



# Memorandum

To: Interested Parties/Prospective Proposers  
 From: Community Development Director, City of Brisbane  
 Subject: **Addendum 1, Request for Proposals for Land Management and Permitting System and Implementation Services**  
 Issue Date: April 24, 2023

---

The above-referenced Request for Proposals is modified, as follows:

**A. Responses to questions submitted by prospective proposer(s):**

No.	Question/City Response
<b>Question 1:</b>	<p>RFP Section A.3 on page 4 (General System Functionality) includes a summary table of functions and features desired by the City. Item h under “Across All Modules” includes a reference to “True API functionality with ALL companion CITY integrations/interfaces.”</p> <p>What is meant by this statement and what City integrations/interfaces does the City want to use the API with?</p>
<b>Response 1:</b>	<p><i>The desired functionality is the ability to have systems/applications communicate or share information between them via a specification or implementation steps. In the same table the City provided a list of existing applications under the Integration/Interfaces section.</i></p>
<b>Question 2:</b>	<p>RFP Section A.3 on page 4 (General System Functionality) includes a summary table of functions and features desired by the City. Item e under “Integration/Interfaces” includes a reference to “Digital Document Management (Versatile Pro Clou-based, Digital Reel, CDs).”</p> <p>Does the City currently have a document management system? If not, would the City consider a fully integrated content management system?</p>
<b>Response 2:</b>	<p><i>The City uses Municode Meetings as an electronic content management system (ECMS) for City committee, commission, and Council meeting content. However, the City does not have an ECMS for other city records. The City’s Technology Master Plan (2021) identifies procurement of an ECMS as a separate capital investment in near term fiscal years.</i></p> <p><i>The City requests that proposers address integrations and interfaces as outlined in this RFP, but proposers may state in their proposal whether they also offer content management services. The City may take that response into consideration when developing future RFPs for such an ECMS system.</i></p>
<b>Question 3:</b>	<p>Page 4: Integration/Interfaces  e. Digital Document Management (Versatile Pro Cloud-based, Digital Reel, CDs)</p>

No.	Question/City Response
	How many (number) of documents, Digital Reel, CD's need to be converted?
<b>Response 3:</b>	<i>The approximate number of documents to be converted is 4,907 records in Digital Reel (a single record may include a number of fiches) and 402 documents on Compact Discs (CDs). Additionally, the City desires to integrate 3,987 records in the GreenVue legacy system (a single record may include a number of files, including but not limited to PDFs, RTF, Excel, or Word documents) per Section 7.4 of "Proposal Content Items" (Section D.1.2 of the RFP).</i>
<b>Question 4:</b>	Can the City provide a list of permitting application types and subtypes in its legacy system that will be implemented in the new system?
<b>Response 4:</b>	<p><i>The list of building permitting application types and subtypes in the legacy system include the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Addition - SFD</i></li> <li><i>2. Addition with Remodel - SFD</i></li> <li><i>3. Attached ADU - SFD</i></li> <li><i>4. Bathroom/Kitchen Remodel</i></li> <li><i>5. Deck - SFD</i></li> <li><i>6. Demo - COMM</i></li> <li><i>7. Demo - SFD</i></li> <li><i>8. Detached ADU - SFD</i></li> <li><i>9. Electrical - SFD</i></li> <li><i>10. Fire Alarm - COMM</i></li> <li><i>11. Fixed Extinguishing System</i></li> <li><i>12. Furnace/Water Heater - SFD</i></li> <li><i>13. HVAC - COMM</i></li> <li><i>14. Misc - COMM</i></li> <li><i>15. Mixed Use</i></li> <li><i>16. New - COMM</i></li> <li><i>17. New - SFD</i></li> <li><i>18. New - Toll Brothers Landmark*</i></li> <li><i>19. Plumbing - SFD</i></li> <li><i>20. PW - Encroachment Permit</i></li> <li><i>21. PW - Encroachment Permit (Traffic)</i></li> <li><i>22. PW - Grading Permit</i></li> <li><i>23. Remodel/Alteration - SFD</i></li> <li><i>24. Retaining Wall</i></li> <li><i>25. Revision</i></li> <li><i>26. RFI - COMM</i></li> <li><i>27. Roof - COMM</i></li> <li><i>28. Roof - SFD</i></li> <li><i>29. SI - COMM</i></li> <li><i>30. Siding - SFD</i></li> <li><i>31. Solar - COMM</i></li> <li><i>32. Solar - SFD</i></li> <li><i>33. Sprinkler - COMM</i></li> <li><i>34. Sprinkler - SFD</i></li> <li><i>35. Storage Racks - COMM</i></li> </ol>

