

Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software Systems Environment



Solicitation Due Date: April 11, 2022

Time: 3:00 p.m. (Mountain Time)

All Proposals must be received by City of Helena, (City) by the date and time cited above. It shall be the Respondent's sole risk to assure submission by the designated time.

VENDORS ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO READ THE ENTIRE SOLICITATION.

Solicitation packages can be obtained by downloading from the City purchasing website, <https://www.helenamt.gov/business/bids/rfprfq> for further information on obtaining copies of the RFP. Should you experience problems downloading the solicitation, contact (Tyler Weingartner – tweingartner@helenamt.gov).

All questions concerning the RFP **must** be submitted via email only, BerryDunn (Kate Offerdahl-Joyce – kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com) as identified within this solicitation in [Section 1.8](#). Communications with other City staff may disqualify you from the evaluation process.

Forms, Worksheets, and Other Attachments

Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms

(See MS Word document "City of Helena ERP RFP – Attachment A.docx")

Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities

(See MS Excel spreadsheet "City of Helena ERP RFP – Attachment B.xlsx")

Attachment C1 – Cost Worksheets

(See MS Excel spreadsheet "City of Helena ERP RFP – Attachment C1.xlsx")

Attachment C2 – Cost Narrative

(See MS Word document "City of Helena ERP RFP – Attachment C2.docx")

Attachment D – Agreement for Professional Services

(See MS Word document "City of Helena ERP RFP – Attachment D.docx")



Forms, Worksheets, and Other Attachments..... i

1 RFP Introduction and Background..... 4

1.1 Introduction..... 4

1.2 About The City..... 4

1.3 Project Objectives..... 5

1.4 Definitions..... 6

1.5 RFP Schedule of Events..... 7

1.6 Prequalification of Vendors..... 8

1.7 Minimum Qualifications..... 8

1.8 Questions and Inquiries..... 8

1.9 Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference..... 8

1.10 Amendments and Addenda..... 9

1.11 Non-Warranty of RFP Information..... 9

2 Project Scope.....10

2.1 Functional Areas.....10

2.2 Alternate Proposals, Partnerships and Proposers of Subsets of Functionality.....14

2.3 City and Project Staffing.....15

2.4 Deployment Model.....15

2.5 Number of Users.....16

2.6 Potential Phasing and Target Live Dates.....17

2.7 Current Applications Environment.....17

2.8 Project Management Documentation.....20

2.9 Budget.....20

2.10 Personnel.....21

2.11 Software Upgrades.....21

2.12 Performance Review.....21

3 Proposal Evaluation and Award22

3.1 Evaluation Process.....22

3.2 Clarification and Discussion of Proposals.....23

3.3 Evaluation Criteria.....23

3.4 No Obligation, Right of Rejection, and Multiple Award.....26



3.5	Offer Held Firm	26
3.6	Contract Negotiation	26
3.7	Failure to Negotiate.....	26
3.8	Contract Type	27
3.9	Contract Approval	27
4	Submittal Response Format	28
4.1	General Instructions.....	28
4.2	Technical Proposal Organization Guidelines.....	29
4.3	Content for Tabs 1 – 14	30
4.4	Price Proposal	30
4.5	Incurred Expenses	31
4.6	Authorized Signatures.....	31
4.7	Rights to Submitted Material	31
4.8	Confidential Information	31



1 RFP Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction

The City of Helena (City) is soliciting Proposals from Respondents capable of satisfying the needs for consulting services to implement a new software systems environment to address the City's needs related to Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP).

In addition to soliciting written responses, this document provides information to assist Respondents in preparing their responses, and facilitates the subsequent evaluation and comparison process. In that regard, this RFP:

- Provides information essential to soliciting meaningful recommendations and realistic commitments from the Respondents
- Specifies the desired format and content of Proposals in response to this RFP
- Outlines the City's evaluation and selection procedures
- Establishes a schedule for the preparation and submission of Proposals in response to this RFP

This RFP and the selected Proposal in response to this RFP will be incorporated into the contract resulting from this solicitation.

1.2 About The City

Founded in 1864, Helena is the State Capital of Montana and the county seat of Lewis and Clark County and is named the "Queen City of the Rockies". It has a Commission-City manager form of government and is situated in Southwest Montana surrounded by majestic mountains. Helena boasts grand architecture, numerous museums, historic sites, a regional airport, shopping and farmers markets, art galleries, microbreweries, restaurants, local music and performing arts, and over seventy miles of trail systems for hiking and biking.

Healthcare, education, and government-related jobs are the primary employers in Helena however, the City also acts as a trade center for agriculture, livestock, and mining enterprises. The City has a history of economic stability with low unemployment compared with the rest of the state.

Helena has an estimated population of 31,500 people but serves a much larger trade area of about 75,000. The larger trade area relies on Helena for employment, professional services, retail goods and entertainment.

The City provides a full range of services including public safety police and fire protection and prevention, municipal court services; public works engineering services, water and wastewater utilities, solid waste disposal, and recycling services; community development planning, zoning, permitting, and building activities; transportation systems including parking, traffic signal, street, roadway and sidewalk construction and maintenance, and operating a vast public transit system. In addition, the City operates and maintains growing open land, parks and recreation programs including



a City-owned golf course, public swimming pool, civic center, tennis & pickleball courts, skateboard park, bike park, and an outdoor skating rink.

Helena employs over 400 full, part-time and seasonal employees with an annual operating and capital budget of approximately \$95 million. Employees are located at multiple locations.

The City of Helena is a public agency and subject to the public records laws of the State of Montana. Any information provided in response to this RFP may be public information and may subject to public disclosure if requested through a written public request.

The following table contains statistics related to the City. These statistics are estimates and are provided for planning purposes only. Additional information has been provided in [Table 04: Functional Area Statistics](#).

Table 01: Statistics

No.	Area	Statistic
1	Operating and Capital Budget	Approx. \$95,000,000
2	Population Served	Approx. 31,500
3	Total FTEs (FY2020)	315.78 FTE (Permanent Full and Part-Time Employees – excludes seasonal and temporary employees) 150 Seasonal
4	Fiscal Year	July 1 – June 30

1.3 Project Objectives

The overall goal of this project is to take advantage of the newest technology and harness efficiencies by reviewing business processes or implementing technology to enhance existing business processes performed by City departments. The City is planning to replace its current software systems environment with a new system or combination of software systems, and to adopt systems functionality to support core processes. In doing so, the City seeks to address several challenges in the current environment, and gain future efficiencies, including, but not limited to:

- Many current workflows are manual processes and are completed outside the system with manual efforts. This includes manually directed emails, fillable PDFs through shared folders, or paper forms.
- The current environment lacks key reporting capabilities, making it difficult to monitor metrics and forcing staff to rely on other methods for tracking including the use of custom in-house reporting or MS Excel spreadsheets.
- Duplication and manual entry is causing business inefficiencies. The lack of integration between systems and/or a lack of reporting has resulted in staff entering information in multiple systems to process their daily work.



