ADDENDUM #2

To:	All Companies Interested in Submitting a Proposal
From:	Diane Muench, CPPB, Purchasing Agent
Proposal:	Asset Management Solution, RFP #PUR0218-129
Subject:	Addendum #2 (6 pages)
Date:	February 28, 2018

Please note the following specification changes/additions/clarifications relative to the above Request for Proposal.

1) **Question**: 4.7: User numbers are different in 4.7.1 and 4.7.2. Which are correct?
   Answer: Use the numbers in the table in 4.7.2.

2) **Question**: 4.6.8: Is the Tyler Tech Asset Management system running SQL on a local server?
   Answer: Yes.

3) **Question**: 4.6.8: Is the Tyler Tech Asset Management system MUNIS?
   Answer: No. It was originally part of EnerGov.

4) **Question**: 4.6.8: Are you using all the solutions listed? Are you looking to replace any of these solutions?
   Answer: All the solutions are being used at this time; there is historical data in all of the solutions. Ideally, the City would like to have one single enterprise solution.

5) **Question**: Do you want a local or cloud solution?
   Answer: The City is open to a local solution, cloud solution or a hybrid solution.

6) **Question**: 4.3.8: Will there be any migration from these software systems?
   Answer: Yes. All systems are local, on-premise and are available. Ideally, all historical asset data should be migrated to new solution.

7) **Question**: 4.8: Is there a tree asset listing in GIS?
   Answer: Yes. ITree code set is used for classifying the species and is included.

8) **Question**: 4.3.1: Does the solution need to be installed by a certain date or will it be phased in over the 5-year period?
   Answer: By 01/01/19, a usable solution must be implemented and in production. Vendor shall provide the total cost for 5-years of usage.

9) **Question**: 4.6.5. What is Oracle used for?
   Answer: In relation to Asset Management, Oracle is the Database Management System for Utilities (Customer Care & Billing). There may be some asset information in CC&B that will need to communicate with an Asset Management solution.

10) **Question**: The City uses Cues CCTV inspection solution. Does this need to be included in the asset management solution?
    Answer: We are currently using GranitNet Version 3.2. Some level of integration would be nice, but it is not a requirement. A good amount of the data collected with GraniteNet in the

field with the TV trucks is migrated back into an office database (SQL). From there some of the assessment and attribute data for the assets are pulled back into the GIS database.

11) **Question**: 4.3.8 and 4.6: What do you want to achieve with each of these integrations? What data will flow from these systems to the asset system and vice versa.
Answer: The City would like to have basic data exchange between the systems listed. Please provide your solution's experience with interfacing with each of these systems.

12) **Question**: 4.3.10: Is the ability to link to outside websites necessary?
Answer: The ability to link to an external website from within the solution is a preference.

13) **Question**: 4.2.12 Definitions: How do the dates relate to the asset management system?
Answer: The dates were inaccurate. They should reflect February 1, 2018 rather than October 1, 2009.

14) **Question**: Is Network Fleet AVL or AVC Verizon included in the integration?
Answer: No, this software is not part of this project.

15) **Question**: What is the level of GIS integration required? What is the end goal?
Answer: Consume GIS layers and elements natively and use GIS data as the source of record for geographic information.

16) **Question**: How many potential tablet-type devices would be engaged in this process?
Answer: No more than 300. This does not include ToughBooks or vehicle laptops.

17) **Question**: 4.9.6: How can we demonstrate our application software?
Answer: Vendor shall provide information on the application software under Tab 3.0 of the proposal submittal. Some vendors will be invited to provide demonstrations of the software as part of the evaluation process.

18) **Question**: 4.3.7: Can you expand on what you are looking for regarding business intelligence and reporting?
Answer: The intention is to be able to utilize reports native to the asset solution as well as the ability to create customized reports.

19) **Question**: Are you looking for a solution whereby employees would be able to modify GIS activities in the field via a mobile application?
Answer: Employees need to modify asset information in the field, GIS or otherwise.

20) **Question**: 4.8: What are the Water Pollution Control assets?
Answer: Detention cells, control panels, LC, motors, pumps - all are included for potential integration in the future.

21) **Question**: 4.5.1: Does the City want the Vendor to provide hardware as part of the asset solution?
Answer: No - Vendor shall provide specifications only. The City will provide all hardware necessary.

