

CIB Permit and Casem Database RFP Questions

REVISIONS to the RFP effective 1/11/2024:

- Proposal submission deadline extended to 3pm on February 23, 2024.
- Expected date of decision notification extended to March 29, 2024

Questions about the Application Process:

Q. In the list of complete proposal contents, the first bullet item is “Completed Proposer Information Forms (Attachments A, A.2, and A.3)”. Is attachment A.1 included in this as well?

A. Yes. The omission is a typo. Please complete and include A.1 as well.

Q. Can applicants recreate the attachments (A, C, and D) or must they utilize the forms given?

A. Applicants can recreate the forms for ease of data entry, but the format should be unchanged.

Q. If we are considering utilizing a CUBE vendor, is the following website the best directory to use? <https://data.boston.gov/dataset/certified-business-directory>

A. When considering CUBE vendors it is ideal to look into the Certified Business Directory linked, all CUBE vendors certified by the City of Boston will be listed. Another resource is the state directory:

<https://www.diversitycertification.mass.gov/BusinessDirectory/BusinessDirectorySearch.aspx>

Q. Relating to CUBE business status, will consideration be given to organizations that begin the process of identifying as one of the listed business types? Are equivalent national certifications for these identifiers able to be used in consideration?

A. A vendor must be certified and able to submit documented proof of such to be considered as any of the specified business type categories. National certifications of equivalent identifiers can be used.

Q. Is there a scoring adjustment used in the evaluation process that encourages proposals that include CUBE businesses?

A. The scoring system is still being developed. CUBE businesses are strongly encouraged to submit responses to the RFP.

Q. Related to Section 7, Project Staffing, are proposed team members required for project commencement or would an equivalent resource with matching experience and education allow for substitution?

A. BPHC seeks to confirm that the proposer has sufficient knowledge, skill, and capacity to successfully develop the system and complete the project. Reviewing the qualifications of the individuals who will be working on the project, particularly those who will interface with BPHC staff, is the best way to assess this. BPHC is looking for named individuals and their qualifications, not general statements that the proposer will hire a sub-contractor with a certain skill set.

BPHC expects that a proposer will do all in their power to accurately reflect in the proposal the actual staff who will be assigned to the project and to have them carry out the work if awarded the contract. However, BPHC also understands that staff changes take place from time to time. When that happens, clearly communicating that someone has left the project and who their replacement will be (even if the change happens before the contract is granted) is as important as the qualifications of the project team.

Q. Do you require that the awarded vendor be headquartered in the United States?

A. The awarded vendor and project team does not have to be headquartered in the US.

Q. Are project personnel required to hold US citizenship?

A. There is no requirement that personnel must be US citizens.

Q. Is BPHC open to choosing a vendor for this project with an existing, fully integrated, payment processing partner out-of-the-box?

A. Yes, BPHC will consider such applications. Review of the payment processor and ability to interface with BPHC's banking and finance systems will be part of the interview process for such proposals prior to final decision.

Q. Was a consultant involved in writing the RFP? Will the consultant be involved in the decision-making process?

A. No, there was no consultant involvement in writing the RFP.

Q. Will there be an opportunity to redact any sensitive information submitted as part of the proposal such as the Future Development Roadmap?

A. BPHC cannot guarantee blanket shielding of information from public record request. Proposers would need to individually explain what they request be shielded and why so that the BPHC legal team could consider and make a determination.

Q. When preparing the project budget and costs, is it permissible to provide a calculated average hourly rate for salaried project staff in lieu of “direct labor rates of proposed staff...”?

A. Yes. Please clearly mark as such.

Q. It is acceptable for a submission to re-organize or tabulate the functional requirements in the Scope of Work to organize a response to each?

A. Yes, a proposer may structure their response in the way they feel best communicates and organizes that response provided that the specified sections of the proposal listed in the Proposal Requirements section are present, clearly labeled, and within the page limitations (if applicable) of each.

Questions about the Overall Project:

Q. What is the primary goal for moving to a new system?

A. BPHC seeks to achieve the following goals by moving to a new system:

- Lowered operating costs
- Improved user interface and usability for field and office staff
- Improved usability for permit/license applicants applying online
- Improved reporting and data analytics

Q. What aspects of project are of highest priority/importance for BPHC?

A. BPHC prioritizes all aspects of the project as outlined in the scope of work.

Q. Does BPHC have a budget for this project?

A. BPHC has not yet set a defined budget for this project. Project budget will be determined by proposals received and annual or special project budget appropriation process. BPHC looks for applicants who demonstrate ability to complete projects on time and on budget once budget and timeline have been set.

