SUBJECT: ENTERPRISE PERMITTING AND LAND USE SOFTWARE AS A SERVICE (SaaS) SOLUTION

BID #: ESC-0503-18 **OPEN DATE: 2018-10-17**

COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

KIND AND BASIS OF CONTRACT: SERVICE CONTRACTS

AGENCY: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES DIVISION/ VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS

BASIS OF AWARD: EVALUATION CRITERIA

NUMBER OF BIDS INVITED: 19 **NUMBER RECEIVED:** 6 **OTHER:** 2

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

On October 17, 2018, the City of Jacksonville, Procurement Division received six (6) responses for subject bid. On December 13, 2018 approval was granted for Software Demonstrations/ Oral Interviews with the top three (3) scoring vendors (1) Tyler Technologies, Inc., (2) Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc., and (3) Accela, Inc. The evaluation of the responses and Software Demonstrations/ Oral Interviews has been completed and scored as follows:

VENDOR	RESPONSE EVALUATION SCORE	DEMONSTRATION SCORE	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE
Tyler Technologies, Inc.	106.74	95.67	202.41
Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.	96.59	91.67	188.26
Accela, Inc.	93.81	91.33	185.14

Recommend approval to move forward with contract negotiations with the highest scoring vendor, Tyler Technologies, Inc.

ATTACHMENTS: Recommendation Memo, Scoring Sheets, Evaluation Matrix, Evaluation of Responses, Previous Awards

ANALYST: _____ For TARYN MANSER

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: _____ GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: Kenneth Lathrop, Chief of Information Technologies / CIO

(ALL AWARD ACTIONS SUBJECT TO LAWFULLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS)

ACTION OF CSPEC COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ABOVE

MEMBERS APPROVING _____ MEMBERS DISAPPROVING _____ DATE: _____

_____ _____ OTHER: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE _____

APPROVED _____ DISAPPROVED _____

OTHER _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION _____

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES DIVISION

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

TO: Greg Pease, Competitive Sealed Proposal Evaluation Committee

THRU: Kenneth Lathrop, Chief of Information Technologies / CIO

FROM: Cheryl Bradley, Applications Development Project Manager

DATE: March 21, 2018

RE: Enterprise Permitting and Land Use Solution

On October 17th, 2018 the City of Jacksonville's Procurement Division received six (6) bid responses for an Enterprise Permitting and Land Use solution (EPLU) RFP. The Evaluation Committee completed their review and recommend approval to move forward with Software Demonstrations / Oral Interviews with the top three (3) scoring vendors.

Demonstrations were conducted with the following vendors between February 5, 2019 and March 15, 2019:

1. Accela, Inc.
2. Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.
3. Tyler Technologies, Inc.

At the conclusion of the demonstration / oral interviews, the results are as follows (in ranking order):

1. Tyler Technologies, Inc.
2. Computronix (U.S.A.), Inc.
3. Accela, Inc.

We recommend the above list be forwarded to the Mayor for final approval to proceed with fee and contract negotiations with the highest ranking vendor, Tyler Technologies, Inc.

Please let us know if any additional information is required.

Cc: Tom Goldsbury, Chief of Building Inspection
Bryan Mosier, Chief of Municipal Code Compliance
Richard Reilly, Applications Development Project Manager
William Killingsworth, Director of Planning & Development
Stephanie Burch, Director of Neighborhoods

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
214 N. Hogan St. 9th Floor | Jacksonville, FL 32202 | Phone: 904.255.8000 | Fax: 904.232.6932

