

# MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT

## NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

<b>SUBJECT</b>	Addressing Database and Maintenance System	<b>DATE POSTED</b>	MC <u>4/15/15</u> ✓ SE DS <u>4/15/15</u> ✓ SE CC <u>N/A</u>
<b>PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE</b>	Matt Donley, 3062	<b>DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED</b>	TBD
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	Building and Development Services Department	<b>CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED</b>	None
<b>SOLICITATION</b>	RFP #15-0623MD	<b>AUTHORIZED BY DATE</b>	Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO April 15, 2015 <u>(4/15/15)</u>

### NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

Notice of Cancellation of RFP #15-0623 to 1) reject all proposals received and 2) cancel the solicitation with the intent to reissue the RFP with a revised Scope of Work and 3) disband the current Evaluation Committee.

### ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY

**Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.**

Pursuant to Section A.12, "Reserved Rights," of the Request for Proposal, the County is publishing notice of its decision to reject all proposals received in response to the above mentioned RFP and cancel the RFP with the intent to reissue with a revised Scope of Work.

### BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

#### **PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

The intent of the Request for Proposal was to acquire, implement and maintain an enterprise-wide, centralized address repository with an accompanying address management system.

Manatee County Government (MCG) lacks a centralized address repository and database. Address information is duplicated across a variety of existing systems such as Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA), Utility Billing, and Building Permitting. Housing addresses in multiple locations results in wasted MCG efforts. MCG's current addressing process is mostly a manual, paper based process. MCG staff lack the technology to efficiently query address information, respond to customer requests and correct addresses as necessary. In addition, the lack of a centralized address database negatively impacts the level of customer service that MCG staff can provide to the public. Address issues create an unsatisfactory experience for customers and reflect poorly on MCG's business operations.

MCG can resolve these issues by acquiring, implementing and maintaining an enterprise-wide, centralized address repository with an accompanying address management system ("Address System"). The Address System will offer an array of methods for sharing address information with existing enterprise-wide systems such as the Geographic Information System (GIS), the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) and the Automatic Location Information (ALI) databases. MCG staff will possess the ability to access and query address information in real time and automatically be alerted to potentially incorrect address information requiring corrective action.

#### **SOLICITATION:**

The RFP was advertised on the Manatee County website, DemandStar, and was also provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its members. Two (2) proposals were received.

Manatee County Firms that were directly solicited: None

Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals: None

Local firms that submitted proposals include: None

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

(List in order of attached)

None

#### **FUNDING SOURCE**

(Acct Number & Name)

- ☒ Funds Verified  
☐ Insufficient Funds

COST	The estimated expenditure is \$300,000 for initial set up fees plus yearly maintenance fee to be negotiated.	AMT/FREQ OF RECURRING COSTS (Attach Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A
------	--	---	-----

**Other (non-local) firms that submitted proposals include:**

Farragut Systems, Inc. – Durham, North Carolina  
Spatial Focus LLC – University Park, Maryland

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE (VOTING) MEMBERS:**

Barbara Redmond - Business Services Manager, Building and Development Services Department  
Mark Murphy - Applications Manager, Information Technology Department  
Matt Donley (Chairperson) - Contracts Negotiator, Financial Management Department

**EVALUATION RESULTS:**

The Evaluation Committee ("Committee") convened on March 26, 2015 to review evaluation guidelines, Committee responsibilities and the Florida Sunshine Law as applicable to public meetings. The Committee proceeded to review the two (2) proposals received for an Address System. Both proposals were deemed responsive to the requirements of the RFP. The Committee discussed the qualifications of each Proposer and reviewed both proposals against the RFP evaluation criteria. As a result of the discussion and based on the content of the proposals the Committee felt there was adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee unanimously voted that it was in the best interests of the County to reject both proposals and cancel the RFP with the intent to reissue. After the solicitation was issued business decisions regarding another piece of hosted software were made that have a direct impact on this RFP, but which were not contemplated in the RFP. In light of those recent developments, the Committee decided the RFP needed a broader Scope of Work to make it more inclusive for Proposers and intends to reissue the RFP as such in the near future.

**REMAINING RESPONDENTS:**

None

**ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES:** The estimated expenditure is \$300,000 for initial set up fees plus yearly maintenance fee to be negotiated.

**FUNDING:** General Funds

*The above justifications are a generalized summary of major observations intended only to provide the County Administrator a sufficiently detailed overview of the main observations of a majority of Committee Members. Each Committee Member may have considered one or more facts or factors more or less important than the other Committee Members when voting, and this summary of the Evaluation Committee's decision is not an attempt to exhaustively describe each of the relevant factors which motivated each of the Committee Members to select the rankings described.*