Q. Please describe the governance structure of your project team, including staffing levels and roles.

A. The following BPHC staff positions will be directly involved with the project:

- Environmental Division Director – primary point of contact, superuser expert in existing system, leadership endorsement to the project, subject matter expert, project timeline management
- Tobacco Control Director – management endorsement, subject matter expert to consult on development and user needs
- Permits Program Supervisor – subject matter expert to consult on development and user needs
- Environmental Hazards Director - subject matter expert to consult on development and user needs
- Software Developer and Data Engineer – in-house expert and primary technical support for the existing system; can dedicate significant staff time to technical and process aspects of this project
- ITS leadership – management support and provision of technical staff support as needed
- Procurement Specialist – contract and procurement paperwork
- Bureau Fiscal Administrator – invoicing, budget management

Q. Do you prefer onsite or remote hours for critical project milestones/activities such as kick-off, requirements gathering, training, testing cycles, etc?

A. BPHC would prefer on-site for project kick-off, requirements gathering, and training, but does not rule out remote hours for these steps if necessary for cost control.

Q. What is the anticipated project start date?

A. BPHC anticipates identifying a chosen vendor by March 29, 2024 and a project start date by or before April 22, 2024.

Q. Does BPHC have a required implementation timeline for the new system to be operational?

A. Yes. BPHC anticipates a complete working system by May 1, 2025 with the remainder of the contracted period (through June 30, 2025 and beyond) for post-go-live support, user training, and last-minute alterations and bug fixes.

Q. Does BPHC desire the May 1, 2025 completion date to include the 6 month post go-live support listed in the scope of work?

A. No. BPHC expects May 1, 2025 to be the “go-live date” with completion of the design, development, data migration, documentation, and implementation by that date. The

post go-live support period is expected to begin May 2025 with BPHC staff using the system daily.

Q. Is BPHC looking for a commercial-off-the-shelf product, a modifiable COTS product, or a custom solution?

A. BPHC welcomes proposals featuring all three types of solutions.

Q. Does BPHC prefer on-site hosting or an off-site SaaS solution?

A. BPHC will consider proposals of both types. Deciding factors will include ease of access to real-time data for data analysis and reporting, annual licensing/maintenance costs, and levels of product support.

Q. Has BPHC seen demos from vendors in the last 12 months?

A. Yes, BPHC has seen examples of multiple potential candidate systems over the past 12 months.

Q. Is BPHC considering one vendor for the entire project or would BPHC consider “best of breed” point solutions for specific components? Is BPHC open to working with a vendor that leverages a partner network to achieve individual requirements?

A. BPHC intends to identify a single vendor to provide all components of the project but does not rule out vendors that make use of third party solutions. Such third party solutions or sub-contract arrangements must be clearly stated in the submission.

Q. Is BPHC open to recommendations from the chosen vendor based on prior experiences with similar sized organizations?

A. Yes

Q. Is there a preference for onsite vs. online training and train-the-trainer vs. train all users?

A. BPHC prefers a train all users approach with a combination of hands-on training and provision of one or both of written reference documents and how-to video tutorials. We prefer on-site, but do not rule out online training if dictated by costs and logistics. The three general groups of users for training are super-users/admins, back-office staff, and field staff. These could be further divided between the tobacco program and the environmental program. BPHC does not have a preference between on-site and virtual training.

Q. If training is held on-site, is there a classroom for training?

A. Yes

Q. How many participants will be trained in total over how many sessions?

A. The number of sessions is at the discretion of the applicant to propose. The number of staff to be trained are:

- 4 back-office permit staff in environmental hazards
- 3 back-office managers in environmental hazards
- 2 back-office staff (1 manager) in tobacco
- 3 field staff in tobacco
- 7 field staff in environmental hazards
- 4 super-users or admin users

Q. Do you prefer for staff to be trained in application administration to make changes, updates, and add new capabilities after go-live?

A. Yes. The 4 top level admin (super user) staff should be trained in how to make changes and updates to the system including adding new record types, processes, automations, and reports.

Functional and Logistical Questions:

Q. How many internal users currently utilize the Accela Solution?

A. There are currently 33 active user license on the Accela Solution

Q. Can you share the number of each user type that will be using the system?

A. The anticipated number of users by each user type for the system is:

- Administrator – 2 users
- Super User – 4 users
- Office Team – 27 users (including mobile access by field staff)
- Regulated Public Users with username/password – approximately 600
- General Public Users (no username/password) – unknown. Potentially the entire population of Boston

Q. How many registered external users (i.e. users who authenticate with username and password) will need access to their submitted applications?

