

Vendor	Date Submitted	Question Submitted	Answer
1	8/18/2026	Budget Allocation – The RFP is broad, covering records management, public records workflow, website modernization, employee portal, and local backup. Please confirm whether the District has a defined budget range for each component (records vs. website vs. portal), or if vendors should propose a consolidated cost structure.	The District does not have a defined budget range and submitters shall present the range and cost structure in the proposal. Proposals should include the requirements outlined in Section 10.20.
	8/18/2026	Project Timeline – The RFP specifies proposals due September 25, 2026. Could you confirm the anticipated timeline for discovery, design, development, migration, testing, and launch phases? Is the District targeting a specific go-live date for the website and records system?	Proposals should present a implementation timeline per Section 11. The website portion of the project will need a go-live date by April 26, 2028 per Section 7.
	8/18/2026	Content Migration – Approximately how many legacy records and website pages should vendors plan to migrate? Are existing records already digitized, or will scanning/conversion be required?	The District does not currently have an exact count or total volume for the legacy records that may need to be moved into the new system. Most of our records are digital and stored in different places and file types. We expect to work with the selected vendor during the discovery process to figure out what should be migrated. The District is not looking to simply migrate the current website as-is. Existing content will be reviewed to decide what should be carried over, updated, archived, or removed.
	8/18/2026	Training & Support – What level of staff training is expected for records management, public records workflow, and CMS use? Should vendors include ongoing support/maintenance in their proposals, or will this be contracted separately?	Proposals may include staff training and ongoing support maintenance to be evaluated by the District.
	8/18/2026	CMS Preference – Does the District have a preferred content management system (e.g., WordPress, Drupal, government-specific CMS), or should vendors recommend platforms that best meet accessibility, multilingual, and non-technical staff update requirements?	Proposals may recommend content management systems that meets the project scope to be evaluated by the District. The District does not currently have a preferred platform.
	8/18/2026	GIS & Data Licensing – For the outdoor burning eligibility tool, should vendors assume responsibility for licensing GIS data layers, or will the District provide access to county/state datasets?	The district does not currently have any GIS data access beyond public access from state, county, or entities. Proposals may identify what data, licenses, or access is needed to meet the project scope. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/18/2026	AI & Automation – The RFP emphasizes “human-in-the-loop.” Please confirm whether AI-assisted classification and redaction tools are required at launch, or if they may be phased in later.	Proposals may include implementation plans that meet the project scope. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/18/2026	Security & Compliance – The RFP references HIPAA and Washington Public Records Act compliance. Should vendors assume independent third-party audits for HIPAA/records compliance, or is vendor self-certification acceptable?	Vendor self certification subject to potential third party audit if determined it will beneficial to the District.

2	8/20/2026	1. What's the budget?	A budget has not been defined. Vendors may present a base proposal with budget options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	2. Is there a separate budget for the records platform and the migration, or one number covering everything?	The District does not have a defined budget range and submitters shall present the range and cost structure in the proposal. Proposals should include the requirements outlined in Section 10.20.
	8/20/2026	3. What funds this? A levy, a grant, or the operating budget?	The District's operating budget.
	8/20/2026	4. How many documents are we migrating, and how many gigabytes? Section 6 requires a migration price based on actual volume and the RFP never states the volume.	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total volume of records that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic, and we have not determined a final scope for how legacy records will move into the new system. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify the records that should be migrated and the best way to estimate that volume. We are not planning to include a large-scale paper records scanning project as part of this RFP unless that need is identified during discovery.
	8/20/2026	5. Break that down by where the records live now: shared network drives, ESO, and local storage.	The District's records are currently stored in several places, including shared network drives, ESO, Microsoft 365/Teams, email, and some local storage. We do not currently have an exact count or data-volume breakdown for each location. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify what records should be migrated from each source and determine those volumes as part of that process.
	8/20/2026	6. How much of that is scanned with no searchable text? We sampled 88 documents published on your current site and 41 of them, 232 pages, are image-only scans with no text layer. Section 5.2 asks for full-text search and exemption analysis, and neither works on those until they are OCR'd. We need to know how far that pattern goes into the archive.	The number of scanned documents with no searchable text is unknown. Proposals may include a method to approach legacy-records. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within
	8/20/2026	7. How far back do the legacy records go?	The District has records that go back many years, but we do not expect every old or archived record to be moved into the new system. We would work with the selected vendor during the discovery and implementation process to decide which legacy records should be migrated based on retention requirements, how useful they still are, how often they need to be accessed, and the format or condition they are currently in.
	8/20/2026	8. How many public records requests do you get a year?	2024 - 74 Requests 2025 - 95 Requests 2026 (as of 8/26) 41 Requests

