

COUNCIL ACTION FORM

SUBJECT: PURCHASE OF INSPECTION DIVISION SOFTWARE

BACKGROUND:

On June 21, 2011, the City Council held a work session with developers to discuss the impact that the City's various development codes have on the renovation of existing buildings. Resulting from that meeting were several suggestions — specifically updated technology — that could help provide better customer service and increase the overall efficiency of the City's Inspection Division.

In an effort to address these concerns, the Deputy Fire Chief was asked to help lead a process for determining software needs for the Inspection Division. Several actions were taken to help determine what might improve the efforts of this Division, including meeting with members of the Division and speaking with other subject matter experts. It was eventually determined that a software solution might greatly assist members of the Inspection Division in the following areas:

Field Mobility

- Ability to complete mobile inspections
- Create field checklists for inspectors
- Provide field access to adopted ICC codes, or State and local ordinances in the field
- Ability to capture customer signatures in the field and e-mail completed forms to customers
- Ability to generate new inspections or add additional information in the field
- Ability to access calendars, past inspections in the field
- Logging of time for field inspectors
- Solutions to provide better efficiency, as well as free time up for the front office clerks

Improved Customer Interactions

- Immediately provide inspection results (rather than wait for a mailed letter)

- Customer access portals (for pulling permits and scheduling inspections – staff, citizens, and contractors)
- Ability to pay bills online with electronic fee payment/cashiering module

Overall Efficiency

- Standard reports which would negate the need to ask for IT's assistance
- Electronic plan review
- Rental housing Inspection module
- Use of Android, Windows, or apple-based products
- Interface with GIS
- Ability to work with other City departments (GIS, Planning & Housing, Public works, etc.)

During the summer of 2011, a cross-departmental group of City employees representing Information Technology (IT), Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Purchasing, Inspections and Fire met several times to discuss options, further review the needs of Division, and develop a Request for Proposals (RFP).

First RFP

In October of 2011, the Division released an RFP for new Inspection Software in accordance with the City's Purchasing Policies and Procedures. In November, the group reassembled to evaluate the 10 vendor proposals received which included 13 different options. Proposals were independently evaluated, scored, and ranked based on a pre-developed matrix with criteria that included proposed design, vendor, experience/references, and cost. The top four vendors were then invited to Ames to provide on-site demonstrations, where each presentation was evaluated, scored, and ranked based on a pre-developed matrix. The criteria for these evaluations included

product scalability, product functionality, proposed design, and overall presentation. The presentations were evaluated by a group of from 13 to 18 City employees representing Inspections, IT, GIS, Finance, Fire, Public Works, Planning and Housing, and the City Assessor's Office. In an effort to learn from others who had recently been through a similar process, in May 2012 six staff members traveled to Omaha to meet with that city's Applications Analyst for Permits/Inspections/Planning to observe and ask questions regarding their inspection software process implementation.

All proposal and presentation evaluations were then tallied by the Purchasing Division. A lead vendor was identified based on meeting all the pre-identified needs of the Inspection Division. **However, the costs of the purchase and implementation were higher than originally anticipated. This concern was taken back to Council, where City staff was directed to budget additional funds to cover the purchase of this software. By the time this directive was received and sufficient funds (\$250,000) were set aside for the purchase, a significant amount of time had passed, and the date timeline for each vendor's cost estimation had expired. The Finance Division was consulted, and their recommendation was to re-release a revised RFP.**

Second RFP

City staff took time to revise the RFP and seek additional input from other City departments. In May of 2013, a second RFP was released. A multi-step process was initiated with Finance's assistance to help select a potential vendor. By June of 2013 a total of seven vendor proposals had been received. The team of seven City employees representing Inspections, IT, GIS, Finance and Fire independently reviewed each proposal, based on a predetermined matrix evaluating cost, responsiveness to the proposal requirements, project understanding, vendor qualifications, and previous experience/references. Scoring and other information about these proposals is summarized below:

Vendors	Total Score	Rank	1 st Year Cost	Ongoing (Annual) Cost	5-Year Cost
Accela/Woolpert, Inc., Reedley CA	512.78	1	\$232,706	\$38,926	\$427,686
EnerGovTyler Technologies, Inc., Duluth, GA	507.76	2	\$258,843	\$37,598	\$409,235
CRW Systems, Carlsbad, CA	450.20	3	\$314,718	\$40,033	\$485,130
CityWorks, Sandy, UT	445.84	4	\$148,423	\$41,273	\$313,515
The Davenport Group, Crystal Lake, IL	444.24	5	\$190,228	\$32,823	\$321,520
Beehive Industries, LLC, Lincoln, NE	372.26	6	\$137,835	\$83,418	\$471,508
Telepresence, Inc., Huntsville, AL	284.00	7	\$158,335	N/A	N/A

Each score was based on a scale of 1 to 5. Overall, 700 possible points were available cumulatively for each firm that responded. **The top two firms were then invited to participate in an on-site interview.** Their presentations would be evaluated by a group of 12 to 14 City employees, representing more than 10 departments or divisions, and be based on product scalability, product functionality, proposed design, and overall presentation.

Based on the matrix combining these criteria, the total scores for the presentations were as shown below:

Vendors	Total Score	Rank	1 st Year Cost	Ongoing (Annual) Cost	5-Year Cost
EnerGovTyler Technologies, Inc., Duluth, GA	73.50	1	\$258,843	\$37,598	\$409,235
Accela/Woolpert, Inc., Reedley CA	66.25	2	\$232,706	\$38,926	\$427,686

Each score was based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 100 possible points being available cumulatively for each firm.

Based on the matrix combining all the previous criteria (presentation, proposal, and cost), the averaged total scores for the entire process are shown below:

Process Step	EnerGov/Tyler Technologies, Inc.	Accela/Woolpert Inc.
Presentation Average Semi -Total:	73.50	66.25
Proposal Average Semi-Total:	64.74	65.85
Cost Semi-Total	54.60	51.80
TOTALS	192.84	183.90

Lastly, the seven-member team called vendor references, reviewed the evaluation results based on this multi-step process (including a professional proposal, highly regarded presentation, moderate one-time/ongoing costs, very positive reference checks, and accessibility of a local Ames office), and recommended that the top vendor—EnerGov/Tyler Technologies, Inc. (Tyler)—be selected.

Not only was EnerGov/Tyler Technologies, Inc. the top choice of the evaluation group, but their business history was substantially impressive. Qualifications include the following:

- 40+ years of industry-leading technology and solutions-based service to more than 11,000 local government agencies
- 2,500 employees throughout 26 offices country-wide, with revenues of \$309 million (2011)
- Named one of “America’s 200 Best Companies” for four consecutive years, and one of the top “100 Most Trustworthy U.S. Companies” by Forbes Magazine

Also of importance for consideration in this decision is that EnerGov/Tyler Technologies, Inc:

- While headquartered in Dallas, TX, the firm has a local Ames office at 2730 Ford Street.
- The software is used in Iowa, with inspection, permitting or land management software utilized in both Cedar Rapids and Polk County.
- They have proposed a six-stage or phased implementation approach that should have many of the software solutions in place to assist members of the Inspection Division

within 10 to 12 months of commencing work. This will significantly improve customer interactions in the field and immediately allow for a more streamlined documentation process for our inspectors and front counter staff.

A final contract with Tyler has been negotiated that represents a decrease in one-time costs by more than \$20,000. The proposed purchase agreement includes costs for one-time software charges, annual maintenance, onsite training, production support, report development, data conversions/integrations, ePortal (the customer’s remote access), and travel costs for the vendor. Based on Tyler’s proposal and City of Ames IT cost estimations, a revised cost projection is as follows:

Services	Onetime Costs	Annual Costs		MS Office/Windows License	\$3,335	\$3,335
(Vendor Fees)				Internet Bandwidth	\$0	\$0
Proposal Summary	\$160,811	\$16,965		SSL Certificate	\$995	\$995
ePortal	\$20,000	\$4,000		Depreciation	\$0	\$3,440
(City IT Costs)				Inspector Hardware/Misc	\$25,521	\$4,999
ePortal Services	\$6,800	\$0		Total	\$238,200	\$43,932
MS Server Licenses	\$3,538	\$1,280		5 Year Cost	\$413,928	
SQL Server/Support	\$7,500	\$3,567				
Application Server/Support	\$5,800	\$3,567				
Web Server/Support	\$3,900	\$1,784				

Thus, staff is requesting from Council authorization to enter into the proposed agreement with EnerGov/Tyler Technologies, Inc. for the purchase of recommended software, installation services, and associated hardware at a cost of \$238,200.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve a contract with Tyler Technologies Inc. to purchase the recommended software, installation services, and associated hardware for a total project cost of \$238,200.
2. Refer the process back to staff with direction to revise the contract with Tyler Technologies, Inc.
3. Direct staff to work with the runner-up vendor (Accela/Woolpert, Inc.) to negotiate an agreement.
4. Direct staff to revise the RFP and go back out for bids.
5. Decide not to purchase a new Inspection Software system at this time.

MANAGER’S RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The software presently being used is not specifically designed for the operations of the Inspections Division, and has proven to be cumbersome and antiquated. Currently the Inspections Division does not have field access to information. Hardware allowing for the use of mobile applications will help facilitate in-field documentation and scheduling for our customers.

From permitting and licensing to inspections and work-orders, proper software provides essential tools to increase productivity and help manage administrative operations. Besides administrative efficiency, our customers will be better served if they have Internet access for their permits and other related data.

New inspections and permitting hardware and software would help facilitate the Inspection Division's ongoing efforts to better manage its operations. The software would be common to the building, rental, plumbing, and mechanical inspections, and would be shared with the Departments of Planning & Housing and Public Works.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the City Manager that the City Council adopt Alternative No. 1, thereby directing staff to sign the agreement with Tyler to purchase and install the recommended software.