

Addendum #1

TOWN OF WAYLAND REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

#18-1068-RFP

PERMITTING SYSTEM CONSULTING SERVICES

NOTE: Submission deadline remains scheduled for Thursday, May 17, 2018 at 2:00 PM

The Town of Wayland is issuing this addendum to respond to questions and provide clarifications based upon questions received relative to the project.

Acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum is required in all submitted proposals.

The following sections replace those provided in the Request for Proposals:

- 1. Page 6, Section E Submittals/Deliverables, subsection 1 is replaced with the following:**
 1. Document a complete work flow path and functional requirements document for land use, annual renewal and general town permits for the following departments: Building, Conservation, Public Works, Fire, Health and Planning. Provide both written and electronic copies.

- 2. Page 6, Section E Submittals/Deliverables, subsection 4 is replaced with the following:**
 4. Provide a written recommendation of permitting software requirements that would best fit the town's needs based on the Town's documented flow path. This should be reviewed with special attention to the level of integration needed with Munis, the Town's general ledger system; i.e. potential manual workarounds needed, and consideration for the possibility of using the permitting system to generate the information that is now generated by using Munis (financial system/annual reporting);

- 3. Page 10, Comparative Evaluation Criteria, subsection 2 is replaced with the following:**
 - 2) **Proposer's experience in evaluating software requirements.**
 - a. UNACCEPTABLE: Proposer has no demonstrated knowledge or experience in evaluating similar software requirements.
 - b. PASSABLE/NOT ADVANTAGEOUS: Proposer has demonstrated only limited knowledge or experience in evaluating similar software requirements..
 - c. ADVANTAGEOUS: Provider has demonstrated some knowledge or experience evaluating similar software requirements which has been moderately demonstrated in proposal.
 - d. HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS: Proposer has demonstrated knowledge and experience in evaluating similar software requirements.

The following responds to questions received:

- 4. Will the vendor selected for this phase of the project (workflow review and software**

recommendation) be eligible to bid on the software procurement that's intended to follow later this year?

Response: This phase of the project is requesting software requirements, rather than a recommended product. Therefore, the same vendor would be eligible to bid on the software procurement.

5. Re; Submission of Exhibit 1 - Proposal Form

Section VI Evaluation Criteria Paragraph 1c says in part that Exhibit 1 Proposal Form must be submitted with the Proposal. It does not specify which Proposal - Technical Content or Price Content - it is to be included in. Exhibit 1 asks for both non-pricing information (e.g., Respondent name and address) and pricing information (e.g., Total fixed priced to complete project). The RFP instructions make it clear that no pricing information is to be included in the Technical Content Proposal. Should separate versions of the exhibit be included in both the technical and price proposals, one with pricing information (the Price Content Proposal) and one without pricing information (the Technical Content Proposal)?

Response: The Proposal form must be included with the Price Proposal only. The technical proposal should contain all other relevant information, except price, including name and address of the proposer.

6. What specifically has motivated the Town to undertake these Permitting System Consulting Services at this time?

Response: The Town has identified that an electronic permitting system would be beneficial for efficiencies of staff and residents.

7. Would the Town please provide the vendor and trade name of all software products MUNIS and FireServer.

Response: Munis provided by Tyler Technologies and FireServer (an in-house program) are the only relevant software applications to this project.

8. Should the Price Proposal include the consultant's services: (1) only through completion of the phase ending October 1, 2018; (2) through the procurement of the new Permitting software; or (3) through the implementation of the new Permitting software?

Response: The Technical and Price Proposals for this project are for the scope of services defined in the Request for Proposals and do NOT include procurement of software or implementation.

9. Where the RFP states at Section C.1. on page 5 that the Town wants the consultant "... to meet with all departments and to draft a flow path for a wide variety of required permitting in town and to meet the deliverables in part E below," would the Town be agreeable to having the consultant draft the flow paths for, for example, five processes?

Consultants need to have some specific statement of exactly how many processes the Town wishes to have mapped here in order to be able to submit a responsive and responsible Price Proposal. We note that the detailed mapping of each process takes approximately one day of time for the Town's process team and the consultant working together.

