13605 Questions and Responses

Please note that the e-mail address on the cover sheet for this RFP was incorrect. The correct e-mail address for Laurie Hoing is laurie.hoing@dot.iowa.gov.

Q1. Can you tell us the incumbent for this project?

A1. There is no incumbent.

Q2. Can you provide us with an estimated cost for this project or an upper limit?

A2. Estimated expenditures for projects are not released to vendors during the Procurement process.

Q3. Do you expect the successful bidder to build an entirely new system or utilize some of the components of the current system?

A3. From the standpoint of the software, build an entirely new system as the current system(s) are built on ancient technology (e.g., MapObjects and ArcView GIS 3.2/3.3). However, the primary data (e.g., crash and road) are already housed within Iowa DOT's Oracle Spatial environment and the data definition/lookup files are already available within that same environment.

Q4. **Section 3.3 Application Environment**
The Languages/Tools listed are "VB.Net, ASP.Net, ADO.Net, JavaScript". Would Iowa DOT consider use of other .Net languages? For example C#?

A4. No.

Q5. **Section 3.3.2 Iowa DOT Information and Technology Standards and Procedures / 5th bullet**
These standards state the application should support IE8. Typically, we develop and test our applications to be compatible with the current and immediately prior versions of IE (v10 & v11), Chrome (desktop & Android), Firefox and Safari (desktop and iOS), allowing us to take advantage of the latest HTML5 web standard. As IE8 was originally released in 2009, it has limited support for HTML5 (http://html5test.com/compare/browser/ie-8/ie-9/ie-10/ie-11.html). Would it be acceptable for the application to be compatible with IE10+, not IE8 or IE9?

A5. If the application is not compatible with IE8 or IE9, the vendor must alert the user through browser detection that it will not work in these versions and give them alternatives.

Q6. **Section 3.3.2 Iowa DOT Information and Technology Standards and Procedures / 11 bullet**
The 11th bullet states "Highway Support Team will review the programming code throughout the development process." Can you provide more details on these code reviews, especially with regards any impact they could have on schedule or budget?

A6. Since the Iowa DOT will eventually be responsible for the deliverable, it would be best if the Iowa DOT staff is familiar with the code in sections rather than obtaining the whole solution. Ideally, Iowa DOT staff would receive a section of the application with the code and would suggest modifications or approve as delivered within 60 to 90 minutes. This would not interfere with schedule as code review can be performed within a very small window of time.

Q7. **Section 3.3.2 Iowa DOT Information and Technology Standards and Procedures / 12 bullet**
What is the current DOT approved security tool?

A7. The Iowa DOT uses HP WebInspect to check Iowa DOT sites for security vulnerabilities and the sites must be WCAG 2.0 levels A and AA compliant.

Q8. **Section 3.3.6 Standard for GIS web applications**
Would Iowa DOT consider a solution based on the Leaflet Map API (http://leafletjs.com/)?

A8. Iowa DOT prefers development which leverages the currently licensed tools per section 3.3.6: GeoCortex Essentials, ArcGIS Online, or ESRI Javascript API. Iowa DOT will evaluate other technologies for their functionality vs. long-term maintenance impact.

Q9. **Section 3.5.1.2 Query/Filter Module**
Allowing users to query the database using SQL can induction severe security concerns, especially due to code injection. Would Iowa DOT consider a slightly different approach where wizards are used to generate the SQL statements rather than allowing them to enter SQL directly? Such an approach may also extend the use of this functionality to users who are less familiar with SQL.

A9. The envisioned query/filter module would allow users to work through their selections in an organized, understandable fashion. Iowa DOT does not intend to require users to write/develop SQL statements. Iowa DOT also did not intend to imply that SQL statements were required…see paragraph 3 below.

The mention of SQL was meant to indicate that, as these selections were being made, the SQL would be available for more advanced users to tweak, customize, or retain if desired. The Iowa DOT is aware of the potential issues but is interested in the flexibility. Perhaps this functionality could be "hidden" unless requested. Creative Solutions are encouraged.

