

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 20-19

CIP Prioritization and Database Software and Consulting Services

Proposals Due: April 24, 2020 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes five (5) pages.**

The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment D - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment E - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment F - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: What has changed that makes this RFP a priority to the City?

Answer 1: The City is seeking a software solution that will integrate the prioritization and database functions into a single software as well as consulting services to assist in updating of the City's prioritization model and criteria. This will improve staff efficiency in producing the CIP and minimize IT time investment in maintaining needed software.

Question 2: When & How are funds approved now?

Answer 2: While approval of the CIP itself is by the City Planning Commission, funding approval rests with City Council. Each fall as the CIP is produced, City Finance staff prepare target budgets for each asset group. The draft CIP prepared by staff and presented to the Planning Commission proposes a schedule of projects for each asset group that fall within these targets. The approved CIP is then used by the City Administrator in preparation of the proposed annual capital budget which is then acted upon by City Council in spring.

Question 3: Please describe in detail how budget estimates are made now. If you are using a form/excel/doc, please provide a copy so we can insure.

Answer 3: Budget estimates are prepared by the staff member assigned to the project. Information from past similar projects is available to assist the staff member. No uniform estimate sheet is used.

Question 4: How many unique staff will be using this tool?

Answer 4: There are five principal users of the software in the City's Systems Planning and Finance Units. There are an additional dozen Project Engineers and other staff members who use the software less frequently.

Question 5: Is Microsoft Office 365 in use by the intended users for above

Answer 5: Yes.

Question 6: Please provide a copy of prioritization Excel & Access database to review for migration estimates

Answer 6: The prioritization model was created by a consultant who has limited our providing it in electronic form to others. We will be able to share it with the successful respondent at a later time. The Access database is run through a back-end Excel table. This table file will be published as a separate file with this Addendum 1 as A2CIPDatabase.xlsx.

Question 7: Please provide screenshots of CIP Details Form for Source(s), Other & Sustainability

Answer 7: See screenshots below.

The image displays two screenshots of a web-based 'CIP Details Form' for a project titled '1250 N Main Area Storm Main Relocation' with ID 'UT-ST-18-17'. The top screenshot shows the 'Source(s)' tab, which includes checkboxes for 'Outside Request?' (checked), 'Staff?' (checked), and 'Master Plan?' (unchecked). Below these are several dropdown menus for 'Condition Analysis' and other project details. The bottom screenshot shows the 'Other' tab, which contains fields for 'Current Budget' and 'Actual Expenditures' (both showing '\$0'), and a dropdown menu for 'Public Art Enhanced' next to a 'PublicArtBudget' field.

The screenshot shows a web application window titled "Project Information" with a sub-header "CIP Details Form". The main project name is "1250 N Main Area Storm Main Relocation" and the project ID is "UT-ST-18-17". There are search fields for "Find by Project Name" and "Find by Project ID". Below this is a navigation bar with tabs: "General Information", "Schedule/Funding", "Source(s)", "Other", and "Sustainability". The "Sustainability" tab is active, showing a grid of categories with checkboxes and dropdown menus:

- Climate and Energy** (checked): Sustainable Energy, Energy Conservation, High Performance Buildings.
- Land Use and Access** (checked): Transportation Options, Sustainable Systems (Modest), Integrated Land Use.
- Community** (checked): Engaged Community, Diverse Housing, Human Services, Safe Community (Modest), Active Living and Learning, Economic Vitality.
- Resource Management** (checked): Clean Air and Water (Modest), Healthy Ecosystems, Responsible Land Use, Local Food.

Question 8: For the map image in CIP Project Datasheet, will City provide an image file provided for each investment or is it expected the tool should provide this capability?

Answer 8: The City will provide the image.

Question 9: How are you currently tracking Assets for KPI, Maintenance schedules & Incident History?

Answer 9: The present CIP prioritization model and asset databases are not used for individual asset tracking. Those functions are handled by other software including Cityworks, ArcGis, and Assetic.

