

ADDENDUM 2



Winston-Salem

Request for Proposals

Code Enforcement System

Proposals will be received by

*****12:00 PM ET, Monday, December 31, 2018*****

IN

**Purchasing Department, City Hall Building
101 North Main Street, Suite 324 Winston-Salem, NC 27101**

December 14, 2018

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum and include with your proposal.

Company

Authorized Signature

Date

Questions/Responses

Please see the following list of questions received with City responses.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
1	Please provide the total number of NAMED users who will be utilizing the system.	While Question #3 of the System Requirements indicates the maximum number of concurrent users is envisioned to be 75, the projected number of NAMED users for proposal pricing purposes should be 40. The current staffing level by position for the Code Enforcement section is stated on page 10 of the RFP is 27. There is an expectation that another 8 or so end users will be accessing the system from other departments on an as needed basis. The remaining user count is an estimate of anticipated growth within the projected contract period.
2	Of the total above, how many operate primarily in the field on daily basis?	Of the 27 current positions, 20 are field-based and 2 supervisors that spend a portion of their day in the field.
3	Please provide a list of the top 10 most cited code violations along with the workflow and adjudication process that accompanies each, if different. For example, what are the steps in the process from case creation to closure?	Page 13 of the RFP provides the activity volume for code violations for the previous 5 fiscal years. Pages 11 and 12 of the RFP contain the high level process flow for Environmental Control, Zoning and Abandoned Vehicles. It is anticipated that these processes will be re-engineered with the adoption of a new code enforcement application to take advantage of the system's capabilities.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
 Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
4	Please provide a fine or fee structure for all code violations.	<p>Minimum Housing Code penalties are \$350.00 the first day and \$100.00 per day thereafter until compliance.</p> <p>Most solid waste environmental cases will be \$85.00 for the abatement, \$50.00 for the administrative fee, and \$165.00 for the penalty or \$165.00 for grass abatements, \$50.00 for the administrative fee, and \$165.00 for the penalty.</p> <p>Solid waste abatement can vary on large jobs when contracted out.</p> <p>Signs in the right-of-way are \$50.00.</p> <p>Graffiti removal can be \$25.00, \$50.00, or \$100.00.</p> <p>Zoning violations are \$100.00 per day.</p> <p>Housing re-inspection fees are \$50.00 per occurrence.</p> <p>Animal citations are \$20.00 per day plus any abatement cost, administrative fee, and penalty.</p> <p>Vehicle claims are using \$75.00 or \$100.00 for the tow, \$60.00 administrative fee, and \$40.00 per day storage.</p> <p>Penalties and charges are subject to periodic changes, usually the changes occur only once a year at budget time.</p> <p>The comprehensive fee structure for Community Development/ Neighborhood Services can be located on page 11 of the document FY 2018-19 User Fee Schedule:</p> <p>http://www.cityofws.org/Portals/0/pdf/FY%202018-19%20Budget/FY%2018-19%20User%20Fee%20Schedule.pdf?ver=2018-12-05-140224-363</p>
5	Will the city please extend the deadline for submission by a minimum of 2 weeks so that we can properly interview and examine any potential M/WBE firms? This is critical for our firm	The City has granted an extension of one week. The proposals are due at Purchasing Office by noon on Monday, December 31, 2018.
6	The 10% goal that has been established for M/WBE participation, is this 10% of the implementation cost or 10% of the entire contract? Our assumption is that this does not apply to the software cost since our firm is the sole / proprietary developer of the proposed software solution.	Your assumption is correct.








































Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response																																	
7	With respect to all integrations, please confirm that the city will engage and secure any required assistance from the provider of each source system in order to facilitate the integration.	The City confirms that it will engage the provider of the source systems, or other 3rd party authorized Value Added Reseller (VAR), in order to facilitate the desired integration.																																	
8	Please provide a list of all reports the city expects the vendor to provide as part of the solution.	<p>The new system will provide the opportunity to re-engineer code enforcement procedures by leveraging technology, electronic data storage, and real time data entry. In so doing, different and new reports may be desired. Review of wants and needs will need to occur before this question can be adequately answered.</p> <p>The bolded reports in the first list below represents the native CD-Plus reports that are in use The second list represents the reports available via the City's Reportal.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>Action Orders</td> <td>Reinspection Report</td> <td>Court Report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overdue Action Orders</td> <td>Activity Report by User</td> <td>Board Agenda</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Action Orders</td> <td>Activity Report by Date-Type</td> <td>Board Agenda w/ Violations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Code Case By Inspector</td> <td>Activity Report by Date-User</td> <td>Overdue Citations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Case-Insp Summary</td> <td>Activity Report by Ref Type</td> <td>Citation Summary Report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Case 30-60-90 Report</td> <td>Letter Report</td> <td>Relocation Monthly Activity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ownership Lien Report</td> <td>Sales Eligibility</td> <td>Activity Report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Activity Report by Insp Area</td> <td>Activity Report by Ward</td> <td>Activity Report by Fire Zone</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing Case Summary</td> <td>Vehicle Case Summary</td> <td>Environmental Case Summary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demolition Report</td> <td>Reinsp By Hearing</td> <td>Vehicle Code Cases</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Code Case Fee's Report</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Action Orders	Reinspection Report	Court Report	Overdue Action Orders	Activity Report by User	Board Agenda	Open Action Orders	Activity Report by Date-Type	Board Agenda w/ Violations	Code Case By Inspector	Activity Report by Date-User	Overdue Citations	Case-Insp Summary	Activity Report by Ref Type	Citation Summary Report	Case 30-60-90 Report	Letter Report	Relocation Monthly Activity	Ownership Lien Report	Sales Eligibility	Activity Report	Activity Report by Insp Area	Activity Report by Ward	Activity Report by Fire Zone	Housing Case Summary	Vehicle Case Summary	Environmental Case Summary	Demolition Report	Reinsp By Hearing	Vehicle Code Cases		Code Case Fee's Report	
Action Orders	Reinspection Report	Court Report																																	
Overdue Action Orders	Activity Report by User	Board Agenda																																	
Open Action Orders	Activity Report by Date-Type	Board Agenda w/ Violations																																	
Code Case By Inspector	Activity Report by Date-User	Overdue Citations																																	
Case-Insp Summary	Activity Report by Ref Type	Citation Summary Report																																	
Case 30-60-90 Report	Letter Report	Relocation Monthly Activity																																	
Ownership Lien Report	Sales Eligibility	Activity Report																																	
Activity Report by Insp Area	Activity Report by Ward	Activity Report by Fire Zone																																	
Housing Case Summary	Vehicle Case Summary	Environmental Case Summary																																	
Demolition Report	Reinsp By Hearing	Vehicle Code Cases																																	
	Code Case Fee's Report																																		

