

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association

Request for Proposal

Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting IT System Analysis and Recommendation

August 11, 2008

The California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA) is currently soliciting proposals to select, hire, and work with a consultant to inventory, assess, and document the information technology (IT) needs for creating and supporting a statewide pesticide permitting and use reporting system and to identify the solution that best meets these needs.

Each proposal shall specify every item as set forth in the attached requirements. Any and all exceptions must be clearly stated in the proposal. Failure to set forth any item in the specifications without taking exception may be grounds for rejection. CACASA reserves the right to reject all proposals and to waive any formalities.

If your firm is interested and qualified, please submit your proposal **by 4:00 p.m. on September 12, 2008** to:

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures
Robert Lilley, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer, Project Manager
2156 Sierra Way, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Proposals must be received by mail, recognized carrier, or hand delivered **no later than 4:00 PM PST on September 12, 2008**. Late proposals will not be considered. Submit 12 printed copies and 12 CD's of your proposal in Microsoft Word or Adobe pdf file format. The original submission shall be clearly marked "ORIGINAL." A representative authorized to commit the proposing entity in contractual matters must sign the copy marked "ORIGINAL." The Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall be typed on 8 ½" x 11" white paper, printed on two sides, and bound.

If you have any questions about the proposal process or content, please contact Robert Lilley, Agricultural Commissioner, via email at rlilley@co.slo.ca.us.

Robert F. Lilley
Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

Table of Contents

1 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	4
1.1 PROJECT FUNDING	4
1.2 CDPR	5
1.3 CACASA.....	5
1.4 COUNTY AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER	5
1.5 AgGIS	5
1.6 RMMS.....	6
2 BACKGROUND AND PROJECT INFORMATION.....	7
2.1 PESTICIDE USE REPORTING OVERVIEW.....	7
2.2 HISTORY OF USE REPORTING IN CALIFORNIA	7
2.3 THE USE REPORTING PROCESS.....	8
2.4 IMPROVING THE PROCESS	9
2.5 SITE IDENTIFICATION (ID) AND COUNTY MAPPING ASSISTANCE	9
2.6 COMPUTERIZED PESTICIDE PERMITTING AND USE REPORTING.....	10
2.7 EVOLVING SYSTEMS	10
3 SCOPE OF WORK	11
3.1 BUSINESS PROCESS ANALYSIS AND REQUIREMENTS DEFINITION	11
3.2 RECOMMEND AN IT SOLUTION.....	12
3.3 PROPOSE IMPLEMENTATION/TRANSITION PLAN.....	13
3.4 OPTIONAL SCOPE OF WORK AREAS	14
4 PROJECT SCHEDULE.....	15
5 SAMPLE CONTRACT.....	16
6 METHOD OF SELECTION.....	16
7 RFP LIMITATIONS.....	17
8 PROJECT MANAGEMENT.....	18
9 INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED.....	18
9.1 GENERAL	18
9.2 INTRODUCTORY COVER LETTER	18

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

9.3 INFORMATION REQUIRED.....	18
10 OPTIONAL VENDOR MEETING	20
11 SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSALS.....	20
12 PUBLIC OPENING OF PROPOSALS	21
13 ATTACHMENTS	21

A. Sample CACASA Contract

B. Map of Counties - AgGIS and RMMS

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

1 General Information

The California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA) is soliciting responses to this Request for Proposal (RFP) to select a Consultant that will engage with CACASA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) to accomplish the processes needed to define the requirements for a statewide pesticide permitting and use reporting system and recommend an IT solution that best meets these requirements.

CACASA and CDPR wish to identify an IT solution that would create a statewide pesticide permitting and use reporting system. Currently, CACASA and CDPR are funding two competing systems. Identifying one IT solution would provide a more efficient and cost effective way of collecting and reporting data, including but not limited to:

- Restricted Material Permits
- Use Reports (UR)
- Operator Identification Numbers (OIN)
- Notices of Intent (NOI)
- GIS Integration

The Consultant must document the current business processes of the County Agricultural Commissioners (CAC) and CDPR where these processes pertain to the pesticide permitting and use reporting requirements; recommend an IT solution; and create an Implementation/Transition Plan.

