



City of San Antonio

ADDENDUM 7

SUBJECT: Request for Information for Land, Permit, Inspection, License, Violation Management System Solution
Released: May 9, 2014

FROM: Jorge A. Garcia, Procurement Manager

DATE: June 3, 2014

THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. 7 - TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

THE ABOVE MENTIONED REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Questions and Answers

Glossary of Terms

'City' – represents the City of San Antonio

'RFCSP' – Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal

- 1. Will the City consider granting a 1-week extension to the Question Submission Deadline and RFI deadline?**
 - a. Addendum # 1 was released on May 12 , 2014 amending the RFI with the following extended dates;
 - i. Questions Submission Deadline: May 29, 2014 by 2:00pm (CST)
 - ii. RFI Submission Deadline: June 6, 2014 by 4:30pm (CST)
 - b. Subsequent Addendum #6 released on June 2, 2014, extended the RFI submission by 1 week.
 - i. RFI Submission Deadline: June 13, 2014 by 4:30pm (CST)
- 2. Can we send in two separate RFI responses?**
 - a. There is no RFI constraints on participating vendors and number of submissions by vendor
- 3. How many printed RFI copies are to be submitted to the City for the RFI titled "Land, Permit, Inspection, License, and Violation Management System Solution"?**
 - a. Addendum 2 was released on May 13, 2014 indicating RFI Respondents must submit 1 electronic version on CD and 1 bound hardcopy of the RFI response.
- 4. Do you also have this RFI in Word format or do you only use PDF?**
 - a. Vendors can use Adobe Professional and or any other available tools to convert the PDF version of the RFI into a MS-Word format or any other desired format as desired by vendor.
- 5. Is there a time frame for which the City would like to procure a solution?**

- a. City is interested in procuring solution by early 2015
- 6. Should procurement be made, how would such a project be funded?**
 - a. Using project funding reserves approved by Council
- 7. Will a formal solicitation be released as part of this project?**
 - a. City intends to release a formal solicitation
- 8. Does the City expect to establish a contract for a consultant to assist with this project? If so, how will the consultant be selected?**
 - a. Yes. Evaluation process to be determined during RFCSP development
- 9. Is the city planning on consolidating Code Enforcement requirement into this larger procurement?**
 - a. The released Land, Permit, Inspection, License, Violation Management System Solution RFI addresses Code Compliance system's needs.
- 10. How can we be of assistance to the City of San Antonio? Can we chat a little about what you're looking for? Once I know more about your workflow, I would be able to respond to the RFI.**
 - a. The City strives to maintain fair and equal communications across all prospective vendors.
 - b. Questions can be submitted until May 29, 2014 by 2:00pm (CST)
 - i. Answers will be published as an addendum to the RFI for all interested parties.
- 11. Does the City have a budget for purposes of this RFP? If so, what is it?**
 - a. City has reserves available for this initiative. Budgeting information is not available for release during the RFI process.
- 12. Please advise what the total number of users that would need access to the system as well as the total number of concurrent users.**
 - a. The total number of City staff users as it relates to licenses that may be required to support the City.
 - i. Hansen – 703 City Accounts
 - ii. ECCO – 243 City Accounts
 - iii. LDS – 70 City Accounts
- 13. Has the City seen any product demonstrations from vendors in the past 2 years? If so which vendors?**
 - a. In 2012, the City saw a demo of My Permit Now
 - b. Demos related to Route Optimization from Descartes, Waste Management Logistics, Apex, ESRI, TeleNav Track, and Xora/Field Force Manager.
 - c. Demo scheduled for May 28 for Selectron solution for mobile inspection input. Selectron is a mobile solution that is stated to be compatible with several permitting solutions (Hansen, Amanda, Accela)
- 14. Please confirm whether the City would prefer to have a city-hosted or a vendor-hosted solution?**
 - a. City-Hosted is preferred, yet there are no constraints on vendor hosted solutions should vendor(s) have an offering that meets business needs.