The Iowa DOT may have erred in the use of the term "SQL" when what was meant is that the query structure would be constructed and available (e.g., "(([DriverAge] >= 21 and ([DriverAge] <= 25)) and ([VConfig] = 14)" to find motorcycle-related crashes involving drivers between age 21 and 25 (inclusive)). Users might want to take this example further and limit the crashes to those involving motorcyclists between those ages which would require the vehicles/units to match. Again, creative solutions to enable this are encouraged.

Q10. **Section 3.5.1.3 Report Generation Mode**
Does Iowa DOT currently have a standard Report Development Kit? If so, which?

A10. If you leverage GeoCortex, the report designer in that software can be leveraged. The Iowa DOT does have Dundas available. See response to Q8.

Q11. **Section 4.3 Schedule of Prices - Cost Proposal**
The RFP instructs bidders to use additional pages for the detail information requested, in support of the Schedule of Prices. What type and level of supporting cost detail is required, if any?

A11. Use of additional pages is not required but may be used for additional detailed information.

Q12. **Section 6.13 Indemnification by Contractor**
The indemnification provision makes the consultant responsible for all claims that arise that relate to the performance of the contract. Based on the nature of the work, this would expose the consultant to an almost unlimited extent. Can the consultant propose alternate language for this provision as part of the proposal?

A12. Please refer to Section 6.1 regarding exceptions to terms and conditions.

Q13. **Section 6.15 Payment**
This section states that payments will be made only on completion and acceptance of deliverables, such as hardware, software, installation and maintenance and support. As there would be a long software development phase of this project, would Iowa DOT entertain a payment schedule that provides for interim deliverables and payments?

A13. Please refer to Section 6.1 regarding exceptions to terms and conditions.

Q14. **Section 6.21 Contractor Warranties**
Warranties are included in contract terms. Among them, the consultant has to ensure that the software performs in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract indefinitely. While the software will be developed to perform in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract using the current tools and technologies, it is not possible to ensure this beyond the term of the Contract. Can the warranty language be adjusted to stipulate this performance period?

A14. Please refer to Section 6.1 regarding exceptions to terms and conditions.

Q15. Please confirm that there will not be a pre-bid Bidders Conference.

A15. There will not be a pre-bid Bidders Conference for this RFP.

Q16. Has a budget been identified for this project?

A16. See response to Q2.

Q17. While this is will be a web-based tool and should be accessible by any device with internet capabilities, should the experience be optimized for a mobile device? If smartphone and/or tablet?

A17. Per the table in section 3.3, desktop and table (preferred), smart phone (optional). Yes, it should be optimized for tablet. The smartphone version may be scaled down with less features and an option to go to the full-site (mobile-only version).

Q18. Are you OK with an out-of-state vendor?

A18. Yes.

Q19. Introduction (Section 1.2, page 12), “special users”; Can you provide more detail regarding envisioned use cases for “special users”

A19. The term "special users" was meant to convey a sense of users who might be outside the range of normally considered users and, as such, the term is admittedly nebulous. However, these users would still fit within the 5Es and, to the extent possible, flexibility should exist within the system to accommodate users both known and unknown. Creative solutions are encouraged.

Q20. Introduction (Section 1.2, page 12), "open access – the application shall provide all functionality, packaged to serve all customers across all devices without a logon requirement"; The use of secured services and active directory seems to be in conflict with the open access requirement. Please clarify.

A20. The public will have access to the site without credentials. Secured services or SSL will be the standard for reading map services (https://geonexusr.iowadot.gov/arcgis/rest/services). If there is a component built that provides more sensitive information to DOT employees or outside vendors, active directory will be used.

Q21. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.1, page 26); "…that will update, consolidate, and expand the current Iowa crash analysis tool features and functionality", Does Appendix A represent the *consolidated* list of requirements for the envisioned system?

A21. Yes. Also included with this list in Appendix A are envisioned phases and timeframes as well as prioritization.

Q22. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.3, page 27); "Application will be built on Microsoft.Net Framework 4.5 or later", Would Iowa DOT consider basing the application on an alternative technology (for example, Esri's Web AppBuilder)?

A22. Yes, per section 3.3.6, the web map infrastructure must be built on GeoCortex Essentials, ArcGIS Online or ESRI's JavaScript API (including ESRI Web App Builder). The Microsoft Framework is only if there is something constructed outside the map framework.

The following questions pertain to Section 3.3.2, pages 28-29.

