

Enterprise Application Integration 4/19/2006
Evaluation Committee Actions

An Evaluation Committee consisting of Lora Beth Canterbury, John H. Carter, James D. Moening, David H. McCune, and Richard C. Rutherford was seated to evaluate proposals received from solicitation SA001889, Enterprise Application Entegration, which was due for submittal 3/9/2006.

The Evaluation Committee received proposals from the following eight firms:

- GeoAnalytics
- Oracle
- KPMG
- Plangraphics
- Attevo
- MWH
- Woolpert
- EMA

The proposal from EMA was not considered as it did not meet the specifications of the RFP. Specifically, the EMA proposal exceeded the 50 page limit by a total of 5 pages, not including 7 fly sheets.

After a careful review of the seven qualifying packages, the Evaluation Committee invited the two top scoring firms of MWH and Woolpert with which to hold additional discussions. References were also checked for both firms.

Following the review of the two top scoring firms the Evaluation Committee met to reevaluate the score of MWH and Woolpert based on additional discussions. The results of the additional review did not result in any change of score for either firm. However, the reference checks revealed a negative recommendation for MWH. Please see attached reference fact finding sheets and reference summation sheet for further details on references.

Please find the scoring results and comments from the Evaluation Committee attached in the standard form prescribed by the Department.

John H. Carter

**Department of Public Utilities
Summary Report**

Division: Directors Office

Date of Notice

To City Council: 3-Apr-06

Project:

Estimated Cost:

RFP Due Date:

9-Mar-06

Professional Services for Enterprise Application
Integration

\$1,300,000

Date of Report:

31-Mar-06

Committee's Ranking of Technical Proposals

Offeror:

Total Points:

GeoAnalytics

50

Oracle

50

KPMG

51

Plangraphics

55

Attevo

56

MWH

81

Woolpert

82

EMA

0

Committee Members

Name:

Classification:

John H. Carter

GIS Analyst DOS

Lora Beth Canterbury

Programmer Analyst DOS

James D. Moening

Software Engineer DOS

David H. McCune

Senior Systems Administrator DOS

Richard C. Rutherford

Water Research Analyst II DOW

Criterion (from public notice): Professional Quality

Offeror: GeoAnalytics

Proposed Subcontractors: SAS Institute

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	30

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

They exhibited moderate understanding of the scope of work with an approach that relied heavily upon department staff to acquire significant documentation and work processes without their involvement, as well as a subconsultant that locked DPU into a specific solution for a possible phase 2. The proposed schedule was extremely unrealistic with a 10 week completion time for the entire work plan. The prime consultant showed little experience with enterprise application projects.

Offeror: Oracle

Proposed Subcontractors: Compuware

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	27

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

This consultant did not offer project specific descriptions for their proposed scope and approach. They did not explore an assessment of existing work flow and business process issues specific to DPU. They did not offer any examples of previous work to demonstrate past performance or understanding of developing an EAI implementation plan. It was felt they made assumptions that their products would meet all our business needs without consideration of alternatives.

Offeror: KPMG

Proposed Subcontractors: Excel

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	23

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

They were not familiar with DPU business operations and did not propose a reasonable method of overcoming this limitation. They did not consider phase 2 in their scope of work or approach. They are limited to business advisory responsibilities and did not show any examples of integration work with little innovation in their proposal. They did not provide strong examples of previous similar experiences or specific experience in EAI.

Offeror: Plangraphics

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	31

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

They relied heavily on their previous experiences with DPU to limit their project approach, however, it was felt that their understanding was out of date and not relevant to our existing business environment. The scope and approach relied on custom solutions without a preference for off the shelf solutions. The length of the proposed schedule was extremely excessive for the amount of work proposed in the scope of work.

Offeror: Attevo

Proposed Subcontractors: Red Oak, Unicon

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	29

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The prime consultant showed little previous experience with similar projects or EAI work. The schedule was poorly defined and did not reflect the tasks proposed in the scope of work. They exhibited an understanding of the scope of work, but the approach was fractured and not clearly defined and showed no innovation with regard to technology.