- 15. What data would the City like converted? (I.e. permits, inspections, code cases)?**
- a. To be determined based on strategic plan, roadmap and overall cost for variant data conversion options.
 - b. At a minimum City anticipates migrating current active operational transactions (including but not limited to contacts, addresses, properties, applications, permits, inspections, enforcement cases, complaints) and dependent archives.
- 16. Does the City have an interest in replacing the current Cisco IVR solution?**
- a. This is not in scope
- 17. The City has requested mobile access for inspection management. What are the preferred mobile devices (laptops, tablets, Toughbooks, etc.)? Please indicate the type and brand.**
- a. Preference is cross-platform mobile application that is device agnostic.
 - b. Please indicate the number of staff/inspectors that would need mobile access.
 - i. 100-150
- 18. In regards to the request for an Electronic Plan Review module, please provide the number of reviewers that would need access to the system.**
- a. Approximately 400-500 reviewers will need access to Electronic Plan Review. This number may vary when including external stakeholders and agencies.
- 19. On page 102 of Appendix A: Systems Replacement Use Cases, item 1.5.1/Use Case Flow/item 4.d “The system shall allow the Applicant to annotate and mark up plans...” has been requested. Please confirm, is the City interested in providing Applicants access to the Electronic Plan Review Module?**
- a. Applicants should have the ability to deliver and receive redlined documents in collaboration with Intake & reviewing staff within the City. How this is done is irrelevant (i.e. Plan Review Module, Portal, hybrid...). City requests vendor to provide options for consideration.
- 20. All throughout Appendix A, the request for the system to be able to capture electronic signature has been indicated. Please clarify the instances where the signature would be needed and if this functionality is for the Staff and/or the Applicant.**
- a. The system must be able to capture electronic signature. We foresee two general scenarios, however future implementation must not be limited to these scenarios and it would be up to the vendor to perform further due diligence with the City to identify all potential scenarios where electronic signature will be needed. The scenarios include, but are not limited to the following:
 - i. Applicant: Online forms where the applicant is self-certifying the information he or she has provided in an application or other communication with City staff is true, accurate, etc.
 - ii. Staff: Approval scenarios where City staff must self-certify that he or she has approved or denied a plan, inspection, review, etc. The digital signature must be able to be applied to any formal documentation generated related to the approval that can be exported out of the system (e.g., letter).

- 21. Can we get clarification on the following statement? This may or may not be applicable for the Hansen replacement? RFI section 1.3, para 3 states that the purpose of this RFI is for gaining knowledge of the products and services available on the market ‘for leasing personal computers and options available.’**
- a. Please verify that you are actually addressing Section 1.2 “General Terms and Conditions”, Item 3. You are correct in that this does not apply to this RFI.
- 22. Are CAD and TIFF files mandatory for Plan Reviews or for GIS capabilities only?**
- a. This requirement is for Plan Reviews. See *Use Case: Submit Plans Online*, which states the following “The System shall at a minimum accept multiple formats for the submission of plans, including: .pdf (mandatory), CAD files (mandatory), .jpg (optional), .tiff (mandatory), Microstation (DGN) (optional).”
- 23. Also, can you please provide additional information for the requirements on Page 115: The System shall support batch approvals, denials, and or conditions for multiple projects / locations, including but not limited to locations like neighborhoods or apartment buildings.**
- a. An example scenario is the following: An inspector performs multiple inspections within one building (e.g., 20 suites). The System would support the inspector entering in a result of “pass” for all inspections within that building with one transaction within the System.
- 24. Please advise which vendor’s product demonstrations (Land, Permit, Inspection, License or similar systems) have been viewed by any City staff in the past 2 years.**
- a. See response to Question #13.
- 25. Approximately how many 1. Internal City staff and 2. City field inspectors will be using the System?**
- a. Approximately 500 users and may be scaled to up to 2,500 City staff users at the City’s discretion
 - b. 100-150 City field inspectors
- 26. The discussion on page 12 of the RFI mentions the Brava document viewer being used with FileNet in the permitting plan review group. Is that integration currently being performed in-house by ITSD, by FileNet, or a third-party vendor?**
- a. Integration between FileNet and Brava has been completed with in-house resources.
- 27. Use Cases 4.1-4.6 discuss various aspects of managing trade licenses, including scheduling examinations. To what extent does the City conduct its own examinations, instead of requiring prospective licensees to attend standard examinations offered by accreditation organizations such as the International Code Council (ICC), after which the licensee provides proof of a test score?**
- a. Presently the Texas Department of License and Regulation issues electrical, electric sign and HVAC licenses through examination. The Texas State Board of Plumbing Examiners issues plumbing license through examination. Billboard Operators and Commercial Sign Operators are issued a license by the City after passing an examination administered by ICC. Homebuilders and Home Improvement Contractors are issue a City registration but no examination is required.
 - b. Some SAPD-managed licenses require the completion of an exam. The exam will be conducted by SAPD outside of the system. The System must support the ability to schedule an in-person exam via calendaring function (see *Use Case: Schedule an Exam Online* and *Use*