8/20/2026	9. How many people handle them today, and is that a full-time job for anyone?	The District Administrative Specialist is designated as the Records Specialist and carries out the duties of public records requests.
8/20/2026	10. Do you have a current retention schedule mapping, or does the vendor build it from scratch?	Proposals may include retention schedule mapping plans that meet the project scope. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/20/2026	11. Do you have written destruction authorizations on file for anything already disposed of?	Yes. We keep a records destruction log.
8/20/2026	12. How many staff will use the records system, and how many will edit the website?	The District has not set a number of users. Proposals may include a user /license model that can allow for personnel growth. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/20/2026	13. Section 5.2 requires the vendor to warrant that the AI system does not expand the District's liability under RCW 42.56. Will you accept that warranty flowed through from the records platform vendor for their product, with us warranting our own components?	The District prefers the selected vendor to provide and be responsible for the solution rather than relying on a separate third-party records platform. If the vendor feels a third-party component is needed, the District may be open to discussing that during evaluation, but the selected vendor would still need to take responsibility for the overall solution.
8/20/2026	14. Will you accept a proposal where the records management and public records platform is a named third-party product we integrate and support, rather than software we build?	Proposals will be accepted as based on Section 10. Proposals may include third-party platforms or vendor-built software.
8/20/2026	15. Section 12 bars any reference to the District in our materials without written consent. Will you grant written consent to name the District and show the finished website in our portfolio, proposals, and reference lists?	Without written consent of the District via contract or otherwise, the vendor shall not make any reference to the District. Proposals may request such a change via base proposal or options presented.
8/20/2026	16. Section 8 requires a 99.9% monthly uptime commitment with service credits. If the District owns the hosting account directly and we manage it, what remedy do you want instead of credits against a subscription?	Proposals may include a reasonable remedy based on the hosting model. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/20/2026	17. Do you want to own the cloud hosting account and billing relationship, or do you want it bundled into a vendor subscription?	Proposals may include the approach the vendor recommends and clearly explain who would own and manage the hosting account, how billing would work, what the District would control, and how access and continuity would be handled if the vendor relationship ended.
8/20/2026	18. Who owns the domain and DNS today?	GoDaddy, renewed in 2022 for 5 years
8/20/2026	19. Where does the local backup live, and who buys the hardware? Section 8 requires District-controlled physical or on-premises storage.	The District will make hardware purchases as recommended or deemed necessary in the proposal.

8/20/2026	20. Will your IT contractor administer and test-restore that backup? We plan to specify the format, schedule, restore procedure, and documentation, and to test a restore with them, rather than supplying hardware.	The District plans to have our IT contractor to be involved with the local backup and restore testing. We're open to the vendor recommending the backup format, schedule, restore process, and documentation, and then work with our IT contractor to make sure the backup can actually be restored. The District would plan to provide the local hardware rather than having the vendor supply it.
8/20/2026	21. Who is the IT contractor, and what will they be responsible for?	Audian. They are responsible for our general IT infrastructure upkeep and general software. They should not be responsible for anything within the RFP. If the vendor believes they may need IT support, that support should be clearly articulated in the appropriate section.
8/20/2026	22. Is ESO staying? Section 6 asks for ongoing ingestion from ESO after migration.	ESO is staying
8/20/2026	23. Does the District have an ESO contract or API access that permits third-party document export?	The District expects the selected vendor to work with ESO as needed to determine what export or integration options are available under our current setup.
8/20/2026	24. Is Springbrook staying, and does anything in this scope need to reach it?	The District plans to continue to use Sprinkbrook software and no intergration ic currently planned for the scope of this project.
8/20/2026	25. Does the District have its own ArcGIS Online organizational account? Citygate used Esri to model your travel-time coverage, but that was their license, not necessarily yours.	No.
8/20/2026	26. For 4.3, can the District get us access to the Snohomish County parcel, UGA, zoning, and city limits services, or do we source them independently?	Proposals may include the necessary data sources, access, licensing, and District responsibilities. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/20/2026	27. Section 4.3 requires the vendor to indemnify the District against GIS data licensing claims. Will you accept a cap on that indemnity tied to the contract value?	Proposed caps on indemnity will be negotiated at the time of awarding but District will not likely accept caps on claims related to a vendors violation of licensing, patents, etc. as those violations are solely in vendors control..
8/20/2026	28. Which county source publishes current burn restriction status in a machine-readable form?	Proposals may include methods and sources to obtain the data.
8/20/2026	29. How does the District issue burn permits today, and does the burn eligibility tool need to issue one or only state eligibility?	Currently the District hand issues burn permits and the tool shall issue eligibility. Proposals may include options to issue permits based off the eligibility. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/20/2026	30. Does the District already have a payment processor and merchant account, or is that still being selected?	No.

	8/20/2026	31. Do you want the intranet on the same platform as the public site or separate?	Proposals may include intranet plans as the vendor deems appropriate. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	32. Is there an existing intranet, SharePoint, or Microsoft 365 tenant the employee portal should work with?	The District does utilize Microsoft 365 and SharePoint platforms. Proposals may include intranet plans as the vendor deems appropriate. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	33. Section 4.1 names Honolulu Fire Department and Griffin Fire Department as references. What specifically do you like about each?	These examples have qualities that fit in with the required capabilities described in Section 4.1.
	8/20/2026	34. Which of the 11 divisions in 4.1.1 actually have staff who will maintain their own content?	Proposals may include plans to incorporate all 11 divisions having the ability to maintain their own content although the site is currently edited by one employee. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	35. Who makes the final call when two divisions disagree?	The Fire Chief.
	8/20/2026	36. Which languages besides Spanish?	Proposals may include suggested language accessibility. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	37. Do you want machine translation with staff review, or professionally translated pages?	Proposals may include multiple/both options via base proposal or secondary options.
	8/20/2026	38. What's the target go-live date? The schedule ends at project commencement on Nov 1 2026 and gives no completion date.	Proposals should present a implementation timeline per Section 11. The website portion of the project will need a go-live date by April 26, 2028 per Section 7.
	8/20/2026	39. Are you willing to phase this, with the website, burn tool, intranet, and records request intake first and the records platform and migration in a second phase?	Proposals may include a suggested deployment model. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/20/2026	40. Does the accessibility requirement in Section 7 apply to the existing published PDFs, or only to the new site and new documents? There are at least 147 of them, with hashed filenames and no metadata, and the image-only ones fail WCAG outright.	The District does not expect every existing PDF to automatically move over to the new website. As part of the rebuild, we will review the current content and decide what should stay, be updated, be archived, or be removed. Vendors should explain how they would handle accessibility issues for any existing documents that are kept on the new site, including any recommended remediation work and related costs.
	8/20/2026	41. Do you have a current accessibility audit or any known complaint on file?	None known.
	8/20/2026	42. Is the Wix site being kept online as an archive, or shut off at launch?	Shutting it off
3	8/24/2026	Please confirm the relative weighting and scoring rubric within each of the four evaluation categories (technical approach 50%, compliance/continuity 25%, vendor qualifications 15%, 3-year TCO 10%) — specifically, what distinguishes a "meets" from an "exceeds" rating under the technical criterion?	This RFP is based on a competitive negotiation process and District staff will exercise broad discretion in the evaluations, the rubric is intended to guide the relative weight of the listed criterion but the evaluation process will be flexible and may involve follow up questions and communications with vendors.

