

**STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2520H004
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR**

AMENDMENT ISSUING OFFICE:



Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Statewide Contracting & Procurement
P.O. Box 112500
(3132 Channel Drive, Room 350)
Juneau, Alaska 99811-2500

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: August 8, 2019

RFP TITLE:

511 Traveler Information System (TIS)

DUE DATE: August 14, 2019 at 2:00PM. Alaska Time

This is not a mandatory return Amendment.

The purpose of Amendment #4 is to:

- Provide answers to questions received for this RFP.

The following are the State's responses to questions that have been received in response to RFP 2520H004.

Question #1:

In the RFP on page 19 for Task 8, it states the contractor is to complete 1 or 2 surveys per year. In the cost section on page 46 for Task 8, it states the contractor is to complete as many end-user surveys as ADOT wishes. In order to accurately price, could ADOT&PF please provide the specific number of surveys per year to be conducted?

Answer #1:

Estimate up to 2 surveys per year.

Question #2:

Attachment 2: Cost Proposal Form on page 42, Task 1 is requested to be entered as a monthly cost, whereas remaining Tasks are requested to be entered as total costs. Entering the monthly cost for Project Management during the period of Tasks 1-5 would not result in a total cost for that period. Would ADOT&PF prefer a total Task 1 cost in the line under the title: "Grand Total Cost for Task 1 through Task 5" on page 44? For example, if the period for Design, Deployment, Testing, and Validation was three months, ADOT&PF would see "monthly cost x 3 = total PM cost during that period".

Answer #2:

We consider Project Management as a monthly cost for the life of the contract. We will consider and evaluate the cost of Project Management on a monthly basis when evaluating costs 1-5.

Question #3

Would ADOT&PF be willing to modify the requirement ETPER-7? On January 12, 2016 Microsoft announced end of support for IE10, IE9, and IE8 on Windows 7, Windows, 8.1, and Windows 10. IE10 is no longer supported by Microsoft and is therefore very difficult to ensure that websites will perform as expected on that platform.

Answer #3:

Yes, we were not aware of the Microsoft statement from 2016. We are replacing ETPER-7 and also Web-4-8 with the following:

All content and functionality on the 511 Entry Tool and 511.alaska.gov shall be fully operational and accessible by modern web browsers and Internet Explorer 11.

Question #4:

The evaluation process provides scores on the cost, but this does not seem to reflect the solutions adherence to the project requirements. Is there any weighting factor to prevent a minimally conforming but low cost solution from having an unfair advantage?

Answer #4:

Yes, please see RFP Section 5 Evaluation Criteria and Contractor Selection. All proposals determined to be responsive will be evaluated using the listed criteria.

Question #5:

In the requirements matrix, the list includes items (parents requirements) with sub-items. How should these parent items be completed in cases where they are descriptive, and the child items have different answers?

Answer #5:

Please answer each requirement given the choices available to the best of your ability. If the parent and child requirements do not relate to each other or are confusing, please provide the specific requirement number(s) and we will review them and provide further guidance.

Question #6:

Many requirements refer to 'Users', but it is not always clear who this is referring to. In general we would typically break this down into roles such as the 'System Administrators', 'Operators', and 'End Users'. For example, PW-1-1-2 and PW-1-2-2 discuss a topic that would typically be of interest to the System Administrators, but not the End Users. How should these situations be handled?

Answer #6:

Requirements for the Entry Tool will always be users of the Entry Tool system. Deciding the user types that will be notified of system outages or other issues will be defined during the design phase.

Question #7:

Req. IES-1-2-2 - Can more details on the communication scheme and data samples be provided for this interface to the (Amber Alert) system?

Answer #7:

This system is managed by another state agency. DOT&PF is still trying to determine an automated ingest method for the AMBER/Silver Alerts (currently need to be entered into the 511 system separately from the other agency's system which is called ComLabs.) There is a possibility that the next 511 system can access the alerts from nixle.com as with the other local law enforcement highway alerts. Due to the uncertainty on how this will work, IES-1-2-2 is hereby changed to:

The 511 Entry Tool shall acquire alerts (including AMBER/Silver alerts) from the State of Alaska emergency alert system (The State of Alaska emergency alert system currently uses a system developed by COMLABS). Alerts entered and distributed by the State of Alaska emergency alert system are not geocoded. It is not definite how the AMBER/Silver alerts will be ingested into the next 511. Nixle.com is a possible source for these alerts. This will be further defined in the design phase. These will be ingested as floodgates.

Question #8:

Req WEB-1-4-1 - To properly render cameras other meta-data is required beyond the URL. For example, to show them on a map we need the camera location. Is this type of information going to be provided for the desired devices?

Answer #8:

Yes, DOT&PF will provide all of the metadata and lat/longs needed for properly displaying the camera icons.

Question #9:

Req WEB-1-4-4 - Can more details on the communication scheme and data samples be provided for this interface to the (RWIS) system? Does this data feed also include other data such as the device location and current functional status?

Answer #9:

The RWIS data and images will be retrieved from a cloud-based server in the Microsoft Azure environment. DOT&PF is currently in the process of migrating RWIS data and images to the Microsoft Azure platform. The current 511 vendor retrieves the RWIS data from our internally hosted DOT&PF FTP server.

Images and atmospheric data are tied to each RWIS site with a unique site ID. We are adding pavement temperature to the next 511 system which is also available on the FTP server and will be in the Azure cloud environment.

The geolocation information is not part of the data feed. DOT&PF will provide the lat/long with the metadata including the unique site ID for each RWIS site. Current functional status of each RWIS site is not provided in the data feed from DOT&PF at this time.

Question #10:

Req WEB-1-5-1 - Can more details on the communication scheme and data samples be provided for this interface to the (DMS) system? Does this data feed also include other data such as the device location and current functional status?

Answer #10:

To access the sign, the selected vendor will use SNMPv2c or SNMP v3 community access through internet connection with public IP. Message boards shall comply with NTCIP 1203. The current procedure for our two current permanent DMS signs is the 511 vendor polls the signs every 5 minutes to check for a current message. If there is a message, display that message on the 511. The location of a permanent DMS sign (Lat/Long) will be provided to the vendor. For Portable Dynamic Message Boards, the access to portable DMS signs has not yet been decided. It will be provided either by SNMP v2c or v3 community query through the public IP of a cellular modem to the modem, sign controller, or other device (e.g. gps) behind the cell modem. The location of the portable DMS will be determined automatically by query from the vendor via a SNMP query to the sign whenever a message is displayed. Lat/long and other required metadata will be provided by DOT&PF.

Signature:



Date:

8-8-2019

Name:
Title:

Chris Hunt
Procurement Specialist III