Case: Manage Examination Schedule). Additionally, the System must be able to capture the results of the examination (see *Use Case: Conduct Examination and Record Outcome*).

28. Clarification Item: The RFI references a City Standard of .NET. The City would like to clarify that it does not have a preferred technology platform for the future state solution and is open to any viable technology platform that is capable of addressing the business needs and requirements as stated in the RFI.

29. To provide an accurate price estimate, please identify the number of distinct named back office users the City requires for the new system (please identify number of named users by department/division):

- a. Plan Review - 80
- b. Land Development - 60
- c. Field Services/Code Compliance - 208
- d. Office of Historic Preservation - 12
- e. Information Technology Services Department - 24
- f. Transportation & Capital Improvement - 48
- g. Fire Department- 42
- h. Parks Department - 2
- i. Bexar County - 17
- j. San Antonio River Authority – 1

Please note that these figures are approximate and subject to change.

30. How many total field/mobile users does the City expect to use the new system? Of the number mobile users, how many are included with the number of back office users requested in the previous question above?

- a. Approximately 100-150 City field inspector users and will require back office access.

31. The City states in the RFI there are a number of additional department with an interest in the project (see list below). Please briefly describe the use cases for each of these departments, and how many system users within these departments there are:

Department	Response Coordinator	Use Cases	# of system users
Finance	Troy Elliott	See 8.1 – 8.5	*
Downtown Operations	Jim Mery	See 1.1 – 1.10	*
SAPD	Cpt Guzman	1.1 – 1.10, 3.1-3.7, 4.1-4.6, 6.1-6.6, 7.1-7.3, 8.1-8.5	*
Aviation	Loyce Clark	1.10; 5.1-5.3	*
CPS Energy	Rick Lopez	5.1-5.3; 6.6; 3.6	*
SAWS	Joe Samples	5.1-5.3; 6.6; 3.6	*
Customer Service (311)	Paula Stallcup	7.1-7.3	*
Animal Care Services	Vincent Medley	3.1-3.7	*
Convention and Visitors Bureau			*
Department of Human Services	Melody Woosley	7.1-7.3; 6.4	*
Metropolitan Health District	Stephen Barscewski	1.10, 3.1-3.7, 5.1-5.3, 4.1-4.6, 6.1-6.6, 7.1-7.3, 8.1-8.5	*
Council District Offices	Chris Callanen		*

** Approximately 2500 City staff across all departments – initial user base is approximately 500 users.*

32. Can the City provide a list of all the current Planning, Permitting and Code Enforcement record types that will also be included in the new system? (e.g., Variance, Commercial – New, High Weeds Complaint, etc.) This is very helpful information to determine the Level of Effort estimate for configuration during implementation. See links below:

- a. Plan Review Types refer to Appendix A located within this document
- b. Permit Types refer to Appendix B within this document
- c. Inspection Types refer to Appendix C within this document
- d. Code Enforcement Violation Types refer to Appendix D within this document

33. Please describe the general contractor license renewal process? (e.g., all renew on the same day each year. Each license type contains only a straight renewal – no other types of related applications or amendments.)

