

**STATE OF ARIZONA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FROM QUALIFIED FIRMS

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Auditor General (Office) for the State of Arizona is requesting proposals from qualified persons or firms (see Section D) to conduct a performance audit of the Maricopa Association of Governments' (MAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Maricopa County. Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §28-6313 requires the Office to contract with an independent auditor to conduct the performance audit. This audit must be completed no later than November 15, 2016. The audit's scope includes a review of statutorily mandated issues and other areas specifically identified in the work statement below.

B. BACKGROUND

The RTP is a comprehensive, performance-based, multi-modal, and coordinated regional plan, covering the period through fiscal year (FY) 2035. The RTP covers all major modes of transportation from a regional perspective, including freeways/highways, streets, and public mass transit. The RTP identifies specific projects and revenue allocations by transportation mode. MAG, which is the regional planning agency for the Phoenix metropolitan area, prepares, updates, and adopts the RTP [See [http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2014-01-30_Final-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-\(RTP\).pdf](http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2014-01-30_Final-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-(RTP).pdf) for the most recent RTP covering the planning period through FY 2035 and https://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2015-12-14_MAG-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-Amendments-as-of-Dec-14-2015.pdf for the most recent approved update to the RTP.]

The RTP has numerous components. The freeway/highway system represents one of the RTP's major elements. In addition, the arterial street grid system is a vital RTP component. Further, the RTP provides for a range of transit facilities and services such as a regional bus network and light rail. As directed by A.R.S. §28-6354(B), MAG has developed criteria to establish the priority of corridors, corridor segments, and other transportation projects. In addition, MAG adopted goals, objectives, and performance measures to guide the RTP's development and to gauge the RTP's progress and success. According to MAG, the RTP is more than 50

percent complete, including the opening of 375 general purpose miles and 360 HOV lane miles.

Major entities involved in RTP

Several different entities have responsibilities related to the RTP, including coordinating, managing, planning, overseeing, and constructing the RTP's projects. A brief description of these agencies, as well as their role in the RTP process, is detailed below:

- MAG—MAG is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning in the Maricopa County region. MAG members include representatives from the region's 27 incorporated cities and towns, Maricopa County, portions of Pinal County, three Native American Communities, the Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC), and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). MAG prepares, updates, and adopts the RTP. In addition, MAG is responsible for providing overall management of and oversight for implementing a half-cent sales tax that voters originally passed in 1985 and reauthorized in 2004, and which provides nearly half the regional revenues for the RTP. MAG is also responsible for administering the sales tax program's arterial street component. This includes preparing the MAG Arterial Street Life Cycle Program (ALCP) that presents revenues, costs, and schedules, and demonstrates that the program is in fiscal balance.¹ On June 24, 2015, MAG approved the 2016 ALCP. (See http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/ALCP_2015-09-01_FY-2016-Arterial-Life-Cycle-Program-August-26-2015.pdf for the 2016 Arterial Life Cycle Program.) Although MAG is responsible for administering the arterial program, MAG is not involved in the actual construction of projects nor does it oversee the construction of projects. Local government agencies accomplish this responsibility. In addition, ADOT maintains the arterial street fund on behalf of the MAG ALCP.
- ADOT—While MAG is responsible for developing the RTP and the ALCP, ADOT is responsible for the overall management of the Regional Freeway/Highway Program, including all design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and maintenance activities. In order to implement the RTP's projects, ADOT develops and maintains a Regional Transportation Plan Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program (RTPFP Life Cycle Program). The RTPFP Life Cycle Program extends through CY 2025 and helps ensure that the estimated costs of

¹ The concept of a life-cycle program refers to a programming approach that forecasts and allocates funds through the full life of a major funding source.

programmed freeway/highway improvements do not exceed the total amount of revenues available for those improvements. The RTPFP Life Cycle Program provides a comprehensive yearly listing of all freeway/highway projects, costs, and implementation schedule. (See <https://www.azdot.gov/docs/default-source/business/cetrpt-7-15.pdf?sfvrsn=2> for the most recent RTPFP.)

