Financial Management Department
Purchasing Division
1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803
Bradenton, FL 34205
Phone: (941) 749-3014
www.mymanatee.org

August 15, 2016

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #16-2602GD: Addressing Database Maintenance System

ADDENDUM No. 1

The following Addendum is issued to add to, modify, and/or clarify the Request for Proposals (RFP) documents. The items contained within this Addendum shall have the same force and effect as the original RFP documents. Proposers shall acknowledge receipt of this and any other addenda issued pursuant to this Request for Proposal in their proposal.

If you have submitted a proposal prior to receiving this Addendum, you may request <u>in writing</u> that your original, sealed proposal be returned to your firm. All sealed Proposals will be opened on the date stated, in conformance with the additions listed herein.

<u>Clarification Requests as submitted by Proposers</u>

1. **Question:** When the address information is shared with different users as listed on page 13, is the County using a specific report, sending specific address types, or sharing change logs (i.e. list of addresses created, updated or deleted)?

   Response: "The current addressing process relies on email communication, outlook calendar reminders to follow up on requests, work documents, excel spreadsheets for process tracking, placing the house number and street name on a paper map, scanning paper maps and letters to create a PDF report which is then sent to the following users" - This process is managed by address coordinator and the objective is to share new address information with address data consumers i.e. USPS, Fire Districts, Tax Collector.

2. **Question:** Would the County consider an address solution built on the SQL Server database?

   Response: SQL server will be considered however the County SDE is underpinned by Oracle and will remain in Oracle. The Address Database itself could be in SQL as long as editing of features can be in Oracle SDE.

3. **Question:** Page15 (Pre-Addressing Task # 3):

   a. Can the County provide examples of different type of addressing events?

      Response: Task # 3 Create & Implement an Address Web Interface to the software/database for reporting, searching, and feedback – Addressing Events can be the reporting of erroneous address information, allow searching of address information and reporting of new addresses added in a specific period.

b. How does the County monitor address related events?

Response: Currently these are tracked on a spreadsheet and email by the Address Coordinator. And these are sent to address consumers i.e. USPS, Fire Districts, Tax Collector.

4. **Question:** Page15 (Addressing Mapping Task #1): If applicants are providing 1:200 and 1:400 scaled maps, how does the County desire to utilize these with the new address solution?

   Response: Currently working on a transition to not use them in future. We are implementing an electronic .DWG template to receive a format that we can load into the system.

5. **Question:** Who are the users of address web interface – County staff, other jurisdictions, and/or the public?

   Response: County staff and other jurisdictions and perhaps public.

6. **Question:** Currently, centerlines are maintained by County GIS and address points are maintained by Public Safety. Who will maintain these with the new address solution?

   Response: The Address Coordinator.

7. **Question:** Do all other jurisdictions provide data in spatial format when updated addresses or centerlines information is provided to the County?

   Response: Occasionally but typically no they do not currently provide in spatial format. Typically in a letter and the volume is very light.

8. **Question:** How is Public Safety/County currently maintaining and utilizing Z coordinates on address points?

   Response: Currently not maintaining Z Coordinates but we are working toward this in the future.

9. **Question:** Does the County have a desired completion date for the new address solution? Are there any other key dates to be considered for implementing the solution.

   Response: Proposer(s) should propose a schedule per Section C.03 with specific detail ensuring Scope of Requirements can be achieved within a reasonable time scale. The contract with commence shortly after a Proposer is selected.

10. **Question:** Will Manatee County consider a one-week extension in the due date for proposals, to 2 September 2016?

    Response: No.

11. **Question:** Is there a page limitation for the proposal responses?

    Response: No. However, Proposer(s) are encouraged to provide a clear and concise response addressing all aspects of information required.

12. **Question:** Will the addressing solution also be public facing?
    a. If so, what capabilities would Manatee County like to provide the public?

    Response: Yes- the project owners to query reserved Street names to see if they are available.

13. **Question:** Regarding **C.02.04, item ii:** Can Manatee County clarify what is needed in terms of details of construction marketing for similar past software projects?

    Response: C.02.04 item ii is requesting any specific services provided to previous client for any of the elements listed as examples in parenthesis. If an item listed as an element is not relevant then do not provide, however do provide items deemed to be relevant to this RFP requirements.

14. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #2** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Capability to share information with other enterprise systems (via APIs or formatted data exports) – Required.

15. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #13** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Integrate with Active Directory – Preferred.

16. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #13** in **Attachment G**: Is Manatee County's current solution integrate with Active Directory?

    Response: We do not have a current addressing solution. The GIS system currently uses database authentication in Oracle.

    a. If so, how is it integrated?

    Response: See above response.

17. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #17** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to enter new lot lines using direction and distance (COGO) – Preferred.

18. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #32** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Must contain an attribute field for Parcel ID – Required.

19. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #36** in **Attachment G**: Required/Preferred field is blank – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Must support common place names for address points – Required.

20. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #38** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide ETL or process integrating/updating address information to and Accela 8.0 development tracking and permitting application – Preferred.

21. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #42** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: FGDC Addressing Standard Complaint – Required.

22. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #46** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Municipal Address Coordinator Portal – Preferred.

23. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #55** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to support storage and analysis of address uses (residential/commercial/industrial/mixed/etc.) – Preferred.

24. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #60** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Must provide functionality to "link" address points (attributes) with its bounding parcel – Required.

25. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #63** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to display/highlight address points by date – Preferred.

26. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #76** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality or solution to automate the notification to a group of addresses (list addresses in emails including attaching a map, a letter or notes (address change emails) – Preferred.

27. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #77** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to create an Address Atlas (digital booklet used to find addresses) from a grid/address listing – Preferred.

28. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #78** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to produce a table compatible with the CAMA input format (iasWorld) – Preferred.

29. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #79** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to produce a table compatible with the Utilities Banner input format (iasWorld) – Preferred. Correction Banner input format Hansen iasWorld should be removed.

30. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #89** in **Attachment G**: What does Manatee County intend to compare within its CAMA and Utilities subsystems?

    Response: Compare the available records in each system to reconcile all data sets from specified systems.

31. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #89** in **Attachment G**: What formats and types of data are contained within CAMA and Utilities?

    Response: Postal address, X/Y coordinates, Owner information.

32. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #90** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Provide functionality to automate the comparing of Utilities, CAMA, and Frontier (ALI) and categorize data according to match or no match and source with output formats being excel, standard text file structured and compatible for updating workgroup applications like Public Works Trapeze, etc. – Preferred.

33. **Question:** Regarding **Requirement #98** in **Attachment G**: Language in requirement is contradictory – can Manatee County please clarify whether this item is required or preferred?

    Response: Use qualified Project Manager either with PMP certification or equivalent experience with similar projects – Preferred.

34. **Question:** Regarding **Attachment J:** How will the data in the Manatee County sub systems be consumed?

    Response: Data in the subsystems can be consumed in multiple ways i.e. scheduled batch upload, real-time query, database links, and REST services.

35. **Question:** RFP Section A.03 indicates that complete copies of the RFP and all related documents are available for public inspection at the Manatee County Purchasing Division. Can the County please clarify what related documents other than the RFP are available for inspection, and can copies of these related documents be provided to the Bidders via electronic or mail delivery?

    Response: No other documentation other than RFP and attachments is available.

36. **Question:** Can the County please provide samples of the project data identified in RFP Section B.04 to the Bidders?

    Response: Data sets can be downloaded from the link below. Parcel, Centerline and Address Points.
    http://www.mymanatee.org/geoportal/catalog/main/home.page

37. **Question:** Can the County please provide the total number of addresses for this project?

    Response: The total number of address points maintained by Public Safety 218,579. Property Appraisers Office maintains addresses for parcels, they may have vacant land that have addresses.

38. **Question:** RFP Section 04.1.6 states that the address points were originally derived from the CAMA parcel centroids. Is there an individual address point for every addressable structure in the County; i.e. multi structure parcels, or is there only one point per parcel?

Response: There is an address for every address in the county. If there are multiple addresses in a structure that structure will have multiple address points.

39. **Question:** Will the successful proposer receive the current address point information from one county source, or will the current address information come from multiple sources? If multiple sources, does this scope of work include integrating and normalizing the addresses to create the 'new' production ready 'best available' address database?

    Response: Address point information will be provided by the County.

40. **Question:** The RFP mentions using both the NG-911 Data Standard and the ESRI Local Government Model. Can the County please indicate which takes precedence?

    Response: NG-911 will take precedence.

41. **Question:** Can the County indicate when they anticipate releasing the notice to proceed for this project and the expected project duration?

    Response: A notice to proceed will be issued when the final selection has been made.

42. **Question:** We have surmised from the RFP that the Address Solution consists of:
    a. a suite of customized ArcGIS Desktop Tool for GIS data editing
    b. a web based application for data querying and report

    Can the County please confirm or explain otherwise?

    Response: This is correct, the web based suite may support capability for municipalities to maintain their own address information. This capability is preferred, not required.

43. **Question:** RFP Appendix G, requirement 16 indicates that the Address Mapping must provide functionality to geo-reference a PDF map. The URL provided below links to a technical article from ESRI which notes that it is not possible to directly georeference a PDF file in ArcMap:
    http://support.esri.com/technical-article/000012398

    Can the County please confirm that it is acceptable that the pdf must be converted to an ESRI supported raster format for the Address Solution?
    Response: This is correct that the file needs to be converted to Raster i.e. TIFF file, this can be accomplished using Adobe Pro or whatever method the respondent choices to use.

44. **Question:** RFP Appendix G, requirement 46 indicates that the Address Mapping must include a Municipal Address Coordinator's Portal. Can the County please elaborate on the functionality required for this Municipal Address Coordinator's Portal?

