

ADDENDUM No. 2

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Procurement Section
3800 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS#93
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000**

March 2, 2018

Addendum To: DEP Solicitation No. RFP 2018019, entitled “ePermitBuilder System”

The Department hereby answers questions posed by prospective Respondents. This addendum does not need to be returned with the proposal. The Department hereby answers the following questions:

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
1.	Section 4.05	37	<p>Page 37 Provides 4 key systems used by Title V permit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA - Repository for all permit projects and action/status tracking. • ARMS - Permit data including conditions, reporting requirements, emission limits, process limits, facility location updates (if any), and regulations applicable to the permit are stored in ARMS. • OCULUS – Repository for all documents. • ADH –Has user interface for submitting permit summary and publishing final documents for access by the public. <p>Will the Permit Builder require to interface with each of those systems?</p> <p><i>Answer: Yes.</i></p>
2.	Section 4.05	37	<p>If yes to question #1, please elaborate the interface requirements.</p> <p><i>Answer:</i></p> <p><i>PA - Reference Section 4.04 PA definition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The solution creates a new project record in PA with an associated linking record that ties the permit to the correct Facility in the ARMS database.</i> • <i>The solution logs event details in PA as activities occur.</i> • <i>Data element details will be further defined as part of data mapping activities.</i> <p><i>ARMS - Reference Section 4.05</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ARMS is the source for Facility data and permit requirements. Any new or changed Facility data and permit requirements must be updated in ARMS.</i> • <i>Interaction with ARMS is critical for Facility data and permit requirements whether through interface screens, API's, direct Oracle table access, or data load processes. We expect the Respondent to propose how in their reply.</i> • <i>If the permit application is for a new facility, the Processor will create a new Facility in ARMS and the solution will make the appropriate Facility data available to the</i>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<p><i>Processor creating the permit. The permit requirements from the newly issued permit and associated regulations must be stored in ARMS but any Facility update will be made by the Processor in ARMS.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• If the permit is a renewal or modification, existing data in ARMS will be used in the permit build process. Any changes will be recorded in ARMS along with any new permit requirements and associated regulations for the renewed permit.</i> <i>• Data element details will be further defined as part of data mapping activities.</i> <p><i>OCULUS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Solution sends Indexing information and Final PDF documents to OCULUS.</i> <i>• The solution must provide program area specific indexing information along with the required final document(s) (including attachments) to DEP’s EDMS (OCULUS) and be able to retrieve the OCULUS link to those documents. DEP API’s are available for interfacing with OCULUS.</i> <p><i>ADH:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The solution must have the ability to provide a zipped Title V permit package to Division of Air in Tallahassee for ADH import; Network copy or email attachment is acceptable.</i>
3.	Section 4.02	28	<p>Migration of legacy system data to COTS solution. This includes mapping relevant data from the current SRF system to the new COTS solution, and providing migration activities to extract, transform (if needed) and load data from the existing legacy system(s) to the new COTS solution</p> <p>What data are stored in the SRF system?</p> <p><i>Answer:</i> <i>SRF system is not involved. Deliverable 3a first paragraph is corrected with:</i> <i>Data Migration Plan and Migration Tasks – Migration of legacy system data to COTS solution; migration plan must be compatible with integration requirements. This includes mapping relevant data from the current DEP systems to the new COTS solution, and providing migration activities to extract, transform (if needed) and load data from the existing legacy system(s) to the new COTS solution. The Contractor will work with DEP program and technical staff to determine what relevant data needs to be migrated/replicated to the new COTS solution.</i> <i>For production data interfaces (read/write to other schemas) this includes mapping relevant data and any required transformations.</i></p>
