



**ADDENDUM NO. 2**

(Issued February 3, 2020)

**Request for Qualifications and Proposals  
Construction Program & Project Management Software**

The following changes, additions, modifications and corrections hereinafter set forth shall apply to the bid documents for the project and shall be made a part thereof and subject to all the requirements thereof, as if originally specified and/or shown;

**OUSD MODIFICATION #1:** The District will be conducting interviews for the short listed firms tentatively scheduled for February 27-28, 2020.

**Question #1:**

Large districts like Oakland USD normally estimate around 100 plus users. What is your estimation when it comes to the number licenses that the district will need?

**District Response #1:**

The Facilities Planning and Management Department (FP&M) has up to 25 persons that will need to use the CM/PM Software. The current CM/PM Software, EADOC, allows District Consultants and Contractors to electronically input, edit and retrieve Project Documents, which would add an additional 75-100 users. So it depends on the operations of proposed software.

**Question #2:**

What is the district's annual construction budget?

**District Response #2:**

Approximately \$100M.

**Question #3:**

California CMAS- All California School Districts can use the CMAS pricing which provides the districts throughout California with best pricing, business Intelligence reports and dashboards, BIM, oData and so on... I need confirmation from you or the districts that we are to use the CMAS pricing agreement.

**District Response #3:**

The FP&M Department does not participate in CMAS pricing.

**Question #4:**

The RFP references an out of the box approach, will we have a chance to take a deeper dive into your requirements around advanced reporting and dashboards, additional processes and any forms that the [proposed firm] team may need to create? If so, will that be done after the RFP is awarded? If not, we will need more of an understanding of any additional processes. What reports are mandatory? How many dashboards will we be creating?



**District Response #4:**

The FP&M Department is seeking an out-of-the-box solution with a limited number of modules. The District would be open to alternative solutions after firms have been short-listed for interviews. The FP&M Department requires the creation of the following mandatory reports:

- Vendor/Invoice Reports
- Master Project List by status
- Project Status Report
- Program Status Report
- Change Order Status Report
- Agreement Request/Contract Report
- Seasonal Report (Summer Work List)

Dashboards are not part of the current CM/PM Software systems.

**Question #5:**

Letter of Interest – Is this letter in addition to the letter of interest submitted by January 22, 2020?

**District Response #5:**

Statement of Interest due on January 22 was a non-mandatory submittal and was for tracking and notification purposes. Letter of Interest in Section 2.a of the RFQ/P is a required submittal and shall contain the requested information and statements.

**Question #6:**

In regard to page limitation of 15 pages, may we include a table of contents, section dividers, and a cover/back that will not be included in the page count? Is it preferred that NO section dividers, table of contents, and cover/back be provided? Please clarify for assuring submitting requirements.

**District Response #6:**

The 15-page limit applies to responses to Sections 2.a thru 2.g. Table of contents, section dividers, and covers that ease the review of the proposal will not count against the page limit. Additional information the proposer wishes to include shall be in an Appendix which will not count against the page limit.

**Question #7:**

Please clarify requirements for following: Page 4, section C – System Description: OUSD Microsoft Access Project Management Database (OUSD PM Tools) and EADOC by Bentley Systems. – Is the district looking for the interface protocols and uploading of data within the two identified district systems? Please provide clarity. For this specific question in section C is the district looking for a straight forward answer and then detailed description in section G.2 System Requirements?

**District Response #7:**

The FP&M Department is looking to replace the current system (i.e., OUSD PM Tools and Bentley Systems' EADOC) with an integrated system that would also permit the transfer of all existing project data. The District is requesting responses to both Sections 2.c and 2.g.



**Department of Facilities Planning and Management**

---

**Question #8:**

Could you please provide clarity as the intended functionality and outcomes of the software solution the district is seeking?

**District Response #8:**

As described in District Response #7, the FP&M Department is seeking to replace the current system. It is also looking for a system that permits outside consultants and contractors to participate on projects electronically.

**Question #9:**

Is the District open to the idea and suggestion to utilizing an integrated system specifically designed to manage to plan, coordinate and manage all functions of a capital bond program?

**District Response #9:**

The FP&M Department is firstly seeking an out-of-the-box solution but would be open alternatives if the benefits could be demonstrated. The District would evaluate the clarity and completeness of the proposals and later in depth during an interview of selected firms.

**Question #10:**

Is the district looking to establish a software solution that allows for internal controls to be identified, developed, and implemented as well as aligned throughout the program that operates in real time with current data working with the fiscal, facilities, and construction processes?

**District Response #10:**

The short answer is yes and real-time is directly linked to construction project time.

**Question #11:**

What is the district's long term vision with the software solution?

**District Response #11:**

The FP&M Department is seeking a firm that can demonstrate its excellence in the field and ability to provide high quality support through multiple capital bond program cycles.

**Question #12:**

Can we get examples of the following reports?

- Ability to provide District with reports for GASB 34 reporting of completed assets for year-end reporting;

- Ability to provide SEC Continuing Disclosure Information and IRS arbitrage information as required for annual reporting;

- Ability to provide OPSC SAB 50-06 Annual and Final Expenditure Reports, and information for the 18-month State Progress Reports and filings as necessary;

- Ability to produce reports necessary for the CDIAC SB 1029 Annual Debt Transparency Report filings.

**District Response #12:**

These reports will be provided at a later date if available and prior to interviews with selected firms.



**Question #13:**

Can the professional service team be a different vendor from the software company?

As in, for PMIS Product X, can Vendor Y implement the Product, or does it have to be the Product X implementation team?

**District Response #13:**

The RFQ/P clearly stated that “The solution must be developed by, implemented by and supported by the same single vendor.” This is intended to provide the District with a degree of assurance the proposer has an integrated solution and ability to provide long-term support. By the same token, the FP&M Department would consider a proposer that can demonstrate the proposed solution meets all other requirements stated in the RFQ/P.

**RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM (AS WELL AS PREVIOUSLY ISSUED ADDENDA) MUST BE  
ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE PROPOSAL.**