Question 10: Does resource capacity play a factor in when projects are scheduled?

Answer 10: Yes, although funding plays a much more significant role. Resource capacity is discussed but is not an item integrated into the present CIP software.

Question 11: Is it desirable to select investments that have the most strategic value to the City?

Answer 11: Yes. The prioritization model is built on that basis.

Question 12: Investment Execution: Is it desirable in future phase to add on features for Execution phase of your investments?

Answer 12: Yes. A Project Management software tool as a later add-on would be desirable but is not sought as part of this RFP. Software should, however, provide an API to extend the native functionality of the purchased application allowing the City to connect it to other City software (ex. Financial System).

Question 13: Investment Execution: Please identify any existing tools being used to manage the execution side of your investments.

Answer 13: No formal design/construction project management tools are employed. Projects are tracked by engineers and other project managers using a variety of spreadsheets. Fiscal tracking is handled by the City's Finance Unit utilizing New World Systems Logos software.

- Question 14: Is automated multi-user prioritization aggregation of investments preferred?
Answer 14: Ability to employ such a tool would be desirable. However, the City presently employs the prioritization model in a group setting which permits give and take discussion.
- Question 15: How many concurrent users are anticipated to have direct edit access to the software solution?
Answer 15: See Answer 4 for total number of users. However, the number using the software concurrently is unlikely to exceed 3.
- Question 16: Does the City utilize any other asset or project management software that would have a listing of vehicles and depreciation schedules?
Answer 16: Vehicles are not an asset included in the CIP and are not, thereof, an asset to be covered by the software sought in this RFP.
- Question 17: Proposal due date is listed as April 23rd on Page 7, Section O - SCHEDULE. Is the Proposal Due Date on April 23rd or April 24th?
Answer 17: This was simply a typographical mistake. Proposal responses are due Friday, April 24 before 2:00pm (local time) as listed on the cover page and Page 4 of the RFP Document.
- Question 18: Is there an established budget for the project?
Answer 18: No.
- Question 19: Given the Covid-19 situation, will a physical, sealed proposal submission still be required?
Answer 19: Yes, a physical sealed submission is required which can be mailed or hand delivered as outlined on Page 4 and 5 (F. Sealed Proposal Submission) of the RFP Document.
- Question 20: Does the city have a preferred cloud vendor they would like to engage for SaaS or cloud based solutions? If so, does the city have existing contracts that could be leveraged for hosting a cloud based or cloud hosted solution?
Answer 20: The City does not have a preferred cloud vendor or any contracts that can be leveraged at this time.
- Question 21: Should the hosting and software licensing be itemized separately in the Fee Proposal?
Answer 21: These two items may be listed separately in your detailed breakdown in the Fee Proposal. However, in the required Attachment B (Cost Summary Table), they should be summed together under the Annual License/Maintenance Cost item.
- Question 22: From a security perspective, is the city looking for a solution capable of supporting single sign on or identity management integration with City's existing authentication/authorization solution?
Answer 22: SSO is preferred but not required.
- Question 23: For integrations with city systems, does the city have a preferred integration method such as REST based APIs or will the mechanism have to vary by source system?
Answer 23: REST-based APIs are preferred, but not required. The City has experience integrating with both REST-based APIs and web services.
- Question 24: How many years of historical data will have to be loaded in the initial release of the system?
Answer 24: Only projects with Active or Programmed status will need to be transferred into the

new software. There are approximately 500 such projects.

Question 25: For solutions that run on existing platforms such as Microsoft Dynamics, SAP, etc., does the city have a preferred base ERP system they would like to see in this solution? If so, does the city have existing licenses they would like to reuse or include with this solution?

Answer 25: The City doesn't have a base ERP system so no need to include.

Question 26: Is there a preferred technology stack the city would like to see for this solution such Microsoft, Java, pure Open Source on Linux, etc.?

Answer 26: Microsoft would be preferred.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.