

## Powhatan County, Virginia



### Addenda No. 2 – October 16, 2019

#### Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for a Tax Billing, Utility Billing, Community Development, Asset Management, and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software Systems Environment

NEW Due Date and Time: **Wednesday, November 13, 2019**, 4:00 PM Local Time

County of Powhatan  
Department of Finance  
3834 Old Buckingham Rd, Suite B  
Powhatan, VA 23139

---

Please note that the date for Vendor Demonstrations presented in the RFP Schedule of Events (Table 02) is modified to list the target date as the week of January 6, 2020.

**Please be advised the due date and time for proposal submissions has been modified. The new due date and time for proposal submissions is Wednesday, November 13, 2019 at 4:00 PM Local Time.**

**Please be advised that the County is also extending the questions deadline to Wednesday, October 23, 2019 at 4:00 PM Local Time.**

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on October 9, 2019 at 1:00 pm (EST). The Pre-Proposal Teleconference was facilitated by the County and the County's consulting partner, BerryDunn, and included participation by key County staff.

Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was **not** mandatory. The following vendors identified themselves on the teleconference:

1. Avenity
2. Bright and Associates
3. CentralSquare
4. Dude Solutions
5. Keystone Information Systems
6. MetaFormers
7. Oracle
8. RDA
9. TreCom Systems Group
10. TruePoint Solutions
11. Tyler Technologies
12. Vision33

Questions and answers provided below include those questions received prior to and following the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference. Any other questions and answers following the issuance of this Addenda will be included in Addenda 3, if necessary.

1. Question: RFP Section 2.2, page 13. In relation to the paragraph beginning with “*Proposers are also encouraged to propose on a subset of functionality if the proposed...*” Does this imply that vendors of CAMA systems for real estate valuation must include ALL of the functionality listed in area “ii”, including Tax Billing, Personal Property, Business Personal Property, etc.? In other words, vendors providing CAMA systems only will not be considered?

**County Response: The County will consider best of breed or point solutions that are proposed in partnerships to address one (or more) of the three groupings identified in this Section of the RFP. Vendors may not submit standalone proposals to address a lesser scope that provided for in this section of the RFP (just budgeting, just cashiering, etc.) Replacement of the legacy CAMA solution is not included in scope of this RFP opportunity.**

2. Question: How many total employees will use the time and attendance functionality, for licensing purposes? We did note that 0 County employees and 20 School employees use time clocks on page 11.

**County Response: Approximately 250 County employees and 700 School employees will use time and attendance functionality. As to the use of time clocks, the County does not anticipate using time clocks in the future to support recording ins/outs, and neither do the schools. If this functionality is offered by vendors, please feel free to include descriptions of the available functionality or hardware clearly marked as on an optional basis. For the Schools, approximately 20 employees currently use time clock kiosks and this number would be expected to be largely the same in the future. If a solution offers mobile “time clocks” this would potentially expand the number of employees using time clocks to include an additional 90 employees to account for bus drivers.**

3. Question: How many Fire/Rescue, Sheriff’s Office and Communications employees will use advanced scheduling employees, for licensing purposes?

**County Response: Approximately 117 full and part-time employees.**

4. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

**County Response: All companies, not dependent on location, are welcome to submit a proposal.**

5. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

**County Response: The County has an expectation that vendors on the Vendor Short List will appear in-person at County offices for scripted demonstrations (Page 19, Section 3.1, part (b)). Per Section 2.3 of the RFP, the County further has the expectation that the selected vendor(s) will include onsite activities at County offices as part of the system implementation activities. Vendors are encouraged to describe the proposed approach to onsite and remote activities as part of the response to Tab 3 of the proposal (Project Approach and Implementation Methodology)**

6. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

**County Response: Please see the response to Question 5 above.**

7. Can we submit the proposals via email?

**County Response: No. Please see Section 4.1 of the RFP.**

8. Is the County able to confirm that there are only approximately 250 utility accounts that are billed?

**County Response: This is correct – there are approximately 250 utility accounts.**

9. Is the County able to further describe the scope of BerryDunn’s involvement following the receipt of proposals – particular as it relates to scoring and the demonstration process?