- Signatures are primarily paper based. Processes that require a signature often make approval routings time consuming and cause several delays in multiple City workflows.
- The current environment does not have an integrated document repository. Many files are stored onsite in file cabinets in various offices throughout the City.
- The time-entry process is currently paper-based and spreadsheet-driven. The timesheet process is time sensitive and requires several steps of manual verification that can result in more manual processes (e.g. payroll corrections).
- The system is not intuitive, especially for novice and infrequent users. Staff at all levels of the City report navigating multiple screens to complete tasks and noted the system is difficult to use without extensive training or guidance from other department staff or a background in information technology.
- The current system requires additional subsystems/programs to complete HR and Payroll business processes. MS Excel is required to accomplish job functions and complete business processes. Examples include FMLA tracking and calculations, workers' compensation tracking, garnishment calculations, longevity pay tracking, and overtime time rate calculations.
- The current Chart of Accounts (COA) does not meet the City's reporting and internal needs. The current COA structure is limited and does not have the capacity to expand to meet the internal and external reporting needs of the City.
- The City does not currently offer electronic self-service options to employees. Employees do not have access to options such as electronic pay stubs, tax statements, or online benefit enrollment.

In order to address these challenges and others, the City has initiated a project to adequately plan for, select, and implement a replacement software systems environment. [Section 2.0 – Project Scope](#), outlines the features and functionality desired in a future system(s), as well as the professional services necessary to implement that system(s).

1.4 Definitions

In order to simplify the language throughout this RFP, the following definitions shall apply:

ADDENDA – Written instruments issued by the City prior to the date for receipt of Proposals that modify or interpret the RFP documents by addition, deletions, clarification, or corrections.

CITY – City of Helena, MT.

CITY EVALUATION COMMITTEE – The team of City staff that will participate in the review, evaluation, and scoring of proposals and subsequent evaluation processes, including demonstrations and reference checks.

CITY PROJECT MANAGER – The person designated by the City to be the City Project Manager assigned to act on behalf of the City during the term of the resulting Contract.



SELECTED RESPONDENT– The Respondent/Proposer that may be awarded a contract to provide software system(s) and professional services to implement the ERP System for the City.

DAYS – Means calendar days unless otherwise specified.

ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SYSTEM (ERP) – Means the financial management and human resource information software system that is described in this RFP and in the Attachments hereto.

PROJECT – The project to configure and implement the ERP System for the City as described in this RFP and in the Attachments hereto.

PROJECT SCOPE – Scope of services to be provided by the Selected Respondent(s).

PROPOSAL – A complete and properly signed Proposal to provide goods, commodities, labor, or services for the sum stated and submitted in accordance with the RFP.

PROPOSER – See “RESPONDENT.”

RESPONDENT or PROPOSER or VENDOR – The person, firm, corporation, partnership, or other entity submitting a Proposal on items listed in the RFP documents, and thereby agreeing to meet the specified Contract terms and conditions if awarded the contract.

SERVICES or WORK – All services to be performed by the Selected Respondent to successfully complete the Project to the satisfaction of the City.

SUBCONTRACTOR or SUBCONSULTANT – Any individual, corporation, company, or other entity that contracts to perform work or render services to the Selected Respondent or to another subcontractor as part of the resulting Contract with the City.

VENDOR – See “RESPONDENT.”

1.5 RFP Schedule of Events

The following RFP Schedule of Events represents the best estimate of the schedule the City will follow, which is subject to change at the City’s discretion. Vendors are encouraged to hold the demonstration dates listed. If a component of the schedule is accelerated or delayed, it shall be anticipated that the remaining components may also be adjusted by a similar number of days via RFP Addendum prior to the submittal deadline.

Table 02: RFP Schedule of Events

Event	Estimated Date
RFP Published	February 28, 2022
Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference	March 9, 2022 at 2pm MST
Deadline for Questions From Vendors	March 24, 2022
Deadline for Proposal Submissions	April 11, 2022 at 3pm MST
Shortlist Vendors notified	Week of April 18 , 2022



Event	Estimated Date
Vendor Demonstrations	Week of May 9, 2022

1.6 Prequalification of Vendors

The City has not employed a prequalification process. No Vendors are either prequalified or precluded from responding to this RFP. The City has not engaged in any formal discussions or demonstrations with vendors leading up to the issuance of this RFP.

1.7 Minimum Qualifications

In order for Proposals to be evaluated and considered for award, Proposals must be deemed responsive to this RFP as determined in the discretion of the City Evaluation Committee. To be deemed responsive, the submitted Proposal documents shall conform in all material respects to the requirements stated in the RFP, and Proposers shall document and validate the capability to fully perform all requirements defined by the RFP. Factors to be considered in connection with a Proposer's capability to fully perform all requirements of the RFP include, and may not be limited to: experience, integrity, reliability, capacity, and other factors required to provide the Services defined by the RFP.

1.8 Questions and Inquiries

It shall be the responsibility of the Respondents to inquire about any portion of the RFP that is not fully understood or that is susceptible to more than one interpretation [prior to the question period closing](#).

- All questions concerning the RFP **must** be submitted via email only, to the City's consulting partner, BerryDunn (Kate Offerdahl-Joyce – kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com).
- Questions and answers will be issued in accordance with [Section 1.10 – Amendments and Addenda](#).
- Only questions and answers publicly published through Addenda shall be binding.

Respondents shall not contact other City staff with any questions or inquiries. Unauthorized contact with any personnel of the City may be cause for rejection of the Respondent's response. The decision to reject a Proposal is solely that of the City.

1.9 Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference

A non-mandatory Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference will be held on **March 9, 2022 at 2pm Mountain Time**.

Vendors that are interested in participating in the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference shall contact BerryDunn in writing (kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com) to request the teleconference information.

The format of the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference will be an overview presentation of the RFP, its contents, the RFP Schedule of Events, and additional topics. Following the presentation, Vendors will be able to ask questions related to the RFP or the overall process. The City will attempt to answer all questions at that time, but answers provided shall not be binding. Following the Pre-Proposal



Vendor Teleconference, the City will post online the material questions asked and their respective answers in an addendum.

1.10 Amendments and Addenda

All clarifications, corrections, or revisions to this RFP will be documented in an addendum, which will be publicly published to the City website. Only questions and answers in an addendum shall be considered as part of the RFP. The City reserves the right to revise the RFP prior to [the deadline for Proposal submissions](#). Revisions shall be documented in an addendum and publicly published.

The City will attempt to publicly publish periodic addenda on a timely basis between the RFP publishing date and the close of the question period. Vendors are responsible for monitoring the City website for the periodic posting of addenda prior to the submittal due date.

1.11 Non-Warranty of RFP Information

Due care and diligence has been exercised in the preparation of this RFP and all information herein is believed to be substantially correct. However, the responsibility for determining the full extent of the exposure to risk and verification of all information herein shall rest solely on those parties making Proposals. The City, its representatives, and its agents shall not be responsible for any error or omission in this RFP, nor shall they be responsible for the failure on the part of any Respondents or their representatives to verify the information herein and to determine the full extent of that exposure.



2 Project Scope

2.1 Functional Areas

The following table contains the list of functional areas of the desired future systems environment.

Table 03: Functional Areas

Functional Areas			
No.	Functional Area	No.	Functional Area
1	General Ledger and Financial Reporting	7	Time and Attendance
2	Budget (Capital and Operating)	8	Human Resources: Personnel Management and Benefits
3	Purchasing, Requisitions, and Contracts	9	Human Resources: Recruiting
4	Accounts Payable	10	Project Accounting and Grant Management
5	Accounts Receivable and Cash Receipts	11	Fixed Assets
6	Payroll	12	Utility Billing

The List of Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities contained in **Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities** contains the detailed functionality the City requires within each functional area in a future systems environment, as well as general and technical system requirements, and data conversion and interface scope.

The following table contains functional statistics of the City. These statistics are estimates and are provided for planning purposes only.

Table 04: Functional Area Statistics

No.	Functional Area/Metric	Statistic
1	General Ledger and Financial Reporting	
	Number of Funds	54 Total General (1); Special Revenue (23); Debt Service (2); Capital Improvement (5); Enterprise (17); Internal Service (6)
	Number of Accounts	5,760
	Number of Journal Entries Annually	450 - 500
	Chart of Accounts Structure	The City's Chart of Accounts (COA) structure is identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund (three characters)



No.	Functional Area/Metric	Statistic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department (four characters) • Account (three characters) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The account structure changed for every fund • Specifier (four characters) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The first t two characters signify the type of expense/revenue (i.e., 10-Payroll, 30-Services)
2	Budgeting	
	<p>Budget Narrative: The annual budget process starts in late August and ends on June 30. Staff set up all the fee changes before the budget is submitted. Finance Department staff pre-populate the operating budget on an MS Excel spreadsheet. Finance Department staff calculate property tax after the initial budget process is finished. Staff create a capital budget and operating budget at the same time. Each department prepares its budget in an MS Excel spreadsheet tab, and Finance Department staff reconcile all budgets on an MS Excel spreadsheet. Finance Department state the most complex piece of the budget is the capital outlay from each department. Staff finalize the final budget process in September. Staff manually record all the budgets in an MS Excel spreadsheet, and staff also prepare employee wages and benefits on an Excel spreadsheet. The Payroll team has a budget module, which has never been used. Finance Department staff create a budget for new employee positions.</p>	
	Operating Budget	\$76M
	Capital Budget	\$19M
3	Procurement	
	Number of Purchase Orders per Year	100
	Number of Blanket Purchase Orders per Year	0
	Number of, RFPs, RFIs, RFQs issued annually	10-20
	Number of purchase cards in use	Approx. 35
4	Accounts Payable	
	Vendor File	Approx. 5,000 Active
	Number of Invoices Submitted for Payment per Year	19,925
	Number of 1099's issued per Year	75-100
	Number of Payments per Year	6,550
	Type of Check Stock	Three part standard/universal blank check form. City of Helena puts all information on the Check.



No.	Functional Area/Metric	Statistic
	Automated Clearing House (ACH) Payments	245
5	Accounts Receivable and Cash Receipts	
	Number of Invoices/Statements per Year	2042
	Number of Cash Collection Points (including all tender types)	19
6	Project Accounting and Grant Management	
	Number of Active Grants	25-30
	Number of Active Projects	245
7	Inventory and Fixed Assets	
	Number of Fixed Assets	2003
	Fixed Assets Threshold	\$5,000
8	Human Resources, Personnel Management, and Benefits Administration	
	Total Full-time Equivalents (FTE)	FY22 – 315.78
	Number of Full-Time Employees	295
	Number of Part-Time Employees	73
	Number of Seasonal Employees	Approx. 150 per year
	Number of Applicants per Year	965
	Labor Unions/Bargaining Units	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helena Fire Department – International Association of Firefighters Local # 448 2. Helena Police Department - Helena Police Protective Association 3. Support Services Division – Dispatch 4. Support Services Division – Records
	Number of Benefit Plans	17
	Open Enrollment Period	May 15 – June 15
	Included in totals above: Number of Sworn Fire Employees	36
	Number of Non-Sworn Fire Employees	7
	Number of Sworn Police Employees	39
	Number of Non-Sworn Police Employees	19 (does not include dispatch or records)



No.	Functional Area/Metric	Statistic
9	Time and Attendance	
	<p>Time Tracking Narrative: The City's time-entry process begins at the department level with an Excel-created timesheet that is department or division specific. Employees are provided with the time-entry spreadsheet that allows them to enter their time under the designated hour codes. Employees then print out the spreadsheet, sign, and provide the document to their supervisor for review and signature. Employee time submission and supervisor approval is due the Friday before payroll for most departments but some departments, like Police, have until Monday. Employees estimate their time for Friday submission and additional time adjustments are made by departments if an employee works Saturday or Sunday. All employees use the Excel timesheet but some divisions utilize scheduling tools to assist with the employee time entry. For example, Pool utilizes When I Work, Golf's restaurant uses HomeBase (and is the only location with a time clock), Police uses Schedule Anywhere, and Fire utilizes Emergency Reporting.</p>	
	Number of employees to use time clocks (future)	Approximately 120 Seasonal Employees
	Departments to use scheduling functionality (future)	Approximately 5 (Public Works, Transportation, Parks & Rec, Police/Dispatch, Facilities)
	Number of employees to use advanced scheduling (e.g. shift swaps, minimum coverages)	Approximately 120
10	Payroll and Compensation	
	Number of W2's per Year	Approximately 582
	Pay Frequency	Biweekly
	Payment Methods	Most employees receive direct deposit, but about 35 employees request to receive paper checks
11	Utility Billing	
	Water Customers	Approximately 12,719
	Solid Waste Refuse Collected	112 Tons per day
	Average Delinquent Bills per Month	400 - 600
<p>Water and wastewater services are billed to the landowner on a monthly basis. Water meters are read once a month and the City bills a month behind. Water is billed on actual usage.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Useful Links</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Comprehensive Financial Report: https://www.helenamt.gov/fileadmin/user_upload/2020_AFR_FINAL.pdf • FY22 Operating Budget: https://www.helenamt.gov/fileadmin/user_upload/FY22_CompleteBudgetDoc_Final.pdf • City Job Opportunities: https://www.helenamt.gov/government/departments/human-resources/employment • Position Descriptions: https://www.helenamt.gov/government/departments/human-resources/position-descriptions 		



2.2 Alternate Proposals, Partnerships and Proposers of Subsets of Functionality

Alternate Proposals:

- Respondents may submit alternate Proposals for evaluation.
- Proposers may submit multiple Proposals for evaluation. For example, if a Proposer offers one or more “branded” products that may meet the needs of the City they are encouraged to separately propose each software package for consideration.
- Software companies that deliver their solution through one or more consulting firms (system integrators) are also allowed to submit more than one Proposal for consideration through differing consulting firms.
- A separate Proposal package submitted in accordance with Section 4 is required in order for the City to accurately evaluate each Proposal independent of the other.

Partnerships:

Respondents are encouraged to establish partnership relationships to fully provide all requirements defined by the RFP.

- Respondents engaged in a partnership relationship shall submit a single proposal in response to this RFP.
- Partnership relationships shall be clearly defined by proposal responses. Such definition shall identify the entity in the partnership relationship deemed to be the Prime Vendor. In the event a proposal that presents a partnership is selected, it is expected that a single contract be executed between the City and the Prime Vendor, and the Prime Vendor be responsible for any contractual relationship with the proposed partner(s).
- Each Vendor engaged in the partnership shall respond to any and all applicable portions of this RFP that relate to the work that will be performed, or the capabilities provided. For example, each Vendor shall provide references, and each Vendor shall respond to the Company Background and History questions.

Proposers of Subsets of Functionality:

As part of this process the City will be allowing Respondents to submit point solutions (best of breed), and encourages Respondents to participate in this process in order to consider and evaluate a range of marketplace offerings.

- The City is willing to consider best-of-breed solutions (“point” solutions), specifically for systems that address core financial management and human capital management in one solution, or systems that address utility billing as a standalone solution.
- The City has a preference on software solutions that provide for the highest level of fit, and facilitate the exchange of information between any disparate systems.



- The City will consider proposers of a subset of functionality on the relative merit of the functionality proposed based on the evaluation criteria laid forth in this RFP, and reserves the right to enter into negotiations for one or more proposers in order to achieve a “best-of-breed” solution.
- The City reserves the right to make one or more awards to competing Offerors for subsets of functionality as a result of this RFP. In the event the City should make awards to one or more competing Offerors, it shall be expected that additional discussion will take place between the City and the Offerors to define requirements and an approach to building an integration or interface between the selected systems. In such instance, the City expects that the Offerors will work together as necessary to develop the necessary integration once one has been identified.
- Vendors responding on a subset of functionality must also respond to Tab 1 (General and Technical) and Tabs 16-17 (Interfaces and Data Conversion) of Attachment B.

2.3 City and Project Staffing

The City intends to have functional and technical resources available during Project implementation, though it is noted that the City does not anticipate dedicating staff full-time to the implementation in addition to managing their core job responsibilities. This applies to both functional resources as well as technical resources internal to the City. It is anticipated that some functional leads will serve as the functional lead, or a subject matter expert, across one or more modules – particularly within the financial modules of a future system – during the implementation process.

Staffing considerations are a consideration for the City in terms of both the implementation process as well as supporting the software once in an operations mode. Vendors are encouraged to submit questions to the City during the RFP questions period to solicit such additional information as is necessary to adequately estimate the resource commitments that would be expected of the City during implementation, and post go-live for ongoing support of the system(s). Additional resource planning will be performed based upon the selected Respondent(s).

Respondents shall clearly indicate in the proposal responses the estimated level of City resource involvement in the implementation process, in order to allow the City to perform adequate planning. The City will utilize the response to Respondents’ Resource Hour Estimates in Tab 3 – Project Approach and Implementation Methodology, of Proposals as an input into the staffing plan the City develops, and requests that Respondents clearly articulate estimated staffing considerations in their responses.

2.4 Deployment Model

The City is open to considering various deployment models, and has structured the RFP to allow for the evaluation of the deployment model as but one factor in the overall procurement process. The City wishes to evaluate the greatest range of marketplace offerings feasible through this process.

The City recognizes there are many factors contributing to a comparison of cost Proposals for these various deployment methods including needed infrastructure and/or hardware costs, the potential for reduced hardware and support costs in hosted/SaaS models, a particular Proposer’s approach to



managing upgrades, and technical staffing needs. The City has a slight preference toward a Software as a Service (SaaS) deployment model, but also recognizes that the scope of this opportunity may result in the award to two or more vendors to address all functionality and the City wishes to evaluate the greatest range of available solutions in the market including those that may be locally hosted by the City. As such, the City is open to considering all deployment models in light of the breadth of functionality and available solutions in the marketplace to address those functional areas. The City will consider, in no particular order, the following deployment models:

- a. On Premise (locally hosted at the City, perpetual licenses)
- b. Software as a Service (SaaS or subscription-based models)
- c. Proposer hosted (hosted and managed by the Proposer, perpetual licenses)

Cost sheets have been provided under **Attachment C1 – Cost Worksheets** for pricing each of the deployment models.

This solicitation is not a bid process nor will it follow a lowest-priced responsive Proposal process, but will be based on most advantageous Proposal(s) utilizing the Evaluation Criteria listed in the RFP, including the review of life cycle costs (i.e. recurring costs, hardware, third-party licenses, etc.).

In developing proposals, Proposer's shall clearly define the proposed deployment model including the licensing model as well as any perceived benefits of the proposed model. In the event two or more products are proposed under the same proposal (e.g. through a partnership or offered by the same company) the Proposer shall clearly indicate in both the technical proposal (Attachment A, Tab 2) and cost proposal (Attachment C1) the deployment model for each proposed software product.

The City does not have a preference as to a specific hosting location, but does have a requirement toward the hosting being within the contiguous United States. Vendors are requested to specify the hosting location in proposal responses, specifically as part of Tab 9 to proposal responses (please see Attachment A for further instruction).

2.5 Number of Users

The following user counts by module contained in the table below are estimates and are provided for planning purposes only. The number of users represents the **anticipated future number of users of a new system**.

- **Departmental (Core/Power) Users:** This category of users includes those City staff that will interact with the system modules on a regular basis, and conduct core business processes within the system as power users. Such generic examples include, but are not limited to: Payroll Clerk, Financial Analyst, System Support Specialist, etc.)
- **Customer Department Users:** This category of users includes those City staff that will interact with the system modules as internal customers by either initiating transactions (e.g. entering a payment or entering a requisition), reviewing/approving transactions (e.g. reviewing leave requests, reviewing requisitions entered by a subordinate), or consuming information (e.g. reviewing departmental budget).