- a. See Use Case 4.3 *Use Case: Manage License Renewals* for requirements for license renewals.

34. Does the City have any specific reports (defined format) that must exist at the time of go-live? If so, how many reports does the City desire? (The definition of a report is any document emitted by the system including letters, citations, permits, statistical reports, etc.)
- a. See response to Question #37

35. Please describe the number and relative skill level of the City's report writing resources.
- a. Staff frequently uses report writing tools similar to Crystal reports.

36. As part of the training protocol, does the City want to be trained in report writing and development; and if so, what percentage of reports does the City wish the vendor to write as part of the implementation? (For example, vendor writes 20 reports, the City is trained to write 30 reports.)
- a. The City would like to be trained in report development. This training would include understanding the solution's underlying data model/table relationships. The proposed solution should provide the City an easy method to access/extract data that may also be loaded into an external data mart. Vendors are also requested to provide report development pricing per unit based on the complexity levels defined in Question #37.

37. Please estimate the number of reports and custom documents the City would like developed based on High, Medium or Low complexity for scoping purposes.
- a. Note these numbers reflect only statistical reports and not letters or form outputs

Complexity	Description	Number
High	Reports that require complex queries, joins, multiple sources, etc. Examples include statistical and analytical reports, schedules, management summaries and agendas.	163
Medium	Reports that require some calculations and summaries. Examples include forms and transaction reports (receipts, permits, inspection tickets, journals, logs). Many reports fall under this category.	100
Low	Reports that require a simple pull from a limited number of database fields and presentation on a document. Examples include letters such as Certificates of Occupancy and notices.	15

38. Please complete the following table with all systems data that must be converted into the new system. Please add any required conversions we missed, or strike any conversions we included that actually are not.

a. Data conversion scope has not yet been identified.

System Name	Vendor	DB Type	# of Base Records	# of data fields
Hansen V7	Infor	Oracle	1,567,777	152
ECCO		Adabas	130,380	167
LDS	In-house VB.net, ASP.net integrated with FileNet	Oracle, MS SQL	10,000	450
TPLT				
Non-Conforming Rights Database	N/A	Excel	1000	7
Zoning Verification Letter database	N/A	Excel	10,000	10

39. Does the City have resources to put the legacy data into a prescribed format, and then participate in the conversion process in the new system?

a. Yes

40. FileNet P8 is not mentioned as a required interface/integration for document management in Appendix C of the RFI. Is an interface required to FileNet P8, and if so, what is the current version?

a. Refer to section 4.1 Future State Application Diagram for core integrations such as FileNet. Per Appendix D – the version is FileNet P8 v 4.5.x (with plans to upgrade to 5.2 in the deployment timeframe for this solution).

41. Would Salesforce be used for Customer Complaint and Requests or is the City looking to have the Replacement system perform these type of requests?

a. The replacement system shall handle these requests, and there would need to be an integration to the City's 311 Lagan system.

42. Is the Dynamic Portal integrated with the Hansen implementation? Or is the staff re-entering this information into Hansen?

a. Dynamic Portal is integrated.

- 43. Is the City looking to replace BRAVA for their Plan Review processes or should the replacement system integrate and/or include BRAVA?**
- a. The City is open to any technology platform/tools that can address the business needs and requirements outlined in the RFI.
- 44. Will the City consider replacing their currently developed EPR Portal if the proposed solution would provide the same functionality for Plan Reviews via Adobe Pro?**
- a. The City is open to any technology platform/tools that can address the business needs and requirements outlined in the RFI.
- 45. Does the City prefer native Electronic Document Review functionality within the new system, or does it prefer a best of breed system with proven interface experience to the selected system?**
- a. The City seeks the best option that meets the business needs and requirements and provides the best integrated, user experience.
- 46. How does the City envision the use of "Use vehicle GPS instead of mobile GPS for tracking" in the Replacement system?**
- a. Vehicle-based GPS stays with the vehicle, mobile device stays with the user. We prefer a solution that would support both for the relevant use cases.
- 47. What is the budget range for this project?**
- a. See response to Question #11
- 48. What vendor systems has the City seen or had demonstrated relative to this RFI?**
- a. See response to Question #13
- 49. For all interfaces required to or from the new, selected system, please complete the table below. Please add any required interfaces we missed, or strike any we included that actually are not required.**

