

**ADDENDUM #1:
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:
CRCOG Regional GIS Portal and Parcel Viewer**

Corrections:

The footers on the attachments for the RFP document have the wrong project name. Please assume that all pages of the original RFP document refer to this project. We will not be issuing a corrected version.

Questions / Answers: These questions are shown unedited and as submitted via email before the 2pm deadline on **November 27th, 2018.**

1. CRCOG released a new GIS and Parcel Viewer on 1/31/2017, authored by AppGEO, which has much of the functionality requested in the RFP. How does this procurement differ from the production AppGEO viewer? Is CRCOG's motivation to migrate to the Esri family of products?

Answer – CRCOG's procurement policy requires a competitive process to enter a new contract for products or services of this magnitude. CRCOG does wish to migrate to an ESRI platform but will evaluate all proposed solutions.

2. CRCOG states one of the options for deployment is a CRCOG-hosted ArcGIS Server deployment. Is there a also a CRCOG-hosted RDBMS (e.g. SQL Server, MySQL) deployment to support the project?

Answer – CRCOG will provide the basic database infrastructure – likely hosted in 3rd party datacenter.

3. Can CRCOG provide a sample digital tax map and a CAMA dataset for a member community?

Answer – CRCOG will not be providing sample data before the contract award. Feel free to view our existing site at - <http://mapgeo.com/crcogct/>.

4. Can CRCOG provide a listing of the CAMA systems used by the member communities?

Answer –

Municipality	CAMA System
Andover	Vision
Avon	Right Angles
Berlin	Vision
Bloomfield	Vision 6.5
Bolton	Vision
Canton	Equality
Columbia	Vision 6.5 (to Vision 8 next spring)
Coventry	Vision 6.5 (to Vision 8, 1/31/19)
East Granby	Vision 6.5
East Hartford	Vision
East Windsor	Quality Data
Ellington	Vision
Enfield	Vision
Farmington	Equality
Glastonbury	Vision
Granby	Vision
Hartford	Patriot Properties Assess Pro
Hebron	Equality
Manchester	Vision 6.5
Mansfield	Vision 8
Marlborough	Vision 6.5
Newington	Equality
New Britain	Vision
Plainville	Tyler Technologies
Rocky Hill	Tyler Technologies
Simsbury	Equality
Somers	Vision
Southington	Vision
South Windsor	Vision 6.5
Stafford	Vision 6.5
Suffield	Vision
Tolland	Vision 6.5 (to Vision 8 in 2020)
Vernon	Pro Val
West Hartford	Vision 6.5

Wethersfield	Vision
Willington	Vision 7
Windsor	Vision 6.5
Windsor Locks	Vision

5. Does compatibility with mobile devices include both tablet and phone?

Answer – Yes

6. Will the functionality of the mobile devices be limited to the viewing portion of the application?

Answer – Yes but all features of the desktop/browser version should be available in the mobile version.

7. Does the update of parcels to level II need to occur within the application, or can this occur in ArcGIS desktop and the portal can run a validation process?

Answer – Parcels updates may be done using ArcGIS Desktop or ArcGIS Pro software.

8. What types of CAMA systems are used by the municipalities? Customized reports from these systems may be required to load into a standardized format.

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 4.

9. From our perspective, your insurance requirements listed on page 8 may add additional costs to the project. Should our firm be considered, are you willing to negotiate these limits?

Answer – For this project you may substitute the following for the required insurance coverage:

a. General Liability Insurance, including Contractual Liability Insurance and Products/Completed Operations Insurance issued by an insurance company licensed to conduct business in the State of Connecticut with: limits not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence with an aggregate of \$2,000,000 All, if any, deductibles are the sole responsibility of the contractor to pay and/or indemnify.

b. Automobile Liability Insurance issued by an insurance company licensed to conduct business in the State of Connecticut with: limits not less than \$1,000,000 for all damages because of bodily injury sustained by each person as a result of any occurrence and \$1,000,000 aggregate per policy year; and limits of \$500,000 for all damages because of property damage sustained as the result of any one occurrence or \$1,000,000 Combined Single Limit (CSL). All, if any, deductibles are the sole responsibility of the contractor to pay and/or indemnify.