4.	Section 4.02	28	<p>Please define the scope of the data migration: How many Tables? Columns? How many years of data?</p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<p><i>Answer:</i></p> <p><i>It is the Agency's intention that the new COTS solution integrate with existing DEP applications.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to Answer 2 and 3.</i></p> <p><u><i>ARMS key information:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Facility Information (read)</i> • <i>Emission Units (read/write)</i> • <i>Emission Unit Limits & their reporting requirements (read/write)</i> • <i>Associated code tables (read)</i> <p><u><i>PA key information:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Projects (historical / open) (read/write)</i> • <i>Scheduled Events (read/write)</i> • <i>Project Numbering (read/write)</i> • <i>Associated code tables (read)</i>
5.	Section 4.02	28	<p>What are the purposes of the SFR data in the new ePermit Builder system?</p> <p><i>Answer: Not applicable, refer to Answer 3.</i></p>
6.	Section 4.02	28	<p>Will DEP require the ePermit Builder to support Title V permitting for all new permit application? Or to continue the activity from the middle of an ongoing permit cycle? If continue with the ongoing permitting cycle is required, please provide details on what are required from the ePermit Builder.</p> <p><i>Answer:</i></p> <p><i>"Will DEP require the ePermit Builder to support Title V permitting for all new permit application? Yes.</i></p> <p><i>Or to continue the activity from the middle of an ongoing permit cycle?" Yes. The renewal of an existing issued permit must be supported. The tool must be able to retrieve existing permit information from ARMS and utilize existing documents from OCULUS (PDF) or local Word document to process a renewal.</i></p> <p><i>ePermitBuilder will not need to support permits already in draft form but not issued.</i></p>
7.	General RFP question		<p>What will be the DEP's target go-live date for the new ePermit Builder system?</p> <p><i>Answer: Respondent to propose.</i></p>
8.	General RFP question		<p>Could the DEP consider to extend the Proposal due date for two more weeks?</p> <p><i>Answer: See the revised Schedule of Events.</i></p>
9.	1.07. Part 1 C.	8	<p>We have developed e permitting systems for many different areas of the Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection. For example, we implemented a system for Fisheries and another for Radiation. Each required unique workflows and solutions. Would these count as</p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<p>two references for the Client Reference Form (Section 11.00)</p> <p><i>Answer: If they are different systems, yes. If they are the same systems but different work flow/business rules, no.</i></p>
10.	Section 7.15.1		<p>Can you please clarify 'support of data integration standards'? Is this referring to the ability to natively (or via API coding) accept data coming from a secondary platform that utilizes these standards, the ability to generate data in these formats or communication methods, or something else?</p> <p><i>Answer: If your solution supports the standard, reply Yes and identify how it is supported in Column E (Explanations).</i></p>
11.	General RFP question		<p>Please clarify whether a vendor with a solution that could be deployed as either a cloud based or premise based solution should submit two entirely separate proposal responses or submit two separate price proposals?</p> <p><i>Answer: Refer to Section 1.04 "Respondents may submit a reply for both the on-premise and SaaS solutions, but a separate Reply will be required for each solution that is being proposed."</i></p>
12.	Section 7.0 – System Service Capabilities Vendor Response		<p>From line item 7.9.3.2 on the above referenced spreadsheet the cell protections and cell masking for the response cells are misaligned. Because of this misalignment, it is not possible to properly respond to these line items: 7.9.3.2, 7.9.3.7, 7.9.4.1, 7.9.4.2</p> <p><i>Answer: This was corrected after the Pre-Solicitation Conference. Please contact the Issuing Officer via email to request updated Section 7 System/Services Capabilities Reply Form (Excel)</i></p>
13.	General RFP question		<p>What is the percentage of individuals and organizations creating, building and issuance of complex permits for Title V facilities that do so on a frequent basis versus those that send in on an infrequent or one time only basis?</p> <p><i>Answer: Unclear question.</i></p>
14.	General RFP question		<p>Is there a preference for a cloud or an on premise solution?</p> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
15.	General RFP question		<p>Please clarify, if a vendor includes and exceptions in their bid, will DEP automatically disqualify their response?</p> <p><i>Answer: A response with exceptions may be disqualified as non-responsive.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
16.	General RFP question		<p>Will the attendees on the webinar conference be announced?</p> <p><i>Answer: The attendee list has been posted to the Vendor Bid System as an attachment.</i></p>
17.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.3.3.4	<p>Could you provide an example of a situation where you receive multiple applications for the same permit?</p> <p><i>Answer: For example, a multi-media Title V ACI permit would contain all the air permit conditions for the ACI as well as the solid waste permit conditions for yard trash storage. In this case, two program area application would be received, and one permit issued containing all conditions for both programs. The scope of this solution would be issuance of Title V permit only with processor added conditions to support the solid waste requirements.</i></p>