Table 1 – Proposed Project Phases

Phase	Description
1.	Business process analysis and requirements definition
2.	Recommend IT Solution
3.	Proposed Implementation/Transition Plan

1.1 Project Funding

CACASA and CDPR will each contribute up to \$74,000, for a total of \$148,000, to fund the Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting IT System Analysis and Recommendation Project. This includes the cost for the vendor, postage for the RFP mailings, and miscellaneous office expenses associated with the project.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

1.2 CDPR

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) is a state agency that protects human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use and fostering reduced-risk pest management. CDPR's strict oversight includes product evaluation and registration, environmental monitoring, residue testing of fresh produce, and local use enforcement through the county agricultural commissioners.

For more information about CDPR, go to <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/>.

1.3 CACASA

CACASA is an organization comprised of all 54 County Agricultural Commissioners/Sealers throughout the State. The mission of CACASA is to represent and assist the membership in carrying out their responsibilities to the public by:

- Promoting professionalism,
- Facilitating communications,
- Participating in the legislative process,
- Representing the membership, and
- Planning

For more information about CACASA, go to <http://www.cacasa.org/>.

1.4 County Agricultural Commissioner

The County Ag Commissioner's Office promotes and protects the agricultural industry, the environment and the public. The CAC provides for the local enforcement of pesticide laws and regulations, conducts pest prevention programs, and protects the consumer and the agricultural industry.

1.5 AgGIS

Pat Way Consulting, in conjunction with Glenn County Department of Agriculture, developed the AgGIS application. The original AgGIS version integrated ArcGIS with the CDPR's Restricted Materials Permit Program (RMPP). AgGIS provided the agricultural commissioner staff and growers with a simplified method to modify and review site-specific geographic data during the permit issuance process.

AgGIS / Permit6 Highlights

- Spatially and Temporally Enabled Database
- Permit Conditions database component
- License & Registration database component
- Spatial analysis component

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

Pat Way's latest version integrates GIS desktop functionality with a PostgreSQL open source database and a user interface that efficiently manipulates the maps, data and information layers needed for the issuance and management of pesticide permitting and use reporting. Building upon a relational database created by Mike Quinn of Merced County Agriculture Department, Pat Way has translated this core database architecture and extended it into a GIS enabled permitting database application. The AgGIS spatial analysis system is incorporated into the permitting process and provides a mechanism for assessing site specific environmental impacts associated with use of restricted materials. The web interface, created by Mike Quinn, enables customers to enter use reports, notice of intents, and access permits securely.

For more information about AgGIS, go to <http://www.waycompany.com/>.

1.6 RMMS

Streamline Business Solutions (SBS) developed the Restricted Materials Management System (RMMS) around seven years ago. The RMMS project was started at the request of several CACASA members that wished to develop a more modern approach to pesticide permitting and use reporting than was available with the existing RMPP system. SBS developed a suite of applications known as RMMSWin as a replacement for the existing RMPP.

RMMSWIN includes:

- Permit management, printing and reporting
- Use Reporting (UR) entry, printing, and reporting
- Monthly Summary entry, printing, and reporting
- Notice of Intent (NOI) management, printing, and reporting
- Master Data management (including Agricultural Contacts, Pesticides, Commodities, Conditions and EPA Products)
- Pesticide information is updated automatically and is current with CDPR and CDMS.

In conjunction with RMMSWin, a secure Web Portal application, RMMSWeb, was developed to provide the counties with a modern interactive Internet Portal for pesticide use reporting. This portal increases the efficiency of use reporting and Notices of Intent by automating the submission of these documents through both on-line web data entry and remote electronic submittal.

RMMS is designed to run on a Microsoft operating system platform using Visual Dataflex 4GL software and Microsoft's SQL Server 2005 database.

For more information about RMMS, go to <http://www.streamlinebiz.com/>.

2 BACKGROUND AND PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 Pesticide Use Reporting Overview

California's pesticide use reporting program is internationally recognized as the most comprehensive of its kind. CDPR annually collects and processes more than 2.5 million records of chemical applications. California was the first state to require full reporting of all pesticide use in agriculture.

Under full use reporting, the following pesticide uses are required to be reported to the County Agricultural Commissioner, who, in turn, reports the data to CDPR:

- for the production of any agricultural commodity, except livestock;
- for the treatment of postharvest agricultural commodities;
- for landscape maintenance in parks, golf courses, and cemeteries;
- for roadside and railroad rights-of-way;
- for poultry and fish production;
- any application of a restricted material;
- any application of a pesticide with the potential to pollute ground water when used outdoors in industrial and institutional settings; and
- any application by a licensed pest control operator (PCO). PCOs include ground and aerial agricultural applicators, structural applicators, and professional landscape gardeners.