Table 05: Number of Users

Functional Area	Departmental (Core/Power) Users	Customer Department Users
General Ledger and Financial Reporting	5	40
Budget (Capital and Operating)	5	60
Purchasing, Requisitions, and Contracts	45	94
Accounts Payable	5	40
Accounts Receivable and Cash Receipts	10	40
Payroll	7	40
Time and Attendance	70	All employees
Human Resources: Personnel Management and Benefits	4	All employees
Human Resources: Recruiting	2	Approx. 70
Project Accounting and Grant Management	10	40
Fixed Assets	10	40
Utility Billing	10	40
<p>It is anticipated that some users will use multiple modules, causing overlap in each functional area. The counts are broken down by functional area to allow Respondents to formulate responses based on each. The City estimates that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The total number of licensed regular daily users of the system (requiring the ability to add, edit, and view content) using a named-seat basis may be around 40 The total number of regular daily concurrent users to be around 100 (unnamed license seats – in other words, how many people are expected to be accessing the system/module at the same time. This is in contrast to named users who have dedicated licenses tied to a unique login/user ID) The City anticipates that all employees (up to 425 during peak seasons) would have access to self-service portal functionality 		

2.6 Potential Phasing and Target Live Dates

The City requests that offerors provide potential phase start and target go-live dates in proposal responses per **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**, Tab 5. These dates should be estimates based on anticipated resource requirements and dependencies between functional areas. These dates are subject to negotiation. The City anticipates that implementation activities would begin in the July 2022. The City would like to target July 2023 as a potential go-live date for financial modules, and January 2024 as a go-live date for human resources and payroll modules. The City follows a July 1 – June 30 fiscal year.

2.7 Current Applications Environment

Central Square ERP is the primary application that supports the City of Helena and County of Lewis and Clark’s financial and human capital needs. The application is administered by the vendor as it is a



cloud-hosted solution. The City IT Division provides on-site support to both City and County staff, and makes every effort to coordinate maintenance outages and upgrades to incur minimal user impacts.

Table 06: Current ERP Functions

Current ERP Functions			
1	General Ledger and Financial Reporting	7	Human Resources: Personnel Management and Benefits
2	Budgeting (Capital and Operating)	8	Human Resources: Recruiting
3	Purchasing, Requisitions, and Contracts	9	Time and Attendance
4	Accounts Payable	10	Project Accounting
5	Accounts Receivable and Cash Receipts	11	Fixed Assets and Inventory
6	Payroll	12	Utility Billing

Other Major Applications

The City also uses a wide variety of applications to provide capability and functionality in specialized areas. **Identification of any potential future system interfaces is provided in Attachment B to this RFP.**

Table 07: Additional Software Applications

Additional Software Applications		
No.	Application	Use/Summary
1	Acorn	Learning management platform
2	Karpel	Legal case management
3	CityWorks	Maintenance management and permitting
4	Cognos	Data analytics and reporting
5	Dude Solutions	Facilities asset management
6	ESRI ArcGIS	Geospatial information system (GIS)
7	M-File	Document management system (DMS)
8	MPERRA	Electronic filing system for Payroll records
9	MS Office	Word processing, spreadsheet, presentation, email, and database functionality
10	Naviline	Customer information system (CIS)
11	Neptune	Electronic meter reading and reporting
12	Open Edge	Credit card processor and software
13	TRAKIT (Central Square)	Licensing software
14	Trello	Project management solution



Additional Software Applications		
No.	Application	Use/Summary
15	Waste Works	Solid waste management
16	Xpress Bill Pay	Billing management

City IT staff provide enterprise support for applications used by City staff. Those applications housed on-premises receive direct support from IT staff prior to vendor engagement, while issues within hosted application solutions are often referred directly to the appropriate vendor unless prior experience indicates that on-premises support is a viable option. City IT staff receive electronic tickets from departmental staff for internal issues, and respond appropriately dependent upon the severity and resource availability.

As is the case with City applications, the City infrastructure is implemented and maintained by the City IT Department. This infrastructure is built on the foundation established by a 1-Gbps internet connection to the City datacenter provided by Montana Internet Corporation, with a backup internet connection of 100-Mbps provided by Spectrum Bresnan. Network connections to outlying, remote facilities are maintained using a variety of dark fiber, dedicated links, and wireless connections. Most links contain redundant signaling capacity, and standardization of the network backbone reduces the risk of inadvertent configuration errors and increases flexibility in the event of equipment failure. The perimeter security strategy is thorough and redundant in nature. Wi-Fi services are available in City facilities, and staff use a secure VPN appliance to gain remote access to City resources when working offsite.

The City datacenter houses and supports all technology assets used for City operations. It is primarily comprised of virtual servers in a high-availability service design, with a smaller number of physical servers for those applications and services not tuned for use on virtual resources. The use of VMWare ESXi on blade-server architecture with a local storage area network, attached to a remote UniTrends disaster recovery appliance, enables the City to perform operational data backups and continuity of operations. These operations are critical in the event of a loss of access to the primary datacenter, equipment failure, or natural disaster. In addition, biweekly data backups are taken to a local backup for archive and security purposes. Life cycle planning and funding for infrastructure was reported to be consistent and sufficient to meet growth needs.

City staff utilize a combination of small-profile desktop devices and laptops to perform their daily work. Surplus devices were provided to remote workers, in conjunction with access to the secure VPN for connection to local assets. This is accomplished using virtual desktop infrastructure, and enables the use of virtual computers when not on-site. This was a technology environment that was reintroduced given the need to support remote workers at the start of the ongoing pandemic, and currently supports approximately 50 users. Staff devices are replaced on a four-year life cycle, with funding remaining consistent in recent years following the recognition by executive staff and elected officials that modern technology tools are essential to the work of the City.

City and City staff have both reported extensive difficulties in maintaining reports that pull information from existing State systems, and attribute this to the loss of staff knowledge due to personnel



transition and lack of technology growth at the State level. Other application customizations exist and occasionally exhibit difficulties for IT staff in support of departmental staff, but the key area to examine further will be M-File. As the document management system used by the City, it will be critical to delve further into any customizations or data conversion requirements prior to implementation of a new ERP given the potential for project impacts downstream. In addition, the City is highly dependent upon obsolete, often barely-functioning macros that support numerous spreadsheet calculations, functions, and processing elements. Given the prevalence of these macros across departments, and the loss of staff knowledge related to the creation and maintenance of them, it is recommended that they be incorporated into a data dictionary for later use in project planning.

2.8 Project Management Documentation

The following information establishes the expectation of the minimum level of project management documentation to be provided by Respondents as a part of, but not exclusively, the resulting implementation services offered. As part of the implementation scope, following signing of a contract, the Selected Respondent(s) shall develop and provide the City with the following items:

- Project Management Plan: a detailed Implementation Project Plan that, at a minimum, includes the following:
 - Objectives
 - Deliverables and Milestones
 - Project Schedule
 - Resource Management Processes
 - Scope Management Processes
 - Schedule Management Processes
 - Risk Management Processes
 - Quality Management Approach
 - Communication Management Approach
 - Organizational Change Management Approach
 - Status Reporting
- Data Conversion Plan
- Training Plan
- System Interface Plan
- Testing and Quality Assurance Plan
- Pre- and Post-Implementation Support Plan
- System Documentation
- Risk Register

Additional documentation about each Plan may be found in **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**, Tab 3, attached to this RFP.

2.9 Budget



The City is committed to fully funding the one-time and recurring annual costs for the acquisition of the software (whether a licensed model or a subscription model is selected as a result of this process). The City does not have an established budget in place for this project, but intends to use the proposals received through this process to inform the budget development process. The City has performed initial, high-level estimations, for the acquisition of either an on-premise or cloud-based software solution including professional services and recurring maintenance/subscription costs. Recognizing the cost and payment differences between deployment models, a final budget will be programmed based on the results of this RFP and final contract negotiations.

The City is sensitive to the total costs, and has listed cost as one of the several evaluation criteria in the RFP; however, this is not an opportunity to identify the lowest priced solution. This RFP opportunity is being presented as a best value solicitation, and not a lowest priced proposal, opportunity.

2.10 Personnel

All of Selected Respondent's personnel providing goods and services under the contract shall possess the necessary skills, experience, and knowledge, to perform their assigned duties. In the event assigned personnel are providing non-conforming or unsuitable services, the City shall notify the Selected Respondent and provide the opportunity to rectify the deficiency. If unable to cure the nonconforming services, the Selected Respondent shall remove from the project and replace the personnel that the City deems unsuitable for the project with a resource possessing the necessary skills, experience, and knowledge, to perform their assigned duties in a satisfactory manner.

2.11 Software Upgrades

The City shall be entitled to any and all upgraded versions of the software covered in the contract that becomes available from the Selected Respondent. Such upgrades shall be provided at no cost to the City so long as a valid maintenance and support agreement, or if applicable software as a service licensing agreement, is in place.

2.12 Performance Review

The Respondent may be required to meet with the City's Project Manager not less than once per quarter to conduct a performance review of the Respondent. These meetings will be either in person at City offices, or via teleconference or web-conference. This performance review will include a review of the pricing, delivery performance, customer service, and improving operational efficiencies.



3 Proposal Evaluation and Award

3.1 Evaluation Process

The following subsection outlines the intended proposal evaluation process the City has identified. The City reserves the right to deviate from this process at its own discretion, and to (i) negotiate any and all elements of the RFP, (ii) amend, modify, or withdraw the RFP, (iii) revise any requirements under the RFP, (iv) require supplemental statements of information from any Respondent, (v) extend the deadline for submission of Proposals, (vi) cancel, in whole or part, this RFP if the City deems it is in its best interest to do so, (vii) request additional information or clarification of information provided in any Proposal without changing the terms of the RFP, (viii) award this project in whole or in part to a vendor other than the highest scoring vendor based on the determination of the best overall value and/or fit for the City, and/or (ix) waive any portion of the selection process in order to accelerate the selection and negotiation with the top-ranked Respondent. The City may exercise the foregoing rights at any time without notice and without liability to any Respondent, or any other party, for expenses incurred in the preparation of responses hereto or otherwise.

- a. **Vendor Shortlist:** The City Evaluation Committee will initially review and evaluate each Proposal received to determine the Proposer's ability to meet the requirements of the City. The evaluation criteria described in [Section 3.3](#) will be the basis for evaluation. The Evaluation Committee will determine the Respondents best suited to meet the needs of the City based on the scoring of the evaluation criteria. These Vendors will form the Vendor Shortlist.
- b. **Vendor Demonstrations:** The City, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to have system demonstrations with those Respondents on the Vendor Shortlist, or any other Respondent. Demonstrations may be conducted at City offices, subject to then-current public health guidance. Demonstrations will involve a scripted demonstration. The schedule, scripts, and demonstration requirements will be provided with the invitation to participate in demonstrations. A Pre-Demonstration Vendor Teleconference will take place for those Vendors that have been shortlisted, and Respondents will have an opportunity to review the format of the demonstrations and ask questions related to procedure and specific demonstration scenarios. Vendors that are invited to participate in demonstrations are advised that the provided scripts must be strictly adhered to while presenting. Optional modules or functionality shall not be presented if they fall outside the scope of requested functionality or that functionality which has been proposed by the Respondents. The proposed version of the software must be shown, and must not include any software that is under development or in beta testing. Evaluation Committee members will view the demonstrations, and additional City staff may also be in attendance to observe and provide informal feedback.
- c. **Reference Checks:** The City may employ a process of contacting references provided through Respondents' proposals. This process may include teleconference meetings, web conferences, and in-person meetings with references. The City reserves the right to conduct reference checks at any point in the evaluation process, and to contact other known users of the proposed system(s) beyond just those references provided.



- d. **Best and Final Offer and Request for Clarification:** A Best-and-Final-Offer process may be initiated if it is determined to be in the best interest of the City. Such process may be initiated following the identification of the Vendor Shortlist or at any other evaluation process step. Additional processes of scope and cost clarification may be employed as part of the evaluation process if it is deemed to be in the City’s best interest.

3.2 Clarification and Discussion of Proposals

The City may request clarifications and conduct discussions with any Respondent that submits a Proposal, including requesting additional information. The City reserves the right to select the Proposal or Proposals that it believes is the most responsive as determined by the City Evaluation Committee, which will best serve the City business and operational requirements, considering the evaluation criteria set forth below. Respondents shall be available for a system demonstration to City staff on dates specified in [Table 02](#) or as otherwise requested by the City if selected for system demonstrations. Failure of a Respondent to respond to such a request for additional information, clarification, or system demonstrations may result in rejection of the Proposal. The initial evaluation may be adjusted because of a clarification under this section. The City reserves the right to waive irregularities in the Proposal content or to request supplemental information from Respondents.

3.3 Evaluation Criteria

As described in the preceding Evaluation process sub-section, the City intends to follow a cumulative approach to scoring based on key evaluation activities (e.g. scoring is conducted in a progressive manner, following various steps in the process). The City hereby reserves the right to evaluate, at its sole discretion, the extent to which each Proposal received compares to the stated criteria. Vendor proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria, subject to variation at the sole discretion of the City:

3.3.1 Short-List Identification: The City intends to utilize the criteria presented in Table 08 following the Evaluation Team’s review of Proposals.

Table 08: Short-List Identification Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Functionality	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vendor’s written responses to the Functional and Technical Requirements for proposed functional areas and overall software solution. • The ability for the proposed software to integrate with the City systems environment. 	35
Technical	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment of the proposed software to the City’s preferred technical specifications. • The vendor’s written response to each Potential Interface. • The level of integration among proposed functional areas. 	15
Approach	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following:	25



Criteria	Description	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The described approach to implement an enterprise system to achieve the City's goals and objectives. The alignment of the proposed implementation timeline to the City's desired timeline. The distribution of implementation tasks among City and vendor teams. The proposed resources hours among City and vendor teams. The vendor's approach to key implementation tasks including but not limited to data conversion, testing, and training. The vendor's planned ongoing support and maintenance services. 	
Vendor Experience	<p>This criterion considers but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vendor's experience delivering the services requested in the RFP. The vendor's experience with similar implementations for comparable organizations. The vendor's experience deploying comparable interfaces to the City's related applications. 	20
Proposed Staff Experience	<p>This criterion considers but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The experience of named staff delivering services requested in the RFP. The experience of named staff with similar implementations for comparable organizations. The qualifications of named staff to deliver the services requested in the RFP with a focus on business process optimization. 	5

3.3.2 Finalists Identification: The City intends to utilize the criteria presented in Table 09 following the demonstrations by Short-List vendors.

