

Land Management Performance Evaluation

***Please Score 1 (lowest) to 5 (best)

Software Application Capabilities	Accela	CityView
1. Rate the initial RFP response from the vendor in regards to meeting our submittal requirements as a whole, quality of content in regards to specific details related to our organizations versus a standard marketing packet.		
2. Rate the quality of the live demonstration provided by the vendor in explaining how the software functions within your individual Departments.		
3. Rate the vendors ability during the live demonstration to take time outside of their planned presentation to answer our additional questions, and their ability to display their response to our question within the software, and clearly show how the software functions versus promising verbally that it could be done.		
4. Rate the quality of the screen layout, color tones, and ability to quickly work through processes efficiently without struggling to find a box or text field to enter data into, the overall layout any type of application.		
5. Rate the quality of the speed of the software as you completed a step or process between need to load additional pages throughout a workflow process on the staff side of the software.		
6. From a citizens and professionals perspective rate the software in regards to being able to quickly set-up a user account, fill out an application, or process a payment efficiently without the need to complete several steps or click through several screens throughout the process.		
7. From a citizens perspective rate the quality of the users dashboard, layout, and ability to navigate quickly to your application to find out details and the status of your application with little effort.		
8. From a citizens and professional perspective rate the quality of the software to offer quick access to public records through different search features available, standard searches by address or utilizing GIS to perform the search.		
9. Rate the vendors most recent proposed implementation schedule in regards to the amount of time and proposed on-site visits with our organizations from initial project kick-off up to when testing when begin.		
10. Rate the vendors most recent proposed schedule for software testing in regards to the projected time laid for testing to be completed within, and also the vendors proposed quality control testing allotted time they will do in advance of asking staff to perform testing.		
11. Rate the level of importance in your own personal perspective in regards to on-site training and support is during the testing procedures.		
12. Rate the level of importance in your own personal perspective in regards to working through the testing procedures through a Shared Point site online versus on-site support.		
13. Rate vendors proposed data conversion schedule and projected cost, and responses they provided to your questions about data conversion and your projected confidence in the vendor to perform these data conversions.		
14. Rate the vendor in regards to their ability to perform the data conversions in regards to the total amount of staff time your Department will spend assisting them through this data conversion, and also the vendors past experience working with data conversions from View Permit.		

<p>15. Rate the vendor in regards to the support you feel will be provided through data conversion of Addressing and scouring and cleaning of old addressing issues we want to resolve.</p>		
<p>16. Rate the vendor in regards to the Integration of GIS mapping system within the software, the search functions available through GIS for staff and public, and how much of this was shown during the live demonstration.</p>		
<p>17. Rate the vendor in regards to Integration of GIS mapping in the field with our Inspector Apps and the quick search features available, or the ability to quickly start a code enforcement complaint in the field through GIS, and how much of this was shown during implementation.</p>		
<p>18. Rate the vendor in regards to the Integration of GIS mapping for staffs ability to quickly set-up custom layers for Planning, Engineering, or create custom reports based on data within the software, or use GIS to start applications where address is lacking or when you're on public property with no parcel ID, and the ability for them to demonstrate this during the live demonstration.</p>		
<p>19. Rate the software during the live demonstration for the second day when staff had the opportunity to test drive the software, in lieu of never using the software before how easy was for you to use the staff side and citizens side of the software, and how efficient did it feel to create a practice application, project, or permit without the need for major support.</p>		
<p>20. Rate the software in regards to creating a Master Project for large commercial developments and the ability for the software to link all these different applications, permits, and licenses under one umbrella, the amount of time and effort it took you or them to create a master project, and the organizational layout once completed.</p>		
<p>21. Rate the software for the staff side in regards to receiving new applications or permits for the intake specialist that will be reviewing new submittals, the screen layout and access to all the information and attached documents that need to be reviewed, and the workflow process out of the box that will be utilized to push that application into the next phase, and time it takes to perform these operations.</p>		
<p>22. Rate the software for the staff side to accessing payments and producing invoices quickly during the application submittal process, and how efficient you felt this process and workflow was completed in, and the ability for the software to send the automatic update to the applicant.</p>		
<p>23. Rate the contractor licensing module within the Permitting module, the data base itself with storing information and quick reports and notices that can be ran and tracked saving you time compared to your current processes.</p>		
<p>24. Rate the data base system of personal information for all users that create accounts, ranging from owners to professionals, and the ability for the software to capture multiple professionals within one record and send notices and updates automatically.</p>		
<p>25. Rate the software in regards to setting up a Plan Review Session for all new applications, taking into consideration how complex the steps were to involve multiple departments and agencies, and time spent uploading documents, or lack of additional steps working within other folders or networks to retrieve files or information.</p>		
<p>26. Rate the software in regards to the Plan Review software used to perform mark-ups and reviews, and the ability to combine summary reports or plan review letters and comments from multiple departments and agencies to create on master plan review format with staff taking time to re-save and organize this.</p>		