Criterion (from public notice): Professional Quality

Offeror: MWH

Proposed Subcontractors: Inflection Point Solutions, HMB, Inflection Technology

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	46

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

They exhibited an excellent understanding of the scope of work. Their schedule was well documented and detailed with a realistic timeframe. They proposed a flexible and realistic schedule for phase 2 implementation based on the needs identified in phase 1. They demonstrated a strong understanding of the necessary technology for the project, as well as a demonstrated understanding of our specific applications.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: EMH&T, Great Northern Consulting

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	47

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

They exhibited an excellent understanding of the scope of work. Their schedule was well documented and detailed with a realistic timeframe. They proposed a flexible and realistic schedule for phase 2 implementation based on the needs identified in phase 1. They demonstrated an understanding of the necessary technology for the project. In addition, they provided a realistic vision for the project highlighting success measures for all users of the system including our citizens.

Offeror: EMA

Proposed Subcontractors: Unicon, Crowe

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

This proposal was in excess of the fifty page limit (page 4 of RFP) and was rejected and was not considered.

Offeror:

Proposed Subcontractors:

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Offeror:

Proposed Subcontractors:

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
50	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Criterion (from public notice): Experience of Team

Offeror: GeoAnalytics

Proposed Subcontractors: SAS Institute

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	13

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. The project team showed a good general experience with utilities and government clients. The personnel also showed experience with projects of similar size and complexity. However, the project manager showed limited experience with utility and information systems projects.

Offeror: Oracle

Proposed Subcontractors: Compuware

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	8

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. A project manager was not named in the proposal and was considered non-responsive. The listed staff showed govt. experience but did not show utility experience. The staff were not committed to any project area and no project team duties or responsibilities were proposed.

Offeror: KPMG

Proposed Subcontractors: Excel

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	11

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. The project team showed experience with govt. and utility customers in the area of financial management, however not in the areas of operations, maintenance, SCADA, or general systems integration projects.

Offeror: Plangraphics

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	15

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. The project manager and all other project staff showed strong experience with projects of similar size and complexity. They also showed significant utility and govt. experience.

Offeror: Attevo

Proposed Subcontractors: Red Oak, Unicon

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. A project manager was not named in the proposal and was considered non-responsive. The staff showed experience with projects of similar size and complexity. They also showed good utility and govt. experience.

Criterion (from public notice):

Experience of Team

Offeror: MWH

Proposed Subcontractors: Inflection Point Solutions, HMB, Inflection Technology

Max. # pts.
Possible

20

Avg. pts.
Received

15

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. The project manager and all other project staff showed strong experience with projects of similar size and complexity. They also showed significant utility and govt. experience as well as knowledge of our specific applications.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: EMH&T, Great Northern Consulting

Max. # pts.
Possible

20

Avg. pts.
Received

15

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Project dedication was not addressed by any proposal and was removed from consideration as a scoring factor. The project manager and all other project staff showed strong experience with projects of similar size and complexity. They also showed significant utility and govt. experience as well as knowledge of the internal workings of government.

Offeror: EMA

Proposed Subcontractors: Unicon, Crowe

Max. # pts.
Possible

20

Avg. pts.
Received

0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

This proposal was in excess of the fifty page limit (page 4 of RFP) and was rejected and was not considered.

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts.
Possible

20

Avg. pts.
Received

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts.
Possible

20

Avg. pts.
Received

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Criterion (from public notice): Experience of Firm

Offeror: GeoAnalytics

Proposed Subcontractors: SAS Institute

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	7

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror has shown participation in utility trade associations, but did not show significant impact in the industry. The offeror has experience with information systems projects, but did not show significant experience across the full spectrum of utility systems to be integrated.

Offeror: Oracle

Proposed Subcontractors: Compuware

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror did not provided any client references to claim or confirm any utility industry experience. In not providing client references or highlighting previous work in general, the proposal was considered non-responsive to these scoring categories.

Offeror: KPMG

Proposed Subcontractors: Excel

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	7

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror showed experience with utility customers in the area of financial management, but did not show significant experience across the full spectrum of utility systems to be integrated.

Offeror: Plangraphics

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	9

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror has shown participation in utility trade associations which demonstrated an impact within the utility industry. The offeror also demonstrated experience in a broad spectrum of utility related information systems.

