



LOS ALAMOS

INCORPORATED COUNTY OF LOS ALAMOS

101 Camino Entrada, Building 3
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544 (505) 709-5503
Procurement Division

July 25, 2024

TO ALL HOLDERS OF SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS FOR:

Request for Proposals No. RFP25-07
RFP Name: Utility Billing and Work Order Software

Addendum No. 1

This Addendum No. 1 forms a part of the Solicitation Documents and modifies the original Solicitation Documents identified above.

This Addendum provides an extension to the Submission Deadline to all potential Offerors/Proposers.

1. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL OFFERORS/PROPOSERS: THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN EXTENDED TO AUGUST 19, 2024, 2:00 PM MOUNTAIN TIME.

Also, this Addendum provides to all prospective Offerors the attendance list for the Pre-Proposal Conference, the County's response to questions received during the Conference, the link to Pre-Proposal Conference video, and updates to the original RFP25-07.

2. See below the attendance sheet from the Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference, held on July 16, 2024, at 10:00 am MT.

Name	Company	E-mail Address
Jeremy Shaw	Tyler Technologies	Jeremy.Shaw@tylertech.com
Monika Jha	Allerin US	monika@allerin.com / amit.r@allerin.com
Ed Joella	Diversified Technology Corp	edjoella@diversifiedtechnology.com
Lance Maxwell	Origin Utility, Inc.	lmaxwell@originutility.com
Lane Ricardo	Continental Utility Solutions, Inc.	lr Ricardo@cusi.com
Zachary Angel	AquaTrax	zach.angel@aquatraxsolutions.com
Tam Ly	SpryPoint Services, Inc.	TLy@SpryPoint.com
Deborah Roache	NorthStar Utilities Solutions	deborah.roache@northstarutilites.com

Name	Company	E-mail Address
Amit Sharma	AquaTrax	amit.sharma@aquatraxsolutions.com
Karen Kendall	Los Alamos County	karen.kendall@lacnm.us
Jaime Kephart	Los Alamos County	jaime.kephart@lacnm.us
Joann Gentry	Los Alamos County	joann.gentry@lacnm.us
Amanda Burnworth	Los Alamos County	amanda.burnworth@lacnm.us
Chuck Bear	Los Alamos County	charles.bear@lacnm.us
Maurice Harary	The Bid Lab	maurice@thebidlab.com
John Lunardini	The Bid Lab	johnl@thebidlab.com

3. Pre-Proposal Questions and Answers

Question 1: Can you please clarify Step 2 Issued and when Step 2 Closes?

Answer 1: Step 1 Evaluation and Finalist selection is tentatively planned for completion by August 27, 2024, after which, County will issue Step 2 to the selected Finalists. Step 2 will consist of a software demonstration script, any questions the County may have for the Finalists, and the Step 2 evaluation criteria. Finalists' responses to questions issued in Step 2 will be due upon Step 2 closing on September 12. County will schedule demonstrations to occur after Step 2 closing. Step 2 demonstrations, evaluation, and selection are tentatively planned to occur between September 13 and October 4, 2024. County reserves the right to modify any of the dates listed herein without prior notification.

Question 2: Is there a file/attachment size limit for the DPU's email server?

Answer 2: 50MB file limit. It may be possible to exceed that limit; however, County's preference is that files submitted be optimized for smaller file size prior to submission. Contact Jaime Kephart at least one business day prior to the RFP closing date and time if file sizes exceed the limit.

Question 3: In the functional requirements for #WO1 - there are references to tree trimming and valve maintenance. Those are traditionally asset-centric work. Is the County open to including in the scope a Work Order/Asset Management application?

Answer 3: WO1 and the other WOs are related to work orders. County does not consider them asset related. The asset management system is separate. County's requested functionality is for work orders to be tied to an address or a meter. Offerors may include information on additional functionality that includes whether the proposed work order system is contained within Offeror's asset management application.

Question 4: How many staff members will require access to the billing software? How many will require access to the work order software?

Answer 4: Approximately 90 with a majority in the field and a smaller number that will use the customer-facing functions in the billing software.

Question 5: Do we need to integrate with the following software or are they are also subject to change? 2.3.1. Tyler Munis 2.3.2. Sensus Analytics 2.3.3. Route Star 2.3.4. Paymentus 2.3.5. Enterprise Bank Lock Box 2.3.6. Single Sign On (“SSO”) to County’s MS Azure Active Directory

Answer 5: County will need the solution to integrate or have the ability to share data between County’s software and Offeror’s software. For some of these systems, integration might be an upload file that is uploaded to one or more systems. For the County’s Azure Active Directory, County is asking whether Offerors can provide SSO capabilities, and if not, what are the options for logging in and how would security be ensured. Each of the systems stated in the RFP are systems currently in use by the County. The exact manner in which the systems integrate, or data is shared between the systems is to be determined based on methods proposed by Offerors. County reserves the right, throughout the term of an Agreement with the selected Offeror, to change the systems with which the Offeror’s system integrates or shares data. Please reference Sections 9 and 10 of the RFP Scope of Services where additional, optional, and future functionality and services and possible future replacement or implementation of integrated systems are addressed.

