

CACASA Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting, RFP #10

This document contains official answers to questions received from interested vendors between October 2nd and 8th, 2009.

Note: Questions 1-66 were answered in previous Q&A documents with filenames:

PPUR RFP Q&A 9-16-09.pdf

PPUR RFP Q&A 9-25-09.pdf

Answers to Individual Questions (in the order received):

- 67) Question: Reports are considered anything that is an output of the system such as a monthly report, form, notice or statement.
- a. Will each county use standard statewide reports or will they be county specific?
 - b. Will the difference simply be a header /footer change or completely distinct?
 - c. How many reports are currently being used by each county?
 - i. Number of forms
 - ii. Number of monthly reports
 - iii. Number of notices

Answer: Required outputs of the system include:

- Restricted Materials Permits (Ag and non-Ag)
- Operator-IDs
- Electronic Pesticide Use Report files submitted to DPR
- Ad hoc statistical summaries and database query results produced for internal use by county Agricultural Department staff.
- Database query results and summaries produced to satisfy public information requests.

Beyond those items listed above, there are no statewide requirements or standards for the production of monthly reports or specific forms, notices, or statements. Individual counties have discretion over the production of whatever “reports” they feel are needed to fulfill their regulatory obligations using county-specific business practices.

The format of RM permits and Operator-ID documents must be approved by California State DPR, and will presumably be the same – with different county identification header information – for every county using the new system. Pesticide Use Reports are regularly compiled (e.g. monthly) into the standard electronic file layout described in Appendix C of the SRS and transmitted to DPR. All other types of “reports” could potentially have unique formats depending on the county and what they are for, but the new system vendor is likely to discover significant commonalities of needs for certain types of outputs among counties and it would be most efficient to develop and “hard code” standardized output that all counties can use for those needs. This is in addition to the more flexible ad hoc output generation capability.

Regarding public information requests, every request received may be slightly different, but virtually all counties with significant agriculture operations receive comprehensive requests for data similar to what was offered to interested vendors as sample data from Yuba and San Luis Obispo Counties.

The number of “reports” generated is very difficult to estimate. All that can be accurately quantified at this time is that the total number of RM Permits statewide is about 30,000, and there is a similar number of Operator-IDs.

68) Question: Other than RMMS and AgGIS conversions, how many other databases require conversion and can you provide a record count and file layout for those databases?

Answer: The other database requiring conversion in some counties is the RMPP database. This is the only database in 12 counties, and in at least four additional counties (possibly more) now using RMMS or AgGIS some of their prior year data are only stored in the RMPP format. For more information on data migration, see answers to previous questions 26, 31, and 35.

69) Question: How many wireless users?

Answer: The exact number of existing wireless users is unknown, but quite small. The potential for future expansion is large due to strong interest in many counties for the capability to carry this application into the field, and as more counties acquire wireless Internet services.

70) Question: For RFP Section 4.1.8 Company Information, can financial statements for the past 3 years be placed in an attachment, rather than bound into the body of the proposal response?

Answer: Yes. Financial statements (as requested in RFP Section 4.1.8 b) may be included as an attachment or appendix, but the body of the proposal must reference where the required material is located (appendix or attachment name) and it must be included both in printed form (two copies) and as a digital file on the same CD as the file containing the rest of the technical proposal – in accordance with RFP Section 4.6 Proposal Packaging Instructions.

71) Question: In the proposal packaging instructions (RFP Section 4.6) please clarify where to insert Company Information requested in RFP Section 4.1.

Answer: Wherever the proposal packaging instructions reference the words “technical proposal”, this refers to both Company Information (RFP Section 4.1) and Technical Proposal Content (RFP Section 4.2), which should be assembled together. The only exception is for financial statements that may be attached separately or moved to an appendix as noted in the answer to Question #70 above.

72) Question: Will user documentation, training, and help information be required to be produced in Spanish as well as English?

Answer: All documentation must be produced in English. There is no requirement to produce any documentation or conduct any training in Spanish.

