: The City is open to exploring solutions available from vendors.

38. **Question:** The City notes in the RFP that the new system is replacing Munis, however in the requirements section it mentions data conversion from SunGard Naviline. Will the historical data conversion occur from SunGard Naviline, Tyler Munis, or both systems?

Answer: SunGard Naviline should be replaced with Tyler Munis.

39. **Question:** please list the total amount of data to be converted from historical/legacy systems:

Answer: See #22 above.

System Name	Vendor	DB Type	# of Base Records	# of data fields
--------------------	---------------	----------------	--------------------------	-------------------------