



Request for Proposals 2026-058

Union County Comprehensive Property Tax Software Solution

Addendum No. 1

Issue Date: April 22, 2026

Responding Offers on this project are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be made a part of the above-named RFP document.

The following items add to, modify, and/or clarify the RFP Documents and shall have the full force and effect of the original Documents. This Addendum shall be acknowledged by the Offeror in the RFP document.

Add/Delete Section

1. Add:
5.8.1 ADA Digital Accessibility Compliance

The proposed solution shall comply with all applicable federal accessibility requirements, including but not limited to:

- Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended by the U.S. Department of Justice Final Rule (April 2024), and
- Conformance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level AA.

The Contractor shall ensure that all public-facing components of the system, including but not limited to websites, web applications, customer portals, and generated electronic documents (for example, PDFs, statements, notices), are accessible to individuals with disabilities.

The Contractor shall provide documentation of accessibility compliance, which may include a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT).

The Contractor must ensure that any third-party hosted or delivered solution meets these requirements throughout the contract term, including updates and enhancements.

Contractor agrees to protect, defend, indemnify and hold Union County, its officers, employees and agents, free and harmless from and against any and all losses, penalties, demands, settlements, costs, charges, professional fees or other expenses or liabilities of every kind and character arising out of or relating to any failure by Contractor to comply with applicable accessibility requirements under 28 C.F.R. Part 35, or any claim that the Contractor's products or services do not conform to WCAG 2.1 Level AA standards.

End of Add/Delete Section

Questions/Answers Section

1. Question: How many years of data would need to be converted for both systems?

Answer: Current plus 10 prior years.

2. Question: Does the County plan to implement the CAMA & Tax system concurrently or start with one or the other?

Answer: We are flexible; however, both systems need to live and operational by November 2027.

3. Question: Would the County prefer to use a proposing vendor's sketching tool or continue to use Apex?

Answer: We currently use Apex. Any proposed solution would need to have the same level of functionality or greater.

4. Question: Does the County leverage Marshall & Swift? If so, would it be required for proposing vendors to integrate?

Answer: Yes. The county uses Marshall and Swift for commercial cost valuation and for some components of residential valuation.

5. Question: Does the County want a selected vendor to provide and support a mobile tool or prefer that we integrate with an existing solution for mobile field data collection?

Answer: We currently do not have a mobile tool or application. A solution would need to be proposed by the selected vendor.

6. Question: What does the County use for building permits, and would you need your selected vendor to integrate?

Answer: Currently building permits are provided by three jurisdictions, on three different systems. A proposed solution to import the data via data file is needed. A possible integration with the primary County system, Evolve, would be useful. We are open to the vendor's proposed solution.

7. Question: What source does the County use for managing deeds?

Answer: The Register of Deeds office uses Logan software for deed processing.

8. Question: What is the workflow for deeds and land records in the County today?

Answer: We do not have an interface with the Logan software application due to Register of Deeds restrictions; however, we would like the capability to integrate in the future. Currently II

deeds are processed manually after being retrieved and scanned into the Laserfiche software application where there is a workflow for Land Records.

9. Question: What is the typical year-over-year growth of the Assessor's parcel count?

Answer: Average historical parcel growth is approximately 2,500 parcels.

10. Question: Technical Requirements Matrix Response Codes: RFP Reference: Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 of the RFP define specific response codes (Y, E, RW, F, MN, MC, N) for the Technical Requirements Matrix. However, the response options and column labels in the County-provided Excel Technical Requirements Matrix do not fully align with those definitions.

Please confirm whether Offerors should:

- Use the response codes exactly as defined in Section 6.1.2 of the RFP, regardless of the Excel column labels; or
- Select responses based strictly on the options provided in the Excel matrix, without modifying the file.

Additionally, please confirm that the Technical Requirements Matrix must be submitted without altering its structure or column headers.

Answer: Offerors shall use the response codes exactly as defined in Section 6.1.2 of the RFP when completing the Technical Requirements Matrix.

The Excel Technical Requirements Matrix is intended as a structured tool for responses; however, the definitions and requirements outlined in the RFP take precedence.

Offerors shall:

- Utilize the response codes (Y, E, RW, F, MN, MC, N) as defined in Section 6.1.2
- Enter those response codes in the appropriate response column within the Excel matrix
- Provide explanatory comments where necessary

Offerors shall not modify the structure, column headers, or formatting of the Excel Technical Requirements Matrix.

Failure to follow these instructions may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive.

