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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RFP No.: 21-027** |  | **DUE DATE: JUNE 8, 2021** |

**ADDENDUM No. 2**

**for**

**COMPUTERIZED ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SOFTWARE PROJECT**

**DATE OF ADDENDUM: April 29, 2021**

**THE ATTACHED** addendum shall become as fully a part of the above-named RFP as if therein included and shall take full and complete precedence over anything contained to the contrary.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT:** Each respondent shall indicate acknowledgment of receipt of this addendum by signing below and submitting this addendum (this page only) with the proposal.

Each respondent shall be responsible for reading every item on the attached addendum to ascertain to what extent and in what manner it affects the work being proposed.

No attempt is made to list Addendum items in chronological order or in conformity with the Drawings to which they refer or which they affect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **NO CHANGE**  **CHANGE TO: 11:00am, Tuesday, June 8th, 2021** |
| **X** |

I acknowledge receipt of this addendum which shall become a part of the submitted bid.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **COMPANY NAME** |  | **PHONE** |
|  | | |
|  |  |  |
| **AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE** |  | **TITLE** |
|  | | |
|  |  |  |
| **SIGNATURE** |  | **DATE** |

The following is hereby made a part of this solicitation:

***VENDOR QUESTIONS:***

1. Can the County please provide more clarity on the proposal format requested under IV.C.1 Page Requirements? Items 1-10 listed do not include where to place Attachments A & B within the outline. County response: Vendor response to Attachment A should be included with Project Plan.
2. **Implementation Outline -** The RFP has an implementation outline included. Is responding in this format a requirement or can the respondent respond with a current best practice implementation process? County response: The implementation outline is the County’s general concept, but we welcome best practice suggestions and recommendations.
3. **JD Edwards Software API -** Does the County know if an API is available for the JD Edwards software? County response: API integrations are available.
4. **Citizen Connect Integration -** The RFP calls for integration with Citizen Connect in section C but refers to a citizen portal generically in Section A. Is the integration to Citizen Connect required, or is the County open to other possible options and alternatives? County response: Integration with Citizen Connect is not an immediate requirement but something we may be looking for in the future. Description of other options and alternatives as it relates to the vendor’s system will be considered.
5. **Data Conversion for Existing Systems -** There are a variety of existing systems listed as existing DPW programs. Will there be data conversion required from these systems into the new AMS? Are there other integrations (other than JD Edwards and Citizen Connect) required? County response: There will likely be data conversion and/or integration to varying degrees for each of the existing systems. The County does not intend to immediately stop using all the current asset-specific systems currently in place but would do so over time.
6. **Requirements Responses Section C & Attachment A -** Does the County require a response to requirements in Section C and Attachment A or only Section C? County response: Vendor should respond to and address items in Attachment A only. Attachment’s B and C are informational only.
7. **SimpleSigns & SimpleCulverts Data Conversion -** Regarding the County’s SimpleSigns AMS & impleCulverts AMS, does the County want data converted? If yes, what data points would the County like converted (Assets? Work History? Resources? etc.) County response: These two systems are more likely to be fully integrated into the new system right away than some of the others, so full data conversion would be necessary.
8. **SimpleSigns & SimpleCulverts Back-end Database -** What is the back-end database built on for the County’s SimpleSigns AMS & SimpleCulverts AMS? Could the County provide a small dataset or copy for review? County response: The database is Microsoft Access. Dataset example can be provided.
9. **811 System -** What system does the County use for its 811? County response: The State 811 “ticket” system interacts with Utilisynch which is used for the stormwater locates.
10. **Stantec RoadMatrix -** Can the County provide more details on their use of Stantec RoadMatrix? Will this continue to be used or is the intent of the RFP to replace RoadMatrix? County response: RoadMatrix is used for our PMA program. The County does not intent to replace RoadMatrix immediately but may transition this to the AMS in the future so integration would be the initial need.
11. **Citizen Connect integration -** Regarding the County’s citizen portal, Citizen Connect – is the County requiring integration to Citizen Connect, or is the County open to replacing Citizen Connect? Related, can the County tell us if Citizen Connect is Open311 compliant? County response: This would be a future application and could consist of integration or replacement. The current system is not Open311 compliant.
12. **County Oracle Enterprise Integration -** Will the County explain in detail their requirement for integration of transportation and stormwater assets with the County Oracle Enterprise database for data sharing and storage? Won’t this information be part of the new CMMS the County chooses to go with? County response: Yes, the information would be part of the new system.
13. **Tracking MOUs and IGAs -** How does the County currently track its MOUs and IGAs? County response: Tracking is currently manual/ad hoc.
14. **Incident Tracking for damage claims -** Section B, number 15, lists “Incident Tracking for damage claims.” as a requirement. Can the County please describe how it intends to utilize the CMMS for incident tracking for damage claims? County response: County is looking for functionality to track costs and other items associated with work performed (potentially multiple work events) related to a specific incident so accurate reports/claims can be developed.
15. **Permit Tracking Today -** Permit Tracking is mentioned throughout the RFP, how is the County currently tracking permitting, permit payment collection, and Land Management? County response: Tracking is currently manual/ad hoc.
16. **Permit Tracking Requirements -** Is Permit Tracking functionality required to be part of the CMMS selected by the County, or is the County open to being able to integrate the selected CMMS into its existing or a future permitting tracking system? County response: County prefers functionality in the new system to track permits.