Table 09: Finalist Identification Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Functionality Demonstrated	This criterion considers new information learned through vendor demonstrations including but not limited to the demonstrated user interface and the alignment of demonstrated functionality with preferred business processes.	15
Technical Capabilities	This criterion considers new information learned through the Technical Discussion as part of vendor demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5
Approach Discussion	This criterion considers new information learned through the Implementation Approach Discussion as part of vendor demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5



Criteria	Description	Points
Experience Discussion	This criterion considers new information learned through the Company Overview Discussion as part of vendor demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5

3.3.3 Preferred Vendor Identification: The City intends to utilize the criteria presented in Table 10 following the completion of reference checks and any site visit.

Table 10: Preferred Vendor Identification Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Reference Feedback	This criterion considers the feedback received from references related to the vendor's performance in the implementation including meeting project objectives and timelines, as well as the knowledge, skills, and experience of implementation staff; capabilities of the software; and ongoing vendor performance with support and maintenance.	20
Comparable References	This criterion considers the relevance of references related to organization size and location, structure of the organization, entity type (e.g. City/town/village), comparable scope, similar software version, and deployment model.	10

3.3.4 Cost Point Allocation: The City will evaluate cost proposals based upon this criteria. Cost points will be applied at the timing in the evaluation process as may determined by the Evaluation Team. The City reserves the right to review cost proposals at any stage in the process to ensure pricing is within internal budget planning ranges. Cost points may be refined or replaced in the event of a subsequent Request for Clarification or Request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO).

Table 11: Cost Point Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Cost	This criterion considers, as applicable, the price of the software licensing, services, and terms of any offered ongoing maintenance and support (including applicable service level agreements, disaster recovery, etc.) proposed in response to the information solicited by this RFP. Respondents will be evaluated on their pricing scheme, as well as on their price in comparison to the other proposers. In evaluating cost, the City may evaluate on a fully loaded ten year cost of ownership. Fully loaded is defined to include (but is not limited to): software purchase and implementation costs; ongoing support and service costs; hardware costs; and associated hardware support costs. The City reserves the right to add their own estimates of the costs (including any anticipated savings) associated with the required level of internal staffing (business users and IT staff) for implementation and for ongoing support, hardware and overhead costs and savings, and may rely on the Respondent's resource estimates as a basis for their calculations.	40



Criteria	Description	Points
	Vendors of point solutions will be compared against other proposals for the respective functional area group.	

3.4 No Obligation, Right of Rejection, and Multiple Award

The inquiry made through this RFP implies no obligation on the part of the City. This RFP does not constitute an offer or a contract with any Respondent or other party. The City reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals, in whole or in part, and to waive any informality in proposals received, deemed to be in the best interest of the City or to accept or reject all or any part of any Proposal. Proposals deemed to be received from debarred or suspended Vendors will be rejected. The City may reject any Proposal that is not responsive to all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and performance requirements of this RFP. The City further reserves the right to award all, part, or none of the components/functional areas included in this RFP. In addition, the City reserves the right to make one or more awards to competing Respondents for subsets of functionality as a result of this RFP. The City also reserves the right to refrain from making an award if it determines it to be in its best interest. The City reserves the right to abandon the Project and/or to re-advertise and solicit other Proposals. The City reserves the right to create a Project of lesser or greater expense than described in this RFP or the respondent's reply, based on the component prices or scope submitted. The City reserves the right to cancel this solicitation or to change its scope if it is considered to be in the best interest of the City.

3.5 Offer Held Firm

Unless otherwise specified, all proposals submitted shall be valid for a minimum period of 180 calendar days following the date established for receiving proposals. At the end of the 180 calendar days the proposal may be withdrawn at the written request of the proposer. If the bid/proposal is not withdrawn at that time, it remains in effect until an award is made or the solicitation is cancelled.

3.6 Contract Negotiation

After final evaluation, the City may negotiate with the Respondent(s) of the highest-ranked Proposal. If any Respondent fails to negotiate in good faith, the City may terminate negotiations and negotiate with the Respondent of the next highest-ranked Proposal or terminate negotiations with any or all Respondents. If contract negotiations are commenced, they may be held at City office locations or via teleconference. If contract negotiations are held, the Respondent will be responsible for all of Respondent's costs including, without limitation, its travel and per diem expenses and its legal fees and costs.

3.7 Failure to Negotiate

If the selected Respondent:

1. Fails to provide the information required to begin negotiations in a timely manner
2. Fails to negotiate in good faith



3. Indicates it cannot perform the contract within the designated timeframes or within budgeted funds available for the Project
4. If the Respondent and the City, after a good-faith effort, cannot come to terms; then

The City may terminate negotiations with the Respondent initially selected and commence negotiations with the next highest-ranked Respondent. At any point in the negotiation process, the City may, at its sole discretion, terminate negotiations with any or all Respondents.

3.8 Contract Type

The contract resulting from this RFP shall be in form and content satisfactory to the City and shall include, without limitation, the terms and conditions provided for in this RFP and any sample agreement provided by the City, and such other terms and conditions as the City deems necessary and appropriate. The resulting contract from this RFP shall be a not-to-exceed based contract, subject to the Payment Terms identified in Attachment C2 for the various cost types. The standard of performance for the contract resulting from this RFP shall be in accordance with the highest applicable standards in the financial information software industry. The initial contract price will be based on prices submitted by the Selected Respondent, subject to contract negotiations with the City, and shall remain firm for the initial term of the contract. Price adjustments may be negotiated at the request of either party in the extension periods with mutual agreement of the parties.

3.9 Contract Approval

The City's obligation will commence only following the parties' execution of the Contract. The City will not be responsible for any work done or expense incurred by the Selected Respondent or any subcontractor, even such work was done or such expense was incurred in good faith, if it occurs prior to the Contract start date set by the City.



