



The Sewerage & Water Board OF NEW ORLEANS

625 ST. JOSEPH STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70165
504.529.2837 OR 52.WATER
www.swbno.org

July 2, 2026

Addendum No. 2

Your reference is directed to the Request for Proposal for: **2026-SWB-39 Customer Information System (CIS) Software and Services** for the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans which proposals are due on **July 14, 2026**, at **11:00 a.m.** CST.

This addendum provides for the following:

1. Answers to Questions.
2. Posting of Pre-Proposal Attendance Sheet

-
1. How many utility accounts per service does the Board manage?

Answer: Please see RFP Section 2.2.6

2. Has a budget range been identified for this project? If so, could you share the estimated implementation cost, annual operating cost, and anticipated term (in years)?

Answer: The Board reserves the right to not share budget at this time and expects bidders to calculate their pricing based on our provided requirements.

3. Does the project have an anticipated Go-Live target date(s)? If a phased approach is preferred is there a tentative go-live schedule based on module or department?

Answer: No go-live date has been set. Per RFP Section 1.12, the Evaluation Committee meeting and Award of Contract dates are listed as TBD. Implementation timing, including any phased approach, will be established with the selected Proposer following award.

4. Has the Board seen any product demonstrations in the last 12 months leading up to the release of this RFP? If so, which products have you seen?

Answer: The Board will evaluate each vendor independently and will select the software and implementor that best fits our needs.

5. Does the Sewer and Water Board have flexibility to go over the \$4.75M budget seen in the CIP?

Answer: Please see Question 2

6. It is our understanding that *** is acting as SWBNO's advisor for this RFP. They are an Oracle Solutions Implementer and a direct competitor to other Oracle Solutions Implementers. We request that they do not participate in the proposal evaluations. If they are allowed to assist in the selection process, we would like to request that they be granted access only to a redacted proposal with our proprietary information removed.

Answer: The Board has contracted this consultant, and they will remain a part of our proposal process in a consulting capacity. They are contracted to evaluate each proposal on how well the software offered meets our technical and functional requirements. The Proposer is welcome to provide a redacted version for submission and review by the Board's consultant for this evaluation. An unredacted version must still be submitted for review by the Board's selection committee members.

7. Can SWBNO confirm the name of the current CIS vendor and whether any incumbent vendor resources will support transition activities?

Answer: Please see RFP section 2.2. We do not expect the incumbent vendor to support the transition.

8. What are the primary operational challenges SWBNO is experiencing with the current CIS environment that are driving this replacement initiative?

Answer: Please see RFP Section 2.2.

9. Can SWBNO provide the anticipated budget range allocated for software implementation, licensing/subscription, and ongoing support services?

Answer: Please see question 2.

10. Are there any additional customer account categories beyond those listed in the RFP that should be supported in the proposed solution?

Answer: Account categories are as identified in RFP Section 2.2.6 and the Functional System Specifications workbook.

11. Can SWBNO confirm the number of active billing cycles currently used for utility billing operations?

Answer: The Board bills 40 cycles per month; 20 mechanical meter cycles and 20 smart meter cycles.

12. Will SWBNO provide the current utility rate schedules, fee structures, and billing calculation methodologies to support implementation planning?

Answer: Rate schedules, fee structures, and billing calculation methodology will be provided to the selected Proposer following contract award.

13. Does SWBNO currently perform any non-standard billing cycles such as seasonal, annual, or special-cycle billing that must be supported?

Answer: The Board does not support seasonal or annual billing, but does bill certain accounts under both a capped method, flat rate per state law, etc.

14. Should the proposed CIS support off-cycle billing adjustments, rebilling scenarios, and mid-cycle recalculations as part of standard billing operations?

Answer: The Functional System Specifications (Billing tab) include requirements for bill recalculation and rebilling, including cancel/rebill and rebilling of an adjusted bill. Proposers should respond to the relevant specification items directly.

15. Can SWBNO provide sample copies of current customer bills, delinquency notices, disconnect notices, and customer communication templates currently in use?

Answer: These will be provided to the selected Proposer following contract award.

16. Who is SWBNO's current provider for bill printing, mailing, and bill presentment services?

Answer: Bills are generated as a PDF from the current CIS, and the file is currently sent to a third-party vendor for printing and mailing.

17. Is SWBNO open to evaluating alternative print and mail service providers as part of the proposed solution architecture?

Answer: Vendors are welcome to provide optional services in their proposal.

