



Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19 D.2 (Rev. 3.0.8, 2/28/2022)

4.1 General Information

1. Agency or State Entity Name: 3480 - Conservation, Department of

If Agency/State entity not in the list, enter here with the [organization code](#).

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

2. Proposal Name: Division of Mine Reclamation SMARA-4

3. Department of Technology Project Number: 3480-052

4. S4PRA Version Number: [Version 1](#)

5. CDT Billing Case Number: CS0002074

Don't have a Case Number? [Click here to get one.](#)

4.2 Submittal Information

1. Contact Information

Contact Name: [Amiko Foster](#)

Contact Email: amiko.foster@conservation.ca.gov

Contact Phone: (916) 302-9064

2. Submission Type: [New Submission](#)

If Withdraw, select Reason: [Choose an item.](#)

If Other, specify reason here: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Sections Changed if an updated or resubmission (List all the sections that have changed.)

[NA](#)

Summary of Changes (Summarize updates made.)

[NA](#)

3. Attach [Project Approval Executive Transmittal](#) to your email submission. Completed, ready for signatures.

See Attached: 3480-052 – DMR SMARA-4 – 19G.1 – Project Approval Executive Transmittal

4. Attach Final [Procurement Assessment Form](#) to your email submission. (Review what we submitted for stage 3 and make changes if needed): See attached.

See Attached: 3480-052-0030 - DMR SMARA-4 - 19B.5 - STP Procurement Assessment

5. **Conditions from Stage 3 Approval** (Enter any conditions from the Stage 3 Solution Analysis approval letter issued by CDT):

We have mapped requirements to objectives. See attached Stage 4 approval letter.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 S3SA Approval Letter - signed

4.3 Contract Management

The Contract Manager must be a state employee and should not be the Project Manager. Please complete the questions below in reference to the **primary solicitation**.

Is the Contract Management Plan complete, approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority, and available for the Department of Technology to review? **Choose:** 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Not Applicable.' If 'No' or 'Not Applicable,' provide the artifact status in the space provided.

1. [Contract Management Plan \(Draft\):](#) **Yes**

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

2. **Has the role of Contract Manager been assigned, and has the Contract Manager reviewed and gained an understanding of the scope, activities, tasks, and deliverables of the contract?** **Yes**

If "No," briefly explain below why both have not been accomplished:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

3. **Does the assigned Contract Manager understand the processes for post-award contract activities, including contract amendments, contract work authorizations, terms and conditions, and contract escalation/resolution?** **Yes**

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4. **Has a post-award kickoff meeting between the Contract Manager and state project team members been scheduled to align state and contractor expectations related to contract, budget, invoicing, requirements review, and contractor incentives?** **No**

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

We have been instructed by CDT OSTP not to engage with the vendor until the contract has been fully executed. Once the contract is in place, we will promptly schedule the post-award kickoff meeting. Calendar invites have been placed internally for the kick-off meeting.

5. Does the Contract Manager understand the Agency/state entity and federal processes, policy, and applicable procedures? [Yes](#)

If “No,” briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

6. Does the Contract Manager have a plan to collect and assess contractor and project performance information on a regular basis (e.g., establish meetings with Project Managers, communication techniques)? [Yes](#)

If “No,” briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4.4 Organizational Readiness

Is the Implementation Management Plan draft complete, approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority, and available for the Department of Technology to review? **Choose:** ‘Yes,’ ‘No,’ or ‘Not Applicable.’ If ‘No’ or ‘Not Applicable,’ provide the artifact status in the space provided.

1. [Implementation Management Plan \(Draft\):](#) [Yes](#)

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

2. Does the Agency/state entity currently have a mature release management process with a repeatable and scalable testing methodology that supports all stages of testing (system, integration, security, performance, interfaces, regression, user acceptance, and accessibility)? [Yes](#)

If “No,” briefly describe below the release management process that will be used to manage, plan, schedule, and control a software release through the different phases and environments, including testing and deploying software releases:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

3. Does the project team have a clear understanding of the areas of business (identified in Stage 1) that will be impacted by the project? [Yes](#)

If “No,” briefly explain below how the Agency/state entity plans to educate the project team to ensure all members have a clear understanding of the impacted business areas by the project:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4. Does the Agency/state entity have processes and methodologies in place to support Organizational Change Management (OCM) activities identified in Stage 2, Section 2.9 Organizational Change Management? Yes

If “No,” briefly describe below how the Agency/state entity will perform OCM activities for this proposal:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

5. Does the Agency/state entity have dedicated knowledge transfer resources assigned to business process improvement or business process reengineering activities resulting from the new solution? Yes

If “Yes,” specify the areas of business process improvement:

[Division of Mine Reclamation SMARA managers and staff serve as subject matter experts \(SMEs\) throughout the PAL process, including during Stage 2’s formative To-Be process development. They applied reengineering principles to optimize business processes, ensuring flex and fit to the envisioned SMARA-4 system such that business needs are met. These same DMR managers and staff are allocated to the SMARA-4 project for the duration, permitting seamless transition between To-Be processes and solution development.](#)

If “No,” briefly explain below how the Agency/state entity will perform business process improvement or business process reengineering activities resulting from the new solution:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

6. Attach Updated Project Organization Chart to your email submission.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 - DOC Organization Chart

4.5 Project Readiness

1. Select the system development methodology you plan to use to design and develop the new system: Adaptive

Provide a brief description of your methodology and reason for selecting it below:

[The Enterprise Technology Services Division \(ETSD\) of the Department of Conservation \(DOC\) currently uses an agile \(adaptive\) methodology to support its many systems. DOC intends to continue with this adaptive/agile methodology for several reasons. First, this is the preferred approach for internal DOC efforts. Adaptive/Agile methodologies provide flexibility to adapt to evolving business needs. Additionally, in the context of working in partnership with a new vendor, the iterative nature of adaptive/agile methodologies allows for a shorter feedback loop to help maintain vendor and DOC alignment. Using scheduled sprints, the vendor will deliver and demonstrate functionality on a frequent basis, permitting DOC to review outcomes directly and provide timely feedback. Potential challenges/issues are more likely to surface earlier in the process than a traditional predictive/waterfall approach would enable. Finally, it serves to develop a strong partnership between the selected vendor and DOC.](#)

Describe below the Agency/state entity's past project experience using the system development methodology selected. If this methodology has never been used before, describe the training and staff development that will be provided to prepare staff to utilize this methodology.

DOC's ETSD currently uses the Agile Scrum methodology to support the many systems under its purview. There are matrixed scrum teams assigned to each system comprised of a scrum master, analysts, developers, and testers. These scrum teams work in two-week sprints on an agreed upon scope of user stories selected from a groomed and prioritized backlog. This work is tracked and managed in Microsoft Azure DevOps for ease of reference and transparency. The teams conduct and hold the essential agile ceremonies, including standups, sprint retrospectives, backlog refinements, sprint plannings, and sprint demonstrations. While the teams do deliver completed user stories and functionality with each sprint, the release of said functionality is coordinated by release managers across teams on a cadence appropriate for the functionality being released. That accounts for other necessary scheduled activities, such as patches and other maintenance.

2. Has the Agency/state entity engaged the Office of Technology Services (OTech) for capacity planning and the development of the solution delivery timeline?

No

If "No," and data center capacity planning and alignment services are needed, explain below the reason OTech has not been engaged and what is the alternative plan:

The SMARA-4 system will be a vended SaaS solution, including vendor hosting. The state will retain ownership of the data, but per the SMARA-4 requirements, the vendor is responsible for all hosting.

3. Have resource commitments been obtained for all those identified in the Resource Management Plan? Yes

If "No," explain below why commitments have not been obtained and the plan to mitigate this risk:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4. Does the Resource Management Plan ensure resources are sufficiently committed to perform project activities if they are also committed to other responsibilities?

Yes

If "No," explain below how sufficient resource levels will be maintained for all project activities:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

5. Have all identified project leads received at a minimum basic project management training? Yes

If "No," explain how the Agency/state entity will educate the project team leads on project management basics:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4.6 Business Objective Valuation

1. **Attach** the Requirements/Backlog Baseline and/or Deliverables Baseline to your email submission.
2. **Insert your Objectives (ID, Objective, Metric, Baseline, and Target Result) from Stage 1 Section 1.7, along with changes and reason for changes, and assign a percent score value to each. The total of all scores should be 100%.**

Objective ID: 1.1

Objective: Reduce DMR staff time spent on manual tasks, such as assembling the Purchase Preference List, responding to queries, including Public Records Act requests, and navigating the cumbersome filing system.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: N/A

Metric: Percentage of DMR staff time spent doing manual tasks monthly.

Baseline: 80.8%

Target Result: Less than 15% of staff time spent doing manual tasks monthly within 12 months of implementation.

Valuation: 40%

Objective ID: 2.1

Objective: Increase percentage of follow up on mine operators who do not complete filing their Annual Reports.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: N/A

Metric: Percentage of mine operators who did not complete filing their Annual Report that are pursued to file their Annual Reports, including payment.

Baseline: 55.2%

Target Result: 100% of non-filer mine operators pursued filing their Annual Report within 12 months of implementation.

