

City of Pinellas Park, FL | ERP Project (RFP 13/025)

Vendor Questions and Responses

City Initiated Clarification Items

1. Vendors should ensure to download a updated version of the RFP 13-025 - ERP PROJECT - VENDOR FORMS.doc from http://www.pinellas-park.com/residents/e-services/bids_rfp.php.

Pre-Proposal Meeting Questions and Responses

1. **What is the City's budget for this project?**

The City's current anticipated budget for the full scope hardware, software, professional services, and ancillary expenses relating to the ERP Project is \$2.1 million.

2. **Would the City consider a best-of-breed community development solution?**

The City is interested in leveraging the benefits of fully-integrated system; however, the City would consider the overall benefits of a best-of-breed community development solution. Accordingly, vendors should recognize that demonstrating how a proposed best-of-breed solution can integrate to a separate system is equally important as demonstrating the proposed solution's functionality.

3. **How many end-users would need to access a best-of-breed community development solution?**

The City anticipates there will be a need for two types of end-users to access the community development modules- Core Users and Non-Core Users. Within the Land Management line-of-business, the City is defining Core Users as those end-users performing processes in the application while Non-Core Users would typically have read-only access to generate reports and perform general inquiries. The estimate below for each of the Land Management modules is expected to be refined and finalized while developing a Statement of Work with the preferred finalist vendor(s) and vendors are requested to clearly describe all licensing approaches, tiers, and levels in their RFP response. Additionally, the City anticipates providing a self-service portal for non-City users to submit and access information.

Module	Core Users (Some Overlap)	Non-Core Users Estimates
Business Licensing	3	230
Code Enforcement	10	180
Electronic Plan Review	13	0
Inspections	23	15
Master Address	3	All
Permitting	8	25
Planning and Zoning	10	35

4. Does the City have a preference toward either a vendor-hosted or on-premise solution?

The City is evaluating the benefits of both options and is currently considering both approaches equally. Vendors are encouraged to share their perceived benefits related to each approach and provide optional cost proposals for both.

5. Would the City consider a best-of-breed Utility Billing solution?

The City is considering a best-of-breed utility billing solution and, as noted in the RFP, is specifically encouraging best-of-breed utility billing solution providers to respond. Vendors proposing a best-of-breed solution should ensure to complete the specifications compliance form for both the proposed modules and the General and Technical Requirements.

6. What is the City's current GIS environment?

The City does not currently have a GIS environment; however, it is considering a potential future GIS implementation and is evaluating GIS vendors including Esri.

7. Does the City currently utilize central cashiering?

Excluding several departments where cash is receipted into third-party applications, the City primarily utilizes a central cashiering approach. The City is anticipating to explore the benefits of the current approach versus a more decentralized approach with the preferred finalist vendor(s) when developing a Statement of Work.

8. What type of mobile device environment does the City currently utilize?

The City does not currently have a true mobile device environment as all current mobile operations are supported through laptop PCs. The City is exploring the benefits of both iOS and Android mobile operating systems and devices.

9. What does the City envision for Electronic Plan Review functionality?

The City is interested in a system that provides functionality to support the electronic submission, workflow, review, and mark-up of plans by multiple stakeholder departments. Greater detail regarding the City's functional requirements are documented in the Specifications Compliance Form.

10. How many City users will utilize the Electronic Plan Review functionality?

The City anticipates that a total of 13 City users would perform electronic plan reviews; however, the City also expects to offer a self-service portal for applicants to upload documents, confirm the status of the City's review, and download City comments and "redlined" plans.

11. Does the City have an existing time and attendance system and does it utilize biometric time clocks? If so, would the system be replaced or maintained?

The City currently uses an AS400-based in-house time and attendance system; however, not all City staff clock-in and clock-out each shift. The City would expect to replace all current systems based on the AS400 server; however, is anticipating to explore all options of time entry including its existing or new biometric time clocks.

Responses to Formal Questions Emailed by Vendors

1. **What data would the City like converted? (i.e. permits, inspections, code cases, contact information, etc.)? How many records would the City like converted?**

The City's expected scope for data conversion for all modules is provided in the Data Conversion worksheet of the Pricing Forms (ERP Project (RFP 13-025) - Pricing Forms.xlsx). The following is an estimate of the number of records for each type; however, this may not reflect that actual number of cases for each type as there are multiple records per case:

Conversion Item	Estimated Number of Records
Code Enforcement	425,000 records
Inspections	534,000 records
Permitting	145,000 records
Land Management Contact Information	We do not maintain any contact information.

2. **Please clarify the level of integration desired with the Pinellas County Licensing Board? Is the City looking to just view details or is an actual integration desired with the Community Development solution.**

The City is expecting maintain all required contractor information in the community development solution based on an "import file from Pinellas County Licensing Board with current valid contractor list who may perform work in the County."

3. **Please clarify the integration desired between FDOR and the Community Development solution?**

The City is expecting to import addresses from Florida Department of Revenue to identify which should be re-coded as Pinellas Park tax district.

4. **Please clarify what information from NFIP is to be tracked in the Community Development solution?**

Please review specification numbers 73 through 84 in the Planning and Zoning module.

5. **Does the City want to store the electronic versions of their NFIP Elevations Certificates in the Community Development software?**

Yes, as described in specification number 76 in the Planning and Zoning module.

