

NAPA SANITATION DISTRICT



January 23, 2018

ADDENDUM #1
RFP: COMPUTERIZED MAINTENACE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Closing January 26, 2018 at 3:00pm PST

Proponents are requested to incorporate the following clarifications noted below into the above proposal document in your possession and be governed accordingly.

This addendum is issued for the following purpose:

1. To respond to questions received by the District. Please refer to the attached.

All other terms and conditions will remain the same.

Regards,

Robin Gamble Holley

NOTE:

1. It is the bidders responsibility to ensure that all issued addenda are received in their entirety.
2. Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged in Appendix E of your submission. Bids received which do not acknowledge receipt will be rejected.
3. This addendum shall remain attached to and form part of the contact documents.

QUESTION #1: In Section D of the RFP (Proposal Format and Detail), two Section E's are listed as sections to be in the proposal. Should the Required Signature Forms be changed to Section F?

RESPONSE – Please change the second Section E to Section F

QUESTION #2: Page 10 says to email proposals and Excel files to Robin, but page 11 says email submissions will not be accepted. Can NapaSan clarify the email requirement?

RESPONSE - Remove reference to no electronic submittals on page 11.

QUESTION #3: Has the District received demonstrations from CMMS vendors in the past 12 months? If so:
a. Were any of these done on-site?
b. Who were the vendors?

RESPONSE – The District has not received any demonstrations from CMMS vendors in the past 12 months.

QUESTION #4: Has the District received demonstrations of CMMS systems by other local governments in the past 12 months?
a. If so, what systems did the District see?

RESPONSE – The District Committee has not received demonstrations of CMMS systems by other local governments in the past 12 months. Some Committee members have seen product demonstrations at various conferences.

QUESTION #5: Has the District sent the RFP to CMMS vendors?
a. If so, which vendors?

RESPONSE – NapaSan forwarded the RFP to several vendors and posted it on the NapaSan website. NapaSan has no knowledge at this point in time which vendors have the RFP or which vendors plan to submit a proposal. NapaSan remains hopeful that numerous proposals will be submitted for the selection process.

QUESTION #6: The RFP states on page 3, section A, last two sentences: “As part of this RFP, NapaSan is requesting vendors provide software purchase costs and implementation costs for their Solution. Although implementation services will not be awarded as part of this contract, the selected software vendor will be retained for implementation services under a separate contract later.”

Question: Is the District only interested in receiving proposals from software vendors that implement their own CMMS product, and not interested in proposals where an implementation partner implements the CMMS product?

RESPONSE – The District is looking to obtain separate costs for the software and implementation. If a particular software can only be implemented via an implementation partner, the District will consider that as an option.

QUESTION #7: What percent (estimate) of the districts linear/horizontal assets are held in the Esri database?

RESPONSE – Collection System assets are in GIS. Lateral line assets are not in GIS.

QUESTION #8: Has the District loaded vertical (facility, plant) assets into the Esri database? If so, what percent (estimate) of assets are held in the GIS database?

RESPONSE – The Treatment Plant assets are not in GIS. An asset register exists in Excel.

QUESTION #9: Please briefly describe the District’s Esri ArcGIS 10.5 architecture, including whether ArcGIS Server is used.

RESPONSE – Data utilized in Hansen is in shapefile format. The Engineering department has data in a personal geodatabase that has reached capacity. ArcGIS Server is not currently used; however, we have a license for it through the County.

QUESTION #10: Does the District desire data migration of historic work order, service request and/or other types of data from the Hansen and MP2 databases into the new CMMS system? (Exclusive of asset records)

RESPONSE – Yes. The District is currently deciding the timeframe threshold for data migration.

QUESTION #11: Are your current workflows/business processes documented?

RESPONSE – Our process workflows will be documented prior to configuration and should not be included in implementation costs.

QUESTION #12: Does the Hansen deployment reflect these current workflows/business processes?

RESPONSE – Yes.

QUESTION #13: Do you operate under any SLA (Service Level Agreements) and associated KPI’s, if so can these be provided?

RESPONSE – NapaSan does not currently operate under a SLA or KPI’s.

QUESTION #14: How are customer complaints/work requests received today?

RESPONSE – For the collection system, in a typical workflow, the work requests are generated internally; however, requests will also come in from the customer through the hotline and then entered manually into the system by the Supervisor. For the treatment plant, in a typical workflow the work requests are generated internally.

QUESTION #15: What version of Esri is currently being utilized?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the RFP.

QUESTION #16: What are the details of your current Esri license?

RESPONSE – NapaSan is part of Napa County’s ESRI licensure. The County has concurrent licensing for ArcGIS Desktop – Advanced, Standard and Basic. The Advanced Enterprise version of ArcGIS Server is also licensed.

QUESTION #17: Are your vertical assets modeled within your GIS now?

RESPONSE - No

QUESTION #18: Does NapaSan rely on any local municipalities to maintain any of its GIS layers?

RESPONSE – Base map layers are maintained by Napa County, NapSan maintains their own infrastructure data.

