

Addendum No. 1
Inquiries and Responses
RFP Solicitation No. 3000002000
Transportation Permit System

1. Please confirm that the deadline for receipt of proposals date and time of "...prior to 3:00 PM CST on Tuesday, August 27, 2013" as listed on page 13 of the RFP is incorrect. **This was an oversight, August 27, 2013 is not correct.** Please further confirm that the correct deadline for receipt of proposals date, listed within the page 8 Schedule of Events is, in fact, "Thursday, September 19, 2013". **Deadline for receipt of proposals has been revised to read Tuesday, October 1, 2013. 2.5 Schedule of Events have been revised please see response Number 97.**

2. Attachment II, Certification Statement contemplates acceptance of all terms and conditions. However, the RFP enables consultants to provide exceptions. Please advise as to what a proposer should do in order to preserve the ability to negotiate exceptions. **Attachment II, Certification Statement number 2 and 3 reads:**
 - Proposer complies with each of the **mandatory requirements** listed in the RFP and will meet or exceed the functional and technical requirements specified therein;
 - Proposer accepts the procedures, evaluation criteria, **mandatory contract terms** and conditions, and all other administrative requirements set forth in this RFP.

3. May the vendor propose a more aggressive schedule for the start and conclusion of Phase II, or is it a requirement that Phase II not start before the date that the State has indicated and not conclude prior to the date shown?

Phase II may begin prior to the conclusion of Phase I.

The RFP states:

Maximum duration of implementation shall be:

- Phase I of the implementation shall be scheduled for completion 9 months from NTP with Phase I training completed 10 months from NTP.
- Phase II, shall be scheduled for completion 26 months from NTP with Phase II training completed 30 months from NTP.

4. Will the costs for the optional items be factored into the price used for calculating the proposal score, or will the price used for the proposal score be based on the mandatory items only?

All pricing information will be considered.

5. Will the hourly rates provided for change orders be part of the cost evaluation of the response, and if so, how will they be factored in?

All pricing information will be considered.

6. May the vendor propose a rate structure for the change orders that includes more categories than those contained within the RFP?

Rates should be provided for the categories included in the RFP to allow DOTD to compare rates among proposers.

7. The pricing table does not contain an area to provide maintenance pricing for the optional tasks. How are maintenance prices for the optional tasks to be addressed in the response?

Under item 5 of the cost proposal, please include maintenance costs for each optional item as a separate line item from the development cost for the optional item. For example, for the optional task "OCR Processing" place the development cost in line 5.1 and the maintenance cost for OCR Processing in a line item beneath it labeled 5.1.1.

8. May the vendor no bid select optional tasks, or must a priced proposal be provided for each option?

Proposals shall not be automatically disqualified if a price is not provided for each Optional Task.

9. Will the State consider an alternate schedule of billing and payment milestones that reflect the proposer's approach to the work?

The RFP states:

The price proposal shall at the minimum be structured by the categories shown in Attachment IV. Each of items 1-6 (and sub-items, for example 2.1, 2.2, etc.) should be priced as separate and distinct line items. The Proposer may choose to itemize costs at a more detailed level than that specified in Attachment IV; however, the price proposal should be capable of rolling up to the line items specified, and each detail level must be associated with a corresponding deliverable that is verifiable by the Louisiana project manager.

10. When the State discusses the schedule for Phase 2 (e.g., on page 140, item D4, where it says, "Phase 2 will be ready for acceptance testing by the state 26 months after Notice to Proceed"), should we assume that Phase 2 will be authorized via a separate Notice to

Proceed from the Phase 1 Notice to Proceed? If not, will the State commit to approving and authorizing work on Phase within 12 months of the Notice to Proceed?

Only one "Notice to Proceed" will be issued. It will be issued at the beginning of Phase I.

11. The RFP Minimum Requirements section states: "The Proposer shall have at least one production permit system operating in a U.S. state. This system must include vehicle routing based on Geographical Information System (GIS) data, and provide a map interface for users performing routing functions." We have permitting solutions in place in other state agencies; however they do not include vehicle routing features. Our partner on this project has GIS routing solutions in place, but they do not include permitting functionality. Our proposal would be to combine the two solutions. Would we be excluding from bidding with this proposed solution?

A joint venture would not be excluded from bidding.

12. 5.1.7 Section 6 Geographical Information System Data Requirements – Proposal submission states that 'the Proposer, if selected by the state to deploy the permit system, will disclose all sources of GIS data'. Does this mean that the vendor will provide the name of the data, such as TomTom street network, or Census Bureau Tiger File or does this mean that the vendor must provide the actual data, in a machine readable format, that is used?

The data used in this system has several characteristics that are critical for the safe and effective operation of the permits system. Specifically, it must be kept current and up to date with regular updates and it must provide a common geospatial platform for the exchange of information from disparate sources (bridges, construction projects, etc.). Therefore, the data must be available for use across DOTD. DOTD would prefer to have at least one dataset that can provide interoperability between existing DOTD databases, using existing GIS resources. This requirement may be met through modifying existing DOTD road network data, augmenting existing contracts for commercial data to provide more frequent updates, or by other means. The dataset cannot be proprietary and unavailable to DOTD GIS users. All the data provided must have complete geospatial metadata and be geographically and topographically compatible with existing DOTD GIS data to ensure that enterprise GIS Data warehouse polygon boundaries and features match.

13. A4.6 and A4.7 - Are sections A4.6 and A4.7 section grouping lines in the Permit System Functional Requirements table? Do they require a Code?

A4.6 is a heading line for sub items A4.6.1 through A4.6.2 and does not require a code. Please provide codes for A4.6.1 and A4.6.2. A4.7 is a heading line for sub items A4.7.1 through A4.7.8 and does not require a code. Please provide codes for A4.7.1 through A4.7.8.

14. A5.9 - Is the DOTD only requiring the driving directions to be available in Spanish? Is our assumption correct that the entire site is not required in Spanish?

Yes. A5.9 only specifies that the driving instructions should be available in Spanish, if requested. It does not specify that the entire system use Spanish as an option.

15. B2.1 - Proposal submission states 'a Verisign certificate must be kept up to date and https shall be used for sensitive data, such as payment information'. Since the DOTD will be hosting the site in a DOTD environment, will the DOTD provide the secure certificate for the site?

DOTD does have a VeriSign Certificate (Symantec) that is valid until 2017 for the existing system.

16. Will you please clarify due date of proposal? The cover page and Schedule of Events note the due date as September 19th, 2013 but on page 13 the due date is noted as Tuesday, August 27, 2013.

Deadline for receipt of proposals has moved to Tuesday, October 1, 2013

17. What version of ESRI GIS is the State currently running? If not the most recent version, what is the upgrade forecast?

For this project, the system must be developed to be compatible with ArcGIS Version 10.2.1 and ESRI Roads and Highways LRS solution. If the project takes several years to complete, the contractor will be required to deliver the GIS components that are compatible with the ArcGIS version that is currently in use at DOTD, at that time.

18. Has the Department seen vendor demonstrations of transportation permit systems in the past two (2) years? If so, will you please provide which vendors have presented their solutions?

DOTD does not track vendor demonstrations viewed by DOTD employees and will not be providing a list to Proposers.

19. Does the State Department of Transportation and Development has a budget for purposes of this RFP? If so, will you please provide?

DOTD will not be providing DOTD budget information to Proposers.

20. The RFP contains extensive requirements that must be responded to. It will take considerable time to work up a response. Can the deadline for receipt of proposals be extended past the September 19 deadline?

Deadline for receipt of proposals has moved to Tuesday, October 1, 2013

21. Section 6.5 Evaluation and Review. What costs are used to arrive at the Base Cost Score (BCS) for the System Implementation and Maintenance Costs scores? What specific items from the Cost Proposal make up the costs that are used in the scoring? The Cost Proposal includes pricing for Phase I, Phase II, Optional Tasks, and Hardware/Software costs. Are optional items included in the overall cost that is used for the scoring?

All pricing information will be considered when evaluating the proposal score.

22. It is specified that optional items don't have a phase specified. However, most of the optional items also have the description preceded with "Optional Task". The following requirements do not have the "Optional Task" specification. Can you please confirm that these are optional because the phase is blank? A1.4.7, A1.7, A4.6, A4.7, and A6.1

- A1.4.7 is a Phase I task. The Phase was erroneously omitted in the RFP.
- A1.7 instructs the reader to see Appendix B for Phasing.
- A4.6 is a header for sub items. Please see Phasings listed for sub items A4.6.1 and A4.6.2.
- A4.7 is a header for sub items. Please see Phasings listed for sub items A4.7.1 through A4.7.8.
- A6.1 is a generalized requirement that is defined more specifically by sub items. Please see Phasings listed for sub items A6.1.1 through A6.1.9.

23. Will the DOT allow replacement of envelope routing with the more complete, accurate, and rapid GIS routing? There are significant differences between envelope routing and GIS routing and the capabilities that each can provide. GIS based routing can provide the most complete definition of the highway system where restrictions can be easily applied and changes to the network can be identified and communicated to all applicants. GIS routing knows about every segment, can be restricted (holidays, Mardi Gras, construction, flooding, etc.) on a segment by segment basis, and can have bridges located and used for determination of bridge office review or other district-type notification. Envelope routing in most instances defines a free-form, pre-approved textual trip definition between an origin and a destination that is "good" up to certain specified envelope dimensions and weights. Being able to determine if a restriction at a very precise linear location along a route affects an envelope route is difficult, if not impossible, because the envelope route by definition does not have that level of detail.

Please see A6.1.1 as it defines the envisioned functionality for determining envelope routes impacted by restrictions.

Please note that Phase II may begin prior to the completion of Phase I.

24. A1.6 – Is any logging of the use of the book permits required? Can more information be provided on the overall workflow with this type of permit?

Additional information is specified in A1.6.1 through A1.6.3. Other details will be determined during the Requirements Task for the project.

25. A1.6.2 – Can more information be provided on this requirement? Is this process just for users to return self issued permits, or is this for every type of application? Will users be required to type out all the forms, or can the forms be handwritten? Doing any OCR on handwritten apps is very error prone with more time needed to review and correct the information than it would just take to enter the data from scratch in the web application. We see all states today require web-based applications to ensure good data the first time without any review and correction of incorrectly OCR'd data. Images of applications, route surveys, etc. can be easily associated with an application, but the use of OCR on application data can be very time consuming and expensive, especially given the global acceptance of web applications. Is web entry and association of application, route survey, etc. images with the application data an acceptable solution?

This requirement refers to faxed in or mailed in self issue permits. The requirement does not state that all returned self issue permits shall be typed.

26. A1.14 – A power unit, or especially a trailer, will be in the system multiple times with potentially very different configuration information. If a trailer plate of ABC 123 is entered, and there are multiple configurations for the vehicle, what should be retrieved? In all other implementations, we have found that users prefer having a library of vehicles they can recall. Based on a vehicle “name”, plate, unit number, etc., the user has a defined configuration they understand and can reload and use at any time. They can update the reloaded information any way they chose if needed. Is the vehicle library an appropriate solution to this requirement?

Requirement A1.14 states:

When a power unit plate number is entered into an application, the system will query CVIEW to obtain plate currency and status, and determine if the vehicle is registered to travel in LA. The implementation of this functionality should be configurable in the system, allowing it to be turned on or off.

27. A1.18 – Can more information be provided about load codes? Should end users be able to add load codes? We envision the load codes becoming unwieldy and useless. Should an “Other” be an option that would require state review, state classification, and state determination of the need for a new code?

Requirement A1.18 does not preclude the use of “Other” as a code. Final detailed requirements will be determined during Phase I Requirements Task.

28. A1.23.1 – Can more information be provided on this workflow and the requirements for supervisory approval?

Known Requirements are listed in A1.23 and A1.23.1. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

“The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

29. A1.24 – Would the state agree to an alternative workflow where the oldest request is assigned to the next available specialist guaranteeing the faster turnaround for all applicants? Our implementations have found that it is best to give the next request to the next available permit specialist. If multiple requests are assigned to a specialist and that specialist becomes unavailable, all of those requests are then in “limbo”.

Page 13 of the RFP states:

“... discussions of functionality not requested by the state in this RFP but offered by the vendor in the proposal should be restricted to Packet 1, Section 7 Additional Information.”

30. A1.30 – If exempt customers are not charged, why is a fee stored? Is there some special report that needs to show fees that should have been charged but were exempt?

Requirement A1.30 is correct as stated.

31. A2.3 – Can information be provided on the state credit card processor and what methods are available for integration?

Known Requirements are listed in A2.3. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

“The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

32. A3.1.3 – Can more information be provided on the agent / supervisor approval process? Why are multiple people needed to say a route is OK? We suggest the addition process be limited to authorized users and if those users add a route, it is added. If something happens and someone else has issues with it, it can be modified or removed. We see the documented process adding a lot of workflow processing causing significant potential delays in making a trip available.

Requirement A3.1.3 is correct as stated in the RFP. Page 13 of the RFP states:

“... discussions of functionality not requested by the state in this RFP but offered by the vendor in the proposal should be restricted to Packet 1, Section 7 Additional Information.”

33. A3.1.4 – We understand this request in general but have the same question about the required internal workflow as with A3.1.3.

Please see the answer to Question 32.

34. A3.1.7 – What should happen if a route is valid for some of the requested timeframe? And should routes always be shown so the applicant can adjust their travel dates around the “holidays”?

Known Requirements are discussed in A3.1.7. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states: “The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

35. A3.1.9 – Can more details be provided on how using envelope routing would meet this requirement? How is the envelope routing expected to have enough details to do this dynamic association? Or can the requirement be removed / modified so that it is defined more appropriately for just the GIS routing option, with the envelope routing manually maintained by state users? Envelope routing in automated systems deployed in other states typically specifies a textual description of a trip allowed between an origin and a destination for a vehicle up to certain dimensions and weights. This type of envelope routing process allows authorized state users to define the trips that can be used safely. Those trips may require detours, movement on local roads, etc. as appropriate and are all defined based on the research of the state user. Envelope route information does not typically have detailed understanding of GIS / spatial or linear locations on a road. The envelope routing is used as a “fallback” because good / complete GIS & inventory information isn’t available to do full GIS routing. When the envelope routing is used to avoid the extensive data requirements, determining the relationship between a dynamic temporary restriction and the envelope routing trip description is not possible. Users typically need to review the envelope route and update the definition of the trip based on new restrictions. The dynamic association / identification of routing affected by restrictions is always done in the GIS routing.

Please see A6.1.1. Also, please note that Phase II may begin prior to the completion of Phase I.

36. A3.2.2 and A3.2.15 seem to contradict on how to handle off-system routing, what is to be included, how the off-system routes are to be referenced, etc. Can more clarification be provided for these conditions?

The system would need to be designed to “best route” to avoid these segments unless they were at the beginning or end of a trip. In the middle – a permit agent would need to

over-ride the system for an exception. At the beginning and end of the route – the program should include it for information only and log it as such on the permit. It should then provide an area referring to the contact information and send a copy of the permit to the parish/city.

37. A3.2.8 – Does the state data include on and off ramps and frontage roads?

Please see Appendix E. Existing DOTD data includes some information regarding frontage roads, as do most commercial vendors. At this time, no DOTD data include routing information.

38. A3.2.9 – Can more details be provided on this requirement?

Known Requirements are discussed in A3.2.9. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states: “The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

39. A3.2.10 – Can more details be provided? Does this mean the system can be allowed to automatically issue a permit, but that issuance is limited to configurable specific types of permits and vehicle dimensions and weights for those permits? And if the system isn’t allowed to issue the permit, are there then similar rules for the state users? Are the state users configured in groups or by individual? Is there a workflow that must be enforced?

Known Requirements are discussed in A3.2.10. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states: “The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

40. A3.2.16 – Can you please clarify what is intended by segment mileage?

A total route may be divided into segments in such a way as to provide useful information to the driver of the route. Segment mileage is the mileage of one segment of the total route. More specific definition of segment mileage shall be included in the requirements phase of the project.

Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

“The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

41. A3.2.19 – What should happen if a route is valid for some of the requested timeframe? And should routes always be shown so the applicant can adjust their travel dates around the “holidays”?

Known Requirements are discussed in A3.2.19. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

“The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

42. A3.2.22 – Can you please clarify “the top-most preferred ‘X’ routes”. When the system looks for the best path, it takes all routing rules (route preferences, etc), along with physical limitations, bridge analysis, temporary restrictions, etc. to find the most preferred permissible trip. If the system is to show more than one preference, it would need to alter key rules that will be configured? What kind of rules should be modified? Or is this intended to purely look at historical information on what routes have actually been used? If this is purely historical, how are the vehicle and load characteristics to be considered? Is it for a vehicle that matches exactly with the input vehicle? That may not happen much. Is it for a vehicle “up to” the size of the input vehicle? If so, routes can be totally different in cases such as a previous vehicle being just a couple inches shorter.

The requirement is not intended to specify that historical information shall be used.

43. A3.2.23 – Does the state have data to sufficiently define such cantilevered conditions and should the system automatically do lane based routing?

Please see Appendix E. When cantilevered structures are defined in the system with all required data, the system should perform lane based routing.

44. A3.2.24 – Can more information be provided on what data exists for the turning analysis and how it should be performed? What data does the state have to identify turning radii, and whether a curb may be climbed? How much data does the state collect / is the state willing to force the users to enter to define the exact articulation and turning capabilities of the permit vehicle? This may include more details on points of articulation, steerable axles, and other technical specifications. Might this be simplified to an overall length limitation?

Please see Appendix E. Specific implementation details will be defined during the Requirements Task for Phase II.

45. A3.2.25 – Can more information be provided on what data exists for the rail crossings? How much is known about the size of the hump and what the grade is both coming into and going away from the track. How much information is collected about the details of the trailer including not only the lowest point of the trailer but the extent of the low level in relation to the closest axles which need to be grounded on each side of the rail crossing. Might this be simplified to a singular minimum underclearance restriction given a specific rail crossing grade?

Please see Appendix E. A3.2.25 does not indicate that the system is expected to collect trailer ‘low level’ or the relation of the ‘low level’ to the closest axle. Specific implementation details will be defined during the Requirements Task for Phase II.

46. A3.2.26 – Can more clarification be provided on how the envelope routes will be detailed enough to be able to convert them to the very GIS / spatially / linearly detailed GIS routing? As indicated in the question for A3.1.9, envelope routing in automated systems deployed in other states typically specifies a textual description of a trip allowed between an origin and a destination for a vehicle up to certain dimensions and weights. This type of envelope routing process allows authorized state users to define the trips that can be used safely. Those trip may require detours, movement on local roads, etc. as appropriate and are all defined based on the research of the state user. Envelope route information does not typically have detailed understanding of GIS / spatial or linear locations on a road. The envelope routing is used as a “fallback” because good / complete GIS & inventory information isn’t available to do full GIS routing.

Requirement A3.2.26 specifies a mechanism to merge and unify permit data based on GIS and envelope routes for aggregate reports. Alternate functionality may be suggested by the Proposer in Packet 1, Section 7 Additional Information.” However, information provided in Section 7 does not alleviate the need for the vendor to provide a response to this requirement in Section 3 of their proposal.

47. A3.2.27 – Can more information be provided on this requirement and when the routing should allow it? What definition should be allowed for “wrong” turns, opposite one-way movements, etc.?

Wrong turns, opposite movements, etc., shall be allowed but shall be built into the system under the restrictions or definitions parameters and assigned by an administrator during the setup or while running the system.

48. A3.2.28.2 – Can more details be provided on “next best”? When it comes to OS/OW routing, all the clearances, restrictions, and live load analyses need to be considered? “Next best” may be one or two segment differences but that could occur anywhere along the extent of the trip. This is not like passenger vehicle routing and Google where any number of significantly different routes may all be “valid”.

The system will find the “best” route. Next the system will analyze the structures on the route using the truck information. If a structure fails, the system will be notified of the issue and location and will place a restriction at that point. The system will reroute and determine a new route for analysis. The “next best” would happen due to a failure of the analysis. The “next best” could be a single segment alternative. All restrictions should be considered when determining the route and the “next best” option.

49. A3.2.29 – Can more information be provided on this requirement and when the routing should allow it? What definition should be allowed for “wrong” turns, opposite one-way movements, etc.?

- Manual routing might be necessary in a variety of instances and the program needs an over-ride capability that tracks the process.

- Wrong turns, opposite movements, etc., shall be allowed but shall be built into the system under the restrictions or definitions parameters and assigned by an administrator during the setup or while running the system.
- The system shall support “restrictions” which technically will re-define the parameters of certain locations. These are known spots that the administrator will define during the setup and/or be allowed to define while running the system.
- Tunnels would have a restriction built in and the route generator would ignore this option from the beginning. Best route would know to route around.

50. A3.2.30 – Can more information be provided on this requirement and when the routing should allow it? What definition should be allowed for “wrong” turns, opposite one-way movements, etc.?

- See Question 49. This is to be a built in feature. The system should support the capability to allow a restriction to be set for two way traffic for set distances. This parameter would allow A/B (parallel) bridges to be utilized in the event one performs better than the other.
- See Question 49. This system should support, within the restriction management or a parameters tab, the option to designate known wrong way movements.
- The system needs to have a parameter check for wrong way options or an over-ride option for administrators and users to toggle. This can flag administrator if set by user and then given the okay or rejection

51. A4.1 – Can more clarification be provided on how the envelope routes will be detailed enough to be able to “know” every bridge that will be encountered? As indicated in the question for A3.1.9, envelope routing in automated systems deployed in other states typically specifies a textual description of a trip allowed between an origin and a destination for a vehicle up to certain dimensions and weights. This type of envelope routing process allows authorized state users to define the trips that can be used safely. Those trips may require detours, movement on local roads, etc. as appropriate and are all defined based on the research of the state user. Envelope route information does not typically have detailed understanding of GIS / spatial or linear locations on a road. The envelope routing is used as a “fallback” because good / complete GIS & inventory information isn’t available to do full GIS routing.

If an envelope route has been marked as having one or more bridges on the route, and the application meets one of the criteria listed in A4.1 the application must be reviewed by bridge rating.

Also, please note that Phase II may begin prior to the completion of Phase I.

52. A4.2 – Can the Virtis data be used in our own live load analysis that will provide for much faster real-time analysis?

Additional Information on suggested functionality may be provided in Packet 1, Section 7 Additional Information.” Additional information may include how the vendor’s live load analysis will:

- Perform engineering analysis meeting LADOTD’s rating/permitting specifications.
- Prove to be a better process and satisfy LADOTD requirements.
- Show how data from Virtis can be used.

53. A4.3 – Can more details be provided on the Influence Line Program, TimberC and the Steel bridge analysis so we understand the integration requirements?

Other rating analysis programs are used for structure elements that Virits has not traditionally performed. These are programs built in-house or by consultants using Microsoft Visual Basic.

54. A4.5 – Can more details be provided on the workflow with the analysis and how the flags actually results? There seems to be some conflict in the different flags.

- The system must provide results in a visual and informative manner to quickly and easily determine the next level of involvement. The method should denote which structure analysis passed all checks, which ones have missing elements in the structures Virtis database, which ones fail the analysis, which ones certain checks failed. The program should have settings and a system of “flags” to identify the results and count the number of concerns and categorize the issues.

55. A4.6.2 – Can more details be provided on this requirement? We do not understand terms like “some” and “nearly all”. How can those values be specifically defined to allow for programmatic analysis?

The system will track results for a set time frame. After this time, the data will be used to show how the state’s structures perform. This data will be used to create allowed trucking zones, to improve the approved trucking routes. It will categorize the structures and place restrictions based on gathered analysis. The network will be categorized into 3 or more named levels.

56. A4.7.1 – Should the system automatically do all bridge analyses before any notification / queuing occurs?

- There should be an over ride to allow DOTD users to place requests in the queue before analysis for certain situations.

- If an envelope route is marked as having bridges, but no bridge data are specified in the system, the permit would be placed in the queue without performing bridge analysis.
- The system should normally run the best route's structures through the analysis. This step will result in "flags" for each of the structures. The flags will identify the results from this analysis.

57. A4.7.4 – Can the Virtis data be used in our own live load analysis that will provide for much faster real-time analysis? And can more details be provided on non-standard gage analysis requirements?

Non-standard gage is a longitudinal and lateral analysis. The vehicles width and tire spacings are known along with the axle spacings to give a 2 dimensional view of the truck. The system runs a refined system analysis in Virtis.

58. A4.7.5 – Is it acceptable that the queue show a core set of information about the requests with easy access to other details (like full route descriptions) via hover over or status detail options? Would it be acceptable to provide a solution that has a very capable queuing process with many filters and options. If this is requirement is really intended to find more about permits that were issued (as an approval date would not show in a pending queue), there are also advanced (yet easy to use) searching options that respond with significant tabularized information.

The intent is to provide a searchable database that uses all the possible filters that multiple users would want to search by. The data needs to be easy to retrieve, filter, sort, derive, interpret, generate, report, and print. This is to capture and discover historical data and pending data. This data is intended to be utilized by multiple departments and needs to be versatile.

59. A4.7.7 – The permit specialist will be in the queue working on pending requests all the time. Should the specialist be emailed (as an additional process) or should they just get the request returned from bridge as their next most important application to process?

The RFP does not specify how frequently permit specialists will be accessing the queue.

60. A4.7.8 – vs 4.7.6 Can more details be provided on the workflow for the provision on approvals / restrictions on the movement vs. the need to create a "draft letter"?

Known Requirements are discussed in A4.7.8 and A4.7.6. Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

"The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system."

61. A4.9 – Is there some formula or algorithm that can be provided for the bridge analysis costs?

The cost is determined by the type and location as expressed in the “Louisiana Regulations for Trucks, vehicles, and Loads” Manual.

62. A4.10 – Can more details be provided on this requirement?

This is a result of the route selected. The main portion of the route (majority of miles on a segment) will automatically pull from the database the corresponding district and list the main route. These are entries into a database, used for information and tracking in historical records.

63. A5.1 – Can a sample map or WMS layer be provided? Do all of these items need to be on one map? Will a user be able to decipher any of the information trying to show that much? We have taken the approach that all of this is verified as a user selects a trip. A user can also show just items that adversely affect the specific permit vehicle. This map is much less congested and makes more immediate visual sense to the users. Are these appropriate solutions?

A5.1 does not specify the map elements that will be displayed at any given time on user screens.

64. A5.3 – Does the state have an idea of what data is missing? Does the state have a list of vendors that currently do similar data collection that we may offer a subcontract agreement?

Please see Appendix E. DOTD will not be providing a list of potential subcontractors to perform this task.

65. A5.7 – Is the stewardship data available in the state data sources? Can sample data be provided?

All of these data are freely available from DOTD.

66. A5.8 – Is the district data available in the state data sources? Can sample data be provided?

All of these data are freely available from DOTD.

67. A5.9 – Can more information be provided on what exactly are universal icons that need to be shown?

The selected vendor shall provide the universal icons. Requirements for icons shall be discussed in the project Requirements Task.

68. A5.14 – Does the state really want your end users to add information to your maps? How is that validated? How is it used? Is it shown to all users? Isn't there a huge liability issue?

A5.14 does not preclude validation, or viewing restrictions for data entered into maps

69. A5.16 – Can information be provided on how sight distances and ramp grade and curvature are to be used? Is this data for informational purposes only?

Data is for user information purposes only

70. A5.17 – Can information be provided on how pavement ages and types are to be used? Is this data for informational purposes only?

Data is for user information purposes only

71. A6.1.4 – Is there a specific mechanism or set of steps envisioned?

No. Exhibit I3-1 lists a requirements milestone for both Phase I and Phase II. The specific steps or mechanism shall be determined during requirements specification.

72. A6.1.6 – Can more details be provided on this requirement?

Please see Requirement A3.1.9 and A6.1.1.

73. A6.1.9 – Can this requirement be migrated to Phase II? This requirement is more easily met with Phase II GIS-based routing.

A6.1.9 is a system requirement that must be in place regardless of the type of routing used, and therefore must be available in the initial release of the system. Please note that Phase II may begin prior to the completion of Phase I.

74. A6.2 – Can more information be provided on this requirement and why specific companies may be allowed to move through an area defined to be too small for the vehicle in question?

Additional information shall be provided to the selected vendor during the Requirements Tasks for the project.

75. A7.8 – Can more information be provided about how the system is to know a report will be large before it is generated?

A7.8 does not specify that the system shall know the size of the report before it is generated; rather it indicates the size should be known prior to printing.

76. A7.9.7 – Can more information be provided on this requirement and why specific companies may be allowed to move through an area defined to be too small for the vehicle in question?

Please see the answer to question 74.

77. A7.10.1 and A7.10.2 – As in A4.6.2, can more information be provided about the determination of the different segment classification?

Please see the answer to question 55.

78. A7.11.3 – How are lanes to be included? How is lane-based routing to be automatically done and then recorded in the system?

Please see the answer to question 43.

79. A7.11.4 – Can more clarification be provided on how the envelope routes will be detailed enough to be able to “know” every district that will be encountered? As indicated in the question for A3.1.9, envelope routing in automated systems deployed in other states typically specifies a textual description of a trip allowed between an origin and a destination for a vehicle up to certain dimensions and weights. This type of envelope routing process allows authorized state users to define the trips that can be used safely. Those trips may require detours, movement on local roads, etc. as appropriate and are all defined based on the research of the state user. Envelope route information does not typically have detailed understanding of GIS / spatial or linear locations on a road. The envelope routing is used as a “fallback” because good / complete GIS & inventory information isn’t available to do full GIS routing.

The association between districts and envelope routes would need to be included with the envelope route definition.

The requirement stated in A7.11.4 is a system requirement regardless of the type of route (envelope or GIS) being used to route the load and, therefore, must be available in the initial release of the system. Please note that Phase II may begin prior to the completion of Phase I.

80. A8.7 – Can more background be provided on this requirement? Would a “next” function in the system where the system automatically gets the specialist the next most appropriate application as they finish the current one be an acceptable solution for this requirement?

Please see the answer to question 29.

81. B2.2 – Should a score be required? It seems the sub-items have all the detailed requirements.

No. It is not required.

82. B2.2.4.2 – Can this requirement be further clarified?

B2.2.4.2 specifies login credentials must be used to access the system database or any secure files used by the system. Users with login credentials may have differing access levels defined.

83. B2.6 – Should a score be required? It seems the sub-items have all the detailed requirements.

No. It is not required.

84. B2.6.4 – Can you please define a transaction? Is that the full process to get to an issued permit? What errors are to be tracked? Does it matter if a user missed a field and got a message they needed to complete it before they submitted? How many types of errors are there? What “other” transaction statistics are required?

A transaction shall be defined to complement business practices and the technical needs of the system. Definition shall occur during the Requirements Task for the project.

Section 4, Paragraph 1 of the RFP states:

“The requirements detailed below provide an overview of the functions the Permit System should perform. The selected Proposer will be required to meet with the State to develop full and detailed requirements for the permit system.”

85. B3.2 – Should a score be required? It seems the sub-items have all the detailed requirements.

No. It is not required.