4 Submittal Response Format

4.1 General Instructions

The following instructions must be followed by Respondents submitting Proposals. Offers that do not comply with all instructions contained herein may be disqualified:

1. **Deadline:** The deadline for Proposal submissions is established in [Section 1.5](#). It will be the sole responsibility of the Respondent to submit its Proposal to the City before the closing deadline.
2. **Hard Copy Proposals:** Respondents shall submit one (1) version of the Technical Proposal and one (1) version of the Price Proposal in separate three-ring binders with tab separators or otherwise under separate cover, clearly marked “Original.”, as well as four (4) copies of the proposal under similar format. Technical Proposals shall not include extraneous marketing materials.
3. **Email Proposals:** No emails will be accepted for proposal submission.
4. **Electronic Media Proposal File Formats and Naming:** Respondents shall submit along with the hard copy proposals, one (1) electronic version of the Technical Proposal and one (1) electronic version of the Price Proposal on separate removable devices (e.g., thumb drive). The following table provides the required file formats and naming conventions for the electronic media files.

Table 12: Proposal Naming and File Formats

Proposal Section	Recommended File Naming Convention	Required File Format
Technical Proposal (Inclusive of Attachments A & B, and any Exhibits/Attachments)	“(Proposer Name)” Technical Proposal	All files combined into one (1) searchable Adobe PDF
Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements	“(Proposer Name) Proposal Response to Attachment B”	To be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, in addition to above PDF format
Price Proposal (Inclusive of Attachments C1 and C2, Respondent’s Standard Travel and Expense Policy, and any Appendices)	“(Proposer Name)” Price Proposal	All files combined into one (1) searchable Adobe PDF
Attachment C1 – Cost Worksheets	“(Proposer Name) Proposal Response to Attachment C1”	To be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, in addition to above PDF format

5. **Amendment of Proposals:** Respondents may amend Proposals prior to the deadline set for receipt of Proposals. In the event an Addenda is issued and a Respondent has previously submitted a Proposal in response to this RFP, the Respondent shall notify the City via email of



the need to submit an amendment, and clearly outline the reasons in writing. No amendments will be accepted after the deadline unless they are in response to a request of the City.

6. **Delivery/Mailing Instructions:** Sealed Proposals shall be clearly labeled on the outside of the packaging with the RFP Title and RFP Number. The mailing address for Proposals is contained in the following table.

Table 13: Proposal Mailing Addresses

Mailing Address
Tyler Weingartner/Project Manager City of Helena 316 N. Park Ave. Helena, MT 59623

7. Except for trade secrets and confidential information that the Respondent identifies as proprietary, all Proposals will be open for public inspection after the contract award.

4.2 Technical Proposal Organization Guidelines

Respondents are instructed to insert the completed Tab forms (**Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**) in the corresponding Tab sections as a part of their response to the Technical Proposal. **The City expects that Respondents will include additional proposal content beyond simply completing the forms and worksheets provided through this RFP.** The following table contains the organization guidelines for Proposal responses.

Table 14: Technical Proposal Organization Guidelines

Proposal Tab No.	Technical Proposal Section
Tab 1	Company Introduction
Tab 2	Software Solution
Tab 3	Project Approach and Implementation Methodology
Tab 4	Key Proposed Personnel and Team Organization
Tab 5	Project Schedule
Tab 6	System and Application Architecture
Tab 7	Data Conversion Plan
Tab 8	Security and Software Hosting
Tab 9	Testing and Quality Assurance Plan
Tab 10	Training Plan
Tab 11	References
Tab 12	Sample Contracts, Warranty, and Escrow



Proposal Tab No.	Technical Proposal Section
Tab 13	Exceptions to Project Scope and Contract Terms
Tab 14	Functional and Technical Requirements Response

4.3 Content for Tabs 1 – 14

a) Tabs 1 – 13

Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms is a Word document that provides detailed instructions and requirements for the Proposer as it relates to the documents to be submitted as their RFP response and Services required for the Project. Proposers are instructed to organize Proposals in a tabbed format and to insert the completed Tab forms (**Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**) in the corresponding Tabs as a part of their response to the Proposal. In addition to the information captured through the questions and tables in **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**, Proposers are requested to provide complementary narrative information, diagrams, and images to help substantiate and support their proposal response to each Tab section. Proposers are directed to **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**, which includes forms, tables, and questions that are to be completed by the Proposer and inserted into each applicable tab of the RFP response (Tab 1 – 13).

b) Tab 14

Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities is an Excel document that provides detailed requirements and capabilities related to software features and functions, as well as potential interfaces and data conversion requirements. This tab is to include Proposer’s response as detailed in **Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities**, which is an Excel document to be filled out by the Proposer. Proposers are to provide **Attachment B** in both Excel format, and also in PDF format appended to the responses to **Attachment A** Tabs 1-13. Proposal Supplements Any Proposer-submitted materials or documentation not specifically requested through this RFP may be included as Supplements to the Proposal as identified in Table 12.

c) Attachment D

City has included as Attachment D to the RFP a sample Agreement for Professional Services that would be expected to be used for the resulting contract with Proposer. Proposer to provide any deviations or exceptions to the sample Professional Services Agreement language proposed by the City. Each item to be listed along with the requested alternative language for review by the City.

If no deviations taken, state as such. Substantive exceptions to the City’s terms, submitted after the date and time established for the submittal of Proposals, will not be considered.

4.4 Price Proposal



The Respondent's Price Proposal shall consist of two sections, as further described below:

1. The completed Cost Worksheets as contained in **Attachment C1 – Cost Worksheets**. Respondents shall not modify the worksheets in any way.
2. A narrative description of the proposed costs in response to **Attachment C2 – Cost Narrative**, including:
 - The Respondent's pricing as provided in vendor's standard quoting/pricing format.
 - The Respondent's standard travel and expense policy.

4.5 Incurred Expenses

There is no express or implied obligation for the City to reimburse Respondents for any costs or expenses incurred in preparing Proposals in response to this RFP, and the City will not reimburse Respondents for these costs or expenses, nor will the City pay any subsequent costs associated with the provision of any additional information or presentations, or to procure a contract for these Services. The City is not responsible for any cost(s) incurred by a Respondent in preparing and/or submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP. The City will also not be responsible for any costs associated with preparing and/or participating in any systems demonstrations requested of the Respondent's products and Services.

4.6 Authorized Signatures

The proposal must be executed personally by the vendor or duly authorized partner of the partnership or duly authorized officer of the corporation. If executed by an agent, a power of attorney or other evidence of authority to act on behalf of the vendor shall accompany the proposal to become a valid offer.

4.7 Rights to Submitted Material

It shall be understood that all Proposals, responses, inquiries, or correspondence relating to or in reference to this RFP, and all reports, charts, and Proposals or referencing information submitted in response to this RFP, shall become the property of the City, and will not be returned. The City will use discretion with regard to disclosure of proprietary information contained in any response, but cannot guarantee information will not be made public. As a government entity, the City is subject to making records available for disclosure.

4.8 Confidential Information

Any written, printed, graphic, electronic, or magnetically recorded information furnished by the City for the Respondent's use are the sole property of the City. This proprietary information includes, but is not limited to, customer requirements, customer lists, marketing information, and information concerning City employees, products, services, prices, operations, security measures, and subsidia