Pesticide use reports help CDPR estimate dietary risk and ensure compliance with clean air laws and ground water regulations. Site-specific use report data, combined with geographic data on endangered species habitats, help County Agricultural Commissioners resolve potential pesticide use conflicts. CDPR also uses the data to analyze how, when and where pesticides are used on different crops. Reduced-risk pest management alternatives can then be developed considering the different regions of the State and the commodities grown in these regions.

2.2 History of Use Reporting in California

California has had limited use reporting since at least 1950. Then, the Department of Agriculture (CDPR's predecessor) reported that the County Agricultural Commissioners "required agricultural pest control operators to submit monthly reports on their work."

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

In 1970, the new regulations required farmers to report all applications of restricted pesticides. PCOs were required to report all pesticides used, whether restricted or non-restricted. Both kinds of reports had to include the pesticide applied, date and location (section, township, and range) where the application was made, and the crop involved if the application was in agriculture. The reports were filed with the agricultural commissioner in the county where the applications were made and were reported, in turn, to the State, which entered the reports into a database and summarized it in annual publications.

The Food Safety Act of 1989 (Chapter 1200, AB 2161) gave the Department clear statutory authority to require full reporting of pesticide use. That year, the Department adopted regulations and full use reporting began in 1990. Reports are filed with the agricultural commissioner in the county where the applications occur. Commissioners send reports to the Department (most do so electronically), and information is entered into the statewide database.

Full use reports include the date and location (section, township, and range) for the application and the kind and amount of pesticides used. If the pesticide is applied to a crop, it must be specified. Two new data items — operator and site identification — were added to help determine and calculate the actual percentage of crops treated. These data items are useful in making pesticide risk assessments.

2.3 The Use Reporting Process

Before the purchase and use of pesticides, every property owner (or operator) is required to obtain a unique identification number from any county in which pest control work will be performed. Growers also obtain a site identification number from the County Agricultural Commissioner for each location and crop/commodity where pest control work will be performed, and this ID number is recorded on the restricted material permit or other approved form.

The information that must be reported for agricultural applications includes geographic location including the section, township, range, base, and meridian; operator identification or permit number, name and address; field location and site identification number; commodity/crop/site treated; acres or units planted and treated; application method (air or ground); amount of product applied along with its name and U.S. EPA/California registration number.

Non-agricultural applicators submit monthly summary reports that include only pesticide product name and manufacturer, the product registration number, amount used, number of applications, the kind of site treated (e.g., roadside, structure), and total number of applications of all pesticides.

Reports are submitted to the County Agricultural Commissioner's office, where they are reviewed by staff for accuracy, and entered into a county database. The data is transferred monthly to C DPR. Fifty-six of the State's 58 counties — representing 99 percent of the reported pesticide use — transfer records

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

electronically. Additionally, some counties accommodate direct web-based reporting eliminating the need for data entry.

2.4 Improving the Process

The California Electronic Data Transfer System (CEDTS) was developed in 1991 by CDPR in cooperation with the University of California and the Kern County Agricultural Commissioner's Office. Using standard modems and local telephone lines, this program provides the basis for transferring notices of intent and pesticide use reports from pest control operators, growers, and others to the County Agricultural Commissioners' offices. CEDTS helps make the full use reporting process more efficient, and improves the quality and timeliness of the data.

Growers and PCOs use many computer systems and software applications in their day-to-day farming and business operations. The CEDTS program does not place hardware or software requirements on industry participants, other than what is required for actual electronic transfer. The only limitations are placed on the data itself, which must meet the specified transmission format. Detailed system requirements and documentation can be obtained from Merced County Agricultural Commissioner.

Although response to CEDTS from pesticide users was favorable, adoption of the reporting system was slow. Many growers and pest control operators lack the time and expertise to write the software that pulls together the necessary pieces of information into a single pesticide use application database that meets CDPR's standardized data requirements. In response, in 1999, private software providers and others began introducing systems that allow use reporting via Internet Web sites. In addition, new programs are being developed to allow nonagricultural users of pesticides to file electronic reports.