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
 Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">  CBD - Open Action Order Code Case Summary  CBD - PDS Real Tiem Logons  CBD Service Requests (All)  CBD Service Requests (Open)  CDPlus - CityLink Extract  CDPlus - CityLink Extract by Ward  CEMA Login and Last Transaction Times  CityLink - Action Order Lookup  CityLink - Address Lookup by Block/Lot  CityLink - Address Lookup by Street  CityLink - Open Vehicle Cases  CityLink - SRs Open for Neighborhood Services  CityLink - SRs Outstanding (Bad Address)  CityLink - SRs that did not create action order  CityLink - SRs with open action  CityLink - SRs with open Code Case  CityLink - Vehicles at City Yard  Code Case - 65 Percent Violation  Code Case - Assigned to RESEARCH  Code Case - Clerical Work Performed -(Visits Closed)  Code Case - Code Cases Closed (Last 30 days)  Code Case - Grass Repeat Offender (Previous Year)  Code Case - House Number Abated (Last 90 days)  Code Case - Trash Repeat Offender (Previous Year)  Code Case - Visits Past Due Summary  Crew Workload (with images)  Notice Of Hearing Report  Open Vacant Unfit Housing  Open Vacant Unfit Housing Excluding Apartments/GRE/Vastu  Open Vacant Unfit Housing Report Excluding Apartments  QC AO Ward Inspector  QC By Visit  Re-inspection by Visit Inspector  Work Assigned (with images) OLD  Work Assigned Summary  Work Assigned Total  Work Completed Summary  Work Completed Summary Time  Work Load Report (desktop)
9	What is the approved budget for this project?	It is not the City's practice to provide the estimated budget during the RFP process.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
 Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
10	Please provide a list of all vendors from which the city has received demonstrations related to Code Enforcement Software over the past 12 months.	Accela and Energov.
11	Does the city prefer a SaaS (Vendor-hosted) or On-Premise (City-hosted) deployment model?	The City has no preference as to the deployment model. The most recent application acquisitions by the City have been SaaS (vendor-hosted): CRM and Website. The City intends to evaluate the merits of either model proposed for cost-effectiveness and ease of support. However, in consideration of the aggressive time line for the project, one would anticipate that the SaaS solution would satisfy this particular deployment requirement versus the other models.
12	According to the Scoring Evaluation table on page 26, there is a greater weight applied towards Location of Business and M/WBE Commitment (20%) than there is for Functionality and Architecture (10%) and the same weight for Experience/Methodology and Price (20%). Can the City confirm that the evaluation table is accurate for this procurement and if so, will you provide some details regarding this reasoning?	The values of the weights in evaluation table on page 26 of the RFP are accurate. The City's Office of Business Inclusion and Advancement is responsible for evaluating proposers regarding M/WBE and Local Participation factors and assuring compliance to procurement regulations. The procurement of previous three application systems were successfully executed under this criteria.
13	Page 28 of the RFP outlines the City's Local Vendor participation requirement. For vendors that have employees who work in home offices located in North Carolina, can the City provide examples of <i>"evidence that said home office is not in violation of any zoning requirements in the event the applicable city does not require a home occupation permit."</i>	Any documentation that explains the home office requirements for the applicable city will suffice (e.g., permit, city code, and ordinance). The following URL describes the City's regulations for use of residential property for commercial purposes: Home Occupations: Zoning and Permitting Requirements: http://www.cityofws.org/Portals/0/pdf/inspections/Home%20Occupation%20Zoning%20and%20Permitting%20Req%20Revised%204-2009.pdf?ver=2010-07-01-140256-000
14	Affidavit B notes, <i>"The utilization of M/WBE firms accounts for 20% of the evaluation and scoring, and will not be allocated to proposals in which an Affidavit B is submitted."</i> Can the City confirm that the 20% scoring weight for M/WBE commitment will not held against firms that complete and submit Affidavit B? In other words, if a vendor completes Affidavit B, will the City void that 20% of scoring but still score that vendor's bid equally against other bids based on the remaining 80% of the weighted criteria?	Each proposal will be evaluated and scored independently by members of the evaluation team based upon the proposal's merits across all six criteria. The aggregate score will ultimately determine the rank order of a proposal when compared to other submissions. As stated on page 37 of the RFP, if an Affidavit B is submitted, the 20% for MWBE commitment will not be allocated to that firm.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
15	Section IV, #16 asks, <i>“Does your database schema contain any proprietary information that would prevent you from providing a copy of the database schema for the solution?”</i> If the vendor’s data schema does contain proprietary information, would a “data dictionary” of customer data stored be sufficient rather than the vendor’s DB schema.	Yes, a "data dictionary" approach to satisfying this requirement is an acceptable alternative in the event that the vendor's database contains proprietary information.