- A. Though the system should be capable of handling a large number of external credentialed users, BPHC anticipates approximately 600 to 1,400 external users with login credentials to submit applications and update/renew permits/licenses as follows:
- ~200 nail salon owners
 - ~300 body artists
 - ~100 other permitted entities including asbestos abatement contractors, medical marijuana dispensary operators, funeral home operators, tanning salon operators, solid waste business operators, etc.
 - Unknown number of tobacco retailers. Currently none use the system, as many as 800 may use the new system

Q. Outside of the credentialed user types listed in the previous question, how many other BPHC users will need to access and interact with reports from the system such as senior management, finance, etc?

- A. BPHC anticipates that the staff with username/password of the types listed in the response to the previous question will be responsible for accessing the system and generating reports from it to transmit to others such as senior management and finance. However, if the option exists to have a ‘reports only’ or similar access type to be provided to management/finance users, that is an additional feature of the system that should be called out in the proposal and should assume an additional 7 users in this type of role.

Q. How many users of the current system are accessing the system via mobile devices?

- A. Currently, a minimum of 18 staff users regularly access the system via mobile devices. Proposals should account for the possibility of up to all credentialed users accessing the system via mobile devices. External users (permit applicants and members of the public) may all access via mobile device, and responsive web design should be used.

Q. Related to payment of fees through connection to a third party payment processor, who is the current/proposed processor for integration consideration?

- A. The current payment processor is ACI Payments, Inc. (Official Payments). A new payment processor under consideration is Bank of America, Commerce Payment Portal. Proposers should plan for integration of either of these payment processors.

Q. What languages, other than English, may need to be supported?

- A. Ideally, public-facing components of the system (online applications, information lookup, etc.) should support, either natively or via resources like Google Translate, the

most common languages spoken in Boston: Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, Cape Verdean Creole, Vietnamese, Chinese

Q. Can you confirm that all accounting and finance processes (other than collecting payments and handling refunds/cancellations) will be handled outside this application?

- A.** Yes. The current system tracks the assessment of a fee to a record based on permit conditions or fines/penalties assessed, directs online payment through third-party payment processor whose confirmation marks the fee paid in the system. Refunds/cancellations are currently handled in the online interface for the third-party payment processor. This functionality should be replicated or improved upon in the successful proposal.

Once funds are deposited in the BPHC bank accounts by the payment processor, all other accounting functions are handled by a separate department using their own software solution. This function will NOT be included in the proposed new system. However, reports generated from the new system, as with the current solution, will be provided to the finance and accounting team for reconciliation and auditing of transactions.

Q. Can you confirm that the new application will be integrated with a financial system or application for accounting related functions such as reconciliation, invoicing, collections, AP, and AR?

- A.** There will be no direct integration of the new application to the existing BPHC finance and accounting systems. Reports from the new application and the third party payment processor are provided to the BPHC Finance team for these purposes.

Q. What is the historical average of applications annually within the current system? Is there any anticipated substantial increase or decrease to these averages?

- A.** The average number of annual permit/license applications in the system is approximately 2,000 to 3,200 depending upon the volume of asbestos abatement project permits received. There is no currently anticipated substantial change in this volume. However, the system should be capable of handling an increase or decrease in this volume due to industry changes or regulatory changes including addition of new permit/license types.

Q. How many permits of each type are created annually?

A. The number of permits and licenses for each type issued annually can vary from year to year. The number of each created in CY2023 was:

- Asbestos project permits: 979 (ranges from 900 to 1,400 per year)
- Body Art Establishments: 26
- Body Art Practitioner License: 415
- Funeral Director Licenses: 42
- Ice Rink Permits: 3
- Medical Marijuana Dispensary Agents: 81
- Medical Marijuana Dispensary Permits: 5
- Nail Salon Permits: 192
- Tanning Salon Permits: 8
- Solid Waste Permits: 6
- Well Operating Permits: 1
- Well Construction Permits: 0 (can range from 0 to 100+ any year)
- Tobacco Permits: 1,021

Q. Do any records require renewals?

A. Each annual operating permit or license is renewed annually. Currently, this is done by creation of a new record associated with the existing parent record. BPHC desires to improve upon this process by having a true renewal of the existing record to reduce data entry tasks.

Q. How many complaint or case records are created annually? How many inspections are conducted annually?

A. The number of enforcement cases and inspections each year can vary greatly depending on a number of factors. The usual range is between 350 and 600 records and up to twice that number of inspections. For calendar year 2023, the following were completed:

- Environmental complaint records created: 419
- Environmental case records created: 83
- Tobacco retail violation records created: 50
- Tobacco workplace smoking violation records created: 10
- Enforcement (complaint and case) inspections conducted: 396
- Outreach visits (recorded as inspections) to small businesses: 999
- Tobacco inspections (all types) conducted: 2,012
- Routine inspections of permitted businesses: 292

Q. Step three of the permit/license loop process requires checking for outstanding fines/violations on all applications. Does this require integration to a State of MA or another database?

