



FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Your Flood Defense System

ADDENDUM NO. 1

50-Year Capital & Financial Modeling Services

RFP Issued: June 5, 2026

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Peter G. Vicari – President
Ronald Schumann, Jr., P.E. Vice-President
David A. Martin, P.E. - Treasurer
Gregory Marsiglia - Secretary
Kerwyn C. King, P.E.
Elton J. Meyers

EXECUTIVE COUNSEL

Kirk Ordoyne

REGIONAL DIRECTOR

L. Jeff Williams

EAST JEFFERSON LEVEE DISTRICT

1100 Rev. Richard Wilson Drive
Kenner, LA 70062
504.469-7522

LAKE BORGNE BASIN LEVEE DISTRICT

P.O. Box 216
6136 E. St. Bernard Highway
Violet, LA 70092
504.682.5941

ORLEANS LEVEE DISTRICT

6920 Franklin Ave
New Orleans, LA 70122
504.286.3100

This Addendum is issued to provide responses to written questions received regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP) for 50-Year Capital & Financial Modeling Services.

All proposers shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their proposal submission.

PROJECT AND ASSET INFORMATION

Question 1

Are there committed operational readiness dates for certain projects to incorporate into the modeling that SLFPA-E can share?

Response:

The Authority has not identified any committed operational readiness dates for projects that are anticipated to be material to the development of the 50-year capital and financial model.

Question 2

What level of detail is the Authority's current data on asset condition/age?

Response:

The Authority maintains a high level of detail regarding its assets through its asset management database, insurance inventories, and annual audit processes. Asset information includes inventory, condition, age, and other asset-specific data maintained to support operational, maintenance, financial, and risk management activities.

Question 3

How comprehensive and recent is the Authority's current data on assets?

Response:

The Authority's asset data is maintained on an ongoing basis through its asset management systems. Asset inventories are regularly updated, and insurance inventories and audit reviews are conducted annually to support the accuracy and completeness of asset records.

Question 4

Can SLFPA-E provide insight into the number and type of assets to be considered in the modeling including those referenced in the Infrastructure Considerations?

Response:

The Authority maintains a diverse portfolio of assets that support its flood protection mission. Asset categories include flood protection infrastructure components, vehicle fleets (including automobiles, trucks, boats, and related transportation assets), tractors, heavy equipment, and other major operational assets. Additional information regarding the Authority's flood protection infrastructure is available through the Authority's FPA Lens Infrastructure dashboard. Please visit <https://www.fpalens.org/infrastructure> for additional information. Detailed asset inventory information will be made available to the selected consultant as appropriate for development of the integrated capital and financial model.

In addition, proposers should note that the modeling effort is expected to consider relevant long-range infrastructure planning information, including applicable assumptions, projections, and planning data associated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Reevaluation Report (GRR) and future levee lift planning initiatives, as described in the RFP. <https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/LPV-GRR/>

EXISTING MODELS, SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY PLATFORMS

Question 5

What format are the existing life-cycle models in?

Response:

The Authority does not currently maintain formal life-cycle models. As described in the RFP, the Authority maintains various supporting datasets, including project inventories, capital planning information, asset condition information, maintenance data, financial information, and other planning data that will be made available to the selected consultant for development of the integrated capital and financial model.

Question 6

Does SLFPA-E have a preferred format for the capital and financial model and does the Authority currently use Esri products, Power BI or other similar analytics platforms?

Response:

The Authority primarily operates within a Microsoft-based technology environment. While the Authority does not prescribe a specific software platform for development of the capital and financial model, proposers should recommend and utilize the tools, systems, and technologies they deem most appropriate to meet the objectives of the engagement. Proposers are encouraged to describe any assumptions regarding software platforms, data visualization tools, dashboard capabilities, and system integration requirements in their proposals.

Question 7

Could the Authority share if it currently utilizes any specific GIS or dashboard platforms (e.g., ArcGIS, Power BI, Tableau) that proposers should be aware of when developing the integration approach?

Response:

The Authority currently utilizes ArcGIS as its primary GIS platform. Proposers may consider ArcGIS capabilities and compatibility when developing their proposed integration, visualization, and data management approaches. Proposers are also encouraged to identify any additional platforms, tools, or technologies they believe would enhance the functionality and long-term usability of the proposed solution.

Question 8

Are AI-enabled tools or functionality acceptable under current policies or constraints?

Response:

The Authority does not currently maintain any specific policies that prohibit or otherwise restrict a consultant's use of AI-enabled tools in the performance of this engagement. Proposers may utilize AI-enabled tools at their discretion; however, the consultant shall remain fully responsible for the accuracy, completeness, quality, and professional judgment reflected in all work products, analyses, recommendations, and deliverables submitted to the Authority.

PROJECT GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

Question 9

Beyond the designated Senior Project Manager / Owner's Representative, could the Authority describe the anticipated governance structure for this engagement? Specifically, we would appreciate information on the expected level of consultant involvement in stakeholder coordination and facilitation (e.g., with the executive steering committee and technical working groups expected to be established).

Response:

As described in Section 6.3 of the RFP, the selected consultant shall coordinate with Executive Leadership, Finance, Engineering, Operations, Maintenance, and other designated stakeholders.

The Authority may establish governance and coordination bodies, including an Executive Steering Committee, Technical Working Groups, Board update meetings, and milestone review workshops, as needed during the engagement.

The selected consultant may be requested to support these efforts by preparing presentation materials, participating in meetings, responding to technical and strategic questions, facilitating discussions within their area of expertise, and serving as a resource to help stakeholders understand project findings, assumptions, alternatives, and recommendations. Final decisions and direction will remain the responsibility of the Authority.

Question 10

To the extent it can be shared at this stage, what key considerations will inform the Authority's decision to exercise the Phase 2 (Strategic Plan) option? Understanding them will help us structure the phasing, pricing, and staffing approach accordingly.

Response:

The Authority is unable to provide additional information beyond what is contained in the RFP. Proposers should rely upon the phased engagement structure, scope of services, and related provisions described in the solicitation documents when developing their proposals. Any decision regarding the exercise of Phase 2 services will be made at the Authority's sole discretion.

PROCUREMENT AND BUDGET

Question 11

Could the Authority share an estimated budget range for this engagement? This would help us align our proposed approach and team structure with the Authority's expectations.

Response:

The Authority is not releasing an independent cost estimate or budget range for this procurement. Proposers should submit pricing based on their independent assessment of the scope of services, level of effort, staffing approach, and project requirements described in the RFP.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1