Reference RFP Section 2.3 for information related to integrations with County systems, which is what is being referenced here.

Question 6: We have our payments integrated with Invoice Cloud. Can we use it?

Answer 6: County would need more details in the response to describe how that feature would work.

Question 7: Will Tyler still be used or replaced?

Answer 7: There are currently no plans to replace Tyler Munis as the County’s ERP. The County has a long-term contract with Tyler and will continue to use it for all other functionality already provided by Munis. The only piece of the Munis system that might potentially be replaced is the utility billing.

Question 8: Would the county be open to replacing Paymentus as a payment portal provider?

Answer 8: The County has a contract with Paymentus. Offerors who provide payment portal functionality should include, as an optional service, all details about that functionality, all costs, how the payment portal will integrate or share data with County’s other systems, and Offeror’s relationship with any third-party payment providers. County may consider but is under no obligation to accept Offeror’s optional payment portal services. Offerors who propose to provide a payment portal as an optional service are expected to also describe in detail how their system would integrate or share data with Paymentus, as requested in the RFP.

4. Pre-Proposal Conference Link

Use the following link to view the recording from the Pre-Proposal Conference:

<https://losalamosnm.egnyte.com/dl/2J08qVWGeU>

5. Vendor Question and Answers submitted to Los Alamos County via email (7/22/24)

Question 1. Most modern CIS systems include purpose-built mobile field service application to work with the CIS. This mobile field application manages the service orders that are

generated from the CIS for account-centric field activities. These are distinct from asset-centric activities, which are typically managed by asset management/maintenance management systems. In the functional requirements #W01 - there are references to tree trimming and valve maintenance. Those are traditionally asset-centric work. Is the County including the scope of work a Work Order/Asset Management application?

Answer 1. This RFP is only addressing account-centric field activities.

Question 2. What is the County's current work order, maintenance management system? If the County intends to keep its current system, will the County require an integration with this system? If yes, can the County provide additional guidance on this integration?

Answer 2. The County currently uses both a GIS System (ARC GIS) and Tyler Munis Work Orders. No integration is anticipated.

Question 3. Does the County desire an integration with its backflow/cross connection? If yes, what is the software application?

Answer 3. No, the County is not looking for integration with backflow/cross connection.

Question 4. Does the County deploy an interactive voice response (IVR) application? If yes, who is the application vendor?

Answer 4. The County does not deploy IVR

Question 5. How many field service staff will require a full read-write license for a mobile field service application?

Answer 5. The total number of users is 83 which includes field crews. Breakdown by utility for field crew only. Total of 60.

GWS	24
Electric Distribution	14
Meter Readers	2
Water Prod	10
Wastewater Treatment	10

Question 6. How many field service staff will require a full read-only license for a mobile field service application?

Answer 6. These are the same totals as listed in Answer 5.

Question 7. Will the County consider longer demonstration times to enable vendors to show in greater detail the functionalities of a modern suite of utility applications.

Answer 7. County will allow demonstrations for Finalists in Step 2 of the RFP up to eight hours, with a minimum one-hour lunch break, if requested by Offerors. Offerors who wish to request additional time for demonstrations, if selected as Finalists, should state their request in their Proposal and should state how much time they are requesting, up to eight hours.

Question 8. Will the County consider a two-week extension to the August 6 proposal deadline?

Answer 8. The County will extend the deadline to August 19, 2024, at 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time. See Addendum 1, No. 1.

6. RFP25-07, Page 3

CONTACT INFORMATION

To request documents for the procurement process or project-specific information, contact the following and include all contacts listed on all correspondence sent via e-mail:

1. Jaime Kephart, Contract Manager, at jaime.kephart@lacnm.us or 505-709-5503.
2. Karen Kendall, Project Manager/Deputy Utility Manager – Finance and Administration, at karen.kendall@lacnm.us.
3. Joann Gentry, Utilities Business Operations Manager, at joann.gentry@lacnm.us.
4. Maurice Harary, Project Manager at The Bid Lab, at respond@thebidlab.com
- ~~4.~~ 5. As an additional courtesy to interested parties, this RFP and related documents may also be downloaded from the County's website at <https://lacnm.com/bids>.

7. RFP25-07, Page 15

PROPOSAL FORMAT

2. To facilitate the review process, County's preference, though not a requirement, is that Proposals be in 8.5X11 inch format, not including Exhibits or attachments. ~~There is not a page limit for the proposal.~~; ~~and g~~ General marketing materials should not exceed ten (10) pages of materials, ~~if included~~.

8. RFP25-07, Pages 16-18

The following corrections to the Section Numbers 3 - 8 are as follows. The remaining components from the original table within the solicitation continue as originally numbered.

