

Planning and Permitting System Replacement – Update 3

1. Why are you now looking for a solution right now?

Skagit County has been using a permitting system acquired in 1994 and is now no longer being developed by the company. We would like to move to a newer technology system. The County has also lost the original staff who managed this software.

2. Did something happen with your current solution to get to this point?

Yes, the Company supporting the software no longer is putting any development resources into the product.

3. Before releasing the RFP is there a vendor's solution that you were considering and working with?

We were working with the Permits Plus system from Accela, Inc., which originally was developed by Sierra Computer Systems, Inc.

4. In the County's Update #2 document; the response to question #14 would indicate that there are 18 different case types/workflows to be configured. In prior correspondence with the County we had received the below list as case types. Should we use the 18 case types in the County's Update #2 or is the below list more complete with inclusion of code enforcement which indicates (including subtypes) approximately 27 workflows. Or do some of these subtypes include identical workflow?

I don't recall the table below and it does not seem accurate? The update 2 table contains all the major types of files - each one having it's own coding script. Within each type there are sometimes 2-20 different subtypes (I.e. a type SEPTIC contains NEW (new design), NON (Table 9 repairs), REP(repairs), SITE(soils only))

Type	Subtype
Building	Residential/commercial building
	Factory-Assembled Structure/Manufactured/mobile home
	Non-building structure/sign/tower
	Mechanical/plumbing
Code Enforcement	All Code Enforcement Cases
CA/Shoreline	Critical Areas Review
	CA Variance
	Shoreline Exemption

	Shoreline Substantial Development
	Shoreline Conditional Use
	Shoreline Variance
Appeal	Hearing Examiner
Fire	Fire Suppression/Fireworks/Special Event
Land Disturbance	Land Disturbance/Clearing/Grading Permit
Land Division	Binding Site Plan
	Standard Short & Long
	CaRD Short & Long
Land/Lots	Boundary Line Adjustment
	Lot Certification Simple & Standard
	Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
	Rezone (Standalone)
Septic	New System
	Design/Redesign
	Repair
SEPA	Standalone
	EIS
Special Use/Variance	Administrative

5. In the list above there appears to be only one generic Code Enforcement case type. Can you confirm that this is the approach the County wishes to utilize in the new system (with different types of Notice of Violation letters)?

See answer 4. There are 17 subtypes for code enforcement.

6. Noting the above generic code case type; the requirements state that the County wants the ability for Citizens to submit code violations via a portal. A portal would typically indicate that multiple violation types would need to be set up as separate case types (weed abatement, bad dog, graffiti, etc.). Please advise relative to question #1 if we should increase the number of case types to accommodate this scenario?

Yes, there are 17.

7. We have the ability to provide a portal (311 type portal) for online code violation submissions as well as a smart phone application. Does the County have a preference between the two approaches? Or would you like to see the smart phone application provided in the quote as optional?

Online with option for smart phone application.

8. On the County's website there is information relative to Home Based Businesses and Farm Based Businesses; some of which require a permit. Are those included in the Special Use/Variance permit?

Yes, Home Based Business would be covered under a special use permit.

9. Are there any licensing requirements in the RFP for issuance of business or professional licenses by the County (this would not include confirming state licensing credentials; only County issued licenses if applicable)?

Skagit County does not issue business or professional licenses.

10. Does the County's IT Department have staff resources available to create custom reports in either Crystal or SSRS as part of the project?

No, this is something we are hoping either the department that wishes the report can do, or we will need to have the vendor create the reports on professional services if needed.

11. In the RFP Update #2 document; the response to question #1 indicated that there were 45 named users for the system. Is this what the County wishes us to use as the number of users in the proposal?

It was stated that it was 100 users. There are 45 active Planning Department staff members. There are multiple departments with access to our Permit Software (Records Management, Health, Public Works, Assessor's, Auditor, etc.)

12. Are all of the 45 named users actually entering and editing data in the system or are some of them simply viewing data? If the latter, how many View Only licenses (run custom searches; view data; run reports) would suffice in lieu of some of the 45 named users? Noting that automated reports can be built into the system for regular distribution which does not require a user license.

Yes, I would say that all 45 should be active users for the PDS department.

13. How many users are in the Planning Department?

45 (includes both Planning & Building)

14. How many users are in the Building Department?

45 (includes both Planning & Building)

15. How many users are in the Environmental Health Department?

There are 13 users in the Environmental Health Department.

16. Are there any users that will need mobile only access?

We will need mobile access for users but no user will need mobile-only access.

17. Can you please share an estimate of the annual number of users who will upload documents for Electronic Plan Review, with comments, markup and signature by multiple reviewers?

We are unclear as to the definition of user.

If it is County staff, then we would estimate 30 users.

If it includes the public, we think this could be approximately 1,200 users based on our annual number of building permits we receive yearly.

18. The last date for the county to respond to questions is the 21st and the RFP response is due on the 23rd which doesn't give much time to respond. I would like to ask if the county would be willing to extend the due date by two weeks.

After consultation with our stakeholder team, we will not be extending the deadline for the submission of the Request for Proposal. We are taking questions now and working hard to get answers back as soon as possible.

Please get your questions in as soon as possible so that you will have time to respond.