



## DIVISION OF FINANCE – PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

100 N. Broadway St, Suite 610 Wichita, KS 67202 • Phone (316) 660-7255 • Fax (316) 660-1839

[PURCHASING@SEDGWICK.GOV](mailto:PURCHASING@SEDGWICK.GOV) • [SEDGWICKCOUNTY.ORG](http://SEDGWICKCOUNTY.ORG)

### ADDENDUM #2

#### RFP #25-0057

#### PERMITTING, LICENSING, AND CODE ENFORCEMENT SOLUTION FOR MABCD AND MAPD

August 29, 2025

The following is to ensure that vendors have complete information prior to submitting a ***Request for Proposal***. Here are some clarifications regarding Permitting, Licensing, and Code Enforcement Solution for MABCD and MAPD.

Questions and/or statements of clarification are in **bold** font and answers to specific questions are *italicized*.

The timeline for RFP #25-0057 has been revised.

The following dates are provided for information purposes and are subject to change without notice. Contact the Purchasing Department at (316) 660-7255 to confirm any and all dates.

**Distribution of Request for Proposal to interested parties July 23, 2025.**

**Questions and Clarifications submitted via email by 5:00 pm CDT August 12, 2025**

**Addendum Issued by 5:00 pm CDT August 29, 2025**

**Proposal due before 1:45 pm CDT September 16, 2025**

**Evaluation Period September 16, 2025 - November 4, 2025**

**Board of Bids and Contracts Recommendation November 27, 2025**

**Board of County Commission Award December 3, 2025**

1. **To support migration planning for Andover's Accela data, can you provide a general overview of:**
  - a. **The version of Accela currently in use**  
*Accela Production 25.4.1.*
  - b. **The expected scope of data to be migrated (e.g., amount of active vs. historical)**  
*There will be a point-in-time cutoff prior to the implementation of any new software at which point Andover will be entering their own permit information into MABCD's current system – it's anticipated that only active permits will need to be imported into the new system. Andover will be responsible for managing their own historical data.*
2. **Any known limitations or restrictions that could affect access, export, or data sharing?**  
*None known at this time.*

3. **To support migration planning from the current Hansen system, can you provide a general overview of:  
The version of Hansen (Infor Public Sector) currently in use**

*2022.10 revision: 2210*

**Whether the system supports standard data export, or if custom extraction will be required?**

*Data is easily exportable and the only customization that may be required is to match fields. This can be confirmed and reviewed with the selected vendor before contracting.*

4. **Any known data quality issues or technical constraints that could affect migration?**

*There are no known technical constraints that would affect migration.*

5. **What are typical daily transaction volumes for permit applications, status updates, and other system operations?**

*In general, MABCD averages just over 100 permit transactions per day.*

6. **What are the seasonal peak periods and capacity needs for the permit system?**

*Generally, February - November for permitting depending upon weather conditions. Permitting capacity needs would be determined by weather events, area growth.*

7. **To support GIS integration planning, can you provide a general overview of your current GIS system?**

- a. **What platform is in use (e.g., ArcGIS Enterprise, ArcGIS Online, or other)?**

*10.9.1 due to "Provider" restrictions*

- b. **Is it hosted on-premises or in the cloud?**

*On-premises*

- c. **Are any major upgrades or migrations planned in the next 1–2 years?**

*Upgrade from ArcGIS Enterprise 10.9 to 11.x (to be determined later)*

8. **To help define spatial data requirements for the permitting system, can you clarify:**

- a. **What GIS data layers are most critical to MABCD and MAPD workflows (e.g., zoning, floodplain, parcels)?**

*Address Points and parcels (we provide many others, but a final critical list should probably come from MABCD)*

- b. **Are there any third-party or proprietary data sources that require special access or licensing?**

*Not on the GIS side to support this new permitting software.*

- c. **What types of spatial functions are expected—basic map viewing, spatial queries, or more advanced analysis?**

*There are existing spatial query functions with Hansen that MABCD staff use. Outside of the simple map, needed analysis or queries should probably come from MABCD. Dataminer looks at City Limits and MapQuarterNumber.*

9. **To help avoid duplicate licensing and ensure compatibility, can you clarify the county's current ArcGIS licensing model?**

*Like other ESRI shops, Sedgwick County will be moving from concurrent desktop licenses to username licenses for GIS staff through Enterprise/Portal later this year. We do not have an enterprise agreement, so any MABCD or MAPD staff needing an ESRI license should be built into a potential contract. GIS Department support licenses should be covered.....any outside user licenses are not.*

- a. **Are existing licenses available to support integration with the new permitting system, or should vendors plan to include separate licensing?**

*See previous notes.*

**10. What GIS capabilities would be most critical for mobile and field users?**

**a. Are there specific workflows using GIS that are important to mobile and field users?**

*There are none to highlight at this time. We are open to suggestions and input.*

**11. To plan Esri service integration, can you specify what services are needed for the application (e.g., geocoding, routing, spatial analysis, map services)? Please include expected volume, performance expectations, address/coordinate formats, and any existing service agreements."**

**a. Coordinate format is NAD 1983 StatePlane Kansas South FIPS 1502 (US Feet) WKID 3420**

**b. Currently providing 39 Service Layers and 9 basemaps**

**c. Dataminer uses 2-4 services.**

**d. Data prep scripts and caching layers scripts take roughly about an hour each week.**

**e. Sync process on average 250 parcels and 150 addresses per week roughly taking 15-30 minutes per week.**

**12. What is the required frequency for GIS data synchronization - real-time, daily, weekly?**

*Weekly*

**13. To ensure seamless integration with MSB for payment processing, can you clarify the following:**

**a. What integration method is currently in use with MSB (e.g., hosted interface, API, or custom integration)?**

*Dynamic portal currently uses the MSB payment provider website where customers can pay either by Credit/Debit card or eCheck.*