- Valley Metro—Valley Metro is the regional public transportation agency providing coordinated, multi-modal transit options to residents of greater Phoenix. Valley Metro, in coordination with its member agencies, plans, constructs, and operates the regional bus and light rail systems and alternative transportation programs. Valley Metro maintains the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) and is charged with ensuring that the estimated cost of the Regional Public Transportation System does not exceed the total amount of revenues expected to be available. (See http://www.valleymetro.org/publications_reports/transit_life_cycle_program for the most recent TLCP.) Valley Metro has one Chief Executive Officer and is governed by the following two boards:
 - The Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) Board consists of representatives from 16 public agencies (15 cities and Maricopa County) that set regional policy direction for all modes of transit except light rail. Per A.R.S. §48-5103, the RPTA Board is responsible for administering the half-cent sales tax revenues deposited into the Public Transportation Fund (PTF). Approximately one-third of the half-cent sales tax for transportation is devoted to public transportation and deposited into the PTF for use on transit projects. The RPTA Board must separately account for monies allocated to light rail transit, capital costs for other public transit, and operation and maintenance costs for other public transportation.
 - The Valley Metro Rail Board sets the policy direction for the light rail program. The Valley Metro Rail Board is composed of elected officials or other designated representatives for each of the five participating cities (Chandler, Glendale, Phoenix, Mesa, and Tempe). The Valley Metro Rail Board receives and disburses funds and grants from federal, state, local, and other funding sources. The Valley Metro Rail Board has the authority to enter into contracts for light rail passenger operations, planning, design, and construction. In addition, it can hire or contract for staff for light rail passenger operation and capital projects, including extensions to the system.

Funding Sources for the RTP

There are a number of RTP funding sources. These sources are considered to be reasonably available through the 2025 planning period. The RTP's major regional-level funding sources include:

- **Half-Cent Sales Tax**—On November 2, 2004, the voters of Maricopa County passed Proposition 400, which authorized the continuation of the existing half-cent sales tax for transportation in the region. As a result, the half-cent sales tax was continued 20 years, through calendar year 2025, to implement projects and programs identified in the MAG RTP. The sales tax is used to construct new freeways; widen existing freeways and highways; and improve the arterial street system, regional bus services, and other special transportation services, and high capacity transit services such as light rail, bus rapid transit, and express buses. The revenues from this sales tax are distributed as follows: 56.2 percent to the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) for freeways; 10.5 percent to RARF for major arterial streets and intersection improvements; and 33.3 percent to the Public Transportation Fund for capital costs, maintenance and operation of public transportation classifications, and capital costs and utility relocation costs associated with a light rail public transit system. All projects funded from the half-cent sales tax are included in the RTP and may be updated periodically by the MAG Transportation Improvement Program or other RTP amendments. The half-cent sales tax is the major funding source for the MAG RTP, providing nearly half the RTP revenues.
- **ADOT Funds**—ADOT relies on highway funding from two primary sources, the Arizona Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) and federal transportation funds. HURF funds can be used only on highways and streets; they cannot be used for transit purposes. The MAG Region receives annual funding from the State Highway Fund share of the HURF distribution. HURF consists of fuel taxes, vehicle license taxes, vehicle registration fees, and other sources. ADOT sets aside 12.6 percent of its distribution by state law, plus another 2.6 percent by State Transportation Board policy, for controlled access highways and freeways in the MAG and Pima Association of Government areas, of which 75 percent is allocated to the MAG region. In addition, a 37 percent share of ADOT Discretionary Funds is targeted to the MAG Region.

- MAG Region Federal Transportation Funds—A number of federal transportation funding sources are available for use in implementing projects in the MAG RTP. The principal sources include: Federal Transit 5307, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5316, 5317, 5337, and 5339 Funds; Federal Highway Surface Transportation (STP) Funds; Transportation Alternatives Funds; National Highway Performance Program Funds; Highway Safety Improvement Program Funds; and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funds. [Chapter 7 of the Regional Transportation Plan at [https://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2014-01-30_Final-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-\(RTP\).pdf](https://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2014-01-30_Final-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-(RTP).pdf) provides additional information on these funds.]

In addition to state and federal funding sources, local governments provide funding that supports the RTP's implementation. These resources provide matching monies for capital projects in the MAG ALCP and Light Rail Program; supplement certain transit operating costs; and, in the form of transit farebox monies, contribute significant funding of transit operations. The Arizona Lottery also provides just over \$11 million each year for transit operating and capital support. These funds primarily support local transit operating and capital costs in the RTP beyond those costs covered by transit farebox collections.