18. Are there any planned future service offerings, metering technologies, or rate structure changes that should be considered for long-term system scalability?

Answer: No plans at this time.

19. Which internal departments, beyond customer service and billing teams are expected to actively utilize the proposed CIS platform?

Answer: Please see RFP Section 2.2.6.

20. Will SWBNO require consolidated billing functionality for multiple utility services under a single customer account structure?

Answer: The Board currently bills water, sewer and sanitation under a single customer account. We do not provide other utility services.

21. Are there any customer assistance programs, discount programs, or special billing programs that must be configured within the new CIS platform?

Answer: Yes.

22. Should late fees, penalties, or delinquency workflows vary based on customer type, account class, or service category?

Answer: Yes.

23. Will the customer self-service portal require delegated account access for landlords, property managers, or authorized third parties?

Answer: The Board currently has a customer self-service portal and is not requesting a customer portal in this RFP. Vendors are welcome to offer optional services in their proposal. Landlord functionality is not yet available but would be considered.

24. Is multilingual support required for customer portal access, billing communications, or customer notifications beyond standard accessibility compliance?

Answer: Yes.

25. Should SMS/text notification services be integrated with an existing SWBNO-approved vendor, or should proposers include notification services within their solution?

Answer: SMS text notification capability is a stated requirement in the Functional System Specifications. Either approach, integration with an existing notification tool or a Proposer's own capability, is acceptable, consistent with the Future State Middleware/best-in-breed approach described in RFP Sections 2.2.1 and 4.7.5.

26. Can SWBNO confirm whether all listed third-party systems require real-time integration or whether certain integrations can operate through scheduled batch processing?

Answer: Real-time integration between modules is generally preferred per RFP Section 4.7.5. Batch processing may be acceptable for specific interfaces where appropriate; this will be confirmed through the Functional Specifications and implementation planning.

27. Which external systems will require bidirectional synchronization with the proposed CIS platform, including customer data, service requests, meter data, and operational records?

Answer: Systems expected to interface with the new CIS are identified in RFP Section 2.2.1.

28. How many years of historical customer, billing, payment, and meter consumption data are expected to be migrated into the new system?

Answer: SWBNO needs to keep all data currently stored in CSM (October 2016 to present) in some form. SWBNO is open to discussing options with the chosen vendor.

29. Approximately how many SWBNO personnel will require administrator, power-user, and end-user training during implementation?

Answer: Please see Section 2.2.6.

30. Does SWBNO prefer an onsite, remote, or hybrid training approach for implementation and knowledge transfer activities?

Answer: Per RFP Section 4.7.6, end-user and technical implementation training is expected to be conducted onsite by the Proposer. A Train the Trainer or hybrid approach is also expected for key SWBNO team leads.

31. Approximately how many internal users will require role-based system access licenses within the proposed CIS platform?

Answer: Please see Section 2.2.6.

32. Can SWBNO provide the estimated number of customers expected to actively utilize the customer self-service portal after implementation?

Answer: The Board currently has a customer self-service portal and is not requesting a customer portal in this RFP. Vendors are welcome to offer optional services in their proposal.

33. Is a native mobile application for iOS and Android expected as part of the project scope, or will a mobile-responsive portal satisfy requirements?

Answer: The Board is expecting that utility staff will access mostly via PC-based web browsers. Any mobile access would be acceptable via mobile-responsive.

34. What projected customer account growth or service expansion rates should proposers consider for long-term infrastructure and scalability planning?

Answer: The Board's customer count has remained fairly consistent for the past 5 years.

35. Will SWBNO require support for parallel run operations between the legacy CIS and new platform during transition and go-live activities?

Answer: Please see RFP Section 4.7.1.

36. Can SWBNO provide the list of firms or vendors that have registered or attended the mandatory pre-proposal meeting for this solicitation?

Answer: Consistent with the Board's practice on the prior CIS solicitation, attendance information from June 23, 2026, mandatory pre-proposal meeting is being compiled by Procurement.

37. Proposal Extension: Given the high level of technical detail required for this fully integrated CIS, CRM, and Business Analysis solution, would the Board consider an extension to the current July 14, 2026, proposal due date?

Answer: At the June 23, 2026, pre-proposal meeting, the Board indicated it was not extending deadlines at that time but would confer with the requesting department if asked. The proposal due date remains July 14, 2026, 11:00 a.m. CST, unless and until changed by addendum.

