PRE-PROPOSAL WEBINAR QUESTIONS:

**Question #1:** Can I get a copy of the Sept 18th pre-proposal webinar?

**Answer:** Yes. C037688 Announcement #1 will release information to access the recording of the 9/18/2018 pre-proposal webinar recording.

**Question #2:** Has NYSDOT set a total budget for this project?

**Answer:** Yes, but for these types of consultant procurement opportunities, is it NYSDOT’s policy not to release budget information. It is NYSDOT’s practice to allow the marketplace to speak freely regarding how to set costs for proposals in response to the C037688 RFP.

**Question #3:** Can my response be vendor-hosted/SaaS only?

**Answer:** Yes, the RFP allows vendors to only submit an Option B-type offer, which is for vendor-hosted/SaaS-type solutions.

**Question #4:** Can two partnering vendors each submit a proposal where each firm is prime on one proposal and a sub on a second proposal (switch roles)?

**Answer:** Yes. However, each proposal would have to be complete (per RFP Section 4 Tables 1 and 2), stand completely by itself and represent an independent proposal. NYSDOT does not interpret this as collusion but as a creative manner to present proposals which may offer the state the best value.

**Question #5:** What happens if I ask a question after the close of the RFP’s Q&A time period?

**Answer:** NYSDOT will acknowledge and consider any questions received after the RFP’s question submittal deadline but is under no obligation to respond, and will only do so if it is determined to be in the best interest of the State. Any response given will be issued publicly, and additional time to submit proposals may be granted. Questions received just before the deadline for proposal submission will only be considered if they expose a fatal flaw which would lead to cancellation of the RFP.

**Question #6:** Can you tell us which vendor is providing the current system?

**Answer:** NYSDOT has in the past worked with a vendor, but is not currently doing so. Please see the Background Section of the RFP main body for more details.
ROUND ONE QUESTIONS (After 9/18/2018 Webinar):

**Question #7:** Can we have another month to submit the proposal?
**Answer:** NYSDOT has revised the RFP’s schedule to allow interested parties three more weeks to prepare and submit proposals, which are now due November 1, 2018 at 2:00 PM. Please see RFP Modification #1.

**Question #8:** We would like to know if the NYSDOT would sign a software sharing agreement with other state DOTs?
**Answer:** Please note that if such an agreement were allowed, per the C037688 RFP all NYSDOT functional requirements still need to be met.

**Question #9:** Page 19 of the RFP specifies the Technical and Management Proposal to be submitted in native MS2 Office 2016 compatible format. Can we just submit all digital content in PDF format?
**Answer:** Yes, as long as a submittal includes both formats (native and PDF).

**Question #10:** For ES3, what type of supporting documentation of company stability is the DOT looking for? Would financial information be acceptable?
**Answer:** Appropriate financial information is acceptable, as is other information (line number of years in service) which helps NYSDOT to determine company stability.

**Question #11:** The AOR form is Attachment 5, not Attachment 4, as written on page 2 of Attachment 12?
**Answer:** NYSDOT will release an amended RFP Attachment 12 such that Requirement MR1 references Attachment 5 and that Requirement MR2 references Attachment 6.

**Question #12:** For Attachment 7, do we need to get a CIN and SFS number prior to winning the Project? If yes, how do we obtain these numbers?
**Answer:** For firms who are interested in other NYSDOT contracting opportunities, registering with New York State is recommended. However, for RFP proposal submission purposes, these fields on Attachment 7 can be left blank if your firm has yet to obtain these numbers. The firm selected for tentative contract award must obtain these numbers and will be given the necessary instructions regarding how to obtain them.

**Question #13:** Please clarify Attachment 13. What is the meaning of “Use Case” in the first column?
**Answer:** References to specific requirements are currently in Attachment 24 ‘Use Cases’. NYSDOT will release an amended Attachment 13 to appropriately reference Use Case Number contained in Attachment 24.

**Question #14:** Also for Attachment 13. At the top of the excel sheet, statement at the end of instructions says, “For each of the following business challenges, provide detailed responses as to how the Proposer’s system meets the requirement.” Where are the actual Business Challenges listed? Is each item identified with Functional ID considered a business challenge? Is the expectation that a detailed response should be given for each item?
Answer: Each category of Attachment 13’s functional requirement (the light blue shaded rows) is considered to be a business challenge, divided up into subcomponents or broken down into individual requirements. A response to each row of Attachment 13 is expected -a simple narrative addressing each business challenge for the non-numbers requirements will suffice; a more detailed response is expected for each of Attachment 13’s numbered functional requirements.

