



DATE: July 20, 2018
TO: City Council
FROM: Shane Pace, Assistant CAO
RE: Cityworks Software

City Council requested additional information on Cityworks and the city's purchasing process. Staff understands the need to clarify the value and purpose of Cityworks and to explain why the city is wanting to move in this direction with Cityworks.

GIS CENTRIC

A core premise of the Cityworks GIS-centric approach is that the ArcGIS geodatabase that Sandy City currently uses integrates with Cityworks. Integration allows Cityworks to provide an up-to-date authoritative data repository for local government assets. Using a single system of record without redundancy improves efficiencies. It's critical that Sandy City map its entire city infrastructure so that the city can properly evaluate current assets to provide quality services to the community. This single system will also allow staff to provide elected officials with the necessary information on the status of our infrastructure that was requested last year.

INTEGRATION

There are very few vendors besides Cityworks that utilize the GIS-Centric approach. Most work management systems do not integrate with ArcGIS. Some can indirectly integrate, but it requires a process of double entry. Without the ability to integrate with ArcGIS, other vendors must copy the spatial data and then import it into their software, which increases the complexity of data transfer, increases risk for error and requires more staff time.

COMPETITIVE PRICING

Sandy City's current pricing structure with Cityworks to implement AMS (Asset Management System) and PLL (Permit, Land, and Licensing) citywide is contingent upon expanding the existing contract we have and adding additional departments. This negotiated pricing would most likely increase if we had to issue an RFP.

Cityworks is offering us reduced pricing due to Cityworks being a Sandy based business. Also, costs are reduced because no travel is required for implementation. In exchange for this reduced pricing, Sandy City is willing to be a "Lighthouse" city for Cityworks. Being a Lighthouse city involves working with Cityworks staff to coordinate efforts to pilot initiatives to improve Cityworks software for all users. Having Cityworks staff work alongside Sandy staff enables

Cityworks to see how their product is used in the field and identify areas for improvement for the end users, which benefits Sandy City and other agencies.

In order to assure that Sandy is receiving a competitive price, staff surveyed a number of Cities to obtain actual costs. Table 1 shows what six cities paid for their Asset Management System (AMS) with City Works. Cityworks bases its pricing on three main factors: the number of users, the population of the city and what programs are added to the basic system. As you can from table 1, the average cost of the cities for both implementation (one-time) and AMS service fee (on-going) are both higher than the price quoted by Cityworks for Sandy.

Table 2 shows pricing for the Permits, Licensing and Land (PLL) system. We could not find as many recent bids on this system. However, you can see from the table that the average price is again higher than the price quoted Sandy City.

Table 3 shows a County's total bids on an RFP. There were six bidders but three of them did not meet the qualifications required in the RFP and were not considered. Cityworks was the lowest priced vendor of the companies who met the qualifications.

When Cityworks has to prepare and RFP they team up with a third-party vendor who actually submits the bid. This increases the price of the proposal. However, Table 3 demonstrates that they were the lowest responsible vendor even with a third-party vendor involved. Sandy's quotes don't include a third-party vendor which lowers our costs.

Table 4 gives you an overall view of the cities we surveyed and the information we received. Table 5 shows the impact this project will have on our budget over the next five years. Table 6 provides a cost comparison of what our costs would be without Cityworks and with Cityworks. This table shows that we will have continued costs with Energov, and will need to purchase and additional software for Hydrant Inspections if we don't move forward with Cityworks.

The conclusion from reviewing the information from other cities is that Sandy is receiving a very competitive price. An additional opportunity is that we can lower our quoted amount by taking more responsibility sooner. The contract will allow us to lower our costs by receiving training and then training our own users.

In addition to the need for a GIS centric system, and the benefit of reduced pricing provided by Cityworks, there are also a number of other advantages of the two proposed systems.

EFFICIENCIES

Asset Management

The work order system allows users to see the complete history of all projects including: equipment used, employee hours worked and inventory used for each individual project. Store Room, the inventory component of Cityworks, assists with replenishing inventory as it generates requests to reorder supplies as they are used on projects. Store Room identifies inventory used on each job and when the supply reaches a designated level, the reorder

request is issued. These asset management features of the AMS system allow field personnel, supervisors and managers to quickly get a snapshot of each project or a group of projects.

Permits, Land & Licensing

An example of improved efficiencies for both staff and the community is the Permits, Land, and Licensing (PLL) software that will be implemented. The current planning review process includes developers coming to city hall to submit their plans in paper form. They are required to submit 8 full sets (usually 24"x36"). Plans are then routed to each department in hard copies for their review. Once the review is complete, the hard copies are returned to planning with approval or any redlines for adjustments. The project planner then scans in each of the redlined pages and electronically attaches it to the database. The developer must then pick up the physical plans for corrections and the process begins again. The developer is required to bring in the redlines with the revised submittal each time there are corrections. Once preliminary approval is given, this process is repeated on a final 8 sets of plans for final approval.

Currently, for developers to know the status of their project, they must contact the Planning department, which will review the project file and reach out to the individual departments who may have additional requirements for the project. The improved efficiencies with the PLL system allow staff and developers to access status updates electronically for real time status at any time.

COMMUNICATION

Cityworks provides improved communication internally and with our customers. While basic tracking is done within the current software, each department is unaware of the status of the project, because staff do not utilize an electronic format to easily access this information. With Cityworks PLL, improved efficiencies will save time for both staff and the community as the process is streamlined. Each department will be able to see the status of all projects in real time and receive notifications of deadlines. Developers will be able to submit electronically as well as monitor the status of their project real time including permit and bond information.

SUMMARY

Because of our desire to use a GIS centric system, reduced pricing from Cityworks, and the operational efficiencies described above we believed Cityworks was the best alternative for our community. In order to meet the city's purchasing requirements for sole source and compatibility, we were able to submit to the purchasing agent, Erica Langenfass, information supporting Cityworks being a sole source vendor and the information supporting the Compatibility, Parts, Training section under ordinance 11-1-6-e of our Purchasing ordinance, that justifies the requirements for an exception to the formal RFP bidding process.

Finally, Exhibit A show the cities who have contracted with Cityworks across the nation and locally. Also attached are some testimonials from selected cities who use Cityworks. Both will give you an idea of why so many cities are going to Cityworks.

We trust this information provided will help alleviate any council members concerns about moving forward with the Cityworks system. Please let me know if there are any further questions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

cc: Mayor Bradburn
Matthew Huish, Chief Administrative Officer
Korban Lee, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer

Exhibit A

Cities that use Cityworks within the U.S. as provided by Cityworks:

- Utah
 - Logan
 - West Valley City
 - West Jordan
 - Salt Lake City
 - Murray
 - Sandy
 - Herriman
 - Park City
 - Saratoga Springs
 - St. George
 - Blanding
- Other US similar size as Sandy
 - Beaverton, OR
 - Renton, WA
 - Shoreline, WA
 - Olympia, WA
 - Oakland, CA
 - Cupertino, CA
 - Woodland, CA
 - Vista, CA
 - Escondido, CA
 - Ontario, CA
 - Long Beach, CA
 - Arvada, CO
 - Fort Collins, CO
 - Nashville, TN
 - Tallahassee, FL
 - Washington, DC DOT
 - Cleveland
 - Boston Water
 - Philadelphia Water and Streets
 - and hundreds more...