A. No. This is an internal check against records in the BPHC system to look for outstanding fines/violations assessed by BPHC and stored in the system.

Q. Regarding asbestos abatement project permits, does the new solution need to managed licensed contractors or firms who are qualified to perform asbestos abatement?

A. Licensure of asbestos abatement professionals (contractor, supervisor/foreman, project monitor, and analytical laboratory) is handled by state agencies. The new solution does not need to process applications for these credentials. However, BPHC staff enter this information (received from the state website) into the system so as to have a table of currently licensed professionals to match against when entering a permit application for processing by entering the state license number and looking up the person/company name and license status.

Q. Can you provide a list of permit types the new solution will support and provide example permit application forms?

A. Current permit application forms can be downloaded from our website at <https://boston.gov/bphc-permits> for the following permit types which are to be supported by the new solution. Note that Burial Permits are also listed on that site, but are managed through a separate state system and not part of this project. Please also note that BPHC is seeking a solution capable of later adaptation including the addition of new permit or license types as needed.

- Tobacco retailer annual operating permit
- Asbestos abatement projects (plans and notices processed using the same form)
- Ice rink annual operating permit
- Nail salon annual operating permit
- Tanning salon annual operating permit
- Body art establishment annual operating permit
- Body art practitioner annual license
- Medical marijuana dispensary annual operating permit
- Medical marijuana dispensary agent annual license
- Well construction permit
- Well annual operating permit
- Solid waste business annual operating permit
- Funeral director annual license

Q. Can BPHC provide statistics for Well permits? How many current permits holders? Average number of new permits received each year?

A. There are currently 9 well operation permit holders in the system. It is impossible to estimate an average number of new well permits each year due to the small number, rarity of the permit type, and sporadic nature of the construction of wells. In a previous year, the office processed 36 well construction permits for geothermal wells and did not process any construction permits for the previous two years.

Q. Can you provide a list of all inspection types the new solution will support and example inspection forms?

A. The new system must support all current inspection types and be capable of future modification to add new inspection types and inspection checklists. Representative sample checklists are attached at the end of this document. Current inspection types include, but are not limited to:

- Annual pre-permit inspections of all permitted business types, each using a business type-specific checklist
- Complaint based inspections (initial, follow-up, and final) of permitted business types, each using a business type-specific checklist
- Complaint-based inspections (initial, follow-up, and final) of environmental hazards. Approximately 12 of the 149 specified hazard types include a hazard-specific checklist
- Educational outreach visits (initial, follow-up, Green & Clean, training) to small businesses are currently handled the same as inspections
- School environmental audits – use a custom checklist to collect 20+ fields of data in every room in every school building in the Boston Public School System
- General field activities – a catch-all for other field work not covered above but handled as an ‘inspection’ for purposes of productivity tracking

Q. Does the new solution need to support sampling activities and lab test results?

A. Yes. Sampling documentation is currently conducted by text entry into case narrative notes and upload of scanned copies of chain-of-custody forms and laboratory analysis reports to the case record as PDF files. BPHC seeks to replicate or improve upon this process.

Q. Can you provide a list of all enforcement types the new solution must support and provide example enforcement documents?

A. Enforcement of violations follows a similar path for most violations. First, a Notice of Violation is issued to the responsible party containing inspection findings, regulatory basis for the violations, and orders to correct. An example template of such a Notice of Violation is attached at the end of this document. Failure to respond to the NOV and

correct violations results in escalation which may include permit/license suspension, fines, or referral to criminal prosecution.

Tobacco violations follow a different path which starts with issuing monetary fines. Repeated violations result in escalating fines, permit suspensions, and possibly permit revocation.

Q. Can you describe the number and nature of regulations and compliance that field inspectors will need to verify?

A. The following is not an exhaustive list, but includes the most frequently referenced regulations by field staff:

- Massachusetts public health regulations (M.G.L. Chapter 111)
- Massachusetts sanitary code (105 CMR 410)
- Massachusetts Lead Law
- BPHC Asbestos Regulations, Massachusetts Asbestos Regulations (310 CMR 4, 7, and 19 as well as 453 CRM 6), EPA Asbestos Regulations (40 CFR parts 61 and 763)
- Federal Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)
- BPHC Nail Salon Regulations
- BPHC Body Art Regulations
- BPHC Medical Marijuana Regulations
- BPHC Well Regulations
- BPHC Solid Waste Business regulations
- Massachusetts Indoor Skating Rinks regulation (105 CRM 675)
- Massachusetts Tanning Salon Regulations (105 CRM 123)
- BPHC Tobacco Regulations, Massachusetts Smoke-Free Workplace regulation (MGL Chapter 270 section 22), Massachusetts General Laws regarding tobacco sales to minors
- Massachusetts regulations on funeral directors and funeral homes (MGL C114, S49)

Q. Is there any process for a business to appeal complaint based cases or enforcement of violation?

A. Yes. All enforcement of violations includes both the possibility for administrative appeal to the Executive Director to overturn or suspend a penalty and the possibility for BPHC to transition a case to criminal prosecution in a court of law for noncompliance.

