

Responses to Questions Regarding Request for Proposals: Property Tax and Billing System Replacement Project



Section 1: Written Questions and Responses

The following written questions were received by Vigo County by the deadline on Wednesday, August 2, 2006. Vigo County's responses are indicated following each question.

Question #1

General Functionality #4 - ability to calculate tax rates - shown as a certification standard requirement - please explain? There is a requirement to import the rates from the Budget order delivered to county from State, but not to calculate the actual tax rates?

Response to Question #1

This requirement, *General Functionality #4 – ability to calculate tax rates*, is addressing 50 IAC 23-7-8 of the rule. This section of the rule states that the tax and billing software must:

- a) Accept data entry of every individual taxing unit fund rate.
- b) Overwrite data entered fund rates with those provided by the Department (DLGF) if the rates in the assessment and tax and billing sub-systems differ and use the resulting set of rates for tax calculation.
- c) Aggregate individual taxing unit fund rates for any given taxing unit.
- d) Aggregate individual fund rates for any given taxing district.

Please respond to the software's ability to meet the above criteria when responding to General Functionality #4.

Question #2

TIF Management #1- please give example. Do you mean be able to retrieve TIF data at a point in time when certified...or to be able to re-create TIF data using any effective date. Please clarify terminology.

Response to Question #2

The system should have the ability to access or retrieve certified TIF information for any payable year (prior or future).

Section 2: Vendor Conference Questions and Responses

The following verbal questions were received by Vigo County during the Vendor Conference on August 14, 2006. Vigo County's formal responses are indicated following each question.

Question #1

Integration with other systems, particularly the CAMA system, can be difficult when other vendors are involved. How can we be assured that access to other vendors' software code will be given in order to comply with the integration requirement?

Response to Question #1

The integration requirement deals primarily with the CAMA system, which is Manatron's ProVal Plus, and the GIS system, which is ESRI.

From the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) perspective, the new rule encourages vendors to share system information which may otherwise be considered proprietary, especially between CAMA and tax and billing systems. The intent from DLGF is to create an environment that allows for more than one vendor to serve a county.

Moreover, Vigo County is not necessarily seeking real-time integration. While that is one option, Vigo County will entertain batch processing of data between systems as an integration option.

Question #2

Allowing the system to retrieve information at any point in time could be very challenging. Can you explain what is to be expected?

Response to Question #2

A general explanation of certain reporting and querying functions should be given. A detailed description is not required; only a basic summary of the reporting and querying capabilities within the software is expected.

Question #3

What is the level of TIF's currently in Vigo County? For example, is there "re-TIFing" of TIF's?

Response to Question #3

TIFs in Vigo County are setup as basic districts. Currently, there is no "re-TIFing" of TIF's in Vigo County and "re-TIFing" is not a requirement for this system. However, if the software does perform this function, you may add note this functionality.

Question #4

What is the current GIS system?

Response to Question #4

The current GIS system which is being integrated with the CAMA system is running on ESRI's ArcIMS 9.0 platform. The data is being maintained in an ArcSDE database that sits on top of MS SQL Server.