Note: Although RMMS and AgGIS continue to support CEDTs, RMMS has enhanced the CEDTs specification for the purpose of more efficiently processing use reports and notices of intent on the web via a process called PReData.

2.5 Site Identification (ID) and County Mapping Assistance

During the first 10 years of full use reporting, site IDs were only unique when combined with the grower identification and often the commodity. They did not refer to parcels or specific geographic locations. Site IDs changed from year to year for the same grower, and also with changes in land ownership and property management. Evaluating historical pesticide use geographically, to the degree now often required, was nearly impossible under the existing site ID system. In December 1994, a pilot project provided training for county commissioner staffs in standard mapping techniques, procedures, and map interpretation.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

This was the first step in the development and implementation of a standardized site identification system. The training provided the skills and materials needed to locate sites (fields) on large, detailed topographic maps which could then enhance the assessment of environmental conditions at application sites and enable long-term tracking of applications on a geographic site-specific basis.

Subsequently, the computerized permit programs were revised to include geographic information system (GIS) capabilities to capture the mapping coordinates of field sites and the supporting data. CDPR has developed tools to allow field sites to be identified geographically, but with changing technological capabilities at the commissioner level, the department's primary function is now to provide technical expertise and support to the evolving county-level GIS programs.

Note: Information for sections 2.1 through 2.5 above was found at the CDPR website, <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/pressrls/dprguide/chap10.pdf>.

2.6 Computerized Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting

Originally, CDPR created a DOS-based, Data Flex application known as Restricted Materials Permit Program (RMPP) for counties to use for pesticide permit issuance and use reporting. Eventually the system became outdated so CDPR started working on a replacement system called Statewide Pesticide Use Reporting System (SPURS). The idea was to create a centralized system for the counties to connect to online. However, there was little support among the Ag Commissioners for such a system and funding was inadequate. Roughly 50% of the counties reporting pesticide use had already invested in other applications to replace or enhance RMPP. The two systems that emerged from these efforts were AgGIS and RMMS. Through the years CDPR has worked with CACASA to improve these two systems, most recently encouraging the vendors to use SQL compliant databases and integrate GIS. The two systems use conceptually different design philosophies. AgGIS is built upon open source software while RMMS uses proprietary software. Because funding for these systems was limited to county general funds, AgGIS had the advantage of low acquisition costs while RMMS had development, licensing, and maintenance fees associated with its use. In 2006, CACASA began allocating funds for these systems through the distribution of Pesticide Residual Mill Funds (a centralized statewide funding system). Agricultural Commissioners now have more flexibility in choosing which system they wish to use. However, the Pesticide Residual Mill Funds is supporting the development efforts of two different systems providing the same solution.

2.7 Evolving Systems

Initially the early systems were designed just to handle permit issuance and pesticide use reporting. Over time additional functions have been automated. Some of these functions such as GIS have been added or will soon be added to the main permit issuance and use reporting systems. Other functions now reside

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

in stand alone and sometimes incompatible systems. These applications have been developed either in-house or by outside vendors such as Statewide Soft which developed an automated inspection reporting system (AIRS).

3 SCOPE OF WORK

3.1 Business process analysis and requirements definition

- The Consultant shall review the functionality of existing pesticide permitting and use reporting systems (AgGIS, RMMS, and other county hosted systems) including but not limited to:
 - Restricted Material Permits
 - Use Reporting
 - Notices of Intent
 - Operator Identification Numbers (OIN)
 - Integrated GIS functionality
- Upon selection, the Consultant shall present an overview to CACASA to discuss their project plan.
- The Consultant shall conduct interviews with stakeholders to determine the pesticide permitting and use reporting system requirements and desired outcomes. The Consultant will interview in the following order:
 - CDPR staff, including the IT and Enforcement Divisions (Sacramento)
 - AgGIS (Chico, CA) and RMMS (Long Beach, CA) vendors
 - CAC staff, including users, IT professionals, and management (8 regionally diverse on-site interviews must be conducted. Location will be determined by the selection committee at a later date)
- Document business related practices and processes.
- Document organizational structure and methods of financing.
- Comparative analysis of using local, regional, and/or centralized Web-based systems to provide pesticide permitting and use reporting functions.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- Conduct a comparative analysis (GAP) between existing systems and desired outcomes.
- List current hardware configurations, software applications and IT staffing requirements.
- The Consultant will tabulate results and provide a detailed written assessment (“Draft Needs Assessment”) of the information gathered. The Assessment will be based on the interviews and research done by the Consultant. The Assessment will discuss the pesticide permitting and use reporting needs and requirements of each county and CDPR.
- Upon CACASA’s review and comment, the Consultant will revise the Draft Needs Assessment to become the Final Needs Assessment, as agreed upon between the Consultant and CACASA.