16	Section III, #2, Mobile Application, to clarify, you are looking for the mobile component to be available to perform back-office tasks from a mobile device? Would inspectors use this interface to perform code enforcement investigations and inspections for cases?	Yes, it is expected that inspectors would use this mobile interface to perform code enforcement investigations and inspections for cases while in the field. However, there are two other distinct types of activities performed in the field by Code Enforcement personnel that the mobile component should support: case abatement tasks and supervisory/oversight activities (requirement #117).
17	Section III, #2, Customer Portal states, <i>“At a minimum, the solution must provide a public-facing web portal for citizen self-service follow up inquiries on the current resolution status of their complaints and related cases.”</i> Do you prefer that the new solution would pass this information back to the MS-CRM public portal to maintain the one-stop shop or do you foresee a public portal being built that would be separate from the MS-CRM providing this information? If the latter, would you want the public portal to be embedded into an existing website?	As currently envisioned by the City, the information to be passed from the Code Enforcement application to the CRM application for complaints initiated via the CRM intake process will be minimal; i.e., current status, estimated completion date, actual completion date, etc. It is envisioned that there will be supplemental, public-facing information about a complaint/case that will reside within the Code Enforcement application that would not be replicated within CRM. This public-facing information could be provided via a public portal for Code Enforcement that is accessible by interested citizens via the City's web site via redirect.
18	Who is the vendor that implemented your CRM solution on MS-Dynamics?	Rock Solid was awarded the contract for the implementation of MS Dynamics CRM. The implementation project is currently underway with a expectation of the initial delivery of services by June 30, 2019.
19	What is the budget that is allocated for this project?	See response to question #9.
20	What are the number of users needed? What are the various roles of the users?	See response to question #1.
21	The integration with Mitchell-Humphries Financial Management System - A/P Module is Required. How is the city integrating with this system currently?	The current code enforcement application does not interface with Mitchell-Humphries Financial Management System - A/P Module. All requests for payment of abatement contractors is performed manually. It is envisioned that new code enforcement application will automate the payment process via web services that are already in use by other applications.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
22	The integration with Mitchell-Humphries Financial Management System - A/P Module is Required. Does the city expect integration with this system to leverage the Enterprise Integration Platform procured by the city?	While it would be preferable for the City to utilize the soon-to-be acquired Enterprise Integration Platform (EIP) for the purposes of integrating FMS and the new Code Enforcement application, the timing of the deployment of the EIP precludes consideration for Code Enforcement project.
23	What technology is the city using to generate the CivicPlus Website? Is this the technology the city plans to keep using?	The City has contracted with CivicPlus to manually migrate the existing web site content to the CivicPlus platform. The City intends to utilize the CivicPlus Content Management System to add or modify content for at least 3 years.
24	The RFP states "The system should support at least 75 concurrent users from workstations and mobile devices deployed by Code Enforcement and supporting Organizations." Our proposed solution does not support concurrent user model. Would the City provide the specific user counts by role?	See response to question #1.
25	What is driving the city's need to implement the code Enforcement System by or before April 1, 2019. Per RFP - "The City is open to either a hosted, cloud based, or on premise solution."	The driving factors for implementation of a replacement of the existing Code Enforcement System are listed on page 14 of the RFP. The target implementation date of April 1, 2019 was determined by Community Development in consideration utilizing the new system prior to the start of their peak period of environmental code enforcement and abatement which lasts for 7 -8 months.
26	What is the city's preference - Hosted, Cloud Based, or On Premise?	See response to question #11.
27	Will the system store PII information?	The current code enforcement system does not store social security numbers, tax identification numbers, driver's licenses or other PII information nor does the City envision the replacement system to retain any PII. As envisioned, the replacement system will store the necessary and sufficient information about home ownership, vehicle ownership, as well as, the contact information regarding persons or entities of interest with respect to code enforcement cases in order to perform the process complaints and cases.

Vendor Questions and Responses Work Sheet FINAL
Questions and Answers

12/13/2018

Question #	Question	Response
28	Does the City currently use an electronic document management system that integration is required with?	Yes, the City utilizes Laserfiche as its document management system. The City is open to consideration of utilizing Laserfiche to store documents, images, signatures, etc. associated with the new code enforcement system. The City intends to utilize Laserfiche to store historical data that will not be converted to the new code enforcement system.
29	The RFP indicates a total of 27 users – but the requirements indicate 75 – please confirm the correct number of office and field users	See response to question #1.