<p>27. "City View Questions Only" Rate the integration of Blue Beam within the software in regards to staffs current familiarity and experience working within Blue Beam, and our citizen's current ability and experience working within Blue Beam, and workflows, tools, reports, or processes that the plan review software offers both sides.</p>		
<p>28. Accela Question Only" Rate the integration of PDF EDR within the software in regards staffs current familiarity and experience working within Blue Beam, and our citizen's current ability and experience working within Blue Beam, and workflows, tools, reports, or processes that the plan review software offers both sides.</p>		
<p>29. Rate the importance of having Microsoft Products including word, excel, and outlook integrated into the Land Management software from a staff and Departments perspective, and how this integration would enhance efficiency to help you manage workload and save time by having auto templates created within Microsoft, but still allowing you quick access to customize a letter without re-creating the entire template.</p>		
<p>30. Rate the software's ability to move between other programs through the integration workflow built- into the software, without actually having to stop and open up another program, or re-save files into our personal network folder and then re-load them back into the software.</p>		
<p>31. Rate the quality of the Plan Review software in having the capability to allow multiple staff members and citizens ability to simultaneously make corrections to a set of plans at the same time, the overlay capabilities of the plan review software to quickly catch what has been changed during the resubmittal.</p>		
<p>32. Rate the quality of the software in regards to tracking Planning Department applications throughout the entire process from intake to completion, including the ability to notify multiple professionals throughout the process, scheduling public meetings and sending notices to neighboring properties, and staff members user dashboard being utilized to assist you in managing your workload to ensure staff deadlines are being met.</p>		
<p>Software Process Improvement</p>	<p>Accela</p>	<p>CityView</p>
<p>Please rate questions 33-37 as: 1= No Change 2= 25% better than current processes 3= 50% better than current processes 4= 75% better than current processes 5= 100% better than current processes</p>		
<p>33. From a staff member and Department perspective, provide a rating of the software in terms how more effectively you feel you will be able to provide better outreach and education, customer service, increase efficiency, manage workload, and meet or possibly decrease your expected turn-around time frames through entire Plan Review Process.</p>		
<p>34. From a staff member and Department perspective, provide a rating of the software in terms how effectively you feel you will be able to manage code enforcement issues, to avoid missing or forgetting about deadlines related to compliance.</p>		
<p>36. From a staff member and Department perspective, provide a rating of the software in terms increased efficiency for daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual reports, and the ability for staff to easily create these reports without special knowledge beyond basic training provided through the testing process, and the ability to easily build custom reports thereafter.</p>		

<p>37. From a staff member and Department perspective, provide a rating of the software in terms how more effectively you feel it will reduce citizen calls inquiring about their projects and status of their projects during application review, inspections, final approval, or simple records request, and how much more easy this software will be from a citizens perspective to utilize with little training, and in terms of screen layout and their user dashboard.</p>		
<p>Vendor Capabilities</p>	<p>Accela</p>	<p>CityView</p>
<p>38. Please rate the quality of the inspection module within the software in regards to the public scheduling inspections online, notification if inspection time of arrival, email notification of results, ability to upload photos of inspections in the field, use of the inspection application when no cellular or wireless data is available, GIS functions for inspections.</p>		
<p>39. Please rate the inspection modules capability of providing the General Contractor with inspection results and reports for all Sub-Permits for Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, or other inspections from Planning Departments and Public Works Departments to help them manage their projects for full compliance.</p>		
<p>40. Please rate the vendors current proposal for the total number of templates that have been included with the cost proposal, to ensure both Planning Departments will be provided with a different template per Application Type you offer the public to avoid Script Change Order Fees during the implementation.</p>		
<p>41. Please rate the software in regards to management or supervisors having easy access to the Administration side of the software, which will allow them to quickly change workflow rules or processes, security access to different modules, setting notifications related to workflows, our customizing workflows after initial Go-Live date to avoid needing support from our IT Departments or the vendor.</p>		
<p>42. Please rate the vendors proposed services they offer in terms of customer support, time frame they have provided when support is requested, or their proposed levels of urgency per support request.</p>		
<p>43. Please rate the vendors proposed training schedule in regards to number of days on-site versus online training, classroom sizes, and separation of training per Department or module, and overall quality of the proposed training to ensure our organizations maximize the full extent of the software capabilities.</p>		
<p>44. Please rate the software in terms of having a majority of our required functions within our RFP actually pre-built into the software versus customization, this can be based upon the live demonstrations provided, the responses in the RFP, and cost proposals, and responses to our questions during the live demonstration and actually shown within the software.</p>		
<p>45. Please rate the vendor in regards to future development of newer software versions being developed, their company policies in receiving feedback to incorporate their customers' requests into these newer versions or software updates, and there current time-frames they have presented for major software version upgrades.</p>		
<p>46. As a staff member rate your confidence level of each vendor or their sub-contractor hired to perform all the services related to implementation listed and your confidence level in the price proposals provided to perform these services to ensure we receive the best possible product with little or no change orders.</p>		

47. Please rate the level of importance on a personal preference or as an organizational preference to have complete separation of software versions between the City and County, known as two instances.		
48. Please rate your confidence level in regards to the City/County sharing one instance of the software through an IGA agreement versus two instances.		
49. How many references did you call that were provided by the vendor. 1= 0 2= 1-2 3= 3-5 4= 5-7 5 = More than 7		
50. Please rate the vendor in regards to the references you called and the feedback that was provided on behalf of these references on a scale of 1-5.		
51. Please answer yes (2) or no (1) if the reference you called utilizes the newest version of each vendor.		
Total Points	0	0

Department	Evaluator	Accela	Cityview
RC Building	T. Carr	165.50	199.50
RC Building	D. Marchbanks	92.00	108.00
RC Building	T. Green	92.00	110.00
RC Building	R. Norton	35.00	36.00
RC Building	M. Ferrier	121.00	135.00
RC Building	L. Bensching	122.00	120.00
RC Building	J. DeWolfe	199.00	214.00
RC Building	A. Ellsworth	58.00	52.00
RC GIS	E. Keeling	50.00	59.00
RC IT	R. Felinczak	35.00	26.00
RC Planning	A. Goldich	82.00	122.00
RC EH	S. Cowman	94.00	92.00
SS Engineering	B. Beall	139.00	154.00
SS Planning	R. Bessey	111.00	144.00
SS IT	M. Schuette	0.00	0.00
Total Points		1395.50	1571.50
Total Evaluations		14.00	14.00
Score		99.68	112.25