**Question #15:** What is the state asking for or what is the state’s purpose in asking this question in the Key Personnel Reference section of Attachment 15: Degree to which offered key personnel were primarily responsible for project delivery?

**Answer:** NYSDOT is seeking to learn the degree to which a Key Person was primarily responsible for delivery of services for other clients for like services. Primary responsibility can be for a role like ‘team leader’ or ‘primary author’ or ‘lead trainer’, etc.

**Question #16:** Should RFP Attachments 9 and 10 be completed and submitted at this initial expression of interest stage of the RFP process?

**Answer:** No. RFP Attachments 9 and 10 are due with your proposal submission.

**Question #17:** I am looking for September 18th pre-proposal webinar recording, but don't see it with the other files on the Consulting Services Opportunities site. Can you assist?

**Answer:** Yes. The 9/18/2018 Pre-Proposal Webinar recording was released via Announcement #1, which was released on September 18th.

**ROUND TWO QUESTIONS:**

**Question #18:** How many WIM stations do you have for handling in the desired software solution? Are your WIM stations all Per Vehicle Records (PVR), or PVR for truck classes only?

**Answer:** NYSDOT currently collects WIM data at approximately 30 locations. Currently about 20 of these locations collect PVR for Class F4-F13 only while the remaining collect PVR for all vehicle types. It is anticipated that during the contract period all NYSDOT WIM sites will collect PVR for all vehicle types.

**Question #19:** Polling (or auto-polling) is not mentioned in the scope of this RFP. Are NYSDOT interested in auto-polling, particularly if it is completely interfaced to the proposed solution and offers significant efficiency gains for processing raw data from the field into a traffic database?

**Answer:** It is explicitly stated in the RFP document that “Communications and maintenance of continuous count hardware” is out of scope for C037688. In this context NYSDOT considers polling to be part of communications and therefore is out of scope for the C037688 contract.

**Question #20:** Technology is changing in traffic counters and NYSDOT may decide or need to upgrade roadside technology within the 8 to 10 year period of this contract. Are NYSDOT looking for a solution scalable and capable for all per vehicle records (F1 through F15) within the contract period?
Answer: At this time NYSDOT has no plans to collect PVR data in greater quantities. However, a contingency requirement could be considered for this item.

**Question #21:** If NYSDOT has ambition to move to PVR data within the contract period and to submit PVR data to FHWA, how would this be priced in the future as the amount of data increases massively?

**Answer:** At this time NYSDOT has no plans to collect PVR data in greater quantities. If in the future FHWA requires PVRs to be collected, NYSDOT will expect the solution to accommodate based on RFP Functional Requirement #GR53: “The solution shall accommodate updates to FWHA requirements, business requests and production support.” However, a contingency requirement could be considered for this item.

**Question #22:** If traffic counters were live (data every 1 to 5 minutes), would Traffic Operations be interested in a live ATMS data feed? Is this a module you may wish to request as an optional cost item?

**Answer:** It is explicitly stated in the RFP document that “Real-time traffic data collection such as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)” are out of scope for C037688.

**Question #23:** In the Mandatory Requirements Attachment 12, please clarify the intention of ‘location in proposal’ vs. the areas to complete the proposer’s response. Does the DOT expect a duplication of responses in the proposal and in the respective fields? If details are provided in Attachment 12, is it necessary to restate the same detail information in the proposal and reference it in this attachment?

**Answer:** The ‘Location in Proposal’ instruction provides flexibility regarding how one responds to each mandatory requirement. Such a response can be wholly contained with an Attachment 12 submission or completely addressed via additional information presented inside a proposal, or a combination of both, is allowed.

**Question #24:** The RFP mentions that the new system is to replace TrafMan. Does that mean any current work under way to update the legacy technology is to be replaced by the TDS, or is an approach that combines software packages of the respective count station vendors with additional new TDS components to satisfy the requirements acceptable?

**Answer:** NYSDOT is currently under way on a separate project to replace the TrafMan functionality. The selected Traffic Data System (TDS) will replace TrafMan only as the final storage and retrieval location of WIM data; TDS is not anticipated to replace any result from the TrafMan replacement project. When completed, the TrafMan replacement will produce output files to be loaded to the new TDS in the same format as TrafMan had previously.

**Question #25:** A. In Attachment 13, Functional Requirements, can you please clarify that the referenced Attachment 5 – Sample of Calculations, refers to the Attachment 16B Required Calculations, and that there is no other attachment providing sample of calculations?

B. Regarding Attachment 13, Functional ID: CALC 1. The description references Attachment 5– Sample of Calculations. Attachment 5 of the RFP does not provide sample calculations. Can you please clarify where the sample calculations were provided that this description is referencing?
**Answer:** Attachment 13 has been revised to refer to Attachment 16B. Reference to Attachment 5 is erroneous. Attachment 16B contains the information one needs to respond to the RFP’s calculation requirements.

**Question #26:** In Attachment 13, can you please explain your understanding of COTS vs. configured in the solution column. In our view, a COTS product may well be configured to the DOT’s specific needs, without any custom development?

**Answer:** NYSDOT understands the difference between pure COTS, COTS with configuration and COTS with customization. Most all COTS applications require some minimal of configuration (look and feel) after installation within NYSDOT’s environment. NYSDOT needs to understand the level of configuration and/or customization required for a COTS solution to provide all of the RFP’s required functionality and meet the RFP’s business requirements.

**Question #27:** For Attachment 13, do you expect the detailed responses on how the system meets individual requirements listed in the ‘Proposer’s Comments’ column, or in a separate proposal with references in the comments column?

**Answer:** Each proposer needs to decide where best to provide a detailed response. It is allowed to either present such in your Attachment 13 response, refer to elsewhere in your proposal or a combination of both. See also response to Question #23.

**Question #28:** In Attachment 13, can you please specify the ‘Field System Server’ in Technical Requirements GR20 and GR21 – what does this refer to?

**Answer:** NYSDOT envisions a Field System Server to pass data through the Field Log Application and maintain configurations and location information as well as LOVs of acceptable inputs, etc. Depending on the proposed solution, this may or may not be separate from the main web server or database supporting NYSDOT and public interfaces.

**Question #29:** If there are any individual details in the functional Requirements per Attachment 13, is it acceptable to submit two proposals, one with the individual details being added per custom development, and one without those details being implemented, allowing to offer a 100% COTS solution? If yes, will they both be independently evaluated using the defined formulas?

**Answer:** Yes, it is allowable for an entity to submit two proposals provided that all RFP submittal requirements are met by each proposal (to be deemed responsive). Each proposal shall be independently evaluated against all RFP requirements based on its own merits.

**Question #30:** Can you provide the NYSDOT ATR and WIM preferred rule set per QC5, Attachment 13?

**Answer:** NYSDOT preferred ATR and WIM rule set are as follows:

1. Data Completeness Checks:
   a. Are all days loaded?
   b. Are all Days Complete?
   c. Are all lanes present?
2. Volume Checks
   a. Consecutive zeroes – Check for X intervals of consecutive zeroes.
b. Midnight/Noon comparison – ensure that midnight values are lower than noon values.

c. Directional split – Daily – check total day directional split against a user determined threshold.

d. Directional split – Hourly – check hourly directional split against a user determined threshold.

e. Unchanging intervals – check for X consecutive intervals with the same values.

f. Peak hour zeroes – check for any zero values in a user defined peak hour period.

3. Classification Rules
   a. Class 1s < 1% (Or a user defined percentage)
   b. Class 2s < 95% (Or a user defined percentage)
   c. Unclassified < 10% (Or a user defined percentage)
   d. Class 4-13 < 25% (Or a user defined percentage)
   e. Class 3-13 > 2% (Or a user defined percentage)
   f. Class 8 vs Class 9
   g. Class 9 vs Class 11-13

4. WIM Rules
   a. Class 9 FAW out of range check - Checks the Percentage of Class 9 vehicles with Front Axle Weight (FAW) outside a user defined range.
   b. Class 9 2-3 Spacing check – Checks the percentage of Class 9 vehicles with Axle 2-3 spacing out of a user defined range

More details can be found on page F-10 of the 2016 FHWA Traffic Monitoring Guide.

**Question #31**: Functional ID: QC6. The description references NYSDOT ATR and WIM preferred rule set. Can you please provide the rule set that this is referencing?

**Answer**: See Answer to question #30.

**Question #32**: While we understand that the DOT’s intention is to maximize the use of COTS, in Attachment 15 ‘Key Personnel Experience’, Requirement KPE1, starts with recommended key personnel qualifications for a Senior Consultant who among other qualifications has experience in facilitating the re-engineering of business processes, as well as planning and design sessions etc. Is it fair to assume that this is based on a standard experience template for ITS contracts, and does not indicate the Department’s need or interest in reengineering business processes as part of this procurement, which might result in software solutions not immediately satisfied through COTS software?

**Answer**: Requirement #KPE1 suggests recommended skill sets and areas of expertise which are illustrative of what NYSDOT is seeking. These are not hard requirements nor do they indicate exactly what NYSDOT is seeking. NYSDOT is seeking to optimize quality at a fair and reasonable cost.

**NOTE**: Questions #33 to #37 pertain to Attachment 16D, regarding the Volume data set provided:

**Question #33**: The first line of data has decimal values for vehicle volumes. Our assessment is that there would be no impact on the final calculation (as this is a Saturday that would be
ignored according to methodology outlined in Attachment 16B). However, can you please confirm if this is intentional, and if decimal values should be expected in typical data that would pass QC?

**Answer:** This was not intentional and NYSDOT does not expect typical data to have decimal values. Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1.

**Question #34:** Attachment 16B states that axle factor is only applied if count type = ‘Axle Pairs’; if count type = ‘Vehicle’, no factor is applied. According to R05C26aDOT0006fieldLogs.pdf, this is a ‘Tube Volume’ count (that is, neither of the options stated in Attachment 16b). Can you please clarify what type of count this is to determine if an axle factor should be applied?

**Answer:** As per the latest version of the New York State Traffic Monitoring Standards for Short Count Data Collection, the Vehicle/Axle Code will be ‘1’ if the traffic count is a Vehicle count and the Vehicle/Axle Code will be ‘2’ if it is an Axle/2 count. The “Vehicle_Axle_Code” field in the volume data set contains the same values as the Vehicle/Axle Code. Please use this field to determine if an axle factor is applied. Please note this field has been updated in the revised data set released via revised RFP Attachment 16D via RFP Modification #1.

**Question #35:** Directions that are in file (N, S) do not match the logsheet and aerial map (E, W). Can you please confirm that North/South should be used as the primary and secondary direction, as indicated in the file?

**Answer:** Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1 to clarify the directions.

**Question #36:** Recorder placement that is in file (210.62 Ft North of E 181 St) does not match the logsheet and aerial map (there is no E 181 St). As this is metadata, there should be no impact on our calculation – however, can you please confirm that this mismatch is not indicative of a larger data issue?

**Answer:** Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1 to clarify the placement.

**Question #37:** The day of week listed in the file is incorrect and does not match the calendar (example: 6/12/2017 is listed as a Saturday in the file, but was really a Monday). Should our test calculations use Day_Of_Week and shift dates to match, or use the Date and shift the Day of Week to match?

**Answer:** The selection of these calendar dates was an error; the calendar dates have been changed to match the day of the week (the date has been changed to 8/12/2017). Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1.

NOTE: Questions #38 to #40 pertain to Attachment 16D, regarding the Class data set provided:

**Question #38:** Only 1 lane (lane 3) is in file, though notes indicate all 3 lanes were counted. Are lanes 1 and 2 missing in each direction? Is this dataset complete?
**Answer:** The sample data set is missing lanes 1 and 2, this will not be revised. Please use the Lane 3 data as the only lane in the direction for the purposes of the sample response.

**Question #39:** Recorder placement that is in file (.12m W of Ridge RD Ramp) doesn’t match the aerial map (Ridge RD not listed on map). As this is metadata, there should be no impact on our calculation – however, can you please confirm that this mismatch is not indicative of a larger data issue?

**Answer:** Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1 to clarify the placement.

**Question #40:** The day of week listed in the file is incorrect and does not match the calendar (example: 6/19/2017 is listed as a Tuesday in the file, but was really a Monday). Should our test calculations use Day_Of_Week and shift dates to match, or use the Date and shift the Day of Week to match?

**Answer:** The selection of the calendar dates was an error. The calendar dates have been revised. Attachment 16D ‘Revised Data Sample Docs’ has been issued via RFP Modification #1.

**END OF ROUND TWO QUESTIONS**