8/24/2026	2. Is there an incumbent vendor or existing records management/website platform currently in use, and if so, will the District require data migration from a specifically named legacy system, or is this a greenfield build?	The District currently maintains a website via Wix. There is not an existing records management systems. The information on the website will need to be reflected in the new website or updated via specifications within the RFP.
8/24/2026	3. For the GIS-based burn-eligibility tool, which authoritative GIS data layers (parcel, zoning, UGA, DNR wildfire risk, hydrant, census/precinct) will the District provide vendor access to, and are any existing GIS platform licenses (e.g., Esri) transferable to the selected vendor?	Proposals may identify what data, licenses, or access is needed to meet the project scope. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal. The District does not have existing GIS software.
8/24/2026	4. For the required independent, District-controlled local backup, please specify the expected storage medium/location, minimum retention period, and the required frequency and format of vendor-supported test-restore exercises.	The District has not set a specific retention period for the local backup. Official records still need to be kept according to the Washington State Records Retention Schedule. For the local disaster-recovery backup, we would like vendors to recommend how long backup copies should be kept and what backup rotation they think will work best for reliable recovery.
8/24/2026	5. Which of the referenced county system integrations (SnoCoAlerts, Smart911, PulsePoint, First Arriving, ESO) currently expose documented APIs or data-exchange protocols, and which will require net-new integration development or coordination with third-party system owners?	Proposals may include a suggested integration approach and identify API dependencies. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/24/2026	6. Please clarify the estimated volume and format of legacy records requiring migration (e.g., page count, file types, physical vs. digital), and whether any records are anticipated to contain PHI subject to HIPAA requirements.	The District does not have an exact count or total volume for the legacy records that may need to be moved into the new system. Most of our records are digital and stored in different places and file types. We expect to work with the selected vendor during the discovery process to figure out what should be migrated and the best way to do that. Some of our records may contain PHI or other sensitive information, so the system and migration process will need to be able to handle that appropriately.
8/24/2026	7. Regarding the contractual warranty that the AI-assisted public records workflow will not expand the District's liability under RCW 42.56, can the District share the specific liability language or legal-review standard proposals will be evaluated against?	The District will require vendors to indemnify the District if Vendor's AI tools create liability. However, provided that AI is assist only as specified, the scope of the indemnification will be limited and negotiated at the time of contract award and vendor selection.
8/24/2026	8. What level of ongoing WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility monitoring is expected post-launch (e.g., automated scanning cadence, third-party audit requirements), and is this vendor-provided or District-managed?	Proposals may include a suggested monitoring model. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
8/24/2026	9. Does the 99.9% uptime SLA and associated service credits apply uniformly across all platform components (public website, employee portal, records management, public records system), or are differentiated SLAs anticipated per module?	Proposals may include an explanation of SLA/service credits for each component. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.

	8/24/2026	10. Please confirm whether teaming arrangements or subcontractors are permitted for specialized scope areas such as GIS integration or records-retention legal consulting, and what disclosure or prior-approval process applies to the prime.	Proposals may recommend integrations, consulting, etc that meets the project scope to be evaluated by the District. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/24/2026	11. Is there a page limit or prescribed format for the technical proposal, and does the District prefer the five listed platform components (records management, public records request system, public website, migration, employee portal) addressed separately or as an integrated narrative?	The District has not established a page limit or prescribed proposal format beyond the requirements listed in Sections 10 and 13. Vendors should provide enough detail to allow the District to evaluate each required component without unnecessary supporting material. Vendors may organize their proposals in the format that best explains their solution. The District requests that each of the five project components be clearly identified and addressed. The proposal should also explain how the components will operate together as a coordinated solution. Vendors may use separate sections, an integrated narrative with clear headings, or a combination of both. Cross-references are acceptable where information applies to multiple components.
	8/24/2026	12. What is the anticipated contract term, and are option years or extension periods contemplated beyond the initial period of performance for ongoing maintenance, hosting, and AI model updates?	Proposals may include a contract term and extensions. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/24/2026	13. Given the anticipated November 1, 2026 project start, does the District expect a discovery/requirements-validation phase prior to development kickoff, and if so, is that phase separately scoped, priced, or subject to a District go/no-go decision gate?	Proposals should present a implementation timeline per Section 11, any phases after the project start will be defined in an agreement.
	8/24/2026	14. For the online payment functionality (burn permits, inspection fees, public records fees), does the District mandate a specific payment processor/gateway, and how is PCI-DSS compliance responsibility divided between vendor and District?	The District does not currently have a specific mandate on payment processing. Proposals may include compliance responsibility roles. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
	8/24/2026	15. How many internal employee-portal users and expected concurrent public-facing users should the platform be architected to support, and does the District have existing identity/access management infrastructure (SSO, Active Directory) the vendor must integrate with?	The employee-portal should support 80 employees while accounting for future growth of up to 125 employees.
4	8/26/2026	1. What level of detail is desired for	
		a. The GIS integration plan for the outdoor burning eligibility	Proposals may include the necessary GIS integration to accomplish the scope outlined in the RFP. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
		b. The burn ban eligibility workflow?	Proposals may present workflows for the District to evaluate. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.

		2. To help us provide a cost estimate records migration, can the District estimate the actual volume to migrate (GB – electronic records and linear feet – paper records).	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total volume of records that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic, and we have not determined a final scope for how legacy records will move into the new system. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify the records that should be migrated and the best way to estimate that volume. We are not planning to include a large-scale paper records scanning project as part of this RFP unless that need is identified during discovery.
5	8/26/2026	1. (Section 3) What types of record workflows are you expecting the system to support? Are you able to provide any examples?	We expect the system to help with things like filing and organizing records, tracking public records requests, searching for records, reviewing records for possible redactions or exemptions, applying retention requirements, and placing records on legal hold when needed. We also want staff to review and approve anything the system or AI suggests before anything is finalized. These are examples. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to figure out what workflows make the most sense for the District.
		2. Is live GIS hydrant/water main data available from the District's water district(s) for integration, or would this layer require a separate data-sharing agreement outside this contract's scope?	The District does not currently know what live hydrant or water main data is available. We expect to work with the selected vendor to identify available sources, access needs, and the best way to include this information in the system.
		3. What is the authoritative source and update method for current county/state burn ban restriction status (API/feed, manual county posting, etc.)?	The District currently uses Snohomish County and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency for burn restriction information and updates our website, social media, and permitting manually. We would like the selected vendor to help identify the best source and method for automating those updates.
		4. Are Snohomish County parcel, zoning, and Urban Growth Area boundary layers available via public GIS REST services, or would the District need to facilitate vendor access?	Proposals may identify what data, licenses, or access is needed to meet the project scope. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal. The District does not have existing GIS software.
		5. Does Snohomish County Emergency Management or SNO911 expose a public API/feed for SnoCoAlerts that would support automatic homepage display, or is a manual link the expected approach?	Proposals may include the necessary data sources, access, licensing, and District responsibilities. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
		6. Does First Arriving offer a documented API for third-party integration, and can the District facilitate an introduction to First Arriving's technical team during discovery?	Proposals may include the necessary data sources, access, licensing, and District responsibilities. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.

		7. What is the District's estimated total records volume (by format: paper, scanned, digital-native) across network drives, ESO, and local storage, to scope migration cost accurately?	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total volume of records that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic, and we have not determined a final scope for how legacy records will move into the new system. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify the records that should be migrated and the best way to estimate that volume. We are not planning to include a large-scale paper records scanning project as part of this RFP unless that need is identified during discovery.
		8. Does ESO offer a documented API or export capability for ongoing document ingestion after migration, and can the District share current ESO version/licensing details?	Proposals may include the necessary data sources, access, licensing, and District responsibilities. Vendors may present a base proposal with options within the proposal.
		9. Is there a target or estimated budget range for this initiative, even directionally, to help vendors right-size the proposed solution and phasing?	The District's estimated budget range for initial implementation is approximately \$60,000–\$90,000. We understand there may also be ongoing annual costs for hosting, licensing, support, maintenance, or other services, and vendors should clearly identify those in their proposal.
		10. What CMS/platform hosts the District's current website, and who currently controls the domain registration and DNS?	Wix hosts the site, GoDaddy owns the domain
		11. Has the District already selected or evaluated a payment processor for Section 4.7, or is that decision still open?	No, a payment processor has not been selected or evaluated.
		12. Approximately how many internal staff/volunteers would need employee portal access, and what is the expected volume of public records requests per month?	The employee-portal should support 80 employees while accounting for future growth of up to 125 employees.
		13. Is there a page limit, font, or formatting specification for the proposal, or is format left to the vendor's discretion?	None, see Section 10 for proposal requirements.
		14. Under what circumstances will the District require consultant interviews (Section 11 mentions "if required") — is this typically triggered for all finalists or only when scoring is close?	Consultant interviews are not automatically required and will not be triggered solely by close proposal scores. The District may conduct interviews when additional clarification, demonstration, or comparison would assist the evaluation committee before making its selection.
		15. For proposals naming a subcontractor/teaming partner, does the District require any additional disclosure, certification, or approval process before contract execution beyond what's listed in Section 9.4?	No additional requirements are planned at this time beyond what is listed in Section 9.4. Vendors should identify any subcontractors or teaming partners and explain what part of the project they would handle. Any other details can be worked through with the selected vendor during the contracting process.

6	9/1/2026	PRR REQUESTS: 1. Section 5.2 requires the system to analyze documents against the Washington Public Records Act, draft a response, and cite the legal basis for suggested redactions. Would a system providing intake, content search, deadline tracking, staff-directed redaction, and audit documentation - but relying on qualified staff rather than automated AI for exemption analysis and legal citations - be considered responsive?	The District may interview one or more finalists based on the written proposal evaluations. If interviews are conducted, invited vendors will receive advance notice of the format, schedule, and topics. The District will evaluate interview information consistently with the criteria published in Section 11 of the RFP.
		2. Section 5.2 requires content search independent of file names or metadata. For scanned or poorly labeled legacy records, is OCR and full-text indexing expected at launch, or as a later phase?	The District has not decided whether OCR and full-text indexing need to be completed at launch or handled in phases. We would like vendors to recommend the approach they think makes the most sense for scanned or poorly labeled legacy records and explain how they would make those records searchable.
		3. For the HIPAA handling in Section 5.5, will the District require a Business Associate Agreement?	This language preserves the discretion already stated in Section 11 and avoids adding a new scoring method after proposals have been solicited.
		4. Section 5.1 requires website-submitted requests to flow into the PRR workflow without re-entry. If the website and PRR components come from different vendors, what integration method does the District expect, and which vendor owns that connection?	The District expects the selected vendor to be responsible for making the website and public records request system work together. If a vendor chooses to use a third-party product for part of the solution, that is fine, but the District does not want to manage the connection between separate vendors. The vendor should explain how the systems will connect and will be responsible for making sure the integration works.
		BUDGET QUESTIONS: 1. Has the District established an anticipated budget range for the initial implementation and/or annual recurring costs for this project?	A budget has not been defined. Vendors may present a base proposal with budget options within the proposal.

		2.Has the District conducted any preliminary market research, vendor demonstrations, or budgetary discussions prior to issuing the RFP? If so, can the District share any relevant findings or anticipated cost range?	Before putting the RFP together, the District had some early conversations with a few website developers and a few records management vendors to get a better idea of what options were out there. We also briefly spoke with one vendor that could potentially provide all of the services in the RFP as one overall solution. These were just preliminary conversations, and no vendor or solution was selected or preferred. Any pricing discussed was only a rough ballpark estimate. A general project range of around \$60,000–\$90,000 was discussed with the Board based on those early conversations. That was not set as the project budget, and vendors should still propose their own pricing based on the solution they recommend.
		3.The RFP requests 3-year and 5-year total cost of ownership. Does the District anticipate funding the complete scope at project commencement, or would the District consider a phased implementation based on available budget and priority?	The District is open to phasing the project if that is what the vendor recommends. We would like vendors to explain what they think should happen first, what could come later, and how that would affect the cost and timeline. We have not decided that everything has to be completed all at once.
		4. Are there specific components the District considers Phase 1 priorities—for example, records management, public records requests, website modernization, records migration, or Fire Marshal workflows?	The District has not set specific Phase 1 priorities yet. We would like vendors to recommend what they think should be done first based on the overall project goals, dependencies, cost, and what will provide the most value to the District and community. Please explain how you would phase the work and why you recommend that order.
		5.Are there grant funds, capital funds, or other designated funding sources associated with this project that carry specific expenditure deadlines or implementation requirements?	None at this time.
		6.Is there a total anticipated cost of software that the District has considered for each component of the RFP (ex. Costs for website design, Permitting Online, Records System, Public Records Request Software)?	The District has not set a separate budget for each part of the project. We would like vendors to propose the software, services, and pricing they think best meet the goals of the RFP. Please break out the costs by major component so we can clearly understand what is included.

		RECORDS MANAGEMENT: 7. Approximately how much digital content is expected to be migrated, measured in total storage (GB/TB), estimated document count, or both?	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total amount of digital content that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic, but we have not determined the final scope for what will move into the new system. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify what should be migrated and determine the actual volume at that time.
		8.Can the District provide an approximate breakdown of records data size by source, including shared network drives, local storage, ESO, and any other repositories that would be included in migration ?	The District's records are stored in several places, including shared network drives, ESO, Microsoft 365/Teams, email, and some local storage. We do not currently have an exact data-size breakdown for each source. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify what records should be migrated from each location and determine the actual volume at that time.
		9. The RFP requests ongoing document ingestion from the District's existing ESO fire records management system after migration. Can the District clarify what records and data are expected to transfer from ESO into the proposed records management system, and whether the District has access to an existing ESO API or other supported integration method?	The District plans to continue using ESO, but we have not yet decided exactly what records or data should flow into the new system. The Vendor should identify what makes sense to transfer and what ESO integration options are available.
		10.Does the migration scope include any paper records or scanning/backfile conversion, or is the scope limited to existing digital records?	The District's main focus is migrating and organizing our existing digital records and moving toward a more paperless system. We do still have paper records, and we would like vendors to explain what options they recommend for handling those records, including scanning or a digital conversion. We have not decided that all paper records need to be included in the initial migration.
		11.Approximately how many District employees will require access to the records management platform, and how many will need administrative or workflow-management capabilities?	Between 2 - 8 employees or as identified during the discovery phase of the project.