38. Inquiry Deadline: Can the Board confirm if any addenda resulting from the June 24 inquiry deadline will include a revised schedule if an extension is granted?

Answer: Addendum No. 1 (June 25, 2026) extended only the question-response publication date, to July 2, 2026. It did not revise the proposal due date or other schedule milestones. Any further schedule changes will be addressed by subsequent addendum, per RFP Section 1.6.

39. Could you provide an extension to the proposal due date (currently July 14, 2026) to allow for the technical complexity of the project?

Answer: See response to Question 37.

40. Are we allowed to use offshore or near-shore development resources, specifically if they are permitted to work on the project while accessing data via onshore servers to comply with the requirement that data be stored in the United States.

Answer: Please see Section 4.7.3.

41. Offshore Resources: While the RFP specifies that all SWBNO data must be stored within the United States, are offshore or near-shore development resources permitted to work on the project if they access data exclusively through onshore servers as outlined in the Data Conversion section?

Answer: See response to Question 40.

42. Cloud Deployment Model: Is the proposed solution a private or public vendor-hosted/cloud solution, and what are the specific impacts on the Board's network and bandwidth?

Answer: The RFP requires a vendor-hosted/cloud solution (RFP Sections 1.1, 2.2.3; Minimum Criteria Checklist) but does not mandate a private versus public cloud model. Proposers should describe their proposed hosting model per RFP Section 4.6. Network and bandwidth impacts will depend on the proposed solution and the current environment described in RFP Section 2.2.2.

43. Security and Authentication: Does the solution fully support Single Sign-On (SSO) via MS Active Directory (Azure/Entra) to align with current technology standards?

Answer: The Board expects that the chosen solution will integrate with Azure/Entra SSO.

44. Middleware Integration: How will the solution interface with the "Future State Middleware" to manage interactions with other cloud applications like Oracle Cloud Financials and Trimble Unity?

Answer: Per RFP Section 2.2.1, the Future State Middleware is intended to manage interactions and interfaces between all future cloud applications, including Oracle Cloud Financials and Trimble Unity (Cityworks). SWBNO will be purchasing and implementing this middleware once remaining vendors are chosen. APIs are the preferred integration pattern.

45. Key Account Management: How does the proposed solution identify and manage "key" accounts that require priority attention, and does it allow for the tracking of comments by specific account managers?

Answer: Per RFP Section 2.2, the CIS is expected to identify, manage, and flag "key" accounts requiring priority attention, with the ability to track comments by key account managers. The specific approach is for the Proposer to describe in its proposal.

46. SmartMeter Integration: Can you describe the process for integrating with SmartMeter to receive monthly reads and how the system handles the validation or estimation of those readings?

Answer: Per RFP Section 2.2, the CIS is expected to integrate with SmartMeter (Sensus) to receive monthly meter reads, with validation and estimation of readings where necessary. The specific integration process is for the Proposer to describe in its proposal.

47. Delinquency Management: How does the system automate delinquency cycles, specifically the management of multiple notices per account and the issuance of disconnection notices?

Answer: Per RFP Section 2.2, the CIS is expected to manage delinquency cycles, including multiple notices per account and disconnection notices. The specific automation approach is for the Proposer to describe in its proposal.

48. Reporting and Analytics: What "out-of-the-box" reports are included to support utility business analysis, and what is the process for the Board to develop custom reports during implementation?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

49. Methodology: Does the Proposer's project management approach strictly adhere to the PMI's PMBOK standards as requested?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

50. Onsite Presence: Can the vendor commit to a fully dedicated Project Manager with a significant onsite presence throughout the engagement?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

51. Data Migration: What is the recommended approach for data scrubbing and cleansing from the legacy Cogsdale CSM system before it is migrated to the new Financial System?

Answer: Please see section 4.7.3. The vendor is expected to recommend an approach.

52. Operational Redesign: How does the vendor assist in a Board-wide redesign of the chart of accounts to leverage the system's financial tracking capabilities?

Answer: Please see section 4.7.9. The vendor is expected to recommend an approach.

53. Training Options: How do the "End User Training" and "Train the Trainer" approaches differ in terms of the documentation provided and the suggested timeframes?

Answer: Per RFP Section 4.7.6, End User Training is delivered onsite by the Proposer for all end-users; Train the Trainer is a hybrid approach for training key SWBNO team leads.

Documentation types and suggested timeframes for each are to be proposed by the Proposer, per RFP 4.7.6 and the Training Form.