22) **Question**: 4.5.6: Are you looking for a mobile app?
Answer: The ability to access the system from a mobile device is desired, whether it's provided through an app or another application.

23) **Question**: Is this a budgeted capital acquisition for on-premise solution only?
Answer: The City is open to on-site, cloud or a hybrid solution.

24) **Question**: Does the Vendor need to be on-site for implementation?
Answer: The Vendor needs to be on-site if the work requires it. The City can accommodate VPN access.

25) **Question**: Does the City prohibit offshore development?
Answer: No

26) **Question**: Does the City feel that known assets are captured in the current systems?
Answer: A majority of the known assets are accounted for in any of the current systems mentioned in the RFP. The City would prefer that all asset data would migrate into a single asset system.

27) **Question**: Are business assets documented and can they be shared?
Answer: Whatever documentation the City has related to assets can be shared with the vendor of the selected solution.

28) **Question**: 4.2.4: Is a mobile application with caching acceptable?
Answer: The system should be able to capture data in the field and sync to the system when the employee is able to connect.

29) **Question**: Are there any limitations to the budget for this project?
Answer: There is no firm budget. The City wants to be able to evaluate the Vendor's proposed solution.

30) **Question**: Has there been any vendor engagement prior to the release of the RFP?
Answer: Not to our knowledge.

31) **Question**: 4.6.2: Are there a specific assets kept in OnBase?
Answer: The City wants to keep OnBase for document storage, with a link in the asset management system to access the document. This access can be provided to OnBase via a URL.

32) **Question**: **Please Extend the response date.** Questions <u>are Due 2/23</u> with the <u>bid due 7 business days later</u>. At least an additional 2 weeks is required to give Cedar Rapids a chance to respond to the questions submitted and our team to review and incorporate your responses.
Answer: The proposal submittal deadline has been changed to Monday, March 19, 2018. The same submittal process will apply - see the RFP, Page 3.

33) **Question**: What is the primary reason to pursue this initiative now? Is there a specific reason the City's goal is to have the new asset management solution implemented and in production by January 1, 2019? Our assumption from that goal is you require a Single Phase (all departments and users go- live "at once") implementation, is that your requirement?
Answer: The current Asset Management solution is not meeting the City's collective needs. The City would like to have a new, replacement solution in place by January 2019.

34) **Question**: Can you please define the term "GIS-centric" and what this requirement means for the City of Cedar Rapids?
Answer: See Question #15.

35) **Question**: Does the City anticipate storing any assets outside of the geodatabase? For example vehicles, equipment, and other non-spatial assets.
Answer: That depends on the architecture of the selected replacement solution.

36) **Question**: Is the GIS division/department the "owners" of all City assets or merely the spatial data maintainers?

Answer: Spatial data maintainers.

37) *Question*: Has the City identified an Asset Manager position within Public Works?
Answer: No.

38) *Question*: What asset management / CMMS solution do your two water treatment plants and wastewater treatment plant use?
Answer: Two Water plants currently use an in-house system and are in the process of migrating to eRPortal. Wastewater treatment plant (WPC) is currently using MainSaver.

39) *Question*: Did a consultant help with the preparation of this proposal? If so, what is the name of the firm and will the firm be assisting in the vendor selection process?
Answer: No.

40) *Question*: Referencing 5.5, how many vendors does the city anticipate inviting to "first-round demonstrations"?
Answer: That depends on the number and quality of the RFP responses.

41) *Question*: We only provide unaudited financial statements. Will our submittal be considered?
Answer: Yes that is fine.

42) *Question*: Can you share the appropriate named users by user type?
   - Full system user (full system access):
   - Mobile users (how many device licenses should be considered for the scope of this project?)
   - Work requester (work or purchase requests only, not maintenance or procurement).
Answer: It is the City's preference that all named users are full system access users as well as mobile users.

43) *Question*: Can you provide a sample of a complex work order?
Answer: Fire department vehicle inspection would probably be our most complex work order.

44) *Question*: How many PM's schedules do you have today?
Answer: Hundreds of PM schedules citywide.

45) *Question*: 4.6.5: Can you provide a list of the Oracle applications that you want to integrate and what is their primary function?
Answer: Please see Question #9.