3.2 Recommend an IT Solution

- The Consultant shall recommend an IT solution for a statewide pesticide permitting and use reporting system. The recommendation will be based upon the needs and requirements of the State and Counties and the evaluation of the existing pesticide permitting and use reporting systems, AgGIS and RMMS. The Consultant shall include in the recommendation:
 - Purchases, specifications, and configuration of data, software and hardware.
 - Strategy for deployment and conversion of data.
 - Provide recommendation on whether to use local, regional, and/or centralized Web-based systems to provide pesticide permitting and use reporting functions.
 - Staffing requirements for implementation including:
 - CDPR
 - CACASA
 - County
 - Contracted consultants.
 - Staff training.
 - Estimate of costs of all items in the Design.
 - Data ownership, acquisition and maintenance responsibilities.
 - Organizational structure and methods of financing.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- Estimate of staffing and costs for on-going IT operations, including:
 - CDPR, CACASA, County, and Consultant staffing,
 - Maintenance, support, and on-going development.
- Any other necessary specifications, procedures, or plans needed for a successful IT solution.
- The Consultant will prepare a report on the design recommendations (“Draft Recommendation Report”).
- Upon CACASA review and comment, the Consultant will revise the Draft Design Report as agreed upon. The Draft Recommendation Report will become the Final Recommendation Report.

3.3 Propose Implementation/Transition Plan

Based on the recommended IT solution, the Consultant will prepare an Implementation/Transition Plan to define necessary tasks and procedures, in a logical sequence, to be taken to implement the Final Recommendation Report. The Implementation/Transition Plan will also define the parties responsible for each step, define a schedule of task start and end dates, and define the necessary sequence of actions required to transition counties from their existing system to the recommended IT solution. The Implementation/Transition Plan will include, but not be limited to, consideration of:

- Data creation, data conversion, and data documentation as necessary
- Quality assurance
 - Test plan
 - Test scripts (with expected testing results)
- Ongoing data maintenance
- Development of customized applications for staff access to data, for initial implementation as well as on an ongoing basis, including programming requirements if needed
- Hardware, software, data installations and configurations
- Training of staff
- How technical support will be delivered
- Development of a timeline for transition

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- Assessment of available funding to acquire the selected solution.
- Development of an audit function for tracking costs and performance measures for implementing the IT solution
- Establish IT solution project management structure
- Define change management process including communication of scope changes and related costs
- Refinement of costs, scheduling, and staffing initially determined in Final Recommendation Report.

The Implementation/Transition Plan will also include a listing and explanation of the above, plus any other pertinent deliverables that the Consultant shall provide to assist in the implementation.

3.4 Optional Scope of Work Areas

The Consultant may opt to bid separately on the items below following the same evaluation process as required for the Scope of Work.

- The CAC pesticide enforcement IT needs beyond the pesticide permitting and use reporting functionality listed in the Scope of Work. Additional areas of interest include automation of:
 - Field Inspection Reporting
 - Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report (PRAMR)
 - Enforcement Log
 - Pesticide Investigation Tracking
- The possibility of finding a pesticide permitting and use reporting system not currently in use by the CACs that would meet their needs is unlikely. However, the Consultant may opt to bid separately on the evaluation of alternative systems.
- CACASA regularly receives requests for funding of new technical projects or enhancements to existing systems. The Consultant may opt to bid separately on developing a strategic plan to oversee the following processes:
 - application requirements
 - project approval
 - project funding
 - milestone tracking
 - project accountability

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

4 PROJECT SCHEDULE

Schedule for Consultant Selection Date

Date	Event
August 11, 2008	RFP Release Date
August 18, 2008	Pre-Proposal Conference (10:30 A.M. Pacific)
September 12, 2008	Proposals Due (4:00 PM)
October 10, 2008	Initial Screening Process Complete
October 27- Nov 7, 2008	Proposer Presentations (finalists only)*
November 14, 2008	Screening Process Complete including reference checks
November 21, 2008	Finalist Selection
December 19, 2008	Contract Awarded

Schedule of Work Date; Deliverable(s)

Date	Event
TBD	Kickoff Meeting
TBD	Final Needs Assessment*
TBD	Recommend IT Solution*
TBD	Implementation/Transition Plan*

* In the proposal the Consultant will indicate time needed to perform Tasks 1, 2, and 3. All tasks associated with this project have to be finalized and completed by **June 30, 2009**.