54. Post-Go-Live Support: Will the Proposer provide the required minimum of three months of post-implementation support, including having a majority of the project team onsite for the first month?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

55. Knowledge Transfer: What specific methodology is used to ensure SWBNO staff can independently maintain, configure, and modify the system once the implementation is complete?

Answer: This is addressed through RFP Section 4.7.12 (Knowledge Transfer), which requires the Proposer to describe its own methodology for transferring knowledge to Board staff.

56. DBE Goals: How does the proposer plan to meet the 6% Economically Disadvantaged Business Program (DBE) participation goal, and are the selected firms SLDBE or LaUCP certified?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

57. Living Wage: Can the proposer confirm that all "covered employees" working on this contract will receive the required Living Wage of \$15.56 per hour?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

58. Maintenance Agreements: How are subscription fees determined, and how are local customizations maintained when the vendor installs new software releases?

Answer: This does not appear to be a question for the Board.

59. For Client References (Section 4.11), are similar-size utility references (in customer count, geography, or services) required, or are other industry references acceptable?

Answer: Please see RFP Section 4.11.

60. How will the Selection Committee weight references that demonstrate vendor-hosted/cloud deployments specifically?

Answer: Please see RFP Sections 3.2.1–3.2.2.

61. Are there specific PCI-DSS, NIST, SOC 2, or FedRAMP compliance requirements the hosted solution must meet?

Answer: Per the Technical and Vendor Hosting Requirements Form, the hosted solution must comply with PCI-DSS and NIST and must undergo an annual SSAE 18 SOC 2 Type 2 audit with no unaddressed material findings. FedRAMP is not listed as a requirement.

62. Are there any SWBNO-specific security policies or audit requirements beyond the cloud provider's standard certifications?

Answer: Security requirements are as stated in the Technical and Vendor Hosting Requirements Form (identification/authorization capabilities, directory services interoperability, cybersecurity controls, forensic logging). No additional undisclosed requirements beyond what is published.

63. Please confirm the EDBP participation goal (6%) and how it will be evaluated for vendor-hosted/cloud SaaS solutions where most labor is software/IP rather than subcontracted services.

Answer: Per RFP Section 4.14, the EDBP goal is 6%. This requirement applies to implementation fees only and does not apply to SaaS/software fees.

64. Integration: The Trimble Unity (CityWorks) implementation is scheduled to start in Q3 2026. Are you planning on using CityWorks for short and long cycle order management? Please provide details. What is the timeline for completion of the implementation? When will you have the exact integration requirement identified relative to the CIS project start? What is your current EAM system? Will you go live with this solution if CityWorks is not yet live.

Answer: Trimble Unity will be used for field services and enterprise asset tracking. As a utility, the Board is not involved in cycle order management. The EAMS timeline will be shared with the winning bidder. The integration requirement is currently determined to be that the chosen CIS will be able to integrate with Trimble Unity for any field services required for meter services (turn-on, turn-off, meter replacement, etc.). Each system's implementation will proceed on their own negotiated timeline.

65. Section 4.76 Training: Does the Board have an internal training resource or plan to have training resources for the project?

Answer: Yes, but we expect the vendor to provide significant training resources for both end-users, SMEs and Administrators.

66. The Proposer must list the nature, level, and amount of training to be provided for both options (End User and Train the Trainer) Do you prefer we provide a response for our preferred training approach (end user, train-the-trainer, hybrid) or do you want an optional proposal for all three models?

Answer: Please see Question 30.

67. Section 4.7.2. The Board requires significant onsite presence from the vendor - Project Manager. In the previous evaluation meeting on May 21, the Board mentioned a need for 100% onsite presence by the Project Manager. Please confirm the requirements for the level of onsite presence by the Project Manager.

Answer: The Board would prefer a 100% dedicated Project Manager from the vendor, as the Board will also have a 100% dedicated PM. The PM's onsite presence should be determined by vendor based on availability, but the Board expects that it be greater than 50%.

68. Pricing Form on the Project Totals tab, the calculated cell for "Staffing Plan Total Hours" in cell J33 appears to populate from a Tab that no longer exists, resulting in a significantly negative number calculating in Cell J35. Please confirm this is acceptable as long as the listed Professional Services Hours on the Pricing Form match the total hours listed for the Vendor on the separately submitted Staffing Plan Excel document.

Answer: This is acceptable and will be noted by the cost analysis.

