



CITY OF WACO

Purchasing Services
 Post Office Box 2570
 Waco, Texas 76702-2570
 254 / 750-6604
 Fax: 254 / 750-8063
 www.waco-texas.com

Date: March 8, 2023
RFP No: 2022-100
Commodity: Permitting and Inspection Software

Closing Time: 2:00 P.M., March 29, 2022

Opening Time: 2:01 P.M., March 29, 2022

Bid Opening Location: 1415 N. 4th St. Waco, Texas (Via Zoom Video & Dial-in)

Addendum No: 4

The above-mentioned bid invitation has been changed in the following manner. **Sign and return addendum to the Purchasing Office by the closing time and date with your RFP response.** Returning this page signed by your authorized agent will serve to acknowledge this change. All other requirements of the invitation remain unchanged. If you have any questions, please call or stop by the Purchasing Office at the above address.

THE FOLLOWING IS BEING ISSUED AS ADDENDUM NO. 4

PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING PAGES

- ANSWERS TO CONTRACTOR SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Firm: _____

Address _____

Signature of Person
 Authorized to Sign Bid: _____

Signor's Name and Title
 (print or type): _____

Date: _____ Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

1. Is the city calling the Scope of Service the same as Scope of Work?
The Scope of Services section provides a summary of our expectations for this project. We are looking for a firm to submit a complete proposal with a scope of work and timeline for project success.
2. How many people will be involved with the electronic plan review? **Approximately 26**
3. How many inspectors will be mobile and require access to plan review markups and corrections? **9 for Inspections Dept. EH-1**
4. How many users will require training? **18 for Inspections Dept. 4 for IT. 16 for Code. EH-12**
5. Of the number of permits issued, do you know what percentage requires plan review?
80% for Inspections Dept.
6. Integrations:
 - a) of the current Tyler Munis system primarily a financial system? **Yes, for the payment functionality.**
 - b) Will you use a document management system like Laserfiche and require integration?
Filebound is our current document management. We would like to see an integration with FileBound, if content management is not included.
7. On page 10 of RFP it states a total of 60 internal users, of which 34 are anticipated to be mobile users. We understand this to be 60 total users and not 94, is that correct? **Yes**
8. How many people will be involved with the electronic plan review? **Approximately 25 total EH - 12**
9. How many inspectors will be mobile and require access to plan review markups and corrections? **9 for Inspections Dept. EH-12**
10. How many users will require training? **18 for Inspections Dept., 16 for Code Dept.4 for IT EH-12**

Permits:

- Of the number of permits issued, do you know what percentage requires plan review?
80% for Inspections Dept.

Integrations:

- Is the current Tyler Munis system primarily a financial system? **Yes**
- Will you be using a document management system such as Laserfiche, and require integration? **Filebound is our current document management. We would like to see an integration with FileBound, if content management is not included.**

Forms:

- The forms that need to be completed and returned; do they need to be completed by all parties involved with the response? **Yes, all forms should be completed and returned.**

11. How many active Business Licenses are there in the City of Waco currently? **960 active business licenses for Inspections .EH - 2257**
12. Can the City of Waco please provide a complete list below for implementation:

Permit Types & SubTypes
a. Inspections Dept.

- i. Residential Building**
 - 1. Accessory structure**
 - 2. Addition**
 - 3. Demolition**
 - 4. Repairs and Alterations**
 - 5. Roofing**
 - 6. Swimming Pool**
 - 7. Duplex**
 - 8. House Moving**
 - 9. Single Family Attached**
 - 10. Single Family Dwelling**
- ii. Commercial Building**
 - 1. Accessory Structure**
 - 2. Addition**
 - 3. Demolition**
 - 4. Repairs and Alterations**
 - 5. Roofing**
 - 6. Swimming Pool**
 - 7. Finish Out**
 - 8. Interior Demo**
 - 9. Multi-Family**
 - 10. New Structure**
 - 11. Shell Building**
- iii. Building Other**
 - 1. Cell Tower**
 - 2. Foundation**
 - 3. Parking Lot**
 - 4. Site Grading**
- iv. Plumbing**
 - 1. Commerical**
 - 2. Residential**
 - 3. Gas**
 - 4. Irrigation/Backflow**
 - 5. Utility Lines**
 - 6. Water Heater**
- v. Mechanical**
 - 1. Commercial**
 - 2. Residential**
 - 3. Ventahood**
 - 4. Walk in Cooler**
- vi. Electrical**
 - 1. Alternative Power Source**
 - 2. Commercial**
 - 3. Residential**
 - 4. Sign**
 - 5. Swimming Pool**