Work shall begin immediately after both the Consultant and the CACASA sign a Consulting Agreement. Time of the completion of the three phases shall be as agreed upon in the Consulting Agreement and the payment schedule as described later in the RFP.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

5 SAMPLE CONTRACT

A copy of a sample contract (attachment A) has been included. Please provide comments on any part(s) of the contract the Consultant would like changed as part of the Consultant's RFP response. If the Consultant is selected as the vendor for this RFP and the Consultant has submitted a change request for the standard contract, the change(s) will be addressed during the vendor contract meetings and changes to the standard contract will be made as agreed to by CACASA and the Consultant. If the Consultant does not submit a requested change(s) to the contract as part of the Consultant's RFP response CACASA will execute our standard contract for this RFP.

Payment for Services. The payment schedule will be by phase deliverable as established by the guidelines of this RFP (see Table 1 on page 4). If a different payment schedule is desired, please indicate such in the RFP proposal.

Retention of Billings. CACASA will retain 10% of each billing amount for each phase until the contract is completed and accepted. CACASA will penalize the vendor \$150 per each business day that the contract is not complete past the project phase deliverables dates.

6 METHOD OF SELECTION

The selection of a Consultant will be based on a ranking given by CACASA's Selection Committee after reviewing the submitted proposals. All proposals will be reviewed by CACASA and ranked based on, but not limited to, the following criteria:

- Experience of the firm
- Experience of key project staff
- References from past clients on similar projects
- Experience with both open source and proprietary software.
- Experience with GIS projects.
- Experience with large scale software development projects.
- Presentation and communication skills
- Responsiveness to the scope of work in the RFP
- Price

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- Ability and capacity to complete the project within the proposed schedule
- Record of performance on previous projects
- Proposed technical and procedural methods to complete scope of work
- Project management

A vendor will be selected that best meets the evaluation criteria. The lowest cost bid will not necessarily be the selected bid, as long as the bid is within our project budget that has been allocated.

A short list of top ranked consultants will be interviewed by the Selection Committee and further reviewed until one Consultant is chosen. References will be contacted to determine if the proposing consultant is responsive and responsible. References will be asked about their overall impression of the proposing consultant, quality of work performed, understanding of the factors affecting the implementation, and the timeliness of the Consultant's work.

All applicants will be advised of the Consultant selected for the project when the Selection Committee has completed its work.

7 RFP LIMITATIONS

CACASA intends to award a single contract to a vendor for the scope of work described in this RFP. However, CACASA reserves the right to:

- Postpone, modify, or cancel this RFP
- Reject any or all proposals
- Amend the scope of work and cost with selected contractor
- Waive any minor irregularities or informalities in the RFP, and
- Request clarification from any bidder on a proposal

The consultant/consulting firm selected by this RFP process will not be allowed to provide or be compensated for the recommended IT solution.

CACASA will not reimburse vendors for any cost associated with preparing or submitting a proposal for this RFP. All proposals, inquiries, written materials, and literature provided to CACASA for this RFP become the property of CACASA and

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

will not be returned. CACASA reserves the right to use any information contained in proposals whether a vendor proposal is selected or not.

8 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The project manager for this RFP will be Robert Lilley, San Luis Obispo County Agricultural Commissioner. Vendors responding to this RFP will indicate the name and experience of the project manager who will be responsible for oversight of this contract and scope of work. After the contract is awarded, the CACASA project manager must approve any change in project management or key personnel assigned to the development of this project.

9 Information to be Submitted

9.1 General

Proposals shall be typed on 8 ½" x 11" white paper, printed on two sides, and bound. Proposals should be concise. Proposals shall not contain extraneous marketing materials or information that is not pertinent to this RFP.

Persons or firms wishing to respond to this invitation must supply the minimum number of copies set forth in the transmittal letter by the date and time requested. The nature and form of response is at the discretion of those responding, but shall include the information listed below. Additional information submitted after the formal closing date and time will not be accepted.

9.2 Introductory Cover Letter

A Letter of Proposal shall be submitted as an introductory cover letter and include the following:

- A statement that your company will perform the services, provide the equipment, and abide by the terms and conditions stated in the Request for Proposal and Proposer Response.
- A statement that you agree to the Terms and Conditions specified in Appendix A – Sample Contract.
- A specification of who should be contacted in follow-up to your response along with their contact information.

9.3 Information Required

To facilitate comparisons during the evaluation, the following information shall be listed in the order shown and shall appear at the front of all proposals submitted, immediately following the Letter of Proposal:

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- Type of service your firm is particularly qualified to perform. Generally describe the scope of services provided by your firm without the use of outside consultants.
- Names of all individuals involved with this project, their proposed areas of responsibility, and their professional qualifications in those areas.
- Include telephone numbers and contact names for personnel of Consultant that are proposed for this project.
- An organizational chart for the project team and resumes for key Consultant personnel should be included. Staff for quality control should be part of the organizational plan.
- The Consultant's current permanent staff size and how the size has varied in the last five years.
- Names, addresses, telephone numbers, background qualifications and the scope of services that will be provided by all Sub consultants proposed to be used.
- A brief representative listing of similar projects completed in the last five years by personnel of the Consultant that are proposed for this project.
- A proposed bid amount with subtotals for each of 3 main deliverables described in the Scope of Work. The proposed bid amount shall include a breakdown, by name of individual project team members, of the amount of time in person-hours that will be devoted to the project for all staff of the Consultant and all Sub consultants. In addition to the estimated person-hours of participation of each, include the hourly rate of each individual, and the amount of reimbursable expenses. The proposed bid amount shall include the amount of all travel that is expected.
- Project Understanding. This section should include a demonstration of the Consultant's understanding of the proposed project and should define the methodology to be used.
- Technical Approach: This section should describe the Consultant's technical work plan for the project. This description should include but not be limited to:
 - A brief narrative of the technical approach to be followed and the quality assurance program to be used.
 - A work program outlining the proposed work steps for each of the tasks discussed in The Scope of Work.

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

- A time schedule indicating start and completion dates for each deliverable. The schedule should emphasize the steps the Consultant intends to take to complete the deliverables according to the schedule.
- Other information that might aid the Selection Committee in ascertaining the Consultant qualifications.
- Listing of any lawsuit or litigation and the result of that action resulting from any job undertaken by the firm or by its Sub consultants that is pending or has occurred on projects within the last five years.

Questions concerning this RFP should be directed to Robert Lilley, project manager, by e-mail at rlilley@co.slo.ca.us.

10 Optional Vendor Meeting

An optional Vendor's Conference will be held at 10:00 on Monday, August 18, 2008 at the San Luis Obispo County Department of Agriculture in the Ag Auditorium – 2156 Sierra Way, Suite A, San Luis Obispo, CA.

The purpose of this conference is to give vendors the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the project and ask questions of our project management staff. Clarification of the specifications, or other matters having to do with the proposal procedure or the work, will be discussed at the meeting. Written clarification or addenda will be emailed to all vendors within five (5) working days after this conference.

11 Submittal of Proposals

Proposals must be received by mail, recognized carrier, or hand delivered **no later than 4:00 PM PST on September 12, 2008 to the following address:**

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures
Robert Lilley, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer, Project Manager
2156 Sierra Way, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Late proposals will not be considered. Submit 12 printed copies and 12 CD's of your proposal in Microsoft Word or Adobe pdf file format. The original submission shall be clearly marked "ORIGINAL." A representative authorized to commit the proposing entity in contractual matters must sign the copy marked

CACASA IT Consultant Request for Proposal

“ORIGINAL.” The Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall be typed on 8 ½” x 11” white paper, printed on two sides, and bound.

12 Public Opening of Proposals

Proposals will be opened publicly on September 12, 2008 at 4:30 PM (PST) in the Center Conference Room at 2156 Sierra Way, Suite A, San Luis Obispo, CA.

13 Attachments

- A. Sample Contract**
- B. Map of Counties - AgGIS and RMMS**