69. Section 4.7.3 Data Migration. Does the Board have on-staff knowledge for the Cogsdale system data conversion extract and transformation?

Answer: The Board has technical staff with general knowledge of the database and structure of CSM, but a vendor's previous CSM migration experience would be helpful.

70. Section 4.7.4 Data Analytics, Report and Form Development. Does the Board have on-staff knowledge for Microsoft Power BI report creation and management?

Answer: The Board has some Power BI knowledge, but if the solution requires BI report creation knowledge, training will be required.

71. Section 4.7.9 Operational Re-design. Please clearly describe the end goal for the GL re-design?

Answer: This section does not mention GL re-design. Please note that our new financial system (Oracle Cloud Fusion) maintains the GL chart of accounts and the new CIS solution will need to follow that.

72. General. What are the operational hours of the Board's core business operations? Are they standard business hours (8 AM – 5 PM local time), or do they run 24/7 critical shifts that require round-the-clock Severity 1 coverage? What is your current SLA requirement for the existing system? What is your current baseline legacy ticket volume (by severity) over the past 6 to 12 months? Do you currently utilize any learning management system for an internal knowledgebase?

Answer: The Board is a 24/7 utility with Emergency Support after-hours. Our lobby is typically open 8am-5pm on regular workdays. Our current system is maintained and managed on-premises and is typically available 24/7 with minor occasional maintenance windows as needed. The Board will share ticket volume with the winning vendor.

73. CRM. Do you use CRM for any specific purposes today? If so, please provide examples and desired end goals. Is CRM currently used today to make up for lacking functionality in the CIS? Please explain. Do you currently use any form of campaign / marketing management? Please provide examples. What is the purpose of tracking Potential Customers? Are these commercial / Industrial customers? Please provide examples. How does a "Potential Customer" transition to a "Customer"? What happens if a Potential Customer does not become a customer?

Answer: The Board does not currently utilize CRM. The Board is a sole-source city-wide water utility and does not participate in marketing campaigns to attract or track potential customers.

74. AI and Omnichannel functionality. Please elaborate on your desire to use AI with the proposed solutions. Please elaborate on your desire to use Omnichannel channel communications. What is the count for CSR allocations for chat interactions? What is the monthly number of CSR inbound and outbound minutes.

Answer: The RFP does not state any desire to use AI or Omnichannel communications. Any AI usage in a proposed solution will be evaluated and must maintain strict controls, especially with access to customer data. The Board will determine what AI usage is acceptable during implementation.

75. The date in the end of Reference Form Attachment says no later than Feb 3,25. We need to clarify the new dates. This will help us determine if you want those forms right away with the RFP or after shortlist presentations.

Answer: The Client Reference Forms are due on the same date and time as the RFP Response.

76. Do you want the different forms in attachment 2026-SWB-39 RFP-CIS Software and Services - Vendor Forms filled in the form itself or should we identify, acknowledged and address each line item in respective sections in the RFP written response document?

Answer: Both. Per RFP Section 4.4 and similar language used throughout Section 4.7, Proposers are directed to address each item in the corresponding narrative section in addition to completing the corresponding standalone form. The forms do not substitute for addressing items in the written proposal.

77. On the specifications workbook - there are some whose priority is indicated as 'I' - however, there is no provided definition for that code. We only have definitions for H, M, L.

Answer: Per the Specifications workbook (Set-Up tab), Priority code “I” stands for “Information Only.”

78. On the specifications workbook – Drop down on Complexity level does not work on most of the tabs. Are we allowed to edit the formatting on that?

Answer: Once a Vendor Response requiring a complexity entry is made, the Complexity Level cell should highlight and the dropdown should function. If it still does not work, open the file in the Excel desktop application rather than a browser or SharePoint view.

79. What is the anticipated timeline from submission of proposals to vendor selection/award? Can you identify target dates (or date ranges) for various milestones of the review and selection process, to include identification of a short list of vendor proposals, finalist demonstrations, BAFO and selection/award?

Answer: Per RFP Section 1.12, the Evaluation Committee meeting and Award of Contract dates are listed as TBD. During the June 23, 2026, pre-proposal meeting, Procurement confirmed whether a short list or a Best and Final Offer process will be used has not yet been decided; that decision will be made by the Selection Committee after Round 2 scoring is complete.