Note: All responses provided in the table above will be subject to change based on the detailed requirements. All transaction-based or real time integration will be through a message bus, and City IT will manage the external system portion of the integration.

Interface Name	One-Way or Two Way	Frequency (Batch, real-time)
Lagan 311	Two Way	Real-time
SAP Finance	One Way	Batch
Court Case Mgmt.	Two Way	Batch
Digital Health	Two Way	Batch
Bexar County Electronic Recordation – E-File Secure	One Way	Batch
Municipal Court Criminal Justice System	Two Way	Batch
Public County Information	Two Way	Batch
San Antonio Information System	Two Way	Batch
State Trade and Licensing	Two Way	Real-time
SAWS Web Application	Two Way	Batch
WMIS	Two Way	Batch
Legistar/Granicus	One Way	Batch
Inspection Scheduler	Two Way	Real-time
Mobile Inspector	Two Way	Real-time
Route Optimization	Two Way	Real-time
Agenda Builder	One Way	Batch
GIS (Arc/MAPP)	Two-Way	Real-time

50. The City states in Appendix D of the RFI that Cisco Unified Communications is the City's IVR solution. Can contractors currently schedule inspections through the IVR, and if so, does the City want an interface from the new system to IVR?

a. IVR is not in scope.

- 51. Will there be a dedicated Project Manager(s), and if so, will the Project Manager(s) be from the City or an outside consultant? To whom will the Project Manager(s) report? How many dedicated City staff will be assigned to the duration of this system implementation and in what roles?**
- To be defined based on selected solution's project implementation plan.
- 52. Please clarify whether the selected vendor will train all of the system users in each area, or if the City desires a "Train-the-Trainer" approach?**
- To be defined based on selected solution's project implementation plan.
- 53. Please state the City's desired implementation timeframe (project start to go-live).**
- To be defined based on selected solution's project implementation plan.
- 54. What business processes or record types will be enabled for electronic plan review? (i.e. Simple Residential Permits, Commercial Permits, etc.)**
- The EPR solution would be expected to accommodate all major business processes and record types requiring plan review, including but not limited to residential, commercial, and land development plan reviews.
- 55. Does the City plan to roll out electronic document/plan review functionality for all record types at once or phasing in record types over a specified timeframe?**
- The City is open to options that best meets the business needs and requirements.
- 56. Are the City's current Adobe Acrobat licenses version Adobe Acrobat X licenses? If not, can the licenses that can be upgraded to Acrobat X? If so, do all the plan review personnel have licenses allocated to them for Acrobat Pro? If not, does the City have a volume price agreement of government rate agreement for the Adobe suite of products?**
- The City will obtain the licenses necessary to support this functionality.
- 57. If the end business solution is the same in a cloud solution as a City-hosted solution, which would the City prefer and why?**
- See Question #14.
- 58. Is it important for the selected solution to be 508c compliant?**
- Yes, including WCAG 2.0
- 59. Is it important to the City to provide multi-lingual support (e.g., English/Spanish) in the Portal for Planning and Permitting applications, and Code Enforcement Service Requests?**
- Yes, this is a requirement.
- 60. Does the City have a cloud strategy? What is it?**
- The city either procures or provides cloud services and solutions according to the approach that delivers the optimum value to the organization. Cloud-based solutions or components

are considered where the risk profile and the overall value proposition meet the City's business needs.