Offeror: Attevo

Proposed Subcontractors: Red Oak, Unicon

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	7

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The prime consultant has not shown significant participation in utility trade association or significant experience in a broad spectrum of utility related information systems. However, the subconsultant did show strong experience in many utility related information systems.

Criterion (from public notice):

Experience of Firm

Offeror: MWH

Proposed Subcontractors: Inflection Point Solutions, HMB, Inflection Technology

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror has shown participation in utility trade associations which demonstrated an impact within the utility industry. The offeror also demonstrated experience in a broad spectrum of utility related information systems. They have a very strong presence in the utility industry nationwide as well as in Ohio specifically. Their team also brings extensive knowledge of our SCADA, LIMS, and PIMS systems.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: EMH&T, Great Northern Consulting

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror has shown participation in utility trade associations which demonstrated an impact within the utility industry. The offeror also demonstrated experience in a broad spectrum of utility related information systems. Their team also brings extensive knowledge of our sanitary, storm, and water utility GIS data and systems.

Offeror: EMA

Proposed Subcontractors: Unicon, Crowe

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

This proposal was in excess of the fifty page limit (page 4 of RFP) and was rejected and was not considered.

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

.

Criterion (from public notice): Local Workforce

Offeror: GeoAnalytics

Proposed Subcontractors: SAS Institute

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror proposed no local workforce for this project.

Offeror: Oracle

Proposed Subcontractors: Compuware

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	15

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that 75% of the proposed project team was paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal was submitted.

Offeror: KPMG

Proposed Subcontractors: Excel

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that 50% of the proposed project team was paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal was submitted.

Offeror: Plangraphics

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that they believe the project staff would be comprised of 25 to 50 percent local workforce for phase 1. This answer was considered to be non-committal to project staff currently paying City of Columbus income tax and the offeror was awarded zero points as a result.

Offeror: Attevo

Proposed Subcontractors: Red Oak, Unicon

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that 50% of the proposed project team was paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal was submitted.

Criterion (from public notice): Local Workforce

Offeror: MWH

Proposed Subcontractors: Inflection Point Solutions, HMB, Inflection Technology

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that 51% of the proposed project team was paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal was submitted.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: EMH&T, Great Northern Consulting

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	10

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

The offeror stated that 50% of the proposed project team was paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal was submitted.

Offeror: EMA

Proposed Subcontractors: Unicon, Crowe

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	0

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

This proposal was in excess of the fifty page limit (page 4 of RFP) and was rejected and was not considered.

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

Offeror: _____

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	

Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided

EAI Project: Amalgamated Score Sheet (April 19th, 2006)

	Professional Quality						50
	PQ1. Approach	PQ2. Demonstrated Understanding	PQ3. Innovation	PQ4. Schedule	PQ5. Sensitivity to Cost	PQ6. Consideration of Relevant City Features	PQ7. Project Specific Criteria
	<i>Is the approach realistic and do it meet the needs of the project?</i>	<i>Evidence of understanding the scope of the work.</i>	<i>Has the Offeror proposed an innovative approach or solution to meet the needs of the project?</i>	<i>Schedule meets need and is realistic.</i>	<i>Sensitivity to cost factors (efficiency, willingness to work from existing and reliable work product, allocation of appropriately-skilled personnel).</i>	<i>Does the Offeror (and the proposed personnel) have a successful history of completing similar projects?</i>	<i>Has the offeror successfully developed an EAI implementation plan?</i>
Max Point Value =	5	9	4	9	5	9	9
Attevo	3	7	0	5	3	7	4
GeoAnalytics	3	5	3	4	4	7	4
KPMG	3	4	1	4	2	5	4
MWH	5	9	3	7	5	9	8
Oracle	3	6	1	6	3	5	3
Plangraphics Inc.	4	7	1	4	3	7	5
Woolpert Inc.	5	8	4	8	5	9	8

