

**Shelby County, Alabama**  
**Request for Proposals for**  
**Electronic Building and Plan Review Software Solution with Trimble Cityworks/Unity and**  
**ESRI Integration**  
**Response to Questions**

**Consistent with Section 1.6 of the RFP, the County provides the following clarifications:**

**Question 1:** Does the County intend for the proposed solution to replace or supplement Cityworks PLL/Unity as the system of record for permit issuance, inspections, and permit tracking, or is the scope limited to plan review, GIS-enabled markup, and portal/payment functionality that integrates with Cityworks as the system of record for permitting and inspections?

***Response: The scope is limited to plan review, GIS-enabled markup, and portal/payment functionality that integrates with Cityworks PLL/Unity as the system of record for permitting and inspections.***

**Question 2:** The RFP cover states a deadline of August 18, 2026, while Sections 1.3 and 4.1 state that proposals are due August 12, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. CT. Please confirm the official proposal deadline.

***Response: The deadline for the RFP is August 12, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. CT.***

**Question 3:** Does the County intend to retain Cityworks PLL/Unity as its permitting system of record and procure an electronic plan-review solution that operates as an integrated layer, or will the County consider a comprehensive permitting, plan-review, payment, and inspection platform that replaces or supplements portions of Cityworks?

***Response: See Response to Question 1.***

**Question 4:** Section 3.3.1 requires a complete, direct integration with Cityworks/Unity Public Portal, with no third-party connectors, and states that alternative solutions will not be accepted. Must this integration already be deployed and operational as of the proposal deadline, or may it be completed using the Cityworks/Unity APIs during implementation?

***Response: It is expected that it will be deployed and operational as of proposal deadline.***

**Question 5:** Section 4.3 requires the proposer to be an “Esri State and Local Government certified partner.” Please identify the specific Esri Partner Network designation, competency, or certification that will satisfy this requirement and confirm whether it is a pass/fail qualification.

***Response: Consistent with Section 4.3 of the RFP, Proposer must be a certified partner, with a preference for a Gold or Platinum Level Partner.***

**Question 6:** Are the AI-powered capabilities in Section 3.4.1 mandatory at the time of proposal submission, mandatory by go-live, or capabilities that may be delivered through an agreed implementation roadmap?

**Response:** *It is expected that it will be deployed and operational as of proposal deadline.*

**Question 7:** Regarding Section 3.4.6, must the successful proposer provide a complete copy of its proprietary application database schema, stored procedures, views, indexes, and relational mappings, or is the requirement limited to the County's data, associated metadata, attachments, and the schema necessary to understand and reconstruct that County-owned data?

**Response:** *The intent of Section 3.4.6 is for the County to understand Proposer's data relations. All requested information should be provided in order to receive full credit in scoring. Proposers are reminded that Proposer may submit a Redacted Copy of the Proposal consistent with Section 2.10 should any information provided be considered proprietary.*

**Question 8:** Please provide the anticipated number of internal users, concurrent reviewers, departments, external users, annual permit applications, annual plan-review submissions, inspections, existing records, and document-storage volume that should be used for implementation and subscription pricing.

**Response:** *For the purposes of the RFP, Proposers should plan for 25 internal user licenses that provide input on the permit and inspection processes. The web-based portal should be available to the general public as needed to provide submissions to support the County's operations. The County averages approximately 2,000 total permits issued per year, and 24,000 inspections.*

**Question 9:** What payment processor or gateway does the County currently use, and is integration with that provider required within the proposed firm-fixed price?

**Response:** *No. It is anticipated that the payment processing function will be handled through the Cityworks public portal and will not be the responsibility of the Proposer.*

**Question 10:** Sections 2.13 and 3.5.6 contain references to drug-testing services and medical and mental-health users that do not appear related to this software procurement. Please confirm that those references are not applicable to the proposed solution.

**Response:** *That is correct. This service does not relate to drug-testing or medical or mental health services.*

**Question 11:** Please confirm the acceptable medium for the required electronic PDF copy and whether the original proposal requires wet signatures. Please also confirm which forms must be notarized.

**Response:** *The original proposal does require wet signatures. The .pdf may be provided on a USB drive. As indicated, only the Cost Proposal requires notarization. The legal certifications must be witnessed, but a notary is not required.*

**Question 12:** Can the County provide an estimated number of internal users by department and role, identify the County departments that will participate in the solution, and provide the anticipated number of external users by category (e.g., contractors, architects, engineers, developers, third-party reviewers, consultants, municipalities, and citizens)?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 8.

**Question 13:** Can the County provide an estimate of the number of field personnel (e.g., inspectors, field representatives, or other mobile staff) who will require access to the proposed solution, including those requiring mobile or tablet access?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 8.

**Question 14:** Can the County please clarify whether the proposed solution is expected to integrate with the County's existing Trimble Cityworks AMS, PLL/Unity, Esri ArcGIS, and other legacy systems, or whether vendors are expected to provide a solution that includes these capabilities as part of the proposed platform?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 1.

