



June 9, 2022

**Addendum #1
RP023-22**

Technical Consulting for Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) and Ad Valorem Tax Records Software

Please see the below summation of corrections, questions, and answers for the above solicitation.

Corrections

Page 4. Project Scope - Change From:

Therefore, the Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners is soliciting competitive sealed proposals from qualified firms to provide professional consulting services to assist the County in its efforts to evaluate the current CAMA system and Manatron-Aumentum applications to determine if additional hardware and software upgrades should be purchased or if an alternate single technology solution or suite of tools should be requisitioned to meet the County's needs with optimal performance and sustainable longevity to allow for proactive planning of resources to ensure continued accuracy and the ability for the Tax Commissioner's Office and Tax Assessors' Office to effectively collect the annual billing order of \$1.2 billion in property taxes.

Page 4. Project Scope - Change To:

Therefore, the Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners is soliciting competitive sealed proposals from qualified firms to provide professional consulting services to assist the County in its efforts to evaluate the current CAMA system and Manatron-Aumentum applications to determine if additional hardware and software upgrades should be purchased or if an alternate single technology solution or suite of tools should be requisitioned to meet the County's needs with optimal performance and sustainable longevity to allow for proactive planning of resources to ensure continued accuracy and the ability for the Tax Commissioner's Office and Tax Assessors' Office to effectively collect the annual billing order of \$1.4 billion in property taxes.

Page 5 Tab C – Project Management, Project Timeline Assurance – Change From:

Consultant should include a projected timeline with milestones that will meet Gwinnett County's overall timeline as indicated below:

Page 5 Tab C – Project Management, Project Timeline Assurance – Change To:

Consultant should include a projected timeline with milestones that can be mutually agreed upon.

Page 8 Tab E - References – Change From:

Consultant shall include at least five (5) different references of county organizations of the same size and complexity of Gwinnett County that have worked with the Consulting Firm in a professional consulting capacity specific to the creation of a proposal for their complete CAMA System and Tax Collections ecosystem as defined in the Project Overview of this document.

Page 8 Tab E - References – Change To:

Consultant shall include at least three (3) different references of county organizations of the same size and complexity of Gwinnett County that have worked with the Consulting Firm in a professional consulting capacity specific to the creation of a proposal for their complete CAMA System and Tax Collections ecosystem as defined in the Project Overview of this document.

Questions

- Q1. How much has the County customized the Manatron/Thomson Reuters systems specific to how the County operates its associated business processes?
A1. The Manatron-Aumentum software is highly configurable and is configured to meet Georgia code. It is not customized specifically for Gwinnett County.
- Q2. Why is the County undertaking this project at this specific time?
A2. Having been on the same system for more than 17 years, the County is interested in ensuring best practices are in place to meet the County's needs. The hardware and the software in place are currently under consideration for upgrade.
- Q3. Has the County identified a budget for the consulting services that you can share?
A3. There is approved funding for this project. Gwinnett County expects each firm to propose a competitive price. Award will be made to the highest scoring firm.
- Q4. Have there been any previous studies related to either of the business systems? If so, who performed that work and can the results of that work be shared?
A4. A request for information (RFI) was completed in 2018. Gwinnett County did not pursue a solicitation as a result of the RFI.
- Q5. Have there been any previous studies or evaluations related to department adherence to mandates and/or best practices? If so, who performed that work and can the results of that work be shared?
A5. See A4.
- Q6. If the decision is made and accepted by the County to move forward with the procurement of a new system(s), would the selected consultant be able to assist the County in the implementation of the selected solution(s) if the County determines those services are needed?
A6. At this time there are no legalities in place to exclude the consultant from assisting the County in the implementation. Implementation, if needed, would be procured through a separate request for proposal process.
- Q7. As part of the up-front assessment, is the County looking to have formal peer benchmarking conducted against other organizations of a similar size and complexity to the County?
A7. No.
- Q8. Is there a timeframe in which the County anticipating the project will start and a desired timeframe in which the up-front "options analysis" will be completed?
A8. Gwinnett County anticipates project start and completion as soon as possible. Gwinnett County will work with the awarded firm on a mutually agreed upon timeframe.
- Q9. Please provide the following:
a. Actual data or an estimated summary that identifies number and types of parcels (the request for proposal includes personal and real parcel estimates; please provide how many of the real are residential, industrial, exempt, etc.)
b. Actual data or an estimate of the number of tax delinquencies in the most recent year that data is available
c. Actual data or an estimate of the number of exemptions
**A9. a. 49,618 personal; 294,500 real (277,000 residential; 14,500 industrial; 3,000 exempt)
b. 18,500
c. 347,277 in 2021**

Q10. Tab-A Firm Experience and Qualifications, Item#8 Subject Matter Expertise, Page 5: Is it the County's expectation that the chosen firm must have expertise across all areas (A through J), and are there any areas that would may be looked upon more favorably than others (e.g. Public sector Tax Assessment and Collections vs. High Availability and Disaster Recovery)?

A10. Yes.

Q11. Tab-D Technical Knowledge, Page 6 & 7: The County does not mention the need for the consulting partner to be objective with respect to the Assessment, Tax & Revenue vendors being considered, as is typically required for selection projects. Is this a quality that the County seeks?

A11. Yes.

Q12. Cost Proposal, Page 8: Please clarify the County's preference with regards to place of performance. For example, is a hybrid delivery approach (largely remote delivery with on-site for critical meetings/briefings) acceptable? Or does the County prefer a 100% on-site delivery model?

A12. Remote and on-site are both acceptable.

Q13. Which firms attended the preproposal conference?

A13. Mindpearl, Grant Thornton, Plante Moran, Gartner Consulting, and Vision Government Solutions

Acknowledge receipt of this addendum on Page 12 of the proposal document.

Sincerely,



Dana Garland, CPPB, NIGP-CPP
Purchasing