

RFP Questions

1. The RFP references SolarAPP+ or "functionally equivalent software" as a requirement under California Senate Bill 379 — can you describe what criteria the City will use to determine whether a vendor's solution qualifies as functionally equivalent?

SolarApp+ is an online web portal and automated software platform designed to simplify and accelerate the permitting process for residential rooftop solar and energy storage systems. We expect the new software to work with SolarApp+ in terms of assigning sequential permit numbers and connecting permittees with the inspection module. Alternatively, the new software would need to provide a web-based portal to issue residential rooftop solar and energy storage systems with no interaction with staff for permitting or plan check.

2. The City currently uses OpenGov as its permitting system — can you describe the scope and format of data the City expects to be migrated (e.g., estimated number of records, data types, how data is currently stored in OpenGov)?

CSV – for reports, datasets, and transparency portal downloads.

Excel (XLSX) – for budget books, financial summaries, and personnel reports.

PDF – for published budget books, reports, and agendas.

JSON – via the OpenGov Reporting API.

OpenGov is hosted primarily on Amazon Web Services (AWS), using secure, modern cloud infrastructure.

I don't know how many records. Planning started using OpenGov about 3 years ago and Administrative Services about 6 years for business licenses.

3. The RFP mentions integration with the California Massage Therapy Council (CAMTC) is a real-time automated API connection to CAMTC required, or would a staff-assisted verification workflow using CAMTC's public lookup tool satisfy this requirement?

A staff-assisted verification workflow using CAMTC's public lookup tool would satisfy this requirement

4. For engineering permits and right-of-way work that is not associated with a specific parcel, does the City need permits tracked by a GPS coordinate or street address only, or is a free-text location description sufficient?

GPS coordinate is preferred. Alternative, the use of address only (with no APN).

5. The RFP mentions "drawdown accounts" as a payment type — can you describe how the City currently uses drawdown accounts and what functionality is expected in the new system?

Drawdown accounts as payment type are used for consultants who help staff review projects including engineering, traffic reports, and prepare environmental documents.

6. The RFP notes that Transtech Engineering uses goPost for surveyor plan checks — is integration with goPost required, or is it sufficient for the new system to track Transtech's review as an external approval step within the permitting workflow?

External review is fine.

7. Will the City require vendors to submit a signed or marked-up version of the Sample Professional Services Agreement (Attachment A) as part of the proposal, or is that agreement reviewed only upon contract award?

If the vendor finds an important conflict with the agreement, this would be the right time to let us know.

8. Is there an incumbent vendor currently providing any portion of the permitting or licensing software, and how satisfied has the City been with that system's performance?

No comment.

9. Who has final budget authority for this project — the department director, the City Manager, or does it require City Council approval?

City Council approval is required.

10. Is the budget for this project already approved for the current fiscal year, and can you share the budgeted range?

This has yet to be established.

11. Can this contract be fulfilled through a cooperative purchasing vehicle (such as Sourcewell, NASPO ValuePoint, or OMNIA Partners), which could streamline the procurement process for the City?

This has yet to be established.

12. Who will serve on the evaluation committee, and what roles or departments do they represent?

This has yet to be established.

13. The RFP requires a "publicly viewable list of registered contractors that does not require registration to access" should this be a searchable directory on the City's website, or is a static page sufficient?

This has yet to be established.

14. For the dashboard that displays activity levels publicly, does the City envision this as embedded on the City's website, as a standalone public URL, or as a display for an in-office screen?

This has yet to be established.

15. Which departments currently rely on manual, paper, or spreadsheet-based processes that the new system is expected to replace?

Public Works for encroachment permits and Parks and Rec for the issuance of special events on City-owned land.

16. What are the total number of permits issued each year?

Approximately 1,200 building permits per year.

17. What are the total number of inspections performed each year?

Approximately 900 building inspections per year.

18. What are the total number of professional licensees managed?

We have approximate 2,800 business licenses in our database.

19. How many total records in Excel need to be migrated to the new system?

Unknown.

20. What types of record are in Excel?

Unknown.

21. How many total records in Google Sheets need to be migrated to the new system?

None.

22. What types of records are in Google Sheets?

None.

23. How many internal users will require write-access permissions at go-live, and how many are anticipated within the next three years?

A total of about 20.

24. How many permit, planning, engineering, code enforcement, and business license application types will need to be configured in the new system?

Please refer to Question No. 2 for an answer to this question.

25. How many inspection types and workflows are currently utilized by Building, Public Works, and Code Enforcement?

We have about 20 inspection types and a total of about 7 workflows.

26. Please provide current record counts for migration, including permits, planning cases, business licenses, code enforcement cases, inspection records, attached documents/plans, and open/in-flight records.

The total number of records is unknown. Migrating building permits can be optional.

27. What OpenGov modules are currently in use, and what data must be migrated from OpenGov into the new solution?

Business licensing, planning, code enforcement and public works.

28. Are there any required integrations beyond OpenGov, Tyler ERP/Munis, GIS, payment processing, CAMTC, contractor verification, and State licensing systems?

Not to my knowledge.

29. What payment processor is currently used by the City, and does the City intend to retain its existing merchant services provider?

We use Tyler ERP / Munis as the financial manager and Global Payment for merchant services. We intend to keep these two services providers.

30. Does the City require GIS integration at go-live, and if so, what GIS platform is currently used (Esri ArcGIS, ArcGIS Online, etc.)?

No. We do not have any GIS platform at this time.

31. Approximately how many document templates, notices, licenses, permits, inspection reports, certificates, and correspondence templates will require configuration?

Approximately 10.

32. What is the City's preferred implementation approach and timeline (phased by department or all departments simultaneously)?

All departments simultaneously.

33. Does the City have a budget range established for software acquisition, implementation, data migration, and annual software services?

No.

34. Does the City expect permitting, inspections, code enforcement, business licensing, payments, and integrations to be fully operational at initial go-live, or may proposers recommend a phased implementation with clearly defined milestones, deliverables, assumptions, and pricing by phase?

We hope to have it all operational at the initial go-live. However, we can consider phasing deliverables.

35. Does the City anticipate a full cutover from the existing OpenGov system at go-live, or a transition/coexistence period during which the current and new systems operate in parallel?

We expect a full transition.

36. For online payments, counter payments, and cash-register/cashiering functions, please confirm which capabilities are mandatory at go-live and which, if any, may be proposed as later-phase deliverables.

All payment options are required at go-live.

37. For the Tyler Munis / ERP Pro 10 integration, please clarify the expected scope and method of integration, including whether the City expects real-time API integration, scheduled import/export, payment or finance posting, reporting export, or another approach. Are current integration specifications, file layouts, APIs, or middleware available?

We expect real-time API integration with Tyler Munis / ERP Pro 10.

38. For other named third-party integrations, including CAMTC, California FTB, CSLB, SolarAPP+ / SB 379, and similar services, please confirm which are mandatory go-live requirements versus optional or later-phase capabilities.

SolarAPP+ is required at go-live. The others are optional or can be done later.

39. Is integration or data exchange with goPost, used by Transtech Engineering for surveyor plan checks, required as part of the proposed system, or is operational coexistence without direct integration acceptable?

Please refer to Question No. 6 above for an answer to this question.

40. For data migration from OpenGov, what export format, schema documentation, record types, and historical date range will the City be able to provide? Will the City be able to facilitate the necessary export from the incumbent system?

Please refer to Question No. 2 above for an answer to this question.

41. May proposers include optional or alternate pricing for specific integrations, modules, or later phase functionality separately from the core implementation price?

Yes.

42. The RFP states a 30-page proposal limit. Does this limit include or exclude required forms, resumes, the cost schedule, and appendices?

The 30-page proposal excludes attachments.