Q23. "The Information Technology Division is responsible for determining the business necessity for secure servers." "REST services and interfaces can be secured using active directory." The use of secured services and active directory seems to be in conflict with the open access requirement. Please clarify.

A23. See response to Q20.

Q24. "Use the Department's web template and navigation, the web template will be provided to the consultant"; Would Iowa DOT consider basing the application on an alternative technology (for example, Esri's Web AppBuilder)?

A24. Yes, see response to Q22.

Q25. "Follow the Department's editing procedure (The Department's copy editor shall edit all text prior to website development, excluding database table content)"; would a review of the draft site by the copy editor and incorporation of the feedback from the copy editor be sufficient?

A25. Yes.

Q26. "Use applications, software, and scripts supported by the Department"; would Iowa DOT consider selective use of alternative applications, software and scripts (for example, Esri Web AppBuilder, ArdGIS Online, HTML/JavaScript and python)? Would Iowa DOT consider selective use of usRAP tools?

A26. Yes for ArcGIS Online, ESRI Web App builder, HTML/JavaScript (with ESRI JavaScript API). Python is discouraged. See response to Q8.

Pertaining to the usRAP portion of the question, though aware of usRAP, the Iowa DOT is not certain what is meant by "selective use of usRAP tools" and would need further information on how these tools would integrate. Creative solutions are encouraged.

Q27. "Develop the web application on Iowa DOT test and production servers. Consultants will be given access to the Test environment at the Iowa DOT to develop their application." We typically develop and test internally. Also, we typically do not develop on production systems.

A27. Not sure what the question is but see response to Q28 which seems similar.

Q28. "Develop the web application on Iowa DOT test and production servers. Consultants will be given access to the Test environment at the Iowa DOT to develop their application." Will periodic releases posted to the Iowa DOT test servers work for Iowa DOT?

A28. Yes, see response to Q6.

Q29. "Highway Support Team will review the programming code throughout the development process. Both Highway Support Team and the consultants will agree on the timing of the reviewing process." What is the methodology/technology and expected outcome for these reviews?

A29. Using Visual Studio, to set up an FTP location where DOT developers can deliver the solution for code review. DOT staff will test the application in the test environment within a short period of time (60 - 90 minutes). The goal to a "lightweight" review where very quickly Iowa DOT staff can identify if the project is going as expected versus waiting weeks to find out the application is not what is expected.

Q30. "External web-based applications shall be tested with the current DOT approved security tool." What tool will be used, and what level of compliance would be expected? (typically there are issues discovered by these tools that are of varying levels of concern.)

A30. The Iowa DOT uses HP WebInspect to check Iowa DOT sites for security vulnerabilities and sites must be WCAG 2.0 levels A and AA compliant.

Q31. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.3.3, page 28), "…existing Server Infrastructure"; What are the number of cores/ratings, available memory, expected concurrent users etc. for the intended platform?

A31. The Iowa DOT basic build is 4 cores @ 2.13GHz or faster and 4GB of memory, but The Iowa DOT uses VMware and they can be scaled to whatever is needed.

Q32. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.3.6, page 29), "..interface development – any or in combination… Option 1 – Geocortex…"; Would Iowa DOT consider use of Option 1 alternatives (including, for example, Esri Web AppBuilder)?

A32. See response to Q20.

Q33. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.3.4, page 29) in the RFP reads "The Safety Analysis Tool application will be hosted by the Iowa DOT." What level of *platform and/or network bandwidth adjustments* can we expect Iowa DOT to support in order to facilitate proper response times for the delivered application?

A33. The platform the Iowa DOT will be using is Windows Server 2012 R2 and IIS will be used to host the website. Currently there is a 240mb bandwidth pipe for the Iowa DOT webservers.

Q34. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.1, page 30) in the RFP reads "User will be able to save their drawn features for later loading/reuse." Is this referring to saved graphics or features?

A34. This comment was related to the "user drawn (e.g., points, circles, lines, polylines, rectangles, polygons/beats) features". The save/reload option is meant to allow users to retain their site selection/identification parameters for subsequent requests (e.g., to enable continual monitoring of the same site without need to redraw the selection area).

