Lacey Fire District 3 ERP – RFP Questions and Answers

Q&A Instructions and Clarification

The following questions and responses are provided to clarify the requirements and expectations contained in the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System issued September 1, 2026.

Proposers remain responsible for reviewing the complete RFP, all attachments, and all written addenda issued by the District.

Unless expressly identified as an amendment to the RFP through a formal written addendum, the questions and responses below are intended only to clarify the District's existing requirements and do not modify, waive, or supersede any requirement of the RFP. Formal modifications to the RFP will be made only through written addenda issued by the District.

In the event of a formal amendment, proposers shall follow the requirements stated in the applicable written addendum.

---

1. **Question (9/2/2026)**
   We noted the requirement to provide two references located in Washington State. Would you be open to considering a proposal from a vendor that does not currently have customers in Washington State, provided we can supply strong, comparable references from other regions?

   District Response:
   Yes. The District recognizes that qualified ERP providers may not currently have public-sector customers in Washington State. Vendors that do not have Washington State public-sector references may provide comparable references from other U.S. jurisdictions.

   The District will consider the relevance and comparability of the references provided, including the customer's governmental structure, organizational size, budget, employee population, payroll complexity, and use of the proposed ERP solution. Washington State public-sector experience remains a relevant consideration, particularly with respect to

Washington-specific governmental accounting, payroll, reporting, procurement, and regulatory requirements.

As formally clarified by **Addendum No. 1**, Washington State public-sector references are preferred but are not an absolute requirement for proposal submission.

2. **Question (9/9/2026)**
   Would Lacey Fire District 3 accept a proposal limited to the Budget Development and Management and Capital Improvement Planning/Project Accounting functional areas without the proposer supplying the core financial, human resources, and payroll ERP components?
   - If so, please clarify whether the District anticipates making multiple or module-specific awards, accepting best-of-breed solutions that integrate with the selected ERP, or allowing a specialty software provider to participate through a prime ERP vendor.

   District Response:
   No. The District is seeking a proposal that includes all Required Functional Areas identified in Section 5.1 and addresses the applicable requirements contained throughout the RFP and Attachment A. Vendors may propose Optional/Future functional areas separately, but the base proposal may not be limited to only the Budget Development and Management and Capital Improvement Planning/Project Accounting functional areas.

3. **Question (9/9/2026)**
   Please also confirm whether the Project Accounting requirement encompasses capital improvement planning, project budgeting, multiyear funding, grant management, contract tracking, and capital project reporting.

   District Response:
   Yes, ideally Project Accounting capabilities would encompass all the mentioned areas.

4. **Question (9/16/2026)**
   Legacy Data: is there a need to retain/rehouse legacy data out of your existing system? Has the District considered how much data should be retained in a data warehouse vs. loaded into the new system, or is open to vendor recommendations?

   District Response:
   Yes, there is a need to retain/rehouse legacy data from four existing systems into a single platform. We maintain two historic financial databases on-prem; one is a Microsoft Dynamics Great Plains server with data residing in a SQL database, the second is BIAS 6 stored in a Pervasive database. Additionally, we have HR data stored in a FileMaker Pro 7 database on-prem that can be exported into a PDF format. Our current ERP data is in a SQL format in our vendors cloud tenant.

5. **Question (9/16/2026)**
   Cloud: could the District comment on which Microsoft cloud your M365 environment is deployed in? Either the Commercial or GCC (Gov't) cloud?

   District Response:
   GCC (Gov't) Cloud.

6. **Question (9/16/2026)**
   Cash receipts and deposits. <<< Can the District provide examples of how you are taking in cash today and for what purposes?

   District Response:
   The District manually receipts payments and prepares deposits. The payments are entered into our ERP system either through the accounts receivable module or journal entry. The general purpose of the payments received are for services rendered.

7. **Question (9/16/2026)**
   Benefits <<< how many benefits providers are currently used by the District?

   District Response:
   The District currently uses 11 different benefit providers.

8. **Question (9/16/2026)**
   Contract Management. <<< how many contracts does the District manage today? where are those contracts currently sitting?

   District Response:
   The district maintains approximately 100 contracts or ILA's at any given time. Most contracts are currently stored on the District's server.

9. **Question (9/18/2026)**
   Do you require responses to the 15 sections on page 21 under 29. Proposal Submission Requirements?

   District Response:
   Yes. Vendors should address each of the 15 components identified in Section 29, Proposal Submission Requirements, and organize their proposal in the order specified so that the District can evaluate proposals consistently.

Vendors should provide the information requested under each applicable section. Duplicative narrative is not required where the same information is provided elsewhere in the proposal or in a required attachment. Vendors may cross-reference the applicable section of their proposal rather than repeat the same information.

The District's intent is to ensure that all requested information is provided and organized consistently for evaluation, rather than to require vendors to unnecessarily repeat the same information in multiple locations.

Vendors should clearly identify all assumptions, exceptions, exclusions, required third-party products, custom development, additional licensing, and future roadmap dependencies, as required by Section 29.

10. Question (9/18/2026)

Do you require responses to each of the items in the RFP which are listed on pages 5 – 30? Many requirements in Attachment A are also stated on pages 5-30 but not all.

- If so, where in the proposal response would you like to see these responses?

District Response:
Yes. Vendors should address the requirements and substantive topics identified throughout the RFP and provide a response to each requirement contained in Attachment A – Detailed ERP Requirements Matrix**.**

To avoid unnecessary duplication, vendors do not need to repeat the same response in both the narrative proposal and Attachment A**.** Where a requirement in the RFP is also included in Attachment A, the vendor may provide its detailed response in Attachment A and reference that response in the applicable narrative section.

For requirements or topics identified in the RFP that are not included in Attachment A**,** vendors should address those requirements in the applicable section of their written proposal.

Attachment A should be completed in its entirety using the response classifications specified in Section 33 of the RFP. Vendors should identify any third-party products, custom development, workarounds, roadmap dependencies, additional costs, limitations, or other material assumptions as required by the RFP.

The District's intent is to receive one complete response to each requirement, but not to require vendors to duplicate the same information in multiple locations.

Addendum No. 2 clarification: Vendors shall complete Attachment A in its entirety, including requirements associated with Optional/Future functional areas identified in Section 5.2. Completion of Attachment A does not make an Optional/Future functional area a mandatory component of the base ERP implementation. The scope designation in Section 5.1 or Section 5.2 controls whether the functional area is required or Optional/Future.

11. **Question (9/18/2026)**

Item 28. (pg. 19) Demonstration Requirements states “Finalists will be required to demonstrate the proposed solution using realistic District scenarios.” It then states “Vendors shall identify for each demonstrated capability whether it is Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, a Workaround, or Future Roadmap functionality. Vendors shall not represent future functionality as currently available.” Are responses to scenarios under 28.1 and 28.2 required with proposal submission?

District Response:

No. The demonstrations described in Sections 28.1 and 28.2 are not required as part of the initial proposal submission.

Section 28 describes the finalist demonstration process. Vendors selected as finalists will receive substantially identical demonstration instructions and may be subject to time limits. The District will use the demonstrations as part of its evaluation of the proposed solutions.

Vendors should, however, provide sufficient information in their initial proposal and Requirements Response Matrix to demonstrate how their proposed solution meets the applicable functional requirements. Vendors should also identify any requirements that are Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, Workaround, or Future Roadmap, as required elsewhere in the RFP.

During the finalist demonstrations, vendors will be expected to demonstrate the applicable capabilities in Sections 28.1 and 28.2 and identify the classification of each demonstrated capability. Vendors should not represent future or planned functionality as currently available.

The District may request additional information or a second demonstration of high-priority requirements as provided in Section 28.1.

12. **Question (9/18/2026)**

Please clarify the intended priority of Performance Management, Fixed Assets, Learning Management, document management, and other functions identified as optional or future in RFP Section 5.2 but that are classified as ‘Highly Desired’ or ‘Preferred’ in Attachment A

District Response:

The classifications in Section 5.2 and Attachment A should be read together. Section 5.2 identifies functional areas that are optional or future in scope, while Attachment A identifies the District's relative preference for capabilities within the overall evaluation.

The District's intended priorities are as follows:

1. Required Functional Areas

Functional areas identified as Required in Section 5.1 are within the core scope of the proposed ERP solution. This includes Document and Records Management. Vendors should address the applicable requirements in Attachment A regardless of the priority classification assigned to an individual requirement.

2. Optional / Future Functional Areas

The functional areas identified in Section 5.2 are not required to be included in the base implementation. These include:

- Learning Management;
- Performance Management;
- Advanced Recruiting / Talent Management;
- AI-Assisted Analytics;
- Predictive Forecasting;
- Fixed Assets; and
- Advanced Contract Lifecycle Management.

Vendors should nevertheless identify whether these capabilities are currently available, configurable, available through a third-party product, on the product roadmap, or otherwise available, and should provide applicable pricing and implementation information as requested by the RFP.

3. “Highly Desired” and “Preferred” Classifications

A “Highly Desired” or “Preferred” designation in Attachment A does not by itself convert to an Optional/Future functional area in Section 5.2 into a mandatory requirement.

Rather, those classifications state the District's relative interest in the capability and may be considered as part of the overall evaluation where applicable. Vendors should clearly identify whether the capability is included in the proposed base solution, available as an optional module, requires a third-party product, requires custom development, is on the product roadmap, or is otherwise unavailable.

