

# CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS Department of Procurement and Contracting Services KATJANA BALLANTYNE MAYOR

| Го:    | Proposers of RFP 25-33 CMMS/EAM and Associated Implementation and Configuration Services |  |
|--------|--|--|
| rom:   | Andrea Caruth, Deputy Chief Procurement Officer  |  |
| Date:  | April 04, 2025   |  |
| Re:    | Response to Proposer Questions   |  |
|        | Addendum No. 1 to RFP 25-33  |  |
| **Plea | se note: the Bid Opening General Contractors remains 04/16/2025, 2PM**                   |  |
| •      | This addendum responds to proposer questions.  |  |
| •      | The City will answer questions received after 3/31/2025 in addendum 2.                   |  |
|        |  |  |

Failure to acknowledge this addendum may result in bid disqualification.\*\*

NAME OF COMPANY / INDIVIDUAL:

| ADDRESS:       |                       |    |    |    |
|----------------|-----------------------|----|----|----|
| CITY/STATE/ZIF | <b>:</b>              |    |    |    |
| TELEPHONE/FA   | X/EMAIL:              |    |    |    |
| SIGNATURE OF   | AUTHORIZED INDIVIDUAL | -: |    |    |
| ACKNOWLEDG     | EMENT OF ADDENDA:     |    |    |    |
|                | Addendum #1           | #2 | #3 | #4 |

| #       | Questions   | Response  |
|---------|---|---|
|         | GENERAL   |   |
| 1       | Can the Bid Bond requirement be waived for this RFP as it is not typically required for this type of procurement.   | The Bid Bond is not required for this RFP. The bid bond reference and requirement online on BidExpress have been removed.   |
| 2       | Sections D. Implementation Approach and E. Functional and Technical Suitability each have a 10-page limitation. That limits what Vendors can convey about the bulk of the CMMS/EAM system functionality — would you consider increasing the page limitation to 15 pages to allow for more clarity of the implementation and all the functionality the system has to offer? It would give you a better idea of the system you would be evaluating. | Sections D. Implementation Approach and E. Functional and Technical Suitability page limits have been increase to 12 pages each.  |
|         | BUILDINGS / FACILITIES  |   |
| 3       | What is the number of city owned buildings/facilities currently under City control that will be managed by this system?   | Buildings are not included in Phase 1, however, the City manages 37 City-owned and 6 rented municipal and public school buildings as of the time of this response.  |
| 4       | What is the Gross Square Footage of these Buildings/facilities?   | The total gross square footage of these buildings is approximately 1,720,000 SF as of the time of this response.  |
|         | OTHER   |   |
| 5       | Have you had any software demos/meetings with vendors for this project? If so, which solutions?   | Yes. Demos to staff for educational purposes were conducted in the summer of 2023. However, there is no current preferred vendor.   |
| 6       | Has the City worked with a consultant on the asset management program and RFP development? If so, who, and will the consultant be involved in the evaluation process for this RFP?  | Yes. Hazen and Sawyer has been supporting the City's Asset Management Program and will be involved in the evaluation process for this RFP.  |
| <u></u> | PRICING / FUNDING   |   |
| 7       | Does the City want proponents to include costs for implementation of any subsequent phases for the additional assets listed or will that be an additional project for the subsequent phases?  | One time costs should only include assets listed in Phase 1. The City does not want proponents to include costs for implementation of any subsequent phases for the additional assets listed. However, if the inclusion of additional asset classes not included in Phase 1, but likely to be incorporated into the |
| 8       | Please confirm pricing requested is for Phase 1 only.   | solution in the future, have an impact on the   |

