

 King County		
Clarification #1		
	RFP Title:	Environmental Health Permitting, Inspection, and Enforcement Management System
	RFP Number:	1083-20-GMK
	Due Date:	9/8/2020 - 2:00 p.m. PT
	Buyer:	Gina Keolker, gina.keolker@kingcounty.gov, (206) 263-9143
	Alternate Buyer:	Cynthia Lewis, clewis@kingcounty.gov, (206) 263-9675
This Clarification#1 is issued to respond to questions received regarding this RFP as follows:		
#	<u>Vendor Questions</u>	<u>King County's Response</u>
1	Several inquiries from potential proposers requested a Due date extension.	The County is taking the concerns into consideration and will issue an Addenda to address the extension shortly. In the interest of time, as promised during the Pre-proposal conference, due to the volume of questions received we are releasing this clarification document in a timely manner. Items still marked pending County responses will be followed through shortly via an Addendum/Clarification.
2	Are you intending to fully replace the existing data system or are you open to keeping existing data and present a new front end? Can you provide data schema for this system?	Yes, the County plans to replace both the existing solution database and the front-end portal for EH staff as well as users from the general public.
3	Is property owner required/able to login and see status of the OSS application? In a private way before the public can view.	For every application, applicants must be able to see application status after logging in. Members of the public must be able to see a public view of the status without necessarily having logged in first.
4	Does King County have a document storage system for storing and presenting documents to the public? If so, what is it and are any APIs available?	Yes, the County uses an Ilinx EDMS. It does not currently use APIs, but the County expects the new Solution to leverage API Management. Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW Section 2.D.1, Current State, and Exhibit 3-Current & Future State Diagram, for additional information.
5	Does King County intend to keep using OnlineRME and SkipThePaper, or have these services migrated to the new system entirely?	Yes, the County intends to keep OnlineRME and SkipThePaper. The new system must be integrated with OnlineRME and SkipThePaper. Reference Exhibit 1-SOW Section 2.2.C.7, and Exhibit 3-Current & Future State Diagram, for additional information.
6	You mention storing personal certification information. Is this simply a record they've completed certain certifications or digital copies of the certificates that must be served on request?	Certification information should be stored in a record in the new system.
7	Does King County intend to maintain and continue using the EC database?	See Response to Question 2.
8	Can you provide details on the DLS and SDCI systems and any apis they have?	Both DLS Permitting and SDCI use Accela's Land Management module. The County expects the new Solution to leverage API Management. Reference Exhibit 3-Current & Future State Diagram for additional information.
9	Can you provide details on the integration with point-and-pay?	The County expects the new solution to leverage API Management. Refer to Exhibit 3-Current & Future State Diagram, and Attachment C - Technical Requirements, Tab 2, 11C, for additional information.
10	Are you open to using a different online payment system?	The Solution must utilize the County's current payment processor. Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.2.D.2.e, for additional information.
11	In the future state, will King County be building the api layer? Or is that intended to be provided by the vendor?	Pending County response.
12	Can you expand on what EHS partners the solution may need to share data with?	Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Sections 3.7.A and 4.1.B; and Attachment C - Technical Requirements, Tab 2, 11K and 11L; for additional information.

#	Vendor Questions	King County's Response
13	Can you expand on automate data input processes?	The County expects users to submit requests online independently, without assistance or data entry performed by EH staff. Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.3.K.
14	Can you provide descriptions and/or schemas for the legacy data systems that must be migrated?	Pending County response.
15	Can you provide more detail on the batch payment processing that is required? Is this in relation to online payments, in person, mail in etc.	The batch payment processing is for renewal payments submitted by mail.
16	Where can we check if a user has a valid certification?	The solution must look up certification expiration dates from certification records stored within the solution.
17	Does King County have a solution that holds and tracks the inspection schedules? Or is that to be provided as part of this scope?	EHS currently does not have inspection scheduling system. Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 3.4 and Optional Future Service, Section 9.4
18	Can you provide more detail or schema for the King County GIS system?	Pending County response.
19	Can you provide detail on the integration with King County Imap system?	Pending County response.
20	Section 3.1, page 20, Item E of RFP document 1083-20, states the following: The body of the proposal should address the evaluation criteria required in Section 2.6 Evaluation Criteria and Proposal Scoring as it relates to Exhibit 1, Scope of Work and provide responses to Attachments A, B, C, & D (excluding Appendix items). <i>Would an additional column (for vendor comments) added to the Evaluation Criteria table be an acceptable response to these criteria?</i>	The Proposer shall provide clear and concise statements that addresses each criteria in Section 2.6 as part of the Body of the Proposal response including but not limited to responding to the Attachments provided in this RFP.
21	RFP Attachment A Pricing – For the purpose of calculating required software licensing:	
	a. How many internal “back office” users will require read/write access to the application?	The County currently has approximately one hundred thirty (130) EHS staff using the existing system.
	b. Will there be a need to support any read-only internal users?	The County requires clarification regarding the definition and context of a "read-only" role or license tier. Please provide explanation on your proposal for more clarity.
	c. How many mobile inspector/enforcement users will require field access to an integrated standalone mobile application (operating on a smartphone and/or tablet). Does the County have a strong preference for iOS or Android operating system for its field devices?	The County estimates there are approximately eighty to one hundred (80-100) such mobile inspector/enforcement users. The County supports both iOS and Android mobile applications for internal use.
22	RFP Section 5, Deliverable Schedule:	
	a. Is the County flexible on the timing of certain deliverables? For example, our proven implementation methodology, resulting in a 100% project success rates, features a slightly different approach for Fit/Gap Analysis. We typically start with product Orientation, involving County Subject Matter Experts so that they are educated on what the COTS product offers before diving into the details of Fit/Gap Analysis. The Fit/Gap process is highly collaborative, involving working sessions with County SME’s, and likely to extend longer than 15 days after contract signing (Deliverable #3 – Fit/Gap Analysis Report End Date).	The County is open to being flexible on deliverable timing and methodology. Refer to Attachment B - Management Questions, Section 5 - Project Approach, Question 13 for a detailed response to this question.
	b. Is the County open to a phased implementation approach? For example, breaking the scope of functionality by type of business process (e.g. permit acceptance and processing vs enforcement) or by business area/department? This would see portions of the solution implemented earlier and allow change management and organizational learning to be applied to subsequent phases.	The County is open to incremental and iterative development of functionality, but a phased deployment that requires coexistence and synchronization of the legacy system and new solution would not be acceptable.
23	RFP Section 6, Training scope of work Section 6.1: Training Overview	