4. Fixed Assets

Fixed Assets is identified as an Optional/Future module in Section 5.2. Therefore, Vendors should treat it as optional rather than a mandatory core implementation requirement. If available, vendors should describe the functionality, implementation approach, integration with financial and capital-project processes, and associated costs.

5. Performance Management and Learning Management

Performance Management and Learning Management are also identified as Optional/Future modules. Vendors should provide information regarding these capabilities where available, including whether they are part of the proposed ERP, separately licensed, provided through a third party, or planned for future release.

6. Document and Records Management

Document and Records Management is different from the functions listed above. It is expressly identified as a Required Functional Area under Section 5.1. Vendors should therefore treat the applicable document and records management requirements as part of the required solution scope, regardless of any priority designation appearing in Attachment A.

Vendors should clearly identify the scope, availability, classification, implementation requirements, limitations, dependencies, and costs for any optional or future capabilities so the District can evaluate them consistently.

Addendum No. 2: The District has formally clarified this issue through Addendum No. 2. Section 5.1 and Section 5.2 control whether a functional area is Required or Optional/Future. Attachment A provides the detailed requirements and relative priority of capabilities within the applicable scope. A "Must Have," "Highly Desired," or "Preferred" designation in Attachment A does not, by itself, convert a functional area identified as Optional/Future in Section 5.2 into a mandatory core requirement.

Vendors must complete Attachment A in its entirety and identify the applicable response classification for each requirement. For Optional/Future functional areas, the vendor should identify whether the capability is included in the proposed solution, available as an optional module, available through a third party, on the product roadmap, or otherwise unavailable, together with applicable pricing and implementation implications.

13. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Will the District provide detailed payroll configuration documentation - including collective bargaining agreements, wage schedules, earning codes, leave rules, benefit contribution rules, retirement rules, premium-pay calculations, and representative calculation examples - before proposals are due or during finalist demonstrations?
    - If those materials will not be provided before proposal submission, what assumptions should vendors use to price payroll configuration, testing, and validation?

District Response:
The District will provide the District's Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) with the Labor Union to the finalists who are selected for demonstrations/interviews. This CBA will include the wage schedules, leave rules, benefit contribution rules, retirement rules, premium-pay calculations, and other calculation examples.

14. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Please identify the number of collective bargaining agreements, bargaining units, employee groups, pay groups, payroll calendars, retirement systems, and distinct compensation structures in scope. Please provide approximate employee counts for each group.

District Response:

The District has one bargaining agreement. There are five employee groups consisting of Executive (6), Operations 24 shift (134), Operations days (5), Support Services (Admin) (25), and Volunteers (20). The District has five pay groups consisting of monthly draw, incentive pays, longevity pay, monthly salary, and draw payback. The District has one monthly payroll calendar. The District has two retirement systems; LEOFF2 and PERS. The District has 17 distinct compensation structures.

These employee counts are approximate and may not total the District's overall employee population due to timing and classification differences. Vendors should use the approximately 193 employees identified elsewhere in the RFP as the overall planning population unless otherwise stated.

15. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Is January 1, 2028 a mandatory contractual go-live date or a target subject to validation during implementation planning? Will the District consider a phased implementation, and if so, which modules must be operational on Jan. 1?

District Response:
January 1, 2028 is the District's target go-live date. Vendors should develop their proposed implementation methodology, schedule, staffing plan, and pricing based on achieving production go-live on January 1, 2028

The District recognizes that the final implementation schedule will need to be validated and refined with the selected vendor based on the vendor's implementation methodology, data conversion requirements, integration requirements, testing, training, and other implementation dependencies. Any proposed change to the target go-live date would be subject to District approval.

At a minimum, vendors should propose a schedule that supports full production operation of the core ERP functions identified in the RFP by the target January 1, 2028 go-live date. The District will evaluate proposed implementation approaches based on feasibility, risk, cost, and the vendor's ability to meet the District's operational needs.

16. **Question (9/18/2026)**
What is the plan for converting and storing historical data from Tyler? Will the District need reporting for legacy and current systems to be supported?

District Response:
The District's preference is to convert and retain historical electronic data from the current Tyler ERP Pro 10 environment and the identified legacy systems, including BIAS 6, Microsoft Dynamics Great Plains, and the FileMaker Pro 7 HRIS database, to the extent technically feasible and consistent with applicable records-retention requirements.

The District's preference is for retained historical information to be accessible from the new ERP environment so that District staff can perform reporting, searches, audits, and historical research without maintaining multiple legacy ERP platforms where reasonably practicable.

Vendors should identify their recommended approach, including any data that cannot reasonably be converted into the production ERP, proposed archival methods, reporting limitations, conversion assumptions, and associated costs.

17. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Will the District accept an alternative proposal using a standardized or preconfigured public-sector delivery model, provided it meets all required outcomes and clearly discloses its architecture, data-separation controls, governance, limitations, dependencies, pricing, and differences from the base proposal? If permitted, should it be submitted alongside a fully conforming base proposal?

District Response:
Yes. The District will consider an alternative proposal based on a standardized or pre-configured public-sector delivery model, as long as the proposed solution satisfies the substantive requirements and outcomes identified in the RFP.

To facilitate a consistent and objective evaluation, the vendor must clearly identify any material differences between the alternative proposal and the vendor's proposed base solution, including architecture, configuration, data-separation controls, governance, functionality, limitations, dependencies, third-party products or services, implementation requirements, pricing, and any other material assumptions or restrictions.

If a vendor proposes an alternative approach, the vendor should submit a fully conforming base proposal in addition to the alternative proposal. The alternative proposal should be clearly identified as an alternative and should not replace or modify the vendor's base proposal.

The District reserves the right to determine whether an alternative proposal is sufficiently comparable to the RFP requirements to permit evaluation and consideration. The District may also request clarification or additional information regarding an alternative proposal.

Vendors should clearly identify which requirements are satisfied by the alternative proposal and use the response classifications required by Section 33 of the RFP.

18. **Question (9/18/2026)**
If the RFP narrative, Attachment A requirements matrix, demonstration script, cost form, and subsequent addenda contain differing scope descriptions or priority designations, what is the controlling order of precedence?

- Specifically, please clarify the intended priority of Performance Management, Fixed Assets, Learning Management, document management, and other functions identified as optional or future in RFP Section 5.2 but assigned other priorities in Attachment A.

- Performance Management is optional/future in the RFP but “Highly Desired” in REQ-193. Fixed Assets is optional/future, while several asset requirements are “Preferred.”

District Response:
Addendum No. 2 formally clarifies the relationship between Section 5 and Attachment A.

For purposes of determining whether a functional area is mandatory, optional, or future, Section 5.1 and Section 5.2 control the scope designation.

Section 5.1 identifies the Required Functional Areas that are within the core scope of the proposed ERP solution. Section 5.2 identifies the Optional/Future Modules that are not required to be included in the base implementation.

Attachment A provides the detailed functional requirements and the District's relative priority for capabilities within the applicable scope. The classifications “Must Have,” “Highly Desired,” and “Preferred” in Attachment A do not, by themselves, change the scope designation established by Section 5.

Accordingly, if an individual requirement within an Optional/Future functional area is identified in Attachment A as “Must Have,” that designation describes the District's desired minimum capability if the vendor offers or proposes that functional area. It does not make the Optional/Future functional area a mandatory component of the base ERP implementation.

Conversely, requirements associated with a Required Functional Area under Section 5.1 remain within the required scope regardless of whether an individual requirement in Attachment A is designated “Must Have,” “Highly Desired,” or “Preferred.”

Document and Records Management is expressly identified as a Required Functional Area under Section 5.1 and therefore remains within the required scope.

Vendors must complete Attachment A in its entirety and identify the applicable response classification for each requirement, including requirements associated with Optional/Future functional areas. Vendors should identify applicable pricing, implementation requirements, dependencies, limitations, and third-party components for Optional/Future capabilities.

Addendum No. 2 supersedes any prior RFP language or Q&A response to the extent it could be interpreted inconsistently with this clarification.

19. Question (9/18/2026)
Functional requirements include the items REQ-125 Bid/quote documentation and REQ-126 Procurement history. Is there a requirement for the system to manage the bid process, including intake, vendor submission, evaluation, and internal decision?

District Response:

No. The RFP does not require the proposed ERP to provide a complete end-to-end bid solicitation management system covering bid intake, vendor proposal submission, proposal evaluation, and internal award decision.

REQ-125 and REQ-126 are intended to address the District's requirements for bid/quote documentation and procurement history, including the ability to retain, associate, and retrieve relevant procurement information within the ERP and/or its procurement functionality.

The District would, however, welcome information regarding any native or configurable bid/procurement solicitation functionality included in the proposed solution. Vendors should identify such functionality in their Requirements Response Matrix and clearly distinguish between functionality that is Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, Workaround, Roadmap, or Not Available, consistent with the RFP's response classifications.

If a vendor proposes third-party functionality or an integrated solution to provide broader bid-management capabilities, the vendor should identify the product, integration requirements, implementation responsibilities, licensing and other costs, dependencies, and ongoing support responsibilities.

20. **Question (9/18/2026)**
    Current volume: About how many documents does the District store today, by system (Tyler ERP Pro 10 attachments, SharePoint, network drives, other)?

    District Response:
    The District has identified 1,012 items relating to contract management located in SharePoint including PDF's, DOCX, and .MSG files.