Response: For the purpose of submitting a Price Proposal, you can assume twenty (20) permitting processes that encompass the 6 departments listed (Building, Conservation, Public Works, Fire, Health and Planning). Each permitting processes may flow through many of the departments.

10. What amount of funding has the Town budgeted for these Permitting System Consulting Services? While we realize that this is sometimes viewed as sensitive information, it is public record and of importance to the consulting community.

Response: A definitive amount of funding has not been established since this is the first step the Town is taking to identify permitting needs.

11. What amount of (1) one-time funds or (2) annual funding does the Town have for the procurement and implementation of the new Permitting software?

Response: A definitive amount of funding has not been established since this is the first step the Town is taking to identify permitting needs.

12. Regarding Section E.1. on page 6, would the presentation of functional requirements in the format used for a RFP to procure the new software be acceptable?

Response: Yes, though no particular format was specified.

13. Regarding Section E.4. on page 6, would the Town accept the recommendation of, for example, three to five leading vendors who may be able to meet Wayland's needs here rather than one, specific vendor?

Response: Note that a software recommendation is no longer required. Rather, the Town requests permitting software requirements. **Please refer to #2 above.**

14. Will the Town agree to reduce the \$3,000,000 combined limit for Automobile Liability stated in paragraph 9 on page 16 to \$1,000,000? \$3,000,000 for this kind of professional consulting services is extraordinary and unnecessary, and not usually seen in this kind of procurement.

Response: Yes.

15. Has the Town organized a staff-based committee to work on this effort? If so, who are the members of this group by position classification, not name?

Response: The Town's Business System Analyst is project manager for this phase of the project. The six departments listed above will participate by meeting with the consultant to provide input on the permitting workflow.

16. Has the Town designated its Project Manager for this effort? If so, who is this person by position classification, not name?

Response: The Town's Business System Analyst is project manager for this phase of the project.

17. Does the Town wish to have the Technical and Cost proposals include detail regarding (1) the procurement or (2) the implementation of the new Permitting system?

Response: No.

18. Would the Town please clarify exactly which departments are included in this project?

Response: Building, Conservation, Public Works, Fire, Health and Planning departments will participate by meeting with the consultant to provide input on the permitting workflow.

19. Where Section I.A. 1. on page 5 speaks about "...approximately ten departments....," Section I.E.1. on page 6 addresses "...permits for Building, Conservation, Public Works, Fire, Health, Planning, Police."

Response: The scope of this project is the following six departments: Building, Conservation, Public Works, Fire, Health and Planning.

20. Is the Town open to receiving proposals from software vendors to provide these services or does the Town desire an independent consultant?

Response: The Town is seeking any consultant with experience defining business workflow processes for permitting processes or for similar processes. Whether or not they are a software vendor is not relevant.

21. Can the Town clarify what is meant by providing a written recommendation on permitting software that would best fit the Town's needs?

- a. The RFP indicates the Town intends to bid and procure software after this project concludes, but this recommendation is stated to be based on an evaluation of available programs. Is the Town looking for a recommendation of vendors to include/invite in the bidding process, or is the Town truly looking for a single vendor to be recommended by the selected consultant?**

Response: This is no longer a deliverable. Please refer to #2 above.

22. Does the Town desire assistance developing an RFP or bid package beyond the work flow path and functional requirements?

Response: No. Not as part of the deliverable for this Request for Proposals.

23. Do all services under this proposal have to be provided on-site or are a combination of on-site discussions as well as video/telephonic discussions acceptable?

Response: The preference is on-site, though all options will be considered.

24. How many relevant staff are in the 7 departments?

Response: This is revised to six departments. Each department has one stakeholder involved in the project. Please refer to #19.

25. Have any of the processes been flow charted?

Response: The Scope of Work for this RFP is to define the workflow, with no prior documented workflow as input.

26. How many process do you anticipate being included?

Response: Please refer to #9 above.

27. Why type of non-building process do you want covered?

Response: Please refer to #9 above.

28. We see 52 boards on the website. Should any of these be included in the process charts and if so which ones?

Response: Please refer to #9 above.

29. Are you asking the consultant to complete an RFP ready to issue, or just indicate what should be included in a Town RFP?

Response: We are requesting requirements only.

Issued May 11, 2018