**Question 15:** The RFP describes the proposed solution as a comprehensive "one-stop-shop" to electronically manage the permitting workflow. Given the requirement to integrate with the County's existing Trimble Cityworks/Unity permitting environment, can the County clarify whether this procurement is intended primarily for an Electronic Plan Review solution, or whether the proposed solution is expected to provide additional permitting capabilities beyond plan review as part of this project?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 1.

**Question 16:** Can the County provide the approximate maximum number of reviewers expected to work concurrently on the same project or plan review?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 8.

**Question 17:** Can the County describe approximately how many users will require read-only access?

***Response:*** See Response to Question 8.

**Question 18:** On page 10, titled "3.4 Electronic Plan Review Capabilities" – Does the County currently engage third-party consultants or external agencies to perform plan reviews? If so, what level of system access will these reviewers require (e.g., review-only, markup, approval), and approximately how many such users are anticipated?

***Response:*** No.

**Question 19:** Does the County have a target project kickoff date and a desired implementation timeline or go-live date that vendors should consider when preparing their implementation approach?

**Response:** *Per Section 3.1, Proposers are to include a detailed implementation schedule as part of their package. The County is, however, prepared for an October 2026 kick-off.*

**Question 20:** On page 9, titled "3.1 General Scope and Software Solution Goals" – Can the County provide approximate annual transaction volumes for the following, if available:

- Building permit applications
- Plan review submissions
- Inspection requests
- Online payment transactions
- Active permits
- Concurrent plan review projects

**Response:** *See Response to Question 8.*

**Question 21:** On page 9, titled "3.1 General Scope and Software Solution Goals" – Can the County provide an estimate of the scope of data migration, including:

- Historical data retention period (i.e., the number of years of data to be migrated)
- Estimated number of permit records
- Estimated number of plan sets and supporting documents
- Approximate total storage volume (GB/TB)?

**Response:** *The County is not requesting historical migration as part of the scope of services in the RFP. Forward moving data export will be required.*

**Question 22:** On page 12, titled "3.4.6 Data Portability Standards" – Will the County provide cleansed and validated data for migration, or should proposers include data assessment, cleansing, and validation activities as part of the implementation?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 21.*

**Question 23:** On page 12, titled "3.4.6 Data Portability Standards" – Does the County expect historical plan review comments, markups, revision history, and audit trails to be migrated, or only finalized permit records and associated documents?

**Response:** *Migration from historical data from a previous vendor is not part of the scope of work. Moving forward, for permits processed with the proposed solution, it is the expectation that all data required by the RFP will be able to be exported.*

**Question 24:** On page 9, titled "3.1 General Scope and Software Solution Goals" – Can the County provide an estimate of the number of distinct permit types, review workflows, inspection types, fee schedules, document templates, notification templates, and standard correspondence templates that will require configuration during implementation?

**Response:** *This Electronic Plan Review solution must support the existing configured Trimble-Cityworks-PLL-Unity system workflows for residential and commercial development. We have approximately 35-40 workflows that may utilize Electronic Plan Review software.*

**Question 25:** On page 2, titled "1.2 Project Description" – Can the County identify their current vendor and describe the primary business or technical challenges the proposed solution is expected to address?

**Response:** *This question is not relevant to this RFP. The scope of work provided by successful proposer shall meet the needs as defined in Section III.*

**Question 26:** Can the County share the current contract value or approximate annual cost of its existing solution, including software licensing, implementation, support, and maintenance, if available?

**Response:** *No.*

**Question 27:** On page 10, titled "3.3 Integration and Partnerships" – Beyond the required integrations with Trimble Cityworks/Unity and Esri ArcGIS, can the County provide a complete list of:

- the current enterprise systems integrated with its permitting environment,
- any additional third-party systems that will require integration as part of this implementation (e.g., ERP/financial systems, document management, payment gateway, identity management/SSO, GIS, reporting platforms), and
- any planned future integrations that vendors should consider in their proposed architecture?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 1.*

**Question 28:** On page 10, titled "3.3 Integration and Partnerships" – Does the County currently utilize an online payment gateway? If so, please identify the payment solution in use and clarify whether the proposed solution is expected to integrate with the existing payment platform or include a new payment processing solution.

**Response:** *See Response to Question 9.*

**Question 29:** On page 14, titled "3.5.7 Innovations Path" – Does the County have any AI governance, security, or data privacy requirements (e.g., restrictions on cloud-hosted AI services, model usage, or data residency) that vendors should consider in their proposed solution?

**Response:** *The County has an acceptable use policy that requires all AI use to be prior approved and vetted in addition to customer PII prohibitions.*

**Question 30:** Does the County anticipate a phased departmental rollout or a single enterprise-wide go-live?

**Response:** *Per Section 3.1.c of the RFP, Proposer should include an implementation schedule, including milestones, as part of the package.*

**Question 31:** Does the County prefer a native mobile application for field staff, or would a mobile-responsive web application also be acceptable?