    Tyler Content Management is limited on reporting a total number of documents. The District is able to identify approximately **64,031** documents by running individual document type searches.

    Additional documents in SharePoint and on the District file server have not been identified for import into a new ERP but may be identified after demonstrations or during the implementation process.

21. **Question (9/18/2026)**
    Current size: What's the total storage size in GB?

    District Response:
    Tyler Content Management does not report current document database storage size. The District has submitted a request to Tyler Technologies for further details.

    The contracts folder located in SharePoint is 763MB or just under 1GB.

22. **Question (9/18/2026)**
    Documents to move: How many are you looking to convert, and how many years back? Can anything be left behind or archived?

    District Response:
    It is the District's preference that electronic historical data from the current production ERP (Tyler ERP Pro 10) as well as archived ERP systems (BIAS 6 / Microsoft Dynamics Great Plains), and HRIS database (FileMaker Pro 7) be converted to the new ERP in accordance

with applicable Washington State Archives retention schedules (see District Response in Question 31).

Post-migration, the District intends to sunset legacy ERP systems to avoid additional business costs. For simplicity in reporting and auditing for District staff, all retained data should be located in the new ERP.

23. Question (9/18/2026)

Other systems: Should any other document stores (SharePoint sites, network drives, other ECM) be consolidated into or connected to the new system?

District Response:

All systems are identified in Question 20.

24. Question (9/18/2026)

Annual volume: About how many new documents are created or received each year?

District Response:

Tyler Content Management is limited on reporting how many new documents are created or received each year. Approximate number of total documents is located in the District response in Question 20.

25. Question (9/18/2026)

Mix by type: Roughly how do current and annual volumes break down: AP invoices, POs and bids, contracts, personnel files, payroll and benefits, project and grant files, Board and budget documents?

District Response:

Tyler ERP Pro 10 is limited on reporting annual volumes. Performing a search by document type, the approximate total breakdown is:

Document Type	Document Count
Accounts Payable	9434
Bank Reconciliation	921
Contract Purchases	13820
General Ledger	1879
Project Accounting	2
Payroll	36887
Accounts Receivable	1088
Approximate Total	**64031**

26. Question (9/18/2026)

Tyler storage: Where are Tyler attachments kept (Tyler Content Management, database, file share)? Can they be exported with their links to transactions (vendor, invoice, PO, employee)?

District Response:
Tyler ERP Pro 10 attachments are currently stored in Tyler Content Management. The District understands that the attachments can be exported from Tyler Content Management; however, the ability to preserve the existing links or associations between individual attachments and the related Tyler records may vary depending on the document and the underlying Tyler data structure.

The District expects the selected ERP vendor to work with the District during data-conversion planning to identify the available attachment data, metadata, and associated record relationships and to determine the most effective method for converting the attachments into the proposed solution.

Where technically feasible, the District expects the conversion process to preserve the relationship between an attachment and its associated record, such as a vendor, invoice, purchase order, employee, contract, or other applicable transaction or master record. Vendors should identify any limitations in preserving these relationships and describe their proposed approach for maintaining document accessibility and context in the new system.

Vendors should also identify any additional tools, services, licensing, or costs required to extract, convert, link, or archive Tyler Content Management attachments.

27. **Question (9/18/2026)**
File formats: Which formats and typical sizes (PDF, TIFF, images, Office files, email)? How much is scanned images that would need OCR?

District Response:
The District uses all mentioned file types

- (PDF, TIFF, PNG, JPG, HEIF, CSV, XLSX, DOCX, .MSG).

A file size limit has not been encountered when importing into Tyler Content Management. PDF sizes can range from 25KB to 100MB depending on scan quality and number of pages.

The existing Tyler Content Management utilizes OCR for all image imports. The District desktop and MFP scanners also automatically scan as a PDF and OCR the contents.

28. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Metadata: Are documents indexed today (vendor, invoice number, employee ID, fund, contract number), and how consistently?

District Response:
Metadata is typically indexed within Tyler Content Management during the task. For example, when a requisition is created for a PCARD purchase, the receipt of the purchase is imported as an attachment. While filing out the requisition, the vendor, invoice number, and requester are captured, and added when the attachment is imported on the requisition.

The District is not currently capturing contract numbers and adding them to requisitions during the process.

29. **Question (9/18/2026)**

Paper records: Is scanning a paper backlog in scope? If yes, roughly how many boxes or pages? How much paper arrives each year that would be scanned going forward?

District Response:
The District has not identified a need for scanning a paper backlog as a part of the RFP project.

30. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Users: How many staff members will be scanning documents into the system?

District Response:
The District has approximately 17 members who scan documents into the system at least once a month.

31. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Retention: Which retention schedules apply (for example Washington State Archives local government schedules)? Should the system enforce retention, legal holds and destruction?

District Response:
The District is subject to the applicable records retention requirements established by the Washington State Archives for local government and fire protection districts.

Applicable schedules include:

- Local Government Common Records Retention Schedule (CORE) v.5.0 (October 2024) – applicable to common local government records, including areas such as administration, contracts, finance, human resources, information management, and other common governmental functions.
- Fire and Emergency Medical Records Retention Schedule v.2.1 (August 2022) – applicable to records specific to fire protection and emergency medical services.
- Emergency Communications (911) and Dispatch Records Retention Schedule v.2.0 (June 2026) – applicable to District records falling within the scope of that schedule.

The District will determine the applicable retention period based on the record series and business function, rather than applying a single retention period to all records. The District's retention requirements may also be subject to applicable statutes, regulations, public records requirements, litigation, audit requirements, or other legal obligations.

The District expects the proposed solution to provide records-management capabilities that can support and, where appropriate, enforce the District's established retention and disposition requirements. Vendors should describe the system's ability to:

- Assign retention rules or retention categories to applicable records and documents;
- Establish retention periods based on record type, classification, or business function;
- Identify records that have reached their eligible disposition date;
- Prevent destruction when a record is subject to a legal hold or other applicable restriction;
- Place and manage legal holds and suspend normal disposition while a hold remains in effect;
- Maintain an audit trail of retention, hold, disposition, and destruction activities;

- Support authorized destruction or disposition of records in accordance with District policy and applicable Washington State Archives requirements;
- Document or report records that are destroyed or transferred; and
- Accommodate changes to applicable retention schedules over the life of the system.

The District does not expect the ERP vendor to independently determine which Washington State Archives retention schedule applies to a particular record or to make legal determinations regarding retention, litigation holds, or public records requests. The District will establish and maintain the applicable retention rules and authorizations.

Vendors should clearly identify which retention, legal hold, disposition, and records-management capabilities are Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, Workaround, Roadmap, or Not Available, consistent with the RFP's response classifications.

32. Question (9/18/2026)

About how many staff will use the purchasing functions: creating requisitions, approving them, receiving goods and services, and processing invoices? Does that number change as staffing grows toward 250?

District Response:

The District has approximately 17 members who create requisitions, receive goods and services, and can process invoices.

The District has approximately 11 total approvers across multiple divisions. Approval paths are determined by Division leadership structure. Typically, there are 3 primary approvers (Fire Chief, Chief Financial Officer, Finance Manager) across each division approval path.

The number will increase minimally in support of staffing growing toward 250.

33. Question (9/18/2026)

How many years of historical Finance, HR, Payroll, Procurement, and Contract data must be converted?

District Response:

Based upon retention schedules referenced in the District Response in Question 31.

34. Question (9/18/2026)

What is the desired outcome or expectations once a bid/contract is awarded? Does data automatically flow into Requisition/PO process?

District Response:

The desired outcome is that, where supported by the proposed solution and appropriate District configuration, information associated with an awarded bid or contract can flow into the procurement process without unnecessary duplicate data entry.

Automatic generation of a requisition from an awarded bid or contract would be highly desirable, but is not a mandatory requirement, as clarified in Question 35.

35. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Does the District require automatic creation of requisitions and/or POs from approved contracts?

District Response:
The District does not require automatic creation of requisition /POs from approved contracts, but it is highly desired.

36. **Question (9/18/2026)**
What system is expected to be the source of truth for requisitions, purchase orders, vendor management, receiving, and invoice matching?

District Response:
The District expects the proposed ERP solution to serve as the primary system of record and source of truth for requisitions, purchase orders, vendor management, receiving, and invoice processing/matching.

The proposed ERP should provide an integrated procurement-to-payment process.

The District may continue to use or integrate with other systems that provide specialized functionality. However, vendors should clearly identify any proposed third-party system that would serve as the system of record for any portion of the procurement-to-payment process, including the reason for using the separate system, the data exchanged, integration method, ownership of the data, reconciliation process, and any additional licensing or implementation costs.

The District's preference is for a cohesive, integrated procurement-to-payment process within the proposed ERP, rather than maintaining multiple systems of record for the same transaction or master data.

Vendors should identify any limitations or exceptions to this approach in their proposal.

37. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Will Vector Scheduling/CrewSense remain the system of record for timekeeping, and what level of integration is required?

District Response:
Yes. Vector Scheduling/CrewSense will remain the system of record for timekeeping and scheduling for District Operations staff (members of the bargaining unit). Currently there is no direct integration between CrewSense and Tyler ERP Pro 10. Information is exported from CrewSense into a CSV file and then loaded into Tyler ERP Pro 10. It is required for the new ERP to at least meet this level of data transfer from CrewSense. Direct integration from CrewSense to the ERP is highly desired.

For Administrative staff, the ERP would be the system of record for timekeeping.

38. Question (9/18/2026)

Does the District prefer a phased implementation or a single ERP go-live?

District Response:

The District's preferred implementation approach is a single ERP go-live, with the core ERP functionality implemented and operational on January 1, 2028.

The District's preference is based on its assessment of the scope of the project, the use of a single integrated ERP platform, and the level of District resources that will be dedicated to the implementation. The District anticipates dedicating approximately 11 staff members to support the implementation, in addition to the selected vendor's implementation team.

Based on the District's current understanding of its requirements and available resources, the District believes that a 9- to 11-month implementation period is a reasonable planning assumption for a well-planned implementation of the proposed solution.

Accordingly, vendors should propose an implementation methodology and schedule designed to achieve a single go-live on January 1, 2028. Vendors should identify the resources, activities, dependencies, milestones, testing, training, data conversion, integrations, and other requirements necessary to achieve that objective.

The District recognizes that vendors may have implementation methodologies that recommend a phased approach under specific circumstances. A vendor may propose a phased approach if it believes phasing is necessary to reduce material implementation risk or otherwise provides a significant operational benefit. In such cases, the vendor must clearly explain:

- Why a phased approach is recommended;
- The functionality and modules included in each phase;
- Which functionality would be operational on January 1, 2028;
- The proposed schedule for completing remaining functionality;
- Any temporary interfaces, manual processes, or workarounds;
- Additional implementation or ongoing costs;
- District staffing and resource requirements; and
- Risks and mitigation strategies associated with the proposed approach.

The District will evaluate the proposed implementation methodology, schedule, resource requirements, and associated risks as part of its overall evaluation.

39. Question (9/18/2026)

Does the District want vendors to respond to each item listed in Sections 5-18 of the RFP document with a detailed response in the required Detailed Functional Response section of the vendor proposal? If not, what information does the District want to see in the Detailed Functional Response section of the vendor proposal?

District Response:
Vendors are expected to address the requirements and requested information contained in Sections 5–18 of the RFP, as applicable to the proposed solution. However, the District does not require vendors to duplicate a detailed narrative response to every individual statement or subsection within Sections 5–18.

The District intends the Detailed Functional Response to provide a clear narrative describing how the proposed ERP solution will address the District's functional requirements, business needs, and objectives. Vendors should use this section to explain the proposed solution and identify important capabilities, configuration options, limitations, dependencies, and any significant considerations relevant to the District.

The Requirements Response Matrix should be used to provide the vendor's specific response to individual requirements. Vendors should complete the matrix in accordance with the response classifications identified in the RFP and should identify whether each requirement is:

- Native;
- Configurable;
- Third Party;
- Custom;
- Workaround;
- Roadmap; or
- Not Available.

For any requirement that is not provided through native functionality, vendors should provide the additional information requested in the RFP, including applicable third-party products, implementation requirements, recurring or non-recurring costs, limitations, dependencies, and availability.

Vendors should avoid unnecessary duplication between the Detailed Functional Response and the Requirements Response Matrix. The District is seeking a complete response to the RFP, but does not require vendors to repeat the same information in multiple sections of their proposal.

In general, the District expects the Detailed Functional Response to explain how the proposed solution addresses the District's needs, while the Requirements Response Matrix provides the more detailed, requirement-by-requirement response.

Vendors should also clearly identify any assumptions, exceptions, exclusions, required third-party products, custom development, additional licensing, or future roadmap dependencies.

40. **Question (9/18/2026)**
For represented employees, please clarify how the employer-funded deferred compensation contribution is calculated, including the applicable percentage and the compensation or salary basis used for the calculation.

District Response:
For operational staff, employer funded deferred compensation is currently based upon 6% top-step (step 5) firefighter base rate. This is included in the CBA and is applicable across all operational staff, regardless of rank.

For administrative staff, the District matches up to 6% of the employee's base salary rate.

41. **Question (9/18/2026)**
For HRA/VEBA contributions associated with medical benefit elections or waivers, please clarify how the employer contribution amount is determined. Is it a predetermined amount based on the employee's election, or is it calculated based on the value of the coverage selected or waived?

District Response:
HRA/VEBA employer contributions are determined based on the following selected formulas:

- Sick leave cash-out upon separation from service or retirement: contributions shall include the cash-out value of all unused sick leave days as indicated in Article 8 of the CBA.

- Employer contribution in lieu of dependent medical insurance: eligibility is limited to employees waiving medical insurance coverage for eligible dependents with proof of dependent coverage under another qualified medical insurance plan. Employer contributions shall include fifty percent (50%) of the difference between the employee's annualized monthly premium with dependents and the employee's annualized monthly premium without dependents.

42. **Question (9/18/2026)**
For the 40% payroll draw, please confirm whether the draw is calculated as 40% of recurring base pay, or whether the amount fluctuates from period to period based on the number of work days or hours within the applicable period.

District Response:
The payroll draw is calculated as 40% of the employee's applicable base pay. The draw is treated as an advance against the employee's regular paycheck issued on the 10th of the month, with applicable estimated federal income tax withholding deducted from the draw.

43. **Question (9/18/2026)**
For the finalist payroll scenario, does the District expect every listed compensation element to be individually configured and calculated within the demonstration environment, or may vendors demonstrate representative configured examples and explain the configuration approach for comparable rules?

District Response:
The District does not require every compensation element listed in the Payroll Scenario to be individually configured and calculated from the beginning of the finalist demonstration.

Vendors may demonstrate representative configured examples and explain how the proposed solution would be configured to support comparable compensation rules and calculations. However, the demonstration must provide the District with sufficient evidence that the proposed solution can support the full range of payroll and compensation requirements identified in Section 14 of the RFP.

At a minimum, vendors should demonstrate representative examples that address the complexity of the District's payroll environment, including applicable pay schedules, overtime and premium pay, longevity, education and certification incentives, HRA/VEBA, deferred compensation, retirement cashouts, benefits, and other applicable compensation rules.

For compensation elements not individually demonstrated, vendors should explain:

- How the rule would be configured;
- Whether the functionality is Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, a Workaround, or Future Roadmap;
- Whether District personnel can configure and maintain the rule without custom programming;
- How effective-dated changes and negotiated compensation changes are handled;
- How retroactive compensation and related overtime or premium-pay impacts are calculated;
- How the rule is maintained when bargaining agreements or compensation structures change; and
- Any third-party products, custom programming, manual intervention, additional licensing, or other dependencies.

The District may request additional live configuration or calculation during the demonstration for high-priority requirements or where the representative demonstration does not provide sufficient evidence of the proposed solution's capability.

Vendors should not represent functionality as demonstrated or currently available if it is dependent upon future development, custom development, third-party products, or functionality not included in the proposed solution.

44. Question (9/18/2026)
For the HR/Position finalist scenario, should vendors demonstrate the complete recruiting lifecycle beginning with an external candidate submitting an application, or may the demonstration begin with a candidate who has already been selected for hire and proceed through hiring and onboarding?

District Response:
The District expects the finalist demonstration to address the end-to-end HR/Position process, beginning with creation and approval of the position and proceeding through recruiting, hiring, onboarding, and establishment of the employee in the applicable HR and payroll processes.

The District therefore prefers that vendors demonstrate the recruiting process beginning with an external candidate submitting an application, rather than beginning with a candidate who has already been selected for hire.

The demonstration should, to the extent reasonably practicable, show:

- Creation and approval of a new position;
- Posting/recruitment of the position;
- External candidate application;
- Applicant tracking and movement through the recruiting process;
- Selection of the candidate;
- Conversion of the selected candidate to an employee;
- Onboarding, including assignment of bargaining unit and applicable employee information;
- Benefits enrollment;
- Establishment of the employee in payroll; and
- The relationship between the position, employee, HR record, and payroll.

The District recognizes that the time available for finalist demonstrations may limit the ability to demonstrate every recruiting step in detail. Vendors may use a representative or pre-configured recruiting scenario, provided the demonstration clearly shows the end-to-end process and the vendor explains any steps that are abbreviated or omitted.

Vendors should identify any functionality that is Native, Configurable, Third Party, Custom, Workaround, or Future Roadmap, consistent with the RFP's demonstration requirements. Vendors should not represent future functionality as currently available.

45. Question (9/18/2026)
For payroll history conversion, please clarify the level of historical detail the District expects to be available within the new ERP at go-live, versus information that may remain available through an archive or legacy read-only environment.

District Response:
The District's preference is for historical payroll information from the current Tyler ERP Pro 10 system to be converted and retained in the new ERP to the extent technically feasible and consistent with applicable records-retention requirements. The District prefers that sufficient historical detail—including payroll transactions, earnings, deductions, benefits, retirement-related information, tax information, and supporting documentation where applicable—be available within the new ERP to support reporting, audits, employee inquiries, historical research, and reconciliation.

Vendors should identify any historical payroll information that cannot reasonably be converted into the production ERP and should describe the proposed archival or read-only approach, including any limitations on reporting or searching. Vendors should also identify any assumptions, conversion requirements, third-party tools, and associated costs.

46. Question (9/18/2026)

Does the District have an expected duration for implementation-team involvement following go-live, or should vendors recommend a stabilization period and level of post-go-live support based on their implementation methodology?