- c. Worker's Compensation Insurance in accordance with Connecticut State Statutes.
- d. Professional Liability Insurance with a minimum \$1,000,000 per occurrence and a \$1,000,000 aggregate.
- e. Any of the aforementioned policies written on a claims form shall have an extended reporting period not less than two years from the end of the project.

10. Who is responsible for maintenance of the application after delivery? Is the CRCOG looking to have an on-going annual support / maintenance agreement with the successful vendor for on-going site configuration, modification and maintenance?

Answer – CRCOG is expecting that support for maintenance, modification and configuration will be part of a final agreement with the selected vendor.

11. Are all 38 municipalities in the Capitol Region participating from the initial launch of this implementation?

Answer – Yes. All 38 municipalities will be part of the deployment, although the level of GIS capability and therefore reliance on the system will vary widely.

12. What CAMA systems are in use by each participating municipality?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 4.

13. Is the CRCOG currently maintaining a regional parcel composite (all community's parcels in one feature class) with linked CAMA data?

Answer – Yes

14. Should we implement our workflow or follow CRCOG's workflow?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 15.

15. Does CRCOG currently has any workflow to collect and consolidate the data from all the cities/Towns that come under CRCOG?

Answer – Currently the workflow for collecting, consolidating and standardizing the parcel and CAMA data for our member municipalities is time consuming, labor intensive and not automated. We are looking for an automated and consistent solution.

16. Does all the entities in CRCOG has data meeting Level II standards?

Answer – All CRCOG Municipalities were brought to Level II in 2014. The current status is unknown.

17. Can we assume that updates will come from entities after performing proper QC meeting the required standards and the portal has to have a function to pull/push the data as required and perform the updates?

Answer – We expect that approximately 50% of the member municipalities may require some manipulation. This should be part of the cost proposal.

18. The Scope of Work includes “Update of Parcels in adherence to (at a minimum) the Level II CT Cadastral Data Standard”.

- a. Does this refer to *editing* parcel data to bring it up to date, or does this imply that current data exists and simply needs to be *refreshed* on the portal?

Answer – See the answer to Question 17.

- b. How many member communities will require parcel updates? Which communities, specifically?

Answer – Unknown at this time.

- c. How frequently will they each need updating, and approximately how many parcels require updating from each community, each year?

Answer – Unknown at this time.

- d. Which communities are no longer compliant, and would require migration to the Standard?

Answer – Unknown at this time.

19. Is there an anticipated budget for this project?

Answer – CRCOG has funding available for this project, but did not set a specific budget because CRCOG wanted to understand the potential costs and options.

20. Approach 1 includes the task, “Provide data update services on a mutually agreed upon schedule” however, Approach 2 does not. Please clarify.

Answer – Both Approaches should include the initial update to the CT Level II Parcel Standard. Please include pricing for parcel line updates for both approaches as an option. CAMA updates should be automated and, ideally, daily or as frequently as desired by the individual municipality.

21. Could CRCOG provide a list of all the member municipalities and which CAMA Vendor, Software and version they are using (or will be using at the time of this project)?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 4.

22. Section C. Proposal Format: - does CRCOG require that the proposal to be organized according to the 14 items listed in this section of the RFP? Or is there flexibility in how the proposal document is structured as long as it contains all of this required information?

Answer – We would prefer that your proposal be organized in the order specified.

23. The RFP states that “a CRCOG hosted solution is preferred if it is deemed feasible”. Does CRCOG intend to host on premises? In the cloud? If on premises, what’s the infrastructure?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 2.

24. Is DBE/WBE/SBE participation mandatory? What level of participation is required? How much weight is given to DBE/WBE/SBE participation in the proposal evaluation?

Answer – DBE/WBE/SBE participation is not required. The weight given to this will be determined prior to opening the proposals but will not be published prior to submittal.

25. Does CRCOG have an Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with Esri?

Answer – CRCOG does not have an ELA with ESRI. We have only desktop licenses.

26. For the second bullet under the Scope of Work, are actual parcel updates occurring at the municipal level and this system will be to accommodate those updates or will the contractor be responsible for making the parcel-level updates for member municipalities?

Answer – CRCOG municipal GIS capabilities vary widely. Many perform their own updates and we would need them to be updated on the system while others will require consultant assistance. We would like pricing for both scenarios.

27. What CAMA systems are being used by member municipalities?

Answer – Please see the answers to Question 4.

28. It appears there is language left over from a previous project in attachments B, C and D (a different RFP name). Should we just assume it is understood to be the current project name and submit as is, or will you provide updated copies?

Answer – Yes, that was an oversight. Please assume that all attachments refer to this project. We will not be providing an updated document at this point.

29. Is there a DBE/MBE/WBE/SBE requirement for this RFP?

Answer – Please see Question 24.

a. If required, can you state the participation goal for each or all categories?

Answer – Not required.

b. If required, can the requirement be met by out-of-state certifications?

Answer – Not required.

30. For the 'vendor hosted solution' option, will CRCOG contract with the physical hosting company (AWS or similar) with the successful bidder acting as CRCOG's agent to manage that hosted site?

Answer – In the case of a vendor hosted solution the vendor would be responsible for the hosting infrastructure. Data would be required to be hosted within the continental U.S.

31. Our Commercial General Liability policy is for \$1M Each Occurance, \$2M General Aggregate, and a \$4M Umbrella policy. Will this comply with your requirements?

Answer –Please see the answer to Question 9.

32. Is it expected that parcel spatial and attribute data will be created and updated within this new portal/viewer, or will that work happen outside of it?

Answer – We expect that editing and updating of spatial data will be performed outside the system. Attribute (CAMA) update will be via a live link.

33. Will mobile devices be used strictly for viewing data?

Answer – Yes

34. When does CRCOG expect to notify the winning vendor?

Answer – This is yet to be determined. Proposals are due on December 17, 2018 at 1pm. It is expected the process will be complete and the selected vendor notified before the end January.

35. Are the property cards in digital format? If so, what is the file format? If not, do they need to be scanned and indexed?

Answer – The answers to these questions vary widely depending on the municipality. Most towns do have property cards in a digital format. Scanning and indexing of property cards will be a separate cost that towns may or may not choose to do individually if desired.

36. At what cadastral and parcel data standard level are the municipalities in the CRCOG? If possible, please provide the number of parcels per municipality?

Answer – All CRCOG Municipalities were brought to Level II in 2014. The current status is unknown.

Municipality	Parcel Count
Andover	1,707
Avon	7,800
Berlin	8,975
Bloomfield	7,318
Bolton	2,366
Canton	3,967
Columbia	2,607
Coventry	6,567
East Granby	2,653
East Hartford	14,259
East Windsor	4,956

Ellington	6,084
Enfield	14,296
Farmington	11,222
Glastonbury	15,124
Granby	5,142
Hartford	19,176
Hebron	3,997
Manchester	16,204
Mansfield	4,620
Marlborough	2,702
New Britain	15,744
Newington	9,907
Plainville	7,585
Rocky Hill	4,923
Simsbury	8,364
Somers	3,866
South Windsor	11,129
Southington	18,374
Stafford	5,384
Suffield	5,606
Tolland	6,537
Vernon	10,061
West Hartford	19,952
Wethersfield	9,960
Willington	2,458
Windsor	12,153
Windsor Locks	4,382
Total	318,127

37. How many municipalities does CRCOG provide parcel editing for?

Answer – CRCOG has provided parcel editing for 1 town in the past.

38. How do you currently handle redacted information (Judge, Police, etc.)? If parcel information is redacted, what is the desired display when a parcel is identified?

Answer – This is handled at the municipal level before transferring to CRCOG.

39. How many different CAMA vendors are used in CRCOG? Are there existing export processes in place for all of them?

Answer – See answers to Questions 4 and 15.

40. What is the expectation of the abutter functionality? Are you referring to a buffer of a selected parcel/parcels?

Answer – Parcels within a specified (buffered) distance from a parcel are selected, address lists and mailing labels can then be generated. Please review the existing process by visiting our current site and clicking the ‘Abutters’ tool. We wish to improve this functionality such as the ability to select which fields populate the labels or Excel lists.

41. What is your expectation for the parcel search capability? Do you expect the user to be able to perform a wild card search? Will the search require multiple criteria (AND/OR) or will the search be limited to one field?

Answer – We are looking for the ability to search by multiple criteria. Wild card searching would be up for discussion with the selected vendor.