		12.For legacy records with inconsistent or missing metadata, does the District have an existing folder structure, naming convention, retention classification, or records inventory that can be provided to assist vendors in estimating migration and classification effort?	The District does have an existing folder structure and file naming conventions. Reviewing and improving those is a big part of this project. We also follow the Washington State Records Retention Schedule. That said, the current structure and naming are not always consistent across all records or departments, and we do not have a complete records inventory. We would like vendors to explain how they would review what we have now, recommend improvements, and handle records with missing or inconsistent information during discovery and migration.
		13.Does the District currently have Washington State Archives CORE retention schedules mapped to its existing records, or should the selected vendor include development and configuration of retention classifications as part of implementation?	The District follows the Washington State Records Retention Schedule, but we would like the selected vendor to help make sure our records and filing structure are properly matched to the correct retention categories in the new system. This should be part of the discovery and implementation process.
		14.For the required District-controlled local backup, does the District currently have on-premises storage infrastructure available, and does it have a preferred backup format, frequency, or recovery methodology?	Yes. The District has on-premises storage available and would work with our IT contractor, Audian, on the local backup setup. The District would like the selected vendor to recommend what they think will work best.
		15. What level of future compatibility with NERIS does the District anticipate, for example, document ingestion, data exchange, or another integration requirement? Is NERIS integration expected as part of the initial implementation or identified only as a future consideration?	The District sees NERIS as something we may need to connect with in the future, but we have not decided what integration looks like yet. Vendors should explain what they recommend now to make future NERIS integration easier.
		16. Is there an estimated user Count for access to the Records Repository?	Between 2 - 8 employees or as identified during the discovery phase of the project.
		17. How many departments will be accessing the Records Repository?	Between 2 - 8 employees or as identified during the discovery phase of the project.
		18. For the Solution are you looking for a Cloud based solution?	The District has not decided that the solution must be cloud-based. We would like vendors to recommend the setup they think will work best for the District and explain why. Any proposed solution will still need to meet the RFP requirements for security, access, continuity, and a separate District controlled local backup.

		PERMITS: 19.If permitting is included in the initial scope, approximately how many permit, inspection, license, registration, or Fire Marshal application types would need to be configured?	The District does not have a final count yet. Our Fire Marshal program is still growing, and we expect the number and types of permits, inspections, licenses, registrations, and applications to change over time. We have a general idea of our current burn permit volume, but not enough information yet to give an accurate total for all future workflows. We would like vendors to propose a system that is flexible and can easily add or change permit and inspection types as our program develops.
		20.For inspections, does the District require capabilities such as online inspection requests, inspector scheduling/routing, mobile field inspections, inspection checklists, correction notices, reinspection workflows, and automated applicant notifications? If so, which capabilities are considered part of the initial implementation?	The District uses two separate inspection tracks. Fire District 4 manages fire and life safety inspections of existing businesses and occupied buildings through First Due. This includes inspection reports, Correction Letters, Red Tags, Notices of Violation, reinspection records, enforcement records, and case-closure documentation. The Compliance Engine also supports this work by collecting inspection, testing, and maintenance reports from private contractors for fire alarms, sprinkler systems, commercial cooking suppression systems, fire pumps, standpipes, and other fire protection systems. The District wants the proposed website and records platform to provide a practical way to bring these related records, requests, compliance information, and public-facing services together. The initial implementation should support online requests and scheduling for existing-building inspections, access to related District services, and coordinated management of records from First Due and The Compliance Engine. Vendors should propose the approach they believe best meets these needs, including integrations, limitations, costs, and recommended phasing. The District is not requiring a specific technical design or replacement of these existing platforms. The City of Snohomish separately manages construction-related permits, plan review, inspection scheduling, construction inspections, corrections, and permit closeout through EnerGov and iG Inspect. Contractors and applicants use the City's public-facing portal. The proposed District solution is not intended to manage or duplicate the City's construction process.

		21. For the address-based outdoor burning eligibility tool, does the District currently maintain the required GIS layers through Esri/ArcGIS services, and can the District identify which required layers are currently available as live services versus those the vendor would be responsible for sourcing or developing?	The District does not currently maintain all of the GIS layers needed for this tool. We would like the selected vendor to help identify what live data is available, what the District can provide access to, and what may need to be sourced or developed.
		22. The RFP identifies online payments for burn permits, inspection fees, public records fees, and future District services. What payment processor and merchant services provider does the District currently use, and are there existing APIs or integration specifications that vendors should account for?	The District does not currently have an online payment processor or merchant services provider. We would like vendors to recommend an approach for online payments and explain what payment processor or service they would suggest.
		23. The District specifically says it will maintain the merchant account/payment processor, what payment processor does the district currently use?	The District does not currently have an online payment processor or merchant services provider. We would like vendors to recommend an approach for online payments and explain what payment processor or service they would suggest.
		24. Is the District open to alternative payment processing solutions, or is integration with the	The District does not currently have an online payment processor or merchant services provider. We would like vendors to recommend an approach for online payments and explain what payment processor or service they would suggest.
		25. Does the District anticipate a single public-facing website, or are there additional subsites	The District is looking for one main public facing website and does not currently anticipate needing separate microsites or subsites. Different areas, such as the Fire Marshal's Office, recruitment, Community Risk Reduction, and other programs, would live within the main website.
		26. Does the District have established branding guidelines, design standards, logos, imagery, or other creative assets that should be incorporated into the new website design?	Yes. The District has logos, photos, etc. that can be used as part of the new website. We would also like to be involved in the design process and work with the selected vendor on the overall look, layout, and feel of the site. Vendors should explain how they typically involve clients in the design and review process.
		27. The RFP references the Honolulu Fire Department and Griffin Fire Department websites. Are these intended primarily as examples of navigation and content organization, or are there specific design elements or functionality from these sites that the District would like incorporated?	The Griffin Fire Department website is mainly a reference for the overall look, feel, and ease of use that we like. The Honolulu Fire Department website is more of a reference for how inspection, prevention, and Fire Marshal-related information is organized and presented. We are not looking to copy either site, but we would like vendors to use them as examples of the direction we have in mind.
		28. For SnoCoAlerts, Smart911, PulsePoint, and First Arriving, does the District anticipate simple links/embeds where available, or are vendors expected to develop API or data-feed integrations to display information dynamically on the website?	The vendor and District will work together on each item to determine the best solutions for the needs. The proposal can list a base solution and options

		29. Does the District have any existing website integrations, APIs, data feeds, or embedded	Pulsepoint
		INTEGRATIONS: 30.Of the GIS layers identified in Section 4.3, which are currently maintained by the District or available through Snohomish County/other agencies and which does the District expect the selected vendor to source, license, host, or maintain?	The District does not maintain any GIS informaiton or layers. The vendor would need to confer with Snohomish Couty/other agencies to determine what is available, costs, or other needs.
		31.What is the authoritative data source for current county and state burn restrictions, and does the District know whether these sources provide an API, GIS service, RSS/data feed, or other machine-readable method for automatically updating burn restriction status?	The District currently relies on Snohomish County and other state agencies for burn restriction information, including the Snohomish County Fire Marshal and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Vendors should recommend how they would monitor and pull current burn restriction information into the website, including what data feeds, GIS services, APIs, or other sources they would use.
		32.What existing data sources does the District currently use to determine outdoor burning eligibility, and which of those sources should the proposed eligibility tool use when evaluating a resident's address?	The District currently uses the Snohomish County Assessor's website to help check whether an address is eligible when reviewing burn permit applications. We also use current county and state burn restriction information. We would like vendor to recommend the best data sources and tools to use for the new eligibility tool so it is accurate, reliable, and easy to keep updated.
		33. What is the authoritative source the District currently uses to determine when county, st	The District currently relies on Snohomish County and the other state agencies for burn restriction information, including The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.
		34. If an authoritative burn restriction source does not provide an API or automated data feed, how does the District envision the website's requirement to automatically update current burn restriction status being fulfilled?	The District and vendor will work toghether to determine sources, options, and best solutions for the information available.
		35. Can the District provide the current business rules or decision matrix used by staff to determine whether residential, recreational, or agricultural burning is permitted at a specific address, including how jurisdiction, zoning, UGA status, DNR restrictions, and active burn bans interact to produce the final determination?	The District does not currently have a written decision matrix that covers every possible situation. Staff currently reviews the address using the Snohomish County Assessor's website and applicable county and state burn restriction information, along with the type of burning being requested. We would like to work with the selected vendor during discovery to build a clear, reliable decision workflow for the new eligibility tool.

7	9/1/2026	<left intentionally blank>	<left intentionally blank>
		1. Does the District have admin staff who are familiar or have experience with a CMS system?	No. The District does not currently have administrative staff with experience using a CMS. Because of that, ease of use and the ability for non-technical staff to make routine website updates are important to us.
		2. Can website updates be done with WordPress, Drupal, or Joomla?	Vendors should recommend the platform they think will work best for our needs and explain why they recommend it. Ease of use for non technical staff will be important.
		3. Is there a preference for or dislike of any of these?	The District does not have a preference for or dislike of WordPress, Drupal, or Joomla. Vendors should recommend the platform they think will work best for the District and explain why, especially in terms of ease of use, accessibility, security, and long-term support.
		4. Would the District prefer website updates are done using Microsoft Word?	Vendors should recommend the update process they think will be easiest for non-technical staff to use and explain how routine content changes would be made.
		OUTDOOR BURNING ELIBILITY TOOL: 1. Will the District accept linking to known, trusted external data systems?	Vendors should explain which external sources they would use, how those links or integrations would work.
		WHAT LEVEL OF DETAIL IS PREFERRED FOR: 1. The GIS integration plan for the outdoor burning eligibility?	Vendors should recommend the GIS data sources, services, and licensing they think will work best for the outdoor burning eligibility tool and clearly explain what access or support they would need from the District.

		2. The burn ban eligibility workflow?	Vendors should provide enough detail for us to understand how their proposed process would work, what data sources it would use, how different restrictions would be checked, and how a final eligibility result would be reached.
		ONLINE PAYMENTS: 1. Does the District have an existing online payment system?	No.
		2. Will the District require payment pages to integrate with back-end fulfillment system?	Vendors should explain how their proposed payment process would connect to the related permit, inspection, public records request, or other service, and what steps could be automated after payment is received.
		3. Can the District describe the back-end fulfillment system?	The District does not have a back-end payment system.
		COMMUNITY RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM SCHEDULING AND REGISTRATION: 1. Does the District prefer the website and Document Management System facilitate and track the requests?	Yes. The District would like the website to allow the public to submit requests, and the records management system to receive, track, and help staff manage those requests through the process. We would like vendors to explain how they think the website and records system should work together.
		2. Is there an existing system in place?	No. The District does not currently have a dedicated public records request system. Requests are tracked and processed manually by the District's Records Officer.
		3. Does the existing system update a backend fulfillment system?	No.
		4. What is the backend fulfillment system?	The District does not have a backend fulfillment system.
		DATA AND DOCUMENT MIGRATION: 1. Can the District estimate the data volume in GB (electronic records) and linear feet (paper records)?	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total volume of records that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic, and we have not determined a final scope for how legacy records will move into the new system. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify the records that should be migrated and the best way to estimate that volume. We are not planning to include a large-scale paper records scanning project as part of this RFP unless that need is identified during discovery.