    Response: For the Municipality to enter and maintain their own address points. This is a preference not a requirement.

45. **Question:** RFP Appendix G, requirement 75 indicates that the Address Reporting must provide functionality or solution to attach reports to a menu. Can the County please elaborate on the functionality required and what is meant by attaching reports to a menu?

    Response: This is to allow the Address Coordinator to send all address documents to a group email. See section B.01 for list of Address users.

46. **Question:** Can the County please provide the available budget for this RFP scope of work and indicate whether the project is fully funded?

    Response: The Project is funded. Currently there is approximately $350,000 identified. The County reserves the right to revise this amount. Proposers are encouraged to submit competitive responses.

47. **Question:** Does the County have a current GIS annotation layer for addresses? If so, is it feature-linked annotation?

    Response: No annotation just labeling.

48. **Question:** B.02 on page 14 states "The Address software shall also integrate with the County ArcGIS 10.3.1 / ORACLE 2gR11 Enterprise GIS and offer options for sharing address information with other business applications using ORACLE." Integration with the legacy systems (CAD, CAMA, Billing, Document Management) is not explicitly mentioned elsewhere. Is this to mean that actual integrations with these systems will be part of a future effort, and that the address database implementation only needs to be ready to support such an effort?

    Response: Yes.

49. **Question:** B.06 on page 22 states "When Cities create or change addresses, those additions or corrections are communicated to County Addressing who then enters the information into the GIS Address Centerline and Points." Are we correct in assuming this County data entry is a duplicate, manual entry process rather than an automated import process?

    Response: Yes this is currently a duplicated process.

50. **Question:** Can the web solution in items 7.3, 7.3.1, 7.3.2, and 7.4 (page 26-27) comprise of more than one application (i.e. separate viewer, change request, and/or reporting apps)?

Response: Yes this can be more than one application, however one launch page is preferable.

51. **Question:** In item 7.5 (page 27), will these applications be internal or public? If public, will they require a login to access the entire app, or will only certain functionality need to be made unavailable to the public?

    Response: The majority will be internal with the limited search abilities for the public.

52. **Question:** In regard to software training in B.08 (page 27), can we assume that County staff have basic ArcGIS Desktop training and/or editing experience such that the Proposer will focus on the addressing-specific tools rather than general desktop editing workflows and server management?

    Response: Yes most all the staff involved have basic knowledge of ArcGIS.

53. **Question:** Can you please provide more information on the County's GIS skillsets (e.g. desktop editing, ArcGIS for Server management, queries and selections)?

    Response: The Address Coordinator has a base knowledge of ArcMap (editing) personnel in supporting departments have a much greater skill set with ArcGIS to include editing in a multiuser database.

54. **Question:** In section 7.2 (page 24) it states "The assigned selected Proposer's Project Manager (PM) will be dedicated exclusively to the County project at a minimum of 75%". Will Manatee County accept co-Project Managers to ensure 75% coverage for maximum customer service on this project?

    Response: County prefers to have one point of contact.

55. **Question:** If a COTS solution is preferred, is the County planning to leave unsupported functionality unimplemented for now or to leave any customizations for such functionality as part of a future phase?

    Response: We are looking for a solution to address as many gaps as possible to meet our requirements.

56. **Question:** Does the County have an ArcGIS Online organizational account? If so, is the County prepared to deploy apps through this platform?

    Response: Yes.

57. **Question:** Does the County have or plan to acquire the Esri Data Reviewer extension for QA/QC?

    Response: The County currently have Data Reviewer.

58. **Question:** Does the County have any addressing web solutions which they can provide as an example of preferences or desired functionality?

    Response: No.

59. **Question:** RFP page 30, C.03.1, requests that for this proposal, we submit a Project Plan developed in Microsoft Project. Do we need to submit a digital file in MS Project format with this proposal?

    Response: Proposer should submit a project work plan. Detailing specific tasks in MS Project is required. We understand that adjustments may need to be made to this plan during negotiation discussions. A digital file of ALL hard copy RFP Proposal response is required per Section A.02.

60. **Question:** Is a 5% Bid bond required with this proposal submittal? Will a Performance Bond be required?

    Response: No Bond is required.

61. **Question:** Regarding RFP pg 31, Section C.04.1, if financial information is required, may we submit this in a separate confidential envelope, not subject to Open Records?

    Response: Section C.04.1 does not require Proposer(s) to submit financial records. It only requires the Proposer(s) to acknowledge and provide authorization for access to financial records at the Proposer(s) facility.

All other terms and conditions of Request for Proposal 16-2602GD remain unchanged.

No additional questions will be considered after the issuance of this Addendum.

Proposals are to be submitted by **August 26, 2016 at 2:00 P.M.** in the Purchasing Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205.

Sincerely,

Greg Davis
Contracts Negotiator
MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT