NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
('CADD II’ RFP)
CADD AND CIVIL ENGINEERING SOFTWARE AND SERVICES FOR NYSDOT
Contract #C037693

Round One Questions and Answers
(Through June 10, 2020)

GENERAL:

Question #1: Who has this contract now and before?
Answer: Bentley Systems, Inc., is the main software provider. Please see RFP Table 1 which identifies engineering software currently in use at NYSDOT.

Question #2: Can you please invite me to the pre-proposal webinar? Can you please register additional attendees for the June 3rd pre-proposal webinar?
Answer: Yes. NYSDOT will register any person or a party who expresses interest in the C037693 CADD II RFP.

Question #3: Would it be possible to get a recording of the June 3, 2020 Webinar that was presented earlier today?
Answer: Yes, NYSDOT will post its recording of the June 3, 2020 Pre-Proposal Webinar as well as the recording of its June 5, 2020 Supplemental Pre-Proposal Webinar (Attachment 13) to the NYSDOT’s C037693 ‘Opportunities’ website location (please visit: https://www.dot.ny.gov/doing-business/opportunities/consult-opportunities).

Question #4: Will the list of changes from the 2018 CADD I RFP C031379 and the recently-advertised ‘CADD II’ RFP C037693 be released?
Answer: For informational purposes, and not for reliance in responding to and of the Department’s RFPs, NYSDOT will post the list of changes from its 2018 CADD I RFP C031379 and the recently-advertised ‘CADD II’ RFP C037693 to the C037693 ‘Opportunities’ website location (please see answer to Question #3).

Question #5: When will the answers to questions be released?
Answer: Answers to Round One Q&A will be released on or after June 17th; answers Round Two Q&A we be released on or after July 1st.

Question #6: Can NYSDOT please provide a list of design awards made over the past three years which were designed by NYSDOT’s consultants, along with associated dollars?
Answer: NYSDOT acknowledges this question yet is unable to provide an answer at this time. NYSDOT may respond to this question with answers to second round questions (due July 1st). The main body of the RFP provides summary statistics of design contracts and values.

Question #7: Regarding structural analysis and design: What is the scope of the required general structural analysis capabilities for structures other than bridges?
Answer: The RFP does not specifically require capabilities for generic structural analysis capabilities for structures other than bridges.

RFP MAIN BODY:

Question #8: Section 1.2, regarding the statement: ‘In addition to direct support of these projects NYSDOT also utilizes CADD for other purposes (e.g., standard drawings, real property/right-of-way mapping, etc.)’ There is almost no mention of GIS in this RFP. If the client desires to use GIS functionality to address other requirements, would that be part of a future Work Order, or would you consider that a core service to be provided under the guise of managing risk?

Answer: Please refer to Attachment 10 for GIS functionality required within this RFP.

Question #9: Section 1.2, regarding the statements: ‘Approximately 2,000 Users statewide utilize CADD / Design software - about half of the users are in Construction’ and ‘Approximately 3,500 Users (3,000 NYSDOT users and 500 external users) utilize the engineering document management system’, of the identified NYSDOT Customer Base how many of the identified users would be considered concurrent?

Answer: Please refer to Attachment 13 for the daily concurrent use required for each functional requirement.

Question #10: Section 1.3, regarding Table 1: Synchro and PTV Vissim for Traffic simulation and analysis are listed as part of the current Civil Engineering Software used by NYSDOT. A: Why are Traffic Engineering and Planning left out from the Evaluation Factors Table as Functional Requirements (Attachments 9A,10) when all other Civil Engineering functions and departments are considered for evaluation? B: How are Traffic Counts, AADT, k values and multiple other traffic assets stored in NYSDOT’s Arc GIS portal Web Services hosted by the DOT leveraged in Traffic Engineering/Planning?

Answer: A: The Traffic Engineering and Planning units of NYSDOT utilize their own tools which are not required as part of this RFP (the software listed in Table 1 is for information purposes only). NYSDOT’s Traffic Engineering and Planning units are not direct users of NYSDOT’s CADD and civil engineering tools. B: Traffic Counts, AADT, k values and multiple other traffic engineering assets are out of the scope of the C037693 RFP and are not response requirements to this RFP.

Question #11: Section 2: Drafting general question: Of current 2,500 CADD users, approximately how many users are from bridge/structural disciplines and how many from roadway/survey disciplines?

Answer: Please refer to the Exhibit 2 Software Cost tab in Attachment 13 for the daily concurrent use required for each functional requirement.

Question #12: Section 2: There are references to Bentley Systems Project Wise. Would the document management platform be solicited with the RFP be a replacement or supplement to Project Wise for NYSDOT?

Answer: The document management platform in this RFP is solicited as a replacement to ProjectWise.
Question #13: Section 3.9 ‘Reporting Requirements’ regarding the statement: ‘An interface for NYSDOT to directly and easily access tracking and report information is required’, what do you envision this interface to be like? Do you currently use a solution for this, or is it up to the Consultant to choose the solution??

Answer: It is up to the Consultant to propose a solution to address this requirement of the RFP.

Question #14: Section 4: A: Is there a file size limitation? B: Are there page limitations?
Answer: A: There is no file size limitation. NYSDOT Contract Management shall utilize a NYS managed files transfer tool (mySend.ny.gov) for C037693 proposers to electronically send their proposal files to NYSDOT. Proposers shall send an email to Al Hasenkopf (alfred.hasenkopf@dot.ny.gov) with their intent to submit their proposal electronically at that time. NYSDOT Contract Management will then send the proposer an invitation to mySend so the proposer can upload their RFP submission files to the mySend site. Acknowledgement of proposal receipt via e-mail shall be sent to the proposer to confirm NYSDOT’s successful receipt of electronic proposal submittal. Proposers are advised to provide ample time to address any technological errors prior to proposal deadlines. B: While there is no page limitation, the RFP does request that proposals be relevant, concise and informatively respond to the RFP’s requirements.

Question #15: Section 4: What is the desired receipt date of the thumb drive submission?
Answer: NYSDOT must receive the requested thumbdrive on or before the July 8th proposal due date.

Question #16: Section 4: How should requested attachments be labelled and attached?
Answer: Each C037693 attachment contains a pre-filled header label, and has a place to identify the proposer name and proposal submission date. When preparing your proposal submittal, please concatenate completed attachments in RFP Attachment number order.

Question #17: Section 5.4 regarding the statement: ‘Evaluators have the authority to identify additional functional requirements which vendors must demonstrate’, does this mean that some vendors may have more/fewer demonstration requirements than others? How will functional requirements demonstrated over and above those required by other competing vendors be scored and how will that impact overall RFP scoring?
Answer: The RFP is being revised to remove the ability of evaluators to require additional functionality to be demonstrated. Please see the RFP modification (once released) for further details. The RFP demonstration requirements shall be the same for all vendors competing for contract award.

Question #18: Section 5.4 regarding the statement: ‘Per RFP Attachment 10, all vendors submitting responsive proposals shall present their products via a demonstration, which shall be evaluated as an integral part of overall technical proposal evaluation (a continuation of preliminary written technical proposal evaluation findings and scores)’, will NYSDOT be providing identical datasets to each competing vendor for demonstration purposes to ensure equality in evaluation of feature requirements? If so, how and when will data sets be distributed?
**Answer:** Data sets will not be provided to the competing vendors. It is up to each vendor to use a data set that best demonstrates how proposed software meets the RFP’s functional requirements.

**Question #19:** Section 5.4 regarding the statement: ‘Per RFP Attachment 10, all vendors submitting responsive proposals shall present their products via a demonstration, which shall be evaluated as an integral part of overall technical proposal evaluation (a continuation of preliminary written technical proposal evaluation findings and scores)’, can you please provide specifics on how demonstrations of functional requirements will be scored (pass/fail, partial points awarded, time to complete task, etc.)?

**Answer:** The RFP is being revised to clarify the proposal evaluation process such that evaluation of the product demonstration shall be evaluated separate from the evaluation of the written technical proposal. Please see the RFP Modification (once released).

**ATTACHMENT 1 DRAFT CONTRACT:**

**Question #20:** Can you please clarify RFP Appendix D pages 46 and 47 regarding MWBE participation? Are there MWBE participation requirements under the C037693 contract opportunity?

**Answer:** Based on a pre-ad waiver, DMWBE and SDVOB goals are not required within C037693 RFP. Appendix D is part of NYSDOT standard contract boilerplate for non-engineering/non-architectural contract opportunities; since C037693 has no goals, Appendix D is not applicable at this time.

**ATTACHMENT 10 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS:**

**Question #21:** Per D10: Ability to integrate multiple 3D models (bridges, drainage, utilities and roadways) into a single model. Can the NYSDOT provide further detail on the scope of this functionality? Will this be for visualization or design analysis?

**Answer:** For drafting purposes, the RFP requires the selected Consultant to have the ability to integrate multiple 3D models (bridges, drainage, utilities and roadways) into a single model.

**Question #22:** Per D10: Are different disciplinary models integrated into single environment for purpose of visualization and coordination, or are other capabilities required as well?

**Answer:** The different models would need to be integrated into a single environment for drafting purposes.

**Question #23:** Per D16: It is understood that importing and referencing Bentley Systems legacy data file types (ALG, DTM, DGN, LandXML) is a functional requirement. It is also understood that three of these file types (ALG, DTM, DGN) are proprietary to, and controlled by the incumbent vendor. Will all potential RFP respondents be provided documentation, schematics, software architecture etc. for these proprietary file types to ensure the preservation of NYSDOT data when imported or referenced in accordance with the requirements of this RFP?

**Answer:** NYSDOT is taking this question under advisement, and intends to address this question during the second Q&A round.
**Question #24:** Per D23: Is there a standard report format or program that NYSDOT would like or use to record and/or report per these items?

**Answer:** NYSDOT does not require a specified report format or program for these items. It is up to the Consultant to propose a solution.

**Question #25:** Per HDM5: It is understood that importing alignments and surfaces stored as DTM, TIN, ALG and LandXML is a functional requirement. It is also understood that at least two of these file types (ALG, DTM) are proprietary to Bentley Systems. Will all potential RFP respondents be provided documentation, schematics, software architecture etc. for proprietary file types to ensure data stored in these formats can be imported in accordance with the requirements of this RFP?

**Answer:** Please see the answer to Question #23.

**Question #26:** Per BSDAR9, BSDA23 & BSSDAR19: What does integration with drafting/3D design tools entail?

**Answer:** The bridge design/analysis solution needs to be compatible with the drafting and 3D design/detailing solution. Models must be able to be imported/exported back and forth between the two.

**Question #27:** Per BSDA9: What specifically does lateral loads refer to beyond seismic, wind, and stream/tidal loads?

**Answer:** Lateral loads would be any horizontal load required by the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specification. See table 3.4.1-1 in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specification.

**Question #28:** Per BSDA22 & BSSDAR18: What analysis results are required to be exported to drafting software?

**Answer:** The bridge design/analysis solution needs to be compatible with the drafting and 3D design/detailing solution. Models must be able to be imported/exported back and forth between the two. This includes analysis results necessary for the creation of 2D plans. Size, shape, and layout of bridge components are necessary including steel, concrete, and reinforcement.

**Question #29:** Per BSSDAR10 & BSSDAR11: Is a particular beam spacing design method required?

**Answer:** No. Software should be able to analyze various beam spacings to determine an optimum design.

**Question #30:** Bridge Design (in general): How does the current RFP address for NYSDOT’s custom abutments, piers and girders created before analysis and design? Instead of using out of the box libraries that come with the software, how does NYSDOT address for the need to create custom parametric steel/concrete bridge shapes?

**Answer:** The RFP does not have a specific requirement for parametric libraries or shapes. It is up to the Consultant to propose a solution.

**Question #31:** Bridge Design (in general): Bridge Functional Requirements – Since the bridge department is also in charge of placing rebar on superstructure and substructure parts
after design, how does the current RFP address for placement of structural rebar? How
does the current RFP consider structural rebar placement in one single seamless
workflow without having the need to export solids and start placement rebar parts from
scratch in a brand-new project? How does the current RFP address the automated
updating on structural rebar and plan production drawings if the bridge’s
horizontal/vertical alignment and/or structural bridge elements change after design?

Answer: The RFP does not have a specific requirement for these capabilities. It is up to the
Consultant to propose a solution.

Question #32: Bridge Design (in general): As NYSDOT’s bridge department is responsible for
designing grading around abutments, how does the current RFP automate the creation of
grading around Full-Retaining, Semi-Retaining, Sill, Spill-Through, Open and Pile-
Encased abutments and their interaction with all roads neighboring the bridge?

Answer: Grading around substructures and earthwork requirements fall under
Attachment 10 Requirement #D8 and Requirement #HDM3.

Question #33: Regarding SDMP1: Items #3 Ability to import feature definitions and level
symbology: What is the source of the feature definitions and level symbology that needs
to be imported? Is it possible to please provide more detail?

Answer: The feature definitions and level symbology are outlined in the NYSDOT CADD
Standards and Procedures Manual available on the NYSDOT web site
They are also in the CADD settings files that are also available through the
NYSDOT website.

Question #34: Regarding SDMP1: A: It is understood that the ability to maintain CADD file
reference logic for legacy data (Bentley Systems) is a functional requirement. It is also
understood that NYSDOT’s current ProjectWise data management environment is
proprietary to and controlled by the incumbent vendor. Will all potential RFP
respondents be provided documentation, schematics, software architecture etc. for this
proprietary data management environment to ensure the preservation of NYSDOT data
and maintenance of file reference logic required in this RFP? B: It is understood that the
ability to migrate and maintain access to CADD legacy data files (Bentley Systems) with
negligible loss is a functional requirement. Please clarify “negligible loss”. Is it a
requirement of this RFP that all legacy Bentley files, civil objects and models (as well as
any pre-existing parametric and/or dynamic relationships between objects, labels, tables
and sheets) be fully preserved in both appearance and operability when accessed or
migrated into the CAD platform of a competing vendor? Will all potential RFP
respondents be provided documentation, schematics, software architecture etc. for any
proprietary content necessary to meet this RFP requirement?

Answer: A and B: Please see the answer to Question #23.

ATTACHMENT 11 FIRM EXPERIENCE:

Question #35: Regarding Req ID# FE3 ‘Company Stability’ which states: ‘The submission of
supporting documentation is required (e.g., company literature, attestations, and other
references)’, can you please provide examples of what supporting documentation should
be attached and where should it be attached? Within the response to the question itself or as an attachment/appendix?

**Answer:** To maintain a fair level playing field, each firm must decide what additional firm information to offer in its proposal. The location of any additional information needs to be identified in the RFP Attachment’s requirement response box.

**ATTACHMENT 11A KEY PERSONNEL EXPERIENCE:**

**Question #36:** There is a section within the RFP for on-site key personnel. Does the NYSDOT have Application Engineer definitions or descriptions for each of these key personnel?

**Answer:** Please examine Requirement ID# KP3 in RFP Attachment 11A ‘Key Personnel Experience’.

**ATTACHMENT 12 SCOPE OF SERVICES:**

**Question #37:** Regarding PM1 ‘Project Management’: What do you envision for ‘Present initial management plans for the following responsibilities: i. End of Contract Transition’? Do you expect time to provide orientation for the next consultant?

**Answer:** As the end of contract approaches and depending upon the successor situation, additional time could be added to the contract to further retain the selected Consultant to assist NYSDOT to transition from one vendor to the next. Also, in RFP Attachment 12, please see last sentence of Requirement #PM5 (‘End of Contract Schedule’) as well as the third item under Requirement #PM8 (‘End of Contract Transition’).

**Question #38:** Rqmt. #PM3 mentions the following for the number of staff requiring training. Based on NYSDOT staff, the following gives proposers a sense of scale regarding implementation of training per RFP Attachment 10:

1. For all staff (approximately 1500): 1 Drafting, 2 Highway 3D Design and Modeling
2. If change in vendor: all staff for: 16 File/Document Mgt, 17 Printing & Plotting
3. For approximately 400-500 staff:
   a. 8 Drainage
   b. 9, 10 & 11 Bridge (three requirements)
   c. 13 Construction Inspection
4. For all other Attachment 10 requirements: manageable scale

Can you please provide a breakdown of the staff training needs per region? How much do you expect the training to be conducted by the onsite consultants?

**Answer:** The RFP presents training requirements via Attachment 11A and 12. At this time, NYSDOT is unable to accurately estimate numbers. NYSDOT envisions training of regional staff to be determined based on the selected Consultant’s offer, via a possible combination of on-site, hands-on training as well as via proposed, acceptable alternative training methods.

**Question #39:** Regarding PM3 (page 4): Can you give more detail/clarity on item #4 (‘Based on NYSDOT staff, the following gives proposers a sense of scale regarding implementation of training per RFP Attachment 10…4. For all other Attachment 10 requirements: manageable scale’)? These are very specialized topics, so are they expected to be taught to a percentage of the design staff (1500)? Should it be assumed a staff size similar to
item #3 of 400-500, or a lower number? These numbers can have a huge effect on costs, so could more detail be provided on any of these (may help keep the costs lower)?

**Answer:** Please refer to the Exhibit 2 Software Cost tab in Attachment 13 for an approximate number of users for each functional requirement category.

**Question #40:** Regarding PM3 (page 5): Is the method of tracking roll-out training completion expected to be handled in a different environment than the New York State’s Statewide Learning Management systems (SLMS)?

**Answer:** The final record will be kept in SLMS.

**Question #41:** Regarding PM3 (page 6): Regarding on-boarding new hires: Can you give us an idea of, approximately, how many new hires to expect per year?

**Answer:** NYSDOT is not able to provide this information.

**Question #42:** Regarding PM4 (page 6): Can the on-site support staff be direct employees of one of the consultant’s subcontractors?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question #43:** Regarding PM6 (page 7): Regarding the statement: ‘The Project Schedule, which must be fully resourced by technical and functional roles (Proposer and NYS), shall include, as applicable but not be limited to:…1. the conversion/migration of data’; Is the expectation that, if a new platform is chosen, that all data will be migrated? In our experience, it is better to convert as needed and not spend the time converting data that may not need to be accessed. Will converting data as needed be allowed?

**Answer:** Yes, NYSDOT will allow data to be converted on an as needed basis.

**Question #44:** Regarding PM7 (page 7): regarding the statement: ‘Provided solutions shall allow for reasonable engineering data management and data transfer for transportation facility asset management. This includes being able to effectively interface with NYSDOT utilized project management and scheduling applications (e.g., Primavera P6), as well as NYSDOT utilized asset management solutions (e.g., AgileAssets, ESRI)’, Do you have any integrations currently that we would want to make sure and maintain?

**Answer:** Figure 2 of the RFP provides details on the types of data that will be transferred as part of the solution.

**Question #45:** Regarding PM8 (page 8): Regarding the conceptual implementation transition plan: If you award this to a new vendor and transition to a new solution, what is your expectation for the duration of the transition period? In other words, how long would you want to keep running Bentley? In our experience, a transition of that caliber would necessitate at least one pilot project - possibly with a regional office team - over the course of a few months to get feedback, understand requirements better, and build the resources they need (software templates and content, add-ons, training curriculum, etc.). Is such a pilot project desirable?

**Answer:** DOT expects a transition period from legacy to replacement system of approximately 12 months. The exact schedule of the transition period is dependent on the detailed plans for disposition and migration of legacy data, which will be determined as part of the implementation planning.
**Question #46:** Regarding PM8 (page 8-9): Regarding the statements: ‘At the end of the term of this Contract, the Consultant may be required to assist with any necessary transition/migration to other replacement CADD solutions and compatibility with Consultant provided services’ and ‘This task shall only be required if the Consultant is not designated for award of subsequent replacement Contract. To ensure a seamless transition between the Consultant and a future designated Consultant, NYSDOT will establish a transition period during which the Consultant will work with the future designated Consultant to provide the necessary coordination and services without interruption during the transition’ Can you please provide any more detail on how long you think this transition period may be? Is this 1 month, 6 months, 12 months, or something else?

**Answer:** DOT expects a transition period from legacy to replacement system of approximately 12 months.

**ATTACHMENT 13 COST PROPOSAL:**

**Question #47:** Can a vendor propose a different software pricing model (that what is outlined in Exhibit 2) or will this cause the vendor to be deemed non-compliant?

**Answer:** NYSDOT acknowledges this question yet is unable to provide an answer at this time. NYSDOT may respond to this question with answers to second round questions (due July 1st).

**Question #48:** Can a vendor propose a different professional services and training pricing model other than what NYSDOT asks for in exhibits 3, 4 and 5 in the cost spreadsheet (attachment 13) or will this cause the vendor to be deemed non-compliant?

**Answer:** NYSDOT acknowledges this question yet is unable to provide an answer at this time. NYSDOT may respond to this question with answers to second round questions (due July 1st).

**Question #49:** Exhibit 2 ‘Software Costs’. NYSDOT asks for the pricing of Bridge Structural Design, Analysis and ratings. If we have two products (one more expensive and one less expensive) do we just put the two products under the list of software applications and price each one separately using the Peak Application usage number twice. Should we put a cost for 30 users for the more expensive product and 30 users of the less expensive product?

**Answer:** For this software functional requirements, a total of 60 NYSDOT users are specified. Therefore, a responsive proposal must provide access to each proposed software functionality for up to 60 NYSDOT users, regardless of price per license.

**Question #50:** Exhibit 2 ‘Software Costs’. A: We understand that NYSDOT is ultimately looking for Daily Peaks and daily pricing with monthly invoicing. When we provide the initial Cost/License for Year ONE, will NYSDOT take that yearly cost number we provide and divide it by 365 days or by (1740 hours or 217.5) working days in order to come up with a daily software usage cost? B: If the answer is YES to ‘A’ above, then how will NYSDOT apply the fact that this will bloat the proposal cost? For example, if we have a lower priced Bridge Structural Design product (which covers design on basic/standard bridges) and a higher priced more complex Bridge Structural Design Product (which covers the design on complex bridge) we have to list both products.
However, our pricing will be dramatically increased because each line item will have the Daily Peak Application Usage applied against it. C: Will NYSDOT ultimately take the Daily Peak Application usage and distribute it between the line items or perhaps have the proposer provide a percentage of users who they think out of the Daily Peak Application usage would use this product on any given day (based on our experience)?

**Answer:** A: A proposed annual license cost should be calculated by a divide by 365 days factor. B: All proposed software functionality must be available every day of a year. C: No, the RFP does not allow usage to be divided. Proposers must follow RFP Attachment 13’s rules.

**Question #51:** Exhibit 3 ‘On-Site Support Costs’. Can you please clarify if On-Site Consultants are to be invoiced monthly for actual work days/hours as indicated Attachment 13 Exh3_On-Site Support Cost, or a fixed monthly payment as indicated in Section 2.2 Contract Objectives, Item 4.c (main RFP document)?

**Answer:** The selected Consultant shall invoice NYSDOT monthly for actual days/hours worked by the On-Site Consultants. The RFP will be revised to consistently specify this requirement.

**Question #52:** Exhibit 2 ‘Software Costs’. A: In Row 37, can NYSDOT please verify the size / amount of the uniform service delivery number (1000 x 10 megapixel photos)/year? By our calculations this would correspond to only 2-3 small drone flights yearly? B: In Row 38, does the cloud storage pricing requested here relate only to the imagery scoped in Row 37? Or does NYSDOT propose that the cloud storage also include the data in Row 37 plus the potential of ALL file/document management in the NYSDOT Resource base (as described in the main RFP document) where there are over 3.2 million files stored within the engineering document management system (1.3 million active files and over 1.9 million archived files)?

**Answer:** A: NYSDOT cannot verify the service delivery number at this time. It is unknown how many photos per year will be collected. The RFP simply provides a starting point. B: The cloud storage referenced in Row 38 will not include all of the files in the file document/management system; the cloud storage pricing, specific to this question, is only related to the imagery.