

Addendum No. 1

Issue Date: 03/26/2026

Project Name: **Service Request Management System**

Project Number: **298-FY26-ITS-RFP-AviAppSRM**

TO: **Prospective Applicants**

This addendum forms a part of the **Request for Proposals** and modifies the original Project Number **298-FY26-ITS-RFP-AviAppSRM** only to the extent specifically noted below. Failure to acknowledge this addendum in the submittal may subject the submitter to being deemed non-responsive.

This Addendum is posted on the City procurement website at www.ashevillenc.gov/bids. This is *the official source* of this addendum. All addenda and attachments shall be published to the same location.

This Addendum consists of 12 pages in total.

This Addendum is to address Clarifications/Changes and Responses to Questions

Clarifications/Changes

The original RFP stated "PROPOSALS DUE BY: April 7, 2026 5:00pm EDT".

This is now changed to "**PROPOSALS DUE BY: April 14, 2026 5:00pm EDT**".

Answers to Questions

1. **Question:** Does the City require a formal Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) or a third-party accessibility audit report as part of the proposal submission?

Response: The City needs to confirm compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA so please identify how we can confirm compliance with your proposed solution.

2. **Question:** Neurodiversity: Beyond standard WCAG compliance, is the City interested in UI/UX features specifically designed for cognitive accessibility and neurodivergent residents?

Response: The City's primary interest is compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA. Any additional features that are beneficial to the City will be considered as part of the proposed solution.

3. **Question:** Does the City expect the SRM to pull live layers from the City's existing ArcGIS

Server (e.g., for verifying property lines or street maintenance jurisdictions) or push data back into a GIS database?

Response: The City would prefer the SRM be able to integrate current GIS Feature services into the SRM using ArcGIS REST API service endpoints, such as Water Service Area Boundaries and Asheville City Limits. The City is open to the SRM pushing data or writing to the City's GIS database, or being able to provide access to all data in an API format.

4. Question: Is there a requirement for the staff-side backend to integrate with the City's existing Single Sign-On (SSO) provider (e.g., Microsoft Azure AD / Entra ID)?

Response: The staff-side backend must integrate with Google SSO as the primary authentication method.

5. Question: In the event of contract termination, what is the City's requirement for data extraction format (e.g., SQL, CSV, API-access) to ensure no vendor lock-in?

Response: The City would like to be able to export all data in a standard, open format at any time. There is no specific requirement for the exact format but please specify available options.

6. Question: Does the City have a preference for cloud hosting regions or specific security certifications (e.g., SOC2 Type II, FedRAMP) for the SaaS provider?

Response: The City does not have a specific preference for cloud hosting regions although the City expects compliance with industry-standard security certifications.

7. Question: Community Engagement, Multi-Channel Support: Does the "modern, user-friendly" requirement include the ability for residents to submit requests via SMS (texting) or AI-driven conversational chatbots, or is the focus primarily on Web/Mobile App portals?

Response: The focus is primarily on web and progressive web apps or mobile responsive web portals but the City is open to new and innovative approaches that best serve our community.

8. Question: Besides English, what are the primary languages the City requires for the localized resident interface (e.g., Spanish, Russian, Moldovan)?

Response: The City is interested in options for multilingual support. The most commonly spoken languages in the Asheville area beyond English include Spanish and Russian.

9. Question: Per North Carolina General Statute §143-129.8, how does the City weigh "Local Business" status or proximity in the evaluation criteria for this specific IT services contract?

Response: There is no consideration for "local business" status or proximity in the evaluation criteria.

10. Question: Which system integrations are required at launch, and which ones are planned for later phases of the rollout?

Response: The City's primary integration needs include Cityworks and Esri GIS. Beyond

that, the City is very interested in the availability of an open API and API documentation that City staff can use for additional integrations. Please note that the City currently uses Cityworks Online but plans to migrate to Cityworks/Trimble Unity Maintain in 2027. This is a required upgrade for Cityworks and the City expects that any integration with Cityworks will be extended to Cityworks/Trimble Unity Maintain when available.

11. Question: What are the primary limitations or pain points of the current system/Asheville app that the new solution needs to address?

Response: Please refer to the list of items under “Description” on page 2-3 of the RFP. Those items generally cover the pain points that the City would like to address.

12. Question: Will the City accept any other forms of SSO or MFA beyond Google?

Response: The staff-side backend must integrate with Google SSO as the primary authentication method.