**b. Are EMV terminals used for in-person payments, and if so, are they integrated with MSB?**

*Yes, the credit card machines are integrated with MSB.*

**c. What payment types are processed (e.g., credit card, ACH), and what are the approximate monthly or annual transaction volumes?**

*In-office: Credit/Debit cards; On MABCD Portal: Credit/Debit card, eCheck, and ACH.*

*In 2024 27,000 transactions were processed in office and on the portal.*

**14. To support integration with MUNIS for payment processing, can you clarify the following:**

*The system will not integrate with MUNIS. This is a change since the original RFP.*

**15. Regarding ATPro by Tyler Technologies:**

**a. What version is currently in use by the Appraiser's Office?**

*2025.1.10*

**b. How is permit data currently shared with ATPro—via manual entry, batch import, or automated integration?**

*Manual entry*

**c. Are there existing specifications or guidelines available for integrating with ATPro?**

*Would need to work with the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) and/or Tyler Technologies.*

**16. Regarding the various Tyler Technologies products mentioned (MUNIS, ATPro):**

**a. Do you have existing agreements or technical contacts with Tyler that could facilitate integrations?**

*Would need to work with the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) and/or Tyler Technologies.*

**b. Are there any planned upgrades to these systems that could impact integration requirements?**

*There will likely be patches between now and go live.*

- 17. To support integration with SAP S/4HANA, can you provide additional detail on the expected integration approach?**
- What version of SAP S/4HANA is currently in use?**  
*SAP S/4HANA Cloud, Private Edition is in the process of being implemented. Once implementation is completed in November 2025, a final version can be provided.*
  - What type of integration is required (e.g., Remote Function Call [RFC], APIs, file transfer)?**  
*RFC*
  - What data or transactions need to be exchanged between the permit system and SAP (e.g., payments, account updates, reporting)?**  
*JEV and Payment Advice for a summary of daily transactions*
- 18. To support financial integration planning, can you clarify the County's core financial and ERP systems?**
- What system(s) are currently used for financial management and accounting (e.g., ERP, general ledger, fee processing)?**  
*We expect to be live on the SAP S/4Hana Private Cloud and Ariba Buying with 3M spend come November 3, 2025.*
  - What integration capabilities are available (e.g., APIs, file exchange)?**  
*We have all integration capabilities available with SAP Integration Suite (API, RFC, etc.).*
  - Are there any key financial workflows, reporting requirements, or synchronization expectations that the new permitting system must support?**  
*The product should allow read only access to the system database or replicated database to facilitate ability to bring data into SAP Business Intelligence for ERP. In addition, preference would also be to have access to the systems data dictionary but may not be required.*
- 19. To support integration with OnBase and ensure document compatibility, can you clarify the following:**
- What version of OnBase is currently in use?**  
*22.1.25.1000*
  - What types of documents are stored in OnBase (e.g., plans, permits, photos, correspondence)?**

MABCD Documents	Neighborhood Inspection Documents
Approved Subdivisions	Abatements
Building Applications	Invoices
Case Applications	Legals
Emergency	Mail Sent
Microfilm	Mail Unclaimed
Plan Review	Misc
Plat Map	Notices
Service Requests	Photos
Structural Disaster Assessments	UCCs
Trade Licenses	Work Orders
Use Permit Applications	

*MABCD also has several automated import processes that can be reviewed further with the selected vendor.*
  - Is OnBase also used for workflow automation or case management?**  
*None other than automated imports.*
  - What integration methods are available (e.g., APIs, web services)?**  
*APIs, Web services, and secure web-based access for processes, forms, and content*

**20. Regarding Laserfiche used by the City of Wichita for MAPD and GIS:**

**a. What version is currently in use?**

*Laserfiche Version 10.4 (10.4.2.256)*

**b. What types of MAPD case documents are stored (e.g., staff reports, maps, graphics)?**

*Staff Reports (which include maps images), public notification documents, application packets, follow up letters, site photos, approved ordinance and drawings (site plans, Community Unit Plans and Planned unit Development.*

**c. How is public access currently provided to these documents?**

*Planning case documents uploaded to Laserfiche is viewable in two (2) ways; the city GIS Viewer where the public can search the case number in the Zoning Case layer or by clicking onto the map. There's an external link that takes them to the City Web Docs to get to the PDF. Second way to get to those documents is the go directly to the City Web Docs website.*

**d. What integration options (e.g., APIs or web services) are available for interfacing with Laserfiche?**

*GIS Viewer and City Web Docs*

**21. Regarding integration with Aumentum for property and legal data:**

**a. What version of Aumentum is currently in use by Sedgwick County?**

*8.6.10*

**b. How is property data (e.g., owner, address, parcel info) currently retrieved and loaded into code enforcement cases?**

*Parcel information is automatically filled whenever an address is entered; this information pulls from map numbers associated with the address in GIS. Property ownership information is manually entered by a Neighborhood Inspector.*

**c. Is this integration triggered at case creation, or are there other workflows that initiate it?**

*The information is entered both automatically and manually.*

**d. What integration methods are available (e.g., APIs, database access, file transfer)?**

*See previous answer.*

**22. Regarding IVR (Integrated Voice Response) functionality:**

**a. Does the county currently have IVR infrastructure that the new system should integrate with, or is a new IVR solution expected?**

*The county has a current IVR solution, Selectron; It is preferred that the new solution have an integrated solution; we are open to options.*

**b. What IVR platform or provider is currently used?**

*Selectron*

**c. Which IVR features are most critical (e.g., inspection scheduling, result reporting, status updates)?**

*All equally important.*

**23. Are there any existing integration specifications or documentation that can be shared with vendors?**

*Any documentation and specifications can be provided once a vendor is selected.*

**24. Are there any other third-party systems, databases, or applications not mentioned in this RFP that the new permitting system may need to interface with?**

*No.*

**25. To support authentication integration and user management planning:**

**a. Is the county currently using Azure Active Directory, SAML, or any other centralized authentication system?**

*We have users synced to Entra but we can also support SAML (SecureAuth).*

**b. Are there any specific authentication or user directory integration requirements that the new system must support?**

*We do not have any requirements but use Active Directory/Entra.*

- 26. To help plan for multi-jurisdictional support, can you clarify the following:**
- a. How many additional jurisdictions are expected to be added over the next 5–10 years?**  
*Not known at this time.*
  - b. What is driving the increasing support for agencies outside Sedgwick County?**  
*Question not relevant to this RFP.*
  - c. Will jurisdictions require separate system instances, or shared access with jurisdiction-specific configurations (e.g., fees, workflows)?**  
*Refer to RFP for answer. Specific section reference: Support of Multiple and Neighboring Jurisdictions.*
  - d. Are there significant business process or workflow differences between jurisdictions?**  
*None known at this time.*
- 27. Will user account and permission management be centralized under Sedgwick County IT, or managed independently by each jurisdiction?**  
*Sedgwick County IT and MABCD staff*
- 28. Do you have existing Azure Enterprise Agreements or other Microsoft licensing that vendors should be aware of?**  
*There is one held by our development team.*
- 29. Are there any specific hosting requirements or preferences for the cloud infrastructure beyond using Microsoft Azure?**  
*No.*
- 30. To support mobile system design for field operations, can you clarify the following:**
- a. What types of mobile devices are currently in use or supported (e.g., tablets, smartphones)?**  
*Tablets, smartphones, laptops*
  - b. Is offline functionality required in areas with limited connectivity?**  
*Possibly.*
  - c. What mobile functions are highest priority (e.g., inspection logging, photo capture, real-time updates)?**
    - i. For Building/Construction Inspection: logging inspection results, real-time updates on permits, licenses, inspections*
    - ii. For Neighborhood Inspection: logging inspection results from field; uploading photos (multiple) from field; printing from field; accessing ownership and contact information quickly from field*
  - d. Are there any mobile device policies or security requirements vendors should be aware of?**  
*We don't allow personal mobile devices to connect to internal networks/resources directly. If there is a public facing app (that filters through DMZ/WAF), those can be accessed with personal devices via internet. We also install CrowdStrike on all systems and join servers to our Windows domain for management/GPO, etc.*
- 31. What are the accessibility requirements for the public portal, and how will user feedback be incorporated into the design process?**  
*ADA's requirements apply to all the services, programs, or activities of state and local governments, including those offered on the web.*  
<https://www.ada.gov/law-and-regs/regulations/title-ii-2010-regulations/#-35200-requirements-for-web-and-mobile-accessibility#subpart10>  
*"Beginning April 24, 2026, a public entity, other than a special district government, with a total population of 50,000 or more shall ensure that the web content and mobile apps that the public entity provides or makes available, directly or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, comply with Level A and Level AA success criteria and conformance requirements specified in WCAG 2.1, unless the public entity can demonstrate that compliance with this section would result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a service, program, or activity or in undue financial and administrative burdens."*  
*Compliance with WCAG 2.1 would be required.*

**32. Does the county prefer a fully integrated plan review module, or integration with an existing or third-party plan review platform?**

*Fully integrated*

**33. If integration is preferred, what plan review software is currently in use or under consideration?**

*ProjectDox is currently used.*

**34. To support plan review functionality:**

**a. How many concurrent plan reviewers are expected to use the system?**

*7*

**b. What are the typical file formats and approximate file sizes handled during plan review (e.g., PDFs, CAD drawings)?**

*Word (specifications), a JIP, a PDF, or CAD Drawings*

**35. Regarding MABCD performance metrics:**

**a. How is the “one-day” residential permit issuance target measured and tracked?**

*Completed applications issued on day of submission.*

**b. How is the “14-day average” for commercial review calculated?**

*It’s calculated from the time the review is assigned to a plan reviewer to when the plan reviewer completes his review and is based on calendar days.*

**c. What reporting capabilities are required to support these metrics?**

*The ability to calculate time between two dates; See RFP for further information regarding reporting requirements and capabilities.*

**36. For Neighborhood Inspection's 9,000 cases + 1,800 illegal dumping locations:**

**a. What is the current average case resolution time by case type?**

*Not relevant to this RFP.*

**b. Do workflow requirements differ by case type (e.g., zoning, nuisance, condemnation)?**

*Not significantly.*

**c. How are inspectors assigned—by geography, caseload, or other rules?**

*Geography*

**37. Regarding MAPD's 715 cases processed in 2023:**

**a. What is the typical case lifecycle and timeline for different case types?**

*Varies by case type. Vast majority of case types have a life cycle about 3-4 months (meaning from the time it is first created to the time it is closed out). It can be as short as 4-5 weeks for certain case types.*

**b. How many cases typically appear on each MAPC meeting agenda?**

*10-15 across all case types.*

**c. What document types and sizes are typically associated with planning cases?**

*Word Docs and PDFs; Typically not more than 1-3 MBs, can get up to 5-10MBs on occasion.*

**38. To inform workflow and data modeling, can you provide:**

**a. A list of permit and license categories currently processed by MABCD and MAPD**

- i. *MAPD*
  - 1. *ANX - Annexation*
  - 2. *BZA – Board of Zoning Appeals (includes Administrative Adjustment)*
  - 3. *CON – Conditional Use (includes Administrative Adjustment and Administrative Permit)*
  - 4. *CUP – Community Unit Plan (includes Administrative Adjustment)*
  - 5. *DED - Dedication*
  - 6. *DER - Development Review*
  - 7. *HPC – Historic Preservation*
  - 8. *LSP – Lot Split*
  - 9. *LUI – Land Use Interpretation*
  - 10. *NHP – Neighborhood Planning*
  - 11. *PLE – Planning Environmental Case*
  - 12. *PUD – Planned Unit Development (includes Administrative Adjustment)*
  - 13. *SUB - Subdivision*
  - 14. *VAC - Vacation*
  - 15. *ZON – Zone Change (includes Administrative Adjustment)*

**Approximate annual volume and complexity level (e.g., typical steps, review intensity) for each permit and license type**

*For MABCD, These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*

- ii. *MAPD*
  - 1. *Administrative Adjustments (BZA, CON, CUP, PUD, ZON)*
    - a. *Case in-take*
    - b. *Fees*
    - c. *Staff Review*
    - d. *Final Drawings (CUP, PUD)*
    - e. *End/Closed*
  - 2. *Administrative Permit*
    - a. *Case in-take*
    - b. *Fees*
    - c. *Public Notification (if applicable)*
    - d. *Staff Review*
    - e. *End/Closed*
  - 3. *Lot Split*
    - a. *Case-In-Take*
    - b. *Fees*
    - c. *Lot Split Distribution*
    - d. *Staff Review*
    - e. *Approval/Signatures*
    - f. *End/Close*
  - 4. *Public Hearing Items – Variance (BZA)*
    - a. *Case in-take*
    - b. *Fees*
    - c. *Public Notification*
    - d. *Staff Review*
    - e. *Board of Zoning Appeals - Public Hearing*
    - f. *End/Closed*



5. *Public Hearing Items – Planning Commission (CON, CUP, PUD, ZON)*
  - a. *Case in-take*
  - b. *Fees*
  - c. *Public Notification*
  - d. *Staff Review*
  - e. *MAPC - Public Hearing*
  - f. *Protest Period*
  - g. *Governing Body (if applicable)*
  - h. *End/Closed*
6. *Public Hearing Items – Planning Commission (VAC)*
  - a. *Case in-take*
  - b. *Fees*
  - c. *Public Notification*
  - d. *Staff Review*
  - e. *MAPC - Public Hearing*
  - f. *Conditions of Approval*
  - g. *Governing Body*
  - h. *Recorded Documentation*
  - i. *End/Closed*
7. *Public Hearing Items – Planning Commission (SUB)*
  - a. *Case In-Take*
  - b. *Fees*
  - c. *Plat Distribution*
  - d. *Staff Review*
  - e. *Subdivision and Utility Advisory Board*
  - f. *Revisions*
  - g. *MAPC*
  - h. *Mylar Submission*
  - i. *Governing Body*
  - j. *End/Close*
8. *Annexation (petition)*
  - a. *Case In-take*
  - b. *Fees*
  - c. *Staff review*
  - d. *Governing body*
  - e. *Final Report*
  - f. *End/Closed*
9. *Annexation (island)*
  - a. *Case In-take*
  - b. *Fees*
  - c. *Staff review*
  - d. *Governing body (City)*
  - e. *County Commission*
  - f. *Governing body (City)*
  - g. *Final Report*
  - h. *End/Closed*

10. *HPC (public hearing)*
  - a. *Case in-take*
  - b. *Public notification (Wichita Register properties only)*
  - c. *Staff Review*
  - d. *Historic Preservation Board - Public Hearing*
  - e. *Governing Body (if appealed)*
  - f. *Final Drawings (if revised)*
  - g. *End/Closed*
11. *HPC (administrative)*
  - a. *Case in-take*
  - b. *Staff Review*
  - c. *Final Drawings (if revised)*
  - d. *End/Closed*
12. *DED*
  - a. *Case In-Take*
  - b. *Governing Body*
  - c. *End/Close*
13. *DER (all items below may not apply in all cases)*
  - a. *Staff Review*
  - b. *Advanced Plans Committee*
  - c. *Planning Commission*
  - d. *Governing Body (City)*
  - e. *Governing Body (County)*

**b. Specialized workflows or approvals associated with any permit types**

*This will be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*

**c. Current processing times for Permits and license type, and any target improvements**

*Based on permit types/license types.*

**d. Known seasonal peaks for specific permit types**

*Related to weather events.*

**39. Are there any implementation milestones, deadlines, or success measures already defined by the County that vendors should incorporate into their proposed project plan?**

*No.*

**40. Are there any dependencies or external factors that could impact the timeline for the project?**

*This will be discussed with the selected vendor as timelines can be adjusted to accommodate the work.*

**41. What specific system performance metrics (e.g., uptime, response time, transaction volume) are expected, and how will those be monitored or enforced?**

*Some system performance metrics can be found in the RFP. Other performance metrics should be proposed by the vendor as seen fit. Monitoring will be decided by application management once implementation is complete. This can be discussed with the selected vendor during contracting if required.*

**42. Regarding API requirements:**

- a. Are there any existing third-party applications that will need API access to the new system?**  
*None other than those already discussed in the RFP.*
- b. Are additional integrations anticipated beyond those listed in the RFP?**  
*No.*
- c. Does the county have preferred API documentation standards (e.g., OpenAPI, WSDL)?**  
*For SOAP APIs, we must have WSDL specifications. For REST APIs, we do not have a documentation format preference.*

**43. To help scope licensing and user role requirements, can you provide approximate user counts for the following groups:**

- a. MABCD staff (office-based and field inspectors)**  
*Approximately 100*
- b. Neighborhood Inspection staff**  
*25*
- c. MAPD staff**  
*20 (including zoning enforcement)*
- d. External users (e.g., contractors, citizens, staff from other jurisdictions)**  
*10,000+*

**44. To plan implementation timing that minimizes disruption:**

- a. What are the seasonal “peak periods” when implementation should be avoided?**  
*See answer below*
- b. Do these periods differ across MABCD, Neighborhood Inspection, and MAPD?**  
*Yes.*
- c. Are there specific months that would be most suitable for implementation activities?**
  - i. Neighborhood Inspection: Highest volume months would be from May thru August. These months should be avoided at all costs for any type of implementation activities.*
  - ii. MAPD: There is no typical “high season” or “low season” for the majority of our case types. We do have high a low times, but they are unpredictable as to when they will come each year.*

**45. Are there any firm deadlines or external factors that would impact the implementation timeline?**

*See previous answer.*

**46. To help plan project resource allocation and collaboration:**

- a. Approximately how much internal IT staff time can be dedicated to this project?**  
*The Sedgwick County IT team has sufficient resources to dedicate to the project.*
- b. Does your team have prior experience supporting large-scale software implementations?**  
*Yes*
- c. Will the county provide project management resources, or should vendors plan to lead PM activities?**  
*The county will assign an IT project manager who will assist the vendor’s project team during the life of the project.*

- 47. Can you provide approximate numbers of users requiring training in each category:**
- a. System administrators**  
*Approximately 5*
  - b. End users (by department)**
    - i. MAPD: Up to 20*
    - ii. Neighborhood Inspection: 25*
    - iii. MABCD (not Neighborhood Inspection): approximately 60*
    - iv. Housing, Fire, Public Works, and IT also have users and these users will be determined with the vendor selected based on user structure.*
  - c. Shift workers requiring special scheduling**  
*None.*
- 48. Regarding training facilities:**
- a. Do you have existing training facilities?**  
*Yes. Sedgwick County has an IT Lab available for us with multiple computers as well as other conference rooms available for training purposes.*
  - b. Would virtual/remote training be acceptable?**  
*Yes.*
- 49. What level of user training and support is expected after implementation, and are there preferred approaches (e.g., train-the-trainer, just-in-time training, open office hours)?**  
*We are open to recommendations based on your company's best practices.*
- 50. How should support requests for the permitting system be tracked and managed?**
- a. Are there existing support workflows or platforms the new system should integrate with?**  
*The vendor should provide the best possible solution.*
  - b. Are there expectations around request prioritization, response tracking, and reporting?**  
*The vendor should provide the best possible solution.*
- 51. To help define appropriate support expectations for a system of this scale, can you clarify:**
- a. What response and resolution times the County expects based on issue severity?**  
*Please provide the best option available within your response. If needed, this can be discussed further with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
  - b. Whether there are defined SLA targets, support hours, or escalation protocols that vendors should align with? None other than those already specified within the RFP.**
- 52. What specific types of data or activities in your permitting or enforcement processes fall under HIPAA?**  
*None.*
- 53. What CJIS compliance requirements apply to the permitting and code enforcement system, if any? (e.g., data storage, access control, background checks, audit logging)**  
*None.*
- 54. Do county security policies include any additional standards beyond HIPAA/CJIS, such as data classification requirements, infrastructure constraints, or training/certification mandates for system admins or users?**  
*None other than those listed in the RFP.*

**55. To support security and risk mitigation planning:**

- a. What types of security testing are required (e.g., penetration testing, vulnerability scans, compliance audits)?**

*Please provide security testing procedures based on your company's policies.*

- b. What is the expected frequency and scope of testing?**

*Please provide the testing frequency and scope per your company policies.*

- c. Are there specific tools, certifications, or methodologies vendors must use?**

*No.*

- d. What are the reporting and remediation expectations for findings?**

*Timely (no specific requirements) on vulnerabilities/patches. If a breach occurs that involves our data, notice must be made in the most expedient time possible without unreasonable delay.*

**56. Are there any defined penalties or liquidated damages for exceeding budget or timeline targets?**

- a. To ensure our proposal aligns with County financial planning and constraints:**

- b. Is there a target budget or ceiling for implementation and ongoing maintenance?**

*No, please provide the best available price.*

- c. Are there distinct budgets for capital vs. operational expenses?**

*Not in relation to this project.*

- d. Are there funding sources (e.g., grants, bonds) that may affect scope or timeline?**

*No.*

- e. Are there approval processes or budget structures we should align with?**

*Yes. Once a vendor is selected, the selection will be reviewed by a Bid Board and Board of County Commission prior to contracting. Once contracting starts there are a number of approvers who will review and sign off before the contract is fully executed.*

**57. To better tailor our response to your selection priorities:**

- a. Are there specific technical capabilities you consider especially critical?**

*Please refer to RFP Scope of Work.*

- b. Are vendor characteristics (e.g., local presence, industry expertise) important in your evaluation?**

*Please refer to RFP minimum firm qualifications.*

- c. Do you have preferred implementation approaches based on past successes?**

*Please provide the best approach for your product within your proposal.*

**58. To inform reporting and analytics design:**

- a. Are there existing data visualization or reporting tools in use (e.g., Power BI, Tableau, Crystal Reports)?**

*Power BI, Crystal Reports, Webi*

- b. What types of dashboards or reports are most important to County leadership or departmental staff?**

*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*

- c. Are there any required export formats or interactivity features?**

*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*

- d. What performance expectations exist for report generation?**

*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*

- 59. To guide document storage and integration planning:**
- a. What document management system(s) are currently used for permit and license documents (e.g., OnBase, Laserfiche)?  
*See RFP*
  - b. What types of documents are stored (e.g., PDFs, images, CAD files), and what contributes most to overall volume?  
*Pdfs, images, outlook messages, voice mail*
  - c. What are the estimated annual document volumes and retention requirements?  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
  - d. Are there any specific document workflows or approval processes that must be supported?  
*Yes.*
- 60. To plan for communication and notification integration:**
- a. What systems or platforms are currently used for sending email, SMS, or other notifications?  
*Outlook*
  - b. Are APIs or integration methods available for those services?  
*Yes.*
  - c. What are the typical notification volumes and frequency (e.g., daily digests, real-time alerts)?  
*MAPD – more real time alerts of when cases are submitted within certain GIS overlays.*
  - d. Are there branding, formatting, or templating requirements for outgoing communications?  
*Yes, Communications will have to be approved by the Sedgwick County Communications team.*
- 61. In the requirements it speaks of a need for functionality in permitting to keep inspector on-track while on inspection. Can you elaborate on this? What is the hoped for functionality and user experience for both the inspector, permit holder, and back-office staff?**  
*This question is too broad to answer effectively.*
- 62. Approximately how many workflows are part of the processing?**  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 63. As far as a public portal is concerned:**
- a. Are Contractors an authenticated user of the system?
    - i. If yes, how many contractors?  
*6500+ and increasing*
  - b. Is Constituent access authenticated or anonymous?  
*Both, Limited information is available to 'anonymous.' Users*
- 64. How many county users are accessing the system (both internal and mobile)**
- a. Of those, how many will need to be able to access drawing files (plan review w/ markup).  
*There are approximately 144 internal users, about half of which could need access. These details can be discussed further during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 65. Data history: What data is required from Accela (Andover, KS) and is the communication path one or two way?**  
*This path is two-way. There will be a point-in-time cutoff prior to the implementation of any new software at which point Andover will be entering their own permit information into MABCD's current system – it's anticipated that only active permits will need to be imported into the new system. Andover will be responsible for managing their own historical data.*

**66. Integration with ATPro: What level of integration is required with ATPro?**

*It would be unidirectional interface to ATPro.*

**a. Are there other systems internally that are integrating today?**

*GIS to MABCD*

**b. Is it to, from or both?**

*To*

**67. Does a filed complaint need the ability to turn into a Legal Matter? If so, will that be handled in this same system?**

*Yes, only the documentation will be housed in this system. The adjudication process is in a separate system.*

**68. Can you provide the approved budget range for this project?**

*No. The budget will be determined based on the vendor selected. Please provide the best offer in your response.*

**69. Are you currently or have you in past 12 months worked with a service provider for delivery of similar services?**

*Yes, Hansen/Infor Public Sector.*

**70. Have you worked with a third-party service provider to help prepare this RFP? If so, can you please share their information with us?**

*No.*

**71. How many internal users does the county anticipate will need access to the new Permitting system?**

*Approximately 144*

**72. Could you please provide the average number of plan reviews the county conducts annually?**

*See RFP for information – Section II: Background.*

**73. How many permit types issued by the county require plan review?**

*See RFP for information – Section II: Background.*

**74. Does the county require the proposed solution store CJIS data?**

*No.*

**75. What level of HIPAA compliance do you require?**

*None.*

**76. Has the county been in contact with and/or seen product demonstrations from any vendors within the last 12 months? If so, please list.**

*No.*

**77. Did the county use a consulting firm to help develop the RFP documents? If so, who? If yes, will the consulting firm continue to support the County through the implementation process?**

*No.*

**78. Does the allocated budget for this project include implementation?**

*Yes.*

**79. Would it be possible to get the “General Requirements” section of the RFP in an editable format?**

*No.*

**80. If we decide to submit a response via email, is there a file size limit?**

*35 mb or less*

- 81. In responding to Section V – Scope of Work, Section A – Project Requirements, does the County prefer a specific response format (e.g., a coded response indicating “Comply / Partially Comply / Do Not Comply”) for each requirement, or would a narrative response addressing each item be more appropriate?**  
*Either is acceptable so please use your best judgment.*
- 82. Can the county provide an inventory list of all forms to be implemented, broken down by department/division, or at a minimum, an approximate number?**  
*This will be discussed with the selected vendor.*
- 83. For each form (or a representative subset for each department/division), can the County provide 2–3 samples or templates?**  
*This can be provided to the selected vendor.*
- 84. Are there forms that require conditional logic, dynamic sections, or complex calculations? If so, please provide descriptions.**  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 85. Will ADA-compliant redesign of existing paper/PDF forms be required for digital use?**  
*Some of these PDFs would fall under this exception <https://www.ada.gov/law-and-regs/regulations/title-ii-2010-regulations/#-35200-requirements-for-web-and-mobile-accessibility> since they are prehistoric documents. However, existing **forms** that users may be required to fill out will need to be converted to accessible forms.*
- 86. Can the county provide detailed workflow diagrams or step-by-step documentation for each process?**  
*This can be reviewed and discussed with the selected vendor.*
- 87. Are there workflows that span multiple departments, and can the county map these interactions?**  
*Yes, these can be further discussed and mapped with the selected vendor.*
- 88. What is the average number of workflow steps per process?**  
*This can be reviewed and discussed with the selected vendor.*
- 89. Are there any mandated timelines or SLAs for certain workflows that must be configured in the system?**  
*No.*
- 90. What is the priority order for department rollouts? Please state priority level by focus area for the implementation?**  
  - a. 1. Permitting and Licensing*
  - b. 2. Plan Review*
  - c. 3. Planning/Zoning/MAPD Functions*
  - d. 4. Neighborhood Inspection Code Enforcement*
- 91. Are there departments with unique compliance, regulatory, or reporting requirements that will require custom configurations? If so, please define these by division/department.**  
*No.*
- 92. What is the total volume of data (number of records/files, total storage size) to be migrated?**  
*Hansen 16.21 GB, Tidemark (older system database) 738 MB*
- 93. In what formats is the existing data currently stored? Please provide file types for documents (PDF, Word, etc.) and data types for metadata (SQL, CSV, etc.).**  
*SQL Server database files are .mdf and .ldf; see other answers regarding document types.*



- 94. May the vendor assume the county will provide cleaned and validated data, or will data cleansing be part of the vendor's scope?**  
*The vendor should be prepared to validate data or at least assist with the validation process.*
- 95. Will active work need to be migrated prior to cutover, or will the new system be leveraged as "day forward" — meaning in-flight work will be completed via legacy systems and processes?**  
*Yes, current work will need to be migrated. The preference is to move all data into the new system.*
- 96. Can the county provide the number of users, their types, roles, and permission levels to be configured?**  
*144; some external organizations use a generic login or our view only so depending on how the license structure works this number may need to be adjusted. A final number will be determined before contracting.*
- 97. Will department-specific role and permission configurations be required?**  
*Yes. Roles will also need to be configurable for the other jurisdictions that would use the system.*
- 98. Can the county provide a list and examples of reports that must be generated or replicated in the new system?**  
*These details will be discussed during the demo processes or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 99. Can the county provide examples of required custom reports and dashboards referenced in the RFP?**  
*These details will be discussed during the demo processes or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 100. Are there any legally mandated reporting formats or schedules not listed in the RFP that must be configured?**  
*No.*
- 101. How many staff members will require training, by department or role?**  
*a. MAPD: Up to 20  
b. Neighborhood Inspection: 25  
c. MABCD (not Neighborhood Inspection): approximately 60*
- 102. Will training need to be tailored to specific departments or processes, or will general platform use and functionality be sufficient?**  
*Training will need to be tailored. This could be via documentation if needed.*
- 103. Will end users require in-person training, remote training, or both?**  
*We are open to either option. Please include in your proposal the best option based on your experience.*
- 104. What is the county's preferred user acceptance testing (UAT) process?**  
*We prefer to have some guidance through the process such as testing checklists, if possible. We are open to suggestions for the process.*
- 105. What is the county's preference as to who will be responsible for creating test cases — the county, the vendor, or a joint effort?**  
*A joint effort is preferred.*
- 106. What is the target go-live date?**  
*We do not have a specific target date and would prefer to go live before end of year 2026.*
- 107. Are there any dependencies on other projects, initiatives, or technology changes that may affect the timeline?**  
*None that are known at this time.*

- 108. Provide details on the scope of migration required, including the total volume of data to be migrated from the incumbent system, and the types of data (e.g., permits, licenses, inspection records, case management data, associated documents).**  
*Hansen 16.21 GB, Tidemark (older system database) 738 MB; See document types in questions regarding OnBase.*
- 109. Can you confirm if mobile and remote access capabilities are a mandatory requirement for the new solution, and if so, what specific functions must be supported in mobile mode?**  
*Yes, it is required – see RFP for details.*
- 110. Could you provide an overview of the workflows currently followed in the incumbent system, and outline the specific changes, enhancements, or new capabilities the county expects the new solution to deliver?**  
*These details will be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 111. The incumbent system is hosted on-premises. Is the county anticipating the new solution to be deployed on-premises or in a cloud environment? If cloud hosting is preferred, does the county have a preferred hosting provider.**  
*The county is open to either on-prem or cloud. We do not have a preferred hosting provider.*
- 112. Should the portal support multilingual interfaces or accessibility standards such as WCAG 2.1 AA?**  
*Compliance with WCAG 2.1 is required. See other answers regarding ADA.*
- 113. If the county already has a preferred plan review software, which one is it? Or should vendors propose an integrated module?**  
*Interested vendors should provide us with the best option for use with their system.*
- 114. Does the county require digital signature / e-signature functionality for license issuance and renewals?**  
*Not at this time.*
- 115. Are there existing APIs available for each system, and will the County provide documentation?**  
*a. OnBase:*  
*b. GIS: There is not currently an API. We would like a better way to interface with GIS and the new system.*  
*c. Laserfiche Interface: Not currently.*  
*d. ATPro: Does not have a current API.*  
*e. SAP: Uses an RFC. Can provide documentation.*  
*f. Aumentum: Does not currently have an API.*  
*g. MSB: Currently integrates directly into Hasen and the Portal. Documentation can be provided.*
- 116. Can you provide a breakdown of the ~30,000 annual permits by type (building, trade, land use, nuisance, etc.)? a.Are there seasonal spikes in permit applications we should account for in capacity planning? How many active licenses and certificates are currently tracked?**  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 117. Is there a cost proposal template the county requires, or can vendors submit in their own format as long as items are unbundled? Should implementation and recurring costs be presented in a ten-year total cost of ownership format?**  
*Vendors can submit cost proposals in their own format as long as they follow all guidelines in the RFP. Implementation and recurring costs should be presented for all 10-years of the anticipated contract term.*
- 118. Are there any features missing in Hansen that are considered top priorities in this replacement?**  
*See RFP requirements.*

- 119. How often does the county expect system upgrades or patches, and should they be scheduled or rolling updates?**  
*The vendor should provide their best solution for updates.*
- 120. What is the annual growth rate of storage expected for the next 10 years?**  
*Unknown at this time.*
- 121. Agency Responsibilities: Could you clarify which specific permitting, licensing, and code enforcement activities each department (MABCD and MAPD) will expect the solution to manage?**  
*Refer to RFP for information. Section II – Background information.*
- 122. Modules & Sub-domains: Are there defined sub-modules (e.g., planning, inspections, licensing, violations, GIS integration, e-payment) that you prioritize or that should be phased?**  
**a. phased in the following order:**  
*1. Permitting/Licensing  
2. Plan Review  
3. Planning/Zoning/MAPD Activities  
4. Neighborhood Inspection*
- 123. License Types: Will different types of users (e.g., staff vs. public, inspectors vs. administrators) require role-based access levels or interfaces?**  
*Yes.*
- 124. Estimated Budget Range: Is there a preliminary budget or budget range allocated for both initial implementation and ongoing software licensing/support/maintenance?**  
*No.*
- 125. Funding Source Constraints: Are there any constraints related to funding (e.g., federal grants, matching funds, multi-year budgeting) that may affect vendor proposals?**  
*No.*
- 126. Desired Timeline: Are there any critical milestone dates (e.g., pilot deployments, inspections season kickoff)?**  
*None at this time.*
- 127. Current Systems Environment: Could you detail existing systems being used (e.g., database back ends, permitting systems, GIS, financial software) and their vendor/platforms?**  
*Please see RFP as well as other answers provided.*
- 128. Integration: Will the county provide documentation and test environments for integrating with MSB, MUNIS (Tyler Technologies), and SAP S/4HANA, Laserfiche, and OnBase? Does the county already have a system for IVR for other processes? If yes, which?**  
*Yes, the County will provide documentation as we are able, and the majority of our environments have test environments. The county uses Selectron for IVR currently.*
- 129. Data Migration Needs: Will data from current systems require migration, and if so, what volume and types of data (permits, inspections, licensure, enforcement actions) are expected to transfer? Can the county provide an example of the data to be migrated from Infor Public Sector (Hansen) and Accela (used by Andover, KS)?**  
*Hansen 16.21 GB, Tidemark (older system database) 738 MB; Historical data from Accela will not be transferred into the new system. Example data can be provided.*