#	Vendor Questions	King County's Response
	i. Will the County provide an on-site training lab or classroom for delivery of training courses? If so, how many workstations are provided in the lab? What is the browser configuration on those workstations? Optionally (due to potential COVID restrictions), is there a remote video conferencing service (e.g., Zoom) that the County would prefer to use for “virtual” training.	The County has on-site technical classrooms. In light of COVID-19 uncertainty, including social distancing requirements and current COVID-19 work-from-home mandates for non-essential workers, it is unclear whether or not user preferences for in-person training will be feasible. The County does conduct business--including training--using videoconferencing and remote content delivery tools including Zoom and Microsoft Teams. Employees have laptops and are substantially set up for remote/distance learning.
	ii. RE B. Scope of end user training deliverables – We are still unclear about the RFP’s expectations for end user training. Will the County provide “end user trainers” who will deliver end user training (i.e., will a Train-the-Trainer delivery model be acceptable for System usage training) or will all end user training be the responsibility of the Contractor? If the County will provide end user trainers, please specify how many trainers approx.	The County is interested in learning about the Proposers' experience-based recommendations regarding the best way to train King County end users. The County is open to the Train-the-Trainer delivery model, Contractor-provided training, or other approaches recommended by proposers. The reference to "train-the-trainer instructor" in Section 6.1.B was a hypothetical example, and should not be construed as a required role for this project.
	b. RE Section 6.2: Training Plan, C, “The Contractor shall provide initial technical training and online training...” -- Please clarify online training expectations.	The County expects web-delivered training content--either instructor-led, or recorded, or a combination of both--with curricular materials, reference documentation, and other required resources available online.
24	For purposes of efficiently preparing a proposal to the County, will the County provided unlocked versions of its Excel-based addenda so that the proposer can easily search/select/copy requirement text?	The County has reloaded all the Excel attachments on our website with revised permissions as requested.
25	How many total named King County employee users are included in the scope (Inspectors, Administrative Personnel, Management etc.). Can the County provide a list of users by program to coincide with the pricing worksheet?	The County currently has approximately one hundred thirty (130) EHS staff using the existing system.
26	Please provide additional explanation regarding the addenda identified as “Attachment D Solution Requirements Existing SaaS.xlsx” and “Attachment D Solution Requirements Built On PaaS.xlsx.” How shall the proposer utilize these two documents, which appear to be similar.	Refer to the Instructions tab in each version of Attachment D for additional information.
27	Technical Requirement 23 reads, “The Solution shall have a screen response time of less than 2 seconds, 95% of the time.” By what method(s) would the County propose to validate this requirement, recognizing the many and varied ways that the County’s network could impact this measure outside of the Contractor’s influence? Note that the County’s Technical Question #70 is acknowledged.	Pending County response.
28	SaaS requirement 165 reads, “As a Food Supervisor/Senior Staff, I want the system to show me as a report the list of permits/restaurants with a discrepancy between the grade calculated in the field and the one posted on the website.” Under what circumstance would a grade calculated in the field differ from the grade posted to the website?	The current system calculates restaurants grade in the field based on historical statistics and some changes such as ownership change and permit classification affect the grade calculation. A change in permit data while field inspection is performed, and grade is calculated offline could result in incorrect placard grade; the new Solution should enable Food Supervisors to identify grade calculation discrepancies caused by inspections performed offline.
29	How many County’s staff will use the new Solution?	The County currently has approximately one hundred thirty (130) EHS staff using the existing system.
30	Approximately, how many external users from the regulated community will access the new Solution?	The County currently has approximately 39,000 active registered public portal users.
31	Could the County please provide a list of Permit types to be included in the new Solution?	Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.2.B and 2.2. for additional information.
32	Could the County please provide a list of Inspection types to be included in the new Solution? Please provide example inspection form for each inspection type.	Pending County response.