73) Question: **RFP Page 8 – Section 1.2.3 point 10.** Does the reference to “establishing system backup and off-site replication procedures” require the vendor to install and maintain a complete backup site for each county for use in the event of complete failure of the county environment?

Answer: Yes. At a minimum, this should be similar to both the RMMS and AgGIS systems which offer replication (and backup) of each county’s data at a central offsite location.

74) Question: **RFP Page 8 – Section 1.2.4.** Please clarify the period of time that the vendor will be required to provide system maintenance and technical support.

Answer: Technical support and maintenance services must be provided from the time of initial system deployment until the end of the initial contract term, which is June 30, 2014. (See RFP Page 54 Term of Agreement).

75) Question: **RFP Page 18 – Section 1.5.4.** The System Requirements Specification (SRS) document is clearly very comprehensive and provides a good measurement for the scale of the PPUR system to be developed. What was the cost of developing the SRS?

Answer: \$70,000 was spent directly and exclusively on SRS preparation. In addition, since each phase of this project has built on the next, and since the direction of the project evolved over time (no RFP or SRS was envisioned at first), a fraction of earlier phase expenditures contributed indirectly to the SRS. At most, indirect contributions might account for one-third of the “true cost” of the SRS.

76) Question: **RFP Page 37 – Section 4.1.8.** As a privately held company, our financial details are not publicly available, and we do not have independently audited financial statements. Will the state accept other financial history information in lieu of this requirement?

Answer: All financial information listed in this section is required. See the answer to previous question #66 (from 9-25-09) for clarification on the definition of “audited financial statements”. Also, refer to RFP Section 2.11 Confidentiality Notice which indicates that company financial information will be considered confidential and not disclosed to anyone except members of the proposal evaluation team.

77) Question: **RFP Page 47 – Section 4.3 – Task Direct Costs.** Should we assume that our specified direct costs should include the cost of all hardware and software

required to implement the PPUR, even those components that are likely to be already in place, for example, a Web server running IIS?

Answer: Yes, cost proposals should include direct costs to purchase all new hardware and software. Existing components that can be re-used or repurposed will be approximated during contract negotiation and accounted for in detail while the project proceeds. See the answer to frequently asked question #C (9-16-09) for clarification offered earlier.

78) Question: **RFP Page 53 – Section 6 Terms of Payment.** The Professional Services Agreement indicates that payments will be made based on milestone invoicing for the fixed costs of the project. However, Section 4 Cost Proposal requires fixed prices for each Task Group. Is it correct to assume that the milestone invoicing table included in the Professional Services Agreement will be negotiated with the successful vendor after award and will not necessarily directly reflect the cost proposal structure?

Answer: Yes, the milestone invoicing table on Page 53 was purposely left blank to indicate that milestone definitions are negotiable. The negotiated breakdown of milestones for invoicing purposes does not have to conform exactly with the cost proposal structure based on Task Groups. For example, milestones could be defined as particular deliverables within one or more Task Groups. It is, of course, expected that there will be a direct and consistent connection between the work completed at each milestone, the amount invoiced, and the contractor's proposed cost.

79) Question: **RFP Page 35 - Section 4.1 Company Information.** Section states "Proposals must include all Company Information requested in the subsections below, and must organize Company Information using the same numbered subheadings in the same order as below." I understand that the subheadings need to be in the same order and maintain the same text, but is it necessary to use the exact numbering scheme? For example, must we use "4.1.1 Cover Letter", or may we use "1.1 Cover Letter"?

Answer: The intent was for proposals to leave off the number "4" prefix from section numbers. Please follow the section numbering convention specified in RFP Section 4.0, which identifies major sections as follows:

1. Company Information, including cover letter.
2. Technical Proposal
3. Cost Proposal (placed in a separate sealed and labeled envelope)

Then order and number subsections consistent with the RFP. For example, "Prime and Subcontractor Identification" is section 1.2, not 4.1.2.

80) Question: How many proposals are you expecting?

Answer: It is anticipated that between 10 and 15 proposals will be submitted. Once the due date has passed, all registered vendors will be provided a list of the companies/teams whose proposals arrived on time.