

1. Regarding requirement IT1.12, how many additional isolated environments does Snoqualmie want?

**Answer:** 2 environments (1 for test and 1 for production)

2. Section 5 of the Company Profile Form asks for the number of cities in California using the proposed software. Should that be the number of cities in Washington instead?

**Answer:** Yes, it should be WA.

3. RE: Section 1 General Information C. Current State and Section 2 Key Requirements B Business Requirements Req ID BR1.19: The City specifies that in 2018 there were 144 General Requests, and 434 total Police Requests. Does the City expect to be able to do all requests using one request type or form or will they expect multiple types of forms to accommodate different types of solicitations from the public?

**Answer:** It should be 1 form that the requesting public sees to input their request details to make the process as simple as possible. The requestor should be able to designate the request type as either Police or General (this is for example) and the application shall then route the request according to the type selected.

4. RE: Section 2 Key Requirements A. Technical Requirements Req ID IT1.2: How do you intend to use MS SQL data or what is the need for data access?

**Answer:** Application will use MS SQL for backend report generation. End users shall be able to run reports using a GUI that would require little to no SQL knowledge. Most if not all reports should be canned, however it would be nice to have the ability to create our own reports from a set of defined parameters (much like a pivot table).

5. RE: Section 2 Key Requirements B Business Requirements Req ID BR1.1: How would an anonymous request be handled by the City? How would you get them their documents?

**Answer:** Legally we can't require identification. We leave name/address optional, and if a request is done online then we must have an email to send correspondence to. My preference is the user would have an "account" based on their email address that they could log into the application portal to manage their requests. Once a PRR is completed an email would be sent to the requestor where they could then click a link to access their documents stored in the app. However, we can't just rely on email as a system identifier. The system needs to also be able to handle those that don't have email because we're a small town and some folks can't/don't want to use email and want us to mail them the physical documents. And sometimes (rarely) but it still happens someone may walk in (or more likely call in) and request documents. In which case we'd have to create a PRR into the system on their behalf and then we'd use a "john/jane doe" for the name and there would be no address/email associated to that request since they are physically present/choose to pick up the documents in person. My recommendation is that the application would need to have a request ID to be able track records tied a request. If the request is filled out online then the email is a required field, with name and address optional. If the request is filled out by a city employee due to the requestor being physically present, then email would not be required. I believe the RCW below will help provide some guidance as to why we can't require identifying information and why we can't force everyone to use the application to submit their requests.

**WA State: RCW 42.56.080** Agencies [shall not distinguish among persons requesting records](#), and such persons shall not be required to provide information as to the purpose for the request except to establish whether inspection and copying would violate RCW [42.56.070\(8\)](#) or [42.56.240\(14\)](#), or other statute which exempts or prohibits disclosure of specific information or records to certain persons. Agency facilities shall be made available to any person for the copying of public records except when and to the extent that this would unreasonably disrupt the operations of the agency. [Agencies shall honor requests received in person](#) during an agency's normal office hours, or by mail or email, for identifiable public records unless exempted by provisions of this chapter. No official format is required for making a records request; however, [agencies may recommend that requestors submit requests using an agency provided form or web page](#).

**For full RCW:** <https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=42.56>

6. RE: Section 2 Key Requirements B Business Requirements Req ID BR1.19: How does the city plan to utilize time tracking for this system?

**Answer:** For state reporting and to provide visibility into how much time is spent on PRR. The purposes of time tracking are not for any payroll function or to bill customers back for time spent (as we're not legally able to do so).

7. Can we add additional value functionality in the proposal?

**Answer:** Absolutely! Just separate that additional value from the core of the requirements. Add in as additional recommendations in your final proposal.

8. Data Conversion Questions:

Do they expect to migrate anything from your current tracking lists? If you reply yes to question 8, please answer Additional Data Conversion Questions

**Answer:** Currently, we track everything in spreadsheets so it should be fairly easy for us to move data. Since we track from beginning of year we won't have much to migrate over, if we can get this implemented within the proposed timeline. We'll keep the old data in spreadsheets and not migrate anything from 2019 or before over.

Additional Data Conversion Questions

9. What format will the city provide existing data in for data conversion?

**Answer:** See question 8. We hope not to migrate anything.

10. How many records will be converted? **Answer:** n/a

11. Are all converted records active or inactive (counts)? **Answer:** n/a

12. Will converted records need to be set up with workflow or status? **Answer:** nope

13. Are there historical retainment expectations that apply to converted data? **Answer:** nope

14. Will the City be responsible for data scrubbing? **Answer:** Sure, we will input data into the format the application requires. We will manually key in outstanding requests from 2019 into the system.

15. How large are the files to be converted? **Answer:** n/a

16. Will there be data converted from any other source? **Answer:** no

17. Does, or can, the City use Microsoft Active Directory Federation Services (ADFS)? **Answer:** No, we don't currently use but please do include why we should if it's part of your solution proposal.

18. Does the City use the Microsoft Azure Government Cloud? **Answer:** No.

19. May vendors provide a response of "NA" in the technical requirements matrix (pp. 10-11) to indicate the requirement is not applicable to the vendor's proposed solution? **Answer:** Yes

20. Has the City secured funding for this project/contract? If so, what dollar amount has been secured? What is the source of the funding? **Answer:** Yes, 10k annual, Sustainment

21. To what extent will implementation and training activities need to take place on site? **Answer:** Training can be done via Web meeting or onsite, in your response you can give us other options too! Regardless of format of the initial delivery, training material should be provided in a recorded format for future use by other employees and also include written instructions (ideally) with screen shots.

22. Did the City view demonstrations of public records request management software prior to releasing this RFP? **Answer:** Yes. If so, which vendors provided demonstrations? GovQA & NextRequest.

23. How many total users will need to have access to the solution? How many concurrent users? **Answer:** Internal users ~10, not concurrently. 2 primary users handle most PRR, remaining users would be using the app to track time and upload documents

24. How many users will need to perform redactions? **Answer:** At most 2 for the foreseeable future.

25. Does the City have a preference between a hosted/cloud-based solution and an on-premise solution? **Answer:** Not really...we're a mix right now.

26. The requirements tables in section two do not include a comments column. May vendors alter the requirements tables slightly to add a comments column and make the responses easier to read, so long as all of the provided information remains the same? **Answer:** Yes, please do!

27. Regarding requirement BR1.13, which finance cash receipts system does the City use? In what format must the proposed solution send receipt of payments received to the finance cash receipts system?

**Answer:** Springbrook On Premise is used for journalizing cash receipts. Preferred format for upload is .CSV We currently use Square and Merchant Transact for credit card transactions and we're not looking to add more payment processors. \*\*Note – we are looking to replace Springbrook within the next 2 years.

28. The Pricing Sheet (Hosted SaaS Solution) provided with the RFP does not seem to correspond to the requirements of the RFP (e.g. there is a line for GIS integration, which is not a requirement). Would the City please confirm the correct SaaS pricing sheet was provided or provide a revised version?

**Answer:** Good observation, you're right to point out that this is a standard price sheet. In its place you can provide us an estimate on a separate sheet but with a detail break down of 1. Annual subscription costs 2. Any other additional service costs (for example, how long do you store our data and if we needed to go back to get data that is over 2 years old, would there be a charge for that and how much) 3. Implementation costs break out. If there are any variable costs involved, then we need to know how many estimated hours and if it's fixed then what is included in scope. For example, if training is charged separately from our annual subscription fee, then how much is it and how many hours of training do we get annually? Most vendors included training rolled into the annual subscription costs because it's already prerecorded and if that's the case here, then just state that as an assumption that training is rolled into the annual fee and can be accessed online on an as needed basis. Is there a charge for support calls? Is there a limit on the number of support calls/year? The spreadsheet was included as guidance so that we aren't caught off guard by any hidden fees, but by all means you can adjust/modify as needed on a separate sheet.

29. The City desired project schedule has a 9 day implementation cycle from project kickoff to production deployment, is this for the base production application without integration, configuration, training, etc. or is the City expecting all the services to be provided in 9 days?

**Answer:** YES! I know it's tight and it's a desired timeline and we expect vendor to work with us to get this implemented as soon as possible. However, I believe it's feasible if the application is SaaS then setup should be fairly quick. And we're asking for a solution that *anyone* can use, so training shouldn't be too involved.

30. What platform is the City using for MFA?

**Answer:** MS Active Directory at network sign on and for some applications we have OMNIKEY pad that can be used.

31. How many department-designated public records liaison will be using the system?

**Answer:** Most departments have 1 person designated to handle PRR. Based on number of departments we could potentially have somewhere between 9-15 users for all departments combined. But most likely it would be 10 or so, as there's cross over in department roles. Ex. PW can include Parks, Maintenance, Facilities, etc..

32. For a SaaS based solution, is the City expecting the SaaS based-PRR solution to use SharePoint as the repository? **Answer:** Not required. But as an fyi - we do use SP365.

33. For a hosted solution, does the City have a preferred CJIS-complaint cloud vendor?

**Answer:** Nope.

34. The City states that it does not charge for PRR; however, fee and staff time tracking is listed as a high priority. Does the City plan to start charging the public?

**Answer:** Legally we can't charge for our time. But we charge for hard copies and media. The tracking of time is used for gauging the amount of resource hours it takes to meet request (which can be a lot!) and helps us with resource planning.

35. Has the City seen any demos from vendors prior to releasing this solicitation?

**Answer:** Yes, we sought feedback of other local cities to see the solutions they were using and asked their vendors to provide demos.

36. What is the budget for this project? **Answer:** 10k annual budget, sustainment.

