COUNTY OF FRESNO

ADDENDUM NUMBER: ONE (1)

RFP NUMBER: 962-5466

PROPERTY TAX COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT SYSTEM

Issue Date: May 3, 2016

IMPORTANT: SUBMIT PROPOSAL IN SEALED PACKAGE WITH PROPOSAL NUMBER, CLOSING DATE AND BUYER'S NAME MARKED CLEARLY ON THE OUTSIDE TO:

> COUNTY OF FRESNO, PURCHASING 4525 EAST HAMILTON AVENUE, 2nd Floor FRESNO, CA 93702-4599

CLOSING DATE OF PROPOSAL WILL BE AT 2:00 P.M., ON JUNE 1, 2016.

PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED LATE WHEN THE OFFICIAL PURCHASING TIME CLOCK READS 2:00 P.M.

All proposal information will be available for review after contract award.

Clarification of specifications is to be directed to: **Gary Cornuelle**, phone (559) 600-7114 or e-mail gcornuelle@co.fresno.ca.us.

NOTE THE "FOLLOWING AND ATTACHED" ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER: 962-5466 AND INCLUDE THEM IN YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE SIGN IN BLUE INK AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

- Updated Close Date is June 1, 2016
- Clarifications/ Additional Information
- **Questions and Answers**
- **Revised Cost Proposal**

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER One (1) TO RFP 962-5466

COMPANY NAME:	
OOM / NAT TA/ NAIL:	(PRINT)
SIGNATURE (In Blue Ink):	
,	
NAME & TITLE:	
	(PRINT)

Purchasing Use: GC:HM ORG/Requisition: 04100500 / 4101600179 May 3, 2016

CLARIFICATIONS/ ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In the RFP under the section titled "Technology Requirements", item 15 should be removed.

For option 2 of the RFP, please provide detailed descriptions of any enhancements your product may have over the listed requirements. An example of a desired enhancement would be a bankruptcy. Such a module could be described as an enhancement with the following benefits to the County:

A Bankruptcy database/module for Secured and Unsecured "Personal" (secured with lien and priority claims)
Property will need to be maintained through the proposed tax system. The Bankruptcy database/module will need
to capture three main areas of information that interface with each other in order to facilitate effective case tracking
of information along with application of interest and payments received. The three main areas are the following:

- 1) <u>Bankruptcy Demographic</u>: Consists of Bankruptcy key fields along with County identifiers (i.e., Bankruptcy Debtor's Name, Bankruptcy Date Filed, Case #, Chapter #, Identity of Court, Terminated Date, Discharge Date, Plan Amount, Discharge Amount, Assessee's Name, APN, Sub #, Lien #, Control #, RCU #, Proof Claim Filed date, Amend Date, Claim Amount, Tax Sale Pulled Date, etc.). The Assessee's Name, Bankruptcy Debtor's Name, Case # or APN are all independent key fields when searching for a bankruptcy account.
- 2) <u>Bankruptcy Calculation</u>: Calculates applicable interest accrual on unpaid taxes for pre-petition of Bankruptcy and CA R&T applicable penalty on post-petition for unpaid taxes. Payments received during a Bankruptcy Plan (i.e., Chapter 11, 12, or 13) from the Bankruptcy Trustee and/or any other payee will need to be applied in accordance with Federal and State Law.
- 3) <u>Bankruptcy Reports</u>: Generates standard and ad hoc reports (i.e., Proof of Claim reports, Administrative reports, Bankruptcy Balance report as of date, simple queries, etc.).

This RFP will be reviewed in two stages. The first review stage will narrow the field of vendors down to those the County would like to see demonstrations from. Criteria will be given to each vendor chosen to present their product, along with a time limit. The second stage of review will consist of solely evaluating the demonstrations presented.

Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466

May 3, 2016

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Question: What is the number of unsecured bills sent out annually?

Answer: Last year (2015) the County issued 12,505 unsecured tax bills, with a value of \$3,190,009,132. During the same period, 286,850 secured tax bills, with a value of \$63,326,932,193 were issued.

2. Question: A question was asked regarding interfacing with remittance processing, and whether or not the proposed PTS would be required to replace the existing remittance processor.

Answer: At this time, all that the County is requiring is that the PTS be capable of generating a file that can be uploaded to the remittance processor system. A set of file specifications will be provided to the successful vendor for the file format.

3. Question: A question regarding the capability of rejected payments to be re-submitted was asked.

Answer: I can find no reference to this question in the PTS RFP. I believe it is from the Remittance Processing RFP.