	Experience of Team				Experience of Firm	
	20				10	
	ET2. Team Leadership	ET3. Gov't Experience	ET4. Personnel Exp	ET5. Project Dedication	EF2. Utilities Involvement	EF3. Industry Experience
	<i>Does the proposed project manager have the appropriate education and training.</i>	<i>Does the Offeror [personnel] involved have Utility and Government experience?</i>	<i>Do the personnel proposed by the offeror have experience with projects of similar size, complexity, and coordination requirements?</i>	<i>Will the project team be dedicated only to this project?</i>	<i>Does the Offeror[firm] understand our business? [e.g. by regularly participating in it's trade associations, AWWA, OTCO, etc.]</i>	<i>Has the Offeror been involved with Information System projects for Utilities?</i>
Max Point Value =	5	5	5	5	5	5
Attevo	0	5	5	0	3	4
GeoAnalytics	3	5	5	0	3	4
KPMG	4	4	3	0	3	4
MWH	5	5	5	0	5	5
Oracle	0	3	5	0	0	0
Plangraphics Inc.	5	5	5	0	4	5
Woolpert Inc.	5	5	5	0	5	5

	Local Workforce [select only one]				Totals
	LW1. 90% in Columbus	LW2. 75% in Columbus	LW3. 90% inside Franklin County	LW4. 50% in Columbus	
	Are at least 90% of the Team's project labor costs assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted? - 20	Are at least 75% of the Team's project labor costs assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted? - 15	Will at least 90% of the Team's labor be performed in an office location within Franklin County, but outside of the Columbus Corporate limits on the date the proposal is submitted? - 15	Are at least 50% of the Team's project labor costs assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted? - 10	
Max Point Value =	20	15	15	10	
Attevo	10				56
GeoAnalytics	0				50
KPMG	10				51
MWH	10				81
Oracle	15				50
Plangraphics Inc.	0				55
Woolpert Inc.	10				82

Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) Reference Summations

References checked on 4/13/2006

Follow-up on MWH Las Vegas reference check on 4/17/2006

The EAI evaluation committee developed a specific set of questions. These questions were asked of two reference projects for each of the two top scoring firms.

References were checked for MWH and Woolpert as part of the Evaluation Committee review process. Woolpert received two very positive recommendations. However, MWH received one positive recommendation and one negative recommendation.

Woolpert Reference Check

The two references checked for Woolpert were Grand Rapids, MI and Topeka, KS. References for Woolpert were very positive for the firm in general and very positive specifically for Paul Klimas, Woolpert's proposed project manager.

MWH Reference Check

The two references checked for MWH were Las Vegas, NV and Ft. Worth, TX. The Ft. Worth, TX reference for MWH was very positive. The Las Vegas, NV reference for MWH was very negative. Las Vegas stated the City decided to end the project early as they did not feel the project was going well. Las Vegas stated they would not consider MWH for further IT Work.

The evaluation committee brings forth concerns regarding MWH with regard to the EAI work under consideration. The committee feels the negative review by Las Vegas calls into question the ability of MWH to do EAI work to the satisfaction of the City of Columbus. Specifically, the committee thought statements made by Las Vegas called into question the ability of MWH's proposed project manager, John Hansen, to adequately perform the implementation phase. This committee opinion is based solely on statements made by employees of the City of Las Vegas. Please see attached fact finding sheets for details.

Please find attached fact finding sheets the committee used to seek reference information.

EAI Reference Responses:

Date of Interview: 04/13/2006
By: Rich Rutherford
City: City of Fort Worth
Interviewee/s: Mr. Randy Rinon, IT Manager, Water Department
(817) 392-8272

- 1) Did **MWH** meet your expectations with respect to:
 - a. Quality of deliverables
Yes: for both validation (of BEA WebLogic) and implementation.
 - b. Meeting project deadlines
Yes: Meet them all as designed.
 - c. Responsiveness and/or follow-up with project issues
Yes: Was able to quickly incorporate changes in Fort Worth's management personnel for this project into the planning & reporting process; Addressed issues well.
 - d. Adaptability to changes
Yes: as above
- 2) Did **MWH** anticipate any project related issues that were not considered by your organization?
Use of GIS technology was a strong aspect for this company's approach.
- 3) Were any changes in project scope resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?
No. Arrived at decisions together with Fort Worth project managers, and implemented well.
- 4) Were any changes in project schedule resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?
No. MWH was on time, and reacted well to changes requested by Fort Worth in scope of project.
- 5) Were any changes in project budget resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?
No. MWH meet its budget, and is projected to finish on time this year in December.