18.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.3.3.5	<p>Would you expand on what is meant by 'fillable fields'? How would it be different from a template that had a marked placeholder for fillable text entry by a permit writer?</p> <p><i>Answer: Your definition matches our intention here.</i></p>
19.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.6.2.0	<p>There are numerous Document and Content management requirements specified in 7.05 and 7.06. The Business Process in Section 4.05 describes document archival in DEPs Electronic Document Management System (OCULUS). Presumably OCULUS provides the capabilities listed. Would storage of finalized documents for management within OCULUS finalized documents be an acceptable approach to satisfy these requirements?</p> <p><i>Answer: OCULUS does not provide the capabilities listed.</i></p> <p><i>The intention of Section 7.05 and 7.06 was to identify requirements that would facilitate management of source documents that could be used to build renewal documents without creating them from scratch.</i></p> <p><i>OCULUS indexes PDF documents for archival and retrieval (refer to Answer 2 for full description) and is used internally and externally for public access. We do not store the source (Word) document in OCULUS nor do we intend to.</i></p>
20.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.10.0.1	<p>Would you provide some examples of business process rules needed and the types of changes anticipated?</p> <p><i>Answer: For example, adding a courtesy draft as an optional step in an existing business process.</i></p>
21.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.11.0.5	<p>It is unclear what is meant by "an existing pre-application subject". Does this refer to project/permit type?</p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<i>Answer: 7.11.0.5 is for informational purposes only as noted in 7.11.0.0 in Section 7. A pre-application subject refers to information we received for a project (months/years) prior to an application being received. Pre-application process is out of scope (Reference "Phase B: Application Submittal – Out of Scope" in Section 4.05).</i>
22.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.11.0.11	<p>There are numerous questions related to manual workflow activities. Workflow consists of a set of activities or tasks to complete as part of Permit development and issuance. What does are examples of non-manual workflow activities?</p> <p><i>Answer:</i> <i>Examples of "non-manual" workflow activities would be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Indexing the document into OCULUS</i> • <i>Updating PA with event statuses</i>
23.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.11.0.19	<p>There are many capabilities of our software no identified in the requirements. This would be difficult to enter into a single cell in the response sheet. May we provide a list of capabilities in a separate sheet of the response workbook?</p> <p><i>Answer: If you need additional space to list capabilities of your software that are not addressed in our requirements for Title V Permits or to further expand on an explanation in the ePermitBuilder tab then you may create an additional tab in the excel workbook and insert your information there. Clearly label what capability or requirement(s) your information applies to. Continuations of an explanation from the ePermitBuilder tab into a separate tab must include the requirement number from Column A and a note to the reviewer to continue reading in the new tab location.</i></p>
24.	Section 7 – System Service Capabilities	Ref # 7.3.1.3	<p>Please describe the minimum 'taxonomy' structure needed by the Agency. Would is a list of conditions organized by Program Area satisfy the core need?</p> <p><i>Answer: No, multiple levels would be needed.</i></p>
25.	Section 4.01 Purpose and Scope	26	<p>Our application provides fully integrated application form design, entry, submission, payment and permit processing. Is DEP open to fully utilizing these capabilities (for example, rather than processing Air Permit applications in EPSAP, linking to our application form entry from EPSAP), if it is a more cost effective option than integrating with EPSAP application submissions?</p> <p><i>Answer: No</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
26.	4.05 Business Process	36	<p>The ITN states the following :</p> <p>The Title V air permits in Level 3 are the only permit types that are targeted for this ITN. Title V permits include Air Construction, Air Operator, and Renewals with associated construction and modifications.</p> <p>So in our response and estimated should we consider only the 4 permit types under the Air Resource Permitting program? Or all the complex permit types?</p> <p><i>Answer: Only Title V permit types and their subtypes are in scope.</i></p> <p><i>Also the first bullet in Section 4.08.C of the ITN Is corrected to state: "There are 540 types/subtypes 359 of which are considered complex. Title V comprises 20 subtypes.</i></p>
27.	4.05 Business Process	36	<p>If the answer to question 1 is yes, then is EPSAP web interface will be the source of the permit application or will it be PA?</p> <p>In other words is there an interface with EPSAP needed?</p> <p><i>Answer: N/A</i></p>
28.	4.05 Business Process	37	<p>Is the ePermitBuilder application expected to provide the functionality of capturing comments on the documents and tracking the history of changes?</p> <p><i>Answer: Refer to 7.3.4.7, 7.3.4.8, 7.3.4.12, 7.3.4.13, and 7.6.2.27, in Section 7 – System Service Capabilities</i></p>
29.	4.08 Permit Structure and Metrics	44	<p>What is the approximate count of the templates/ document libraries that the ePermitBuilder application expected to handle/support?</p> <p><i>Answer:</i></p> <p><i>Approximately 100 prefilled templates for documents plus about 250 template emission unit permit sections that can be dropped into a permit template (for example, emergency engines).</i></p>
30.	4.06 Application Architecture	41	<p>Is all document repository storage automated or is there any manual process involved in uploading/maintaining/categorizing the documents?</p> <p><i>Answer: Assuming this question refers to OCULUS (the Agency Electronic Document Management Systems), refer to Answer 2. Interface to OCULUS can be manual or automated through DEP APIs.</i></p>
31.	4.05 Business Process	37	<p>Does DEP envision to change the way of publishing the permit summary and final documents with the new EPermitBuilder or will the ADH interface stay as it is?</p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<i>Answer: Modifying ADH is out of scope. Please refer to ADH interface requirement in answer 2 for more detail.</i>
32.	4.06 Application Architecture	41	<p>Will the FDM database with the master list of facilities and affiliations to be migrated/copied/referred in the ePermitBuilder?</p> <p><i>Answer: No, this information is contained in the ARMS database. Please refer to answer 2 for more detail.</i></p>
33.	4.05 Business Process	37	<p>What is the average calendar days for a permit application to be reviewed, processed and a permit be issued?</p> <p><i>Answer:</i> <i>The Department seeks to reduce this metric as low as possible. On average, a Draft Title V Permit Package is issued in ~52 days. The next phase contains two issuances, a Proposed Permit Package and a Final Permit Package. These two items happen over an average of ~87 days. The average time a project may be "In House" (time from application receipt to final permit package issuance) is ~155 days.</i></p>
34.	4.08 Permit Structure and Metrics	44	<p>What is the maximum size of a permit document the ePermitBuilder is expected to build?</p> <p><i>Answer:</i> <i>There are no maximum permit document sizes by page number or document size. The permit package can contain multiple files, such as the Written Notice to Issue, Permit, Appendices, supporting documents, etc. The permit document itself could be upward of 500 printed pages, depending on the number of emission units and processes in use at the facility. The stored zipped permit packages can be nearly 50 MB after they were converted, zipped and compressed.</i> <i>The maximum allowable file size in OCULUS is 200MB.</i></p>
35.	4.06 Application Architecture	41	<p>Please provide the following information on the existing OCULUS EDMS:</p> <p>10a. What is the technology platform?</p> <p>10b. What types of integration patterns does OCULUS support (web-services, point to point, file based batch process)</p> <p>10c. Does OCULUS provide version control for work in progress and final work products?</p> <p>10d. Is OCULUS used to manage work in progress or only the final documents?</p> <p>10e. is loading documents to OCULUS manual only as opposed to an automated or schedule interface?</p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<i>Answer: Refer to Answer 2 "Oculus"</i>
36.	4.06 Application Architecture	eI41	Does the department plan to replace permit processing for the Title V air permits currently performed by the Permitting Application (PA) as part of the solution procured in this ITN? <i>Answer: Refer to Answer 2 for expected interaction with PA.</i>
37.	1.07, Part I, Section E (Tab E); also Section 14.00	9 & 79	Regarding the Foreign State Preferences in Contracting Form, would the agency allow bidders to provide details of their home state's bidder preferences and accompanying regulations in lieu of involving an attorney? This is an expensive requirement for information that is readily accessible on every state's procurement website. <i>Answer: This is a statutory requirement Section 287.084 (2), F.S. states, "A vendor whose principal place of business is outside this state must accompany any written bid, proposal, or reply documents with a written opinion of an attorney at law licensed to practice law in that foreign state, as to the preferences, if any or none, granted by the law of that state to its own business entities whose principal places of business are in that foreign state in the letting of any or all public contracts."</i>

