Bid Proposal 14860

Statewide Roadway Data Collection Services

Responses to question Set 3

1. Is there a particular format that the data from the Field Evaluation needs to be delivered in? CSV file, Excel, shape files…etc? Excel or CSV will be acceptable for data collection. Videolog images are specified as jpeg. The location must be able to be read with the imagery.

2. Is there a DMI calibration site near the test routes that the vendors can use prior to the Field Evaluation or do the vendors need to set one up? There is no DMI calibration site.

3. When delivering the Field Evaluation data, can we deliver the data in person to the DOT to install software and provide some basic functional training to view the images and data? No. If we have questions, we will contact the vendor through the purchasing agent.

4. Can the DOT provide their annual budget for this project or provide the contract value of the last pavement data collection project? Budget for this project is unknown at this time. Due to the changes in requirements for data collection from the previous contract to the new contract, the cost of the previous contact value would not be a fair comparison.

5. How does the DOT want the pricing schedule in the proposals for the optional asset data items that are listed on page 30 in Section 3.8?

   1 per mile/per item for primary and 1 per mile/ per item for non-primary

6. On page 31, Section 3.8 Roadway Asset Data Specifications - Optional, it lists MIRE data elements. Are there a certain data elements that are a priority for the DOT? Not at this time

7. The RFP details a large number of urban miles that are required for collection as part of this project. These routes require the same deliverables as the interstate, NHS, non-NHS, and rural routes, however the methodology required to collect urban routes can differ greatly. Collecting in an urban environment involves very short routes, collection of cul-de-sacs, increased traffic at varying speeds, and obstacles not found on interstate and state routes. This increases the time required for collection, and in turn drives up the cost of the project. Other State DOTs have approached this problem by changing the collection specs required for urban routes. Specifically, they have only required the collection of imaging and positional data (and LiDAR for assets, if selected) on these routes, allowing for the use of a smaller and more maneuverable collection vehicle. Instead of the deployment of multiple full pavement vehicles, which are inherently more expensive to operate, these smaller vehicles are able to collect the urban routes more efficiently. For pavement condition data, a visual assessment is performed using the right-of-way images. This option has been selected for statewide projects in the past as it can provide a very noticeable cost savings. Would the Iowa DOT consider this alternative to collecting urban routes? If so, how should it be detailed in the RFP response, as well as the cost proposal?

   The vendors should bid the RFP as-written, but may include unit prices for both primary and non-primary/urban separately in the cost proposal.