

**City of Hood River Request for Proposal
Permitting Enhancement Project Implementation Management
Submitted Questions with Answers**

Project Governance:

- Who is the project sponsor (name, title)?
 - This project is sponsored by our City Manager, Rachael Fuller.
- Can you specify how the evaluation of each section will be weighted?
 - Please reference the distributed RFP. Pg 6 & amendment.
- Has the City received any 3rd party assistance in preparing this RFP? if so, can you provide which firm?
 - Yes. Lisa Yeo Consulting provided initial scoping and research that has informed the current RFP.
- Please describe the project implementation methodology used for the City implementation.
 - Partially Agile, with a focus on each phases key outcomes.

Project Resources:

- Without looking at the total level of effort, it would be difficult to estimate the total cost of each phase. What is the City's expectation? Would the City accept a response without 6.c. Estimated total cost for each phase?
 - The final award will be on a time and materials basis with a not-to-exceed amount. The City realizes that it may be difficult to accurately price each phase without additional information. An addendum will be issued revising the scoring criteria to include evaluation of a rate sheet instead of a bottomline project cost. An additional evaluation step will be added to interview a short-list of finalists to further discuss a final price.
- What is the allocated budget for the implementation of the proposed solution?
 - The City expects the project will cost less than \$80,000 for a period of two-years.
- What internal resources are committed to project support across the four phases? What is the level of commitment anticipated for these resources?
 - Project committee has been established, and created the outcomes to date. Anticipation and commitment is quite positive.
- What is the expected level of engagement in terms of the number of resources and number of hours per month?
 - The team is expecting to dedicate 2-3 hours weekly for meetings and progress work. The project lead will dedicate more, but no finite time has been allocated.
- What is Hood River's commitment to turnaround time on key project decisions, reviews, approvals?
 - Committee/departments and Sponsor all highly committed.
- Please describe the roles and responsibilities of each member of the City project team.
 - Project Sponsor - City Manager
 - Project Lead - GIS Analyst
 - Committee members:
 - Building Department
 - Building Official
 - Administrative Assistant
 - Planning Department

- Planning Director
- Assistant Planner
- City Contracted Engineer - Bell Engineering
- Engineering - Right-of-way Inspector

Project Management:

- Is there any flexibility to the requirement that the project manager be on site every week? Could this be a bi-weekly? If not, are all the consultants required to be onsite?
 - The Project Manager must attend the weekly meeting on site, in person. However, if a team is used, the entire team does not need to be on site.
- You state 4 Phases of the project; can you confirm the number of business process reviews to be included in each Phase or the number of record types configured in Accela currently?
 - The City does not have a count of discrete business processes
- You have stated the City is assuming a 6-month timeline per each phase. Has the City determined in the plan the number of hours allocated to the project by the Hood River team weekly to be led by selected Consultant/ Project Manager?
 - The team is expecting to dedicate 2-3 hours weekly for meetings and progress work. The project lead will dedicate more, but no finite time has been allocated.
- SMEs (Subject Matter Experts) availability throughout the project is key to a successful implementation. What allocation is available for your SMEs over the life of the project? (i.e. participation in workshops, attending train the trainer sessions, perform/assist in performing UAT, etc.)
 - See previous answer for expected time commitment
- How long have you allocated for system testing and how many rounds? Is the testing formalized or with documented test cases?
 - With regard to the first and second phases, we are utilizing a pre-designed, free SAS version of Accela through the State of Oregon. To that end, we have not allocated any dedicated project time into system testing.
- For the end of each phase, does the City anticipate system testing and go-live?
 - The human aspect of the system will need to be trained and comfortable with new processes prior to launch. Later phases of the project may require software/hardware testing, but both phase 1 and 2 are utilizing the State SAS.
- Would you prefer UAT (User Acceptance Training) to be managed by the vendor or internally by your project team?
 - Whether the consultant is asked to provide user training will be jointly determined by the City and selected consultant based on a best value analysis. Alternatives to consultant hosted trainings may be coordinating/managing the training by an outside vendor.
- The RFP states “A project team of City staff from the Building, Engineering, Planning and technology departments has drafted an action plan to implement improvements that will deliver on the above goals. The plan includes implementation of new technology as well as internal process re-engineering.” In the NEEDS section it states: “Lead process analysis and reengineering efforts”.

- The RFP reads as though the City has complete Business Process Analysis and re-engineering. Has the City completed Process Analysis and documented the “As Is” to “To Be” state of its business processes?
 - The City has developed a ‘wish-list’ goal set along with generalized step implementation, and has outlined the current operational patterns.
- Do you want additional analysis to occur from the partner based on best practice?
 - Yes. The City recognises that more research and analysis is key to achieve best practice grade procedures.
- Please confirm the number of business processes between Building, Engineering and Planning.
 - The City does not have a quantified, finite number. Projects can span from a dozen to dozens of processes between departments and public applicants.
- If you have only completed a portion, how many processes remain to go through Process Analysis?
 - We have a set direction for phase 1’s implementation and goals. Phases 2-4 have general direction level goals. We have recognised that more specific research will be required to identify a desired solution and this research may lead to alterations of expected process improvements. The City does not have a discrete count of processes remaining.

Software/System Questions:

- The RFP states “Implementation of Bluebeam Revu (or other software)”. Why have you specifically mentioned Bluebeam? Is it in use already within the City or the State?
 - The City currently has a license with Bluebeam with some team members using or having experience using.
- Will Hood River go live with the existing version of Bluebeam or will an upgrade/new version be required?
 - The City will expect to go live with the most current Bluebeam offering when the time comes for its implementation.
- Is Bluebeam Revu the preferred EDR (Electronic Document Review) or could you use the inbuilt EDR in the Accela solution?
 - Yes, mainly because of the familiarity of the (Bluebeam) software and existing licensure . Accela’s ‘inbuilt’ integrates Adobe Pro. City does not have a multi-seat Adobe concurrent license.
- How much customization will be required?
 - The City is implementing a SAS version of Accela from the State of Oregon. The potential for customization is extremely limited. We do not foresee customization, but recognise that requirements discovered through the implementation process may lead to necessary changes, even at the platform level.
 - If this is unknown, how does Hood River want to handle scope changes?
 - In the descriptions of each phase, the need for further research has been identified before the initiation of any subsequent phases. During research, new/better solutions may be discovered beyond the SAS Accela package. If this

- Does the City have a preferred methodology? We are Agile experts. Would Agile be acceptable?
 - The City has a long term desired outcome, built in a phased approach to step us to the final outcome. The design team met weekly, and hopes to keep that schedule for the next phases. We do not have a set methodology, but the process (without the Agile terminology) has been very Agile “like”.

Training Questions:

- What is the primary skillsets Hood River is seeking with this RFP? Is it focused on experienced IT Project Management with Organizational Change Management to support adoption? Or, is it more focused on Accela implementation skills with Project Management experience?
 - We are looking for expert project management with an in depth knowledge of civic Permitting/Planning/Engineering processes, and experience with new process/system implementation.
- Does Hood River support a train-the Trainer approach to training end-users? If so, how many trainers can be expected?
 - Group members will receive training in their respective departments to become the point-people for questions/help for the remaining staff in the department. On top of that we would have 1 or 2 people trained across all departments and more in depth who can act as in-house trainers who would train the remaining staff members from the ground up.
- What, if any, specific training has been completed up to now by the previous implementer and is there an expectation for any re-training of those completed trainings or to other departments that may have been missed?
 - With the exceptions of the Building Permit Technician and Project Lead, minimal. The level of training to date has been enough to give the committee an introductory knowledge of potential systems to be implemented. Refresher on aspects of Accela may be necessary for the group to analyse its potential use in solving our issues.
- Since the City uses the State of Oregon’s Accela system, does the State insist on any level of technical, project, or other oversight?
 - No, the state does not require oversight in implementation of their SAS once access has been granted. The State does provide technical support, and contact will be required to implement any of the other module solutions they have provided (Engineering/Public Works and Planning). At that point, State will aid in the implementation to some degree.
 - There are constraints that are inherent in the software as a service used across multiple municipalities.