



Sussex County, Delaware

Addendum No. 1 – March 23, 2015

Request for Proposals:
Software and Implementation Services for Computer-Assisted Mass Appraisal
(CAMA) System
Issue Date: March 6, 2015

Due Date and Time: April 2, 2015, 12:00 PM Eastern Time

Sussex County
2 The Circle
P.O. Box 589
Georgetown, DE 19947

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference was held on March 20, 2015 at 10:00 AM Eastern Time. The Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference was hosted via teleconference. The Pre-Proposal Conference was facilitated by the County and the County's consulting partner, BerryDunn.

The format of the Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference covered the following topics:

- Section 1.3 of the RFP – Project Objectives
- Section 1.9 of the RFP – RFP Schedule of Events
- Section 1.14 of the RFP – Point of Contact
- Section 4.1 of the RFP – General Submittal Response Instructions
- Section 4.9 of the RFP – Functional and Technical Requirements Response

Participation in the Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference was not mandatory.

Please be advised that the deadline for vendor questions is March 25, 2015.

1. Question: What information will be available at bid opening, namely in relation to competing vendor pricing?

County Response: The County will only announce the vendor name during the bid opening.

2. Question: Is the County interested in receiving information for a vendor-hosted solution?

County Response: The County only requires cost proposals for County-hosted solutions, given that a vendor-hosted solution is not a proposal requirement. However vendors are allowed to provide information on a vendor-hosted solution as part of the technical proposal.

3. Question: Section 4.13 of the proposal specifies that "Proposers shall provide at least five (5) government clients with whom the proposer has worked during the past three (3) years that are of similar size and complexity to Sussex County. References shall be from governments that have been live with the current software version for a minimum of two (2) years." Is it permissible to reference a client with whom the vendor has been engaged for at least three (3) years and has been live for two (2) years, or must the vendor reference client engagements that have occurred within the past three (3) years and have been live for the past two (2) years?

County Response: The County requests references that have undergone implementations within the past three (3) years and have been live for the past two (2) years. The criteria provides the



County with references that are certain to have undergone the vendor’s latest implementation and go-live methodology and currently operate on the most recent version of the vendor’s system. If the client reference does not meet the criteria in its entirety, the vendor must make note of this in the references section. The County will accept a reference outside of the three year timeframe so long as the reference is live with the current software version.

- 4. Question: The Requirements Worksheet lists that the County desires Marshall & Swift as an approach to valuation. Does the County currently use Marshall & Swift, and if so, is the approach used for residential or commercial valuation?

County Response: The County does not currently use Marshall & Swift as an approach to valuation, so the vendor may exclude the functionality from the technical proposal.

- 5. Does the County currently use a Statewide appraisal manual or a County-specific approach to appraisals?

County Response: The County currently uses a County-specific approach to appraisals, which will need to be replicated in future business processes.

- 6. How much County data will vendors need to convert into a future system, in what format is the current data, and how much access will vendors have to current data?

County Response: The County requires the vendor to convert all data dating back to 1974. The County is able to export the data into any file format. The County is in the process of gathering sample data and will provide in the final addendum.

- 7. Is the County’s current CAMA system a third party application or a homegrown system?

County Response: The County currently uses a homegrown system.

- 8. Does the County currently use a sketching application? If so, would the County consider replacing the sketching application with another sketching program that would be integrated in the replacement system?

County Response: The County currently uses Apex Medina Pro v4 as a sketching application. The County does not have a preference between Apex and a replacement application, and would accept an integrated sketching program in the replacement system.

- 9. The Requirements Worksheet lists that County requires a library of standard reports (i.e., “canned” report). Does the County currently have a library of canned reports?

County Response: Since the current system is homegrown, the County does not presently have a library of standard/canned reports.

Proposers are instructed to return a copy of this addenda form signed by an authorized firm agent as part of proposal responses.

SIGNATURE

COMPANY

DATE