Q. Are the current workflows meeting the business needs? If not, what areas require workflow re-design?

A. In general the current workflow meets most business needs. Areas for improvement include removing some redundancies and duplications, improving automation around updating record status at key steps, revision of the permit renewal process (current process creates a new record rather than renewing the existing record), and adding automated notifications such as flagging when an enforcement case is past due for follow-up action.

Q. Item 6b of the Scope of Work refers to scheduling inspections. Does BPHC prefer to use their existing scheduling software or can integration to the new solution be utilized?

A. Current scheduling is within the existing Accela system and allows for creation of the inspection component of the case record with a selected scheduled date and time for the inspection. This is used for generation of a Daily Destination Report sent by field staff to managers which shows where they are scheduled to go that day and for generation of a monthly mileage reimbursement report (created in ArcGIS using the exported inspection address, dates, times) for each inspector. BPHC would like to integrate similar scheduling into the new solution.

Q. Are there integration points to other sites for public access to this proposed solution?

A. Yes. The current system is accessible by regulated entities for purpose of applying for permits online via the BPHC website at www.boston.gov/bphc-permits. BPHC intends to keep similar access for the new system. Additionally, BPHC seeks to allow access to the system via the Boston.gov website for members of the public to conduct limited searches of the database such as to look up the permit status of a business.

Technical/IT Questions:

Q. Do Accela Automation, Accela Citizen Access, and Accela Mobile all have their own databases or is the data for all three contained in one database?

A. All three are user interface solutions that work with the same central database of records.

Q. From what systems, other than Accela, will data have to be migrated?

A. None. All data to be migrated is in Accela.

Q. Is there a list of requirements/BPHC privacy data laws related to SaaS products?

A. The BPHC’s privacy data requirements for SaaS products are aligned with Federal and State relevant laws, regulations, and best practices to ensure the protection of sensitive health information. Here are some key requirements:

Compliance with Data Protection Laws: Vendors should ensure compliance with relevant data protection laws, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

Data Encryption: Vendors should use strong encryption protocols to protect data both in transit and at rest. Implement measures to safeguard against unauthorized access, ensuring that only authorized personnel can decrypt and access sensitive information.

Access Controls: Vendors should implement robust access controls to restrict access to sensitive data based on user roles and responsibilities using BPHC Active Directory Integration.

Audit Trails: The vendor must maintain detailed audit logs that track user activities and interactions with the SaaS application. Regularly review audit trails to detect and respond to any suspicious or unauthorized activities.

Data Portability and Interoperability: the vendor must ensure that the SaaS product supports data portability standards, allowing seamless transfer of data to and from other systems. Prioritize interoperability with other public health systems to facilitate data sharing while maintaining privacy.

Incident Response and Breach Notification: The vendor must establish a robust incident response plan to address potential data breaches promptly. Define clear procedures for notifying relevant authorities and affected individuals in the event of a data breach.

Vendor Security and Compliance: the vendor must verify that the SaaS vendor follows industry best practices for security and compliance. Ensure that the vendor undergoes regular security assessments and audits.

Data Ownership and Transfer: The vendor must clearly define data ownership and transfer agreements between the BPHC and the SaaS vendor. Ensure that data can be securely transferred or retrieved when needed, even in the event of terminating the contract with the SaaS provider.

Q. Does BPHC have a central SSL digital certificate store from which the selected vendor can apply an SSL certificate to the System without additional cost, or should the vendor include the cost of procuring the digital certificate to the cost of the solution?

A. BPHC would prefer vendors to use their own SSL certificates, especially if they are providing a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution.

Q. Does BPHC use its own GIS? If not, does BPHC have full access to the City of Boston's GIS?

A. BPHC has complete access to the City of Boston ArcGIS system.

Q. The RFP mentions "integration with CRM" as a requirement under Section 6 Functional Requirements. What CRM does BPHC currently use?

A. BPHC is currently in the process of implementing the Microsoft Dynamics 365 CRM system.

Q. Can you provide a list of systems (in addition to GIS, CRM, and financial applications) to interface with and the nature of integrations including data volume and frequency?