District Response:

The District does not have a predetermined number of days or months for vendor implementation-team involvement following go-live. Vendors should recommend an appropriate stabilization period and level of post-go-live support based on their implementation methodology, the proposed solution, and the District's implementation scope and complexity.

Because the District's preferred approach is a single ERP go-live, the District expects the selected vendor to provide sufficient post-go-live support to ensure a stable transition to ongoing operations. Vendors should clearly describe their proposed stabilization period, including:

- Recommended duration following go-live;
- Vendor staffing and availability during the stabilization period;
- Support hours and escalation procedures;
- Response and resolution expectations for critical payroll, financial, HR, and other system issues;
- Process for identifying and resolving configuration, data conversion, integration, and reporting issues;
- Knowledge transfer to District staff;
- Transition from the implementation team to the vendor's ongoing customer support organization;
- Criteria for determining that stabilization is complete; and
- Any additional costs associated with post-go-live support.

Vendors should include the proposed stabilization and post-go-live support period in their implementation methodology and pricing. The District will consider the proposed approach as part of its evaluation of implementation methodology, vendor support, and total cost of ownership.

47. Question (9/18/2026)

Would the district extend the due date for questions by one week?

District Response:

No. The District would like to maintain the timeline that is currently outlined in the RFP.

48. Question (9/18/2026)

Would the district be open to a proposal that includes integrated solutions from multiple vendors in order to deliver as much of the required functionality as possible?

- If yes, would the district be open to separate contracts for each vendor?

District Response:

The District is open to proposals that incorporate integrated third-party solutions where those solutions are necessary or provide significant functional value, provided that the proposed solution satisfies the requirements and objectives of the RFP.

Vendors must clearly identify all components of the proposed solution that are provided by the primary vendor and those provided by third parties. The proposal must also identify applicable integrations, licensing requirements, implementation responsibilities, data ownership and flow, dependencies, limitations, support responsibilities, and all associated costs.

The District's preference is for the proposed solution to provide a cohesive and well-integrated overall ERP environment rather than requiring the District to independently manage and utilize multiple disconnected systems.

The responding vendor should identify a primary point of accountability for the overall proposed solution and clearly describe how issues involving integrations or third-party components will be managed and escalated.

The District may consider separate agreements with third-party providers where appropriate; however, vendors should not assume that the District will enter into separate contracts with each component provider. Vendors should identify in their proposals whether their proposed solution requires separate contracts and explain the implications for implementation, pricing, support, renewals, data ownership, security, service levels, and termination/transition.

The District reserves the right to determine the contractual structure that best supports the District's operational, legal, financial, security, and procurement requirements.

49. Question (9/18/2026)

Are you looking for new Custom built ERP vendor?

District Response:

No. The District is not seeking a newly custom-built ERP system. The District is seeking an established ERP software solution with demonstrated functionality, an established product roadmap, and demonstrated implementation and support experience.

The proposing organization may be newly formed, provided the proposer satisfies the RFP's reference, qualification, financial, implementation, support, and other requirements. Vendors should clearly identify the legal entity proposing to contract with the District, the ERP product owner/provider, implementation partners, subcontractors, affiliates, and other entities whose experience or resources are material to the proposed solution.

50. Question (9/18/2026)

Are you preferring any licensed ERP product such as Oracle, SAP, Microsoft dynamics etc.?

District Response:

No. The District does not have a preferred ERP product or manufacturer. The District is seeking an established ERP solution with demonstrated functionality, implementation experience, strong customer support, and the ability to meet the requirements and long-term objectives identified in the RFP.

51. Question (9/18/2026)

What's the process to register as an approved/qualified vendor, and is there a formal vendor portal or procurement system we need to be listed in?

District Response:

No separate pre-registration or approved-vendor enrollment is required solely to submit a proposal. This RFP is not part of a master contract or vendor roster.

The selected vendor will be required to satisfy all applicable legal, licensing, registration, tax, insurance, and contracting requirements before execution of the District's contract, as applicable.

52. Question (9/18/2026)

Do you require any pre-qualification, insurance minimums, or bonding before we're eligible to bid?

District Response:

No. Pre-qualification, insurance, bonding, and related contracting requirements are not required as part of the proposal submission. Any applicable requirements will be addressed during the contracting process with the selected vendor.

53. Question (9/18/2026)

Is there a vendor onboarding packet (W-9, certificates of insurance, banking info, tax documents) we should submit proactively?

District Response:

No. A vendor onboarding packet and related documentation will be addressed during the contracting and onboarding process with the selected vendor.

54. Question (9/18/2026)

Do you have a small business, minority-owned, woman-owned, veteran-owned, or disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE/MBE/WBE) certification program, and does this procurement have any set-aside or participation goals?

District Response:
No. This is not required for this RFP.

55. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Are there state or local small business certifications (e.g., SBA 8(a), HUBZone) that would help us qualify for preference points in scoring?

District Response:
No. This is not required for this RFP.

56. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Is there a small business liaison or procurement office contact who can guide us through first-time bidding?

District Response:
No. The District is unable to provide this resource.

57. **Question (9/18/2026)**
What past-performance or reference requirements are strict minimums versus preferred/scored criteria — since as a new business we may not have prior engagements in the US but have customers worldwide with 10000+ free users and 40+ Customers?

District Response:
The RFP establishes certain minimum reference requirements that apply to all proposers. As clarified by Addendum No. 1, Washington State public-sector experience is preferred but is not an absolute requirement for proposal submission.

Vendors shall provide:

- A minimum of five public-sector references;
- At least one customer comparable in organizational size, complexity, or public-safety/special-district environment; and
- At least two references that completed implementation within the last five years.

Vendors that do not have Washington State public-sector customers may provide comparable public-sector references from other jurisdictions. Washington State public-sector experience remains relevant to the District's evaluation, particularly with respect to Washington-specific governmental accounting, payroll, reporting, procurement, and regulatory requirements.

References shall include the organization name, contact person, title, email address, telephone number, modules implemented, and go-live date.

The District may independently contact references and may inquire about implementation, support responsiveness, product reliability, reporting, HR/payroll functionality, vendor

responsiveness, contract administration, and whether the customer would select the vendor again.

The RFP does not establish a specific minimum number of years in business, minimum number of customers, or minimum number of U.S. customers as a separate pass/fail requirement. The RFP does request information concerning vendor experience, organizational qualifications, ERP customers, staffing, financial stability, and related experience as part of the District's evaluation.

A newly formed business may submit a proposal. However, individual employee experience, worldwide users, or general customer counts do not by themselves replace the RFP's stated reference requirements. Vendors should clearly distinguish between experience attributable to the proposing legal entity and experience attributable to founders, employees, parent companies, affiliates, subcontractors, or other organizations.

Vendors that cannot provide references satisfying one or more of the stated minimum reference requirements should clearly identify that limitation in their proposal and explain the relevant experience they are proposing for consideration.

The District will evaluate the information provided consistent with the RFP, Addendum No. 1, and the stated evaluation criteria.

58. Question (9/18/2026)

Is there a list of bidders we can join to be notified of this and future opportunities?

District Response:

The District will not provide this.

59. Question (9/18/2026)

What's the minimum experience/staffing requirement, and would a proposed subcontractor's experience count toward meeting it?

District Response:

The RFP does not establish a specific minimum number of years of vendor experience or a minimum number of vendor employees as a pass/fail requirement. Rather, the District will evaluate the vendor's experience, qualifications, staffing resources, financial stability, and ability to successfully implement and support the proposed ERP solution over its anticipated 10–20-year lifecycle.

Vendors should provide the information requested in Section 26 regarding the organization providing the proposed ERP solution, including years in business, number of customers using the proposed ERP solution, number of employees supporting the proposed solution, public-sector experience, and other information demonstrating the vendor's ability to provide long-term support.

Vendors must also identify their proposed implementation team and the roles, responsibilities, qualifications, and experience of key personnel who will support the District's implementation.

Subcontractor experience may be considered when the subcontractor will have a material and continuing role in providing the proposed solution or implementation services. Vendors must clearly identify the subcontractor, the specific services and responsibilities the subcontractor will perform, and the relevant experience and qualifications being relied upon.

Subcontractor experience will not automatically be considered equivalent to the primary vendor's ERP experience. The District will evaluate the experience of the proposed team and organizational structure as a whole, including the primary vendor's responsibility and accountability for the proposed solution.

Vendors should identify any subcontractors or third parties whose experience, personnel, technology, or services are material to the vendor's ability to meet the requirements of the RFP.

60. Question (9/18/2026)

Can a newly formed business submit a proposal with key personnel resumes (rather than company history) to demonstrate capability?

District Response:

The District will consider proposals from newly formed businesses; however, the District must be able to evaluate the demonstrated performance and experience of the proposed ERP solution and the organizations responsible for implementing and supporting that solution.

A newly formed proposer may demonstrate its organizational and implementation capabilities through the experience of its key personnel, parent or affiliated organizations, subcontractors, or implementation partners, as applicable. However, individual resumes alone will not satisfy the RFP's public-sector reference requirements.

The proposer must provide the required references for the proposed ERP solution and/or the organization responsible for providing, implementing, and supporting that solution, as applicable. Where a reference reflects experience of a parent, predecessor, affiliated organization, subcontractor, or key personnel's prior organization, the proposer must clearly identify that relationship and the role that entity or individual will have in performing the District's contract.

The District reserves the right to evaluate whether the submitted references are sufficiently relevant to the proposed solution, implementation team, and contractual responsibilities.