Q35. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.2, page 31) in the RFP reads, "Often used queries/filters should be tracked and shown as "trending", with a quick method of replicating the query/filter..." Is "replicating" meaning the same as utilizing?

A35. Yes.

Q36. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.2, page 31) in the RFP reads; "Users will be able to save their selections and load them later, creating user-defined, "standardized" selection sets." The use of the term "selection sets" is not clear. Is this a query to replicate the selection or a list of the features selected?

A36. "Selection sets" in this context refer to a listing of the attributes that were selected to be queried on (e.g., Vehicle Configuration = Passenger Car, Four-tire light truck (pick-up, panel), Van or mini-van, and Sport utility vehicle) which, when the "selection set" is saved (e.g., as "Passenger Vehicles"), it can be later reloaded and utilized. Within the current SAVER system, this operation manifests as a saved file listing all the attributes selected that, when later reloaded, automatically set the options within the query GUI per the "selection set". Basically, this allows users to define standard queries specific to themselves which should increase consistency, especially from session to session, and reduce time spent selecting attributes.

Q37. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.3, page 32) in the RFP reads; "Users will be able to save their selections and load them later, creating user-defined, "standardized" selection sets." The use of the term "selection sets" is not clear. Is this a query to replicate the selection or a list of the features selected?

A37. Same idea as the response to Q36 but for standard report sets that the users might want to generate (e.g., perhaps a user is analyzing a set of 25 intersections and doesn't wish to specify the reports to generate every time and, taking this further, perhaps this user knows this analysis will be periodic or that another set of intersections will be analyzed later using the same reports).

Q38. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.3, page 32) in the RFP reads; "…via an enhanced interface which will also enable user-defined report creation…users will be provided an ability to develop their own reports using a visual, drag-and drop environment (i.e., a Report Development Kit (RDK))." Does Iowa DOT have an existing enterprise reporting system (i.e.: SQL Reporting Services) that could support user define/published/private reporting?

A38. See response to Q10.

Q39. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.4, page 33) in the RFP reads; "If the proposed RFP solution were to utilize Crash Magic Online, a seamless connection would be preferable." If we elected to interface with pdMagic -- would Iowa DOT provide access to pdmagic's external interface as well as the online software (for all phases of the project)?

A39. No. If the proposed solution utilizes Crash Magic Online, please list additional costs as a separate line item on your cost proposal.

Q40. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.1.6, page 33) in the RFP reads; "The special operations module encapsulates features not part of the other modules..." Can you provide envisioned use cases?

A40. Per section 3.5.1.6 and section 7 of Appendix A, example use cases are applications of SPFs, CMFs, and calculation of rates and densities.

Q41. The Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.2, page 33) in the RFP reads; "As indicated above, Iowa DOT envisions several datasets as part of the proposed safety analysis, visualization, and exploration resource":

a. Are these datasets envisioned to be provided by Iowa DOT? In other words, the awarded vendor should not expect any data conflation/migration/correction activities, but rather Iowa DOT will be solely responsible for the "data" (except application required internal tables)?

b. Is existing Iowa DOT sample data available? If so, how do we acquire it?

A41. a. Yes. Data will be available or Iowa DOT will need to make it available to meet the requirements.
b. Sample crash data are now available via an FTP site:

ftp://165.206.203.34/TrafficSafety/TrafficSafetyPublic/

under the "_saver Statewide Crash Data – 2004 – 2014 – 20150415" folder. These crash data represent the full, non-personal crash dataset. A format file is available under the same folder.

Sample roadway data are available via:

http://www.iowadot.gov/gis/downloads/zipped_files/GIMS_History/Statewide/

with metadata available via:

http://www.iowadot.gov/gis/downloads/zipped_files/GIMS_History/metadata/.

Q42. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.2.1, page 34) in the RFP reads; "For public release, these data will need to be cleansed of personal data; however, there is an interest internally to have these personal data available". Will Iowa DOT do the mentioned cleansing or will this be the responsibility of the awarded vendor?

A42. Iowa DOT has cleansed the crash data.

Q43. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.5.2.1, page 34) in the RFP reads; "Further information and use cases are available at: http://www.iowadot.gov/tsda/crash.html, http://www.iowadot.gov/tsda/crashreports.html, http://www.iowadot.gov/tsda/crashmaps.html". There are several cases where links to "use cases" are provided as in this example. Are these links included as the pointers to content representing additional requirements (e.g. Reports, Maps) for the project?

