A. PREVIOUS Q&A (FROM ORIGINAL RFP; STILL RELEVANT)

RFP MAIN BODY:

**Question 1:** How much Federal budget is approved and for what period of time is the budget authorized?

**Answer 1:** It is not NYSDOT’s practice to release information regarding a project’s budget being progressed via competitive selection of a consultant. Any federal-aid participating in this project will be obligated shortly after contract negotiation is completed (during the first portion of contract execution) and the duration or term of federal-aid participation will be established at that time.

**Question 2:** NYDOT is very clear on the requirement for a COTS-based solution, however the RFP also includes a very extensive set of NYDOT specific requirements. Has the State considered compromising NYDOT specific requirements in order to reap the full benefits of a COTS implementation?

**Answer 2:** The RFP’s specifications remain unchanged via its re-release. Interested firms are encouraged to offer a complete-as-possible solution which can address all or most of the RFP’s requirements. An offered solution which does not meet specific RFP requirement(s) may be downgraded during proposal evaluation as not meeting the RFP requirement(s). However, a firm may offer alternative solutions for NYSDOT’s consideration (which NYSDOT has no obligation to consider); NYSDOT is obligated to review proposals against the RFP’s published requirements, yet via the RFP re-release, evaluation flexibility has been authorized (reviewing proposals from a higher perspective; not from an individual requirement perspective). While a COTS-based solution is originally desired, the Department is interested in the best possible, optimal solution.

**Question 3:** Will NYSDOT consider proposals that outline a different set of project management protocols, particularly if they designed to accelerate the project schedule and reduce the overall project cost?
Answer 3: NYSDOT will allow a different set of project management protocols provided that the similar level of project management performance is provided. It would behoove a proposal to demonstrate how NYS project management protocols are covered via use of alternate protocols. NYSDOT is very much interested in receiving effective schedules and reduced project costs.

Question 4: May a vendor reply with a non-standard proposal for a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) solution? A proposal oriented on what a vendor can deliver in 12 months compared to a proposal that address the 500+ COTS and Custom requirements in NYDOT’s RFP?

Answer 4: While all of the re-release RFP’s requirements remain unchanged, they have been regrouped at a higher level to allow firms flexibility to offer an optimal solution. A vendor needs to indicate how their offer meets or does not meet the RFP’s requirements via completed Attachment 1. An offered solution which does not meet specific RFP requirement(s) will still be considered. A firm may also offer an alternative proposal (submit a second, complete proposal in two parts) for NYSDOT’s additional consideration (NYSDOT is obligated to independently consider both).

Question 5: Please describe in detail the contents of a “Conflict of Interest Management Plan” that is required if a vendor is awarded both the HOOCs system project and the Permit Office Staffing project.

Answer 5: Should the same firm also be awarded the CPO Staff Augmentation contract #C031103, NYSDOT shall require that firm to propose a Conflict of Interest Management Plan for NYSDOT review and approval. The current Permits Office consultant has not been involved in specifying HOOCs or reviewing draft HOOSC requirements (a firewall has been maintained).

Question 6: Are there workflow diagrams that show the specific workflow / process between the various NYSDOT and non-NYSDOT offices and agencies involved in the overall process?

Answer 6: These diagrams do not exist at this time. NYSDOT’s current system sends permit information to NYCDOT’s permit system. NYCDOT issues their own permits using their system while NYSDOT issues its permits separately. NYSDOT does not receive any information from NYCDOT. NYSDOT does not currently share permit information with any other agencies as procedures, processes or workflows have yet to be established. In addition, the One Stop Credentialing and Registration (OSCAR) system operated and maintained by the NYS Department of Tax and Finance allows enrolled OSCAR customers the ability to access the NYS Department of Transportation’s permit system to order Special Hauling Permits (with the exception of credit
card transactions, no processing takes place in the OSCAR website). Once NYSDOT’s Central Permits Office evaluates and analyzes a permit request, the response is sent to the customer. The new system shall be capable of interfacing with the OSCAR system for both Special Hauling and Divisible Load permits.

Question 7: Re-Release RFP Section 1.3.1, last item #5, (old RFP Section 1.3.2): A) Must the solution be based on / be compatible with Oracle WebLogic Server / SOA? B) What integration capabilities will this solution be required to offer in the future? C) What turn/maneuver information presently exists?

Answer 7: A) & B): Refer to RFP Requirements 3.6.3.2.0-1 through 3.6.3.2.0-9, inclusive. Also, NYSDOT has a future goal to implement and extend a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) solution using Oracle's WebLogic Server, Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) Suite, and Business Process Management (BPM) Suite. SOA is not yet operational at NYSDOT but could be someday. C) Turn/maneuver information does not currently exist. Based upon their expertise, NYSDOT is open to suggestion from the Vendor on how these could be applied.

Question 8: RFP Section 2.1: A): What is required in the document management system being able to interface with other document management solutions? B): Regarding this quote: “…transportation agencies include, but are not limited to…” – how many other total agencies may be required to be part of the proposed solution? What permitting requirements will each agency have? C): What additional fees will be allowed to ensure the proper agency integration / deployment?

Answer 8: A): Refer to RFP Requirements 3.6.2.5.0-1 and 3.6.2.5.0-2. B): Potential transportation agencies are noted on Page 14 of the RFP. The State does not know what agencies potentially would eventually be integrated into HOOCS. NYSDOT’s current system only transmits data to NYCDOT. NYSDOT has not yet expanded this to other agencies nor is NYSDOT receiving any permit information from other agencies. The ability to incorporate these agencies would have to be present but it is likely more work would have to be done if and when this takes place. C): The RFP instructs vendors to propose costs for all aspects of its proposal, including any additional fees associated with proposed solution services.

Question 9: RFP Section 2.1.1 indicates that: “The Regulatory Compliance feature is an additional component for which the offeror must propose a solution (technical and cost) but which NYSDOT is not obligated to purchase.” Attachment 8; Cost of Services worksheet contains a separate section for Regulatory Compliance. This section seems to imply that the Regulatory Compliance requirements must be treated as a separate project with its own
set of deliverables and payments. Can this be addressed as a lump sum optional line item pending a decision to purchase? If NYSDOT purchases the Regulatory Compliance feature will this feature be implemented in parallel or will this feature be implemented on a separate schedule?

**Answer 9:** Yes, an offered Regulatory Compliance feature can be addressed as a lump sum optional line item pending a decision to purchase. NYSDOT may or may not opt to purchase the Regulatory Compliance feature (to be decided either during contract negotiations or after contract approval via side letter). For a proposal to be responsive, a firm must propose their best solution for integrating this feature into the overall HOOCS Implementation Plan, or offer an alternative approach. Firms are required to propose an approach and offer a scope of service to provide Regulatory Compliance services (a separate but related project is a good description; ready to go from day one or on day ‘n’). Costs for contingency services shall be measured as a function of competitively bid rates by title times a prescribed block of time. Regarding any contingent purchases, final project and payment schedules shall be negotiated with the selected vendor.

**Question 10:** A): RFP Section 3.1; page 18 states that the Consultant must adhere to the New York State Project Management Guidebook Release 2 for its project management methodology. The New York State Project Management Guidebook Release 2 methodology contains additional process outputs/deliverables that are not necessarily identified as deliverables within the RFP. Is the Consultant required to provide all outputs for each Project Management process as defined in the NYS PM Guidebook? B): RFP Section 3.1 page 18 states that: “All systems and services provided under the resulting contract must be consistent with state and federal laws and regulations.” Please provide the link to any required State and Federal laws and regulations that pertain to this procurement.

**Answer 10:** A): Vendors should consider the HOOCS’ RFP and its requirements and deliverables as taking precedence over deliverables or processes in the New York State Project Management Guidebook, Release 2. The selected vendor is required to offer sound Project Management protocols. B): The laws and regulations referenced pertain to the issuance of OS/OW permits and are available on NYSDOT’s website via: [https://www.dot.ny.gov/nypermits](https://www.dot.ny.gov/nypermits).

**Question 11:** Original RFP sections 3.4 and 4.4 requires that vendors address every item in Section 3; however there are tables in Section 3 that do not appear as if they require a response, and instead appear to be a list of items the vendor is to provide after award. Please clarify what is expected as a response for the tables provided in this section.

**Answer 11:** The Re-Release RFP clarifies a vendor’s response: Re-Release RFP Section 4.3 provides a list of items to include to ensure complete
proposal delivery. All redundant requirements have been eliminated and should only appear once (either in the RFP’s attachments or in RFP Sections 3 and 4.

**Question 12:** Page 128 of Re-Release RFP Attachment 1 indicates that: “...it is expected that automated and manual data cleaning will need to occur.” Does NYSDOT require that the selected Consultant perform manual and automated data cleansing or will NYSDOT personnel be responsible for this effort?

**Answer 12:** The selected Consultant shall assist NYSDOT to migrate and cleanse data using NYSDOT approved scripts (among other related duties). The Consultant is responsible for performing these duties under NYSDOT guidance and supervision.

**Question 13:** RFP Attachment 1 page 131 states: “The Consultant shall propose all expenses related to the provision of the training (excepting costs associated with agent travel to the training location).” Attachment 8; Cost Proposal appears to accommodate the expenses within the “Cost of Services tab” which appears to be contradictory. How are travel expenses for training to be addressed within the proposal response?

**Answer 13:** It is NYSDOT’s policy to reimburse its consultant for directed travel (travel in direct support of service delivery) and not for commuting costs. To be acceptable, a proposer needs to identify what and why travel is necessary to deliver requested training, and must include costs for travel in Attachment 8. NYSDOT sees these rules as complementary and not in contradiction.

**Question 14:** Object Number: 3.6.1.2.0-3, ID 338: Wherever possible, the system shall verify that submitted permit information matches known information. Please provide a list of data sources and data items for “known information” that the permit system should use to verify submitted data.

**Answer 14:** This feature is desired to ensure that data is consistent when customers renew permits or use existing equipment on new permits. For example, truck and trailer axle data should not change from year to year. Data sources would include: power unit axle ratings, power unit axle spacings, power unit vehicle weight ratings, trailer axle ratings, trailer axle spacings, trailer vehicle weight ratings, and trailer length.

**Question 15:** Object Number: 3.6.1.2.0-6, ID 329: The system shall provide the ability to validate registration information for certified escorts with the appropriate Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Please provide detailed information on the interface/web service required to complete this validation.

**Answer 15:** There is no interface set up at this time. DMV can provide an Excel spreadsheet with the relevant information. The intent of this
requirement is to ensure the HOOCS system has the ability to interface with the DMV at a future date. It is expected that some additional work would have to be done at that time.

**Question 16:** Object Number: 3.6.1.6.0-5, ID 585: The system shall enable customers to amend their permit applications in accordance with business rules. Please provide the business rules for when a permit may be amended and what fields can be amended.

**Answer 16:** Business rules on when permits may be amended and what fields can be amended are included in the RFP.

**Question 17:** Object Number: 3.6.1.3.0-3, ID 952: The system shall calculate the minimum turn radius for the vehicle defined in the permit application. Please provide the formula you’d like the vendor to use to calculate the minimum turn radius along with any variants that should be included in the calculation.

**Answer 17:** NYSDOT does not have a formula at the present time.

**Question 18:** Object Number: 3.6.1.5.1.0-12, ID 1465: The system shall enable authorized users to mark an account as a municipality account. Please describe the attributes of a “Municipality Account”. What functions can this account perform that can not be performed by other accounts?

**Answer 18:** There are two differences between municipal accounts and regular carrier accounts. NYSDOT does not charge municipalities permit fees, and a DOT number is not required for a municipality to apply for a permit. All other account functionality is the same.

**Question 19:** Object Number: 3.6.1.6.1.0-6, ID 491: The system shall enable users to pre-fund their account using Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT). Will NYSDOT provide web services for interface with EFT processes? If so, please describe those web services.

**Answer 19:** Presently, NYSDOT does not accept EFT’s. The HOOCS RFP has this requirement in case NYSDOT wanted to accept this form of payment in the future. The procedure or required interfaces will be provided at that time.

**Question 20:** Object Number: 3.6.1.6.3.0-9, ID 441: The system shall provide an interface to a third-party service for the validation of credit card payments. Does NYSDOT currently have a preferred credit card vendor or is NYSDOT asking the vendor to supply the credit card processor?

**Answer 20** At this time, NYSDOT’s system only interfaces with DMV via OSCAR. The window point of sale machine and the website credit card application are separate. NYSDOT enters credit card transactions from these into our system manually. Credit card payments are currently processed via the NYS Department of Motor Vehicles. Per
NYSDOT HOOCS RFP, the vendor does not have to supply the credit card processor. The system will have to interface with NYSDMV.

**Question 21:** Object Number: 3.6.1.6.6.0-3 ID: 474 - The system shall enable printing any required data elements on each payment instrument, application, and any other required document. Will NYSDOT supply the appropriate printers to accomplish this task or will the vendor be required to supply printing hardware?

**Answer 21:** No printers or any other hardware needs to be supplied by the vendor. NYSDOT shall supply any and all printers. The intent of the requirement is to give the customers the ability to print these documents in a printer-friendly format. The vendor’s solution must provide a printing function.

**Question 22:** Object Number: 3.6.3.5.3.0-4 ID: 204 - The system shall scan all external file transfers for viruses before accepting them into the data repository. Will NYSDOT provide the required virus scanning software and interfaces that will be used to scan files before they are accepted into the data repository?

**Answer 22:** Virus scanning and interfaces required to protect data will be dependent upon the vendor’s proposed solution and approach.

**Question 23:** RFP states that “Failure to meet any Mandatory requirement shall go through a confirmation process.” Is this sentence correct?

**Answer 23:** “Failure to meet any Mandatory requirement shall go through a confirmation process” is a correct sentence. NYSDOT has a process it follows to verify if indeed a mandatory requirement has been failed.

**Question 24:** Is Object Number 4.5.1.3.0-4 optional? It states that it is necessary but the description say that a proposal “may include…”

**Answer 24:** This requirement, which reads: “The Technical Proposal may include any additional reference information submitted to further support a firm’s technical submission (e.g., a training manual, a relevant sample work product for another client, etc.) and such additional references must be indexed in the RTM Attachment 1 submission as well as in relevant locations in the main body of the proposal” is to allow a firm to offer additional material yet tie that back to the RFP’s requirements.

**Question 25:** RFP Section 4.5.3.0-7: can details about the required case study be provided? Is there a sample?

**Answer 25:** The case study should describe how the vendor provided training to a customer or customers on the use of their HOOCS solution. At a minimum, the case study should:
- Profile a similar engagement where the vendor has provided customized, role-based user training.
- Describe the training need and training audience.
- Describe the instructional content and instructional delivery method (web, computer-based, self-paced).

The case study should also provide other relevant information about how the vendor solved a training problem.

**Question 26:** RFP Section 4.5.3.1.0-3: Are all of these technical/architecture documents required as part of the initial proposal or as part of the project work?

**Answer 26:** The 1st sentence of 4.5.3.1.0-3 presents the RFP’s requirement – the rest is information to guide your submission. NYSDOT is seeking to gauge a consultant qualifications and abilities in these areas.

**Question 27:** RFP Section 4.5.3.2.0-5: Will the sample data provide just routing data or everything about the existing permitting system too? We cannot create mappings without a detailed understanding of all systems. Does this mapping need to be provided as part of the proposal or project work?

**Answer 27:** The Sample Data does not represent all data in the existing permitting system. The Sample Data includes representative GIS data that NYSDOT intends to use for the routing and restriction management functionality in the RFP/resulting HOOCS System. The sample data will contain some restriction information. It is up to each consultant to figure out, considering its business models, how to optimally respond to each RFP requirement such that NYSDOT can gauge the proposer’s degree of ability and qualifications. Use of GIS is a prominent feature in HOOCS.

**ATTACHMENT 12 Draft Contract:**

**Question 28:** Can the definition of "Consultant-Owned Software" be changed to read: means Software developed and owned by the Consultant or its subcontractors which either pre-exists, or whose development is not funded by this agreement, that is used as part of the HOOCS Software. To the extent that the software is both Consultant-Owned Software and Third-Party Off-The-Shelf Software, then the provisions of this Agreement relating to Consultant-Owned Software shall apply and prevail over contrary or additional provisions related to Commercial-Off-The-Shelf Software unless it is expressly provided otherwise?

**Answer 28:** In Article 3 Definitions, the definition of ‘Consultant-Owned Software’ remains unchanged. It is recommended reading this definition in conjunction with Article 10.2 Consultant Owned Software.

**Question 29:** Can the definition of "New Version" be changed to read: shall mean a new release of Software, other than enhancements, Maintenance Releases or
modifications, tailoring and/or customization resulting from Integration Services, or a new option not previously available which add to any Software significant new features, functions or capabilities or significant improvements in performance. Such new Release/option shall be deemed a New Version rather than a Maintenance Release only if and so long as Consultant continues to maintain, enhance and market the Software without such new release/option and generally charges its maintenance clients an additional charge?

Answer 29:  NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 30: Can the Change the definition of "Open Source Software" be changed to read: shall mean any software obtained under a license that permits materially unrestricted use, modification, and redistribution in modified or unmodified form. A subset of open source licenses also require that redistribution (in modified or unmodified form) be accompanied by the corresponding source code.?

Answer 30: The definition of ‘Open-Source Software’ remains unchanged. The requested change adds the word “materially” without clarifying its definition or use, so its application is unclear.

Question 31: Can the section titled ‘NYSDOT Project Management’ be changed to read: The work of the Project shall be performed under the program direction and contract administration of NYSDOT. NYSDOT shall have a Project Director, who may be an employee of another public agency, acting as a representative of NYSDOT. Subject to the overall supervision of and accountability to the Program Manager, the Project Director is Consultant’s day to day contact for: ensuring performance of the work within the Scope of Services and the Project Budget; coordination with the Program Manager, processing of payment requisitions; and, the initiation and coordination of review of any changes to the Contract Documents. The Project Director is not the NYSDOT contracting officer, however. Any amendment to the Contract Documents requires an amended or supplemental agreement signed by the NYSDOT contract officer?

Answer 31: Section 4.3 of the Draft Contract remains unchanged.

Question 32: Can ‘Consultant Personnel Changes’ be changed to read: Any change of Consultant key personnel by the CONSULTANT shall be subject to the prior written approval of the STATE and are subject to NYSDOT’s Consultant personnel change process?

Answer 32: Draft Contract Section 4.4.2 ‘Consultant Personnel Changes’ remains unchanged. To quote the RFP: “NYSDOT reserves the right to approve the replacement of key personnel (project leadership; who may have responsibility with the HOOCS project) as well as all proposed Consultant personnel.” Therefore, all Consultant personnel changes are subject to NYSDOT review and approval.
Question 33: Can Insurance 9.A.1 1. Coverage Types and Policy Limits be changed to read: The types of coverage and policy limits required from the Consultant are specified in subarticle B below. Insurance shall apply separately on a per-job or per-project basis?

Answer 33: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 34: Can Insurance 9.A.3 be changed to read “thirty days” instead of “thirty work days”?

Answer 34: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 35: Can Modify Primary Coverage in Section 9 be changed to read: All insurance policies, excepting workers’ compensation and professional liability insurance, shall provide that the required coverage be primary as to any other insurance that may be available to the Department for any claim arising from the Consultant’s Work under this contract, or as a result of the Consultant’s activities?

Answer 35: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 36: Can Modify Waiver of Subrogation in Section 9 be changed to read: As to every type and form of insurance coverage required from the Consultant except professional liability insurance, there shall be no right of subrogation against the State of New York/New York State Department of Transportation, its agents or employees. To the extent that any of Consultant’s policies of insurance prohibit such a waiver of subrogation, Consultant shall secure the necessary permission to make this waiver?

Answer 36: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 37: Can Modify Policy Renewal/Expiration in Section 9 be changed to read: At least thirty (30) days Prior to the expiration of any policy required by this contract, evidence of renewal or replacement policies of insurance with terms no less favorable to the Department than the expiring policies shall be delivered to the Department—in the manner required for service of notice in subdivision (A)(3) above.

Answer 37: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 38: Can Modify Self-Insured Retention/Deductibles in Section 9 be changed to read: Self insured retentions and deductibles shall be approved by NYSDOT which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld. Consultants utilizing self insurance programs are required to provide a description of the program for Department approval. Collateralized deductible and self-insured retention programs administered by a third party may be approved. Except as may be specifically provided in the Contract Documents of a particular project, Consultant administered insurance deductible shall be limited to the amount of the bid deposit or $100,000, whichever is less.
Security is not required if it is otherwise provided to an administrator for an approved risk management program. The Department will not accept a self-insured retention program without security being posted to assure payment of both the self-insured retention limit and the cost of adjusting claims. The Consultant shall be solely responsible for all claim expense and loss payments within any permitted deductible or self-insured retention. If the Consultant’s deductible in a self-administered program exceeds the amount of the bid deposit, the Consultant shall furnish an irrevocable Letter of Credit as collateral to guarantee its obligations. Such Letter of Credit or other collateral as may be approved by Department must be issued by a guarantor or surety with an AM Best Company rating of “A minus” or higher. If, at any time during the term of this agreement, the Department, in its sole discretion, determines that the Consultant is not paying its deductible, it may require the Consultant to collateralize all or any part of the deductible or self-insured retention on any or all policies of insurance or, upon failure to promptly do so, the same may be withheld from payments due the Consultant.

Answer 38: NYSDOT accepted this change.

Question 39: Can Modify Subconsultants’ Insurance in Section 9 be changed to read: In the event that any portion of the work described in this contract is performed by an approved subcontractor, the insurance requirements of this Article shall be incorporated into the subconsultant agreement. Subcontractor insurance requirements shall include the requirements for Workers’ Compensation, Commercial General Liability, and, if applicable, Commercial Auto and/or Professional Liability. Excess or umbrella insurance is not required for subconsultants. Consultant shall require that Certificates of Insurance meeting the requirements of the Department be provided to the Department documenting the insurance coverage for each and every subconsultant employed by them to perform work under this contract. Provided, the Department may grant a waiver of the foregoing insurance required of approved subcontractors which waiver shall not be unreasonably withheld?

Answer 39: Modify Subconsultants’ Insurance in Section 9 remains unchanged. Some insurance requirements are statutory and workers’ compensation insurance cannot be waived. NYSDOT also requires the selected Consultant to carry a CGL which is viewed as an indication of vendor responsibility.

Question 40: Can the references in the contract terms that describe specific requirements be changed from specifying the information contained in the “RFP” to the negotiated Statement of Work which will be incorporated into the agreement as Exhibit A?

Answer 40: Article 1 ‘Documents Forming the Agreement’ remains unchanged. Exhibit A shall only contain those Scope of Service clarifications which
both parties agree to as the result of contract negotiations. See Article 3, ‘Scope of Services’ for the definition of Contract #C030786’s resulting Scope of Services.

**Question 41:** Can the following be substituted for the current System Acceptance language?

*System Acceptance.* In accordance with the Project Plan, the Consultant shall advise NYSDOT writing that the HOOCS Software (System) is ready to be tested in accordance with the procedures outlined in Task ___ of Schedule A (Scope of Services). Prior to conduct of any acceptance testing the Consultant shall, at no additional expense to NYSDOT, provide training to NYSDOT staff.

If and when the acceptance test results establish that the System is performing properly, NYSDOT shall notify Consultant in writing of its acceptance. Upon NYSDOT acceptance of the System, NYSDOT shall sign the Final Acceptance Certificate and the earlier of the date specified in the Final Acceptance Certificate or the date of execution of the Final Acceptance Certificate shall be the date on which the term of the Warranty Period shall begin (hereinafter, the Final Acceptance Date).

If the System repeatedly fails to perform properly in accordance with the Acceptance Test procedure outlined in Schedule A (Scope of Services), NYSDOT may determine that such failure constitutes a material default under this Agreement for the purposes of the default and termination provisions of this Agreement, or may afford the Consultant with additional opportunity to cure the default.

The Consultant’s correction of the product deficiency shall be at no additional cost to NYSDOT, unless the system acceptance failure(s) are the results of Disputed Work within the meaning of Article 4.6 of this Agreement (in which case the remedy within such section applies). The Consultant shall, however, bear sole responsibility for the costs of correction of product deficiencies revealed by such testing, including all previously unanticipated and unscheduled time and effort required for the development of corrective measures.

**Answer 41:** Article 14 System Acceptance remains unchanged.

**Question 42:** Can the applicable warranty period in Section 15 be changed to read: Consultant warrants that, for 18 months one year from the acceptance of the system per the successful completion of the system acceptance, all HOOCS Software and Systems, including all Service Components, Developed Software, and Consultant-Owned Software furnished hereunder, both as to each individual element and for the overall HOOCS System, shall be free from significant programming and operational errors which
shall prevent it from operating in conformity with the standards set forth in this Agreement?

**Answer 42:** Section 15 of the Draft Contract remains unchanged.

**Question 43:** Can the following sections be added to the Warranty section (Article 15 of the Draft Contract)?

If NYSDOT notifies Consultant that any Software, System or Service fails to conform to the requirements of this agreement during the Warranty period, Consultant shall remedy such failure at no additional cost to NYSDOT.

*NYSDOT agrees to provide Consultant with access (via remote desktop or virtual private network) to Department owned, leased or third-party servers sufficient to be able to carry out necessary Warranty repairs or modifications.*

*NYSDOT agrees that Consultant’s Warranty obligations do not apply if NYSDOT, or third parties representing or working on behalf of NYSDOT make any changes to the Software, System, or Service without approval in writing by Consultant.*

*NYSDOT agrees that Consultant’s Warranty does not apply to problems caused by failures, outages, or improper installation or maintenance of hardware or other (non-HOOCS) software; or by failures or bandwidth delays in network connectivity that are the responsibility of the Department, the Department’s hosting contractor, or any other third party.*

*NYS%DOT agrees that Consultant’s Warranty does not apply to problems caused by upgrades or other changes by the Department, the Department’s hosting contractor, or any other third party to the hardware, software, and configuration of the HOOCS hosting environment, unless the Consultant is notified a minimum of 30 days in advance of any such planned changes and given the opportunity to coordinate such upgrades.*

**Answer 43:** Article 15 Warranty Provisions remains unchanged.

**Question 44:** Can 16.2.2 be changed to read: In the event of the failure of a Project element or component, or in the performance of the HOOCS Software, Systems, or Services during the Warranty Period as stated in 15.1 above, NYSDOT may suspend Consultant's performance, in whole or in part, without terminating this Agreement, and contractually or otherwise remedy the failure at costs to be charged to Consultant or offset against Consultant's compensation under this Agreement. In the event of such suspension or other remedy, Consultant’s aggregate liability shall not exceed two hundred percent (200%) of the amount stated in 16.2.1 above.
In the event of such suspension or other remedy, NYSDOT may: (i) recover from Consultant reasonable costs, fees and expenses incurred by NYSDOT to remedy such failure, including for elements which are rendered substantially useless as a result of such failure up to the amount paid to Consultant for the specified, project deliverable that has so failed; and, (ii) if such failure is integral to the entire System, all money paid for the Software and Systems as well as associated services?

**Answer 44:** Article 16.2.2 (under Article 16 Suspension and Termination; Bankruptcy) remains unchanged.

**Question 45:** Can paragraph 36 be modified to read: Security and Confidentiality of Information. Information received as part of this contract shall be considered Confidential Information. The Consultant warrants that it will take the appropriate steps as to its personnel, agents, officers, and any Subcontractors/Subconsultants regarding the obligations arising under this clause to ensure such confidentiality. The Consultant shall have written policies and/or business procedures in place which will protect Confidential Information from unauthorized disclosure, use, access, loss, alteration, or destruction. The Consultant may disclose to other parties, as authorized by the NYSDOT Project Manager, or as described in the scope of services, only the information necessary to perform services under this contract. However, the Consultant, under no circumstance, shall communicate with the public or news media without prior authorization from the State's designee. Neither shall the Consultant disclose information deemed confidential by the State nor disclose any other information obtained or developed in the performance of services under this agreement without the written authorization of the State. This warranty shall survive termination of this Contract. Provided, the foregoing shall not preclude the Consultant from referencing the work performed under this Agreement for purposes of evidencing its qualifications?

**Answer 45:** Article 36 of the Draft Contract remains unchanged, as this concern is addressed via this sentence: “The Consultant may disclose to other parties, as authorized by the NYSDOT Project Manager, or as described in the scope of services, only the information necessary to perform services under this contract” within Article 36.

**Question 46:** Can the following sections be deleted: 4.4.1? 6.3, Item IV? Section 9.A. 3 “In addition, if required by the Department, the Consultant shall deliver to the Department, within Forty-Five (45) days of such request, a copy of any or all policies of insurance not previously provided, certified by the insurance carrier as true and complete.”? Sections 37, 48 and 49. Consultant’s obligations with respect to these areas are defined elsewhere in the agreement with greater specificity.? Appendix C, Section 11 in the Special Equal Employment Opportunity Provisions that requires Special Training.

ATTACHMENT 5:

Question 47: Are we correct in our understanding of the milestone payments that a full 50% of the implementation costs are held until final system acceptance?

Answer 47: This is a correct understanding.

ATTACHMENT 3:

Question 48: There is a requirement for detailed contact information on the resume format for all individuals’ prior jobs, presumably so that NYSDOT can contact these individuals as references. Since some of our colleagues have been with our company for a number of years, this information may be unobtainable, or irrelevant in terms of their current expertise and work. Plus, these past points of contact may no longer be with the previous firms. Would it be possible to eliminate this requirement and allow vendors to provide three professional work references of our own choosing for the key staff?

Answer 48: It is up to each proposing firm to provide NYSDOT with reachable, relevant references. NYSDOT’s inability to successfully verify attested experience via reference checks may lead to technical proposal score reductions.

Question 49: Form 1, the Project Structural Engineer resume format contains Section 3-Work Description pertaining to engineering duties. However, Form 2, Project Staff Resume ALSO contains this engineering duty requirement, which may not be relevant for all key staff members. Was there to be a different form for Form 2? If not, would you consider removing the word “engineering” regarding describing the work experience with the firms on Form 2?

Answer 49: NYSDOT agree to remove the word “engineer” from Section 3 Work description of Form 2 in Attachment 10.

ATTACHMENT 15:

Question 50: Can more information be provided on what is required with NYCDOT, NYSDMV, and what integration is possible with Authorize.Net?

Answer 50: At the present time NYSDOT sends information to NYC via a web service call. To date, there have not been further discussions with DMV regarding the escort file. NYSDOT believes there is no intent to
integrate with Authorize.net, just OSCAR/DMV. Vendors can assume that NYSDOT will continue to enter these transaction manually, assuming Authorize.net is still being used once released.

**Question 51:** Item 3.1 - Can technical details be provided on integration capabilities with OSCAR, all its capabilities, payment processing, etc.? Exactly what functionality must be used?

**Answer 51:** OSCAR provides two main services: 1) Provides a portal that customers use to access NYSDOT’s system; and 2) Process credit card transactions via DMV. Oscar is a one stop shopping portal operated by NYS Dept. of Tax & Finance for a customer to log on and request a permit and/or other truck credentials. OSCAR really just sends the customer to NYSDOT’s permitting system once the log in is successfully completed; OSCAR also receives the information from NYSDOT to pass onto the customer. The customer can also do business for other truck credentials such as IRP and IFTA from other NYS agencies, in this example DMV and Tax. The actual data elements would be essentially those that are reflected in the “approved” permit credential (business, permit number, restrictions, etc.).

**Question 52:** Item 4.1 - this seems to be a very complex flow for how the routing is done. Is there any ability for the applicants to have more control over the methods used? Or must the solution adhere to this specific flow?

**Answer 52:** Permit applicants can input a proposed route if they don’t want to use either the established route or the best ranked route. Based on the flow permit applicants would see the other routes but could decide to enter in their own route.

**ATTACHMENT 1:**

**Question 53:** Are any of the requirements in Attachment 1 mandatory? It appears that there is no technical functionality that is mandatory and that all of the requirements are Necessary or Contingency?

**Answer 53:** Yes. Only RFP Requirement 3.5.0-1-1064 on page 138 in Attachment 1 is mandatory.

**Question 54:** Can more details / examples be provided on the following RFP Requirements?

- 3.6.1.1.1.0-7? Answer: This is applicable to Divisible Load Permits. We can issue multiple DL permit types on a single application. For example a customer can request a Type 1 (which covers a single truck) and a Type 1A (which covers that truck and a trailer) on one application.

- 3.6.1.1.1.0-8? Answer: This is applicable to Special Hauling annual permits. Multiple truck/trailer configurations that allow different
weights can be listed on the same permit. An example can be provided.

o 3.6.1.1.1.0-21? Answer: The basic idea is that if we reject a permit application, and a customer modifies that for resubmittal, that would be noted along with the original App ID. This could be done so the new reviewer could see why the original application was rejected.

o 3.6.1.1.2.0-3? Answer: See answer for Question 16.

o 3.6.1.1.2.0-5? Answer: For example a reviewer could put an application on hold for another reviewer to pick up and continue. Another example would be to note that an application is being reviewed by our Structures Dept. The intent of the requirement is to have various queues to “park” the applications during the review process.

o 3.6.1.1.2.0-7? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.2.0-11? Answer: A permit application could be voided from the system, or if approved in error returned to a “pending” state.

o 3.6.1.1.3.1 (all the conversions)? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.2.0-3? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.2.0-4? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.2.0-5? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.3.0-2? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.3.0-5? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.4.0-1? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.5 (all the details of weight banking)? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.1.3.6 (all the details of upstate tokens)? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.2.0-6? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

o 3.6.1.3.0-3 (what’s done with this – what analysis / geometric comparisons)? Answer: The Department does not have any formulas to calculate this radius, or any comparisons at this time. The Department is open to suggestion from the Vendor on how these could be applied.

o 3.6.1.6.2.0-1 (how does this go along with other NY services we must use)? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.
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3.6.1.6.3.0-13? Answer: This would allow the Department to remove a payment if we decided to refund the funds or use them for another permit. This assumes that payments would be specific to a permit or permits.

3.6.1.6.7.0-1? Answer: The system would have to allow the Department’s Office of Finance to be able to reconcile revenues shown in the system to submitted checks, credit card receipts, reports from CC processors, etc.

3.6.1.7.0-20? Answer: For example a superload permit application could be reassigned from a regular reviewer to a reviewer assigned to review these types of applications.

3.6.1.8.1.0-8? Answer: This would be applicable to a Special Hauling Annual Crane Permit, which allows travel by counties. The Department assigns these counties based on the applicant’s request and business rules.

3.6.1.10.4.2.0-1? Answer: The system must allow a user to save a report in various formats, typically in a pdf or Excel file. Sharing files could include the capability of emailing a report without having to manually save it and open an email client.

3.6.1.10.4.2.0-2? Answer: An example of an alert or event could be a travel restriction that was placed on a route, or the closure of a section of the State due to a weather event.

3.6.2.3.0-7? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

3.6.2.3.0-8? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

3.6.3.2.0-4? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

3.6.3.9.0-1 ? Answer: No additional information is available. This RFP specification remains unchanged.

Answer 54: Embedded in Question 58.

END OF ORIGINAL RFP Q&A
B. RE-RELEASE RFP Q&A

**Question 55:** Do subconsultants need to complete any of the required forms other than resumes and references?

**Answer 55:** Subconsultants do not need to fill out any forms yet if included should be featured where applicable in RFP attachments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8.

**Question 56:** Should the items to be listed with regard to FOIL be included in the cover letter or in the executive summary?

**Answer 56:** Include FOIL items in the cover letter.

**Question 57:** Are the staff references to be included in each Attachment 3 meant to be references from employers or references from relevant project work?

**Answer 57:** Attachment 3 references should be relevant and aimed to cover attested experience, whether it be by person or by firm.

**Question 58:** In Attachment 4, the instructions state that we can include up to two past project references. Is that a maximum of two references total or a maximum of two for each firm on the team?

**Answer 58:** Two past projects is the minimum, and can cover both applications.

**Question 59:** Due to the thorough and complex nature of this RFP and the timing for the State's response to questions (including the explicit possibility for a second round of questions), would it be possible to extend the due date of at least 3 weeks to allow more time to produce a thorough response?

**Answer 59:** Additional time to submit proposals has been granted. Proposals are now due January 3, 2014.

**Question 60:** Will vendors be permitted to ask any subsequent questions that might be generated from answers posted by the state after the November 22nd questions deadline?

**Answer 60:** Yes. A second Q&A round for the HOOCS RFP re-release is possible (and allowed).

**Question 61:** Object Number: 3.6.2.3.0-8 ID: 1385 – The system shall enable authorized users to create an order. Please define “an order.” What attributes are associated with an order?

**Answer 61:** An Order is an official adjudication decision (decree) resulting from an administrative law hearing that directs parties to undertake certain steps (outcome or outcomes per a judges written order). An example is included in new Attachment __.

**Question 62:** Requirement 3.6.1.6.1.0-2 states that the customer must be able to replenish their account online. Requirement 3.6.1.6.1.0-4 states that the customer must be able to replenish their account using a credit card. What online
methods does the NYSDOT envision the customer using in 3.6.1.6.1.0-2 that would not be a credit card?

**Answer 62:** The only on-line funding method currently allowed by NYSDOT is via credit card. NYSDOT envisions allowing account holders to prefund their account via Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) at some point. This may not be part of the original system but functionality to allow these types of transfers is desired.

**Question 63:** Please provide additional information for the Warehouse modeling requirement in 3.6.3.1.0-13. Can additional information on NYSDOT Data Modeling requirements be provided?

**Answer 63:** NYSDOT currently uses Embarcardo ER Studio as a data modeling tool. NYSDOT, like other New York State agencies, is in an IT transition and the future use or ER Studio could come into question. Additional information regarding New York State’s warehouse modeling will be provided during contract negotiations with the selected Consultant.

**Question 64:** Please estimate the percentage of Turn/maneuver restriction information that is currently in the NYS street layer?

**Answer 64:** NYSDOT will provide a statewide layer of turn restriction information that dates from 2008 for the implementation of the routable street network. This layer is licensed to NYS from a commercial source but has not been maintained by NYSDOT since 2008. The turn restriction layer provides a large percentage of turn restrictions on the NYS Streets layer that NYSDOT would be responsible to verify. The proposer is encouraged to provide guidance and best practices around maintaining turn restriction information on the NYS Street layer. The following shows the schema of the turn restriction layer:

1.1.1 **Maneuver (Maneuver – Transportation):**

**Layer Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS_FID</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spatial information storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN_ID</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unique Permanent Maneuver ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQUENCE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sequence # of maneuver record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN_TYPE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maneuver Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM_ID</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>From Dynamap_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROMID_END</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“T” or “F” indicating end of From_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGLE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Turn angle from From_ID to To_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Restricted = “-1”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOO</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hours of Operation (GDF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NYSDOT is not currently using this turn restriction information with the NYS Streets layer and it was not included in the sample GIS dataset (which is only available upon request).

**Question 65:** Does the NYS street layer contain any signage (For example, Take Exit 1N I-87North Saratoga, Montreal)?

**Answer 65:** There is currently no signage information in the NYS Streets layer. NYSDOT does have access to Fugro Roadware based photolog on the state highway system.

**Question 66:** Will HOOCS have an ADA exception for the dynamically generated maps?

**Answer 66:** ADA compliance and exemptions for the HOOCS solution will be determined by New York State Information Technology Policy NYS-P08-005, which is available via: [http://www.its.ny.gov/policy/NYS-P08-005.pdf](http://www.its.ny.gov/policy/NYS-P08-005.pdf).

**Question 67:** Please describe how the NYSDOT envisions HOOCS integrating with an EFT system as described in requirements in 3.6.1.6.1.0-6, 3.6.1.6.9.0-1 and 2?
Answer 67:  See Answer for Question #62.

Question 68: Will the NYSDOT consider providing all NY State GIS data for the technical presentation rather than a sample?
Answer 68:  For proposal evaluation and development purposes, NYSDOT believes that the sample is adequate.

Question 69: Requirement 4.5.3.1.0-11 states that the Technical Proposal shall describe the methods and tools proposed for providing an Application Program Interface (API). The preferred method is for all data, and corresponding business rules to be exposed by an associated API (Web Service or Java) that can be used to extract or populate data to and from the new System. Please describe what types of data NYSDOT would like to extract or populate to the system. Company information, user information, permit data, business rules, other?
Answer 69:  Please refer to Attachment 15, HOOCS Overview and the following web page https://www.dot.ny.gov/nypermits for more information regarding the types of data NYSDOT would like to extract from or populate into the HOOCS system.

Question 70: 3.6.3.10.0-1 states that the system shall utilize the existing NYSDOT Esri ArcGIS 10 environment for mapping, routing, and other GIS functionality. Will it be acceptable for the vendor's system to utilize data provided by ArcGIS 10 but to perform its own routing, location lookup, and map creation and the system not utilize the Esri products for routing, location lookup, and map creation?
Answer 70:  The goal of this requirement is to ensure that all NYSDOT business systems are fully integrated and compatible with NYSDOT’s GIS environment. NYSDOT is willing to review proposals that include non-Esri GIS components but these GIS components must have the capability to seamlessly communicate in both directions with NYSDOT’s Esri-based GIS environment including the Esri Roads and Highways based Enterprise Linear Referencing System. Routing and restriction management functionality in HOOCS must not only be capable of consuming GIS data from the NYSDOT Esri environment but also providing information back to the NYSDOT Esri environment. For example, highway restrictions managed by HOOCS will need to be located on the NYSDOT Enterprise Linear Referencing System and available to other NYSDOT systems.

Question 71: 3.6.3.2.0-1 states that the system shall enable building Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) interfaces to external systems, and data exchanges, with outside entities, using industry standards. Can you please provide an idea, using examples, of the level of granularity you expect the system functions to be built?
Answer 71: The ‘System Interfaces’ section of Attachment 1 (page 88) presents good examples of SOA. Please refer to Attachment 16, Oscar Overview, for more information regarding interfaces.

Question 72: A) Is it the intent of the state to replace the current structure analysis program? B) If so, is there a preferred system for replacement [concerning structure analysis]? C) If not, what is the database/program currently being used by the structures group for Structure impact analysis?


Question 73: A) Is there an API available for the Structures program? If so, please provide the write-up describing the API components. B) Please describe the intended interface in the following requirement: “The system shall accept bridge information from the NYSDOT Bridge Data Information System (BDIS). 3.6.3.2.0-5 34”? What database technology is used to store the bridge data, and will the state provide an API interface?

Answer 73: A) NYSDOT’s Structures program does not have an API. BDIS interfaces with other systems via views or materialized views that reside in their own schema. System jobs then pull the data into BDIS or the other systems. BDIS is a Java application with an Oracle backend. B) BDIS will provide a Database View that will contain the needed information (and data required for bridge analysis, such as number of spans, number of girders, girder spacing etc.). The Proposer’s software shall interface with that View. BDIS utilizes an Oracle Database.

Question 74: Regarding the following requirement, will the state accept a routing solution that utilizes the ESRI map data, but independent of the ESRI software: “The system shall utilize the existing NYSDOT Esri ArcGIS 10 environment for mapping, routing, and other GIS functionality.(3.6.3.10.0-1 504 Necessary)”?

Answer 74: See the answer for Question #70.

Question 75: Several sections of the RFP ask the Consultant to provide technical, project or pricing assumptions (e.g., 4.5.2.0-4, 4.7, 4.9). However, on page 43, the RFP states: “The Consultant’s proposal and/or proposed cost must not be contingent on …any project assumptions.” Please advice as to what project assumptions are prohibited?

Answer 75: Technical, project and cost derivation assumptions help NYSDOT to more completely understand a proposal. However, making a proposal contingent on an assumption unreasonably falling this way or that unnecessarily increases risk for both parties thus is not fair to all parties. NYSDOT would reject a proposal with conditions which are
not in the State’s best interest. NYSDOT prefers to use the pre-proposal Q&A rounds to make it clear to all parties what’s at stake.

**Question 76:** The table in the cost proposal only asks for hourly rates for the Key Positions defined in the RFP. There are other roles involved in the implementation of a project of this scope, such as Developers, Test and QA Staff, Support Agents. Should the vendor add additional labor categories and rates to the table to provide a complete picture of the personnel that will support the project? If not, does the State envision the contractor using one of the requested categories for all activities in support of the contract, even if that work can be fulfilled by a lower skilled and so less expensive resource?

**Answer 76:** Yes, if a vendor proposes additional roles or labor categories then rates for each one added must be included.

**Question 77:** The SOW states that the vendor is to provide hardware specifications, but not pricing. The cost proposal has a place for hardware pricing. Is the requirement to provide hardware pricing, or should the locations in the cost volume for hardware pricing be left blank?

**Answer 77:** Please leave Attachment 5’s hardware pricing fields blank, for NYSDOT use.

**Question 78:** The system the Vendor will propose will require relational database services. Should the Vendor propose licenses for the Database Engine, or can the Vendor assume that the State will provision the required database services?

**Answer 78:** The vendor should propose licenses for the database engine. In the event NYSDOT has a matching, appropriate license, adjustments to the pricing can be negotiated during contract negotiations.

**Question 79:** The Client environment specified is based on Windows XP, which will be end of maintenance by mid 2014. Should the vendor continue to target system compatibility to Windows XP/IE8, or can the vendor assume that by the time the system goes into production the client systems will have migrated to Windows 7/IE9?

**Answer 79:** Respondents should assume NYSDOT will migrate to Windows 7 as well as IE 9 or IE 10 by the time HOOCS is operational.

**Question 80:** The IT Specifications section states that the vendor will develop in the State’s development environment. The Vendor’s standard practice is to develop in an internal development environment and migrate to the State environment after the completion of Unit Test. May the vendor follow our standard approach for development/integration and unit test, or must these be performed in the State’s environment even if this increases costs?
Answer 80: NYSDOT’s practice is to have vendor’s development in the Development tier and then promote the application through Testing, Quality Assurance and eventually, move the application into the Production (live) environment.

Question 81: A) The RFP requires that the consultant adhere to the NYS Project Management Guidebook. The processes outlined there are most appropriate for the design and development of new systems, rather than customization and deployment of existing, off-the-shelf systems. The RFP also indicates that consultants can "organize and plan for the accomplishment of the work based on their experience and expertise." Our firm uses a streamlined, less document-intensive, iterative development approach that has been proven to be effective in the development, delivery, and support of large-scale systems (both OS/OW, and other mission-critical applications) in New York State and around the USA. Will NYSDOT consider a proposal based on a different project management approach, as long as it ensures a high level of transparency, visibility and financial control? B) Along the same lines, the RFP defines certain supplemental processes in addition to those outlined in the PMG (e.g., Section 6.5, Deliverable Submittal, Review and Acceptance Process). Will NYSDOT consider alternatives to these processes that we believe, based on our experience and expertise, will be more effective and result in a better end product, once again while ensuring a high level of transparency, visibility, and financial control?

Answer 81: A&B) Yes, provided that any alternative project management approach is sound and as robust as the methods used by the State.

Question 82: The RFP specifies that the proposed solution must work with Microsoft Internet Explorer Version 8, which has - since it's original release in 2009 - been upgraded through Versions 9, 10, and 11. It is likely that by the time the OS/OW software is deployed, IE Version 12 will be released and in common use. Accordingly, would NYSDOT consider revisiting the software versions identified in the RFP at the time a contract is negotiated for this work?

Answer 82: Please refer to the Answer given to Question 80.

Requested Changes to the Draft Contract:
Question 83: Is it possible to delete Article 9.A.9?
Answer 83: The requested change is possible.

Question 84: Since the contract requires the consultant to maintain weekly backups of the source code that must be provided to NYSDOT on request, will NYSDOT remove the requirement to escrow the source code? If NYSDOT will not remove the requirement to escrow the source code, will NYSDOT reimburse the cost of the escrow? (Articles 11.7 and 12)?
Answer 84: NYSDOT will not remove its source code back up requirement, which is an eligible, directed project expense, and should be included in your cost proposal.

Question 85: May the consultant or sub-consultant provide its standard maintenance terms and conditions to supplement the maintenance requirements included in the Draft Contract in Attachment 12?

Answer 85: NYSDOT shall not consider any consultant or subconsultant standard maintenance terms and conditions unless doing such is in the State’s best interest. It also makes fair and equitable comparisons across competing consultants’ proposal difficult and problematic.

Question 86: Revise Article 16.8 such that the Consultant does not have the obligation to warranty the software in the event of early termination by NYSDOT or suspension by NYSDOT.

Answer 86: Acceptance of previously delivered product by NYSDOT should remain under warranty in the event of early termination (for the remainder of the Project). Project suspension (depending upon the reason) may lead to suspension of the consultant’s warranty period (with a possible extension and continuance of the warranty period to complete should the project go back on line).

END OF RE-RELEASE RFP 1ST Q&A ROUND

C. RE-RELEASE RFP Q&A: SECOND ROUND Q&A

Question 87: The answer to Question #70 states that HOOCS must integrate with the Esri’s Roads and Highways (R&H) system. The RFP also lists the following systems for integrations with HOOCS: RIS, 511NY, MAMIS, CARS, and WTA. Is there an ETA on when the R&H system will go into production? Will a potential integration with R&H replace integrations with the other systems listed here?

Answer 87: NYSDOT expects the new Roads and Highways implementation to support integrations between NYSDOT’s business systems, including HOOCS. As NYSDOT systems such as 511NY and MAMIS are integrated with Roads and Highways, there will be capabilities to share information between these systems using web services based on the single representation of the roadway network. NYSDOT will pursue Roads and Highways integrations in place of other custom built alternatives.

Question 88: The answer to Question #72 states that NYSDOT has an intention to replace the current structural analysis program with the AASHTO BR
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(formerly Virtis) engine. The RFP also has extensive requirements for a BigTruk II replacement program. Is HOOCS expected to have a BigTruk II module along with in integration with AASHTO BR? Does NYSDOT anticipate using AASHTO BR exclusively?

Answer 88: The intention is to replace BIGTRUCK II, with more refined and robust analysis tool. There are no requirements for BIGTRUCK II. A detailed description of BIGTRUCK II is provided to inform proposers the current functionality of BIGTRUCK II.

Question 89: At the beginning of the RFP it says to send the proposal to Al Hasenkopf but on page 54 it says to William A Howe, Director NYSDOT Contract Management Bureau. Should proposals be sent to his attention or to Al Hasenkopf’s attention?

Answer 89: Please address HOOCS RFP proposals to Al Hasenkopf’s attention. You can reference Mr. Howe’s name, yet proposals need to go to Mr. Hasenkopf’s attention.

Question 90: First, on page 45 of the RFP it has a registrations section that states that: “Each proposer must reference its NYS Statewide Financial System (SFS) Vendor Identification Number and NYSDOT-issued Consultant Identification Number (CIN) in its Cost Proposal (Attachment 7). A vendor cannot do business in New York State unless it has registered in NYS’s Statewide Financial System. Please contact NYSDOT if your firm does not yet have its New York State SFS vendor ID number.” If a proposer is selected for contract award and does not have a NYSDOT Consultant Identification Number (CIN), will it be required to obtain one through the following NYSDOT website prior to negotiation of the contract? From what I can tell this is something that is initiated by a NY agency on the vendors behalf and not by the vendor. Is this the case or can you direct me in what I need to do to establish an SFS # and CIN #?

Answer 90: If the selected Consultant does not have a CIN at the time of designation, NYSDOT will work with the selected Consultant to register with NYSDOT and obtain a CIN. The same hold true for a selected Consultant without a SFS vendor ID number. A proposal is acceptable with or without a CIN and SFS VIN.

Question 91: Second, from what I can tell from my emails and looking at the procurement site there were no questions and answers for round 2. Is this correct?

Answer 91: Answers to the second round of questions has been released via RFP Modification #1. The HOOCS RFP question-and-answer period is now closed and NYSDOT is not obligated to respond to any questions posed after Mod#1’s release.

END OF RE-RELEASE RFP 2nd Q&A ROUND