ADDENDUM #1
Information Technology
Project Agenda Automation
RFP # 7190-20

January 15, 2021

The attached addendum supersedes the original Information and Specifications regarding RFP # 7190-20 where it adds to, deletes from, clarifies or otherwise modifies. All other conditions and any previous addendums shall remain unchanged.

Please note: Due to COVID-19, BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org**.**

1. Question: How many departments and committees will be using the agenda software?

   ANSWER: It will be somewhere between 15 and 20 departments and committees using the platform.

2. Question: How many different workflows will be needed?

   ANSWER: We would like to start with at least six operational workflows.

3. Question: Are there multiple meeting types? Could you give an amount?

   ANSWER: Yes. We have identified at least the following 8 but there will be more, up to 12
   - **Work/Joint Sessions**
   - **Public Hearings**
   - **Public Meetings**
   - **Business Meetings**
   - **Organization Meetings**
   - **Board of Adjustment**

- **Parks and Open Space Advisory Committee**
- **Community Planning and Permitting Planning Commission**

4. Question: How many agenda templates will be required?

   ANSWER: Up to a dozen, in relevance to the number of meeting types, but considering the similarities between certain meetings, we will start with 3 or 4. Additionally, we would like to be able to adjust the template after it is instantiated into an agenda. Example: Removing certain headlines or sections like titles, etc...

5. Question: On page 5 of the RFP a "drawing" and "specifications" are mentioned, where can we find those items?

   ANSWER: Page 5 is our standard RFP wording. In this particular RFP there is no drawing to review. There is a specification file in the form of an Excel spreadsheet.

6. Question: If it is suggested that a staggered implementation approach is ideal to optimize project roll-out. Would it be amenable to the County to take this approach, even if it affects the June rollout date desired?

   ANSWER: We have one department (Board of County Commissioners) that must be live in May with several users being able to submit agenda items. Other departments/commissions could be staggered, but it is not preferred. Our goal is to be fully operational by end of June for all departments.

7. Question: Is there a budget?

   ANSWER: Yes, but that information is not available at this time. We want to focus on the answers from a business requirement standpoint before discussing budget.

8. Question: What advantages are you seeking by "automatically" moving Agenda Items through approval process and state? What triggers an automatic transition? (REF #5)

   ANSWER: The main advantage is to reduce manual activities. For example: an agenda item has been submitted for review and must pass two levels of approval before it gets added to an agenda. We expect that email notifications be sent to the approvers at both levels to inform them they have to review and approve the item. Once approved at first level the item would go to second

level automatically. The submitter would also receive notifications of the item's status in the workflow.

9. Question: How much flexibility is expected to change templates? i.e. Will the templates be set once at the beginning or need to be changed often? (REF #6)

    ANSWER: In most cases, the templates format will be set at the beginning of this implementation and seldom changed afterwards in terms of format. But there are items within the templates that will change on a semi-regular basis like for example the names of board members, the name of the board itself due to organizational changes, etc...

10. Question: Can you please give examples of how these may be used? (REF #9)

    ANSWER: We expect the system to allow us to create custom fields for certain objects when these objects do not have it natively.
    A good example for a user object is a "department" field. It may be present but if we want to add a second layer and add the "division" of the user.
    Another example for an agenda item object is being able to create a custom field to specify possible actions on that object: "approve", "reject", "tabled to a date-certain", "send to another board or commission", etc....
    Overall we hope the proposed solution has that object custom field feature available to an administrator, without having to require development cycles from the bidder.

11. Question: What advantages are you seeking by having workflows function in this way? (REF #10)

    ANSWER: The advantages are:
    -   **Workflow consistency for agenda item objects created under the same template for a specific board. For example: all agenda items created for planning commission would follow the same "planning commission" workflow.**
    -   **Workflow consistency for agenda item objects related to a specific meeting type. For example: all agenda items related to a Planning Commission meeting also follow the same process.**
    Having workflow assign at either board or meeting type gives us extra granularity in managing them.

12. Question: What advantages are you seeking by having workflows function in this way? (REF #11)

    ANSWER: See answer #11

13. Question: Can you describe the different post-approval workflow steps that you are seeking? (REF #13)

   ANSWER: See answer #8. To extend the answer, once an agenda item has been approved, it could be assigned to the immediate next meeting or deferred to another meeting in the future, or transferred to another board because it's more appropriate to be reviewed there. These are a couple different post-approval steps that could be used.

14. Question: Can you please describe what meta-data is expected for here? (REF #20)

   ANSWER: See answer #10 related to custom fields. To extend the answer to meta-data, we'd like to know item creation date, creator, an audit trail of the status it went through, etc... We expect each object in the system will have this sort of meta-data and hope the bidder can explain what they are in their proposals.

15. Question: Can you please explain how you expect scheduled and completed states to be managed the lifecycle? (REF #23)

   ANSWER: "Scheduled" would be when the item is assigned to a "Meeting" object with a scheduled date. "Completed" would be after board review/approval during that meeting. Additionally, these two states (like any other state of an agenda item) can be used to "trigger" automated actions, for example sending email to the submitter about the status of the agenda item.

16. Question: Can you explain the expected management of cutoff dates (e.g. at Board level, at Meeting level, etc)? (REF #25)

   ANSWER: Usually the cut-off date will be a couple business days prior to the meeting, and we expect the submitter cannot create or modify an agenda item past the cut-off date for a scheduled meeting. At that point, only the meeting manager or administrator would be able to "override" any submitted agenda item for a particular meeting.

17. Question: What types of custom fields are you seeking? (REF #38)

   ANSWER: See answer #10

18. Question: What's the intended use of the generated Microsoft Word document? Does it need to be Word so that it can be further edited or would a PDF product be acceptable if editing could happen in the system? (REF #54)

ANSWER: The intended use is to provide a draft to internal or external parties that may not have access to the solution and add non-official information to it like potential outside speakers.

Most recently, because of COVID 19 and the way we have conducted our meetings remotely, we also present/share that generated document into our remote meeting solutions.

Additionally, depending on the level of integration with the video system, we could use such a file to import into the video system to perform the tagging of the video in regards to agenda items.

Finally, we could print such a document and make it physically available on post-boards and such.

Word is preferred, PDF is acceptable.

19. Question: Confirming that the official mail service system used by the county is MS exchange /Office. Correct?

    ANSWER: Correct. Office 365 with Exchange Online GCC

20. Question: Referring to line #52 in the Business Requirements tab, does the proposed solution need to take into account free/busy status of the rooms? If so, should the system prompt the meeting creator to alternative rooms or time?

    ANSWER: This particular scenario is not a hard requirement, but it would be great if the proposed solution could do this.

21. Question: Referring to line #52 in the Business Requirements tab, will the zoom/Teams links be selected by the creator? Will there be a pool of links to choose from in order to avoid conflicts?

    ANSWER: Online meeting links would be inputted for each meetings, however if links for recurring meetings (they do not change either in Teams or Zoom) can be added to the meeting template, that would be ideal.

22. Question: What is the budget for this project?

    ANSWER: See answer #7

23. Question: Is the ability to time-stamp Agenda Items required to be available during the meeting, after the meeting, or both?

    ANSWER: Both

24. Question: Does the County require the ability to receive comments from constituents on specifically chosen (or all) agenda items prior to the meeting, to be made available for review by elected officials and/or staff?

    ANSWER: This is not a hard requirement, as specified in the requirement document. But if the solution can offer it then yes.

Submittal Instructions:

Submittals are due at the email box only, listed below, for time and date recording on or before **2:00 p.m. Mountain Time on January 29, 2021**.

Please note that email responses are limited to a maximum of 50MB capacity. NO ZIP FILES OR LINKS TO EXTERNAL SITES WILL BE ACCEPTED. Electronic Submittals must be received in the email box listed below. Submittals sent to any other box will NOT be forwarded or accepted. This email box is only accessed on the due date of your questions or proposals. Please use the Delivery Receipt option to verify receipt of your email. It is the sole responsibility of the proposer to ensure their documents are received before the deadline specified above. Boulder County does not accept responsibility under any circumstance for delayed or failed email or mailed submittals.

Email purchasing@bouldercounty.org; identified as **RFP # 7190-20** in the subject line.

All proposals must be received and time and date recorded at the purchasing email by the above due date and time. Sole responsibility rests with the Offeror to see that their bid is received on time at the stated location(s). Any bid received after due date and time will be returned to the bidder. No exceptions will be made.

The Board of County Commissioners reserve the right to reject any and all bids, to waive any informalities or irregularities therein, and to accept the bid that, in the opinion of the Board, is in the best interest of the Board and of the County of Boulder, State of Colorado.

**RECEIPT OF LETTER
ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

January 15, 2021

Dear Vendor:

This is an acknowledgment of receipt of Addendum #1 for RFP #7190-20, **Project Agenda Automation**.

In an effort to keep you informed, we would appreciate your acknowledgment of receipt of the preceding addendum. Please sign this acknowledgment and email it back to purchasing@bouldercounty.org as soon as possible. If you have any questions, or problems with transmittal, please call us at 303-441-3525. This is also an acknowledgement that the vendor understands that **due to COVID-19, BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org.**

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. This information is time and date sensitive; an immediate response is requested.

Sincerely,

Boulder County Purchasing

Signed by: _____ Date: _____

Name of Company_____

End of Document