Valuation: 20%

Objective ID: 2.2

Objective: Increase ratio of approved Financial Assurance Mechanisms (FAMs) on file to approved Financial Assurance Cost Estimate (FACE) values.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: N/A

Metric: Percentage of total approved FACE value covered by approved FAMs on file.

Baseline: 41.9%

Target Result: 80% of total approved FACE value covered by approved FAMs on file within 12 months of implementation.

Valuation: 20%

Objective ID: 3.1

Objective: Increase the quality of FACE reviews conducted by the SMARA Technical Unit (STU) team by increasing the proportion of field FACE reviews conducted.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: N/A

Metric: Percentage of total FACE reviews conducted in the field.

Baseline: 7.2%

Target Result: 25% of total FACE reviews conducted in the field within 12 months of implementation.

Valuation: 15%

Objective ID: 4.1

Objective: Electronically receive more of the required approved documents from Lead Agencies.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: N/A

Metric: Percentage of required approved documents from Lead Agencies received annually.

Baseline: 22%

Target Result: 50% of required approved documents from Lead Agencies electronically received annually within 12 months of implementation.

Valuation: 5%

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + in the lower right corner of the above seven fields to add multiple objectives.

4.7 Schedule Baseline

1. Schedule Summary

Project Execution Start Dates

Proposed Project Start Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap, most likely Stage 2): 4/15/2026

Baseline Project Start Date (Stage 4): 6/29/2026

Variance between most recently approved schedule most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): 76 Days

Project End Dates

Proposed Project Finish Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap, most likely Stage 2): 4/15/2027

Baseline Project Finish Date: 6/29/2027

Variance between most recently approved schedule (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): 76 Days

2. Reason(s) for Variances Provide reasons for any date variances:

We have identified two primary factors contributing to the variance in the project's start and end dates:

Pre-solicitation and evaluation timeline:

We underestimated the duration required for the pre-solicitation and bidder evaluation process by approximately two months when we created our Stage 2 timeline.

Contract development timeline:

We anticipated that once evaluations were complete, OSTP would need about one week to generate a draft contract. In practice, the draft contract took just over three weeks to produce.

3. Master Schedule and Key Milestones

See Attached: SMARA-4 Master Project Schedule with Key Milestones

4.8 Cost Baseline

Is the Cost Management Plan complete, approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority, and available for the Department of Technology to review? Choose: 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Not Applicable.' If 'No' or 'Not Applicable,' provide the artifact status in the space provided.

1. Cost Management Plan (Approved): Yes

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

2. Cost Summary

Total Planning Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW, most likely Stage 2):

\$2,751,699 (12/29/23)

Baseline Cost (Stage 4 FAW): \$3,210,554

Variance between most recently approved FAW (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): +\$644,173

Reasons for Cost Variance:

FY 24/25 (full year) and 25/26 (half year) added to Planning.

+\$371,933 Personal Services - All Staff: Increased salaries for existing staff and removed new staff from 24/25.

+\$272,240 Total OE&E: Added FY 24/25 full year of OE&E costs under Planning; shifted CDT OSPD cost over one year; shifted IV&V Consultant cost to Project FY 26/27; decreased PAL BA cost in 23/24, added full year cost for FY 24/25 and added half year cost for FY 25/26; reduced CDT cost in FY 23/24 to \$82,515 and added full year cost for FY 24/25 Planning, FY 25/26 & 26/27 Project; reduced CNRA cost in FY 23/24 & 24/25 to \$25,000 + added cost for FY 25/26 & 26/27 Project, increased Microsoft Azure Hosting starting in FY 23/24 and added full year under FY 25/26 & 26/27 Project; updated subscription vendor and cost starting in FY 25/26; moved Equipment cost from FY 24/25 to 25/26.

Total Project Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW, most likely Stage 2):
\$1,534,341 (12/29/23)

Baseline Cost (Stage 4 FAW): \$2,429,189

Variance between most recently approved FAW (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): **+\$894,848**

Reasons for Cost Variance:

FY 25/26 (half year) and 26/27 (full year) added to Project.

+\$314,297 Personal Services - All Staff: Increased salaries for existing staff and added new staff in 25/26.

+\$580,551 Total OE&E: Moved all FY 24/25 OE&E (New) to FY 25/26 and added FY 26/27 expenses; moved all Consulting and Prof. Services: Interdepartmental to FY 25/26 + added full cost for FY 26/27; moved all IV&V FY 25/26 to Project + added FY 26/27; added full year Consolidated Data Centers cost to FY 25/26 & 26/27; updated Project IT costs adding FY 25/26 & 26/27.

Total Future Operations IT Staff and OE&E Cost (Continuing)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW, most likely Stage 2):
\$3,348,896

Baseline Cost (Stage 4 FAW): \$3,659,460

Variance between most recently approved FAW (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): **+\$310,564**

Reasons for Cost Variance:

+\$774,063 Total Personal Services – All Staff: Increased salaries and updated existing staff.

-\$463,499 Total OE&E Expenditures: Increased OE&E costs, CNRA Cost, Microsoft Azure cost; decreased vendor subscription cost.

Total Project Cost

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW, most likely Stage 2):
\$7,634,936

Baseline Cost (Stage 4 FAW): \$9,484,521

Variance between most recently approved FAW (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): \$1,849,585:

Reasons for Cost Variance:

+\$644,173 Planning Cost (One-Time)

+\$894,848 Project Cost (One-Time)

+\$310,564 Future Operations IT Staff and OE&E Cost (Continuing)

Total Annual Fut. Ops IT Cost

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW, most likely Stage 2):
\$1,026,427

Baseline Cost (Stage 4 FAW): \$1,156,365

Variance between most recently approved FAW (most likely Stage 2), and Baseline Cost (Stage 4): \$129,938

Reasons for Cost Variance:

+\$306,714 **Total Personal Services Expenditures:** Increased salaries and updated existing staff.

-\$176,776 **Total OE&E Expenditures:** Increased OE&E costs, CNRA Cost, Microsoft Azure cost; decreased vendor subscription cost.

TIP: Baseline costs match the Stage 4 Financial Analysis Worksheet (FAW).

Reason(s) for Variances

Provide reasons for any cost variances: See Reasons for Cost Variance under each sub-section.

Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Summary

3. Budget Request ID: 3480-003-BCP-2026-MR

Budget Request Year (0000-00): 2026/27

Requested Amount (specific to the project): \$869,000

Status: Supported

Budget Bill Language (if supported): Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1), \$869,000 shall be available for support of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA-4) project. Of this amount, \$703,000 for project implementation activities shall only be available upon the Department of Technology's approval of the appropriate Project Approval Lifecycle documents.

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add BCPs as needed (e.g., Planning and Project related).

Financial Analysis Worksheets (Baseline)

Attach Final FAWs to your email submission.

See Attached: 3480-052-0230 - DMR SMARA-4 - Financial Analysis Worksheet Stage 2 Approved

See Attached: 3480-052-0230 - DMR SMARA-4 - Financial Analysis Worksheet for Review (05.12.26) Stage 4

4.9 Primary Solicitation Results

1. **Attach** the approved Evaluation and Selection Report for the primary solicitation to your email submission.
2. **Attach** the proposed contract resulting from the primary solicitation to your email submission.
3. **Was one of the viable solutions in Stage 2 selected for final contract award?** [Yes](#)
If “No”, please describe:
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)
4. **Selected Vendor Name:** [MERP Systems](#)
5. **Contract Number:** [25-4-002-1](#)
 - a. Contract Start Date: [6/29/2026](#)
 - b. Contract End Date: [6/29/2029](#)
6. **Total Contract Cost (without optional years):** [\\$814,498.76](#)
 - a. Optional Years (Number of Months): [72](#)
7. **Total Cost of Optional Years:** [\\$1,185,501.24](#)
8. **Total Contract Cost (with optional years):** [\\$2,000.000.00](#)

Are the following Project Management Plan Drafts approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority and available for the Department of Technology to review? **Choose:** ‘Yes,’ ‘No,’ or ‘Not Applicable.’ If ‘No’ or ‘Not Applicable,’ provide the artifact status in the space provided. These plans may be completed with the selected primary vendor.

1. [Configuration Management Plan \(Draft\):](#) [Yes](#)

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

2. [Data Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

3. [Maintenance and Operations Transition Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: In draft status. Awaiting CDT Approval.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Master Project Management Plan Stage 4

4.10 Risk Register

Attach Risk Register to your email submission.

See Attached: 3480-052 DOC DMR SMARA-4 Risk_Register

End of Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval Document.

Please ensure ADA compliance before submitting this document to CDT.

When ready, submit Stage 4 and all attachments in an email to ProjectOversight@state.ca.gov.

TIP: Use the Gate 4 Project Readiness and Approval Evaluation Scorecard ([SIMM Section 19-D](#)) as an internal tool to ensure a quality submission.

Department of Technology Use Only

Original “New Submission” Date: [05/20/2026](#).

Form Received Date: [05/20/2026](#).

Form Accepted Date: [05/20/2026](#).

Form Status: [In Analysis](#).

Form Status Date: [05/20/2026](#).

Form Disposition: [Choose an item](#).

Form Disposition Date: [Click or tap to enter a date](#).