6) Were there significant changes to **MWH**'s project team throughout the project?

Somewhat. But it was not an issue for the specified project. MWH was re-orienting its structure part way through the project to go from decentralized (personnel) resources (& online support), to a central office approach based from Denver. After this, MWH had a member dedicated to the project on site (working/living in the City of Fort Worth.)

7) Would you consider **MWH** for further IT related work with your organization?

Yes. They currently had seven million dollars invested with the firm, aimed toward their current middlewear solution.

8) Please describe the project they did for you and how you feel it went.

Mr. Rinon gave MWH good marks for their work, cooperation and professionalism on the project.

9) Does the integration require maintenance and/or updating? If so, is this done in-house or by service contract, etc?

Mr. Rinon described their current maintenance strategy as three part: 1) Via software vendor's and warranties; 2) In-house capabilities given internal programmers & analysts; and 3) having hired a new sub-consultant (either IBM or EMA) to handle general system maintenance.

He mentioned that MWH did not seek the maintenance contract after completion. And they did not go with the subs used by MWH.

Overall Notes:

Mr. Rinon described MWH's involvement for the listed reference work as involving:

- Business Process Assessment (Business Modeling)
- Selection of Systems
- Recommendation and implementation of the selected systems

Maintenance as mentioned was left to others.

Strangely, Mr. Rinon was not aware of Nathan Weddle's involvement. But mentioned working with John Hansen, Rodney Dell, and Jeff Price (as Project manager)

Date of Interview: 04/13/2006
By: Rich Rutherford
City: City of Las Vegas
Interviewee: Conference call lead by Ms. Dody Bateson for Las Vegas, Senior Management Analyst, Public Works
(702) 229-6737

1) Did **MWH** meet your expectations with respect to:

a. Quality of deliverables

No. MWH generated nice paper work, but it was too “pre-programmed”, the sense being that the work was from a template. An example was given with the organizational plan document that was ten pages long, having eight pages of filler background, with only the last two pages being specific to Las Vegas.

b. Meeting project deadlines

Yes. Met them, but Las Vegas decided to shorten the schedule to end the contract.

c. Responsiveness and/or follow-up with project issues

First response was Yes, then later changed to No. Some expectations were not met. Too many revisions of the plan being a key issue.

d. Adaptability to changes

Yes, but problematical.

2) Did **MWH** anticipate any project related issues that were not considered by your organization?

Yes. MWH did intercept and fix an issue that developed during data conversion in Las Vegas’ new LIMS system (Maxtrix plus), where they negotiated with the vendor for the fix.

3) Were any changes in project scope resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?

Yes? Project was ended early. “Many issues” [with MWH]

Ms. Bateson felt that MWH would work better with smaller systems, or systems that were entirely new. She mentioned problems with infrastructure assessment, and having far too many revisions in this stage as well.

- 4) Were any changes in project schedule resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?

Yes, See #3

- 5) Were any changes in project budget resulting from poor performance or negligence by **MWH**?

No specific budget overruns alluded to.

- 6) Were there significant changes to **MWH**'s project team throughout the project?

None mentioned.

- 7) Would you consider **MWH** for further IT related work with your organization?

No. Trying to get a handle on this I asked, on a 1-10 score how they would rank MWH (10 being the highest) they said MWH finished at 5. Started at 8-9, and went down in their estimation.

- 8) Please describe the project they did for you and how you feel it went.

"Not satisfied." Ms. Bateson felt that project management on the Las Vegas side was not factored into enough of the planning.
"They considered their role as sole managers..."

- 9) Does the integration require maintenance and/or updating? If so, is this done in-house or by service contract, etc?

Las Vegas chose to go with another group for system maintenance, other than MWH (mentioned Oracle PeopleSoft in this context.)

Overall Notes:

It was mentioned that the MWH were bright folks.

Sounds as if Las Vegas is going with Oracle PeopleSoft for their SOA, which they pointedly mentioned MWH could not support.

Given our situation, the Las Vegas project is more like a start from scratch implementation given our discussion.

Ms. Bateson did mention that she thinks things would have gone smoother with MWH if she had been in charge as project manager from the beginning. [I got the distinct sense that she did not appreciate the Las Vegas employees who hired MWH for the job.]