46) *Question*: Considering the City has multiple asset hierarchies distributed among several legacy systems, what percentage of rework do you think will be required to have a single hierarchy view in the new system?
Answer: The City cannot answer this question. This is part of what we are seeking from a vendor.

47) *Question*: What is the current system of record? Is it a single system or spread across multiple systems?
Answer: Spread across multiple systems referenced in this RFP.

48) *Question*: How many inventory warehouses currently exist?
Answer: See 4.6.8 in RFP. At least six solution categories are represented.

49) *Question*: 6.2.7: This item states that the Proposal Pricing Submittal Form should be included in our response, but Attachment C does not include that form. Could you provide that form?

Answer: Vendors shall disregard using the Proposal Pricing Submittal Form and shall instead provide a breakdown of the pricing in the Vendor's format.

50) *Question*: 4.3: Are there any current integrations between GIS and PeopleSoft, OnBase, etc.?
Answer: No current integrations between GIS and PeopleSoft. There is a current project linking GIS and OnBase but is not complete. There are integrations between GIS and custom-built applications.

51) *Question*: 3.1.1: Could you please clarify the intended length/end date of the initial term of the Contract? 3.1.1. states that the end date would be 12/31/18, but this seems to be an error since the stated implementation goal is 1/1/19.
Answer: The contract date will be determined by the schedule that is mutually agreed upon between the Vendor and the City.

52) *Question*: 3.3.1: Could you please further describe the payment arrangement you are suggesting, especially as pertains to payment being contingent on acceptance? Is the City proposing a single payment upon completion of implementation? Would it be open to paying license fees upon contract execution and services fees on a milestone basis?
Answer: Vendor shall provide their pricing structure, including anticipated milestone payments, with their submittal.

53) *Question*: The date listed in these definitions is October 1, 2009. Could you please clarify if that is the intended date or if it should be updated.
Answer: Please see Question #13.

54) *Question*: 4.2.12 & 4.2.14: We are proposing a complete asset management solution that includes licensed software, maintenance, and professional services. Could you please clarify if this is what is meant by the phrase "complete operating system" in this provision? (We would not be providing what might typically be referred to as an "operating system"—the underlying software that controls the basic functions of the City's computers).
Answer: The City seeks a self-contained, fully operational Asset Management solution that will function on the Microsoft operating systems.

55) *Question*: 4.9.15: Regarding the last sentence, "This includes, but is not limited to, all requirements of the State of Iowa and United States Government, whether or not specifically identified in this RFP": To what type of requirements does this refer? If you are aware of any of these state or federal requirements, could you please list them?
Answer: We are unaware of any requirements that are not stated in the RFP. Vendors can disregard this sentence.

56) *Question*: 4.9.15: The third sentence of this provisions states that, "All application software, system software and other components of the system shall remain the property of the vendor until acceptance by the City." In a software licensing situation, the change of ownership described here would not be applicable. Is the City open to a licensing model, and would it consider revising this provision it to make this clear?
Answer: The City is open to a licensing model.

57) *Question*: 4.9.16: The third sentence of this provisions states that, "All application software, system software and other components of the system shall remain the property of the vendor until acceptance by the City." In a software licensing situation, the change of ownership described here would not be applicable. Is the City open to a licensing model, and would it consider revising this provision it to make this clear?
Answer: See Question #56.

58) **Question**: 4.9.16: The fourth sentence of this provision states that, "The Vendor shall assume full financial responsibility until system acceptance testing has been completed successfully as mutually agreed upon by both parties." Could you please describe what the City means by "financial responsibility" in this clause?
Answer: The final payment would not be released until the system has been accepted by the City.

59) **Question**: 4.9.17: Annual upgrades and patches are included as part of our maintenance agreement and may be implemented at the City's election. We also support older versions for three years following the introduction of a new version. Does this meet the requirements of this provision?
Answer: This is acceptable to the City.

60) **Question**: 4.9.17: While we provide annual upgrades and patches as part of its maintenance, the user is responsible for implementation. In the event that the City wants assistance with the implementation, applicable service fees would apply. Does this meet the requirements of this provision?
Answer: This is acceptable to the City.

All addenda that you receive shall become a part of the contract documents and shall be acknowledged and dated on the bottom of the Signature Page (Attachment B). The deadline for sealed proposals is **Monday, March 19, 2018, before 3:00 pm CDT** at the Office of the City Clerk, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401.