13. Question: What are the top 10–15 service request types by volume that must be included at initial go-live, and which request types may be deferred to later phases?

Response: Please refer to the request types listed on the existing Asheville App: https://iframe.publicstuff.com/#?client_id=819. The City is open to new approaches to organizing request types although this current list seems to be covering most of the City’s needs at this point.

14. Question: What are the City’s primary success metrics for year one (e.g., time-to-first-response, resolution time, resident satisfaction, request deflection), and are KPI targets already established?

Response: These have not been fully defined at this point although resident satisfaction is always a high priority. The City is open to ideas for success metrics and/or KPI targets based on your experience with other clients.

15. Question: What is the expected average monthly service request volume and peak volume, including any known seasonal or event-driven spikes?

Response: Between 600 - 1000 requests per month. Summer was a bit heavier over the past year.

16. Question: Is the SRM intended to function only as a service request system, or also as a broader resident landing hub, given the requirement to embed additional City content on the landing page?

Response: The SRM is intended to function as a service request system. If you look at the current Asheville App (from Google or Apple store), you will notice that we have a few helpful links on the landing page including related items like “Neighborhood resources” and a “Find Parking” app for parking garages. The City is interested in the ability to include this kind of content that might be helpful to residents looking for City services. This is not intended to be a broader resident landing hub; rather, it is focused on resident services.

17. Question: For requests that are not the responsibility of the City (e.g., NCDOT roads), does the City prefer automated forwarding, guided redirection, or a hybrid approach by request type?

Response: The City is open to ideas on how to best handle redirecting requests to other agencies that will work in most if not all use cases.

18. Question: How many internal staff users (by department and role) will require access to the staff portal, and does the City prefer assignment via department queues or named individuals?

Response: The City currently has approximately 30 staff who actively manage service requests. However, there are dozens more that receive notifications when requests are submitted and who have the ability to step in and manage requests if/when needed. The City prefers an enterprise-wide licensing model that provides access to all staff members without per-user restrictions. Our goal is to ensure that any member of the staff can access the system to manage or fulfill requests as needed, maintaining our current standard of unlimited user access.

19. Question: Is WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance required for both the public-facing portal and internal staff interfaces, and how will accessibility compliance be formally validated?

Response: The City's primary interest is compliance with any public-facing websites or apps although compliance for internal staff interfaces would also be welcomed. Please indicate how you plan to demonstrate compliance in your proposal.

20. Question: Does the City require a formal accessibility conformance deliverable (such as a VPAT or equivalent) as part of proposal evaluation or go-live acceptance?

Response: The City has familiarity with the Accessibility Conformance Report based on the VPAT. Please indicate how you plan to demonstrate compliance in your proposal.

21. Question: How should expected completion times be calculated for residents (static targets, dynamic backlog-based estimates, or integration with work order scheduling systems)?

Response: The City is open to ideas on how best to set expected completion times. Currently, the City uses static targets.

22. Question: For Cityworks integration, should service requests automatically generate work orders upon submission or only after staff triage, and which system is the system of record for status and closure?

Response: For the Cityworks integration, service requests should not automatically generate work orders upon submission. Work orders are generated in Cityworks after staff review. Cityworks is considered the system of record for status and closure.

23. Question: What level of Esri GIS integration is required at go-live (e.g., reverse geocoding, district lookup, asset proximity, map-based submission, geofenced routing)?

Response: The City would like to require map-based submission with reversed geocoding and use lookup for geofenced service areas and/or boundaries. The City would be

interested in using asset proximity.

24. Question: What is the desired data migration scope from the existing Asheville App (PublicStuff): active-only, last X years, or full historical archive including attachments and comments?

Response: The City has no expectation for data migration from the existing Asheville App.

25. Question: What level of Esri GIS integration is required at go-live (e.g., reverse geocoding, district lookup, asset proximity, map-based submission, geofenced routing)?

Response: Please see response to Question 23.

26. Question: Is U.S.-only data storage and transmission a hard requirement or a preference, and what are the City's expectations for uptime SLA, maintenance windows, and RTO/RPO targets?

Response: The City of Asheville prefers that all data storage and transmission be located within the United States. The City does not have pre-defined expectations for SLA, maintenance windows, and RTO/RPO targets. However, the City will consider that information in the proposed solution.

