



Fayette
COUNTY

"WHERE QUALITY
IS A LIFESTYLE"

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
140 STONEWALL AVENUE WEST, STE 204
FAYETTEVILLE, GEORGIA 30214
PHONE: 770-305-5420
www.fayettecountyga.gov

September 4, 2015

**Subject: RFQ #1016-P Permits & Inspections Plan Review Software –
Addendum #1**

Dear Gentlemen/Ladies:

Included herein is additional information and clarification for the above referenced request for proposal. Please consider all of this information when preparing your proposal.

1. **Does the county have other systems/software integrated with their web page currently?** No
2. **Does county have other systems in the Cloud currently?** Yes; Office 365 is the only one that impacts the Permits & Inspections Department. Dropbox is also used in limited fashion.
3. **Have the county standardized on file types for electronic submission?** Yes; PDF format.
4. **Does the county have plans to expand beyond PDF reviews, including 3D, BIM, DWG, DXF, etc.?** No; Not at this time.
5. **Is the county taking any files electronically now? If so, how are they being utilized in the review process?** No, the county is not taking any files electronically.
6. **Please define the level of integration you are looking for to ArcGIS? Please provide an example of integration needed.** This requirement is not required any longer. This function will be performed by the Permitting Software.
7. **Has the county experience any markup tools like Bluebeam or Brava? Is there a preference to a markup tool?** Yes; The County would prefer Bluebeam or other product with equivalent capabilities.
8. **What is the county using today for electronic document management and/or records management?** Nothing that is relevant to this RFP.

9. **What security standards do you have for the online portal?** Information security protections, critical security controls and best practices utilizing FISMA standards.
10. **During inspections, is there a requirement to validate the current version of document being built?** Yes; The County currently validates these documents using inspector laptops. **Would that be beneficial?** N/A.
11. **Please clarify if you want ability for plan reviewers to edit submitted files?** Yes; if pages are out of order etc. but this is not going to be a primary function. We will probably send back to submitter. The functionality would be beneficial to have if needed.
12. **Do you want successful vendor to provide portal for electronic submission only or permit application as well?** Yes; The County wants the successful vendor to provide portal for electronic submission and permit application as well as other permit documents to allow department to have a paperless intake process.
13. **Would the county like integration to a current document management system, or do you want the Electronic Plan Review (EPR) solution to handle that as well? If integration is required, which document management system is being used?** The county will not be using its document management system (TCM) to store files but will continue to store files as attachments to the Energov permitting system to allow for viewing in the field by inspectors.
14. **For requirement number 21, please clarify.** Our standard is PDF, but if we get a CAD file for example, we need the capability for it to be converted to PDF. **Are you planning to accept any file format, and want the EPR solution to handle this conversion?** Primarily PDF format.
15. **Has the county researched cloud data centers available?** No; the county has not. **Is there a preference?** No; as long as it meets best practices in network and security standards and the Fayette County Information Technology department.
16. **Has the County completed the workflows for your permit types?** Permit workflows are not relevant for the plan review software. **Are you in the process of doing that currently?** Yes; we are in the process and are at a point of the workflow process where we integrate vendor concepts.
17. **Could you provide a diagram of one or more of your permit workflows?** All workflows today for plan review are a manual paper process. A typical workflow requiring a Plan Review for a Residential Single Family Dwelling is as follows in the most basic form. Applicant submits paper documents in person to Permits Department>Permit Document Intake (if all paper documents are correct) - Permit Office enters permit information into Energov – hand carries to Plan Review >Plan Review (if no corrections – hand carries to Zoning >Zoning(if no corrections) – hand carries to Environmental Management >Environmental Management (if no corrections) – hand carries to Permit

Office>Permit entry of final items and creation of Permit Cards etc.> Issue Permit. If corrections are needed at any point in the approval process that department contacts the submitter directly for corrections before moving the Plans to the next department. The final approval (if not received as part of the Intake documents) is our Environmental Health Department. That could hold up the permit being issued until approval is received by the Permits Department. Our goal as part of this RFP is for electronic submission to the Permit Office and if all documents are in order that a parallel plan review process will take place by all affected departments simultaneously.

18. **Is it important to the County for the EPR workflow to be customized/modified easily when change is needed?** Yes; it is important to the county.
19. **What Electronic Plan Review solutions has the county seen/researched?**
The county has performed research of commonly used solutions within the industry.
20. **Are you interested in an EPR solution that utilizes multiple review/markup tools?** No; we are not.
21. **How many permits does the county handle in a year?** The county handles approximately 1200 permits a year.
22. **Do you have a set budget for this solution?** A budget is not being released at this time. We are asking all responders to submit pricing according to the scope.
23. **IS there any mandate or "pressure" from above to move to an electronic plan review system?** No; this is a department initiated project to improve processes.
24. **Is Energov deployed on County hardware or hosted by Energov?** On county hardware.
25. **Is ESRI deployed on County hardware or is it hosted by ESRI?** On county hardware.
26. Responders shall include within their pricing the number of hours of professional services custom programming for (data integration or integration with current system) and cost per hour if these hours are exceeded.
27. Listed under the Software heading, Item number 14 has been changed to:
Provide a feature rich API enabling integration between permitting systems (Energov) and Plan Review software.

Received by _____ Company _____

Note: If this addendum is not returned to the Fayette County Purchasing Department or if it is returned not signed, all responders shall still be responsible for the requirements of this addendum and the specifications or changes herein.

The opening date for this request for proposals has been changed. The new opening date is: 3:00pm, Wednesday, September 16, 2015. Proposals must be received in the Purchasing Department at the address above in Suite 204 on or before the new opening date and time.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ted L. Burgess", is written over a faint, light blue oval background.

Ted L. Burgess
Director of Purchasing

TLB/tcb