QUESTION #19: In order to provide guidance to develop the integration effort and costs please provide some high level functional requirements and business rules of the following integrations:

- a. Trakit
- b. USA Earthnet
- c. Linko

RESPONSE –

- a. Trakit permitting – indicator on the CMMS map that there is a permitting record in that location
- b. USA North EarthNet 811 utility – at a minimum, an indicator on the CMMS map that there is a locate record at that location. Ideally, the system would auto-generate work orders in the CMMS to reduce risk for the District. Communication back to the 811 system does not need to occur.
- c. Linko system - indicator on the CMMS map that there is a permitting record in that location

QUESTION #20: Can some details of current reporting requirements be provided?

RESPONSE – Some examples are as follows:

Collection system: Emergency service summary, Service Requests, Service Request Response Time, Service Request Cost, Open and Completed Work Orders, Work Order Response Time, Work Order Cost, Daily Cleaning Report, Daily Mainline TV Report, Mainline Condition Score, Preventative Maintenance Monthly Summary, Quarterly CM/PM ratio

Treatment Plant: Work Orders by Month by Type (All, Unscheduled, Scheduled), Work Order Type on Completed Work Orders (PM, Reactive, etc.) Summary of Hours by Work Order Type, Annual Retired Assets, Quarterly CM/PM ratio

QUESTION #21: Does the current Hansen instance reflect all of the Work Orders currently needed, both reactive and PM's?

RESPONSE – Yes.

QUESTION #22: Does the current MP2 instance reflect all of the Work Orders currently needed, both reactive and PM's?

RESPONSE – Yes.

QUESTION #23: Regarding the legacy data conversion to the new system, are historic work orders associated to an asset or an address?

RESPONSE – Existing work is assigned to an asset where one exists.

QUESTION #24: Can you please provide more information regarding the question “how contractor assigned work is addressed” from Appendix A?

RESPONSE – NapaSan is looking to understand what typical procedure is used when addressing outside contractors and your software. We are interested in understanding if outside contractors will be assigned a login and require an additional license. Additionally, if contractors are off-site, provide the notification process for required or upcoming work.

QUESTION #25: Can you provide a listing of the specific assets that are managed within your current systems (Hansen, MP2, and ESRI) that are expected to be part of the new CMMS?

RESPONSE – Hansen maintains sewer mains and manholes. The MP2 asset list is rather extensive and maintains detailed information for outlying pumping stations as well as all assets that are part of the liquid and solids process, gas train, recycled water, solids process, support building, and support system.

QUESTION #26: There are many requested integrations to other software; we strongly recommend a full review of the goals and expectations of the integration to determine the best way to integrate the systems and determine if an integration is needed. We often find that a full integration is not needed after fully scoping the needs. Is the District open to listing the integrations as “optional” and showing an estimated as part of the pricing and scoping for the RFP? Should it be determined a specific integration is needed, a full project scoping will take place later in the project.

RESPONSE – Integrations with SCADA and CCTV systems are not optional. The Trakit, USA North Earthnet 811 Utility, and Linko systems may be listed as optional with estimated pricing and scoping.

QUESTION #27: Is data able to be consumed to be integrated for each of these systems, and how will the system access this data

Trakit
USA Earthnet
Linko

RESPONSE – The District would like, at a minimum, an indicator on the CMMS map of current Trakit permits, USA North Earthnet 811 Utility locates, and the Linko system notifications.

QUESTION #28: What data points are desired for the integration with SCADA? Does the CMMS need to push data back into SCADA? If so, what data points will the CMMS feed?

RESPONSE – CMMS does not need to push data back to SCADA. The District would like to have run time hours for PMs and Alarm Sound work orders created.

QUESTION #29: What data points are desired for the integration with Trakit? Does the CMMS need to push data back into Trakit? If so, what data points will the CMMS feed?

RESPONSE – The District would like at a minimum, an indicator on the CMMS map of current Trakit permits. The CMMS does not have to push data back to Trakit; however, the District would eventually like their sewer mains in the Trackit system – that is low on the priority list at this moment.

QUESTION #30: What data points are desired for the integration with USA Earthnet? Does the CMMS need to push data back into USA Earthnet? If so, what data points will the CMMS feed?

RESPONSE - The District would like at a minimum, an indicator on the CMMS map of current open 811 locates. Optimally, the system would auto-generate work orders in the CMMS to reduce risk for the District. Communication back to the 811 system does not need to occur.

QUESTION #31: What data points are desired for the integration with Linko? Does the CMMS need to push data back into Linko? If so, what data points will the CMMS feed?

RESPONSE - The District would like at a minimum, an indicator on the CMMS map of current Trakit permits. The CMMS does not have to push data back to Trakit.

QUESTION #32: Is Napa Sanitation Open to a deadline extension? Answers to the submitted questions will affect our RFP response, and the timeline from when answers to the questions will be received to when the RFP response needs to be shipped is very tight.

RESPONSE – Please note the RFP is to be submitted electronically.