A. Integration requirements for the solution include connectivity with Azure Active Directory/AD, ArcGIS, and BPHC's Microsoft PowerBI dashboard. The Tobacco Control Program is required to export selected enforcement data to Excel quarterly to transmit to the MA Department of Public Health

Q. For hosting in the cloud environment, is there a preference or a requirement for GovCloud capabilities?

A. BPHC has a preference for utilizing the Microsoft Azure Gov Cloud for cloud-hosted solutions.

Q. Please provide a list of all anticipated interfaces/integrations to the existing system.

A. Azure Active Directory/AD, ArcGIS, and BPHC's Microsoft PowerBI dashboard.

Q. Can you describe legacy back-office applications that will remain and those that will be phased out?

A. The successful system will replace the current suite of Accela applications (Accela Automation, Accela Citizen Access, Accela Mobile) which will all be phased out at the conclusion of the project.

Q. Can you provide information regarding the systems, tools and applications that may exist and/or you prefer to use for the program?

A.

- a) Data warehouse – N/A
- b) Data lake – N/A
- c) Middleware for integrations – N/A
- d) Extract Transform Load tool for data migration – N/A
- e) Test automation or regression testing tool – N/A
- f) Accessibility testing tool – N/A
- g) Performance test tool – N/A
- h) DevOps or deployment tool – N/A
- i) Requirements Management tool – N/A
- j) Document generation tool – N/A
- k) Business Intelligence (BI) or analytics tool - PowerBI
- l) Document Management system or document repository – N/A
- m) GIS (in 6.G) - ArcGIS
- n) CRM (in 6.G) – N/A
- o) Financial or accounting application (in 6.G) - Microsoft Great Plains
- p) Learning Management System (LMS) for training (in 5.3D) - Cornerstone LMS
- q) e-Signature tool - SignNow

Data Migration Questions:

Q. From how many data sources will data migration take place? What is the total table count and database size?

A. There is only a single data source – Accela. There are 955 tables in the database and the database size is 12 GB.

Q. What is the source of the data? SQL, Oracle, other?

A. The data source is from Microsoft SQL

Q. How many years of historical data are to be converted?

A. The database has been in active use for 9 years. Historic data going back to 1981 was converted and uploaded to the system at initial launch.

Q. What is the nature and content of the data to be converted?

A. The existing data to be converted to the chosen system consists of permit and license records, enforcement case management records, and outreach/education records equivalent to those record types described in the Scope of Work. These consist of ‘core’ data fields such as addresses, contact information, start and end dates, etc. as well as record-specific custom fields (permit or hazard type, types of asbestos materials removed, numbers of nail care stations, etc.) and uploaded electronic documents.

Q. Migration question – do you have active projects in the data to be migrated, will you need to close any open applications in the selected vendor’s system or are you able to close them in the current system?

A. BPHC anticipates that there will be a number of currently active or ‘in progress’ records that will be part of the data migration to be subsequently closed out in the new system. These will include annual operating permits and licenses that have been issued and are active and open environmental enforcement cases that are ongoing at the time of data conversion. It is impossible to provide an exact count of such records, a safe estimate would be 1,400 active permits and licenses (~200 nail salons, ~800 tobacco retailers, ~200 others of varying types) and ~100 active enforcement cases.

Q. How many records of each type are currently stored in the current Accela System?

A. As of January 5, 2024, the current count of records in the Accela System are:

- Permits (all types) – 65,092
- Complaint records – 5,222
- Enforcement case records – 9,616
- Tobacco enforcement records – 8,790
- Outreach site records – 2,212

Q. What are the formats of electronic documents/images to be migrated and what is the number and average size of those documents?

A. Electronic documents associated with existing records to be migrated include files in the following formats: PDF, DOC, DOCX, JPG, PNG, XLSX, and CSV. There may be a handful of WMV and MOV files.

The total number and size of all attached electronic documents is unknown. Photo and video attachments to records range from 0.5MB to 3.5MB while PDF and Word files are generally under 200KB. A safe estimate is to assume all permit records have an average of 2 documents totaling 600KB, while Complaint and Enforcement records have an average of 3 files each totaling 2MB.

Q. Is there a current provider that manages the Accela solution including the automation, citizen access, and mobile outside of CIB? If so, what provider/company/vendor?

A. The current Accela solution is hosted off site by Accela who provide support via their online user community/knowledge base and help ticketing system. BPHC staff provide in-house support for the system (modifying forms and fields, managing automation scripts, resetting user passwords, etc.) and there is no other third party support provider.

Q. How long does BPHC anticipate continued access to the Accela System after this contract is issued?

A. BPHC expects to continue to use Accela as the primary permit and case management system through May 1, 2025 or the go-live date of the project developed under this proposal, whichever comes first. BPHC will have access to the Accela system until July 1, 2025.