27. Question: Has the City established an approved budget range (first-year and multi-year total) for the SRM solution, including licensing, implementation, integrations, training, and support?

Response: The City has not established an approved budget range for this project although the "Cost" for the SRM solution represents 20% of the evaluation criteria.

28. Question: Does the State of North Carolina provide shared services, platforms, funding, standards, or direct IT support that this SRM solution must align with or leverage?

Response: The City is not aware of any such requirements.

29. Question: How many licensed users (e.g. City of Asheville employees working on requests within this new system) would need access to the SRM system?

Response: The City prefers an enterprise-wide licensing model that provides access to all staff members without per-user restrictions. Our goal is to ensure that any member of the staff can access the system to manage or fulfill requests as needed, maintaining our current standard of unlimited user access.

30. Question: For the Cityworks integration, is real-time bi-directional synchronization required, or would a scheduled/batch synchronization approach be acceptable?

Response: The City prefers real-time bi-directional synchronization. However, the City will consider scheduled/batch synchronization (e.g hourly batch synchronization).

31. Question: What specific information is expected to flow between Cityworks and the SRM platform: work order status updates only, or also asset data, crew assignments, and completion notes?

Response: Specific information expected to flow between Cityworks and the SRM platform include service request details (type, description, location, photo(s), etc.), request status, general comments, and completion notes.

32. Question: The RFP references other departmental applications. Which of these are considered in-scope for Year 1 versus future phases?

Response: The City's primary integration needs include Cityworks and Esri GIS. Beyond that, the City is very interested in the availability of an open API and API documentation that City staff can use for additional integrations.

33. Question: For a typical request, how many departments or staff roles are involved across the request lifecycle?

Response: The number of departments or staff roles involved in a typical request lifecycle varies depending on the complexity, scope, and type of request. Most request types involve one or two departments. For example, with the "Report a parks concern" request type, if the requestor indicates that the issue is related to a greenway, it is routed to a Transportation Department staff member. Otherwise, it is routed to the Parks and Recreation Department.

34. Question: For requests redirected to external agencies such as NCDOT, does the City expect those redirects to be formally logged and tracked in the system, or is it sufficient to notify the constituent of the appropriate outside agency?

Response: The City is open to ideas on how to best handle redirecting requests to other agencies that will work in most if not all use cases.

35. Question: Approximately how many internal staff users across all departments will require system access?

Response: The City currently has approximately 30 staff who actively manage service requests. However, there are dozens more that receive notifications when requests are submitted and who have the ability to step in and manage requests if/when needed. The City prefers an enterprise-wide licensing model that provides access to all staff members without per-user restrictions. Our goal is to ensure that any member of the staff can access the system to manage or fulfill requests as needed, maintaining our current standard of unlimited user access.

36. Question: Do any current workflows include supervisory approval steps, or are assignment and resolution handled entirely at the staff level?

Response: Current workflows include assignment and resolution of requests at the staff level with supervisors notified in some but not all request types. The City is open to ideas on how best to handle workflows.

37. Question: What is the current average monthly volume of public service requests, and is there an expected future growth estimate?

Response: Between 600 - 1000 requests per month. Summer was a bit heavier over the past year. There is no expected future growth estimate.

38. Question: What is the approximate volume of historical PublicStuff records expected to be migrated?

Response: The City has no expectation for data migration from the existing Asheville App.

39. Question: Is the City expecting migration of historical attachments such as photos and videos, or only structured request data and statuses?

Response: The City has no expectation for data migration from the existing Asheville App.

40. Question: Are there specific KPIs or metrics currently tracked that must be replicated in the new system at go-live?

Response: There is nothing that needs to be replicated. The City is open to ideas for success metrics and/or KPI targets based on your experience with other clients.

41. Question: In order to provide a cost efficient model, will you be accepting hybrid model for the team consisting of developers, architects and testers from India?

Response: The City will accept proposals from vendors with staff working internationally.

42. Question: How does Asheville envision managing inappropriate or abusive user comments?

Response: Although infrequent, this has been an issue in the past. The City is open to ideas on how best to manage inappropriate or abusive user comments. The current Asheville App allows staff to “mute” comments that are deemed vulgar or offensive. The mobile app also contains a “Code of Conduct” that details expectations.

43. Question: Does the City of Asheville use Microsoft Entra in any capacity?

Response: No.