61. How many dedicated full time equivalent (FTE) staff manage and maintain the relevant current systems (please break out support staff by system supported)?

- a. System Administration (Solaris, Windows Server), Database Administration (Oracle, SQL, ADABAS), and Content Management (FileNet) are not dedicated, they are supported by internal support groups in those service areas. Application Development and Support (primarily Hansen and ECCO) consists of approximately 2.5 FTEs.

62. What is the City's current disaster recovery strategy? How are systems backed up? Is there a second data center?

- a. The disaster recovery strategy is determined by the availability requirements of the application.
- b. Systems are backed up using industry standard backup software on a schedule that is aligned with the availability requirements of the system.
- c. The City currently operates out of two different data centers connected by a 10 gig bandwidth with < 5 ms latency between centers across dual fiber.

63. Please summarize the City's existing security policy for the relevant current systems.

- a. Please reference the following City Administrative Directives, available at http://www.sanantonio.gov/HR/admin_directives/index.asp:
 - i. Technology Policy 7.4A - Acceptable Use of Information Technology
 - ii. Technology Policy 7.8D – Access Control

64. Page 18 of the RFI document requests the following:

“Key product and implementation partnerships that relate to Systems Replacement scope as describe in the future solution vision above. In particular the City is interested in information regarding:

COTS Message Bus – As described in the Current Application Environment, the City is using a custom developed Message Bus (GUMB). The City is interested in details about COTS Message Bus options that could be used for all enterprise application communications.”

What exactly does the City mean by “...Systems Replacement scope...”?

- a. “Systems Replacement scope” includes permitting, licensing, land management, code enforcements, and inspections.

65. The RFI notes “...all enterprise application communications.”?

- a. Correction to RFI: This note should read “...all enterprise application integration.” The intent of the “message bus” is to facilitate enterprise application communications (e.g. from the Replacement system with external systems where appropriate).

- 66. Is the City interested in vendor experience with integration of IPS with COTS middleware products such as MS BizTalk or Oracle Fusion or is the City interested in the vendor's general IPS Web Services integration experience?**
- The City is interested in both middleware products and the product vendor's integration capabilities (i.e., web services). This is correct
- 67. Has the city seen any demos from any vendors in preparation for this RFI?**
- See response to Question #13
- 68. Who was the implementation partner for the current Infor Hansen system being replaced?**
- Hansen before they were bought out by Infor
- 69. Has the state identified target hardware for mobile platforms?**
- City prefers a platform agnostic mobile solution that is capable of working across multiple mobile device types that include iOS and Android devices.
- 70. Please clarify if the current procurement process for route optimization is continuing or if this proposal is to provide route optimization?**
- The proposal should include options to integrate with the City's current route optimization solution or propose an alternative route optimization solution.
- 71. Has the city considered the change management implications on non-technical staff in relation to moving from a system with limited workflow to a system driven by workflow? Will a solution that is not dependent on Crystal Reports be preferred or will the system be required to provide data to Crystal Reports?**
- The vendor should provide change management to help the City transition from the current system to the new solution. The solution should not be dependent on Crystal Reports, but capable of providing reporting data through Crystal Reports with ease.
- 72. What version of Lagan is in place now, are there any planned upgrades?**
- Lagan ECM 8.0.2, upgrade to 14R1 planned for 2015
- 73. Please clarify why the city has interest in a city hosted solution? Will solutions not hosted by the city be considered equally?**
- Please see response to Question #60; yes, solutions not hosted by the city will be equally considered.
- 74. Can the City provide a working web link so vendors can access Appendix A – Systems Replacement Use Cases?**
- The URL to access Appendix A is:
<http://www.sanantonio.gov/purchasing/biddingcontract/opportunities.aspx>