Q. Has BPHC already received permission from Accela to retrieve all stored data in their database?

A. BPHC retains ownership of all data collected in the Accela system and regularly receives data downloads by request for on-site data analysis directly with the raw data.

Q. Will Accela provide any technical resources during the data migration process?

A. BPHC does not anticipate that Accela will provide any additional technical assistance or resources for this project beyond their current customer support provided to BPHC.

Example Notice of Violation Template



[Instructions: replace all highlighted text in brackets with the appropriate information about the case or delete if that information is not used. Delete this instruction block before printing.]

1010 Massachusetts Avenue
Boston, MA 02118

telephone (617) 534-5966
fax (617) 534-2372

[date mailed]

[Responsible Party
Address
Goes here]

THIS IS A LEGAL DOCUMENT. PUBLIC HEALTH COMMISSION ORDERS ARE CONTAINED HEREIN. READ CAREFULLY. YOUR RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED.

RE: Health Hazards Related to [Insert nature of hazard and address] Pursuant to M.G.L. c111, s122 et. seq. and M.G.L. c111, s30

Dear [Insert Responsible party]:

The following is a report of an inspection performed by personnel of Boston Public Health Commission, Division of Environmental and Occupational Health (EOH). You will also find an explanation of the pertinent laws and regulations and correction orders.

Date of Inspection: [Date of inspection]
Address: [Address Inspected]
Area(s) Inspected: [Location at address that was inspected]
Inspected by: [Inspector Name(s)]

FINDINGS UPON INSPECTION

In response to a health complaint related to [nature of complaint] BPHC inspector [Inspector name] inspected [location(s) at the address] at [address] on [date of inspection]. The following conditions were observed:

1. [visual observations – note location, what was observed and repeat with an additional item for each observation/area]
2. [olfactory observations – note any odors detected such as “using olfactory senses, inspected detected a musty odor”. Be sure to identify where detected and how strong; separate item for each odor/location]

3. [auditory observations – if there’s a sound component to the case, note if you hear anything, where, how loud, and describe the noise and/or source]
4. [touch – was anything wet to the touch? Cold when it shouldn’t be? Hot when it shouldn’t be? Etc.]
5. [instrument readings – moisture meter, Q-Trak, etc. Describe what you used, where, what the min/max/average readings were and how they compare to reference/normal values. Separate item for each reading or include a chart outside the numbered list]
6. [other observations – did you speak with anyone other than the complainant who told you something pertinent to be entered into the record as part of the NOV? etc.]
7. [Health concerns associated with the observed conditions – these can be general]

VIOLATIONS OF LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS

The above findings, which may not be inclusive of all existing defects, constitute nuisances and health hazards pursuant to the following legislation and regulations:

1. MGLc111s122 REGULATIONS RELATIVE TO NUISANCES, EXAMINATIONS

The board of health shall examine into all nuisances, sources of filth and causes of sickness within its town, or on board of vessels within the harbor of such town, which may, in its opinion, be injurious to the public health, shall destroy, remove or prevent the same as the case may require, and shall make regulations for the public health and safety relative thereto and to articles capable of containing or conveying infection or contagion or of creating sickness brought into or conveyed from the town or into or from any vessel...

2. MGLc111s30 AGENTS; APPOINTMENTS; INSPECTIONS

Boards of health may appoint agents or directors of public health to act for them in cases of emergency or if they cannot conveniently assemble, and any such agent or director shall have all the authority which the board appointing him had; but he shall in each case within two days report his action to the board for its approval, and shall be directly responsible to it and under its direction and control. An agent or director of public health appointed to make sanitary inspections may make complaint of violations of any laws, ordinance or bylaw relative to public health.

3. MGLc111s123 ABATEMENT BY OWNER

Said board shall order the owner or occupant of any private premises, at his own expense, to remove any nuisance, source of filth or cause of sickness found thereon within twenty-four hours

4. [list additional pertinent regulations related to the violations of the case here as numbered items. For example, if it is a mold/leak case, add in:

“105 CMR 410.500 Owner’s Responsibility to Maintain Structural Elements

Every owner shall maintain the foundation, floors, walls, doors, windows, ceilings, roof, staircases, porches, chimneys, and other structural elements of his dwelling so that the dwelling excludes wind, rain and snow, and is rodent-proof, watertight and free from chronic dampness, weathertight, in good repair and in every way fit for

the use intended. Further, he shall maintain every structural element free from holes, cracks, loose plaster, or other defect where such holes, cracks, loose plaster or defect renders the area difficult to keep clean or constitutes an accident hazard or an insect or rodent harborage.”]