4. Question: Would real-time reporting of credit card payments, as opposed to nightly batch processing, be considered an enhancement the County would like to hear about?

Answer: Yes. Any variation in current processing which provides faster availability to information regarding payments would be considered an enhancement.

5. Question: If the demonstration criteria requests to view something not fully developed, can the vendor show the plans for the development of that item in lieu of demonstrating the item itself?

Answer: Yes. Plans for future development can be shown, with a timeline for development and an expected go-live date of the item.

6. Question: On the requirements spreadsheets, what does the County want to see in each column?

Answer: The requirements spreadsheets have three columns for vendor responses. The first column "Available in current build" is simple a check box. If the base product/price includes this functionality, check the box. If this functionality is not currently included in the price/product, fill out the second and third column.

The second column "Development required" is also a check box. Check this box and fill in column three "comments" with the expected cost to develop or purchase this functionality.

7. Question: Please provide counts for the number of programs, maps, JCL streams, PROC streams and BMS maps used in the application.

Answer: Online Programs: 209 Batch Programs: 791 JCL streams: 674 Proc streams: 664 Cardlib: 777 BMS maps: 183

8. Question: Please provide the number of VSAM files used by the application.

Answer: 106

9. Question: How many of the VSAM files represent multiple types of data within the same VSAM file? For instance, you may have a file that can contain a set of data fields defining a tract of land or that same file could contain data fields defining a home. The determination of the format for each record is made using a "record type" field in the record.

Answer: 9

10. Question: Will the County provide the servers for the application and for the related SQL Server database?

Answer: Yes, all required servers and workstations, will be provided by the County. The vendor is expected to give baseline requirements for each.

Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466

May 3, 2016

11. Question: Wil the County also configure the server(s) within the current County infrastructure?

Answer: Yes, all servers and workstations will be configured to County standards, and then vendor requirements will be added.

12. Question: Will the County purchase (or use pre-existing licenses for) Visual Studio, Team Foundation Server and the other Microsoft products that are beneficial to the development and maintenance lifecycle?

Answer: The County will provide, for their developers and server maintenance people, the appropriate MS products.

13. Question: Will the solution be delivered into an existing Visual Studio environment that has been defined according to the County standards, or will the .NET processing environment be new to the County teams?

Answer: Yes, the vendor would be delivering the solution into the County's existing Visual Studio environment.

Questions 14-15 Refer to Page 22 of the Bid

14. Question: Does the current system meet all the minimum requirements show in the bulleted section starting with "Calculate Countywide tax rates"?

Answer: For vendors responding to option #1, there is no expectation of additional functionality. If the current system does not meet the requirement, the converted system is not expected to.

For vendors responding to option #2, these requirements are expected to be available, even if as optional modules. If they are not included in the base price for the system proposed, please identify the costs on the Cost Proposal under the additional modules item.

15. Question: #2 starting with "Data Normalization", please describe your expectation for the option 1 conversion solution regarding data normalization.

Answer: For option #1, our data normalization expectation is the same as presented. Individual vendors may present different methodologies, the County's expectation however, is that all the identified steps would be included.

Questions 16-18 Refer to Page 23 of the Bid

16. Question: Second Sentence in second para starting with: "The system should provide for the import and export of data in a common and universal format". For option 1 (conversion), does the current system provide this functionality?

Answer: Yes, several text files are exported from the main-frame then imported into various systems within the County.

17. Question: Under section titled "Overall Project Objectives" #6, does the current application have interfaces to connect to additional COUNTY systems?

Answer: Yes, through the export and import of various text files.

18. Question: #6 starting with "Create appropriate", are you expecting the conversion option 1 solutions to add interfaces to connect to additional COUNTY systems or are these already in the existing county application?

Answer: For option 1, we are only looking to maintain the existing interfaces described in the previous two questions.

Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466

May 3, 2016

Questions 19-23 Refer to Page 24 of the Bid

19. Question: Since only the County teams are expert in the execution of the existing application, will the County provide test scripts that exercise the features according to the standard workflow for the applications?

Answer: Yes.

20. Question: Will the County also provide appropriate data so that vendor testing can take place prior to delivery of the converted application and database to the County?

Answer: Yes.

21. Question: Will it be possible for us to test the majority of the online application in our Tech Lab without the external interfaces described in the RFP?

Answer: There should be no problem testing in your lab, the output files can be generated then compared to file format requirements.