**Response:** *A mobile-responsive web application is acceptable if security provisions are met.*

**Question 32:** Can the County identify any additional GIS components, ArcGIS applications, or GIS services (e.g., ArcGIS Enterprise, ArcGIS Online, Utility Network, parcel services, map services, or custom GIS applications) that the proposed solution will be expected to integrate with?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 1.*

**Question 33:** Will the County provide API documentation and technical resources for the existing Cityworks and GIS environments during implementation?

**Response:** *Yes.*

**Question 34:** On page 2, titled "1.2 Project Description" – Has funding been approved for this project? If so, can the County confirm whether funding has been fully allocated and provide the approved project budget or estimated budget range for this procurement?

**Response:** *This question is not relevant to this RFP. All proposals and costs are subject to approval by the Shelby County Commission.*

**Question 35:** Can the County clarify whether this procurement is intended to address only the Electronic Building and Plan Review solution, or whether the County anticipates future procurements for additional permitting and licensing capabilities?

**Response:** *The scope of work for this RFP is outlined in Section III.*

**Question 36:** Can the County identify the primary building, fire, zoning, and related codes, compliances and standards currently enforced (e.g., ICC code editions, local amendments, and County ordinances) that the proposed solution should support during plan review?

**Response:** *Please see <https://www.shelbyal.com/236/Permits-and-Inspections>.*

**Question 37:** The RFP states that the proposer must be an "Esri State and Local Government Certified Partner." Can the County clarify whether this is a mandatory minimum qualification for responsiveness, or whether proposers with demonstrated experience integrating with Esri ArcGIS solutions, but without this specific certification, will also be considered?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 5.*

**Question 38:** Can the County confirm whether any local vendor preference, Alabama business preference, or other geographic preference will be applied during the evaluation of proposals? If so, could the County please describe how such preferences will be applied?

**Response:** *The RFP did not designate a local vendor preference. Proposer must meet applicable legal requirements, for example, the requirement to be registered to do business in the State of Alabama.*

**Question 39:** Has the County conducted vendor demonstrations, proof-of-concept evaluations, or market research prior to issuing this RFP? If so, which vendors participated?

**Response:** *This question is not relevant to this RFP.*

**Question 40:** The first page of the RFP states that the proposal deadline is "August 18, 2026," while the procurement portal and the procurement schedule indicate a deadline of "August 12, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. CT." Could the County please confirm the correct proposal submission deadline?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 2.*

**Question 41:** Since the addendum containing questions will be released after July 31, leaving less than a week to better understand the requirements, would the County consider extending the proposal due date by two weeks to allow vendors additional time to prepare a comprehensive response?

**Response:** *No.*

**Question 42:** The RFP cover page lists the deadline for submissions as August 18, 2026. Section 1.3 of the RFP indicates proposal are due August 12, 2026, at 10 AM. Please confirm the submission deadline.

**Response:** *See Response to Question 2.*

**Question 43:** What version of ArcGIS Enterprise is Shelby County using?

**Response:** *The County is currently using version 11.3, with a plan to migrate to version 11.5.*

**Question 44:** What version of Cityworks is Shelby County using?

**Response:** *The County is currently using version 23.13.*

**Question 45:** Are the Cityworks workflows that require plan review in Respond or Office?

**Response:** *Yes, both are required.*

**Question 46:** How many existing Cityworks workflows are expected to have plan review?

**Response:** *See Response to Question 34.*

**Question 47:** Are there any new Cityworks workflows that will have to be configured in Cityworks for plan review?

**Response:** *Not at this time; however, the County reserves the right to establish new workflows in the future.*

**Question 48:** Please provide details on the County's Property Tax Commissioner GIS parcel mapping software solution (name, version, etc.).

**Response:** *The County utilizes ArcGIS Pro Version 3.3 of Parcel Fabric and is currently also working with ArcMap version 10.8.2.*

**Question 49:** How long has the Shelby County been using the existing parcel mapping software solution?

**Response:** *This Question is not relevant to the RFP.*

**Question 50:** Can you provide additional clarification on what is expected with "portal connections" in section 3.3.2. "The solution must also provide portal connections with the County's Property Tax Commissioner GIS parcel mapping software."

**Response:** *The proposed solution must be capable of pulling in either ESRI web services or maps containing parcel owner information.*

**Question 51:** Section 3.2 (PDF page 10) of the RFP states, "Proposer should include in its proposal a list of other applications that may be available." Can you provide additional clarification?

**Response:** *Proposer should include any wrap around products or functionality that might enhance experience.*

**Question 52:** Regarding Section 3.3.1, can you provide additional clarification on what Shelby County considers to be a 3rd-party connector?

**Response:** *A third-party connector generally refers to a software component, integration, or interface that allows the product to communicate with systems, services, or data sources that are not developed or maintained by the product.*