11. Section 6 Technical Requirements Matric, Sales Processing. Item # 3

Question: (Record types of financing) Are you referring to how the property was purchased (i.e. type of loan, cash, etc.)? Could you provide your source for this information, and provide some examples?

Answer: Yes, the type of financing will be things like loans, cash, or self-financed. The source would come from MLS, questionnaires, or from buy/seller.

12. Section 6 Technical Requirements Matric, Sales Processing. Item # 7

Question: (Equity comparable grid) Could you define what grid means?

Answer: An equity comparable grid is just like a sales comparable sales grid—showing 3 to five comparables—but using the most similar properties to verify equity/uniformity of appraised values.

Section 6 Technical Requirements Matric, Sales Processing. Item # 9

Question: (The ability to interface with MLS) Is this a direct import of data based on the counties' subscription to MLS data files, or is this for a direct partner integration with MLS?

Answer: This would be using an API from our MLS vendor to import data.

13. Section 6 Technical Requirements Matric, Collections. Item # 8

Question: (Reporting & Analytics) Please clarify whether the "compliance gap" refers to staff compliance or taxpayer default.

Answer: Taxpayer compliance with established payment plans or other delinquent actions

14. SCOPE & ELIGIBILITY CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Personal Property Module – Phased Delivery: Section 5.5 outlines Personal Property requirements. Is the County open to a phased delivery approach where the Personal Property module is deployed in a subsequent phase (e.g., Year 2), provided the vendor demonstrates the technical architecture and a committed development roadmap at the time of proposal submission?

Answer: Our preference would be to implement an established application across all related functions in the scope of the RFP.

15. SCOPE & ELIGIBILITY CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Company Age vs. Team Experience: Section 4.6 references "demonstrated financial stability and a proven track record," and Section 7.2.2 requires five past projects of similar scope. For purposes of evaluation, does the County consider the combined professional experience and track record of the firm's principals and key staff (e.g., decades of assessment industry experience,

IAAO professional designations), or must the qualifying experience reside solely in the corporate entity's history?

Answer: While all of the items noted are important, the preference would be that the corporate entity is well established with a solid client base.

16. TECHNICAL & INTEGRATION CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Current System Identification: The RFP references a system procured under RFP 2016-034. Can the County identify the current software vendor and platform in use? This information is essential for planning the data migration and conversion approach described in Section 5.9.

Answer: Current vendor is Devnet, Inc. The current software is MS SQL based operating in an on prem virtual server environment

17. TECHNICAL & INTEGRATION CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Tyler MUNIS Integration Specifics: Section 7.2.4 references integration with "Tyler MUNIS (or successor ERP)." Can the County confirm the current version of Tyler MUNIS in use and whether APIs are currently available for the tax-to-ERP data exchange, or is this integration currently handled through flat file exports?

Answer: Current version of Tyler Munis is 2024.6.0.1.1167 . There are no APIs currently in use between tax and Tyler. Data is exchanged via flat file exports.

18. TECHNICAL & INTEGRATION CLARIFICATIONS

Question: GIS Platform & Parcel Layer: Can the County identify the GIS platform currently in use (e.g., Esri ArcGIS, QGIS) and confirm whether the parcel layer is maintained in-house or by a third-party provider? What is the County's preferred format for GIS data exchange?

Answer: Union County uses ESRI ArcGIS. Parcel layer is maintained in-house. Preferred data exchange formats could vary based on implementation. Could be Shapefile, geodatabase, or REST.

19. TECHNICAL & INTEGRATION CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Database Requirement: Section 5.8 states vendors must "Utilize SQL Server 2019+ or equivalent enterprise database." Will the County accept PostgreSQL/PostGIS as the equivalent enterprise database, particularly in the context of a cloud-hosted SaaS solution where the County would not be managing the database directly?

Answer: Yes, when discussing cloud solutions the vendor can show proof of concepts utilizing other database schemas.

20. EVALUATION & AWARD CLARIFICATIONS

Question: Multi-Vendor Award Scenarios: The Notice of Advertisement states that "Union County reserves the right to award a contract to multiple vendors." Can the County elaborate on the scenarios in which a multi-vendor award might be considered? For example, would the County consider awarding the CAMA/valuation component to one vendor and the Billing & Collections component to another?

Answer: Preference is for a single vendor with a fully integrated solution. However, if it is deemed more beneficial for a separate award, it would likely be split between CAMA/valuation/Land Records and Billing/Collections.

End of Questions/Answers Section

End of Addendum No. 1