



ADDENDUM NO. 2

DATE: October 6, 2014
FROM: City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division
TO: All Offerors
RE: RFI-3915-14-SH County Clerks Recording System

Firms responding to the above referenced solicitation are hereby instructed that the requirements have been clarified, modified, superseded and supplemented as to this date as hereinafter described.

1. I was just interested to know if the CCCA currently uses a recording system, and if so, who is the vendor who provides it? When was it acquired from said vendor and what, if you know, is the main reason for switching to a new system? I was also curious how this effort is being funded and how you plan to proceed after reviewing responses to the RFI (RFP, state contract, etc...)? – There is no current CCCA or state supported system in existence. Currently 64 counties contract independently with one of nine vendors. Ages of the systems vary from over ten years old to a few counties who have recently implemented a new system.
The plan is to establish budgetary and functional requirements for a possible future procurement.
The goal is to find out what options might be out there and ask what it might cost so that fees can be established to build funds for a future RFP.
2. Is the intent of this RFI to be followed at some point with an RFP from the CCCA? - The intent of the RFI is to identify available functionality and obtain a potential cost basis that could support a future RFP. As part of the objective, CCCA is considering creation of a “specific use fund” that could support counties in the ongoing replacement and maintenance of their recording management systems.
3. Is the intent of this RFI to only simplify the procurement process for each county or to create a centralized recording system that a county may opt in to use? - The CCCA is seeking your input to identify available functionality through this process and a potential cost estimate. The intent of this project is to provide a complete turnkey commercial off the shelf (COTS) Recording System which may be used by any Colorado county to

provide the services listed in the RFI including but not limited to electronic recording services, issuance of marriage licenses/civil unions licenses, data management and archiving, disaster recovery and to provide online access to all participating counties and stakeholders to recorded documents across the state. At this point we are seeking information and cost estimates. In doing so, the RFI may contribute to a future RFP that could potentially simplify counties procurement for a recording management system by offering a comprehensively vetted and competitively priced recording management solution or organically become a centrally supported recording system.

4. Is the intent of this RFI to provide all hardware (servers, client work stations, scanners, printers, etc.)? Is this a mandatory requirement? - As part of the RFI, we need to understand your hardware requirements. The RFI provides the option for vendors to include those items. If applicable, pricing should include the cost of hardware. The cost of hardware should be priced separately, in a line item format to allow counties to factor the cost in or out of a total cost projection.
5. Under PROJECT INTENT/GOALS – the RFI talks about “online access to all participating counties and stakeholders”. Is the intent to have a centralized repository or for each county to have its own repository? If it is, where would this be located? - It really depends on the counties. It may start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centralized repository over time at the sole discretion of participating counties. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for either structure.
6. Under SERVICES a) ii., is the intent to provide integration with a company like Simplifile or to provide a web based program to submit or both? - Responses may include integration with an e-record submitter such as Simplifile or could be a provided web based program or both. There is desire for internal eRecording functionality that would enable internal (other county funded submitters) to submit documents without requiring a 3rd party vendor.
7. Page 4, Project Intent/Goals, second paragraph? - Yes. Exhibit A was published under Addendum 1 on October 1, 2014.
8. Page 4, Services, a), ii: Web based e-recording. Is it the intent that the “system” provide a State eRecording portal? If yes, how will the service be funded? Submitter will pay – same structure as existing eVendors? No cost to the submitter (free eRecording) - Flat rate maintenance fee paid by “system” counties? Other method? -_The system could provide a state eRecording portal, or the system could provide individual eRecording portals in each region or in each county. Currently the submitter pays a fee when e-recording. Currently counties pay maintenance fees to the Recording vendor that accommodates e-recording. In the future the fee structure could be altered. We seek a better way to do business and to lessen the costs to smaller jurisdictions. We seek suggestions and pricing in this request for information.
9. Page 4, Services, b), iii: Ability to have a rush status or workflow. The requirement is asking for rush status or workflow. Could you please elaborate on this requirement? Is this a request due to a limitation of an existing system? - Rush status or workflow is included to provide the ability to have a rush status or workflow expedited for select recorded documents such as marriage licenses that are needed right away.

10. Page 4, Services, e),ii: Receive payments at county's POS locations. Are these payments received from the eRecording systems from Services, item a)? - It would be desirable for the cashiering system to be able to accept payments over-the-counter or on-line from web based subscriptions or transactions.
11. Page 5, Services, k), i: Support multiple formats and customized. Could you please elaborate on the requirement? - Please provide a list of supported formats and standards (PRIA, etc...).
12. Page 2, section 2 Project Background: Provision of a solution that will enable implementation of mandatory all electronic recording statewide. From the requirements from the Services section of the RFI it appears that walk-in paper documents will be converted to eDocuments via either an Over the Counter eRecording solution or an eRecording Kiosk. Is this correct? Regarding mail documents. How will these be handled? Over the Counter eRecording solution? Rejected per a new statute? - The solution of recording all documents in the order they are received from any source could be an all electronic recording system. If there is another way to accomplish it without manual tracking or manipulation we would be interested to know what that looks like. Our desired functionality is to convert any paper document received over-the-counter or by mail into an electronic document in the order received and then place the electronic document into an electronic recording work queue. However, we are open to any other workflows or suggestions that would accomplish our goal. Mail documents could be scanned into a kiosk or over the counter eRecording solution by a staff member upon receipt. We are not envisioning any automatic rejection protocols for receiving a paper document either in person or by mail. Our desire is to convert them into an electronic document and then place them into an electronic recording queue in the order received.
13. Project Requirements (Page 4): The second paragraph under PROJECT INTENT/GOALS, refers to an attached Exhibit A. The document I downloaded had no Exhibit. Please clarify whether there is an Exhibit or if all required services are contained in the SERVICES section that follows this paragraph on pages 4 and 5. - Yes Exhibit A should have been attached; it was posted and noticed in Addendum 1 on October 1, 2014.
14. SERVICES item e iii (Page 4), Integrate with County's electronic accounting software: Does the accounting software vary from county to county or do all use the same one? If the same, what is the product name. Is it custom software? - The accounting software varies from county to county. It would be helpful for you to respond with a list of systems your software is compatible with and indicate your willingness to customize an interface if necessary. What are your solutions preferred method for exchanging data? Web Services API, Export/Import, etc...
15. SERVICES item f (Page 4), Integration with Assessor's office data: Does this software vary from county to county or do all use the same software? If the same, what is the product name. Is it custom software? - The Assessor's software varies from county to county. It would be helpful for you to respond with a list of systems your software is compatible with and indicate your willingness to customize an interface if necessary. Does your solution offer the capability to export documents and associated metadata

on a predefined scheduled via electronic means (i.e.; FTP, direct download, Email, etc...)

16. Is the intent of the RFI to provide a single portal for searching state-wide rather than county by county? - It depends on the counties. It may start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centralized repository over time at the sole discretion of participating counties. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for both structures for consideration.
17. Do all the counties have high-speed internet access? - All counties are connected to the statewide voter registration system. Speeds vary but there are no dial-up connections left. The Secretary of State's office upgraded connections in 2007 and 2008.
18. Is the state looking for on-site installations vs. cloud installations? - Currently it is on-site installations. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for either structure.
19. What recording system components should be included in pricing/cost for each of the different recording volume levels:
 - a. e-Marriage services – for remote internet completion of marriage license applications?
 - b. OCR/Automated Indexing?
 - c. OCR/Automated Redaction?
 - d. Passport Application Processing?
 - e. "Web Services" component for integration with other systems (Appraisal, County)?- The desired outcome is to have options for all sizes of counties.
20. Page 5, item "k.i." includes the word "construction" among the services to be provided by a vendor. Can you provide an indication of what "construction" this RFI anticipates a software vendor might provide? - Construction in this context means assembly.
21. Does this RFI contemplate that there are likely to be a number of "customization" requirements that counties may have that will impact cost outside of a standardized software offering? - The CCCA has not surveyed counties on the customizations that currently exist in their systems today nor are we confident to say what the need maybe with a new system. Exhibit A was meant to be an indicator of basic functionality expected in a desirable recording system.
22. What additional services are being sought by this RFI?
 - a. SaaS/Hosting of the land records application?
 - b. Disaster Recovery Services?
 - c. On-going Hardware Maintenance services? - Please provide information for all three items if you offer the service.
23. The RFI appears to contemplate the need for conversion services for index and images from prior/existing systems. Since there is wide variation in the volume needs for conversion based on the date ranges for specific county's use of such systems,

how does this RFI envision the likely variation in conversion services costs? - It will be appropriate for vendors to include a range of conversion costs in their response.

24. How does the RFI contemplate or envision that a vendor should respond when there are likely wide variations in the number of full staff users and the number of public users in each office, especially in those offices where the range of recordings is between 20,000 and 100,000, or those over 100,000? (Financial, etc.) - The CCCA expects that the vendor would respond with pricing scenarios to serve various sizes of counties small being considered less than 20,000, medium being considered 20,000 to 100,000 and large being over 100,000. We seek a better way to do business and to lessen the costs to smaller jurisdictions. We seek suggestions and pricing in this request for information.
25. Are you envisioning a statewide eRecording portal only solution that all Counties and stakeholders have access too? - The system could provide a state eRecording portal, or the system could provide individual eRecording portals in each region or in each county. We seek a better way to do business and to lessen the costs to smaller jurisdictions. We seek suggestions and pricing in this request for information.
26. Is the proposed system to be designed to limit access to only those counties to become part of the system and their stakeholders to search for and view the recorded documents of those counties who are participants in the County Clerks Recording System? - The request for information is seeking a better way to do business and to lessen the costs to the smaller jurisdictions. If there is benefit or consequence to either scenario (limited access to only those counties or welcoming to other counties to upload to) please respond with pricing for both models.
27. Is this envisioned to be a recording system for all 64 counties connected to the system, or instead is the proposed system to connect to the counties and pass the documents and payments for the county system to record? - It depends on the counties. It may start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centrally managed system counties feed into. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for both structures for consideration.
28. In regards to searching is this to search all counties or the specific county where one is conducting business? - It depends on the counties. It may start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centralized repository over time at the sole discretion of participating counties. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for both structures for consideration.
29. The RFI states that all documents are to be sent electronically and also says that Respondents and representatives and interested person may be present for the Open Records review after a final selections made. Will the responses be opened at a public location or just opened electronically and shared? - There is no final selection anticipated and may be boilerplate language that was inadvertently included. They will be opened at a public location.

30. Is the City of Grand Junction serving as the sole representative of the CCCA? This inquiry is being made as the city is not a current member of the CCCA and there may be some questions pertaining to the county and the city that considerably differ. - No, the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County have partnered to share purchasing services. Therefore the City is assisting with the RFI for Mesa County who is a member of the CCCA.
31. Not all counties have the same protocols and processes. Are you expecting this to be standardized for all counties that are connected to the system or just standardized for the stakeholders? - The CCCA imposes no expectations on the individual counties for standardization. Standardization might happen organically for the counties using the same vendor and serving a common pool of stakeholders.
32. Do all counties use the same accounting software? If not how many different systems is the proposed system expected to connect to? Have all the County's electronic accounting software been identified and is the list available? - The accounting software varies from county to county. It would be helpful for you to respond with a list of systems your software is compatible with and indicate your willingness to customize an interface if necessary. What are your solutions preferred method for exchanging data? Web Services API, Export/Import, etc... No a list has not been compiled but certainly would need to be prior to the release of an RFP.
33. Do you expect the single vendor to supply the kiosk systems or will they be provided by each county that wants a kiosk? - Pricing should include, at a minimum, construction, equipment, software, initial and ongoing maintenance, installation.
34. Do you anticipate the vendor to convert all existing data and images from all counties, or only from the participating counties? - Conversion for participating counties.
35. Do you expect the vendor to redact the documents and send to the counties documents that are changed and different in content than what is provided to the vendor by the submitter? - There are counties who do not provide on-line access to images because they do not possess the resources and/or software to perform the redaction required. Exhibit A, Item 21 requests the functionality on a go forward basis. If it is an option for historical documents to be redacted as a service you would provide, please do include that pricing structure. Counties desire to have documents that are currently redacted, with a stored back up image, to be converted to a new system in their current state (if there is a back-up image without redaction that would also be desired.)
36. Is the proposed system to search on all the existing records housed in all the counties that participate? - It depends on the counties. It may start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centralized repository over time at the sole discretion of participating counties. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for both structures for consideration.
37. Is the proposed system expected to be a single repository of all the existing and future recorded documents regardless of the original format and index that they are currently maintained under within each individual county? - It depends on the counties. It may

start as an individual on-premise solution to a small number of counties and then organically grow to be a centralized repository over time at the sole discretion of participating counties. It could be a go forward solution or include existing and future recorded documents. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas for both structures for consideration.

38. Are the fees the same in every participating county for all documents types and recording services? - Most fees are set according to Colorado Revised Statutes. Additional fees or customizations would be a consideration for all interested counties. Copy charges, subscriptions and bulk images currently vary. The system should be able to accommodate fee structures determined by each county.
39. Will each county provide a secure process for sending payments to? - Secure environments and process may become a requirement if the system were to take the shape of a centrally managed system and if payments were collected centrally. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas regarding possible structures for consideration.
40. Have the counties agreed to provide APIs to allow connection to their filing systems and payment systems? - Crafting agreements for connections may become a possible requirement if the system were to take the shape of a centrally managed system and if document submissions and payments were collected centrally. We do not wish to limit options and would appreciate pricing and ideas regarding possible structures for consideration.
41. Are you expecting the vendor to supply the hardware or will the counties take responsibility for procuring and maintaining the required hardware? - Pricing should include, at a minimum, construction, equipment, software, initial and ongoing maintenance, installation of equipment and software, and training. The needs of each county are likely to vary. Please separate the cost of hardware. (See Question and Answer 4).
42. Exhibit "A" requirements were released about a week after the RFI. Would you consider extending the deadline one week to 10/17/14 to provide additional time for documenting these items in the response? - No. We are not inclined to extend at this point in time.

The original solicitation for the project noted above is amended as noted.

All other conditions of subject remain the same.

Respectfully,

Susan Hyatt
Senior Buyer
City of Grand Junction, Colorado