DEPARTMENT DETERMINATIONS AND ORDERS

1. [Responsible party] must [first action you want them to take for immediate response such as restrict access to an area, etc. This is for the immediate action that you likely ordered them to do at the time of inspection.]
2. [EXAMPLE - Responsible party must hire a licensed professional to evaluate the cited problems and submit a written abatement plan to EOH for approval within 15 days.]
3. [EXAMPLE - After plan approval from EHO, responsible party must take the additional abatement measures outlined in the plan such as repair the leak and replace damaged building materials or have a licensed asbestos contractor abate the asbestos hazard, etc.]
4. [Other orders/instructions or fines continue here. Add more numbered items as needed.]
5. ALL ABATEMENT WORK MUST BE COMPLETED WITHIN [THIRTY (30)] DAYS OF receipt of these orders. A copy of these orders should be given to your contractor.

If you have any further questions regarding compliance with these orders, please contact EOH at 617-534-5965.

This inspection report is signed and certified under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Sincerely,

[inspector name]
Health Inspector

Example Nail Salon Inspection Checklist

Boston Public Health Commission Nail Salon Inspection Form	
Salon Name:	
Salon Address:	
Salon Phone Number:	# Manicure Tables: # Foot Baths:
Reason for Inspection:	<input type="checkbox"/> Permit application [Permit Number: _____] <input type="checkbox"/> Complaint [Record Number: _____ Complaint type: _____] <input type="checkbox"/> Post-violation follow-up [Case Number: _____] <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

Citation	Paperwork Present	Pass	Fail
3.1	Salon has a valid Boston Public Health Commission permit or is applying for one?		
240 CMR 3.01	Salon has a current license from the Board of Cosmetology publicly displayed?		
4.8	Public health notice posted and worded according to regulations?		
4.1	MSDS/SDS for all chemicals are present and stored where employees can have access to them?		
4.13, guidelines section 6.B	Salon has an autoclave or dry heat sterilizer and a log book of use properly filled out (including attached indicator strips) or the monthly commercial laboratory results for the past 12 months?		
Supplies and Fixtures			
4.7	Single-pass mechanical general ventilation that brings in fresh outside air and vents to outside present and operating? (required of new salons and all salons by October 2018)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
4.7	Source-capture ventilation that vents to outside present and operating at each station? (required of new salons and all salons by October 2018)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
4.1	All chemical containers labeled with contents and closed when not in use?		
4.2	Lidded waste container at each manicure station?		
4.1	Salon has a proper flammable storage cabinet in which chemicals are properly stored?		
4.4	Salon has a fully stocked first aid kit?		
4.3	Salon has a functioning eye wash station (not a sink) located outside the bathroom? If the eyewash is not plumbed (bottled solution, etc.) verify that the solution is full and not expired.		
4.5	Salon has at least one hand washing sink in or adjacent to manicuring area?		
4.5, 4.6	All hand washing sinks kept in sanitary condition with hot and cold water, soap, and disp. towels?		
5.2	Latex and/or nitrile gloves available to salon employees?		
4.9, 4.11	Clean tools, clean towels, and new tools stored separate from used items in a closable container or cabinet?		
Prohibited Items & Practices			
6.3	<u>No</u> open flames or burning (incense, candles, smoking, etc.) present in the salon?		
6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8	Salon <u>does not</u> have on site – razor type callus shavers, skin graters, formalin, MMA, or alum or astringents in stick/lump form? If any present, note type and photograph.		

Guidelines section 4.B.5	Salon does NOT have a UV light box anywhere in the salon space?		
Sanitation Practices & Status			
4.13	Re-usable metal tools (clippers, scissors, etc.) are sanitized between clients. Sanitation is done by pre-washing and using either: US FDA registered dry heat sterilizer or autoclave ONLY.		
4.10, guidelines section 4.D	The following are single-use tools that are disposed of between clients: toe separators, cotton balls, pumice stones, non-metal files, flip flops. (look for workers saving instead of throwing out)		
4.12, guidelines section 6.C, 6.D	All manicure stations and foot baths not in use appear clean and sanitized? (Check for ring around foot bath basin, liquid or dust on manicure tables, dirty filters in pedicure chair, etc.)		
4.14	If the salon offers waxing, single-use containers or applicators are used so as to prevent "double dipping". Check to make sure wax is free of contaminants.		
Which types of products are used to sanitize foot baths and manicure tables?		<input type="checkbox"/> 10% bleach solution <input type="checkbox"/> EPA approved disinfectant <input type="checkbox"/> 70% or greater isopropyl alcohol	

Inspection Notes and Correction Orders	

Inspection Results:

- Pass
- Fail (check all that apply)
 - Warning Issued
 - Notice of Violation will be issued from the office which may contain fines and/or permit suspension