Demonstrations Scoring Matrix

ESC-0503-18

Enterprise Permitting & Land Use SaaS Solution

Total Points	15 Points	35 Points	20 Points	15 Points	15 Points	OVERALL
Criteria	Presentation	System Functionality	Overall Ease of Use	System Flexibility	Report Creation	Total Points (100 max)
COMPUTRONIX (U.S.A), INC.						
Bryan Mosier	15.00	30.00	15.00	12.50	15.00	87.50
Tom Goldsbury	14.00	34.00	19.00	14.00	15.00	96.00
Richard Reilly	12.00	33.00	19.00	14.00	13.50	91.50
Average	13.67	32.33	17.67	13.50	14.50	91.67
ACCELA, INC.						
Bryan Mosier	12.50	30.00	17.50	15.00	15.00	90.00
Tom Goldsbury	14.00	33.00	18.00	14.00	14.00	93.00
Richard Reilly	13.00	32.50	18.50	14.00	13.00	91.00
Average	13.17	31.83	18.00	14.33	14.00	91.33
TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.						
Bryan Mosier	14.00	33.00	20.00	15.00	15.00	97.00
Tom Goldsbury	14.00	34.00	19.00	15.00	15.00	97.00
Richard Reilly	12.50	33.50	19.00	14.00	14.00	93.00
Average	13.50	33.50	19.33	14.67	14.67	95.67

Total Combined Scores

ESC-0503-18

Enterprise Permitting & Land Use SaaS Solution

Total Points	120 Points	100 Points	OVERALL
	RFP Response Score	Demonstration Scoring	Total Points (220 max)
COMPUTRONIX (U.S.A), INC.			
Bryan Mosier	81.25	87.50	168.75
Tom Goldsbury	101.50	96.00	197.50
Richard Reilly	107.03	91.50	198.53
Average	96.59	91.67	188.26
ACCELA, INC.			
Bryan Mosier	80.95	90.00	170.95
Tom Goldsbury	97.00	93.00	190.00
Richard Reilly	103.47	91.00	194.47
Average	93.81	91.33	185.14
TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			
Bryan Mosier	98.18	97.00	195.18
Tom Goldsbury	114.00	97.00	211.00
Richard Reilly	108.05	93.00	201.05
Average	106.74	95.67	202.41

ATTACHMENT B-1
Demonstrations Evaluation Criteria

ON-SITE DEMONSTRATIONS. The demonstration evaluations will be based upon the criteria identified in the table below. In preparation for the on-site demonstration, please adhere to and see the requirements stated in Section 4 of this Proposal. **Please note that the on-site demonstrations categories have a combined total of 100 points.**

Criteria	Description of Criteria	Maximum Points Available
Presentation	Implementer's overall presentation, knowledge and understanding of the SaaS Solution.	**15**
System Functionality	Demonstration of the end-user daily activities processes, including but not limited to enterprise functions (e.g. plan review, permitting, inspections, etc.), GIS attributes and integration, address validation (using the City's database), notifications & workflow, attaching documents to emails, using the SaaS Solution through integrated applications such as Outlook, Word, Excel, etc.	**35**
Overall Ease of Use	Intuitiveness of the SaaS Solution to the novice user, user friendliness of the SaaS Solution, and ability to seamlessly navigate between applications or work processes.	**20**
System Flexibility	Ability of the City system's administrator to make configuration changes to the SaaS Solution, to include views, functions, etc.	**15**
Report Creation	Ability to quickly produce ad-hoc or custom reports in varying formats.	**15**
	Maximum Available Score	**100**

terms or conditions of the RFP, Contractor must follow the process set forth in Section 2.2 ("Questions and Requests for Amendments").

G. Unless otherwise requested by Buyer, Contractors should make only one proposal for each RFP item. Multiple offerings, alternates (unless any are specifically requested by Buyer) and/or stipulations may be cause for rejection of a Response.

H. Price offerings shall be **inclusive of ALL costs** (including but not limited to administrative cost for submission of all required paperwork on Buyer's behalf and any other costs) and will be the only compensation given to Contractor for the services purchased by Buyer under this RFP.

I. All prices submitted under the RFP shall be indelible. The use of correction fluid or erasures to correct line item bid prices and/or quantities are not acceptable. Corrections must be by lineout of the incorrect figures, writing in of correct figures, and initialing of the corrections by the originator. Correction fluid or erasure corrected bids will be considered non-responsive for the corrected item(s) only, and may render the entire Response as nonresponsive.