| 9  | Should cost proposals include only the assets listed for Phase 1?  Is this project currently budgeted and if   | recurring cost, proponents should document this in the price proposal cover letter. This applies to potential recurring costs (i.e. licensing, hosting, etc.) resulting from Phase 2 to include, but not be limited to, additional asset class/system modules or the incorporation of additional assets and types.  Yes, the project is currently budgeted and part |
|----|--|---|
| 11 | not, will the pricing be used for upcoming fiscal year budget requests?  Is there a budget for this CMMS/EAM   | of the City's operating budget.   |
| 12 | project? Can the City share the budget?  Is there a budget range or cap for this   |   |
|    | project for annual software and one-time implementation fees?  |   |
|    | FUTURE PHASES  |   |
| 13 | What is the expected timeline to begin and implement Phase 2?  | There is no expected timeline to begin and implement Phase 2. However, Phase 1 will be substantially complete before Phase 2 begins.  |
| 14 | What is the anticipated timeline for implementing Phase 2?   | There is no expected timeline to begin and implement Phase 2. However, Phase 1 will be substantially complete before Phase 2 begins.  |
| 15 | Fleet requirements are included in the functional requirements, but fleet is listed as being part of phase 2. Are phase 2 functional requirements being evaluated as part of this RFP? | Yes. The CMMS/EAM software selected should be able to expand to the assets not included in this RFP but are included in the City's Asset Management Program.  |
|    | EXISTING DATA  |   |
| 16 | What is the form and format of existing asset data to be migrated into the new platform (Work Order information, photos, related data)?  | The form and format of the existing asset data to be migrated into the new platform varies. Please refer to Table 2-4 in section 2.3.5 Data Migration of the RFP.   |
| 17 | Are there existing workflows that define business processes related to the maintenance of various asset types?   | Key processes and workflows have been defined. The City continues to review and document process flows.   |
| 18 | Does the City plan to initially implement new or existing workflows?   | Key processes and workflows have been defined. The City continues to review and document process flows. Existing workflows may be updated or modified to align with selected CMMS solution.   |
| 19 | Does the City have an existing library of PM procedures to be loaded into the system? Are they available for all asset classes?  | The City does not currently have a complete list of PM procedures/schedules for all assets included under Phase 1.  |

| 21 | What are the City's integration priorities? There are a number of potential integrations noted in the Appendix, does the City want to integrate with all of those systems or are there some systems that take priority over others?  Is your pavement and sidewalk assessment data in Esri? If only in IrisPro, is the data exportable to a csv/excel format? | The integrations listed in Appendix A, Attachment C are the existing systems at the City that the assets currently use or interact with. The CMMS/EAM system must be able to provide the designated integration or interface capabilities.  Yes. The City's pavement and sidewalk assesssement data is in the City's GIS.  |
|----|---|--|
| 22 | Does the City currently have access to an API in Munis for integration purposes?  PARTS INVENTORY   | Not yet. Data from MUNIS would be exported to the solution.  |
| 23 | Do you have a parts inventory?  | The City does not currently have a complete parts inventory or centralized warehouse   |
| 24 | What is the approximate number of inventoried parts in the current system?  | facility.  |
| 25 | How many warehouses are used to manage and store parts and supplies?  |  |
| 26 | Will parts inventory be included in Phase 1?  | No.  |
|    | USERS   |  |
| 27 | In reviewing Table 2-3 - Projected CMMS/EAM Users by Department, the user counts are the same for a few line items:  IT Dept and IAM - 3 users each (total 6 users)  IAM - Capital Projects and IAM Capital Engineering - 11 users each (total 22 users)  W&S Dept/Water Dept and W&S Dept/Sewer Dept - 24 users each (total 48 users)                        | Yes. Each department will potentially require user access. These are separate groups who are responsible for specific assets: IT, IAM, IAM - Engineering, IAM - Capital Projects, W&S Dept - Water Dept, and W&S - Sewer Dept.  Table 2-3 summarizes the projected numbers and types of users in each department and/or division. The tables included in the RFP are not inclusive and are provided for planning purposes. |
|    | Please confirm each will potentially require user access.   |  |
| 28 | What is the expected number of Requestor Users (users who can only submit and track work orders) for the CMMS/EAM system?   | Please refer to Table 2-3 in the RFP.  |

| 29 | How many concurrent users does the   | Please refer to Table 2-3 in the RFP. |
|----|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|    | City anticipate using the system? If |                                       |
|    | possible, group these into:          |                                       |
|    | a) Administrative                    |                                       |
|    | b) Supervisor/Team Lead              |                                       |
|    | c) Field Users                       |                                       |