17. **Emergency response, including in remote areas without communication infrastructure -** Can the County please clarify the requirement listed under Section B, number 18, “Emergency response, including in remote areas without communication infrastructure.” Is this a different way of phrasing a requirement of ‘offline access within the CMMS’? County response: Yes.
18. **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) asset tracking and compliance -** Can the County please describe in detail what it intends for requirement listed under Section B, number 19, letter l, “Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) asset tracking and compliance”? Does this mean the software must be ADA compliant itself, or does this mean the County wants to track ADA related assets and the conditions of those assets? County response: The requirement refers to tracking ADA related assets and attributes.
19. **Contracts Section B. No.19.Letter N. -** The County states “Contracts” as a requirement under Section B, number 19, letter n. Can the County please provide clarity around what it wants the CMMS to support related to “Contracts”? County response: Functionality/module to assist in tracking standing contracts and associated documents, expiration dates, etc.
20. Concurrent or unlimited licenses/subscriptions (NOT named user) Section C, number 6, letter e, the desired functionality asks for “concurrent or unlimited licenses/subscriptions (NOT named user)”. Since “NOT named user” is specifically called out, will the County reject any response which proposes named users? County response: County will not reject such responses but reiterates its preference for concurrent/unlimited.
21. **Safety and lock out/tag out (LOTO) -** Attachment A, number 9, letter m, lists “Safety and lock out/tag out (LOTO)” as a technical requirement. Can the County explain in detail what process(es) it is trying to accomplish related to this requirement, and what the intent of this requirement is? County response: Whether the system has functionality to integrate/develop LOTO requirements/procedures into certain work orders (e.g., a work order for a particular piece of equipment would provide the worker a procedure for de-energizing the equipment prior to work).
22. **Staff planning and utilization** - Attachment A, number 12, letter f, lists “Staff planning and utilization” as a technical requirement. Can the County clarify in detail what the desired outcome of this requirement is? County response: What functionality the system has for scheduling/rescheduling staff against system work orders.
23. **Work inspections scheduled or sequenced when add queue -** Attachment A, number 18, letter a, lists “Work inspections scheduled or sequenced when add queue.” as a technical requirement. Can the County describe what “or sequenced when add queue” means? County response: Wording is an administrative error. The requirement pertains to the ability to schedule work and inspections as well as to view multiple activities happening to the same asset or in the same area in order to create proper sequencing.
24. **Vendor Demonstrations -** How many vendor demonstrations has the County had as it pertains to CMMS applications in the past 24 months? What vendors have those demonstrations been with? County response: None. An outside consultant was used to assist in identifying and developing the salient and performance characteristics of the desired solution. This process is intended only to establish a performance standard. No brand names or proprietary systems are intended or inferred by way of this process. If any contractor believes to the contrary, they should contract the Procurement Specialist in charge of the solicitation.
25. The County specifically mentions that all work must be completed by June 30, 2022 to fulfill funding requirements.  Considering that an Asset Management Program requires on-going development over time, can the County elaborate on what future plans are being made to accommodate these future needs? County response: The County is looking for basic functionality and useability of the system to be complete by June 30, 2022. Arrangements for continuing development would be made at a later date with the selected vendor.
26. During the pre-bid conference, it was noted that this is not a replacement project, but rather a transition to a full Asset Management Program.  Can vendors therefore assume that not all data required to meet all of the listed objectives is available and that a process will need to be developed to meet some of the County’s objectives? County response: It is likely there will be gaps in data, but system functionality must be in place to receive data that is collected or discovered over time.
27. Would the County be open to a phased implementation approach that could include phases beyond the listed completion date of June 30, 2022? County response: The County is looking for basic functionality and useability of the system to be complete by June 30, 2022. Arrangements for continuing development would be made at a later date with the selected vendor.
28. Under ‘General System Requirements’, it is mentioned that either on-premise, cloud, or a hosted solution is acceptable, with a cloud solution being preferred.  Is the County therefore interested in hosting the application in its own cloud environment? County response: A final decision has not been made in this regard, and all options may be considered, though hosted or cloud solution is preferred.
29. Did the County receive any assistance with defining requirements for this RFP, and were any systems reviewed as part of that process? County response: An outside consultant was used to assist in identifying and developing the salient and performance characteristics of the desired solution. This is process is intended only to establish a performance standard. No brand names or proprietary systems are intended or inferred by way of this process. If any contractor believes to the contrary, they should contract the Procurement Specialist in charge of the solicitation.
30. Would the County consider extending the deadline an additional four weeks due to the multiple formatting and requirements revisions mentioned during the pre-bid call? County response: The County will and has agreed to extend the due date for three (3) weeks. Please note new date and time of 11:00am (our clock), Tuesday, June 8th, 2021.

***ATTACHMENTS:***

***GENERAL INFORMATION:***

**END OF ADDENDUM NUMBER TWO**

All other terms and conditions of the original RFP shall remain unchanged and the subsequent proposals received as a result of this solicitation shall be opened and evaluated in accordance with those terms and conditions.

Please sign the addendum signature page and return it with your proposal. Failure to acknowledge this addendum in writing may be cause for rejection of your proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Matt Stephens**  **Matt Stephens, CPPO, CPPB**  **Procurement Specialist** |