44. Question: Will the City consider vendors that have 3+ years of experience providing a service request management system for one government customer, with other government references for different cloud solution/application development projects that are not SRM-related?

Response: The City will consider all responsive proposals. Please refer to the Evaluation Criteria in the RFP. In this situation, a proposal might be scored lower for criteria that are not fully met but would still be considered.

45. Question: Any preference on the ticketing tool like Servicenow, Jira etc..

Response: A ticketing tool is not explicitly required. However, the City has no preference if a ticketing tool is part of a proposed solution.

46. Question: What is the manual process right now City of Asheville departments are doing to engage agencies.

Response: There is no consistent manual process at this time. In some cases, staff will provide residents with contact info for other agencies. In some cases, staff may contact other agencies directly.

47. Question: Does the City currently use any BI tools (Power BI, Tableau, etc.) that the SRM system will need to export structured data into?

Response: Yes. The City currently utilizes enterprise business intelligence tools, including Google BigQuery for data warehousing and Looker for reporting and analytics. The SRM system should be capable of exporting structured data in a format that can be readily integrated with these platforms, enabling downstream reporting, dashboarding, and analysis. Utilization of a robust API for data access and integration is preferred.

48. Question: How many other agencies are at present to redirect the requests that are not the responsibility of City Of Asheville.

Response: Other agencies include NCDOT, Buncombe County and Duke Energy.

49. Question: What email domains are expected for users. Will it be only Gmail or how many domains are we expected.

Response: For staff using the system, the only domain is ashevillenc.gov which uses Gmail.

50. Question: What is the volume of tickets received at present average monthly tickets just to get an idea of volume.

Response: Between 600 - 1000 requests per month. Summer was a bit heavier over the past year.

51. Question: Flexibility with other systems - What other systems are referred here.

Response: The City is looking for a system that is flexible to integrate with other systems through an open documented API.

52. Question: Multilingual Support - Assuming its English and spanish. Please suggest what other languages are referred in multilingual support.

Response: The City is interested in options for multilingual support. The most commonly spoken languages in the Asheville area beyond English include Spanish and Russian.

53. Question: References can be of Local Government outside of USA or should be of inside USA.

Response: The best references are those that are most similar to the City of Asheville however all references listed will be considered.

54. Question: What cloud provider is being used right now. Google, AWS,Azure. Is GCP preferred cloud provider?

Response: The City of Asheville uses Google, AWS, and Azure. The City does not have a "preferred" cloud provider.

55. Question: Is there any scope of extending the RFP submission date by 1-2 weeks if possible.

Response: The City has extended the RFP deadline by one week. As noted above in this addendum, proposals are now due by April 14, 2026 5:00pm EDT.

56. Question: When are we expecting a response to all the questions.

Response: Please refer to the schedule listed in the RFP.

57. Question: For maintaining the “Asheville App” branding, does the City require full UI/UX customization, or only basic branding (logos, color palette)?

Response: The City is open to suggestions on how best to handle branding. However, basic branding should be sufficient.

58. Question: Can the City clarify the expected scope of data migration from the current Asheville App (PublicStuff), including data volume, formats, and specific modules to be migrated?

Response: The City has no expectation for data migration from the existing Asheville App.

59. Question: Are there any predefined workflows, service categories, or departmental routing rules that vendors should be aware of for estimating configuration complexity?

Response: The City currently maintains approximately 10 service categories and 30 request types, each of which may have multiple workflows based on submitter-selected values and routing logic. The City would expect a solution that allows staff to configure and maintain categories, request types, and associated workflows, including departmental or staff routing rules.

60. Question: Aside from WCAG 2.1 AA, are there any additional accessibility expectations or compliance tests the City will require during implementation?

Response: The City’s primary interest is compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA. Any additional features that are beneficial to the City will be considered as part of the proposed solution.

61. Question: Can the City confirm if SSO should be available for both public users and internal staff, or only City personnel?

Response: SSO is only required for City personnel, but the option would be good for public users.

62. Question: Is a full sandbox environment required with the same capabilities as production, or will a simplified test environment be acceptable?

Response: A simplified test environment may be acceptable if it still enables reliable validation of workflows, integrations, and user roles. The current Asheville does not have a test environment so this is considered a preference rather than a requirement.

63. Question: Are there minimum response and resolution times the City expects beyond standard industry SLAs?

Response: The City would like to have the ability to adjust SLA times to meet specific

needs. To start, standard industry SLAs are sufficient.

