

Capital Planning Software RFP Vendor Questions

Last updated: April 9, 2018

Q1. What is the software used to host the current assessment data?

A1. The current software is Sightlines' *Capital Renewal* product.

Q2. Is the incumbent software provider eligible for this procurement?

A2. Yes.

Q3. How is the annual assessment update performed? Are all buildings inspected for this update?

A3. Physical plant managers may choose to inspect their campus buildings in order to gather data for the annual update, however, most managers enter any changes in their data annually based on their institutional knowledge.

Q4. What physical breakdown structure (standard) is used to define building systems & sub-systems?

A4. Building systems and sub-systems are currently broken down according to Capital Renewal's categorization, which was customized for Minnesota State in 2004.

Q5. How many systems & sub-systems are maintained in the current system?

A5. There are approximately 1,000 buildings listed across the 54 campuses, and each building has up to 13 different sub-systems (and a range of types within some of the sub-systems, such as roofs) depending on the complexity of the building. For example, a storage shed may simply have "All Renewal-Small" while a science education building will have all subsystems. Please see Appendices A and C.

Q6. Which systems and sub-systems are the focus of the annual inspections?

A6. Main campus roofs are inspected every-other year. No other sub-systems are inspected for condition on a recurring, periodic basis.

Q7. What is the volume of deficiencies related to these systems?

A7. Systemwide (including both academic and revenue-funded buildings) metrics are shown below.

Total Gross Square Feet	Facilities Condition Index	Current Replacement Value	Backlog	Backlog/SF	10 year renewal
28,675,891	0.11	\$ 10,059,432,086	\$ 1,060,905,197	\$ 36.00	\$ 1,253,206,844

Q8. Data model is considered a proprietary part of the system and is not available to customers. The User Interface of our proposed system provides a browser based access to all data elements and allows the User to dynamically define new data fields and elements. Is this an acceptable solution?

A8. Yes.

Q9. In 1999 a baseline assessment study was completed. Who did this study and was it a full Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) done by an FCA consultant?

A9. Comprehensive Facility Condition Assessments for the 54 campuses were split among five firms, all of whom were local architecture or engineering firms. The baseline FCAs were completed in two phases between 1998 and 2003; the first phase included inspections of academic buildings, while the second phase included inspections of revenue-funded buildings.

Q10. In 2004- Minnesota State contracted with a vendor to provide software to forecast renewal needs. Was this the same vendor or a different Vendor?

A10. The original vendor (in 2004) was the Pacific Partners Consulting Group, and their software was known as Facilities Renewal Resource Model (FRRM). The model uses Minnesota State-specific building information (e.g. building name, gross square feet and construction date) and a proprietary methodology based on sub-system lifecycles and replacement costs to estimate the backlog and future capital repair needs. The assumptions were customized for the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system. The FRRM model was acquired by Sightlines, LLC in 2011, repackaged and rebranded as Capital Renewal; the underlying design remains basically unchanged.

Q11. The last physical assessment appears to have been done in 1999. Is that correct?

A11. Although main campus roofs are inspected biannually, a complete Facilities Condition Assessment has not been completed since the 1998-2003 assessments.

Q12. Is it the intent of the Minnesota University to update the Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) data in 2018/2019 as part of this process to establish a new third-party baseline?

A12. We anticipate that a new baseline (including backlog, renewal, and CRV estimates) will likely be established if we contract for software services with a vendor that is not our current vendor due to variation in construction cost estimating data sources. However, at this point, we do not have available budget to perform a Facility Condition Assessment to establish a new baseline, but we may “true up” the backlog and renewal data with an FCA at a future date.

Q13. Will Minnesota State accept software and FCA proposals that would be more comprehensive and include components of the systems, rather than the system only? Or is it the Minnesota universities intent to keep the existing system based model in place?

A13. We will consider proposals that include components of systems so long as all mandatory requirements have been met through the combination of those components.