42. On page 10 of the RFP, “overlay of additional data layers and/or map services” is stated as a requirement. How many of these layers are available as map services? Do they cover the entire CRCOG area or would each have to be compiled from different sources?

Answer – All of the additional layers will be available as static data or as a map service. The selected vendor is not expected to compile these datasets. However, we wish to have the ability to change or add layers and map services.

43. Will all the Basemap options be available as map services (Street, Ortho 2012-2016, CRCOG 2009)?

Answer – The street basemap source will be determined with the selected vendor. State and CRCOG imagery datasets are available via map service from CTECO.

44. How many different CAMA schemas are we planning to integrate with our update task?

Answer – It is likely that even municipalities with the same CAMA vendor do not have the same CAMA schema.

45. Please provide some background on the need for migrating to a new regional parcel viewer and what features are not available in the AppGeo solution currently utilized by CRCOG?

Answer – Per CRCOG’s purchasing guidelines we are required to evaluate current technologies through a competitive process in order to enter a new contract for products and/or services.

46. Are there any existing data update processes, for CAMA and/or parcels, that are already in place with any of your members? If so, can you provide details on those processes?

Answer – See answers to Questions 4 and 15.

47. Is there an expectation that there will ongoing maintenance for the solution that is implemented?

Answer – Yes, See answer to Question 10.

48. Can you provide additional details on the GIS and CAMA data solutions that are currently used by your members?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 4. You can assume that municipalities that have GIS capabilities use ESRI software or have the ability to use and export ESRI formats.

49. How does the Level II CT Cadastral Data Standard apply to this project? Are parcels simply being replaced from existing GIS data as part of the automated process or is actual data creation and/or remediation an expectation?

Answer – We wish to promote parcel standardization across municipalities. See answer to Question 17.

50. Does CRCOG have an estimate on the number of parcel edits by town required to update the regional parcel layer?

Answer – No

51. How will parcel updates be provided to the selected vendor? Will we be responsible for gathering all of the data necessary from each municipality?

Answer – The number of parcel updates is unknown. The selected vendor will be responsible for collecting the data for the initial update.

52. How many different CAMA systems are within the CRCOG Region and can CRCOG provide a list of what is used by each town?

Answer – Please see the answer to Question 4.

53. Has the link been maintained that was developed between the GIS parcel layer and the CAMA systems for each town?

Answer – There are unique linking fields between existing CAMA and parcels. Currently no live link to municipal CAMA systems

54. Attachment A (Purpose) specifies that the GIS Portal and Parcel Viewer should be “compatible with mobile devices”. Can CRCOG expand on the level of compatibility desired?

Answer – See answers to Questions 5 and 6.

55. Regarding Project Approach 1 on page 11, does CRCOG already own an ArcGIS Enterprise license?

Answer – See answer to Question 25.

a. If so, is software currently deployed and what version (e.g., 10.5.1)?

Answer – ArcGIS 10.5, ArcGIS Pro is currently being deployed.

b. If so, is the Esri software maintenance up-to-date/current?

Answer – Yes.

56. Regarding municipal training, approximately how many municipalities (and end users) does CRCOG expect the selected vendor to train?

Answer – This is yet to be determined, minimum 4-6 CRCOG staff.

57. Are all municipal training sessions expected to be on-site, instructor-led sessions? Or is remote, web-based (e.g., webinar) training acceptable?

Answer – Some advanced training of CRCOG GIS staff will likely need to be onsite. Remote or web-based is acceptable for end user training.

58. Attachments B-D appear to have the incorrect RFP title (*Spring 2016 Statewide GIS Data Acquisition and Services RFP*). Is this correct, or should this be modified prior to submitting?

Answer – See answer to Question 28.

ADDENDUM #1 CROCOG Regional GIS Portal and Parcel Viewer

Please note that all terms and conditions appearing in the original Request for Proposals remain unchanged.

Respondents are asked to sign, date, and return this sheet (not the entire addendum), along with their response package, in order to verify their receipt of this addendum prior to the specified submission deadline. Please fill out all sections below in order to ensure that your response is considered complete.

Name _____

Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

(City) (State) (Zip)

Telephone _____

Signature _____ Date _____