6. Temporary Final
7. Temporary Pole
- vii. Sign
 1. Illuminated
 2. Non-Illuminated
 3. Temporary

Planning Application Types

- a. Rezoning
- b. Special Permit
- c. Concept PUD
- d. Final PUD
- e. Land Use Change
- f. Minor Plat
- g. Major Plat
- h. Abandonment
- i. Annexation
- j. Variance
- k. Historic Landmark Designation
- l. Certificate of Appropriateness
- m. Encroachment
- n. Street Name Change
- o. Ordinance Amendment
- p.

Inspection Types

- a. Code
 - i. Annual Re-Inspection
 - ii. Citation Re-Inspection
 - iii. Code Enforcement Final
 - iv. Commercial Tag Re-Inspection
 - v. Confirm Abatement
 - vi. Housing 60 Day Comm Inspection
 - vii. Housing 60 Day Res Inspection
 - viii. Junked Vehicle Re-Inspection
 - ix. Nuisance Re-Inspection
 - x. Post Hearing Re-Inspection
 - xi. Residential Tag Re-Inspection
 - xii. Secure Re-Inspection
 - xiii. Zoning Re-Inspection
- b. Inspections
 - i. Above Ceiling
 - ii. Building Commercial Check
 - iii. Ceiling Insulation
 - iv. Demolition
 - v. Draft Stop
 - vi. Exterior Lath

- vii. Exterior Wrap/Masonry Ties
- viii. Exterior Wrap/Waterproofing
- ix. Final
 - x. Fire Blocking
 - xi. Fire Rated Assembly
 - xii. Fireplace
 - xiii. Fireproofing
 - xiv. Floor Framing
 - xv. Floor Insulation
 - xvi. Footing
 - xvii. Foundation (non engineered)
 - xviii. Framing
 - xix. Framing/Exterior Wrap
 - xx. Framing/Fireplace
 - xxi. Grade Beam
 - xxii. Info for Building
 - xxiii. Info for Electrical
 - xxiv. Info for Plumbing
 - xxv. Infor for Mechanical
 - xxvi. Masonry Ties
 - xxvii. Partial Final
 - xxviii. Pier
 - xxix. Pool Belly Steel
 - xxx. Pool Final
 - xxxi. Roofing Final
 - xxxii. Temporary CO
 - xxxiii. Wall Insulation
 - xxxiv. Wind Bracing/Structural Frame
 - xxxv. Building Sign Final
 - xxxvi. Building Temporary Sign Final
 - xxxvii. Ceiling Rough
 - xxxviii. Deck Bond
 - xxxix. Electrical Commercial Check
 - xl. TXU Check
 - xli. Pool Bond
 - xl.ii. Electrical Pool Final
 - xl.iii. PV Rough
 - xl. iv. Rough
 - xl. v. Service Change
 - xl. vi. Sign Final
 - xl. vii. Slab Grounding
 - xl. viii. Slab Rough
 - xl. ix. Temporary Final
 - l. Temporary Pole
 - li. Underground
 - lii. Wall Rough