86. B3.4 – Much of the overall performance of the system is outside of our control. If we host the system, we control the servers and have more control, but we are always dependent on Internet connectivity, user machines, etc. Some reports and queries are very complex and will take more than 4 seconds. Most of the typical permitting process should never exceed these parameters, but there are still many infrastructure variables. What happens if movement between pages takes more than 4 seconds?

Vendors shall not be held responsible for factors outside their control. Lengthy report requests or other exceptional requests as defined by DOTD are not included in this requirement.

87. B4.1 – Can we please get all data dictionaries and sample data? There are significant data integrity issues with the new system in using previous system data than can have significant use and cost ramifications.

Data Dictionaries shall be provided during the Requirements Task detailed in Exhibit I3-1.

88. C1.3 – Can more specifics be provided on exactly what must be monitored?

Please review the performance requirements listed in the RFP to determine what must be monitored. Additional details on performance monitoring may be determined in the Requirements Task listed in Exhibit I3-1.

89. C1.8 – Can more information be provided on exactly what is required for “on-site technical” support? We can typically do the support virtually faster than anyone on-site.

The frequency of on-site technical support requests will be influenced by the quality of service that is provided remotely

90. C2.4 – Can an estimated / expected number of days be provided so everyone is pricing on the same expectations?

The number of days may differ from vendor to vendor depending on the quality of service that is provided remotely.

91. **Section 3.2 Determination of Responsibility** – the State indicates that it must find that the selected proposer “has adequate financial resources for performance, or has the ability to obtain such resources as required during performance” and that “Proposers should ensure that their proposals contain sufficient information for the State to make its determination by presenting acceptable evidence of the above to perform the contracted services.” Can the State provide examples of the type of information it would deem sufficient?

The State will review any supporting documentation provided, including but not limited to financial statements, letters of recommendation from previous clients, any pertinent certification of good standings, submissions pursuant to Section 5 of the RFP (Response Instructions) and any other supporting documentation.

92. **Section 3.12 Contract Award and Execution** – the State indicates that a proposer shall not submit its own standard contract terms and conditions as a response to this RFP, but then in Section 5.3 specifically requests that the proposer submit its standard license agreement for each of the applicable components. Can the State please advise whether a proposer is permitted to include a copy of its standard support and maintenance agreement (including its standard license agreement) when such agreement serves to describe the features and benefits of proposer’s support and maintenance program that are not addressed by the State’s standard form terms and conditions, provided that the State terms and conditions would take precedence in the event of any conflict?

Proposers should describe the features and benefits of proposer’s support and maintenance program that are not addressed by the State’s standard form terms and conditions. Per 3.12 of the RFP, the Proposer should submit with its proposal any exceptions or exact contract deviations that its firm wishes to negotiate

93. **Attachment III, Section 8** – can the State please clarify whether “other material related to this contract and/or obtained or prepared by Contractor in connection with the performance of the services contracted for herein” is intended to apply to or exclude the licensed software provided to the State by Contractor?

Attachment III is a Sample Contract. Attachment IV is a sample software license and maintenance agreement. Ownership clause will be completed during negotiations.

94. **Attachment IV Software License and Maintenance Agreement** – the State has included a model Software License and Maintenance Agreement, but this agreement is not referenced within the RFP as either being mandatory terms and conditions or that it will be part of the resulting contract. RFP Section 5.3 then specifically requests that the proposer submit its standard license agreement for each of the applicable components. Can the State please clarify the intention behind including the model Software License and Maintenance Agreement in Attachment IV? Additionally, can the State please advise whether the State’s Software License and Maintenance Agreement or the proposer’s standard license agreement will be included as part of the resulting contract?

Attachment IV is provided as a sample for informational purposes. Final software license and maintenance agreement is to be negotiated.

95. Will you please provide details of the construction/incident restriction database? Type, details contained, etc.?

Known requirements are listed in A6.1 and A6.1.1 through A6.1.9. The selected vendor shall provide a database to meet these requirements.

96. Is the Department of Transportation using ArcGIS Server? If so, is it Standard or above?

DOTD has all levels of ArcGIS Server available. By the delivery date of this project, ArcGIS version 10.2.1 or later will be in production. The vendor will be required to provide sufficient support for migration to any later version.

97. 2.5 Schedule of Events has been amended to read as:

Event	Date
Deadline for receipt of proposals	Tuesday, October 1, 2013
Oral Presentations	October 8, 2013 (on or about)
Announce Award of Contractor Selection	October 15, 2013 (on or about)
Contract Execution	November 1, 2013(on or about)