80. What is the anticipated implementation timeline from project kickoff to go live, identifying target dates for both?

Answer: No implementation timeline has been established. Per RFP Section 4.7.1, a detailed work plan and schedule will be proposed by the Proposer and finalized with the selected Proposer following award.

81. When does your current CIS provider sunset their support of your current CIS system? What is the contract end date?

Answer: Please see section 2.2.

82. Who is the consultant assisting with the RFP?

Answer: Please see Question 6. The Board will not share the name of the consultant in this forum.

83. The posting of Pre-Proposal Attendance Sheet will be posted to the SWBNO website

The changes, additions, and/or deletions included herein are hereby made part of the solicitation documents for 2026-SWB-39 Customer Information System (CIS) Software and Services, as fully and completely as if the same were set forth therein. The proposer shall be responsible for having knowledge of all addenda issued for this RFP.

***** END OF ADDENDUM *****

Please write legibly



PRE-PROPOSAL ATTENDANCE SHEET

PROJECT: RFP - <u>CIS Software and Services 2026-SWB-39</u>			MEETING DATE: June 23, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.	
PLACE/ROOM: Microsoft TEAMS/Saint Joseph Executive Board Room			FACILITATOR: Cash K. Moses, Procurement Director	
NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	DBE FIRM	EMAIL
Prentice Mackyeon	Purchasing Agent	SWBNO		pmackyeon@swbno.org
Tony Johnson	App Sales Manager	Orack		Tony.H.Johnson@orack.com
Nicole Kelly-Gaines	UCSM	SWBNO		nkelly@swbno.org
Keith James	UCSM	SWBNO		kjames@swbno.org
Angel Johnson	EDBP Compliance	SWBNO		ajohnson4@swbno.org
Irma Plummer		SWBNO		iplummer@swbno.org
Darrell Eilts	CIO	SWBNO		deilts@swbno.org
Renelle Brown	Interim CCSO	SWBNO		rbrowne@swbno.org
Nolan Brinkman	Sales Manger	Accenture		nolan.brinkman@accenture.com
Cashanna Moses	Procurement Director	SWBNO		cmoses@swbno.org
Malcolm Garrett		SWBNO		mgarrett@swbno.org
Rojeen Abedini		Cayenta		Rabedini@cayenta.com
Yann Lalisie		Sprypoint		No Email Sent
Cory Boggess		Utility Solutions		corey.boggess@utilitysolutionsllc.com
Brad Masterson		Accenture		brad.masterson@accenture.com
Bobby Tolleson		Abjayon		bobby.tolleson@abjayon.com
Carolyn Terry		Denovo		Cterry@denovo-us.com
Erin Ennis		Harris Computer		eennis@harriscomputer.com

Please write legibly



PRE-PROPOSAL ATTENDANCE SHEET

PROJECT: RFP - <u>CIS Software and Services 2026-SWB-39</u>			MEETING DATE: June 23, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.	
PLACE/ROOM: Microsoft TEAMS/Saint Joseph Executive Board Room			FACILITATOR: Cash K. Moses, Procurement Director	
NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	DBE FIRM	EMAIL
Nic Lowry		Accenture		nic.lowry@accenture.com
Steven Hic		Accenture		steven.hic@accenture.com
Ryan Heckman		i3Verticals		rheckman@i3verticals.com
Corey Labor		Origin Utility		clabor@originutility.com
Nonna Horton		Utility Solutions		nonna.horton@utilitiesolutions.com
Trisha Innis		i3Verticals		tinnis@i3verticals.com
Josh Wolf		Harris Computer		Jwolf@harriscomputer.com
Erin Danielle Romo		Abjayon		erin.romo@abjayon.com
Rachel Schoutz		Itineris		Rachel.Schoutz@itineris.com
Rujul Sharma		TSCTI		rujuls@tscti.com
Shannon Martin		Itineris		Shannon.Martin@itineris.com
Lily Foks		Coresphere		Lily.Foks@coresphere.com
Doug Gardner		Sprypoint		No Email Sent
Darren Germundson		Accenture		darren.germundson@accenture.com
Sylvia Gedge		Univerus		Sgedge@univerus.com
Mikey Middlestedt		Red Clay		mikey.middlestedt@redclay.com
NaZyia Reece		BAA Consulting		zyia.reece@baaconsulting.org
Kelsey Shaner				No Email Sent
Kimberly Williams		Itineris		Kimberly.Williams@itineris.net

Please write legibly



PRE-PROPOSAL ATTENDANCE SHEET

[illegible]