

**STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2520H006
AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO**

AMENDMENT ISSUING OFFICE:



Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Statewide Contracting & Procurement
P.O. Box 112500
(3132 Channel Drive, Room 310)
Juneau, Alaska 99811-2500

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: August 30, 2019

RFP TITLE:

TRAFFIC DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

REVISED DUE DATE: September 13, 2019 at 2:00pm prevailing Alaska Time

This is a mandatory return Amendment. *Your proposal may be considered non-responsive if this signed amendment is not received [in addition to your proposal] by the date and time proposals are due.*

State Signature

Signature: _____

Name: Tom Mayer

Date: _____

Title: Procurement Specialist IV

Vendor Signature

Business Name: _____

Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Signature: _____

Title: _____

The following questions have been submitted by the vendor community in response to this RFP. The state has provided answers to each question below.

Question 1: We wish to propose a team of individuals, some are based in the US and working in the US, but our software developers are domiciled in the UK and would therefore be doing some of the work (when not travelling) in the UK. Please can I request a waiver with reference to SEC. 3.17 LOCATION OF WORK?

Answer 1: Yes, please submit this request via email to the procurement officer at:
tom.mayer@alaska.gov

Question 2: Is the schedule in the RFP fixed or can we propose our own?

Answer 2: Yes, offerors, may propose their own project schedule depending on what they see as reasonable and achievable. However, vendors must consider that it is DOT&PF's goal to have a timely and seamless deployment that will allow DOT&PF to operate the fully functional replacement system using 2019 traffic data (Goal 4, pg 14).

Question 3: Section 4.03 Offerors Response Requirements: could you please clarify the first paragraph?

Answer 3: Please see **Change 7 below**.

Question 4: Will the state provide the Offerors Certification (as outlined in sec. 1.08 Proposal Contents, (b) Offeror's Certification) as a form like you've done in the past?

Answer 4: No. However, the state recommends that offerors include a declarative statement that confirms the offeror will comply with the requirements outlined in Section 1.08 (a through e).

Question 5: Could the state please clarify the instructions written under Section 4.03 – Offerors Response Requirements on page 37 of the RFP? It is very awkward and confusing as currently written.

Answer 5: Please see **Change 7 below**.

Question 6: It seems offerors can respond to the RFP by following one of two separate sets of instructions: one way is to answer the questions and respond to the "Offerors Response" notations shown in various tables on pages 6-38. The second way is to follow the instructions beginning on page 37 under the section titled "Section 4.01 Proposal Format and Content". Which set of instructions does the state want offerors to respond?

Answer 6: Offerors should respond to all "Offerors Response" items found within the RFP. Section Four, Proposal Format and Content merely describes the format the proposal should follow for ease of evaluation. Please see **Change 7 below** for additional information.

Question 7: Please tell us how to unlock the .xls attachments (A, B, and E) or how to create .pdfs from them so that we can copy these forms into our format and present a uniform appearance in our submittal.

Answer 7: Attachments A, B, and E are locked to ensure Offerors submit this information in the same format as requested for ease of evaluation.

Question 8: What is meant by Section 1.08 (e) "Federal Requirements"? Is this in reference to traffic data monitoring? To contracting? Please explain.

Answer 8: As experts in providing Travel Monitoring System, Offerors should indicate any known Federal Requirements. If none, Offerors should state there are no known Federal Requirements.

Question 9: Is the state looking to manage intersection turning movement count data in the new TDMS?

Answer 9: Managing turning movement count data is a wish list item but not an immediate need. Data is compiled using MioVision software applications.

Question 10: Can companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (For example, from India or Canada).

Answer 10: Please see answer 1 above.

Question 11: Do vendors need to come to Alaska for meetings?

Answer 11: As seen in section 3.10.1: Task One: Kick Off Meetings: Kick Off Meeting One may be held electronically while Kick Off Meeting Two is to be held in Juneau, Alaska and the contractor must be onsite.

Question 12: Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (For example, from India or Canada)

Answer 12: Please see answer 1 above.

Question 13: Can we submit the proposals via email?

Answer 13: Please see **Changes 1 and 2 below.**

Question 14: What is the expected volume and velocity/update frequency of data from the traffic recording and counting devices?

Answer 14: Whether auto-polling (if available) or manually downloading and uploading traffic data, DOT&PF intends the following:

- **Short-Term Stations:** We will manually upload short term data periodically typically during normal business hours between May-September with minimal uploads of short term data in the winter.
- **CCS:** Daily downloads from stations and daily uploads to TDMS 365 days a year for the previous 24 hours of binned and/or per vehicle data from each station if auto-polling is available; or, a minimum of downloading and uploading traffic data two times per week all year long during normal business hours (Real-Time data not required).
- **WIM:** A minimum of weekly downloads from stations and weekly uploads to TDMS year round for the WIM stations (Real-Time data not required).

Question 15: Does AK DOT&PF intend to maintain integration of ESRI R&H with maps and feature layers in their ESRI ArcGIS server?

Answer 15: AK DOT&PF will maintain the R&H maps and feature layers within their ESRI software applications. In regards to "Integration" offerors shall propose a solution and describe how their solution synchronizes with the DOT&PF's R&H maps and feature layers. Please see question 24 for additional information.

Question 16: For Functional Requirement 3-50: What methodology does Alaska DOT&PF employ in the determination of factor groups? Your thoughts?

Answer 16: **ANSWER:** AK DOT&PF implements a traditional approach to generating seasonal factor groups as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Traffic Monitoring Guide. The current TDMS system does not allow DOT&PF to seasonally factor class data from Continuous Counting Stations. However, that functionality is a priority in a new system. Axle correction factors are generated by the current TDMS system by utilizing an axle/vehicle value which is based on all collected classification data, the staff manually assigns stations to the groups based on local knowledge. Other approaches to

generating factors will be considered but it is a priority to DOT&PF that the system allows staff the flexibility to adjust groups based on their local knowledge.

Question 17: For Functional Requirement 3-67: What is meant by "status of network?" and what is the "network?"

Answer 17: *Please see **Change 8 below**. In regards to the Status of Network, this refers to the status of the station connection based on the last attempt to poll the data. Stations may be down due to communication or power failure and data is unable to be polled.*

Question 18: In regards to Attachment B, Reporting Requirements, Item 30: Raw Data: What does Alaska DOT&PF mean by "raw speed data?"

Answer 18: *Raw data is defined as data that has not been quality checked for accuracy. It is important the traffic group be able to upload all collected data to the TDMS before performing quality control checks on the data, identifying what is to be excluded in reporting and annual statistic calculations.*

Question 19: In regards to Attachment B, Reporting Requirements, Item 31-Raw Data: What does Alaska DOT&PF mean by "raw data?"

Answer 19: *Please see question 18 above.*

Question 20: In regards to Section 3.10.4, can Alaska DOT&PF provide more information for the data to be migrated in terms of scale and scope? (file types, quantities of files, size of files, etc.)

Answer 20: *The response is variable and dependent upon the migration plan, of which TDP is expecting a solution from the awarded bidder. DOT&PF has raw (unprocessed) files of generic/custom plain text file categories, as well as other data types in encoded file types. Our current database backup is accessible through 2 .bak files (sum size total of 160 gb's) which can be extracted and partitioned in an instance of SQL Server. We also have access to our current TDMS which may possibly be extracted in some manner and format.*

Question 21: In regards to Section 3.10.4, Can Alaska provide example migration files for each referenced migration time period?

Answer 21: **ANSWER:** *Alaska DOT&PF does not have an example of a migration file. Ideally, DOT&PF would like to extract all data back to 1978 from the current system, Traffic Server. It is anticipated that DOT&PF and the new contractor shall work cooperatively with the current vendor, Transmetric America, to extract all traffic data in a consumable format while ensuring proprietary information is protected.*

Question 22: In regards to Section 3.10.4, is historic data migrated into the system to be also associated with historic LRS/geometries? Or associated with unique Station IDs to current LRS?

Answer 22: *The historic LRS is not able to be referenced accurately going back 5-30 years. DOT&PF desires to have the historic stations associated with the current LRS through a snapping service (ex. ESRI event editor) and have the stations be identified as archived/historical.*

Question 23: In regards to Section 3.02, currently there are 3 response choices, would Alaska DOT&PF consider adding a 4th option specifically for customization (as specifically different than an add-on)?

Answer 23: *Please see **Changes 3 and 8 below**.*

Question 24: In regards to Sections 3.04.6, 3.04.7, 3.04.8, and 3.06: please answer the following questions:

24A: Can Alaska DOT&PF provide more detail on the integration and synchronization?

Answer 24A: *The Proposed system should be able to, via automated methods, either receive broadcasts from DOT&PF's R&H or consume services that update the network or roadway attributes as to avoid discrepancies and provide accurate data analysis. Additionally, the expectation is that spatial/relevant attribute changes to the stations/traffic links should be able to be, via automated methods, broadcasted as registered external events to R&H for consumption or comparable method.*

24B: What is the relationship between the two systems?

Answer 24B: *Offerors shall propose an integration and synchronization method that best meets the expectations as described in the response to 24A.*

24C: For various business data, what system should be the system owner vs. consumer.

Answer 24C: *See Section 3.04.7, GIS/LRS Layers List, for a list of business data maintained in the DOT&PF R&H geodatabase (owner). The TDMS will be a 'consumer' of those event feature classes listed. For traffic data related features/attributes such as traffic stations, traffic links, annual statistics, etc. the Proposed System will be the 'owner' unless otherwise recommended in the offerors proposed solution. The DOT&PF R&H geodatabase would then 'consume the traffic data related features and attributes from the Proposed System.*

24D: What business data should the proposed system be capable of writing to R&H?

Answer 24D: *See question 24C*

24E: Is there a mandatory method, preferred method, or just to propose a successful method?

Answer 24E: *Mandatory, preferred, and successful methods are inconsequential distinctions. The method that incorporates efficiency, reliability, and integrity of synchronization and integration is the most valuable.*

24F: If multiple method options are requested to be proposed, how should a vendor bid each method as each might have their own costings?

Answer 24F: *Offerors should propose the most optimal solution given the goals outlined in the RFP. Multiple methods are not requested of this RFP. Please see section 1.14 for information relating to alternate proposals.*

Question 25: In regards to Section 3.04.1, the preferred schedule does not allocate time for software customization if customization is acceptable.

Answer 25: *Offerors may propose their own project schedule depending on what they see as reasonable and achievable. The DOT&PF's goal is to have a timely and seamless deployment that will allow us to operate the fully functional replacement system using 2019 traffic data (see Goal 4, pg. 14).*

Question 26: With the understanding our software meets all FHWA requirements, can the following 2 response options be added to Attachment A?

Proposed Response 1: Yes, the proposed solution will meet the requirement with customization.

Proposed Response 2: Yes, the system meets the requirement but uses different methods than described in the RFP

Answer 26: *Please see **Changes 3 and 8 below**. Proposed response 1 above has been added to Attachment A as **Response Option 4**. Offerors should fill in the "Explanatory Narrative" cell to explain the extent of customization required and whether or not it could delay the project schedule.*

*Please see **Changes 3 and 8 below** below. Proposed response 2, above has been added to Attachment as **Response Option 5**. Offerors should fill in the "Explanatory Narrative" cell to describe and define the alternative method to meet the requirement.*

Question 27: With the understanding our software meets all FHWA requirements, can the following 2 response options be added to Attachment B?

Proposed Response 1: Yes, the proposed solution will meet the requirement with customization.

Proposed Response 2: Yes, the system meets the requirement but uses different methods than described in the RFP

Answer 27: *Please see **Changes 4 and 9 below**. Proposed response 1 above has been added to Attachment B as **Response Option 4**. Offerors should fill in the "Explanatory Narrative" cell to explain the extent of customization required and whether or not it could delay the project schedule.*

*Please see **Changes 4 and 9 below**. Proposed response 2 above has been added to Attachment B as **Response Option 5**. Offerors should fill in the "Explanatory Narrative" cell to describe and define the alternative method to meet the requirement.*

Question 28: On Attachment A, item 2-11, is this asking if the software connects to the short-term equipment directly and pulls the data files from the counter?

Answer 28: *Please see **Change 8 below**.*

Question 29: On Attachment A, item 2-13, is this asking if the software connects to the short-term equipment directly and pulls the data files from the counter?

Answer 29: *Please see **Change 8 below**.*

Question 30: On Attachment A, item 2-14, please provide further detail regarding 'decoder rules'. The term 'decoder rules' is also used in other Attachment A requirements.

Answer 30: *While many of the files are plain-text, others are encoded or binary. The requirement is prompting the verification that the proposed system is capable of decoding files from various traffic collection vendors and be able to do so consistently by use of the same "decoder rules" or the same decoding process.*

Question 31: In Section 2.04, Data Collection Stations, on page 12, the RFP identifies eight (8) WIM station types. Notes taken during preconference recalls Alaska stating 'No WIM' included in this RFP. Is the Traffic Data Management System expected to process WIM data?

Answer 31: *Yes, the offered Traffic Data Management System is expected to process WIM data.*

Question 32: Section 3.15, **Proposed Payment Procedures** (p.32), indicates payments based on negotiated payment schedule and progress report. During the preconference meeting, it was mentioned that payments will not be made 'monthly' but by 'task'.

- A. Tasks in Attachment E contain multiple sub-tasks and in some cases, can span multiple years.
- B. Is 'task' used in the context of referencing Attachment E 'tasks'? or some other project progress/deliverable?

Answer 32: *The State Project Manager will approve payment upon completion of a task, or if the vendor has shown significant progress toward completing a task. When working on time consuming tasks that span over a month (Task 3 & 4) the vendor may bill for significant progress toward completion of a task. For tasks that are ongoing (Task 7 & 8) the vendor may bill monthly.*

In addition to the above questions, the following changes are hereby incorporated:

Change 1: *Delete Section 1.03 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

SEC. 1.03 DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

Please see the front page of this amendment for the due date and time that proposals must be received.

Faxed, or oral proposals are not acceptable. **Email Proposals** are acceptable. Please see section 1.07 for additional information related to email submissions.

Change 2: *Delete Section 1.07 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

SEC. 1.07 RETURN INSTRUCTIONS

OFFERORS RESPONSE: Offerors must submit one original, one copy, and one electronic copy of their proposal to the procurement officer in a sealed package.

OFFERORS RESPONSE: Attachment E, Cost Proposal, must be included with the package and must be in a separately sealed envelope from the rest of the technical proposal and must be clearly identified. An electronic copy of Attachment A must also be submitted on the thumb drive with the technical proposal.

The sealed proposal package(s) must be addressed as follows:

Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Division of Administrative Services
Statewide Contracting & Procurement
Attention: Tom Mayer
Request for Proposal (RFP) Number: **2520H006**
RFP Title: Traffic Data Management System

If using U.S. mail, please use the following mailing address:

P.O. Box 112500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-1500

If using a delivery service, please use the following physical address:

3132 Channel Drive, Room 350
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Important Note: Overnight express mail delivery to Juneau, Alaska may be not be available.

If submitting a proposal via email, the technical proposal and cost proposal must be saved as separate PDF documents and emailed to:

tom.mayer@alaska.gov

Emailed documents must be separate, clearly labeled attachments, such as "Vendor A – Technical Proposal.pdf" and "Vendor A – Cost Proposal.pdf" (Vendor A is the name of the offeror).

The email must contain the RFP number in the subject line.

The **maximum** size of a single email (including all text and attachments) that can be received by the state is **20mb (megabytes)**. If the email containing the proposal exceeds this size, the proposal must be sent in multiple emails that are each less than 20 megabytes and each email must comply with the requirements described above.

It is the offeror's responsibility to contact the issuing agency at 907-465-8855 to confirm that the proposal has been received. The state is not responsible for unreadable, corrupt, or missing attachments.

The State of Alaska provides one Request for Proposal (RFP). Additional RFPs may be purchased for the cost of reproduction, \$.25 per page.

Change 3: *Delete Section 3.02 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

SEC. 3.02 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SOFTWARE

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS: Attachment A, Functional Requirements: This attachment is a Microsoft Excel File containing multiple tabs as seen below:

Tab 1:	Instructions	
Tab 2:	Functional Requirements:	Overall Requirements
Tab 3:	Functional Requirements:	Acquisition and Storage
Tab 4:	Functional requirements:	Traffic Data Collection
Tab 5:	Functional Requirements:	Traffic Reporting
Tab 6:	Functional Requirements:	Optional Features

Each tab contains the desired functional requirements for a specific category of requirements as seen above.

The functional requirements seen in Attachment A were developed by the DOT&PF TDP team to document the minimum functionality the proposed system must perform in order to meet end users' needs but is not intended to dictate 'how' the functions are performed.

However, DOT&PF is interested in all the features and functions of a fully functional traffic data monitoring system, regardless of whether the functions are mentioned in the requirements.

Attachment A - Instructions: In column C of Attachment A, the offeror must use the drop down menu to select one of the five following responses. A definition is provided for each response below:

Response	Description	Definition	Is the completion of Column D Required?
1	Yes, The system meets the requirement out of the box	This means the offered system meets the requirement out of the box at the price offered with no additional modules or add-ons required to deliver the functionality.	No
2	Yes, The system meets requirement with an add-on module	This means the offered system meets the requirement and delivers the functionality with an add-on module that is included with the cost offered. Note: If an add-on is required to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column D must be completed.	Yes Identify and describe the included add-on module in Column D
3	No, The system does not meet the requirement	This means a module or add-on does not exist that will allow the system to deliver the required functionality.	No
4	Yes, The system will meet the requirement with a customization	This means the offered system will meet the requirement and deliver the functionality with a customization and the cost of the customization is included in the cost offered. Note: If customization is required to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column D must be completed.	Yes Identify and describe the customization required in Column D
5	Yes, The system meets the requirement but uses a different method	This means the offered system meets the requirement but does so using different methods and the cost of utilizing this method is included in the cost offered. Note: If the system meets the requirement using a different method to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column D must be completed	Yes Identify and describe the method used to meet the requirement in Column D.

Note: Offerors do not need to meet all of the requirements. However, if an answer is not provided for a specific functionality, the state will construe the no-answer as response 3.

OFFEROR RESPONSE: To be considered responsive, offerors must complete and submit Attachment A, Functional Requirements. Instructions are included on Tab 1 of the attachment. This attachment shall be evaluated per Section 4.12.

OFFEROR RESPONSE: In addition to submitting **Attachment A**, Offerors must also submit a detailed narrative statement that describes the flexibility of the proposed replacement system in regards to how the system can be customized or modified.

OFFERORS RESPONSE: Offerors must also submit detailed narrative statements that describe the type of software ownership being proposed. The statements must answer the following at a minimum:

1. Will DOT&PF own a license to use the software system?
2. Is the license perpetual or are the mandatory annual fees to continue using the system?
3. Are updates to the software included in the purchase price?
4. Will DOT&PF own rights to the software source code?
5. How many desktop users are permitted under the proposed license structure?

Change 4: Delete section 3.03 in its entirety and replace with the following:

SEC. 3.03 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SOFTWARE

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS: Attachment B, Required Reports: This attachment is a Microsoft Excel File that describes the list of reports that are essential to meeting DOT&PF reporting needs.

The reporting requirements seen in Attachment B were developed by the DOT&PF TDP team to document the reports that are essential to the state and represent the full reporting functionality required by the DOT&PF Highway Data Teams.

However, DOT&PF is interested in all the reports a fully functional traffic data management system would normally produce regardless of whether the report is identified in Attachment B.

Attachment B – Instructions: In column D of Attachment B, the offeror must use the drop down menu to select one of the five following responses. A definition is provided for each response below:

Response	Description	Definition	Is the completion of Column E Required?
1	Yes, The system meets the requirement out of the box	This means the offered system meets the requirement out of the box at the price offered with no additional modules or add-ons required to deliver the functionality.	No
2	Yes, The system meets requirement with an add-on module	This means the offered system meets the requirement and delivers the functionality with an add-on module that is included with the cost offered. Note: If an add-on is required to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column D must be completed.	Yes Identify and describe the included add-on module in Column E
3	No, The system does not meet the requirement:	This means a module or add-on does not exist that will allow the system to deliver the required functionality.	No
4	Yes, The system will meet the requirement with a customization	This means the offered system will meet the requirement and deliver the functionality with a customization and the cost of the customization is included in the cost offered. Note: If customization is required to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column E must be completed.	Yes Identify and describe the customization required in Column E
5	Yes, The system meets the requirement but uses a different method	This means the offered system meets the requirement but does so using different methods and the cost of utilizing this method is included in the cost offered. Note: If the system meets the requirement using a different method to meet the requirement, the cost must be included on Attachment C, Cost Proposal and Column E must be completed	Yes Identify and describe the method used to meet the requirement in Column E

Note: Offerors need not meet all requirements. However, if an answer is not provided for a specific functionality, the state will construe the no-answer as response 3.

OFFERORS RESPONSE: To be considered responsive, offerors must submit Attachment B, Required Reports. Instructions are included on the attachment. This attachment shall be evaluated per Section 4.12.

Change 5: *Delete Section 3.10.4 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

SEC. 3.10.4 TASK FOUR TRANSITION AND DATA MIGRATION

The offered Task Four costs shall include any staff time, additional equipment, or other related costs required to migrate data from the legacy DOT&PF system to the proposed system. The Task Four offered cost should also include any staff time, additional equipment, or other related costs required to prepare the data in preparation for the data migration process. Travel expenses will be reimbursed per Section 3.16 and **should not** be included in the Cost Proposal.

TRANSITION AND MIGRATION PLAN:

Preferred Transition and Migration Plan: Currently, all traffic data is contained in Traffic Server. To ensure a smooth and seamless transition of data to the proposed replacement system, the contractor awarded a contract as the result of this RFP shall work cooperatively, and in a timely manner, with the state project team to establish migration parameters. Backup data will be provided to the contractor by the state in a Microsoft SQL Server Database format.

Prior to 2014, data was collected and stored in a legacy database called the Highway Analysis System (HAS). Traffic stations, traffic links, roadway segments, annual statistics and classification data were exported from HAS and then imported to Traffic Server. 2014-2018 data has been collected and stored within Traffic Server. All 2019 data will be imported to Traffic Server during the solicitation process. The table in Section 2.04 highlights the number of stations and as mentioned in Goal #3, some traffic stations have data going back to 1978.

In the event Traffic Server Microsoft SQL Server extracts are unable to-effectively be imported in to the replacement system, the DOT&PF has other sources of data (raw traffic data, HPMS annual stats, HAS legacy system files) that may have to be used.

Effectively imported refers to all traffic stations, traffic segments and their associated attributes (road names, route IDs, Station ID, Segment ID, functional class, city, region, etc.) and the traffic data (raw, summary, AADT, Class, by lane, % trucks, growth rates) have been completely and accurately loaded for all years (1970's and newer).

Alternate Migration Plan: If, after award, it is determined that using sources other than the Microsoft SQL Server Extracts, the contractor shall develop and provide to the State Project Manager, a cost estimate using the hourly rates offered under Optional Task (Task 9), System Modifications, Section 3.11.1. The estimate must include the number of anticipated hours and the hourly rates for each employee that will perform the service. If the estimate is acceptable to the state, the contract amendment shall be issued to authorize the work under Task 9.

If an alternate migration plan is required as defined above, the contractor be compensated in accordance with the cost estimate provided to the State Project Manager and not the lump sum rate offered for deliverables 3-6 as seen in Section 3.10.4 and on Task 4 of Attachment E, Cost Proposal.

Vendors may opt to sub-contract the work to support the data migration.

DATA MIGRATION

The contractor shall migrate all data stored in the current system to the new replacement system. Data will be verified and tested according to the approved test plan to ensure data

integrity and completeness. The data migration shall follow the data migration test plan as outlined in the Management Plan in Task 2.

The contractor shall propose a phased approach of migrating data over by years. First and foremost is to ensure that the most recent data (2009-2019) is migrated first to allow for timelier implementation.

The following table illustrates the type of data included in the Traffic Server system:

Data Item	Description
Traffic	Continuous Count Stations – Volume & Class
	Short Term Counts - DOT&PF collects a full week of data (7 days) – Volume & Class
	Wavetrax – Volume, Class & Speed
	Traffic Statistics
	WIM- Volume & Class
HPMS	AADT
	AADT Single Unit
	Percent Peak Single
	AADT Combination
	Percent Peak Combination
	K Factor
	Directional Factor
	Future AADT

DELIVERABLE FOUR

Data Migration Plan: The contractor shall develop and implement a data migration and transition plan to ensure that existing data is migrated successfully as outlined in the Project Management Plan developed in compliance with Task 2. The deliverables for this section include the following:

1. Develop and Implement the Data Transition Plan
2. Develop and Implement the Data Migration Plan
3. Complete the migration of all 2009-2019 data
4. Complete the migration of all 2000 - 2008 data
5. Complete the migration of all 1990 – 1999 data
6. Complete the migration of all 1989 and older data

Change 6: Delete section 3.10.8 in its entirety and replace with the following:

SEC. 3.10.8 SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS WITH TECHNICAL SUPPORT

The offered Task Eight costs shall include all costs related to providing remote operations, maintenance and technical support throughout the full term of the contract, including all renewals.

Software maintenance, operations, and technical support will include the following tasks at a minimum:

1. The contractor shall provide access to the proposed system for DOT&PF personnel on a 24/7/365 basis via user id & password. DOT&PF highway data staff often work evening and weekend shifts during the summer months and will need access to the system to

upload and validate traffic data 24/7/365.

2. The contractor shall perform all maintenance, including bug fixes, additions or revisions of functionality necessary to meet the functional requirements, upgrades or updates to keep up with changing federal and state requirements. This shall require minimal support from DOT&PF IT staff.
3. The contractor shall perform regular back-ups of the DOT&PF traffic data and statistics. At a minimum the vendor shall back up all data on a daily basis and provide DOT&PF access to the backup data. Backups can be stored offsite for DOT&PF to access. On a quarterly basis, the contractor shall provide the state a copy of the backup data in a non-proprietary format. The back-ups shall include instructions on how to read and understand the file, including definitions and the source of each of the data fields.
4. The contractor shall provide technical support to the state to assist with the access and performance of any functionality within the proposed system during Alaska's normal business hours 8:00am – 5:00pm (AK Standard Time), Monday thru Friday, with the exception of nationally recognized holidays.
5. The contractor shall provide technical support to DOT&PF IT or GIS staff when requested.
6. The contractor shall perform system downtime maintenance outside Alaska's normal business hours of 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM (AK Standard Time), Monday thru Friday. The system downtime maintenance schedule shall be provided to the State Project Manager upon request.
7. The contractor shall, for all system revisions, upgrades, updates, bug fixes, document in the configuration management portion of the Management Plan (Task 2) all changes. This includes changes to the vendor's methodology as outlined in Task 2.
8. The contractor shall provide DOT&PF with a SLA identifying at a minimum:
 - Procedures for initiating requests for service to include point of contact and contact information;
 - Procedures for escalating service requests to include a point of contact and contact information;
 - The contractors approach and methodology that will be implemented to support requests for technical assistance and reports of system outages or functional issues with the system; and,
 - Measurable metrics that demonstrate project efficiency and success.

TASK EIGHT DELIVERABLES

1. The contractor shall provide all the maintenance required to ensure the system remains operational in accordance with the SLA executed between the parties.
2. The contractor shall provide all the technical support required to ensure the DOT&PF has the support required to ensure end users have minimal issues with system operations.
3. Offerors must submit their proposed SLA with their proposal and identify at least three other clients for which the SLA is used.

Change 7: *Delete Section 4.03 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

SEC. 4.03 OFFERORS RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

Sections 4.04-4.07 of this RFP define various Offeror Response items that should be submitted for evaluation purposes. The narratives should include individual documents for response item for ease of evaluation and should be presented as separate and individually titled documents and sections within a document for each of the required OFFEROR'S RESPONSE items.

Change 8: *Delete Attachment A, Functional Requirements in its entirety and replace with the following file:*

- RFP 2520H006 Attachment A – Functional Requirements V2 8 30 19

Change 9: *Delete Attachment B, Reporting Requirements in its entirety and replace with the following file:*

- RFP 2520H06 Attachment B – Reporting Requirements V2 8 30 19