No.	Question/City Response
	<p>36. <i>Tenant Improvement - COMM</i></p> <p>37. <i>Termite - SFD</i></p> <p>38. <i>Windows – SFD</i></p> <p><i>* Indicates permit type that will not be brought forward into new system</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the City may create new building permit application subtypes based on consultation with the successful vendor to capture multi-family development types, which are currently processed as a combination of NEW-SFD and NEW-COMM subtypes. The City would be interested to discuss whether existing application types may be consolidated or organized differently based on the successful vendor’s system capabilities.</i></p> <p><i>The list of code enforcement types in the legacy system includes the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. CE (Code Enforcement)</i></li> </ol> <p><i>The list of planning permit subtypes in the legacy system includes the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit)</i></li> <li><i>2. AMP (Amplified Sound Registration)</i></li> <li><i>3. CC (Certificate of Compliance)</i></li> <li><i>4. DA (Development Agreement)</i></li> <li><i>5. DGA (Design Guidelines Amendment)</i></li> <li><i>6. DP (Design Permit)</i></li> <li><i>7. ER (Environmental Review)</i></li> <li><i>8. EX (Grading Review)</i></li> <li><i>9. FD (Fence Deviation)</i></li> <li><i>10. FPM (Final Parcel Map)</i></li> <li><i>11. FSM (Final Subdivision Map)</i></li> <li><i>12. GPA (General Plan Amendment)</i></li> <li><i>13. HCP (Habitat Conservation Plan Compliance)</i></li> <li><i>14. HE (Height Exception)</i></li> <li><i>15. LLA (Lot Line Adjustment or Merger)</i></li> <li><i>16. LS (Landscape Review)</i></li> <li><i>17. MM (Minor Modification)</i></li> <li><i>18. NE (Noise Exception)</i></li> <li><i>19. PC (Planning Commission Resolution)</i></li> <li><i>20. PCN (Public Convenience or Necessity)</i></li> <li><i>21. PD (Planned Development)</i></li> <li><i>22. PL (Plan Lines)</i></li> <li><i>23. PZ (Pre-Zone)</i></li> <li><i>24. RZ (Zoning Amendment)</i></li> <li><i>25. SE (Setback Exception)</i></li> <li><i>26. SP (Specific Plan)</i></li> <li><i>27. SR (Sign Review)</i></li> <li><i>28. STR (Short Term Rental)</i></li> <li><i>29. TC (Telecommunications)</i></li> <li><i>30. TPM (Tentative Parcel Map)</i></li> <li><i>31. TSM (Tentative Subdivision Map)</i></li> </ol>

No.	Question/City Response
	<p>32. TR (Tree Removal)  33. UP (Use Permit)  34. V (Variance)  35. VTM (Vesting Tentative Map)</p> <p><i>The list of desired engineering permits include the following (note these applications are currently processed manually):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grading</li> <li>2. Encroachment</li> <li>3. Encroachment (Traffic)</li> </ol> <p><i>Please note additional permit types may be developed by engineering in consultation with the successful vendor as the existing manual process is digitized through system implementation.</i></p>
<b>Question 5:</b>	Would the City consider a “train the trainer” approach or training its system users to configure the software?
<b>Response 5:</b>	<i>Yes, either approach would be considered. Proposers are encouraged to offer solutions that will provide the best ongoing value and efficiency to the City.</i>
<b>Question 6:</b>	<p>RFP Section A.3 on page 4 (General System Functionality) includes a summary table of functions and features desired by the City. Under the “General Requirements” heading, seven functional areas are listed, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Land Management</li> <li>b. Planning</li> <li>c. Engineering</li> <li>d. Plan Check/Building</li> <li>e. Inspection</li> <li>f. Code Enforcement</li> <li>g. Citizen Access</li> </ol> <p>Can the City provide the number of users per group?</p>
<b>Response 6:</b>	<p><i>The number of users per group will change as the City grows and hires additional staff. Currently, users by group are as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Land Management: 60 users (Note: This includes all current City employees and contractors who may need to access land management data associated with a specific address, with a buffer for planned/anticipated new hires in the next 5 years).</i></li> <li>b. <i>Planning: 10 users</i></li> <li>c. <i>Engineering: 10 users</i></li> <li>d. <i>Plan Check/Building: 60 users</i></li> <li>e. <i>Inspection: 30 users</i></li> <li>f. <i>Code Enforcement: 25 users</i></li> <li>g. <i>Citizen Access: Open access to members of the public</i></li> </ol>

**All other specifications, terms and conditions remain unchanged.**

**Attachments:**

None.

Cc: City Engineer