



CITY OF RIO RANCHO
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL SERVICES
PURCHASING DIVISION
3200 CIVIC CENTER CIRCLE NE 3rd FLOOR
RIO RANCHO, NEW MEXICO 87144
PHONE: 505-891-5044 FAX 505-891-5762

**ADDENDUM NO (1) One
RFP 14-PW-012
Mobile Asset Data Collection/Sign Inventory**

January 16, 2014

Addendum Number (1) One forms part of the contract documents and modifies them in the manner and extent set forth below.

ATTENTION CONTRACTORS

- Questions & Answers

Questions and Answers

Question: What is the City's existing work order management system? There are multiple asset management systems available for sign inventory management.

Answer: The City does not have a Work Order Asset Management Program. The question refers to showing compatibility of the requested mobile maintenance equipment and software package with Work Order Asset Management Programs currently available in the marketplace. Any recommendations should be compatible with our GIS database. We are hoping that this program will also be used by our Streets and Right-of-Way Division in Public Works and our Park and Recreation Department.

Question: Task II a) states: "... Should include the ability to take retro-reflectivity readings of signs". Does the City simply want the vendor to collect retro-reflectivity data as a part of Task II or does the City desire to acquire retro-reflectivity hardware?

Answer: The inventory is the primary goal of this project. Retro-reflectivity readings while helpful are not absolutely required. If the City chooses to go with a total sign replacement by zone/area in the future then it wouldn't be absolutely necessary. Having the ability to take readings for future maintenance activities would be desirable.

Question: In reference to mobile maintenance equipment, is the City looking for handheld GPS devices?

Answer: If that is part of the recommendation it would be considered.

Question: Does the City have definitions for the overall sign conditions as termed “Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor”?

Answer: Excellent - New or relatively new with no defects visible and very good reflectivity (visually). Good – Minor to no visual defects with good reflectivity (visual). Fair – Sign has visual defects but still exhibits good reflectivity (visual). Poor – Sign has many visual defects with poor reflectivity (visual).

Question: The City has pre-defined attributes in a Sign File Geodatabase, are additional attribute fields anticipated or are additional attribute options under the Field Headings such as Pole_Type anticipated?

Answer: The pre-defined attributes in the Sign File Geodatabase are the minimum attribute fields required for this project. The selected vendor can recommend additional attribute fields if needed. The same applies for attribute options under existing fields.

Question: Are additional sign codes beyond the MUTCD Sign Codes anticipated? For example, does the State of New Mexico or the City have standard sign codes that will need to be included as part of the project?

Answer: The city does not have additional standard sign codes in addition to what is listed in the MUTCD.

Question: Will the City provide preliminary data or will the database be empty with only predefined schema? Will the City provide current GIS mapping of the City roadways for use during data collection?

Answer: The database will be empty with only pre-defined schema in place. The City will make arrangements to provide current GIS mapping of the City roadways for use during data collection.

Question: The City is asking for a File Geodatabase, will it be possible to accept a Personal Geodatabase instead?

Answer: The City would prefer a file geodatabase due to the larger file size capacity and cross-platform compatibility; however, a personal geodatabase would be acceptable.

Question: Does the City maintain an ArcGIS SDE installation?

Answer: Yes.

Question: The RFP refers to a “Work Order Asset Management Program” at the City, what is this program, who published it, and who maintains it? Is the program hosted by the City or by a 3rd party?

Answer: City does not have a Work Order Asset Management Program. The question refers to showing compatibility of the requested mobile maintenance equipment and software package with Work Order Asset Management Programs currently available in the marketplace. Any recommendations should be compatible with our GIS database. We are hoping that this program will also be used by our Streets and Right-of-Way Division in Public Works and our Park and Recreation Department.

Question: What version of GIS software does the City current use and what version should the sign data collection program be compatible with?

Answer: The City uses ESRI ArcGIS 10.2 software.

Question: Can the City share its budget for the current effort?

Answer: Our current budget for this phase is \$86,000.00.

Question: Does the City have a project end date for completion and delivery or all work elements?

Answer: The project should be completed within 6 months of issuance of a NTP.

Question: Are the proposals required to be organized in order by Section 1, Section 2, and Section 3 (as defined on page 9 of the RFP)?

Answer: Yes.

Question: The Cost Reasonableness section counts as part of the 5 page limit for the response and is in Section 3, is it okay that its location is not continuous with the other pages that are part of the 5 page limit?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Should the cost proposals include both Primary and Secondary centerline miles of roadway as identified on page 13 of the RFP?

Answer: Yes and they should be split up into each category.

Question: Does the City want to see the Cost Proposal and relate Cost Reasonableness, itemized to for Task I.a) PRIMARY separately and then Task I.b.) also separately, and incremental to the completion of Task I.a)? We believe that this would be beneficial.

Answer: Yes.

Question: Can the City provide details on the specifics of its GIS infrastructure, both hardware and Esri software and version?

Answer: The City uses ESRI ArcGIS 10.2 desktop software. We have a dedicated server with Windows Server 2008 Standard as the OS, SQL Server 2008 R2 as the DBMS, and use ArcGIS Server 10.1.

Question: The requirements of the Cost Proposal show that it must be a Cost per Centerline Mile of roadway inventoried. This is a logical way to express the Cost for Task I. Should this unit cost include the effort to prepare the documents that would be the final deliverable from the winning contractor conveying the information required by Task II (all parts)? Alternatively, should Task II parts a) and d) be directly answered within the response to the RFP and Parts b) and c) included as separately priced items within the Cost Proposal?

Answer: Task II should be included as separately priced items from Task I.

Question: The RFP specifies that all Warning, Regulatory and Guide signs shall be inventoried. Is it accurate to interpret this to mean all those, and only those, signs that have a MUTCD code “W” for Warning, “R” for Regulatory (including R7-x series Parking) and “D” for Directional (as Guide) including all D3-1 Street Name) shall be inventoried? If not, can the City please provide additional detail regarding the sign series to be included and excluded?

Answer: The city does not have additional standard sign codes in addition to what is listed in the MUTCD.

Question: Does the City have any series of unique of City specific or custom signs that the City considers as part of one of the included categories but do not have a MUTCD designation?

Answer: No.

Question: Can the City publish the budgetary or funding limit for this project?

Answer: \$ 86,000.00

Question: Can you share your criteria for achieving the most available points for the Technical Items 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3 and 4.3.4? Could all proposals receive the same Technical score or will a ranking process be used to create distributed scoring?

Answer: That information is provided in the RFP document in sections 4.3.1 through 4.3.4. The scoring is based on the RFP committee members scoring of each of the scoring criteria. The scores are then averaged to determine the final score.

Question: Are signs to be assessed for Condition according to functionality in daytime viewing, nighttime viewing or both?

Answer: This would depend on the selected vendor’s standard method of data collection. The City does not have a preference.

Question: Can the City provide a detailed shapefile of roads they maintain? Does the shapefile provide a field for paved vs. unpaved roads? The shapefile of City roads available publically from Sandavol County shows a dramatic difference in road miles paved and unpaved from the quantities stated in the RFP.

Answer: The City does maintain and can provide the consultant with a roads centerline shapefile. This layer does have an attribute field with the following classifications: Paved, Graded-Millings, Unmaintained, & Unpaved-Graded.

Question: Does the City partially maintain roads along its border, i.e. one direction of travel?

Answer: No.

Question: Does the City maintain signs within the right of way of non-project roads that intersect with project roads?

Answer: No.

Question: Can the City provide a definition of what constitutes “completion of data collection?” Are the references to 30 and 45 days calendar or working days? Is there an overriding deadline, date or number of days, for completion of the project?

Answer: Completion of data collection would be defined as completion of field data collection. Days referenced are calendar days. The project should be completed within 6 months of issuance of a NTP.

Question: Are some or all of the 145 centerline miles of unpaved roadways passable by vehicle or will these require other methods of data collection?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Has the city been in any conversations with vendors or have you received any demonstrations or proposals in the last 1 ½ years related to mobile data collection? If so, which vendor(s)?

Answer: We have received demos from Data Transfer Solutions, LLC and WH Pacific.

Question: What is the city’s current GIS platform/version?

Answer: The City uses ESRI ArcGIS 10.2 desktop software and ArcGIS Server 10.1.

Question: What is the city’s current Work Order Asset Management Program referenced in Task II (d) on page 13 of the RFP?

Answer: The City does not have a Work Order Asset Management Program. The question refers to showing compatibility of the requested mobile maintenance equipment and software package with Work Order Asset Management Programs currently available in the marketplace. Any recommendations should be compatible with our GIS database. We are hoping that this program will also be used by our Streets and Right-of-Way Division in Public Works and our Park and Recreation Department.

Question: Is there any existing systems or files that contain a city sign inventory?

Answer: No.

Question: What is the anticipated total number of users and concurrent number of users of the Mobile Maintenance Equipment and Software referenced in Task II on page 13 of the RFP?

Answer: 5 total users with no more than 2 concurrent users. These users are specifically for the Engineering Traffic Section. A cost should be provided on a per user basis for additional users over the 5 requested.

Question: How many field users? How many office desktop users? If the city is uncertain at this time, can you provide an estimated number of licenses in order for vendors to provide comparable pricing?

Answer: Ten licenses.

Question: Is the city’s preference to host the mobile maintenance software on city servers or would the city prefer a hosted solution?

Answer: The City would entertain either solution, but would make the final decision on which way to go after all information is presented.

Question: Does the city prefer to host the imagery and its related software solutions related to the mobile asset data collection solution or would the city prefer the vendor host the imagery and provide the city security access via the Internet?

Answer: If possible, the City would prefer to host the imagery and software solutions.

Question: Task II (a) on page 13 of the RFP states, "Should include the ability to take retro-reflectivity readings of signs." Is the city looking to procure retro-reflectometer's? If so, how many units does the city believe they will need?

Answer: If that is part of the recommendation it would be considered. No more than 2 devices would be required.

Question: Also, Task I (e) on page 13 of the RFP states that a retro-reflectivity reading of the signs is not required as part of task one. It is not required, but is it desired in light of Task II (a)?

Answer: The inventory is the primary goal of this project. Retro-reflectivity readings while helpful are not absolutely required. If the City chooses to go with a total sign replacement by zone/area in the future then it wouldn't be absolutely necessary. Having the ability to take readings for future maintenance activities would be desirable.

All other provisions of the Contract Documents shall remain unchanged. Each Offeror should ensure that they have received all addenda and amendments to this RFP before submitting their proposal.