



City of Columbus
Mayor Michael B. Coleman

Department of Finance and Management
Paul R. Rakosky, Director

Purchasing Office

Sean Fouts, Procurement Manager

50 W. Gay Street, 1st Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9036
(614) 645-8315 Fax: (614) 645-7051

To: Paul R. Rakosky, Finance and Management Director
From: James R. Miller Jr., Procurement Administrative Officer
Date: June 16, 2011
Subject: Asset, Inventory, and Work Order System RFP Rankings

SA003862 was advertised and proposals were opened on March 17, 2011. Three hundred and seventy one (371) potential bidders were notified and nine (9) responses were received.

Electronic data was required with the bid responses and several discs were received in formats that were not readable. Additional information was requested and received from those bidders and the data was aggregated into a single document for the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee consisting of two representatives each from Public Safety, Recreation and Parks, Finance and Management, and one representative from Technology met on April 4 and again on April 19. After the April 19 meeting the four highest ranked bidders were scheduled for presentations on May 19 and May 20. After presentations, the committee met and submitted their final rankings on May 25.

After evaluating all bids and viewing four presentations, in compliance with Columbus City Code 329.14(g), the committee submits the attached rankings and the following explanation:

GBA Master Series, Inc. (now dba Lucity) provided, what the committee considered, the most comprehensive solution. Their interactive software modules provide comprehensive "out-of-the-box" solutions, which are compatible with the widest variety of desired City business functions. These "out-of-the-box" solutions also appear to require minimal customization when compared with the products of the other vendors.

Their products include both Web and desktop (power users) interactive interface solutions. The City can select one or both based upon the individual needs of each department, thereby providing greater product distribution flexibility and economy.

Their products also include a web based GIS mapping solution that is compatible with the City's own GIS map files and aerial photography. This mapping solution is interactive with their work order and asset management modules, allowing a user to shift between products without sign offs and additional log-ins. It also allows work order creation from the map, thereby assigning a more precise location to work orders when desired.

In addition to the committee rankings and explanation, I have some observations and thoughts based on the proposals, presentations and past software implementations (both good and bad) that I thought might be helpful.

No detailed discussions were conducted between the committee and the presenters concerning the pricing submitted with their proposals. When reviewing the rankings and summaries of ranking of the proposals, there are several issues which could greatly change the submitted cost proposals need to be considered and specifically addressed during negotiations.

Though the GBA proposal was considered by all members to be in the top two, the presentations revealed there are several requirements that will require modifications and will likely increase the first year (and possibly subsequent years) cost of the product. This is not a unique issue. All products were found to require additional modifications beyond the submitted proposals. Most of this issue is a result of the generalities of the RFP requirements. Where interfaces are required or desired (311, GIS, employee pay information, purchase order information, etc.) it is necessary for the potential awardee to have much more detailed requirements of what is expected by the City. From my understanding of the CHRIS issues, the lack of such clarification and definition was initially the major culprit in the delays and increase costs.

Only the Cartegraph presentation actually demonstrated their application on anything other than a laptop. It is anticipated that much of the future use of these products will take place on various hand held devices. Whether usable applications from the purchased software will be a modification or base lined into the software should be defined.

The details concerning the number of hours and cost of City personnel and infrastructure varied wildly from bid to bid even though eight of the bids would require the same basic infrastructure and implementation. The GBA proposal was based on the City needing to spend only 60 hours of City employee time to implement and only 45 minutes of support per week.

Copies of any proposals or detailed spreadsheets of the bidders responses are available should you require any addition information.