- liii. Duct Rough
- liv. Duct Wrap
- lv. Exhaust Duct
- lvi. Grease Duct
- lvii. HVAC Final
- lviii. Mechanical commercial check
- lix. Seam
- lx. Ventahood
- lxi. Walk in Cooler
- lxii. Boiler
- lxiii. Gas Final
- lxiv. Gas Rough
- lxv. Gas Yard Line
- lxvi. Grease Trap Line
- lxvii. Grease/Lint Trape
- lxviii. Irrigation/Backflow
- lix. Plumbing Commercial Check
- lxx. Roof Drain Final
- lxxi. Roof Drain Rough
- lxxii. Roof Drain Top Out
- lxxiii. Rough In
- lxxiv. Sewer Line
- lxxv. Shower Pan
- lxxvi. Top Out
- lxxvii. Water Heater
- lxxviii. Water Line
- lxxix. STR Life Safety Inspection
- lxxx. Alcohol (bldg, elec, plum, mech)
- lxxxi. Nightclub (bldg, elec, plum, mech)
- lxxxii. Indoor Amusement Facility (bldg, elec, plum, mech)
- lxxxiii. Sexually Oriented Business (bldg, elec, plum, mech)
- lxxxiv. Open Air Vending

Code Enforcement Case Types

- a. Annual Grass & Weeds
- b. Nuisance
- c. Junked Motor Vehicle
- d. Secure Structure
- e. Housing 60 Day: Commercial
- f. Housing 60 Day: Residential
- g. Substandard Structure: Commercial
- h. Substandard Structure: Residential
- i. Zoning
- j. Lien Management (Unless tracked in separate module)
- k. Citizen Contact (Unless able to track elsewhere)
- l.

Business License Types

a. Inspections .

- i. Alcohol
- ii. Credit Access Business
- iii. Coin Operated Machines
- iv. Indoor Amusement Facility
- v. Nightclub
- vi. Sexually Oriented Business
- vii. Short Term Rental
- viii. Open Air Vending
- ix. Environmental Health
 - 1. Adult Care- Food Establishment
 - 2. Adult Care- Inspection
 - 3. Child Care Food
 - 4. Child Care Food Establishment - Non-Profit
 - 5. Child Care Inspection
 - 6. Food Establishment- Seats
 - 7. Food Establishment- Seats- Non-Profit
 - 8. Food Establishment- Square Foot
 - 9. Food Establishment- Square Foot- Non-Profit
 - 10. Foster Care Group Inspection
 - 11. Foster Care/Adoption
 - 12. Mobile Food Establishment Vendor
 - 13. Mobile Food Establishment Vendor- Non-Profit
 - 14. Pool Inspection
 - 15. Spa Inspection
 - 16. Temporary Food Establishment
 - 17. Temporary Food Establishment- Non-Profit

13. Can the City identify how many sources of data conversion are to be converted? 3

14. Has the City had any demonstrations of any permitting/planning/land management/code enforcement/business licensing systems in the past 12 -24 months? **We have previously seen demonstrations from MyGov and Infor. With releasing this RFP we are focused on finding a best-in-class solution to meet our needs.**

15. If you have had a demo, can the City please provide a list of the products you have seen? **We are currently using Tyler's Energov solution and we have seen demonstrations from MyGov and Infor. After these demonstrations, it was decided to release an RFP to find the best solution for the City of Waco.**

16. Has the City received any pricing estimates from any vendor for permitting, planning, land management, code enforcement, or business licensing system in the past 12 – 24 months? **We have not received quotes from other vendors.**

17. If so, can the City please provide a list of the vendors you have received pricing from?
N/A

18. Has anyone outside of the City staff helped with the development of this RFP and/or the requirements list provided?

City Staff based portions of our RFP on the City of Conroe's RFP and requirements. The requirements were edited based on feedback from City Department and Staff.

19. If so, can the City please identify the parties that helped?

City Staff put the RFP together with help from the City of Waco Purchasing department.

20. What is the approved budget for the new solution? **There is not an approved budget for this project. This project is supported by Council and the Management Team to procure a best-in-class solution for our user community.**

21. Does the City have an anticipated project timeline and/or go-live date? **We are looking for firms to recommend a timeline that focuses on projects success and realistic timelines and milestones.**

22. Does the City have a budget approved for the project? If so, can the City disclose the budget? **There is not an approved budget for this project. This project is supported by Council and the Management Team to procure a best-in-class solution for our user community.**