75. In reference to page 19 of the RFI, item 10. "The City envisions that multiple agencies may wish to share the same platform. What options are there for hosting multiple tenants in one environment?" Please clarify the City's definition of "agencies." Would this be a reference to other departments within City or other external municipalities?
- a. Agencies refers to both other City departments and non-City agencies such as SAWS (the water provider) and CPS (utility provider).
76. In reference to page 19, item 6. "Based on your experience with rule automation in this domain, what is the estimated portion of service scenarios that can be pragmatically expressed and executed through rule automation, and which constraints do you envision?" Please clarify whether this question is referring to the self-service citizen portal or the proposed solution as a whole.
- a. This question refers to the proposed solution as a whole.
77. For electronic plan review, does the City have a preference for a fully integrated solution where electronic plan review is part and parcel to the system, or does the City prefer a best of breed electronic plan review solution with a proven interface to the chosen permitting system?
- a. The City seeks the best option that meets the business needs and requirements and provides the best integrated, user experience.
78. Since the City has not yet answered our questions submitted on May 2nd, will the City please consider granting an extension to the RFI response due date and schedule it for one week after the City publishes the final Q&A? This will allow vendors time to incorporate City answers into their RFI responses.
- a. Please see Addendum 6; vendor deadline to respond to RFI has been extended to June 13th.

All questions must be submitted to:

Jimmy Caldwell, PMP
Project Manager
City of San Antonio
Information Technology Services Dept. (ITSD)
425 Soledad, Suite 350
San Antonio, TX 78205
Office: (210) 207-5218
Fax: (210) 207-5556
James.Caldwell@sanantonio.gov
www.sanantonio.gov



Jorge A. Garcia
Procurement Manager
Finance Department – Procurement Division

Appendix

Appendix A

PLAN REVIEW TYPES

Internal Reviewers:

- Building Reviews
- Commercial Reviews
- Construction Trade (MEP) Review
- Electrical Reviews
- Fire Alarm Reviews ** requires final approval from SAFD
- Fire Code Reviews ** requires final approval from SAFD
- Fire Sprinkler Reviews ** requires final approval from SAFD
- Mechanical Reviews
- Medium Opening Reviews
- Plumbing Reviews
- Residential Reviews
- Right/Left Turn Lane Reviews
- School Reviews ** Performs all review types for all School buildings.
- Sidewalk Plan Reviews
- Traffic and Sidewalks Reviews
- Traffic Impact Analysis
- Traffic Plan Reviews
- Tree, landscape, and irrigation Reviews

External Reviewers

- Aviation Reviews
- Disability Reviews
- Flood and Drainage Reviews
- Health Environmental/Food Reviews
- Historical Preservation Reviews
- Neighborhood Planning Reviews
- Planning and Community Development Reviews
- Storm Water Reviews **Uses internal Hansen product

Appendix B

PERMIT TYPES

New Buildings

- Residential Building Permit Application
- Commercial Remodel Permit Application
- Commercial Grading Permit Application
- Foundation Permit - Residential and Commercial
- Heating/Air Conditioning Permit Fees – Residential (New Construction only)
- Plumbing/Gas/Sewer Permit Application
- Electrical Permit Application
- Annual Mechanical / Plumbing Maintenance Permit Application
- Annual Electrical Maintenance (Property) Permit
- Temporary Electrical Service Application
- Fast Track Permit Application
- Fast Track Mechanical Permit Application
- Fast-Track Plumbing Permit Application
- Fast-Track Electrical Permit Application
- Fast-Track Metal Stud Permit Application
- Certification of Occupancy

Existing Buildings.

- Plumbing Application for Home Owner's Permit
- Plumbing One- And Two-Family Limited Service and Repair Permit
- Foundation Repair Permit - Residential and Commercial
- Electrical One- And Two-Family Limited Service and Repair Permit
- Heating/Air Conditioning One-And-Two-Family Limited Service/Repair Permit
- Sidewalk Curb Application
- Re-roof Application
- Fence Permit Application
- Portable Storage Unit Affidavit
- General Repair Residential Permit Application
- Cellular of Wheels Permit Application
- Demolition Permit Application (IB106)
- Permit Extension and Completion Request Form
- Cancel Permit Request
- Garage sales