6. **Please clarify if the Letter of Map Amendment log is a source of data to be integrated with or tracked within the Community Development software.**

The Letter of Map Amendment log is expected to be tracked within Community Development software specification numbers 76 and 82 in the Planning and Zoning module.

7. **Please clarify the integration desired with the National Fire Incident Reporting system.**

This interface (e.g. Interface # C-23) can be eliminated.

8. **Would the City consider extending the deadline when proposals are due to allow the vendors more time in responding?**

No, the City is committed to the project schedule and all proposals must be received by November 15, 2013 @ 4:00 P.M. local time as described in the RFP.

9. **Does the City have a budget or specific funds set aside for the purchase of Pension Management and Utility Billing solutions separate from the ERP budget since the you are requesting “best of breed” vendors to respond? If so, can you provide the budget or funds allocated to these solutions?**

The City has not allocated funds to any specific functional area or solution.

10. **In footnote #2, can you clarify the City’s desire for best-of-breed vendors? Is the City willing to accept independent proposals from vendors who are responding only to the Pension Management or Utility Billing requirements included within the RFP? (RFP Page: 9. RFP Reference Section: 1.1.1 – Module Scope Diagram.)**

Yes, the City is willing to accept independent proposals from vendors who are responding only to the Pension Management or Utility Billing requirements included within the RFP; however, the City would encourage them to partner with a broader local government ERP solution, if possible. Vendors responding only to the Pension Management or Utility Billing requirements must also complete the General and Technical requirements in the Specification Compliance Form.

11. **Will the City commit to notifying vendor if the City receives a Freedom of Information Act request regarding information vendor has identified as confidential? (RFP Page: 32. RFP Reference Section: 2.11.)**

Data is a public record but intellectual property is exempt from public record status and will not be given out.

12. **Req. ID 16 requires the ability to integrate with a document management system to attach correspondence and documents. What version of Laserfiche is currently used? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

8.3.1

13. **Req. ID 37 refers to a Cash Balance Plan. Do you offer a cash balance plan to any of your employees? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

The share in Fire could be considered cash balance; however, this can be discussed during the vendor demonstrations with the shortlisted vendors.

14. **Req. ID 80 includes a state tax type. Is it correct that you do not withhold taxes for the state of Florida and there is no state tax reporting requirements? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

Yes

- 15. Req. ID 92 requires the system to generate the 1099-R tax statement. Do you print the 1099-R forms in house? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

Question is redundant with Question 18 below and as the same response.

- 16. Req. ID 135 references an export for state reporting. What type of data is needed for this export? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

Name, Social Security Number, Date of Hire, Date of Termination, Date of Birth, Pension Option, Received for year, Current Pension Amount, Beneficiary.

- 17. Are you expecting the pension payroll for retirees and beneficiaries to be processed in the Pension Management system? If so, will you also be printing checks and advices in the retirement office as well as creating the ACH file? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

No, No

- 18. Req. ID 92 requires the Pension Management system to generate the 1099-R tax statement. Do you print the 1099-R forms in house? (RFP Page: 50. RFP Reference Section: 4 – Functional Requirements (Pension Management).)**

No

- 19. This section requires that vendors maintain the required insurance coverage for 6 years after completion of the Project. Does the commitment to purchase 6 years of post-Project coverage satisfy the tail requirement in Section 5.6(C)? (RFP Page: 55. RFP Reference Section: 5.6(D).)**

No, not if it's a claims made policy.

- 20. There is a reference to "10.A" that appears to be an erroneous reference. What is the correct section reference? (RFP Page: 55. RFP Reference Section: 5.6(E).)**

The correct reference is 5.6(A).

- 21. Our insurance carrier advises that this type of information is not included in the ACORD Certificate. Will the City accept evidence of this provision such as copies of applicable portions of the Vendor's insurance policies? (RFP Page: 55. RFP Reference Section: 5.6(G).)**

Yes

- 22. The section references in this section do not seem to match sections of the terms and conditions. Can you provide correct section references? (RFP Page: 56. RFP Reference Section: 5.11(C).)**

The references to "Part I - Section 7, Part I - Section 8, and Part I - Section 15" should refer to 5.11(A) and 5.11(B).

- 23. The section references in this section do not seem to match sections of the terms and conditions. Can you provide correct section references? (RFP Page: 67. RFP Reference Section: 5.41(C).)**

The reference to testing process "defined under Part II - Section 3.B" should refer to Section 5.41(B).

24. Will the City consider modifying the indemnification and hold harmless agreement to match the terms set out in Section 5.3 (H) of the City's Proposed Contract Terms & Conditions? (RFP Page: 87. RFP Reference Section: 7.4.)

The City expects to negotiate all contract terms and conditions with the finalist preferred vendor(s). Vendors should document exceptions to any specific proposed terms and conditions included in Section 5 of the RFP in the Contract Terms and Conditions Compliance Checklist – Exception Explanations Form provided in Section 6.1 of the RFP. The conditions provided in Section 7.4, Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement should be considered valid for the purposes of submitting the form provided on page 87 of the RFP.

25. Will the City consider bond forms issued by reputable bonding companies that may not be identical to the sample bond forms? (RFP Page: 108. RFP Reference Section: Appendix D.)

Yes, we will consider the use of the bonding companies forms as long as the same terms and conditions are applied.