J. Failure to sign any form requiring a signature may be grounds for rejecting a Response.

2.4 Submission of Responses

A. The location and deadline for submitting Responses is set forth in Section 1 of the RFP. Contractors are fully responsible for meeting these requirements. Reliance upon mail or public carrier is at Contractor's risk. **Late bids will not be considered.**

B. The City will only accept Responses from Lead Contractors meeting the Minimum Requirements set forth in Section 1 of the RFP. The Lead Contractor shall submit:

1) One (1) original signed version of its Response clearly marked as "ORIGINAL." The Response must be signed by an officer or employee having authority to legally bind Contractor.

2) Six (6) hard copies of the entire Response.

3) One (1) scanned copies (in .pdf format) of entire Response on CD-ROM or USB Drive. Large files may be scanned as several separate PDF files.

4) One (1) REDACTED scanned copy of the Response (if necessary pursuant to Section 2.12). This copy should be marked "Confidential - Trade Secret" or something comparable to alert the reader of Contractor's claim of a public records exemption.

All copies are to be placed in a sealed package. The outside must be marked with (i) the RFP title and number, and (ii) Contractor's name, address, contact person, and telephone number.

It is the sole responsibility of each Contractor to assure all copies are EXACT duplicates of the original Response. Photocopies or CD copies will be used for the purpose of evaluating the Responses. Any information contained in the original Response which has not been transferred to the CDs, USB, or photocopies will NOT be considered. The original document will be used solely for official record keeping and auditing purposes.

2.5 Evaluation of Responses

A. Buyer will determine the qualifications, interest and availability of Contractors by reviewing all Responses and, when deemed necessary in the sole discretion of Buyer, by conducting formal interviews of selected Contractors that are determined to be the best qualified based upon evaluation of the Responses.

B. The determination of which Contractors are "best qualified" will be based upon the criteria set forth in the RFP.

C. Buyer will employ the following process steps when evaluating which Contractors are "best qualified":

1) Buyer will evaluate and score Responses using the evaluation criteria set forth in the following table and in Attachment B.

Response Evaluation Category	Maximum Score
Cost	20
SaaS Solution Requirements Response	40
SaaS Solution Hosting Requirements & Services Response	20
Implementation Services & Deliverables Response	20
Qualifications and Experience of Implementation Services Contractor and Proposed Personnel	20

2) Based on the scoring of the Response evaluations using the criteria above, Buyer intends to short-list no less than two (2) but no more than four (4) Contractors for software demonstrations. Buyer reserves the right to conduct more of fewer software demonstrations at its sole discretion. Buyer will evaluate Contractor demonstrations using the evaluation criteria set forth in the following table and in Attachment B-1.

Demonstration	Maximum Score
Presentation	15
System Functionality	35
Overall Ease of Use	20
System Flexibility	15
Report Creation	15

Note: Should the City short-list Responses that contain the same software solution, the software solution will only be demonstrated once.

3) Based on the combined scores of the response evaluation and software demonstrations, Buyer will select the highest rated Response and begin contract negotiations with the Implementation Services Contractor and the SaaS Solution Contractor.

4) If successful in negotiations, Buyer will move forward to award contracts per the guidelines outline in Section 2.6

D. Before making an award, Buyer reserves the right to seek clarifications, revisions, and information it deems necessary for the proper evaluation of Responses. Failure to provide any requested clarifications, revisions or information may result in rejection of the Response.

E. Buyer reserves the right to accept or reject any and all Responses, or separable portions thereof, and to waive any minor irregularity, technicality, or omission if Buyer determines that doing so will serve Buyer's best interests. Buyer may reject any Response not submitted in the manner specified by the RFP.

2.6 Award of Contracts

A. The process for contract award is set forth in Jacksonville Ordinance Code Sections 126.204. For this RFP, the City will award Contracts to the responsible and responsive