Appendix C

INSPECTION TYPES

- Building
 - Frame
 - Foundation
 - Insulation
 - Final Inspection
 - UD Inspections
- Electrical Rough-in , Final
- Mechanical Rough-in , Final
- Plumbing Rough-in , Final
- Environmental (Trees and Landscaping)
- Engineering
 - Streets
 - Sidewalks
 - Driveways
 - Right Away
 - Traffic
 - Signs
- Fire (Sprinkler, Alarms, Fireworks)
- Health Environmental/Food Inspections
- School
 - Building
 - Electrical
 - Plumbing
 - Mechanical
- Certification of Occupancy
 - Building
 - Electrical
 - Plumbing
 - Mechanical
 - Fire
 - Traffic

Appendix D

CODE ENFORCEMENT

- Alley Inspection/Low Hanging Limbs
- No Address Posted
- Broken Sewer Line
- Curbstone Vehicle
- Environmental Brush Program
- Dead Trees-Private Property
- Dumpster City-Right-of-Way
- Dumpster: Maintenance
- Flood Damage
- Front Yard Parking
- Graffiti
 - Abatement Unit Investigation
 - Commercial (Occupied)
 - Initial
 - Private Property
 - Public Property
 - Residential (Owner Occupied)
 - Tenant Occupied
 - Vacant Commercial
 - Vacant Lots
 - Vacant Residential
- Home Occupation
- Junked Vehicles
- Alley
 - Rubbish/Garbage
 - Tall Grass/Weeds
- Min.Housing
 - Premise-Rubbish/Garbage
 - Premise-Weeds
- Outside Placement
- Fences
 - Barbed Wire
 - Heights
 - Walls
- House Numbers
- Min.Housing
 - Owner Occupied
 - Structure-Ext.
 - Structure-Int.
 - Sweep
 - Tenant Occupied
- No Sewer Service
- No Water Service
- Certificate of Occupancy

- Permits
 - Building
 - Fences
- Garage Sales
- Vendors/Peddlers
- Mosquito Breeding-Pooled Water
- Portable Toilets
- Basketball Goal
- Right-of-Way Obstruction
- Right-of-Way Obstruction Trash Cans
- Low Hanging Branches
- Bandit Sign
- Solid Waste
 - Dead Animal
 - Fly Breeding
- Animal Waste/Fly Breeding
- Swimming Pool Insp.-Residential
- Scrap Tire
 - Approved Storage Methods
 - Identification Markings
 - License Process
 - License Required
 - Quarterly Inspections
 - Transport Permits Required
 - Transport Records
- Vacant Lots
 - CDBG (1000ft.)
 - CDBG (12in.)
 - CDBG (48in.)
 - City (1000ft.)
 - City (12in.)
 - City (48in.)
 - County (1000ft.)
 - County (12in.)
 - County (48in.)
 - Initial
 - Private (1000ft.)
 - Private (12in.)
 - Private (48in.)
 - Rail Road (1000ft.)
 - Rail Road (12in.)
 - Rail Road (48in.)
 - State (1000ft.)
 - State (12in.)
 - State (48in.)
 - Unknown Owner (1000ft.)
 - Unknown Owner (12in.)
 - Unknown Owner (48in.)

- Wasting Water
 - General
 - Leaks
- Discharging in Public Waters/Streets
- Print All Dangerous Premise
- Antennas
- Business in a Residential
- Illumination
- Salvage Yards
- Zoning
 - Manufactured Homes
 - Multi. & Single Family Res.
- Outside Storage
- Oversized Vehicles
- Set backs
- Visual Obstructions
- Easements
- Dangerous Premise
 - Clean & Secure
 - Cut/Clean Only
 - Emergency Main & Accessory
 - Secure Only
- Emergent: Main Structure Only
- Emergent: Accessory Structure Only
- DSDB Ordered/Hold Harmless
 - Reg All
 - Reg Asse
 - Reg Main
 - Donation Container Permit