In accordance with Section 1.04, Addenda, the Department hereby formally amends the Solicitation as follows:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

(Addendum No. 2, Revised 03.01.18)

DATES	EVENTS	METHOD
January 30, 2018	Solicitation Advertised	Vendor Bid System http://www.myflorida.com/apps/vbs/vbs_www.main_menu
February 12, 2018 @ 1:30 pm ET	Mandatory Pre-Solicitation Conference	<p><u>Mandatory</u> Pre-Solicitation Conference will be held in Room 170, Carr Building via GoToMeeting:</p> <p>Florida Department of Environmental Protection Carr Building 3800 Commonwealth Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000</p> <hr/> <p>ePermitBuilder ITN Pre-Solicitation Conference:</p> <p>You must register to attend. Join us for the webinar on Feb 12, 2018 at 1:30 PM EST (we encourage you to log in between 1:00 PM and 1:30 PM to allow time to resolve any last minute technical issues).</p> <p>Register Now! https://attendeegotowebinar.com/register/6762079362628524034</p> <p>After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.</p> <p><u>View System Requirements:</u> https://link.gotowebinar.com/help-system-requirements-attendeeg</p> <p>If you require technical assistance, please contact DEP Service Desk at: 850-245-7555.</p>
February 19, 2018 @ 5:00 pm <i>(Revised Addendum No. 1)</i>	Questions Submitted in Writing	Procurement Contact identified in Section 1.02, Procurement Officer
On or about, February 26 March 2 , 2018	Answers to Questions Posted	Vendor Bid System http://www.myflorida.com/apps/vbs/vbs_www.main_menu
MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN: March 26, 2018 @ 4:00 pm ET <i>(Revised Addendum No. 2)</i>	SEALED RESPONSES DUE	<p>Submit to: Florida Department of Environmental Protection DEP Procurement Section, Room 215 3800 Commonwealth Blvd, MS93 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000</p> <p>SOLICITATION NUMBER MUST BE ON ENVELOPE</p>
March 27, 2018 @ 10:00 am ET <i>(Revised Addendum No. 2)</i>	Public Response Opening	Florida Department of Environmental Protection DEP Procurement Section, Room 215 3800 Commonwealth Blvd, MS93 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000
On or about, March 26 April 9 , 2018 <i>(Revised Addendum No. 2)</i>	Notice of Negotiations	The Department anticipates posting the evaluation scores and the notice of negotiations (Section 1.15) on the Vendor Bid System: http://www.myflorida.com/apps/vbs/vbs_www.main_menu
On or about, April 23, 2018 <i>(Revised Addendum No. 2)</i>	Negotiations	ITN Negotiations Begin, starting with a demonstration from the selected vendors of their solution

On or about, TBD	Public Meeting	Negotiation Team Recommendation Meeting
On or about, TBD	Anticipated Posting of Recommended Award	Vendor Bid System http://www.myflorida.com/apps/vbs/vbs_www.main_menu

1.08. Submittal of Reply. Both Technical and Price Replies (Reply) must be received in accordance with VBS and Schedule of Events. Sealed Proposals must be executed and submitted in two (2) parts and be marked as follows:

- Part I – Technical Reply (One Separately Sealed package for Technical Reply); and
- Part II – Price Reply (One Separately Sealed package for Price Reply)

THE SEPARATELY SEALED PACKAGES MAY BE MAILED TOGETHER IN ONE ENVELOPE OR BOX.

The face of the envelope shall contain the Solicitation number and opening date. All Solicitations are subject to the conditions specified herein. Those that do not comply with these conditions are subject to rejection.

The Respondent must submit two (2) copies (one (1) Original hard copy and one (1) duplicate copies) and two (2) duplicate electronic copies of the Technical and Price Reply to the Department. The original hard copy of the proposal shall bear original signatures and be marked as the “Original.” The electronic copies of the Reply may be submitted on CD, DVD, or USB-compatible memory stick and must be in .pdf format and excel format. The Department will reject Proposals submitted in alternate file formats or which contain information different from that in the hard copy of the Proposal. *(Revised Addendum No. 2)*

If you assert that any portion of your Responses are exempt from disclosure under the Florida Public Records law, you must submit a redacted version of the Responses along with the un-redacted version. The redacted copy shall be clearly titled “Redacted Copy.”

All proposed materials must be packaged so that each box of materials shipped to the Department does not exceed 25 pounds.

Respondents are advised to ensure the files are not corrupt prior to mailing as any material which is not readable will not be considered.

CAUTION: Replies received at the office designated after the exact time specified for receipt will not be considered.

NOTE: This section supersedes Section 2.00, General Instructions to Respondents (PUR-1001) Paragraph 3, Electronic Submission of Replies.