Regional revenue sources for the MAG RTP between FY 2014 and FY 2035 are projected to amount to \$25.7 billion and include:

Proposition 400 half-cent sales tax extension: \$13.6 billion

ADOT funds: \$6.7 billion

Federal Transit funds: \$2.9 billion

Federal Highway Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds: \$1.2 billion

Other Federal Highway Funding: \$140 million

Finally, local funds and other state revenue sources are estimated to provide an additional \$33 billion.

The RTP has been adjusted and updated to respond to changing conditions and new information. For example, current estimates of total 20-year revenues from the half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation in the MAG area is more than 42 percent lower than the estimate prepared before the effects of the 2007-2009 economic recession.

Consequently, each of the key transportation modes—freeways, arterials, and transit—are working with reduced forecasts of future revenues.

C. WORK STATEMENT

The Statement of Work is intended as a listing of minimum tasks required of the person or firm. The purpose of the audit is to assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and performance of the Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan for Maricopa County; examine projects previously funded during FYs 2011 through 2015 and their impact on relieving congestion and improving mobility; examine projects scheduled for funding during FYs 2016 through 2020; review specific areas the Office identified through interviews with and input from various interested parties; address statutorily mandated issues; and recommend ways to improve the RTP's efficiency and effectiveness. As such, the following tasks must be performed:

1. After receiving formal "Notice to Proceed" from the Office, make all necessary off-site preparations sufficient for the person or firm to execute the project with minimal support from the Office.
2. Organize, schedule, and facilitate a project entrance conference in Phoenix with representatives from ADOT, MAG, Valley Metro, and the Office. The purpose of this entrance conference is to introduce the person or firm, establish work space, identify liaisons for each entity, determine a periodic meeting schedule, and discuss the scope and time frame for the audit. Attendance at the entrance conference is mandatory for the project manager. Others who will perform evaluation tasks in Arizona as listed in the proposal may participate by telephone.
3. Address the following issues:
 - a. As required by A.R.S. §28-6313(C)(2), the audit shall review past expenditures of the RTP during the time period of fiscal years 2011 through 2015 and examine the performance of the system in relieving congestion and improving mobility. In addition, the audit shall evaluate the extent to which projects RTP expenditures fund have impacted/improved the region's transportation system's integration and connectivity across and between modes.
 - b. As required by A.R.S. §28-6313(B), with respect to light rail systems, the audit shall consider the criteria the federal transit

administration uses (mobility improvements, land use, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness, and operating efficiencies) pursuant to 49 United States Code §5309(e)(1)(B) and the interrelationship among the criteria to provide federal funding for light rail systems. For light rail projects that receive federal funding, the consultant may consult with and, as appropriate, confirm with the appropriate federal agency making the grant that the project met the prescribed criteria.

- c. As required by A.R.S. §28-6313(B), for light rail systems, the audit shall also consider:
 - 1. Service levels.
 - 2. Capital costs.
 - 3. Operation and maintenance costs.
 - 4. Transit ridership.
 - 5. Farebox revenues.

Specifically, using Valley Metro Rail's regional transit standards and performance measures, industry benchmark standards, and best practice examples from peer agencies, the audit should evaluate the extent to which transit standards and performance measures have been met for each area, the reasons for any deviations, and how Valley Metro Rail compares in these areas to other peer agencies.

- d. As required by A.R.S. §§28-6313(A) and 28-6313(C)(1), the performance audit shall examine the regional transportation plan and projects **scheduled for funding during FYs 2016 through 2020** based on the performance factors established in A.R.S. §28-505(A), the performance measures in the RTP dated January 2014, and the FTA New and Small Starts criteria, in the context of the transportation system. [See <http://www.azleg.gov/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/28/00505.htm&Title=28&DocType=ARS> for the performance factors in A.R.S. §28-505(A), https://www.azmag.gov/Documents/RTP_2014-01-30_Final-2035-Regional-Transportation-Plan-%28RTP%29.pdf for the performance measures in the Regional Transportation Plan–January 2014 and <http://www.fta.dot.gov/12304.html> for information on FTA New Starts/Small Starts.] The person or firm should determine the projects examined, but they should include projects from each major transportation mode; i.e., freeways, arterial streets, light rail, and buses.

- e. Using qualitative and quantitative measures, the audit shall evaluate the extent to which Active Traffic Management technology has been, and is being, effectively used (1) to manage recurrent and nonrecurrent road/freeway congestion and (2) to optimize existing transit and road/freeway capacity. In addition, the audit shall evaluate Active Traffic Management technology's impact on previously funded projects, its impact on projects scheduled for funding, and how it is being used to plan future transportation projects.
 - f. Identify and evaluate any changes to federal or state laws that may have a significant impact on the RTP.
 - g. As required by A.R.S. §28-6313(C)(3), the audit shall make recommendations regarding whether further implementation of a transportation system is warranted, warranted with modifications, or not warranted.
4. Commit a substantial portion of work hours by the person or firm to work on-site. The Office expects the person or firm to perform most tasks in Phoenix and to interview MAG, ADOT, Valley Metro executives, and staff initially face-to-face.

D. QUALIFICATIONS AND INDEPENDENCE

The person or firm must have national status with expertise in evaluating multimodal transportation systems and in regional transportation planning. In the event the person or firm has within the last 10 years performed work for the State of Arizona or any of the local governments related to the Maricopa Association of Governments or Valley Metro, the person or firm must disclose the nature of the work performed and when it was performed. If there is a current working relationship with MAG, Valley Metro, or ADOT, the person or firm must disclose the nature of the relationship and its duration. Any member of a firm who performed such work before joining the firm must also provide the prescribed disclosure. The person or firm must submit this information using the Independence Disclosure Forms in **Attachment A** to this RFP. If the Auditor General determines that a conflict of interest exists, the person or firm's proposal will not be considered. The Auditor General is the sole authority in determining whether any conflicts of interest exist.

E. REPORTING

1. The Auditor General requires the following reports as a part of this project:
 - a. An initial draft report of the person or firm's findings and conclusions, to be submitted to the Office on or before September 2, 2016. The draft report should include the information and evidence supporting the person or firm's findings, conclusions, and recommendations and should address the issues identified in section C3 of this Request for Proposal.
 - b. A revised draft report to be submitted to the Office and MAG, ADOT, and Valley Metro officials on or before September 30, 2016. The revised draft report should incorporate any comments, suggestions, or recommendations the Office makes that resulted from review of the person or firm's initial draft report.
 - c. A final revised draft report to be submitted to the Office and MAG, ADOT, and Valley Metro officials on or before October 28, 2016. The final report shall be responsive to any comments, suggestions, or recommendations the Office, MAG, ADOT, and Valley Metro make that resulted from reviewing the person or firm's revised draft report. This report will be the basis for MAG, ADOT, and Valley Metro to submit their final agency response, which shall be included in the final report.
 - d. The final report of the person or firm's findings, conclusions, and recommendations, including the written responses from each of the entities, to be submitted to the Office on or before November 10, 2016. The person or firm shall deliver 1 unbound and 30 bound copies of the final report. This final report shall incorporate a transmittal letter from the Office. In addition, the person or firm shall provide an electronic copy of the final report, including any graphics and appendices, by e-mail. The electronic version of the final report shall be in PDF format and must not be password protected. Further, links and bookmarks set up for each page of the table of contents within the PDF files would be helpful.

The final report shall be responsive to any comments, suggestions, or recommendations the Office makes that resulted from review of the person or firm's final, revised draft report.

- e. The Office requires periodic briefings during the course of the project and will require written progress reports every 2 weeks for the purposes of monitoring the status, progress, and direction of the person or firm's work, and the substantive issues under review.
 - f. The person or firm shall schedule and hold periodic meetings (at least one meeting every 4 weeks) with MAG, ADOT, and Valley Metro, as well as the MAG transportation policy committee, to update them on the progress of their work and substantive issues under review.²
2. Retain audit documentation supporting the person or firm's audit report for at least 5 years from the date of the final report and make it available, free of charge, for examination by authorized office representatives. If the person or firm does not desire to retain the documentation for such period, the person or firm shall give the documentation to the Office for safekeeping.

F. TERM OF AGREEMENT

The term of this Agreement shall provide for a performance audit of MAG's RTP for Maricopa County including a review of statutorily mandated issues and other areas specifically identified, which is due on or before November 15, 2016, and shall continue for the purpose of retaining audit documentation.

G. EXIT CONFERENCE, POWERPOINT, PRESENTATIONS AND FOLLOWUP

- 1. Prior to completing the final report, the person or firm shall organize, schedule, and facilitate a project draft exit conference in Phoenix, AZ, approximately 3 hours in length, with responsible officials of MAG, ADOT, Valley Metro, and the Office. Prior to the draft exit conference, the person or firm shall provide the above officials with a draft audit report (see Reporting E.1.b above). The draft exit conference's purpose is to discuss the draft audit report, identify any potential

² If a local person or firm is chosen, in-person attendance at these conferences is required. If a firm or person is chosen that is located outside the Phoenix metropolitan area, the person or firm shall attend and participate by teleconference.

misstatements, and obtain comments on the report's findings and recommendations. Office staff shall participate in the exit conference. Attendance at the draft exit conference is mandatory for the selected person or firm's project manager and any other staff who performed evaluation tasks as listed in the proposal. Others contributing indirectly to the project in a support role may participate by telephone at the Office's sole discretion.

2. Submit to the Office a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the report's findings and recommendations. The presentation, which is intended for the selected person or firm's use when presenting to legislative committees, must be submitted in electronic form to the Office.
3. Plan and budget time and resources for presentations to legislative committees. The selected person or firm must allow for at least one follow-up trip to Phoenix, AZ, for a presentation to legislative committees when the Office requires. The selected person or firm may be requested to perform several presentations during one trip.
4. Plan and budget time and resources to conduct follow-up work and issue a follow-up report on the status of report recommendation implementation. The selected person or firm must conduct at least one followup 12 months after the audit report's release. The follow-up work and report format shall follow the format of the follow-up reports the Office issues. (See <http://www.azauditor.gov/reports-publications/counties/transportation-department/report/maricopa-county-regional> for an example of a follow-up report.) If subsequent followups are required, these will be negotiated at a later date.

H. PROPOSAL DELIVERY

1. Sealed proposals will be received until 5:00 P.M., Mountain Standard Time, on March 22, 2016, at the following location:

Office of the Auditor General
State of Arizona
2910 N. 44th St., Ste. 410
Phoenix, AZ 85018

Timely receipt of proposals will be determined by the date and time the proposal is received at the address specified. No proposals will be accepted after the time indicated. Proposals received after the

deadline will be stamped for time and date, and returned unopened.

All material submitted in accordance with this solicitation becomes the property of the State of Arizona and will not be returned.

2. Five copies of the proposal are required. They should be packaged in such a manner that **the outer wrapping clearly indicates** the following information:

PROPOSAL FOR MAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
PERFORMANCE AUDIT
PROPOSAL DEADLINE: March 22, 2016

3. Any questions relating to the RFP should be directed to Ms. Kim Hildebrand at khildebrand@azauditor.gov. E-mail inquiries will be acknowledged, and all inquiries and responses will be posted on the Office's Web site (www.azauditor.gov) within a reasonable amount of time. E-mail inquiries will be accepted only until March 11, 2016. No responses will be provided for inquiries received after that date.
4. Additional background information can be obtained at the following Web sites:

ADOT—www.azdot.gov

MAG—www.mag.maricopa.gov

Valley Metro—www.ValleyMetro.org

5. Information provided in the proposal, including cost, will be held confidential and will not be disclosed to competitors prior to selection of the person or firm. However, proposals may be disclosed following selection of the person or firm.

I. PROPOSAL CONTENT

1. The technical portion of the proposal should not exceed 20 pages and shall include as a minimum:
 - a. A brief statement of the person or firm's understanding of the work to be done.

- b. A work plan detailing how the person or firm will plan and organize tasks described in the Work Statement of this RFP. The methodology should be described in narrative, outline, or graphic form, explaining the person or firm's approach to accomplish the tasks.
 - c. A plan for organizing and staffing the project with an estimate of time each project staff member will devote to the project.
 2. The cost portion of the proposal should include at a minimum for each task in the Work Statement of this RFP:
 - a. Costs of personal services broken down by hourly direct salaries and estimated hours to be spent. The person or firm must submit this information using the Cost Proposal Form in **Attachment B** to this RFP.
 - b. Other direct costs such as transportation, lodging, meals, report production, etc. The person or firm must submit this information using the Cost Proposal Form in Attachment B of this RFP. (NOTE: The person or firm's travel, lodging, and meal costs will be reimbursed only up to the amount allowable per the State of Arizona per diem and hotel rates. For the State's travel reimbursement rates, see http://www.gao.az.gov/publications/SAAM/Supp_I_trvrates-012308.pdf)
 - c. Overhead costs should also be clearly identified on the Cost Proposal Form.
 3. Other items to be included in the proposal are:
 - a. A description of the person or firm's expertise in evaluating multi-modal transportation systems and in regional transportation planning.
 - b. A description of prior experience with projects or studies of a similar nature, including references. The person or firm must include at least three references. Please include the following information for each client reference:
 - Name of the organization
 - Dates of service
 - List of services provided

- Responsible official or contact person
 - Address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address
- c. Identification of personnel who will be conducting the work, including the project manager, a resume for each describing experience with similar projects, the role each individual will perform, and the person-hours each individual will spend on the tasks identified in this work plan. Personnel may not be substituted without the Auditor General's written permission.
- d. Identification of any proposed subcontractors to be used for the project, a description of the subcontractor's experience, and a resume for each of the subcontractor's personnel.
- e. Prior to commencing the work described herein, the person or firm shall furnish certificates showing insurance in force as follows:
- Public Liability and Property Damage insurance in an amount not less than \$2 million (\$2,000,000).
 - Professional Liability insurance in an amount not less than \$1 million (\$1,000,000).
 - Valuable Papers insurance in an amount sufficient to assure the restoration of any working papers, documents, memoranda, reports, or other similar data relating to the work or reports of the selected person or firm used in this contract's completion.

Excepting the Professional Liability coverage, insurance certificates shall name the State of Arizona AUDITOR GENERAL as an additional insured.

A representative or officer authorized to bind the selected person or firm shall sign the proposal. The person or firm should identify by name, title, address, and telephone number individuals authorized to negotiate a contract for and on behalf of the selected person or firm.

J. PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION

1. A selection committee will review and evaluate the proposals between March 23 and April 1, 2016. P. During that time, please be

available to answer questions by telephone. As part of the final selection process, the Office reserves the right to:

- a. Contact a reasonable number of references from among those provided by the person or firms as requested in the Proposal Content.
 - b. Request oral presentations or discussions with the person or firms.
2. The Office shall select the proposal judged most likely to meet the project's needs and objectives. Emphasis will be placed on:
- a. Responsiveness to the issues described in the RFP.
 - b. Person or firm's related past experience and reputation.
 - c. Qualifications of staff assigned to the project.
 - d. Proposed work plan.
 - e. Project hourly and total costs.
3. A recommendation for contract award will be made to the Auditor General; her decision will be final. The Office will award the contract to the responsible person or firm whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the State.

K. CONTRACT AWARD

1. A contract is expected to be awarded on or before April 5, 2016. The Office will notify a successful bidder by telephone with a confirmation letter and contract to follow. A sample contract is included and illustrated in Attachment C.
2. The Auditor General reserves the right to:
 - a. Cancel this solicitation.
 - b. Reject any and all proposals.
 - c. Select for contract negotiation the person or firm's proposal that, in the Auditor General's judgment, best meets the

Office's needs, regardless of any differences in estimated project costs between the person or firm and all others.

- d. Negotiate a contract that covers selected parts of this proposal or a contract that will be interrupted for a period or terminated for lack of funds.

Timeline for Proposal Process, Status Reports,
Briefings, and Submission of Audit Reports

The following dates will apply unless the Auditor General waives or modifies them in writing:

Event	Date
RFP released	February 18, 2016
Deadline for submission of proposals	March 22, 2016
Estimated contract award and notice to proceed	April 5, 2016
Written status reports due to Office	Every 2 weeks
Briefings provided to audited entities	Monthly
Deadline for submission of initial preliminary draft	September 2, 2016
Deadline for submission of revised draft	September 30, 2016
Deadline for draft exit conference	October 14, 2016
Deadline for submission of final report for agency response	October 28, 2016
Agency final response due	November 4, 2016
Deadline for submission of final report to Auditor General	November 10, 2016
Issue report	November 15, 2016
Consultant presentation to legislative committee	TBD
Consultant conducts initial followup	November 2017
Consultant conducts additional followup, if necessary ³	TBD

³ If all recommendations in the report were implemented at initial followup, no further followup is necessary. If necessary, the Office will negotiate the cost of conducting this followup separately.