[I was very surprised that MWH's first reference rated them so poorly. Possible personality conflict? The Las Vegas interview started off guarded, then went south for MWH.]

EAI Reference Response MWH Followup:

Date of Interview: 04/17/2006
By: Rich Rutherford
City: City of Las Vegas
Interviewee: Conference call lead by Ms. Dody Bateson for Las Vegas, Senior Management Analyst, Public Works
(702) 229-6737

1) What where the cost for the **MWH** project?

The Las Vegas EAI project was described in two parts. The first phase being assessment & planning, and the second phase being the implementation of the final plan (also see pg. 23 of the MWH proposal to Columbus.)

The first phase cost \$556,000 & the second cost \$1.8 million.

2) What has been the timeline for the **MWH** project?

The first phase ran from November 2003 to June 2004 (8 months), and the second phase has run from January 2005 to May 2006 (17 months.)

3) Who has been the assigned project manager from **MWH**?

During the first phase it was Mr. Tommy Bernard.

During the second phase it began with Mr. Tommy Bernard, who then left the position for another company. He was replaced by Mr. John Hansen as project manager.

However, Ms. Bateson said that she had most of her contact with Mr. Tim Gallager from MWH during the project.

Date of Interview: 4/13/2006
By: John H. Carter
City: Grand Rapids, MI
Interviewee: Assistant City Manager Mr. Greg Sundstrom, questions 1-7
IT Manager Mr. Tom McQuillin, questions 8 & 9

- 1) Did Woolpert meet your expectations with respect to:
 - a. Quality of deliverables
yes
 - b. Meeting project deadlines
yes
 - c. Responsiveness and/or follow-up with project issues
yes
 - d. Adaptability to changes
yes
- 2) Did Woolpert anticipate any project related issues that were not considered by your organization?
Yes, alternative proposals
- 3) Were any changes in project scope resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?
No
- 4) Were any changes in project schedule resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?
No
- 5) Were any changes in project budget resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?
No
- 6) Were there significant changes to the Woolpert's project team throughout the project?
No
- 7) Would you consider Woolpert for further IT related work with your organization?
Yes, are currently.
- 8) Please describe the project Woolpert did for you and how you feel it went.

Paul Klimas was a City of Grand Rapids employee during the 2002 project. Ordinance change helped fix address problems. City Works – bs&a (taxes) – ESRI – Accella. Paul has expert knowledge in the field of integration.

- 9) Does the integration require maintenance and/or updating? If so, is this done in-house or by service contract, etc?

Maintenance is required. They do it in-house. Technical maintenance like programming would be contracted. Maintenance is critical.

Date of Interview: 4/13/2006
By: John H. Carter
City: Topeka, KS
Interviewee: Mr. Kyle Tjelmeland

1) Did Woolpert meet your expectations with respect to:

a. Quality of deliverables

Yes

b. Meeting project deadlines

Yes, there were extensions to deadlines but they were because the Topeka city staff could not keep up with the review.

c. Responsiveness and/or follow-up with project issues

Very Good

d. Adaptability to changes

Excellent

2) Did Woolpert anticipate any project related issues that were not considered by your organization?

Yes Woolpert did bring valuable information to the table that was not initially considered at the inception of the project.

3) Were any changes in project scope resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?

No

4) Were any changes in project schedule resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?

No

5) Were any changes in project budget resulting from poor performance or negligence by Woolpert?

No

6) Were there significant changes to Woolpert's project team throughout the project?

No Topeka is still working with the same Woolpert project manager on the extension of the contract as on the original contract.

7) Would you consider Woolpert for further IT related work with your organization?

Yes, Topeka has already extended the original contract to accomplish additional work.

- 8) Please describe the project they did for you and how you feel it went.

The project consisted of a strategic plan for information management. The solution involves the implementation of new software to integrate some departmental functions while using existing software for other functions. Topeka advises that Woolpert did a very good job of assessing the various business functions and of documenting the combined needs.

- 9) Does the integration require maintenance and/or updating? If so, is this done in-house or by service contract, etc?

Topeka could not answer this yet as the system is still being implemented but the belief is that contract help would be needed for updates.