A43. Provision of these links is meant to convey a sense of current output provided by Iowa DOT tools and not to limit options. Creative solutions are encouraged.

Q44. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.10.2, page 38) in the RFP reads; "Bidders shall list all options available for 24/7/365 support, including but not limited to including an escalation plan for calls received."

a. Do we understand that Iowa DOT would like the awarded vendor to provide tech support 24/7/365?
b. Is this support for the web application only?
c. Does Iowa DOT have staff for support of the platform (processors, storage, network…)?
d. What is Iowa DOT s expectation for initial (Tier 1) call support (Iowa DOT or awarded vendor)?
e. Once awarded vendor deems it to be a platform issue does Iowa DOT envision that the call would be routed to appropriate Iowa DOT platform support?
f. Would the awarded vendor be provided administrative access to perform required support?

A44.
a. No. Iowa DOT will be Tier 1 support.
b. Yes.
c. Yes.
d. Iowa DOT.
e. Yes.
f. Access would be provided for web application support.

Q45. Specifications and Technical Requirements (Section 3.2, p.26) in the RFP reads; "More details of current SAVER…..functionality…" Is a user manual or design documentation available for the current SAVER application? If so, how would it be possible to acquire it?

A45. Per the response to Q41, the available user manual and training examples are now available via the same FTP site and folder. The GUI and functionality represented within these documents were built on

ancient technology (e.g., ArcView GIS 3.2/3.3) and should not constrain the proposed solution. Creative solutions are encouraged. See also the response to Q50.

Q46. Section 1.2 – Overview: "open access – the application shall provide all functionality, packaged to serve all customers across all devices without a logon requirement"

1) Please clarify the desire of the system to serve all customers without a logon. Although data for reporting can be made available to non-secure and non-licensed users, many applications use "user sign-on" to facilitate the administration of role based functionality, data &/or model inputs, system security and administration, and even the retention of user preferences and settings.

2) Will the Iowa DOT consider a proven system that requires some level of user name and password access (can even be Single-Sign-On) for the core application and main users of the system?

3) Please clarify the total number of users expected to utilize the proposed application. This number is an important factor in determining licensing, system architecture, and training needs.

A46. 1) There will be no logon. All functionality will be available to all users. The user will save their own data, preferences, or settings to their computers. Iowa DOT will not store user data, preferences, or settings.

2) No, see response to Q46, part 1.

3) At one time there were roughly 1,000 users of both CMaT and SAVER.

Q47. Section 3.1 – Purpose: "The purpose of this RFP is to create a custom-built "Safety Analysis Tool" website that will update, consolidate, and expand our current Iowa crash analysis tool features and functionality", There is at least one Commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) applications that has been successful deployed across several US State DOTs that can be configured to meet the functional needs specified by Iowa DOT. Would Iowa DOT be open to a configurable COTS solutions?

A47. See response to Q8.

Q48. Section 3.5 - Technical Requirements (Scope): "The Iowa DOT is open to alternate concepts, with the vision representing an ideal solution", There is at least one Commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) applications that has been successful deployed across several US State DOTs that can be configured to meet the functional needs specified by Iowa DOT. Would Iowa DOT be open to a configurable COTS solutions?

A48. See response to Q8.

Q49. Section 3.3 - Application Environment: "Application will be built on Microsoft.Net Framework 4.5 or later", Would Iowa DOT be open to an applications that utilizes an Oracle and J2EE environment?

A49. See response to Q8. Yes to Oracle.

Q50. Appendix D: "CMaT Download Instructions – FTP", We have not been successful downloading and running the CMaT application. Is there someone who we may contact to with questions specifically related to this issue with the CMat application?

A50. As per section 2.2 of the RFP, bidders may only contact the issuing agent. Appendix B and E should be sufficient for indications of CMaT functionality and output. Appendices B, C, D, E, and F are meant to convey current systems capabilities but not to limit solutions. Creative solutions are encouraged. See also the response to Q45.

Q51. In order to maximize what is provided for the resources available, will Iowa DOT confirm your project budget for both implementation period and ongoing support & maintenance?

A51. Please see response to Q2.