61. Question (9/18/2026)

During the initial RFP meeting you mentioned the Payment is once per year, please let me know is this applicable for all the project work and support contract renewal every year.

District Response:

The District's reference to annual payment was intended to address the recurring annual ERP subscription/support costs, not to require that all implementation or project-related services be invoiced only once per year.

The RFP contemplates separate pricing for:

- One-time implementation and deployment services;
- Data conversion;
- Integration and other implementation services;
- Training and change management;
- Third-party products or services, where applicable;
- Recurring annual ERP subscription/support costs; and
- Optional modules or services.

Vendors should clearly identify the proposed billing frequency and payment terms for each category of cost. For implementation and other project services, the District expects payments to be tied to defined implementation milestones and/or deliverables, consistent with the RFP's implementation requirements.

For recurring annual subscription/support costs, vendors should provide the annual recurring cost and identify the proposed annual renewal/payment schedule, including any applicable annual price escalation. The District is requesting sufficient information to evaluate five-year and ten-year total cost of ownership.

Vendors should not assume that the District requires all project costs or implementation services to be paid on an annual basis. Any proposed payment schedule, including required prepayment, milestone payments, or other payment terms, should be clearly identified in the Cost Proposal.

62. Question (9/18/2026)

Which existing systems must remain connected to the new ERP, and what information must be exchanged?

District Response:

The District expects the proposed ERP to integrate with the existing systems identified in Section 19, System Integration Services, as applicable to the functionality proposed and the District's business processes.

The currently identified systems and integration needs are:

Existing System/Service	General Information to Be Exchanged
Vector Scheduling (formerly CrewSense)	Employee time/scheduling information needed to support time entry, time approval, overtime, leave, compensatory time, and payroll processing
Operative IQ	Asset, equipment, supply, inventory, and related information where applicable to financial/procurement processes
Vector Solutions / Target Solutions	Employee training, certifications, qualifications, and related information relevant to HR/personnel records
Microsoft 365 / SharePoint	Documents, records, collaboration content, and other information requiring interaction between the ERP and Microsoft environment, as applicable
Banking / Financial Institutions	Electronic payments, ACH, banking transactions, reconciliation information, and other applicable financial data
Benefit Providers / Carriers	Employee benefit enrollment, eligibility, deductions/contributions, qualifying life events, and benefit reconciliation information
Adobe Acrobat Sign or equivalent	Documents requiring electronic signature and associated signature/status information
Identity Provider / SSO	User identity, authentication, and access information necessary for SSO/MFA and role-based access

These integrations are intended to support the District's operational, financial, HR, payroll, benefits, and security processes. The RFP specifically requires integration or time import with Vector Scheduling/CrewSense, integration with Operative IQ, integration with Vector Solutions/Target Solutions, compatibility with Microsoft 365/SharePoint, banking and financial institution integrations, benefit provider integrations, electronic-signature integration, and identity-provider/SSO integration.

The District has not prescribed a final field-level interface specification or required a particular integration technology. Vendors should propose the appropriate integration architecture and method based on the requirements and should identify, for each material integration:

- Systems involved and system-of-record responsibilities;
- Information/data exchanged;
- Direction of data flow;
- Real-time, near-real-time, event-driven, or scheduled/batch methodology;
- Frequency of exchange;
- APIs, middleware, file transfers, or other technology used;
- Error handling, monitoring, and reconciliation;
- Security and authentication requirements;
- Implementation and ongoing maintenance responsibilities;
- Third-party products or licensing required; and
- Any limitations, assumptions, dependencies, or additional costs.

The District also expects the proposed ERP architecture to support future integrations without major platform redevelopment, consistent with Section 19 of the RFP.

63. Question (9/18/2026)

For those integrations, is real-time exchange mandatory, or are scheduled transfers acceptable?

District Response:

The District does not require all integrations to operate in real time. Scheduled or batch data transfers are acceptable when they appropriately support the business requirements and operational needs of the integration.

The District will evaluate the proposed integration approach based on its ability to provide reliable, secure, timely, and supportable exchange of information.

64. Question (9/18/2026)

For bank statement import and reconciliation, is automated file transfer or statement upload acceptable, or is a direct bank connection mandatory?

District Response:

The County serves as the District's Treasurer and typically interacts directly with the bank on behalf of the District. EFT transactions are typically entered via ACH manually through the banking portal. Therefore, direct bank connection is not mandatory.

65. Question (9/18/2026)

Must the ERP submit payments to banks, or generate payment files for authorized staff to upload?

District Response:

The ERP solution is expected to generate payment files, but does not need to submit the payment file to the bank.

66. Question (9/18/2026)

For the required payroll tax filing, is an integrated third-party service acceptable, or must it be delivered directly by the ERP provider

District Response:

Yes. An integrated third-party payroll tax filing and compliance service is acceptable, provided the proposed solution meets the applicable payroll, tax, reporting, reconciliation, security, audit, and integration requirements of the RFP.

Vendors should clearly identify whether payroll tax filing and compliance functionality is provided:

- natively by the ERP;
- through an integrated third-party service;
- through another proposed solution component; or
- through a manual process.

Vendors shall identify all associated implementation, recurring, and non-recurring costs, responsibilities, dependencies, limitations, and integration requirements.

67. Question (9/18/2026)

Beyond the payroll rules listed in the matrix, are there additional employment agreements or exceptions that affect calculations? Please share representative, anonymized payroll examples.

District Response:

Payroll rules are generally determined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or by policy. The District will share the CBA with finalist vendors selected for demonstrations.

68. Question (9/18/2026)

For recruiting, are background checks, assessments and I-9/E-Verify connections required in addition to the applicant tracking, interview scheduling, offer management and onboarding already specified?

District Response:

While background checks, assessments and I-9 documents are required by the District, it is not a requirement for those to be connected to the ERP system.

69. Question (9/18/2026)

Beyond the contract lifecycle already specified, are clause libraries, contract redlining and obligation tracking required in the initial scope?

District Response:

No. Clause libraries, contract redlining, and obligation tracking are not required components of the initial ERP scope.

70. Question (9/18/2026)

Which documents require electronic signatures, and must an existing signing service be retained?

District Response:

New hire letters, contracts, and Board minutes require electronic signatures. The current existing signing service will be retained. However, that may not be directly tied to the new ERP.

71. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Please share the document-retention schedule and any requirements for legal holds or restricted deletion.

District Response:
The District is subject to applicable Washington State Archives records-retention requirements. The applicable schedules include the Local Government Common Records Retention Schedule (CORE), the Fire and Emergency Medical Records Retention Schedule, and, where applicable, the Emergency Communications (911) and Dispatch Records Retention Schedule.

The detailed retention requirements and the District's expectations for retention, legal holds, disposition, and auditability are provided in the District's response to Question 31.

72. **Question (9/18/2026)**
How many years of historical data must be migrated from Tyler ERP 10, including transaction details and supporting attachments?

District Response:
This question is addressed in the District's responses to Questions 16, 22, 33, and 45.

73. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Must all historical data be available for reporting within the new ERP, or can older records be provided through a searchable, read-only archive?

District Response:
It is the District's preference that electronic historical data from the current production ERP (Tyler ERP Pro 10), as well as archived ERP systems (BIAS 6 and Microsoft Dynamics Great Plains) and the HRIS database (FileMaker Pro 7), be retained within the new ERP in accordance with Washington State Archives records-retention schedules (see District Response to Question 31).

It is also the District's preference that reports and searches can be easily performed against historical data from one location—the new ERP—to minimize the additional business costs associated with supporting multiple platforms.

74. **Question (9/18/2026)**
Please confirm when Attachments A through F—including the detailed requirements matrix, cost proposal form, demonstration script, evaluation scorecard, contract terms, and reference questionnaire—will be issued and whether those attachments will constitute the final controlling response requirements.

District Response:
These attachments were made available on the District's RFP webpage when the RFP was issued on September 1, 2026. They are still available to view and download.

75. Question (9/18/2026)

Please provide the desired number of historical years and approximate record, file, and document volumes for finance, payroll, HR, procurement, contracts, and audit data to be converted from Tyler ERP Pro 10, along with any known export formats or data-quality limitations.

District Response:

The desired number of historical years to be converted from Tyler ERP Pro 10 will be in accordance with Washington State Archives records-retention schedules (*see District Response in Question 31*). Approximate existing document volumes may also be found in the *District Response* to *Questions 20 and 25*.

Tyler Content Management allows for documents to be exported as PDF and TIFF files depending on how they were imported. The District will need to coordinate with Tyler Technologies to determine what bulk export options are available.

The current production ERP vendor, Tyler Technologies, stores the District's data in a Microsoft SQL database in the cloud. The District does not have direct database access and will need to coordinate with Tyler Technologies to obtain an appropriate data export.

76. Question (9/18/2026)

How many parallel payroll cycles will be required before go-live, and what quantitative reconciliation tolerances and acceptance criteria will apply to gross-to-net calculations, retroactive pay, deductions, benefits, retirement contributions, tax filings, and general-ledger posting?

District Response:

The District would prefer to complete at least two full monthly payroll cycles and two payroll-draw cycles before go-live.

The objective for payroll parallel testing is zero unexplained variance. Any variance should be investigated, documented, and resolved or formally accepted by the District. Minor documented differences attributable solely to system rounding or other mutually agreed technical differences may be acceptable.

