

RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System  
Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011

| Questions  | Answers  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
|--|--|------------------|----|--------------|-----|-------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------|--|--------------|-------|----------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|
| RFP  |  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Could you provide a definition of the term 'PROPOSER'?   | A PROPOSER refers to either the prime consultant or joint venture partners.  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Given your encouragement of LBEs participating, can we assume that if an LBE responds to the effort as a Prime, the overall team's experience and qualifications will be used in the evaluation of the Minimum Qualifications rather than just the Prime's alone?  | The City strongly encourages response packages from qualified local business enterprises (LBEs). However, when determining whether a response package has satisfied the RFP's minimum qualifications only the PROPOSER's (e.g. prime consultant's or joint venture partners') experience and qualifications will be used in the evaluation process.  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| On page 19 (Section IV E), it states The PROPOSER submitting the lowest comparable price will receive the maximum total number of assigned points (10). The other proposals will then be scored by dividing the amount of their price by the lowest price and then multiplying the result by the total number of points assigned to the price evaluation criteria (10 points). ' Did you mean to say '...by dividing the lowest price by the amount of their price and then multiplying the result by the total number of points assigned to the price evaluation criteria (10 points) ? | <p>The PROPOSER submitting the lowest comparable price will receive the maximum total number of assigned points (10). The other proposals will then be scored by dividing the lowest price by the amount of their price and then multiplying the result by the maximum possible points assigned to the price evaluation criteria. For example:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Maximum points =</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 1 =</td><td>\$5</td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 2=</td><td>\$8</td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 3 =</td><td>\$9</td></tr> <tr> <td>Points</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 1 =</td><td>10.00</td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 2 = (\$5/\$8)X10=</td><td>6.25</td></tr> <tr> <td>Proposer 3= (\$5/\$9)X 10=</td><td>5.56</td></tr> </table> | Maximum points = | 10 | Proposer 1 = | \$5 | Proposer 2= | \$8 | Proposer 3 = | \$9 | Points |  | Proposer 1 = | 10.00 | Proposer 2 = (\$5/\$8)X10= | 6.25 | Proposer 3= (\$5/\$9)X 10= | 5.56 |
| Maximum points =   | 10   |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 1 =   | \$5  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 2=  | \$8  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 3 =   | \$9  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Points   |  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 1 =   | 10.00  |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 2 = (\$5/\$8)X10=   | 6.25   |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |
| Proposer 3= (\$5/\$9)X 10=   | 5.56   |                  |    |              |     |             |     |              |     |        |  |              |       |                            |      |                            |      |

**RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System**  
**Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011**

| <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>The first Q&amp;A provided at the Pre-Proposal Conference states:</p> <p>“The successful Proposer will be required to enter into a contract substantially in the form of the P-500, P-450, and P-540 attached to the RFP.”</p> <p>There does not appear to be a P-450 agreement attached to the RFP. Please confirm P-450 actually refers to P-545 (RFP Attachment H – Software License Agreement).</p> | <p>There are 3 contract forms :</p> <p>Professional Services Agreement (P 500) – The successful PROPOSER will need to execute this agreement<br/> <a href="http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=694">http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=694</a></p> <p>Software License Agreement (P-545) - The successful PROPOSER may be required to enter into a Software License.<br/> <a href="http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=691">http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=691</a></p> <p>Software Maintenance (P-540) - The successful PROPOSER may be required into Software Maintenance Agreements (Attachment I).<br/> <a href="http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=692">http://www.sfdbi.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=692</a></p> |
| <p>If vendors want to propose optional elements that do not fit into the pre-populated macros in the required RFP Attachments, how/where should those items be provided?</p>   | <p>They should be provided in the binders adjacent to the response to which they are related with clear labeling as to which section in Attachment A they refer to.</p>  |
| <p>The previous RFP has information not include in the current RFP, should we take information from the previous RFP into consideration in our response?</p>   | <p>PROPOSERS should only respond to this RFP and no information from the previous RFP should be considered.</p>  |

RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System  
Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011

| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
| <p>Please confirm the following response structure satisfies the submission requirements described on RFP page 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original Binder – Proposal Summary (Att. A) and Func/Tech Reqs (Att. B)</li> <li>• 1 unbound – Proposal Summary (Att. A) and Func/Tech Reqs (Att. B)</li> <li>• 1 CD (Word or Adobe) – Proposal Summary (Att. A) and Func/Tech Reqs (Att. B)</li> <li>• 1 Original Binder separately sealed – Pricing Template (Att. C) and Hosted/ASP Option (Att. D)</li> <li>• HRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 CDs sealed together (Word or Adobe) – Att. E-1, E-2, E-3 HRC Forms</li> <li>• 1 Original Binder and 1 binder copy sealed together – Att. E-4 HRC Form</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 1 Original Binder and 1 binder copy sealed together – Att. F-1, F-2, F-3, F-4, F-5</li> </ul> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The CD need to include all the</p> <p>This does not have to be a binder however it needs to be in a separate, sealed envelope</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> |

**RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System**  
**Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011**

| <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>  |
|--|---|
| Was an outside firm used to research and complete the Action Plan Study in 2008? If so, can you share the name of the firm or consultant?  | A study was done by the Matrix Group. Based on the recommendations an Action Plan was developed.  |
| Was an outside firm used to conduct the Business Process Reengineering review in late 2007? If so, what was the name of the firm or consultant?  | No outside agency was used to conduct the DBI Business Process Reengineering review. There was a steering committee comprised of key decision makers from the Mayor's Office, city departments, and stakeholders from the public. Four subcommittees were formed: Plan Review and Permit; issuance; Inspections; Automation, and Performance Measures. Each subcommittee included staff representing city Departments involved in the review and inspection of developments, city union representatives and representative from industry, community organizations and individual customers. |
| What is the overall budget for the project, and will the project be considered a top 10 project for 2011/2012 for COIT?  | At this time, the City will not be addressing the budget as we are just beginning the budget process. The City is looking for proposals that will meet the requirements as outlined in the RFP in an efficient and effective way.   |
| Does the CCSF have a preferred integration platform?   | No  |
| Does CCSF require conversion of inactive Building and Planning historical data for permits, inspections, fees, payment transactions, and other information?  | Yes   |
| What are CCSF requirements for accessing the proposed solution using mobile devices (including the # of mobile devices to be connected)?   | This is undetermined at this time.  |
| Does CCSF have a SAN or NAS storage facility in the data center (or any details about the type/capacity/features of the facility)? If so, could the device be leveraged for this project to minimize cost? | CCSF has a SAN however no storage device may be leveraged for this RFP.   |

RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System  
Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
| How many Building application types does the CCSF have?  | <p>Building Permit Application Types</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1      Type 1,2,3,4 Structure (New)</li> <li>2      Multi-Story type 5 Building (New), Wood Frame</li> <li>3      Additions Alterations or Repairs</li> <li>4      Erect Sign</li> <li>5      Quarrying, Grading, Excavation, Filling</li> <li>6      Demolition</li> <li>7      Wall Sign</li> <li>8      Additions, Alterations or Repairs-"I" Occupancy with no Plans</li> </ol> <p>However there are other permit types such as Plumbing, Mechanical and Electrical Permits</p> |
| Does CCSF have a virtualized infrastructure? If not, is Microsoft preferred for future virtual environments?   | The City does not have a virtualized infrastructure at this time. It is undetermined as to whether or not Microsoft will be used.   |
| Item number 47 states "System shall provide authorized users with the ability for application filing, permit issuance and renewals on-line with electronic plan submittals." Please clarify whether the Authorized User is to be a CCSF employee or a citizen (or both). | The item refers to citizen access.  |

RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System  
Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011

| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
| <b>Attachment A Proposal Summary Template</b>   |   |
| <p>The A Proposal Summary Template 1 14 11 document cannot be modified to include the Executive Summary and other sections requested. The cursor jumps directly to Past Project Description #1, Agency Name: Is it acceptable to CCSF to duplicate the Attachment A – Proposal Summary Template and insert the required sections where they are required?</p> | <p>The Letter of introduction should include the executive summary and certifications in one document on the vendor's letter head under the signature of the person designated by the firm to obligate the firm to perform the commitments contained in the proposal.</p>     |
| <p>Please confirm vendors should provide the Executive Summary in a new Word document separate from Attachment A – Proposal Summary Template</p>  | <p>Yes, the Letter of Introduction should include the executive summary and certifications in one document on the vendor's letter head under the signature of the person designated by the firm to obligate the firm to perform the commitments contained in the proposal</p> |
| <p>The Attachment A Proposal Summary Template shows a section I. Letter of Introduction followed by sections A. Executive Summary and B. Certifications. These are immediately followed by section IV. Information Requirements. Are there sections II. and III. that were not included from the template?</p>  | <p>We will be issuing an Addendum on this topic to clarify that Section IV should be renumbered to Section II.</p>  |
| <p>Requirement B.1.b on page 9 of the Proposal Summary Template asks for vendors to provide a proposed organization chart of the project team. The password-protected Word template does not allow formatting of any kind (including inserting graphics). Please advise on how vendors can insert their proposed organization chart into Attachment A.</p>    | <p>The Organization charts should not be pasted into Attachment A as these charts are often not uniform in size. The chart should be inserted into the binder behind Attachment A and clearly identified.</p>   |

RFP- Permit and Project Tracking System  
Questions and Answers as of February 3, 2011

| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
| The version of Attachment A – Proposal Summary Template that we downloaded appears to be missing sections II and III, is that correct version we should be utilizing? | We will be issuing an Addendum on this topic to clarify that Section IV should be renumbered to Section II. |