City of San Antonio

ADDENDUM II

SUBJECT: Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal for Land Development, Permit, Inspection & Compliance Software, (RFCSP 14-039, 6100004961), Scheduled to Open: November 21, 2014; Date of Issue: September 16, 2014

FROM: Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator

DATE: October 17, 2014

THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. II - TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS

THE PERIOD FOR QUESTIONS IS HEREBY EXTENDED TO FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2014, 2:00 PM CENTRAL TIME.

THE RFCSP CLOSING DATE IS HEREBY EXTENDED TO FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2014, 2:00 PM CENTRAL TIME.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 011, RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS:

Question 1: In the RFCSP Section 3.2.2 on page 7, the City mentions Process Inefficiencies and Data Quality as current challenges. Can you please provide specific examples of each?

Response: Some examples of process inefficiencies are the review and markup of paper plans and challenges in sharing activity on property between the 4 core systems. An example of a data quality issue is the entry of dummy data into Hansen 7 as a workaround to progress from one step to another in the workflow.

Question 2: What current system does SAPD use for its related permits, licenses and inspections, and who is the vendor?

Response: SAPD has the False Alarm Management System (FAMS) by Orion for alarm permit management. SAPD's Contract Towing Office uses GTU, which was created by ITSD, to track Companies, Drivers and Vehicles for their Vehicle for Hire process.

Question 3: What system does SAFD use to track fire and life safety inspections, and who is the vendor?

Response: There is no interface requirement because SAFD uses Hansen to track their inspections and this system will be replaced.

Question 4: Is an interface required for the current SAFD fire and life safety inspection systems to the new DSD system? If so, please describe the interface requirements.

Response: There is no interface requirement because SAFD uses Hansen to track their inspections and this system will be replaced.

Question 5: Does the City use the same work order system to track 311 related work orders as it does internal related work orders? Please describe the systems, including system vendor, used to track work orders.

Response: The City uses a combination of the ECCO Systems, shared network drive, and Excel spreadsheets to track work orders. Related financial processes (e.g., invoicing) are handled in SAP and if applicable, a bill to the home owner is created in CEAR.

Question 6: On page 19 of the RFCSP, the City states requirements for interfaces to both MARR and SAP Finance. Assuming we're interpreting the requirements correctly, why would both MARR and SAP interface be required when the financial data could be passed directly to SAP by the new system?

Response: The detailed scope for financials integration is currently under development as part of the City's new Cashiering system, still to be determined. Currently the Hansen system processes payments directly and functions as a subsidiary ledger, which necessitates the MARR integration with SAP as the system is currently implemented. Other payments are processed against SAP accounts receivable, hence the direct SAP integration requirement. The desired to-be state includes a single Cashiering system for all City services, some of which will be against SAP receivables and some of which will be against receivables in Departmental systems. Both integration methods need to be accounted for in the proposed solution.

Question 7: What asset management/work order system does TCI use to track infrastructure for all City Buildings, Streets, Traffic and Storm Water assets?

Response: TCI primarily uses PRIMELink for tracking capital improvement projects.

Question 8: Please describe the SAPD background check and finger process for relevant permits. For example, does the City use a 3rd party service for background checks and finger printing, such as Morpho Trust? Does the City pull data from Texas DPS?

Response: The Administration and Record/ Identification office is responsible for the fingerprinting and submitting background checks for city hires, vendors and permit applicants. These background checks are national submission only. The fingerprints are submitted to the FBI for a national background check. At this time SAPD does not use a 3rd party service.

Question 9: For the Future State User Counts listed on page 20 of the RFCSP, are the 100 to 150 mobile users inclusive in the 500 total City users, or are they separate?

Response: Mobile users are also included in the total count.

Question 10: What is the Cashiering system used by the City? If the decision on the new vendor for this system is still being considered, can the City share with POS/Cashiering vendors are under consideration?

Response: The City is currently under negotiations and is unable to disclose further information regarding a specific vendor. However, the City expects to award a contract for a comprehensive, standards-based cashiering system that will accommodate the cashiering needs of this solution by the end of 2014.

Question 11: The number of interfaces listed in the Attachment H "Interfaces" tab is less than the possible interfaces listed in Tables 6, 7, and on pages 18-21 of the RFCSP. For example, Salesforce is listed as an integration point in Table 7 of the RFCSP, but is not listed in the "Interface" tab in Attachment H. Please confirm if the Attachment H "Interface" tab is inclusive of ALL required interfaces or whether or not there are some from Tables 6 & 7 of the RFCSP are optional, please indicate as such, and describe how vendors should respond to those optional interface requirements given all interfaces listed in the Attachment H "Interfaces" tab are mandatory.

Response: Table 7 is described as containing systems that "would be retained, replaced, and/or integrated" with the New System. This is not a list of interfaces. Respondents should refer to Attachment H as the comprehensive list of interfaces to respond to.

Question 12: With respect to the State Trade and Licensing system mentioned in the Attachment H - Interface tab:

a. What State of Texas agency maintains the State Trade and Licensing System?
b. Please describe this system. Is it SQL or Oracle db? Does it have defined web services, etc.?

Response: This requirement to interface with the State Trade and Licensing System mentioned in Attachment H - Interface Tab is now optional and is no longer a Mandatory interface requirement. DSD confirms licensing information from the following Texas agencies:

Texas Board of Professional Engineers website: http://engineers.texas.gov/
Texas State Board of Plumbing Examiners website: http://www.tsbpe.state.tx.us/
Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation website: http://www.tdlr.state.tx.us/

Question 13: The Attachment H - Interface tab lists the County's Court Case Management system as a required interface. However, we were not able to find any mention on this system in the RFCSP. Please provide details about this system, such as:

- Vendor vs. custom
- MS SQL db, Oracle db, or other
- Standard web services

Response: The reference in Attachment H to "*County's Court Case Management*" was an oversight and has been removed from the Interfaces tab in Attachment H. The correct Court Case system is the *City's Municipal Court Case Management System* which is the "system of record" that replaced MCRT.

Question 14: Are any departments and/or divisions included in the scope of this project responsible for rental housing inspections? If so, please describe which department/division, and whether or not rental housing inspections are in scope, or if they would be included in a future TBD phase.

Response: Yes, this is under DSD and would be an inspection type required to be supported by the system.

Question 15: Can you please describe the current process for how DSD's performance measures (see http://www.sanantonio.gov/dsd/performance.asp) are tracked? For example, is a BI tool used to aggregate data from multiple systems, and if so, what is the BI tool? What are all the systems of record for the source data?

Response: DSD uses a number of Business Objects and Crystal Reports to obtain performance measure information. Some information is also manually tracked. Staff inserts their information in the spreadsheet found at sanantonio.gov/dsd/performance. The systems of records for the source data are:
Rights Determination – LDS (manual lookup)
Zoning – Spreadsheets
Plats – Tplat (Computerized report)
Plan Review, Permits & Inspections – Hansen (Business Objects and Crystal Reports)
Telephone Calls – Cisco (system generated report)
Customer Wait Time – Q-Matic (system generated report)

Question 16: Are there any challenges to the current Performance Measuring process (e.g., # of day it takes to generate reports, # of resources required to maintain performance measuring process, accuracy of source data, etc.)?

Response: The major challenge to the current performance measure process is that each business area is responsible for running their performance measure reports and inserting the numbers on the spreadsheet. Often times the spreadsheet is locked for editing.

Question 17: Is responsibility for nuisance code owned by DSD and managed in ECCO, or is nuisance code management owned by another department, such as Solid Waste?

Response: ECCO is Code Enforcement's proprietary inspections environment. We enforce a wide range of property maintenance, health and safety, junk vehicle and various licensing programs. We handle public nuisances in the Code Enforcement arena.

Question 18: Will there be any extension to the proposal due date?

Response: The period for questions has been extended to Friday, October 31, 2014 at 2:00 pm CT. The RFCSP closing date has also been extended to Friday, December 5, 2014 at 2:00 pm CT.

Document Change Notation 1: On Pages 20, 25, and 28 of the RFCSP verbiage has been changed as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Document Change Notation 2: On Page 64 of the RFCSP language has been changed in **010 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS** as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Document Change Notation 3: On Page 65 of the RFCSP language has been changed in **011 RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATION** as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Document Change Notation 4: On Page 68 of the RFCSP language has been changed in **017 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS** as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Document Change Notation 5: On Page 124 of the RFCSP language has been changed in **RFCSP ATTACHMENT F** as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Document Change Notation 6: On Page 126 of the RFCSP language has been changed in **RFCSP ATTACHMENT H** as indicated in highlighted green within RFCSP 6100004961 v3.

Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator
Finance Department – Purchasing Division