- 130. Reporting Requirements:** Are there existing reporting or dashboard expectations? Any particular compliance or state-mandated reporting that must be supported?  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 131. Inspections Workflow:** Are there any unique workflow needs—such as mobile inspection workflows, enforcement case tracking, violation notices, interagency communication flows?  
*Yes, all of those listed.*
- 132. Code Enforcement Scope:** Are code enforcement functions limited to physical inspections, or do they include case management, or administrative adjudication?  
*They include all options listed.*
- 133. Regulatory Standards:** Are there specific local or state regulatory standards/requirements (e.g., ADA, Iowa–North Kansas zoning codes) that the solution must comply with?  
*See other answers regarding ADA.*
- 134. Security & Privacy:** What are the security, data privacy, and audit requirements (e.g., HIPAA, CJIS, PCI) applicable to the solution?  
*See RFP for security requirements.*
- 135. Training Expectations:** What training services (e.g., train-the-trainer, on-site, webinars) are expected—both at go-live and as new features are added?  
*The county is open to all forms of training and would like each vendor to propose their best solution based on their product and capabilities.*
- 136. Support & SLA Requirements:** Can you provide details on expected ongoing support levels (helpdesk hours, response and resolution times, update cadence)?  
*See RFP.*
- 137. Deployment Model:** Are hosted/cloud, on-premise, or hybrid deployment models of interest? Is there a preferred IT hosting strategy?  
*Please include the best option in your proposal.*
- 138. Infrastructure Constraints:** Are there existing infrastructure limitations or standards (e.g., authentication services like Single Sign-On, network restrictions, browser compatibility)?  
*See RFP technical requirements.*
- 139. Evaluation Criteria:** What are the key evaluation factors (e.g., technology maturity, cost, vendor experience, references) and their relative weighting?  
*See RFP evaluation criteria section.*
- 140. Vendor Demonstrations:** Will vendors be asked to deliver live demonstrations or proofs of concept? If so, what functionality should those focus on?  
*It is likely demos will be requested. Functionality should focus on the requirements outlined in the RFP and can be discussed further if/when vendors are selected to provide a demo.*

- 141. Does the county already have a vendor in place for the described IVR functionality that could be integrated to? Does the county wish the response to provide a solution and pricing for an IVR vendor?**  
*Yes, the current vendor is Selectron. The county is not tied to that vendor so a solution and pricing can provided to work with a new vendor or for an integration with Selection.*
- 142. Does the county already have a vendor in place for the Electronic Plan Review functionality requested? Does the county wish the response to provide a solution and pricing for an Electronic Plan Review vendor?**  
*Yes, ProjectDox is currently in use. Vendors should propose a plan review process that works best with their system.*
- 143. Regarding the database requirements of HIPAA and CGS, are those two requirements still valid if we are not integrating patient information or court informat**  
*No.*
- 144. Is the Agency looking for a fixed fee engagement for implementation?**  
*We are open to either option as long as it is what works best for the vendor and our operations.*
- 145. Has the Agency seen any product demonstrations at this point?**  
*Yes.*
- 146. Does the Agency need an integration with its financial system?**  
*Refer to RFP.*
- 147. Has the Agency identified a payment processor?**  
*Refer to RFP.*
- 148. Does the Agency have a go-live target?**  
*No.*
- 149. Can the Agency provide a list of all business processes in scope i.e. licenses, permits, complaints, amendments, appeals, registrations, etc.?**  
*These details can be discussed during the demo process or with the selected vendor prior to contracting.*
- 150. Concerning integrations; can the Agency provide a list of required integrations and what data needs to be transferred between the solutions?**  
*Some of this information is found in the RFP. Remaining details can be further discussed during demos or with the selected vendor.*
- 151. Does the Agency have a list of required reports needed for go-live?**  
*No.*
- 152. Does the Agency have resources for building reports beyond those included in the solution or would the Agency prefer that the vendor write custom reports?**  
*The county also has PowerBI that can be used for building reports. There may be the need for the vendor to write some custom reports.*
- 153. Can the Agency provide more information on the data sources that need to be migrated, including number of sources and formats?**  
*Some of this information is found in the RFP. Remaining details can be further discussed during demos or with the selected vendor.*
- 154. Do you need documents to be migrated?**  
*Yes.*

**155. How many weeks will the Agency need for User Acceptance Testing?**

*This will depend on the vendor selected and the timing of the rollout.*

**156. What is the budget allocated for this project?**

*Please provide the best available price.*

Firms interested in submitting a ***Request for Proposal***, must respond with complete information and **deliver on or before 1:45 pm CDT, September 16, 2025**. Late responses will not be accepted and will not receive consideration for final award.

**“PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM ON THE RFI RESPONSE PAGE.”**



---

Lee Barrier, NIGP-CPP  
Senior Purchasing Agent

LB/ch