77. Question (9/18/2026)

For Vector Scheduling/CrewSense, Operative IQ, Vector Solutions/Target Solutions, benefit carriers, banks, retirement systems, and Adobe Sign, please identify the current interface methods, data-transfer frequency, available API or file specifications, and responsibility for third-party access or transaction fees.

District Response:

Responsibilities for third-party access or transaction fees have not been confirmed with the District's existing system providers. The District has not confirmed the applicable third-party access or API fees with each existing system provider. Vendors should identify any anticipated third-party API, interface, licensing, or transaction fees and clearly state the assumptions used in their pricing.

System	Current Interface Method	Data-Transfer Frequency	Available API or File Specifications?
Vector Scheduling / Crewsense	Timesheet information is exported via CSV from Vector Scheduling for import into Tyler ERP Pro 10.	Monthly	RESTful / CSV
Operative IQ	None	None	RESTful / XLSX
Vector Scheduling / Target Solutions	None	None	RESTful
Benefits Carriers	None	Annual Enrollment and Life Changes only	API feasibility unknown - PDF and image file
Banks	ACH file export from ERP to Bank as a manual upload	Payroll - Once a Month / AP - Bimonthly	ACH File - Thurston County does not allow direct integration with Bank.
Retirement Systems	Notes only / Otherwise PDF attachment uploads to vendors as needed.	Annual Enrollment and Life Changes only.	API feasibility unknown - PDF and image file
Adobe Sign	Adobe Sign documents are exported to PDF and imported in HRIS and Requisition/PO systems manually.	24	MS365 App Integration / PDF

78. Question (9/18/2026)
Please provide the expected counts of full ERP users, finance/HR/payroll administrators, managers, employee self-service users, concurrent users, and required production and non-production environments that vendors should use as the common pricing baseline.

District Response:
Full Count of ERP Users (Including Employee Self Service) - 200

- Administrators – Including members who cross-staff
  - Systems Administration – 6
  - Finance – 4
  - HR – 4
  - Payroll – 3

- Managers
  - Executive Chiefs – 3
  - Executive Assistant – 1
  - Assistant Chiefs – 5
  - Battalion Chiefs – 8

    - Managers (Finance, Support Service) – 2
    - Directors (HR, IT, Support Services) – 3

- Concurrent Users – 20

Concurrent user number is based off the number of purchasers who typically submit requisitions once per month.

The District has not established a specific required number of non-production environments. Vendors should identify the standard production, test, development, sandbox, training, and other environments included in their proposed solution and pricing, and identify any additional environment costs.

For growth planning, vendors should assume the District may grow toward approximately 250 employees during the anticipated lifecycle of the ERP and should identify any pricing changes associated with that growth.

79. Question (9/17/2026)
Has the District established a budget range for software, implementation, and ongoing subscription costs? We've noted that cost is not sole deciding factor, as stated in RFP.

District Response:
Yes. The District has established budget capacity for the ERP implementation and ongoing subscription costs. The District is not providing a specific budget range as part of this Q&A.

Vendors should submit their best proposed pricing using the requirements and pricing forms included in the RFP. Cost will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria and total-cost-of-ownership requirements identified in the RFP.

80. Question (9/17/2026)
Are there budget constraints or budget timing processes that would favor phased implementation versus a "big bang" full-suite deployment?

District Response:
The District's budget is structured to support the planned January 1, 2028 target go-live. The District does not have a budget constraint that requires a phased implementation.

The District has a strong preference for a single ERP go-live, as described in Questions 38, 90 and 91.

81. Question (9/17/2026)
Is the District committed to a single enterprise platform, or are they comfortable with a best-of-breed ecosystem?

District Response:
The District has a strong preference for a cohesive, integrated ERP environment in which the core financial, budgeting, procurement, HR, payroll, position control, employee self-service, reporting, workflow, and related functions operate as an integrated solution.

The District is open to a best-of-breed or multi-product approach when the vendor can demonstrate that the proposed ecosystem:

- Meets the District's functional requirements;
- Provides reliable and sustainable integration between systems;
- Clearly establishes system-of-record responsibilities;
- Provides appropriate data flow, reconciliation, auditability, and security;
- Does not create unnecessary duplication of functionality or data entry;
- Provides a clear support and escalation model;
- Identifies all implementation, integration, licensing, maintenance, and recurring costs; and
- Can be maintained and supported over the District's anticipated 10–20 year ERP lifecycle.

Vendors proposing third-party or best-of-breed components should clearly identify the primary ERP solution, each third-party product, the functionality provided by each component, integration responsibilities, data ownership and flow, dependencies, limitations, licensing requirements, and associated costs.

The District also expects the proposing vendor to identify the primary point of accountability for the overall proposed solution and explain how issues involving integrations between the ERP and third-party products will be managed and escalated.

The District's preference is therefore not for a single vendor at all costs, but for an integrated and cohesive enterprise solution rather than a collection of disconnected systems.

82. Question (9/17/2026)

To what extent is the District willing to adopt standard leading practices rather than recreate existing Tyler processes?

District Response:

The District is receptive to adopting leading practices and modern ERP processes and does not intend for the implementation to simply replicate existing Tyler ERP Pro 10 processes.

The District expects the selected vendor to bring relevant public-sector ERP experience and to identify opportunities to improve, simplify, standardize, and automate existing processes. The District is open to changing current processes when a proposed change provides greater efficiency, improved controls, better reporting, reduced manual effort, improved employee or user experience, or other meaningful operational benefits.

At the same time, the District does not expect every existing process to be changed simply for the sake of standardization. Certain processes may be appropriately maintained because they are driven by Washington State requirements, collective bargaining agreements, District policies, public-sector accounting requirements, internal controls, or specific operational needs of the District.

Vendors should therefore identify where they recommend adopting a standard or leading-practice process and where they recommend retaining or modifying the District's existing process. For significant recommended changes, vendors should explain:

- The proposed leading practice or process;
- The differences from the District's current approach;

- The expected operational benefits;
- Any impacts on District staff, policies, or procedures;
- Configuration or implementation considerations;
- Training and change-management implications; and
- Any limitations, dependencies, or additional costs.

The District is particularly interested in reducing unnecessary manual processes, spreadsheet dependency, duplicate data entry, and workarounds associated with the current environment.

The District's objective is not to reproduce Tyler ERP Pro 10 in a new system. The objective is to implement a modern, sustainable ERP environment that incorporates appropriate public-sector leading practices while preserving requirements that are necessary for the District's legal, operational, financial, and organizational needs.

Vendors should use their experience to recommend the processes they believe will provide the best long-term outcome for the District. The District will evaluate those recommendations as part of the implementation and process-design discussions.

83. Question (9/17/2026)
Is executive leadership prepared to modify business processes to align with a modern SaaS platform?

District Response:
Yes. Executive leadership is supportive of modifying existing business processes when doing so will improve efficiency, standardization, automation, internal controls, reporting, user experience, or the long-term sustainability of the District's operations.

Executive leadership is prepared to support the organizational change, process redesign, training, and change-management activities necessary to achieve the objectives of the ERP implementation. Vendors should identify significant process changes they recommend and explain the expected benefits, implementation considerations, resource impacts, training requirements, and any associated costs or risks.

The District's expectation is that the implementation will be a business-process transformation, rather than a technical replacement of Tyler ERP Pro 10. Vendors should therefore propose processes that take advantage of standard SaaS functionality and leading practices wherever appropriate, while identifying those areas where District-specific requirements reasonably warrant a different approach.

84. Question (9/17/2026)
Are there any "must-preserve" legacy processes that cannot change?

District Response:
The District has not identified specific Tyler ERP Pro 10 processes that must be preserved solely because they are legacy processes. The District is generally open to changing existing processes when a modern SaaS platform can provide a more efficient, effective, controlled, or sustainable approach.

However, certain business requirements and outcomes must be preserved, even if the underlying process or system configuration changes. These include requirements arising from:

- Applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Washington public-sector accounting and reporting requirements;
- Collective bargaining agreements and negotiated compensation provisions;
- District policies and established internal controls;
- Statutory or contractual payroll, tax, retirement, benefit, and leave requirements;
- Required financial controls, auditability, segregation of duties, and approval authorities; and
- Operational requirements that are essential to the District's fire and emergency services environment.

The District therefore distinguishes between preserving a requirement or business outcome and preserving the existing Tyler process used to accomplish it. Vendors should not assume that an existing Tyler workflow, screen, report, or workaround must be replicated in the proposed solution.

Vendors should identify any areas where they believe the District's current processes should be changed to align with standard SaaS functionality or leading practices. For material differences, vendors should explain the recommended future-state process, expected benefits, impacts to District staff, configuration requirements, training and change-management considerations, and any limitations or additional costs.

The District's expectation is that the selected vendor will work collaboratively with District staff to determine the appropriate future-state processes during implementation. The goal is to preserve necessary business requirements and controls—not to preserve legacy processes simply because they exist today.

85. Question (9/17/2026)

How satisfied are you with the current payroll operation today?

District Response:

The District's current payroll operation is functional and meets the District's basic payroll requirements; however, the District has identified significant opportunities for improvement and modernization.

The District's primary concerns are not limited to the ability to process payroll. They include the complexity of administering the District's compensation and benefit rules, the amount of manual effort required for certain processes, reporting and reconciliation capabilities, the ability to efficiently manage changes, and the overall integration between payroll, HR, timekeeping, benefits, and financial systems.

The District's payroll environment includes a number of complex requirements, including multiple pay schedules, negotiated compensation provisions, overtime and premium pay, longevity and education/certification compensation, HRA/VEBA, deferred compensation, retirement-related payments, leave, rate changes, and other bargaining-unit-specific requirements.

The District therefore views the ERP replacement as an opportunity to improve the payroll operation rather than simply replicate the current process in a new system.

Vendors should demonstrate how their proposed solution would address the District's payroll requirements while reducing manual effort, improving accuracy and transparency, supporting effective-dated and retroactive changes, strengthening integration with HR and finance, and providing District staff with the ability to maintain appropriate configuration without relying on custom programming.

The District is particularly interested in the vendor's ability to support the District's payroll complexity through standard or configurable functionality and to clearly identify any areas requiring third-party products, custom development, workarounds, or manual processes.

86. Question (9/17/2026)
How many bargaining units exist today?

District Response:
The District currently only has one bargaining unit.

87. Question (9/17/2026)
Would the District consider outsourcing payroll tax filing and compliance services if it reduced risk and total cost? (This might reduce implementation costs significantly.)

District Response:
Yes. The District would consider an outsourced payroll tax filing and compliance service if a vendor believes there is a compelling operational, compliance, risk, or financial benefit. However, outsourcing payroll tax filing and compliance is not the District's preferred future-state approach and is not anticipated to be the desired operating model.

The District's preference is for the proposed ERP solution to provide integrated payroll tax calculation, reporting, reconciliation, compliance, and filing functionality, either natively or through a tightly integrated service where appropriate.

Vendors may identify an outsourced service as an optional component or alternative approach, but should not assume that the District intends to outsource these responsibilities.

Any proposed outsourcing arrangement should clearly identify all services, responsibilities, costs, risks, dependencies, security requirements, and limitations.

88. Question (9/17/2026)
Has the District benchmarked the cost of internal payroll administration against outsourced alternatives?

District Response:
No. The District has not conducted a formal benchmark of internal payroll administration costs against outsourced alternatives. The District is not requesting vendors to perform that analysis as part of their proposal. Vendors may identify the costs and potential benefits of an optional outsourced payroll tax filing and compliance component as described in Question 87.

89. Question (9/17/2026)
How much internal staff time/persons can be dedicated to the project?

District Response:
The District anticipates dedicating approximately 11 internal staff members to support the ERP implementation. The specific level of participation will vary by role, project phase, and area of responsibility.

The District expects key subject-matter experts to participate in requirements validation, configuration, data conversion, testing, integration, training, change management, and other implementation activities as appropriate to their areas of responsibility.

The District does not anticipate that all 11 staff members will be dedicated to the project on a full-time basis throughout the entire implementation. Vendors should therefore identify the anticipated District staffing commitment by role and implementation phase, including any periods requiring significant full-time or near-full-time participation.

Vendors should clearly identify any assumptions regarding District staff availability that are necessary to achieve the proposed implementation schedule and January 1, 2028 target go-live.

90. Question (9/17/2026)
Is the January 1, 2028 go-live date considered firm?

District Response:
January 1, 2028 is the District's target go-live date and should be treated as the planned go-live date for purposes of the vendor's proposal, implementation methodology, staffing plan, and pricing.

The District's preferred implementation approach is a single ERP go-live, and the District believes that a 9–11 month implementation period is a reasonable planning assumption based on the anticipated scope of the project and the internal resources the District expects to dedicate to the implementation.

Vendors should therefore propose an implementation plan designed to achieve a January 1, 2028 production go-live and should clearly identify any assumptions, dependencies, risks, or District resources necessary to meet that date.

The District recognizes that implementation schedules may require refinement following contract award as detailed requirements, configuration, data conversion, integrations, testing, and other implementation activities are validated. Any proposed change to the January 1, 2028 target would require District approval.

If a vendor believes that January 1, 2028 cannot reasonably be achieved under its proposed implementation methodology, the vendor should clearly identify that limitation in its proposal and provide its recommended alternative schedule, the reasons for the alternative, the impact on the implementation approach, and any associated cost or operational implications.

91. Question (9/17/2026)

Would they consider a phased rollout if it reduced project risk? If phased roll out is preferred, do you desire a prescriptive approach from Vendor?

District Response:

The District has a strong preference for a single ERP go-live rather than a phased rollout. The District's objective is to implement the proposed ERP as an integrated solution, with the core ERP functionality operational on the target go-live date of January 1, 2028.

The District's preference for a single go-live is based on its assessment of the project scope, the use of a single integrated ERP platform, and the level of internal resources the District anticipates dedicating to the implementation. The District anticipates approximately 11 internal staff members supporting the implementation and believes that a 9–11 month implementation period is a reasonable planning assumption.

Accordingly, vendors should develop their proposal and implementation methodology based on a single ERP go-live on January 1, 2028. Vendors should not assume that the District is seeking or prefers a phased implementation.

The District may consider a phased approach only when the vendor can demonstrate that phasing is necessary or would materially reduce implementation risk, improve implementation outcomes, or provide another significant operational benefit. A vendor proposing a phased approach must clearly explain why a single go-live is not recommended and provide the proposed phases, functionality by phase, schedule, dependencies, costs, District resource requirements, temporary interfaces or manual processes, and risks.

The District does not intend to prescribe the vendor's implementation methodology. Vendors should recommend the implementation methodology they believe provides the best path to a successful single ERP go-live, consistent with the District's target date and available resources.

The District will evaluate the proposed implementation approach based on its feasibility, implementation risk, resource requirements, cost, and ability to achieve the District's objectives and target go-live date.

92. Question (9/17/2026)

How receptive is the District to process change?

District Response:

The District is receptive to process change and expects the ERP implementation to provide opportunities to improve and modernize existing business processes.

The District is not seeking to simply replicate all existing processes in the new ERP system. Where the proposed ERP provides a more efficient, effective, controlled, or sustainable way to accomplish a business process, the District is open to adopting the vendor's recommended best-practice processes and workflows, provided they meet the District's operational, regulatory, financial, and organizational requirements.

At the same time, the District recognizes that certain processes are driven by Washington State requirements, collective bargaining agreements, District policies, internal controls,

public-sector accounting requirements, or operational requirements and therefore may not be appropriate for change.

Vendors should identify opportunities where they believe the District could benefit from process improvement and should explain:

- Recommended changes to existing processes;
- The benefits and efficiencies expected from the change;
- Any impacts on District staff or operations;
- Configuration or implementation considerations;
- Training and change-management requirements; and
- Any areas where the vendor recommends maintaining the District's existing process.

The District expects the selected vendor to bring relevant public-sector ERP implementation experience and best practices to the project and to work collaboratively with District staff to determine where process changes will provide meaningful benefits.

The District's goal is to implement a modern ERP solution that improves business processes rather than simply reproducing existing manual processes in a new system.

93. Question (9/17/2026)
What previous ERP implementation experience does the District have?

District Response:
The District's implementation team has relevant prior ERP implementation experience.

The District's CFO was directly involved in a major ERP implementation at Pierce County in 2015, including the adoption of Workday Financials in a large governmental organization.

In addition, the District's IT Director and Payroll Administrator were involved in the District's implementation of Tyler ERP Pro 10 in 2017. The District's HR Director also has prior ERP implementation experience from her previous position in the private sector.

Accordingly, while the District has not previously undertaken an ERP replacement of precisely the same scope as this procurement, several members of the District's proposed implementation team have direct experience with ERP implementations, including financial, payroll, HR, technology, and organizational implementation activities.

The District expects the selected vendor to provide a comprehensive implementation methodology and appropriate project management, configuration guidance, data conversion, integration support, testing, training, change management, go-live, stabilization, and knowledge transfer. Vendors should identify the District resources and vendor support they recommend based on the proposed implementation approach and the District's available internal expertise.

The District anticipates approximately 11 internal staff members will participate in the implementation, with the level of involvement varying by role and implementation phase.

94. Question (9/17/2026)
Was the RFP influenced by any consultants or advisory firms?

District Response:
No. The District did not work with any paid consultants or advisory firms when developing this RFP.

95. Question (9/17/2026)
How many vendors have demonstrated solutions, or solution overviews in last 24 months?

District Response:
The District has had 5 vendor demonstrations in the last 24 months.

96. Question (9/17/2026)
Once RFP vendors are selected to demonstrate, we understand approximately 12 hours are allotted per finalist, to be broken up over two days. Is that still accurate?

District Response:
Yes. The District currently anticipates allocating approximately 12 hours of demonstration time per finalist, generally divided over two demonstration days.

The District will provide finalists with substantially identical demonstration instructions and generally consistent time allocations to support a consistent and equitable evaluation process.

The District will provide finalists with additional information regarding the specific schedule, allocation of time between scenarios, and demonstration logistics following finalist selection.

The District reserves the ability to establish reasonable time limits and may request a second demonstration of high-priority requirements as provided in the RFP.

97. Question (9/17/2026)
Will all the applicable staff be present for all hours of vendor demos, or will departments be cycling in and out per demo subject content?

District Response:
The District intends to have its core evaluation team participate throughout the finalist demonstrations. Subject-matter experts and other applicable District personnel may participate in the portions of the demonstrations most relevant to their areas of responsibility.

Vendors should not assume that every District employee or subject-matter expert will be present for every demonstration scenario.