23. Does your schedule include any demonstrations? **Yes, we plan to schedule demonstrations for our top vendors.**

24. Would the City like to replace their existing Bluebeam Electronic Plan Review? Or just need integration with the Bluebeam? If looking for replacement, then how many Users will need Electronic Plan review? **Approximately 26 users for Plan Review.**

25. Did the City have pre-RFP presentations from vendors including Tyler Tech and others? **We have previously seen demonstrations from MyGov and Infor. With releasing this RFP we are focused on finding a best-in-class solution to meet our needs.**

26. Has the City seen any presentations, software demonstrations previously related to the Permitting & Inspection software project & from whom? **We have previously seen demonstrations from MyGov and Infor. With releasing this RFP we are focused on finding a best-in-class solution to meet our needs.**

27. What is the biggest pain or issue that you have now with the current system?
- a. **Code – Unreliability and limitations of mobile apps**
 - b. **Planning & Inspections – Unreliable, limitations for both back office &**

mobile apps, software support, lack of customization for citizen portal , lack of electronic communication from the system.

- c. EH Health – Lack of support to get ongoing issues fixed. Unreliable, when issues are fixed it causes new issues; items that were working, no longer work.**
28. Can we get a list of Standard & custom reports that you would like to have?
- a. Code: Notice of Violation, Hearing Notice, Billing invoice**
 - b. Inspections Dept: Business License, Certificate of Occupancy, Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, Certificate of Completion**
 - c. Planning: Staff reports for cases, annual and trend reports for development applications**
 - d. EH- Billing reports, custom field reports, unrenewed reports, inspections per inspector**
29. How many records needs to be converted? **~250000**
- What is the cleanliness of data on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the cleanest? How many data fields are there? **6 on cleanest scale. Data fields depends on your definition of the data field.**
30. Does the City prefer End user training or Train the trainer approach? **The City of Waco is looking for each vendor to submit a training plan for this project. We are looking for a proposal that addresses training for our user community.**
31. Can you please share the list of permits and Inspection types that you need? **Answered above.**
32. How many inspections does City of Waco do annually for both ‘Permit-driven’ and ‘Complaint-driven’ inspection types?
- a. Code ‘Complaint-driven’ inspections: 2,000 + a year**
 - b. Inspections Dept – Complaint & Permit Driven Inspections: Approx 31,000 a year**
 - c. Environmental Health- Approx 5,000 a year**
33. Would the City like to replace their existing Bluebeam Electronic Plan Review? Or just need integration with the Bluebeam? If looking for replacement, then how many Users will need Electronic Plan review? **Approximately 25 users EH-1. We are looking for a complete system and best-in-class solution. We are open to looking at a replacement that’s fully integrated.**
34. Does the City need Point of Sales/Cashiering solution? If yes, How many Users will need Point of Sales (POS)/Cashiering? **The city uses Tyler cashiering.**
35. Is the City using online customer payments for permitting now? If no, would the City like the new cashiering solution to become the Customer Payment Portal for permitting? **Development Services Dept currently uses online and in house payments for**

permitting. Yes EH-no; software would need to be able to speak to Tyler hub through Tyler cashier.

36. Would the City like to scan checks at the counter? Does the City have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in the response? What is the annual volume that the City would scan using this process? **Inspections does not currently scan checks. EH-no; software would need to be able to speak to Tyler hub through Tyler cashier.**
37. Would the City like the cashiering solution to create an Image Cash letter (ICL) containing check images for deposit, and send it to your bank? If so, which bank? **We use Tyler cashiering and we have an exclusive contract with Wells Fargo.**
38. Does the City have any preferred Payment Gateway? **We have an exclusive contract with Wells Fargo. Authorize.Net is a common integration for us currently and it's supported by Wells Fargo.**
39. Does the City have a desired implementation timeline? **The City of Waco is looking to have each vendor recommend a Timeline within the proposal.**
40. Will the City grant a 2-week extension to the current due date of 3/13? **Yes.**
41. Which software vendors has the City seen demos from before the RFP was released? **MyGov and Infor.**
42. Would the City like to have vendors include current customer references in their responses? If so, how many? **Yes, this would be an alternate submission item.**
43. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 2.2.11 appears to be incomplete. Could the city provide the complete requirement if there is some missing detail to this requirement? Currently the requirement is "Ability to prevent an inspection from being scheduled if there are unresolved conditions relevant to the." **Relevant to the "inspection."**
44. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 1.5.2 "Unprinted letters, across the entire system, can be managed from a centralized location ("print queue"). Please provide additional details regarding what letters across the entire system? What specific letters would be batch or queue printed? **Code-Batch notices of violation, batch hearing notices.**
45. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 2.1.25 "Ability to launch electronic documents for markup or stamping within Bluebeam Revu or similar software". However, items 3.1.31 and 4.1.31 list "Ability to launch electronic documents for markup or stamping within Bluebeam Revu." Based on the first referenced requirement, this seems to indicate that the City is open to working with electronic review software other than Bluebeam Revu. Is the City in fact open to working with a different electronic Plan Review product that is fully integrated to the proposed system? Or is the City requiring a Bluebeam Revu integration? If the City is open to an included, fully integrated solution, how many users would require access to the electronic plan review capabilities? **Inspections Dept is open to something other than Bluebeam, approximately 25 users**

46. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 2.1.26 is “Supports permit applications for special events”. Please provide examples of the “special events” activities. Are these permits that are related to non-addressable types of locations such as Right of Way permits or something else? **Outdoor Events Permits are issued to events that take place on city property (parks or open spaces) or request city services such as exclusive use of an area, road closures, Waco PD or other city services. These events include everything from large festivals, to runs/races, parades, parties and smaller events, such as weddings. They are not related to ROW permits.**
47. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 7.1.19 is “Ability for the public to submit applications (tax abatement) online and pay required fees”. Please provide additional details and/or an example regarding tax abatement applications. What is the typical workflow for these applications?

Here is the essential outline of the residential tax abatement process.

- **Application**
 - **Contractor/Homeowner submits form, documents, and fee**
 - **Application Review**
 - **Address is within the tax abatement district**
 - **Ownership verified**
 - **Guidelines met in the proposed project**
 - **Clearances**
 - **Existing and all owned property taxes and water bills paid**
 - **No City liens**
 - **Plan Review**
 - **No existing permits on the property**
 - **Home construction plans meet neighborhood compatibility design standards and zoning**
 - **Council Approval**
 - **Permit waiver calculations**
 - **30 day public notice**
 - **Council Approval**
 - **Construction**
 - **Complete within 1 year of contract execution**
 - **Verify construction costs**
 - **Guidelines met in the final project**
 - **Sale & Assignment**
 - **Contractor requests City to make assignment to new owner**
 - **30 day public notice**
 - **Council Approval**
48. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 8.1.4 is regarding tracking parcel-related data in the system. Does this information/data currently exist in the GIS layers? **Yes.**
49. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 8.1.7 is regarding tracking non-parcel-based location types of data in the system. Does this information/data

currently exist in the GIS layers? **Yes, the data exists in an Esri enterprise geodatabase.**

50. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, the Comments Column I provides very little room for comments (about 6 words). In the instructions it indicates “Should you need to add comments to clarify your responses further, please use the space provided in the column entitled Comments. If there is insufficient space for your explanation, you can include additional information in the appendices of your proposal and reference the appropriate appendix in the comment column.” Would the city agree to allow word wrap and provide an updated spreadsheet for this column to provide for slightly more space? It is our concern that it may become frustrating for reviewers to reference another document for comments. **Yes, staff will take care of this.**
51. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 8.1.5 is regarding Backflow testing. Is the new system to track and schedule backflow inspections? Or is the city just wanting to track the data associated with the backflow testing that is done by another department? If the city is simply looking to track this data, where is the data originally entered/captured? Does the city desire an import to capture this data? Will this be stored as a layer in GIS? (Is this information currently tracked in GIS?) **City staff will remove this requirement.**
52. On Page 9 of the RFP document, Rock Solid OneView is listed as a software in which the new system should integrate. However, there are no requirements in the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File. Is this an optional integration that will be explored at a later time? Or should this integration be included in the proposal? If this integration is to be included in the scope of the proposal, please provide the details regarding what data is to be exchanged between the two systems and if this is a one-way or two-way integration. **We are looking for a system that has an open API concept to integrate seamlessly with environments that have open API integrations as well. Please indicate if your solution has the ability to integrate with Rock Solid OneView and how your firm will leverage this integration to potentially streamline processes.**
53. Does the City have a preference to the phasing/order of implementation/ module prioritization of the new system? For example, does the city prefer that licensing be first, permitting next, etc. Are there any circumstances to consider when scheduling the order of the phases? **We do not have a preference and we are looking for a vendor to submit a plan and timeline to complete this project.**
54. In the 03 2641939_RFP_2022-100_Software_Requirements File, Item 2.2.54 refers to “specific checklist items on the inspection, in the case of food/health inspections where detailed checklists are required” Please provide examples of the detailed checklist expected to be setup/configured for this type of inspection. **EH- Workflow process**
55. Please confirm the following list of integrations:
 - a. **Esri Yes**
 - b. **MUNIS Yes**
 - c. **Microsoft Office o365**
 - d. **MS-Outlook/Exchange o365**
 - e. **EDMS – Filebound or TYLER TCM Yes**
 - f. **Texas DLR**

project plan. City staff will work with the successful proposal to outline a calendar of events to not conflict with Holidays and major events.

73. Can bidders assume that the portable tablets for City staff and internet connectivity will be supplied by the City? **Yes**
74. What presentations, software demonstrations and/or estimates / quotes have City programs received related to the Permitting and Inspection Software project and from whom? **We have seen presentations from Infor and MyGov. Not quotes have been received.**
75. Given the complexity of the RFP, extensive requirements, physical response delivery requirements, etc. can the City extend the proposal due date by at least 3-4 weeks beyond answers being posted to vendor questions? **City staff has extended the deadline and we will continue to evaluate timelines to meet vendor needs.**
76. How much is overall cost factor into the City's evaluation of proposals given pricing does not seem to be one of the Evaluation Criteria listed on page 14 of the RFP?
77. For data conversion requirements, please inventory all data sources, file formats, and size of the current data sets to be converted and migrated into the new system. **The current data is stored in the MS SQL (250k records), MS Excel, AS400(Central Square)**
78. What is the City's budget for the initial system implementation? **We are looking for a best-in-class solution and we are prepared to invest to make this a successful project.**
79. What, if any, amount of the budget is subject to expire by a certain timeframe and when? Please elaborate. **N/A**
80. What amount is being budgeted for ongoing support, software licensing, hosting, and support of the new system. **N/A**
81. Is the City desiring to have the option for staff to be trained on application administration to make changes, updates, and add new capabilities to the system after go-live? Or is the City anticipating the vendor to perform future updates and changes (such as addition of new license types, form configuration, business rule changes, etc.) to the system? **We are looking for a best-in-class solution that delivers a user friendly system that we can modify**
82. Please identify ALL other systems that the new solution will need to integrate with (i.e. payment processor, other systems such as financial, etc.) along with an inventory of which interfaces will need to be wither a one-way (import or export) or two-way data exchange? **Munis, Filebound, GiS, WellsFargo merchant processor**
83. Can the City provide an inventory of all the reports that need to be replicated within the new system? **Code- Notice of violation, hearing notice, billing invoice**
84. Can Appendix A be submitted to the City in xls format? **Would prefer to have it submitted as PDF (save as).**
85. Does the City have an anticipated start date for the implementation project? **We are looking for a firm to submit a timeline that delivers project success.**
86. Does the City have an anticipated duration for the implementation project? **We are looking for a firm to submit a timeline that delivers project success.**
87. Can the City Provide a list of required transaction types in the following categories:

- a. **Permit applications**
 - b. **Planning entitlement applications**
 - c. **Code case types/subtypes**
 - d. **Contractor registration types**
 - i. **Inspections Dept**
 - 1. **Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC, Building**
88. Can the City elaborate on it's need for data conversion of records:
- a. Are all records coming from the legacy Tyler system? If not, which other systems? **Tyler, CentralSquare, MS Excel**
 - b. Does the City want to convert only closed records, open and closed records, or has it not yet been decided? **This has not yet been decided.**
89. Will the City please detail out of the required integrations to 3rd Party solutions including the following information:
- a. **System Name Munis**
 - b. **Vendor Tyler**
 - c. **Direction of data – Outbound/Inbound/Bi-Directional -Both**
 - d. **Type – Real time/Batch Prefer both**
 - e. **Description of data elements? Tyler tech.com**
 - f. **System Name Filebound**
 - g. **Vendor Upland software**
 - h. **Direction of data – Outbound**
 - i. **Type – Real time/Batch Any**
 - j. **Description of data elements? TBD**
90. Is the City open to both self-hosted or Cloud solution? **Both**
91. Of the number of permits issued, Can the City confirm what percentage requires plan review? **Approximatley 80% for inspections dept.**
92. How many years of record types needs to be retained during migration to a new system?
- a. **Code: All Energov data (12/2018) ~ 250k records. There is also legacy lien data in 2 different data sources.**
93. Please list the number of state agencies that the solution will need to integrate with to verify licensing. Do you currently get a batch file from these agencies today? **We are currently not batch uploading to any state agencies. This is something we will want to do with 3 agencies.**
94. Will the City consider waiving the hard-copy requirement and accept proposals electronically? **The City is currently only accepting hard-copy proposals, we are scheduled later this year to begin electronic bidding.**
95. Regarding he form called, Texas Sales and Use Tax Exemption Certification,” does this have to be filled out and mailed back with our proposal? Or is this for the vendor awarded the contract? **This form is required to be sent in with your proposal.**
96. What costs has the City incurred for the initial set up, ongoing maintenance, hosting, software licensing, support, and enhancements (i.e., “change orders”) for Energov? **Approximately \$60,000.**
97. Please provide an approximate number of standard email/letter templates that will be used by the City that are to be integrated and automated by the system.

- a. Code: 3 letter types, 1 email type**
98. Please provide the annual number of applications / renewals processed by the City. **Roughly 11,500 permits and 700 licenses for inspections.**
99. Which vendors attended the pre-proposal conference? <https://www.waco-texas.com/Departments/Purchasing/Bids/RFP-2022-100-Permitting-and-Inspection-Software>
100. Will a recording of the preproposal conference be made available along with answers to vendor questions? **The recorded Zoom meeting is available here -> https://wacotx.zoomgov.com/rec/share/yUhWLtIJ5tMTxPONSw8xGSDPBbmwQzU0XzTyQvccpy0fAL6_hCSuVPcrSuKXWTjM.o0R7eRNGIDR8zSgT (Passcode: 2VS2Ifp*)**
101. Will the selected vendor have the opportunity to provide exceptions and/or alternative contract language during contract negotiations, or will vendors need to provide those within their respective proposals? **Please submit alternative language with proposal, if selected for award, negotiations can be made with the department.**
102. Will not meeting the requirement of minority and women owned and managed business automatically mean a failed proposal or reduction in score? **Sole source vendors are welcome to submit proposals, this is not a disqualifying condition.**
103. If the City is looking for an alternative Electronic Plan review, out of 34 Mobile Users how many will require access to plan review & corrections? How many Electronic Plan Users will require training? **Yes, 14 users for inspections dept.**
104. The Scope of Services for the RFP states the maximum number of internal users is 60. Could you please confirm named users included employees, contract employees, and the mobile workforce?
- a. Code: 2 desktop users, 14 desktop + mobile users**
105. In the Requirements spreadsheet, the engineering section (4.1.1 thru 4.1.37) is a duplicate of the planning section above it. Does the City have requirements specific to Engineering that should be in the spreadsheet? **No, this can be remove from the Engineering section.**
106. My main question to submit by today's deadline is if a single-source vendor for EH (this is solely what we do) is ok or if this disqualifies us as a 'best of breed/single offering only' vendor? **Sole source vendors are welcome to submit proposals, this is not a disqualifying condition.**