		2. Will the District accept proposals showing service ranges and descriptions that could be finalized and confirmed following discovery?	The proposals should list a base price with services covered. Vendors are allowed to show options to that base. The options should show a corresponding price increase or deduction for each option. Options can be shown in a range of costs, however, the base price cannot be a range and must be a figure. The items in the base must be clearly defined. If costs are not one time costs (i.e. ongoing, subscriptions, etc), those should be clearly articulated as future ongoing costs that will continue after completion of the project. The term of the ongoing costs should be clearly articulated. This includes items in the base price.
8	9/1/2026	1. Section 3 states the District prefers one prime vendor accountable for the complete solution, while Section 2 notes the District does not require every function to be delivered through one product. Will the District accept a proposal limited to the Records Management and Public Records Request components (Sections 5 and 6)	No. The District is looking for one prime vendor to be responsible for the full scope of the RFP. We understand that not every part of the solution has to come from one product, and vendors may use third party products or partners, but the prime vendor should be responsible for making the full solution work together.
9	8/31/236	1.Has the District established an internal budget range or not-to-exceed figure for this initiative (setup, migration, and ongoing subscription combined)? If so, can it be disclosed to ensure proposals are appropriately scoped?	The District's estimated budget range for initial setup and implementation is approximately \$60,000–\$90,000. We understand there may also be ongoing annual costs for hosting, licensing, support, maintenance, or subscriptions. Vendors should clearly identify those ongoing costs separately in their proposal.
		2. Is there a (CMS) platform preference?	The District does not have a preferred CMS. Vendors should recommend the platform they think will work best for our needs and explain why they recommend it. Ease of use for non-technical staff will be important.
		3. In order to quote hosting: a.Can you provide the number of page views per month, currently, for the site? b.What is the average bandwidth usage per month? c.Can you provide current storage requirements for both database and files?	a. 1,221. b. Unsure. c. We currently have 8GB of files on our site.
		4.How many people will be administering content?	Between 2-8 people.
		5.Can the District provide details on the current ESO fire records management system's data structure/export capabilities to help vendors scope the Section 6 ESO migration requirement?	The District does not currently have detailed information on ESO's data structure or export options. We expect to work with the selected vendor and ESO during discovery to figure out what records should be transferred and what export or integration options are available.

		6.What is the estimated volume of existing digital and legacy records to be migrated (approximate document/page count, formats, and locations — network drives, ESO, local storage)?	The District does not currently have an exact estimate of the total volume of records that will need to be migrated. Most records are electronic and are stored in several places, including shared network drives, ESO, Microsoft 365/Teams, email, and some local storage. We expect to work with the selected vendor during discovery to identify what records should be migrated and determine the actual volume at that time.
		7.Does the District have any existing GIS licensing (e.g., Esri) already in place, or county-provided GIS services vendors should plan to integrate with rather than duplicate?	The District does not currently have its own GIS licensing or maintain GIS layers. Vendors should identify what county, state, or other public GIS services may be available and recommend the best way to use existing sources.
		8.Will Snohomish County provide point-in-area analysis or will the vendor need to build a GIS analysis of map layers?	Vendors should plan to identify the available GIS data and services and recommend whether existing county resources can be used or whether additional GIS analysis will need to be built as part of the solution.
		9.Will the vendor be able to leverage existing map services and county GIS products like Vertigis for spatial analysis?	The District’s geographic information system (GIS) access is limited to publicly available data and map services. Vendors may propose using these resources for spatial analysis, subject to applicable terms of use. The District does not have licenses or special access to county GIS products, including VertiGIS, to provide to the selected vendor. Proposals should identify the intended data sources and tools, along with any additional access requirements, licensing, and associated costs.
		10.What financial/accounting software does the District currently use, and is integration with that system in scope for the payment/fee-tracking requirements (Section 5.6)?	The District does not currently have a financial/accounting system that needs to be integrated as part of this project. Vendors should explain how their proposed payment and fee-tracking process would work.
		11.What is the District's approximate annual volume of public records requests, and typical complexity (single-document vs. multi-department, multi-hundred-page requests)?	The District received 74 public records requests in 2024, 95 in 2025, and 41 as of August 26, 2026. Requests vary in size and complexity, but the District does not track them by categories such as single-document, multi-department, or page count.

		12.Does the District have documented redaction/exemption criteria or a PRA training program already in place that the vendor's advisory AI tooling should be configured against?	The District follows the Washington Public Records Act and other applicable laws when reviewing records for exemptions and redactions. We do not currently have a separate redaction guide or training program that the AI would need to be built around. Any AI tools should be used as a support tool only, with District staff reviewing and approving any suggested exemptions or redactions before anything is finalized.
		13.Are there specific past PRR compliance incidents or challenges that should inform the priority features in the RFP response?	The District is not aware of any specific past PRR compliance issues that need to shape the project. One challenge we do run into is how long it can take to find records when files are named inconsistently or saved in the wrong place. Improving how records are organized, named, and searched is one of the main things we hope this project will help with.
		14.Who currently maintains and updates burn ban status information, and how is that status communicated today prior to the new tool?	The District currently relies on Snohomish County and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency for burn restriction information. Staff then updates the District website, social media, and permitting information manually when restrictions change.
		15.Will the District facilitate direct introductions/data-sharing agreements with Snohomish County GIS and DNR, or is the vendor expected to establish those independently?	The District has not set a specific process for this yet. Vendors should let us know what data access, agreements, or agency coordination they would need. The District can help with introductions or coordination with Snohomish County, DNR, or other agencies as needed.
		16.Who supports the current site?	Wix
		17.What was last year's annual budget for website maintenance and hosting?	We last renewed our host 3 years ago, for \$350.00. We spend minimal time updating our site “regularly”.