1.13. Evaluation Criteria Scoring. With the exception of the cost and past performance reviews, each Reply will be reviewed by at least ~~six (6)~~ **five (5)** evaluators. Each member of the Evaluation Committee will be provided a copy of each Technical Reply. Replies will be evaluated independently on the criteria established in Section 12.00, Evaluation Criteria in order to ensure that Replies are uniformly rated. However, the IT related sections will only be reviewed by three (3) of the evaluators who have a specialized knowledge of IT; the scores from IT will be averaged will be provided to the evaluators for inclusion on their score sheets for calculation of the total numerical rating. The Evaluation Committee will assign points, utilizing the technical evaluation criteria identified herein and the Procurement Office will complete a technical summary. *(Revised Addendum No. 2)*

A Department representative will contact references via telephone to obtain the past performance reviews. The DEP Procurement Section will evaluate the cost section of the Reply. The scores for the past performance reviews and the cost evaluation shall be provided to the evaluators for inclusion on their score sheets for calculation of the total numerical rating.

The DEP Procurement Section will use the total point scores to convert to rank by each evaluator and then calculate an average rank for each Reply for all evaluators. Using the evaluation criteria specified below, in accordance with Section 287.057, F.S., the Department shall evaluate and rank responsive Replies and, at the Department’s sole discretion, proceed to negotiation.

For example:

Firm	Raw Points Received	Rank
Company A	200	2
Company B	210	1
Company C	180	3.5*
Company D	175	5
Company E	180	3.5*

In the event that multiple firms have the same raw point score, the rank positions for these firms are averaged and each firm receives that rank. In this case the third and fourth ranks are tied so 3 + 4 = 7; 7

divided by 2 = 3.5. Each firm receives a rank of 3.5. All Replies must comply with the terms of this Solicitation.

Deliverable 3a contained within Section 4.02. Schedule of Tasks and Deliverables, is hereby replaced with the below:

Deliverable 3a: ~~Data Migration Plan and Migration Tasks~~—Migration of legacy system data to COTS solution. This includes mapping relevant data from the current SRF system to the new COTS solution, and providing migration activities to extract, transform (if needed) and load data from the existing legacy system(s) to the new COTS solution. The Contractor will work with DEP program and technical staff to determine what relevant data needs to be migrated to the new COTS solution.

Data Migration Plan and Migration Tasks – Migration of legacy system data to COTS solution; migration plan must be compatible with integration requirements. This includes mapping relevant data from the current DEP systems to the new COTS solution, and providing migration activities to extract, transform (if needed) and load data from the existing legacy system(s) to the new COTS solution. The Contractor will work with DEP program and technical staff to determine what relevant data needs to be migrated/replicated to the new COTS solution.

For production data interfaces (read/write to other schemas) this includes mapping relevant data and any required transformations.

Date Due: The due date for this deliverable will be established by the Department's approved project management plan/schedule. Adjustments to the due date will be handled by demonstration of the Department's written acceptance of an updated project management plan.

(Revised Addendum No. 2)

4.08. Permit Structure and Metrics. In PA, permits, projects, and events comply with the following basic structure:

- Permits are associated with projects.
- A project may involve one or more program areas (i.e., as in the case of multi-media permits).
- Permit applications are associated with a facility that has a GIS location, contacts (affiliations), and other data.
- Facility source data location depends on the program area.
- Required and optional events and timer workflow are assigned to a permit based on program area and permit type/subtype.
- Monitoring parameters based on the issued permit are transferred to the program area specific compliance and enforcement application database.

A. Overall – All Permits (difficulty levels 1, 2, and 3)

- The PA database consists of around **513,567** permit records, **1,969** of which have an “Open” status.
- There were approximately **24,000** permits processed in calendar year 2015.

B. Complex Permits (difficulty level 3)

- There are 540 types/subtypes but only **359** are **considered complex and will be the focus of the new system.**
- As illustrated in Figure 2 (*High Level Vision*), complex permits make up about 34% of the permits processed in 2015 (~**8,600** permits).
- There were approximately **24,000** permit Agency actions in 2015 (as recorded in PA). The graph below shows the trend in complex permits over the past 3 years.

C. Complex Permits (difficulty level 3)

- There are 540 types/subtypes but only **359** are ~~considered complex and will be the focus of the new system.~~ **359** of which are considered complex. Title V comprises 20 subtypes.
- As illustrated in Figure 2 (*High Level Vision*), complex permits make up about 34% of the permits processed in 2015 (~**8,600** permits).

There were approximately **24,000** permit Agency actions in 2015 (as recorded in PA). The graph below shows the trend in complex permits over the past 3 years. *(Revised Addendum No. 2)*

Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, or failure to post a bond or other security required by law within the time allowed for filing a bond shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Florida Statutes.

– Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank –