

ADDENDUM #1

Request for Proposals

Development of a System to Establish Feasibility and Prioritization of Capital Improvement Projects

February 13, 2009

Responses to Inquiries

After review of proposals, would the State consider trying to put together a team of different Proposers based on the strengths of the different Proposers?

No. While it appears such is not prohibited in the RFP or in Louisiana statute, it is the intent of the State to award a contract to a successful Proposer.

Will the firm selected for the consulting work under this contract be excluded from any follow on work such as facility condition assessments or technology solutions?

No.

Could you be more specific as to what Capital Assets are being included in the scope of the project? For example, buildings, building-related site infrastructure, highways and bridges, waterways and dams, etc.?

See Exhibit C of the RFP. Since the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development has processes in place for State highways and public works projects, the primary focus of the proposal should be on State-owned buildings and building-related infrastructure. However, since Act 911 also requires non-State projects to be reviewed for feasibility and priority, processes for non-State project types as enumerated in Exhibit C of the RFP need to be considered (although perhaps not as detailed or intensive as for State-owned buildings and building-related infrastructure).

Concerning Tasks 1, 6 and 7, the RFP references that the review should include practices of Louisiana's "peer States". If known, please provide a list of what States are considered peer States or state that identification of peer States is part of the project.

Identification of peer States is part of the project.

Concerning Task 4, the State refers to several dates related to the timing of the project deliverable. Can you state specifically when you expect the project to begin and the deadline for submission of deliverables? How long does the State anticipate implementation to take? Is there any flexibility in these time frames?

The RFP indicates the project is anticipated to begin on March 16, 2009. Deliverables and the scheduling of such are part of the proposal (see Section 8.2.2 of the RFP). The schedule in the RFP is as desired by the State. There is a need to show progress in implementing the requirements of Act 911 of 2008; consequently, if Proposers cannot meet full implementation by August 2009 then it is highly recommended that a phased approach be clearly outlined in the proposal, with significant implementation milestones reached by August 2009.

Concerning Task 5, in relating to establishing a uniform cost planning and estimating system, this task states, "Consideration should be given to establishing level of quality designations." Could you please expand on this concept, perhaps with some examples of your expectations?

In order to make cost planning more accurate, it may be beneficial to use a classification system where buildings are grouped by cost influencing items such as function, quality of materials, finishes, system standards, hardware, amenities, etc. of similar nature. Alternatively, regression models considering similar variables may be usable.

Does a computerized application currently exist to assemble all capital outlay request data; specifically the information included on Exhibit B-Current Capital?

Yes. The State uses a web-based application called e-CORTS for applicants to complete the capital outlay request. These requests populate a database; several prepared reports are used by the State to query particular established data fields. Ad hoc reports are necessary for reporting on other data fields.

Act 911 section 101 A.(1) states that each year the head of each budget unit shall present to the office of facility planning and control ... a request for all expenditures ... Approximately how many budget units are there participating in this process?

To date for fiscal year 2009-10, 88 State budget units have submitted capital outlay requests. For information, 447 non-State entities have submitted capital outlay requests for fiscal year 2009-10.

In reviewing the schedule, we anticipate this to be a 5 month project. Is this correct? What is meant by the *implementation of initial process for feasibility* within the first month of the project?

Yes. The schedule in the RFP is as desired by the State. There is a need to show progress in implementing the requirements of Act 911 of 2008; consequently, if Proposers cannot meet full implementation by August 2009 then it is highly recommended that a phased approach be clearly outlined in the proposal, with significant implementation milestones reached by August 2009.

Last year, due to a large backlog of projects, no new capital outlay projects were included in the original capital outlay bill as proposed by the governor. The only new projects in the eventual capital outlay act were projects added during the legislative process. If such a scenario unfolds again this year, the State needs to have in place by the time of the 2009 legislative session the criteria by which feasibility can be evaluated based on the currently available data. The final feasibility and prioritization processes should not contradict any principles established for this interim feasibility procedure.

The Total Cost Breakdown Form requires the proposer to indicate *percent of time on project*. Is it correct to assume that if the duration of the project is 5 months and someone is assigned to the project for its duration, then that person would show 100% for 5 months or approximately 860 hours?

Yes.

Section 8.1 Task 2 indicates that a multi-attribute decision analysis such as an analytical hierarchy process (AHP) should be considered. Is it envisioned, at this stage of the project, that the tool would be a written/charted decision making model, a functioning spreadsheet or database, or the identification of an available computer software application? Section 8.2.3 indicates that any computer application necessary to fully implement any adopted processes will be procured separately from this RFP.

At this stage it could be either of the mentioned possibilities. It will be to the Proposers to present their plans on how the State can fully implement any adopted processes. If a Proposer plans to use Microsoft Word, Excel, or Access as a part of the solution, then programming of these applications should be included in the proposed work effort. Any computer application beyond the programming of Microsoft Word, Excel, or Access would be procured separately from this RFP.

Section 8.1 Task 3 indicates a working feasibility evaluation system needs to be created. Similar to the tool in Task 2, is it envisioned that the system would be a written/charted decision process model, with identified sub-processes for different categories of projects, a functioning spreadsheet or database or the identification of an available computer software application?

At this stage it could be either of the mentioned possibilities. It will be to the Proposers to present their plans on how the State can fully implement any adopted processes. If a Proposer plans to use Microsoft Word, Excel, or Access as a part of the solution, then programming of these applications should be included in the proposed work effort. Any computer application beyond the programming of Microsoft Word, Excel, or Access would be procured separately from this RFP.

Section 8.1 Task 3 indicates a working feasibility evaluation system needs to be created. If the intent is for a functioning spreadsheet, database, or commercial computer software application, are there any requirements that need to be considered? (i.e., multi-user, login ID/Password protection, current version (i.e., 2003 or 2007) of Microsoft software being used by the State, server or client based, server operating system (Microsoft, Oracle, Sun), etc.)

The Division of Administration recently migrated to Microsoft Office 2007. If programming of any of those applications is proposed, then provisions for security/accessibility would eventually need to be included. Multiple users are anticipated. Server based is anticipated. Microsoft server operating system is anticipated.

Any computer application beyond the programming of Microsoft Word, Excel, or Access would be procured separately from this RFP. Any requirements for hosting, access, security, format, etc. for an application to be procured in the future would be made at the time of that procurement.

Section 8.1 Task 5 indicates that a sustainable, uniform, robust cost planning system is to be created that can be later melded into a uniform cost estimating system and that this RFP scope includes the cost planning portion associated with pre-design, only. Has the cost estimating system been identified or purchased? If so, are there any specifications that can be provided? As it pertains to the use of the word “pre-design”, to what state of development (i.e., conceptual, visual layout, working beta, etc.) of the system or what deliverable items are expected at this phase?

No cost estimating system has been identified or purchased. The word “pre-design” was used in the building architectural sense, i.e., the planning activities prior to architectural design phases (design phases being programming, schematic, design development, construction documents). The intent is for the cost system to encompass the whole life of a potential capital outlay project, from early planning (pre-design) through construction. The RFP contemplates

only the early planning (pre-design) phase; however, this needs to be able to support a system that accommodates latter phases, also.

End of Questions and Responses