#	Vendor Questions	King County's Response
33	Exhibit 4 (Data Conversion) shows 44,159 Facility records. Does it means that the Environmental Health Services Division currently regulates 44,159 facilities?	Exhibit 4 (Data Conversion) are all facilities in the system, EHS regulates approximately 15,000 active facility.
34	Exhibit 4 (Data Conversion) shows 14,945,9442 violation records, and 8,059 enforcement records. Is it possible to elaborate the reason(s) for a pattern of low enforcement actions with high violation count?	Not every violation results in an enforcement action.
35	On average,	
	a. How many permitting events (new, renew, ownership change, etc.) does EHSD process each year?	Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.2.C provides available aggregated information for each EHS program.
	b. How many inspections (new, renew, ownership change, etc.) does EHSD perform each year?	Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.2.C provides available aggregated information for each EHS program.
	c. How many violations (new, renew, ownership change, etc.) does EHSD flag each year?	Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.2.C provides available aggregated information for each EHS program.
36	Does King County prefer to use their own Azure Tenant for the solution?	Refer to Exhibit 1-SOW, Section 2.4 - Scope, second paragraph, for additional information.
37	Based on the RFP requirement – “ <i>Be capable of interfacing with and extracting data from existing legacy systems</i> ” – can King County provide more detail on the existing system that the proposed system will need to interface with and the data formats available for extraction – i.e. - amount of existing data?... file formats?	Refer to Exhibit 3-Current & Future State Diagram; and Attachment C, Tab 2, Rows 11A - 11M; for additional information.
38	Is there any requirement for the system to meet US EPA Cross Media Electronic Reporting Rules – CROMERR?	Pending County response.
39	The County web page containing the RFP documents shows two documents labeled attachment D. Should we assume the larger file is the correct one and bidders should ignore the smaller one?	The first Attachment D is for Solution Requirements built on Paas and the second Attachment D is for Solution Requirements built on Existing SaaS
40	The RFP describes the need for County personnel to record data on a “mobile” app for later synchronization with the solution. What type of mobile devices must the Solution support?	The County expects support for a range of standard devices and mobile operating systems, including smartphones and tablets running iOS and Android.
41	Can the County describe the volume and frequency of the data exchanges with the County’s Department of Local Services (DLS) and City of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections SDCI? Is the interface bi-directional? Is the interface documented?	In the current state, no data exchange between the legacy system and partner systems occurs. In the future state, the data exchange will be bi-directional. Based on the County's understanding of this question, there are no current state volume and frequency data to share.
42	Exhibit 1 says that the “...Contractor shall provide industry-standard tools for creating and visualizing reports and dashboards, such as Tableau, Power BI, and ArcGIS Online...”. Can you clarify whether you want the Contractor to purchase licenses for one or more of these products or instead to support their use?	The products listed in this section represent hypothetical examples. The County expects the Proposer to recommended approach to implementing reporting tool functionality. If licenses are required for functionality then the Proposer must indicate any additional cost to the County if applicable.
43	Exhibit 1 lists several deliverables that the Contractor must provide shortly after the contract effective date: Fit/Gap Analysis Report (15 days), Configuration Management and Implementation Plan (40 days), Interfaces and Data Exchange Plan (20 days), Data Conversion Plan (20 days), Test Plan (30 days), Initial training for SMEs, developers, and administrators (40 days). According to this schedule, the contractor will need to complete these plans before the project discovery phase is complete. Is that what the County intends?	The County is open to being flexible on deliverable timing and methodology. Refer to Attachment B - Management Questions, Section 5 - Project Approach, Question 13 for a detailed response to this question.
44	Part E of Section 3.1 of the main RFP document lists sections of Attachments B, C, and D. Can the County explain the meaning of the identifiers in those tables, such as B1-6, B1-7, B1-19, B1-20, etc.?	Section 3.1 lists items requiring proposal submittals. Each identifier corresponds to a specific required data point the referenced Attachment. Please note, Attachment B is a Word doc not Excel as originally indicated.

#	Vendor Questions	King County's Response
45	Section 2.6(E) of the main RFP document contains a description column that does not match exactly with the corresponding attachment. Attachment B, Management Questions is an example. The description column seems to list some, but not all the sections in Attachment B. Is it the case that some questions in Attachment B are scored but others are not scored?	The Attachment descriptions in Section 2.6.E are general in nature. Scoring will be based on responses to all of the specific questions comprising Attachment B.
46	Question 13 in attachment B asks for the Contractor to provide a proposed contractor work plan, but other questions indicate that the Contractor will complete a contractor work plan after the discovery phase of the project.	The County expects that the preliminary version furnished as part of the proposal will form the basis for iterative revisions, beginning with the post-discovery version referenced in Exhibit 1-SOW.