8. Responses to the RFP should include the following Proposal Response Components:

Section Number	Section Title	Submission Information (In addition to any other information requested in this RFP)
1	Cover Sheet (One page only)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide the full legal name of the Contractor who will execute the contract, and the name, phone number, and e-mail address of the primary person responsible for responding to questions and communication related to the RFP. 2. Reference the RFP number and name.
2	Cover Letter (One page only)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Size of company or organization. 2. Length of time in business. 3. Include qualifications and a narrative description of the characteristics that set the company apart such as unique examples of service or added value, and any recognition or endorsements received. 4. Describe the company's financial growth history and viability.
4 3	Executive Summary (One page only)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a clear, concise overview of the Proposal.
5 4	Proposed Staff Qualifications and Experience	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and experience of all staff proposed to accomplish the work during Project Implementation and those required to adequately maintain the System after initial Project Implementation throughout the term of an agreement with the County. 2. Detail background and experience of the individual to be assigned as the single point of contact for the Project. 3. Provide a list of any subcontractors or third parties who will be used to provide any Services throughout the term of an agreement, describe Offeror's relationship with them, and briefly describe their qualifications and abilities to provide the Services. 4. Provide the number of years Offeror has been providing the proposed Software.

Section Number	Section Title	Submission Information (In addition to any other information requested in this RFP)
65	Previous Client Implementation and References	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information provided in Proposals will be used for evaluation purposes. The County reserves the right to contact some or all the references to verify any information provided and to request that references provide additional information. 2. If previous client reference information is confidential, you may state so, however, evaluation scores will reflect Offeror's inability to include requested reference information in the Proposal. 3. Provide references for at least three projects completed in the last three years for similar work and implementation. 4. References should include company name, address, contact name, position, telephone number, and the period during which services were provided. 5. Provide the start and end date of services and note if reference is still a current client.
76	Software Requirements (Scope Section 1)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrated understanding of the requirements and ability to provide the requested services as described in the Scope of Services. Offerors should provide a clear narrative and provide any information specifically requested in the Scope of Services for each of the sections listed. Restate the section from the Scope of Services when responding. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Section 1.1. - Licensing and/or Subscription b. Section 1.2. – Maintenance and Support Services and SLA, including any additional governing documents referenced therein. c. Section 1.3 - Warranty d. Section 1.4. - Data Security and Ownership
87	Software Functional Descriptions, Technical Specifications, and Integration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Demonstrated understanding of the technical requirements and ability to provide the requested services as described in the Scope of Services. Offerors should provide a brief summarized narrative to demonstrate their understanding of Section 2 of the Scope of Services. Restate the section from the Scope of Services when responding. 3. Describe in more detail, using Exhibit G, whether the proposed Software Solution provides the features and functionality requested. This document is also provided to Offerors as an MS Excel document to facilitate responses. 4. If Offerors provide a demonstration or "sandbox" version of the proposed Software or offers an online

	with County Systems (Scope Section 2)	demonstration or video library, describe how the County may obtain access during the evaluation period of this RFP. This is a preferred, but not a required component of the RFP response and is not a scored Evaluation Criteria. County declines to sign any non-disclosure agreements or confidentiality agreements prior to receiving access to a demonstration or “sandbox” version of proposed Software or online libraries to use during evaluation. County will provide names and email addresses for all County Evaluation Committee members for the purpose of granting accounts and access.
98	County Technical Standards (Scope Section 3)	1. Using Exhibit E – County Technology Standards Requirements for On-Premise, Hybrid, or Cloud/Hosted Solutions, describe Offeror’s ability to conform to the applicable County requirements for hybrid or cloud-hosted Solutions. This document will also be provided to Offerors as an MS Word Document to facilitate responses.

7. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR STEP 1

As described and/or demonstrated in the RFP response.

Number	Criteria	Max Points
1	Software Requirements; Software Features and Functionality (Exhibit G); and Ability to Conform to County’s Technical Standards (Exhibit E)	35
2	Ability to Provide the Scope of Services and overall suitability to County of Optional Services Proposed Overall suitability to the County’s stated Scope of Services and the optional services proposed.	20
3	Proposed Staff Qualifications; Experience; References; and Valid Licenses, Permits, Training and Certifications	10
4	Proposed Project Initiation, Management, and Implementation Plan	10
5	Cost Proposal	20
6	Ability to Provide Services and Pricing for a Full Fifteen (15) Year Agreement Term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifteen (15) Years = 5 points • Seven (7) to Fourteen (14) = 3 points • Less than Seven (7) Years = 0 points 	5
Total Points		100

8. Exhibit E - County Technology Standards Requirements for On-Premise, Hybrid, or Cloud/Hosted Solutions - RFP NO: 25-07 - Attachment

Exhibit E is provided as a separate Word document and attached to this Addendum.

All other provisions of the Solicitation Documents shall remain unchanged. This Addendum No. 1 is hereby made a part of the Solicitation Documents to the same extent as those provisions contained in the original documents and all itemized listings thereof.

Each Respondent is requested to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1 with the Proposal Forms.

I hereby acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1.

Signed _____ Print Name _____ Date _____

Title _____ Company _____