22. Question: We can identify and make recommendations for replacement of 3rd-party tools that will work well for the County (scheduler, batch submission and management, print control, etc.). Will the County select, purchase and install these tools and utilities outside of the scope of this RFP?

Answer: They could be included in the proposed price, but please identify them as options on the price sheet.

23. Question: #9 starting with "Data Views", are you expecting the conversion option 1 to meet this requirement?

Answer: Yes, the data must be available to be viewed by staff in at least the format it is currently.

Question 24 Refers to Page 25 of the Bid

24. Question: Under "SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE" 1D, does the current system provide an API? If not, for conversion option 1, would an API need to be added to the converted application?

Answer: No, the current system does not provide an API, nor will option 1 respondents be expected to add one.

25. Question: The County references the desired use of a "fifth generation language" but also states that Option 1 could be a conversion to .NET and SQL Server. C# .NET is an object-oriented language rather than a 5GL. Is C# .NET (maintained using Visual Studio) a suitable solution for the County?

Answer: Yes, a 5GL is preferable, but C# .NET is acceptable.

26. Question: There are several cells from Attachment A - Tax Collector where the text has been cut off. Please provide full content for these:

Answer:

- a. Parcel display includes all previous APNs (or other parcel identifications) for that...
- b. System produces a CSV file containing impending Power to Sale notices for all parcels that will have defaulted taxes that will qualify at July 1, CCYY, for Power to...
- c. System allows the Tax Collector and Assessor to create new parcels and separate...
- d. System provides a report showing roll changes, to include parcel identification, tax code, amount canceled for each installment in tax code sorted by APN, sample...
- e. The Tax Collector is responsible for mailing unsecured tax bills, processing tax payments, reprocessing of rejected payments, issuing refunds for duplicate payments and overpayments, issuing mobile home tax clearances, issuing vessel registration clearances recording and releasing liens bulk transfers demands and...
- f. Please see attached spreadsheet "Attachment A"

Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466

May 3, 2016

27. Question: The RFP checklist refers to items a & b below. Are these relevant to this RFP? If so, please provide additional information on registration.

- a. Verification of Department of Industrial Relations Contractor Registration.
- b. Verification of Contractor's License and the Department of Consumer Affairs Contractors' State License Board.

Answer: These do not apply.

28. Question: A tax collector requirement mentions "System makes CSV available in a similar file format for all report types currently produced in our Property Tax System for record retention in E-Reports". Could you provide a list of each report type currently produced for records retention in E-Reports?

Answer: There are too many to list. Please note if your system is capable of ad hoc reporting, and delivering those reports in a CSV format.

29. Question: There is a requirement for the Tax Collector which reads: "System produces "Tax Sale Chains" for each power to sell a parcel". Does this mean a document indicating the history of the parcel, what led to its default and the steps taken leading up to sale?

Answer: No. It is a document that details the current assessee demographical information, default date, power to sell document number and date recorded, tax roll information, and full legal description.

30. Question: Will the vendor be expected to create 'dummy' test data or will the County allow the vendor to use actual production data (possibly masked)? If dummy data is to be used, does the County have the ability to load similar dummy data on the PTCD production environment for testing validation purposes?

Answer: The County will provide test data. The test data will be from the actual production environment so resulting calculations can be compared.

31. Question: Please provide information about your available staff and the amount of time they will have available to support the project, whether that is code conversion, a COTS package, or new development.

Answer: Until such time as an option and vendor has been chosen, the County does not feel confident in making any commitments on available resources.

32. Question: The County makes no mention of a Disaster Recovery Test so is the Vendor expected to include such an option to prove the migrated system recovers successfully?

Answer: No. Unless the vendor is proposing a Cloud based solution, then yes.

33. Question: Is the County open to running the newly migrated system from the Cloud?

Answer: Yes, but there are additional IT requirements for securing data from/in the Cloud. These would need to be addressed at the time of contract negotiations.

34. Question: Is the vendor expected to include resources who will be accessing and working with the County mainframe or will the County perform any mainframe functions required for the project?

Answer: County will provide required main-frame support.

35. Question: Does the County have a preferred development approach (Waterfall, Agile, Iterative) if the vendor opts to bid a custom solution?

Answer: Not at this time.

36. Question: Please identify if the County currently has other .Net environments and which, if any, standard application software components those use, such as application schedulers, ad hoc reporting software, or app monitoring tools?

Answer: The County has .Net environments.

Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466

May 3, 2016

37. Question: The County security requirements leave considerable room for interpretation so can the County please further elaborate what is expected? Will there need to be data masking for testing, encryption for data at rest and in transit, multiple user roles based on differing access requirements, code scans to prevent vulnerabilities, etc.?

Answer: The answers to this question will depend largely on the option and delivery method the vendor chooses to propose. They will be very different for a cloud based solution as opposed to a server/client proposal and will be addressed further within the project planning phase.

38. Question: The RFP mentions County IT standards for connecting new infrastructure into the COUNTY LAN or WAN. Please provide these standards or least indicate if there are there any special considerations the Vendor should be aware of such as restrictions on data center access, standardized server configuration requirements, or rack space limitations?

Answer: Physical access to the data center is limited to County IT personnel only. Others are permitted access only when accompanied by County IT staff. VPN access to vendor supported servers is allowed, but limited to the application server or database only. The County utilized virtual servers whenever possible, to minimize the rack configuration and space limitations.

39. Question: Does the County already have existing tools for monitoring server environments and databases for an MS-Windows .Net environment or is the Vendor expected to bid those functions?

Answer: The County has mechanisms in place for monitoring databases, OS's, and applications. The vendor will only need to bid on proprietary monitoring/evaluation tools.

40. Question: Please clarify who is expected to actually procure any hardware and software required, the County or the Vendor? If it is the County, are there any special requirements the Vendor must be aware of, such as long lead times or special contractual pricing, to procure the items?

Answer: The County will procure all required, non-proprietary hardware and software required for this project. Standard lead times for County purchased hardware is 4-6 weeks.

41. Question: Does the County have an existing Test or Development environment or is the Vendor expected to provide those at a non-County location for conversion staff to do their work?

Answer: The County prefers to have distinct test and production environments. Conversion would be expected to take place at the location to provide the greatest efficiency and chance of success.

42. Question: Does the County expect the Vendor to provide/procure multiple system environments, such as production, test, and development or does the County have infrastructure components that can be leveraged for some of the environments including available rack space in the County Data Center for the new equipment and any firewalls, switches, and/or routers needed?

Answer: The County prefers to have distinct test and production environments.

43. Question: Does the County have any restrictions on the location or citizenship of resources supporting this project?

Answer: No.

44. Question: Does the County have a method such as VPN for conversion resources to log into their infrastructure environment to reach test, development, or production boxes?

Answer: Yes, VPN access to the test, development, and production servers will be provided to the vendor.

45. Question: We respectfully request a two week extension to the proposal due date until May 31, 2016. This additional time will enable vendors to fully evaluate all possible solutions for the County and develop a comprehensive solution/proposal.

Answer: The RFP close date will be extended to June 1.

46. Question: What is the County's Personal Property count?

Answer: 60,319

May 3, 2016

REVISED COST PROPOSAL

Summarize and detail the proposed costs related to the purchase, modification, installation and support of the Remittance Processor System. Detail Costs must be submitted for the following:

1.	Apı	plication Software	
	a.	Base system components (please show the number of licenses included):	
	b.	Additional modules, if any:	
	c.	Additional licenses:	
2.		difications, these include and enhancements necessary to be responsive to the RFP, ss-referenced to the appropriate section of the scope of work/system requirements:	
	a.	Modification description:	
	b.	Required hours:	
	C.	Hourly rate:	
	d.	Total cost:	
	e.	RFP section and page number:	
3.	On	e-time costs:	
	a.	Documentation	
		i. User guides:	
		ii. Training manuals:	
		iii. Technical manuals:	
	b.	Training:	
	c.	Conversion:	
	d.	Interfaces:	
	e.	Consulting services:	
		i. Travel:	
		ii. Hourly rate:	
	f.	Third party vendors:	
4.	Anı	nual and on-going costs:	
	a.	Application maintenance (including upgrades and license fees):	
	b.	Hardware maintenance:	
	c.	Operating system maintenance (including upgrades and license fees):	
	d.	Escrow for source code, if applicable:	
	e.	User group membership:	
	f.	Telephone support:	
5.	Tot	tal contract price, by year:	
	-	i. Year one:	
		ii. Year two:	
		iii. Year three:	

Addendum No. One (1) Request for Proposal Number: 962-5466 May 3, 2016		
	iv. Year four:	
	v. Year five:	
	vi. Year six:	
	vii. Year seven:	
	viii. Total contract price:	
a.	Include all taxes and fees:	
b.	If more than one alternative system is being proposed, complete a separate proposal including cost review, for each:	
C.	Government discount, if any:	