**County Response: The County has retained BerryDunn as a consulting partner for this project. The role of BerryDunn is to provide information and analytical services to support this project from an independent and objective standpoint. BerryDunn will be facilitating activities as part of the procurement, but will not be participating in the evaluation scoring. Evaluations and resulting decisions will be made solely by the County.**

10. Who is on the County evaluation team and what is the evaluation structure and process?

**County Response: Detail surrounding the intended evaluation process may be found in Section 3.1 of the RFP. As to the composition of the Evaluation Committee, it will include cross-functional representation of staff from the County and Schools both, however the County will not be disclosing the names or titles of Committee members at this time. The Evaluation Committee will be tasked with carrying out the evaluation process set forth in Section 3.1 of the RFP, while additional County and School staff may be invited to participate in the evaluation process in an informal capacity to provide input into the selection of a future system(s).**

11. When will addenda #1 be made available on the website?

**County Response: Addenda #1 may be found on the eVA website, and will be posted to the County website following the pre-proposal teleconference.**

12. What is the County’s target go-live date?

**County Response: Proposers are encouraged propose phasing and timelines that best align with the Proposers implementation approach and what Proposers have seen as most effective based on past experience. The County follows a July 1- June 30 fiscal year, and issues real estate and property tax bills with a due date of June 5 and November 5, to the extent these key activities influence phasing and proposed go-live dates. The ultimate go-live dates and phasing will depend on the configuration of vendors and systems that the County selects. Initial discussions of potential dates or phasing include:**

- **Financial Modules: March 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021**
- **HR/Payroll Modules: January 1, 2021 – January 1, 2022**
- **Utility Billing and Tax Systems/Modules – Go-live on a quarter-end for reporting purposes**

13. Are there any specific goals for minority/small business requirements?

**County Response: No, there are not any formal goals.**

14. Is there a date that vendors can expect to receive the final addenda following the October 16 questions deadline?

**County Response: The County endeavors to answer questions as quickly as possible following the question deadline passing. The exact timing will depend on the volume of questions received. Vendors are encourages to submit questions one day in advance of the questions deadline, if at all possible, to help expedite County responses.**

15. When will the data conversions addendum be available?

**County Response: Please see the response to question #11.**

16. Where the County and the Schools are using differing legacy systems, is it anticipated that there will be a need for performing data conversion from two separate systems?

**County Response: Yes – as further defined in Appendix 1 to Addenda #1.**

17. Is there a projected number of staff who will be using time clocks?

**County Response: Please see the response to question #2.**

18. Will the CAMA software remain or is the County looking to replace it?

**County Response: Replacement of the legacy CAMA software is not within the scope of this opportunity.**

19. Did the County participate in any demonstrations of software during the development of the RFP or leading up to this process?

**County Response: County staff regularly attend conferences and tradeshow where software may be demonstrated, so it is challenging to identify if staff have observed software demonstrations in this context. The County did not, in the past 12 months, engage in any structured demonstrations prior to the release of this RFP.**

20. Are vendors permitted to propose on one of the three functional area groupings listed in Section 2.2 (i-iii) and also include other subsets of tabs of the requirements in the scope of the proposals? For example, would a proposal addressing iii. Community Development (tabs 19-23 of Attachment B) and also Tabs 24 and 8 be considered?

**County Response: Yes. This is permissible.**

21. What is the expected budget for the software and services included in the scope of this RFP?

**County Response: Proposed Response: Please see Section 2.10 of the RFP. The County does not intend to make available to vendors the amounts initially budgeted for this initiative.**

22. Under the project schedule, November 1st, 2019 is listed as the RFP due date. Can an extension to November 15, 2019 be granted?

**County Response: Please see the notice on page 1 of this addenda granting an extension.**

Respondents are instructed to return a copy of this addenda form signed by an authorized firm agent as part of proposal responses.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMPANY

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE