Addendum #1 to RFP 19-5720 Operations Management Software

Guadalupe County Purchasing Agent
212 W Nolte Street
Seguin, Texas 78155
Phone 830-303-9729

Date: May 2, 2019

This addendum is being issued to provide clarification to questions.

This addendum is an integral part of the proposal package under consideration by you as a Proposer in connection with the subject matter herein below identified. Guadalupe County deems all sealed proposals to have been proffered in recognition and consideration of the entire proposal package – including all issued addenda.

Receipt of this Addendum by a Proposer should be evidenced by returning it signed as part of the Proposer's sealed proposal.

---

1. This addendum does not change the due date of the proposals. Sealed proposals must be received in the Purchasing Office by: **2:00 pm CST on May 15, 2019.**

2. The following general questions and answers are provided for clarification of the RFP specifications:

a. What is the budget for this project? Of the overall budget, what is the anticipated breakdown between the cost of software, services (implementation/training), and annual maintenance? **Answer. The County estimated budget of $125,000 is for the purchase and implementation of the Core Applications of the software. The County will negotiate annual maintenance costs with the contracted vendor and the County will budget for future annual maintenance. The County will evaluate the proposed costs of the Optional Applications for affordability and make a determination on when the County can purchase the Optional Applications.**

b. How many users that will interact with Plan Review Projects and Documents directly in terms of routing, reviewing, commenting on, or marking plans. This includes Permit Techs, Coordinators, Plans Examiners, Supervisors, IT System Administrators and/or any other role names that your agency uses. Also indicate if any of these users would interact with Plan Review less than four hours per day, which typically suggests they could share in a concurrent license pool instead of having a named user license for Plan Review. Provide the number of users (if any) who only require access to view documents but

will not be involved in reviewing, marking up, and approving of plans. **Answer. The primary personnel that will interact with Plan Review Projects and Documents are the 8 personnel in the Environmental Health Department and 2 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department. Each of the person is projected to have an individual license and the County would like the option to purchase additional licenses as needed.**

c. List the types of permits/reviews that require Plan Review. For example, Building Permits, Trade Permits and Rezoning reviews almost always require plan review, whereas Special Event Permits or Moving Van permits typically do not require Plan Review. **Answer. The primary types are Construction Plans, Utility permits, and driveway permits.**

d. How many users does the County anticipate needing access the OMS' asset/work order management functionality? **Answer. The primary personnel that will access the OMS' asset/work order management functionality are 4 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department.**

e. How many users will need access to the OMS' permitting functionality? **Answer. The primary personnel that will interact with Plan Review Projects and Documents are the 8 personnel in the Environmental Health Department and 2 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department.**

f. Does the County require a web-based portal for citizens to submit service requests directly to the OMS? **Answer. Currently, Service requests from citizens are received by phone or email. The County will consider other options.**

g. How many users do you expect to be processing work orders in the field (mobile)? **Answer. The primary personnel that will be processing work orders in the field (mobile) are 6 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department.**

h. How many users will be responsible for reviewing/approving citizen service requests, creating/releasing work orders, managing crew details, and/or executing work orders within the application? How many users will be managing work order templates, activities, asset types, PM schedules, inventory—maintaining the asset and work order infrastructure necessary to keep the application compliant with County's needs? If work orders are to be executed by paper, how many users will be entering data and/or printing work orders? **Answer. The primary personnel that will be performing these duties are 5 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department.**

3. The following questions are from specific sections of the RFP and answers are provided for clarification of the RFP specifications:

a. Section 3.3. If the OMS application is deployed on-premise, is the County willing to acquire/install hardware or configure VMs (based on provided system requirements) to facilitate the hosting of the OMS? Or is the vendor required to provide and install the necessary hosting hardware? **Answer. The proposed solution must include hardware specifications. The County will evaluate all proposals based on the criteria in the RFP.**

b. Section 3.7.4.2. Would an OMS/Fleet integration with the financial system be at the individual work order level, or be an aggregation at the equipment level for all work orders within a given time period? **Answer. The County is interested in a proposed OMS/Fleet integration with the financial system that allows expense reports and invoicing that can be customized based on site, equipment types, or specified individual equipment.**

c. Section 3.7.4.3.2. Does the county require an integration between the OMS an AVL system? If so, which AVL system is in use? What usage data from the AVL system would need to transfer to the OMS? **Answer. Currently, the County does not have an AVL system.**

d. Section 3.7.4.6.4. Is the reporting requirement listed in this item, a direct result of the fuel system integration mentioned in 3.7.4.8? Is an integration between the OMS and the County's financial system a requirement? If so, which financial application? Would this integration be one-way or two-way? (Suggested in 3.7.4.2) Would any financial integrations with the OMS be facilitated by the financial system's APIs, or would a flat-file export be required from the OMS? **Answer. The County's financial system is Tyler New World. Currently, the fleet and fuel data are manually entered. The County would like to improve the integration of fleet data and fuel data.**

e. Section 3.7.4.8. Is the County requiring an integration between the OMS and the existing fuel system? If so, which fuel system is in use? Would this be a one-way or two-way integration? Is data required to be imported into the OMS, or exported from the OMS, or both? What general information is needed to facilitate the import or export integration(s)? What other 3rd party application(s) would be involved in the integration? **Answer. The County's existing fuel system is through the use of Fleet Fuel cards. Currently, the fleet and fuel data are manually entered. The County would like to improve the integration of fleet data and fuel data.**

f. Section 3.7.4.5.12. Is an integration required between the County's procurement system (New World) and the OMS' inventory management system? If so, please explain the desired functionality, directionality, data content to be shipped, etc. **Answer. Currently, the County does not have an inventory management system. The County would like to improve the integration of inventory management data into the financial and procurement systems.**

g. Section 3.8.1. Does the County have the current work processes documented? (i.e., documented workflows for each permit type). How many unique permit types does the County need configured within the OMS? **Answer. Currently "The Safe Program" allows changes to be made to the different types of receipts and also changes can be made to the fee amount. Having that flexibility benefits when there is a fee change or need to add another type of receipt. The County has 21 different types of receipts.**

h. Section 3.8.1.7. How many users does the County anticipate accessing the Electronic Plan Review capabilities of the OMS' permitting solution? **Answer. The primary personnel that will interact with Plan Review Projects and Documents are the 8 personnel in the Environmental Health Department and 2 personnel in the Road and Bridge Department. Each of the person is projected to have an individual license and the County would like the option to purchase additional licenses as needed.**

i. Section 3.8.1.8. Does the County plan to accept payments for permit applications submitted through the OMS' online application? If so, which payment gateway does the County use? **Answer. Currently, the County does not have the capability to offer payment for permits online. We accept cash or check only.**

j. Section 3.7.4.5.1. Have a bar coding system for parts and vehicles. Does the County have existing bar coding equipment to be used, intend to procure the bar coding equipment or is the equipment to be part of the proposal? **Answer. Currently, the County does not have a bar code system or equipment.**

k. Sections: 3.8.1. Environmental Health Permits, licensing and land (PLL) Management; 3.8.1.1. Permitting; and 3.8.1.3. Plan Application Tracking. Is it the County's intent that the preferred solution have the cashiering/payment solution for the permitting? What is the current solution for these functions? What is the County's ERP software? **Answer. Currently, the County does not have the capability to offer payment for permits online. We accept cash or check only. The County's ERP/financial system is Tyler New World.**

The information included herein is hereby incorporated into the documents of this RFP and supersedes any conflicting documents or portion thereof previously issued.

Receipt of this Addendum is hereby acknowledged by the undersigned Proposer.

_____
Authorized Signature (Proposer)

_____
Title of Person Signing Above

_____
Typed Name of Firm, Corporation