64. Question: The RFP notes the City wishes to “expedite as much as possible.” Does the City have a preferred go-live target date?

Response: The City does not have a preferred go-live date. However, given the Justice Dept ruling that all websites/apps need to meet WCAG 2.1 Level AA requirements, the City may discontinue the current Asheville App on 4/24/2026. The City hopes to minimize overall downtime while a new platform is being deployed.

65. Question: Can the City provide current and expected annual service request volume, as well as the number of internal users and departments that will utilize the system?

Response: Between 600 - 1000 requests per month. Summer was a bit heavier over the past year. There are 19 departments. The City currently has approximately 30 staff who actively manage service requests. However, there are dozens more that receive notifications when requests are submitted and who have the ability to step in and manage requests if/when needed. The City prefers an enterprise-wide licensing model that provides access to all staff members without per-user restrictions. Our goal is to ensure that any member of the staff can access the system to manage or fulfill requests as needed, maintaining our current standard of unlimited user access.

66. Question: Will all departments currently using service requests be included in the initial implementation, or is a phased rollout anticipated?

Response: The City expects that departments currently using service requests be included in the initial implementation. The City will consider alternative approaches as proposed.

67. Question: Can the City clarify the expected level of integration with Cityworks (e.g., bi-directional sync, work order creation, asset linkage, or reporting only)?

Response: The City prefers real-time bi-directional synchronization. However, the City will consider scheduled/batch synchronization (e.g hourly batch synchronization). For the Cityworks integration, service requests should not automatically generate work orders upon submission. Work orders are generated in Cityworks after staff review. Cityworks is considered the system of record for status and closure.

68. Question: Should GIS integration support real-time editing and synchronization, or is visualization and geolocation sufficient?

Response: The City prefers map-based submission with reversed geocoding and use lookup for geofenced service areas and/or boundaries. The City is open to the software pushing data or writing to the City’s GIS database, or being able to provide access to all data in an API format.

69. Question: Beyond Cityworks and GIS, are there any priority systems (financial, CRM, or others) that should be considered critical for integration?

Response: The City’s primary integration needs include Cityworks and Esri GIS. Beyond that, the City is very interested in the availability of an open API and API documentation that

City staff can use for additional integrations.

70. Question: The RFP notes a desire to “expedite as much as possible.” Can the City clarify a target or preferred go-live timeframe?

Response: See response to question #64 above.

71. Question: Can the City confirm whether cost-related narrative (e.g., pricing assumptions) may be included in the technical proposal, or if all references to cost must be limited strictly to the cost proposal section?

Response: Cost-related narrative can be included in the technical proposal but please ensure that all costs are identified in the cost proposal section. There are additional lines available to use if needed.

72. Question: Given the importance of aligning with the City’s integration requirements (particularly Cityworks and GIS), data migration considerations, and the desired accelerated implementation timeline, we respectfully request consideration of a two-week extension to the proposal submission deadline. This additional time would allow us to ensure our proposal is fully tailored to the City’s requirements and provides the highest level of detail and accuracy.

Response: The City has extended the RFP deadline by one week. As noted above in this addendum, proposals are now due by April 14, 2026 5:00pm EDT. Also, please note that there is no need for data migration.

73. Question: Number of administrative users and concurrent users (external users)?

Response: The City currently has approximately 30 staff who actively manage service requests. However, there are dozens more that receive notifications when requests are submitted and who have the ability to step in and manage requests if/when needed. The City prefers an enterprise-wide licensing model that provides access to all staff members without per-user restrictions. Our goal is to ensure that any member of the staff can access the system to manage or fulfill requests as needed, maintaining our current standard of unlimited user access. For external users, there are thousands who have downloaded and use the Asheville App to submit service requests. The current app also allows for anonymous service request submissions.

74. Question: Are HUB credits going to be used in evaluation?

Response: Please refer to the Asheville Business Inclusion documentation. To be considered a responsive proposal, that documentation must be completed. Beyond that, there is no additional use in the evaluation.

75. Question: Is there a cap on the budget for the city?

Response: The City has not established an approved budget range or cap for this project although the “Cost” for the SRM solution represents 20% of the evaluation criteria.

I understand that failure to acknowledge any addenda may cause this bid/proposal to be deemed non-responsive.

Authorized Signature

Company

Date

- End -