

## Proposal 14927 – Electronic Construction Contract Administration System

### Questions and Responses

**Q1)** How many local agencies are expected to use the system?

**R1)** Iowa has 944 cities and 99 counties who may use the system; however, we currently have 385 LPAs using the Iowa County Engineers Association's Transportation Project Management System (TPMS). We currently expect no more than 500 separate LPAs using this system.

**Q2)** How many local projects per agency are expected to use the system?

**R2)** We expect that a LPA using the system may create an average of 10-15 projects per LPA in a given year.

**Q3)** How many total local projects are expected to use the system?

**R3)** We estimate there may be 350 to 400 locally funded and let projects that may use the system. We are basing this estimate on projects reported by Cities on the Street Finance Report and the 10-year average number of projects created by the Counties using the TPMS local letting tool. The number of locally let DOT projects is available in Question #6.

**Q4)** The requested information in section 4.2.4 "Specifications and Technical Requirements" and section 4.2.15 "Work Plan" appears to be identical. Can you differentiate what is needed in these sections?

**R4)** Bidders are to respond to the requirements in each subsection of Section 3 in as much detail as possible. Section 4.2.15 -Work Plan should be the overall approach to meeting or exceeding the requirements by proposing the selected goods or services to meet the need of the bid proposal. In addition to the detail in Section 3, bidder's work plans should include items such as timeline, additional functionality and any other pertinent information that would assist the evaluators in making the final recommended award.

**Q5)** What is the typical construction project lifecycle at the Iowa DOT? Do you have a process document or flow that depicts this and shows the interplay of various systems during the process?

**R5)** Please see our draft Iowa DOT Office of Local Systems Instructional Memorandum (I.M.) 3.805 located on our website. This I.M. outlines the typical construction project lifecycle and the duties and responsibilities of the project engineer and inspector. Although, the

Contractor is usually able to complete most construction work within one construction season, the construction phase of a typical project may last 2-3 years from letting to final project closeout. Work done after construction is complete includes a review of the project's documentation by the LPA and the DOT, which would be stored in this system.

**Q6)** How many construction projects have you undertaken this fiscal year and what is the average size of these projects?

**R6)** The chart below is for Locally Administered project let by the Iowa DOT. By policy, Federally funded, locally administered projects must be let at the Iowa DOT, with the exception of small Transportation Enhancement projects, generally under \$100,000. This chart does not include locally funded, let, and administered projects where a LPA may choose to utilize this application.

Locally Administered Construction Projects Let by the Iowa DOT (by Calendar Year)				
Year	Number	High	Average	Low
2010	126	\$ 5,216,048.14	\$ 614,810.14	\$ 75,324.00
2011	128	\$ 4,612,864.23	\$ 679,574.80	\$ 39,415.00
2012	104	\$ 6,620,967.68	\$ 720,580.12	\$ 56,433.00
2013	109	\$ 31,090,039.37	\$ 892,182.28	\$ 27,662.50
2013	108	\$ 7,130,000.00	\$ 555,790.25	\$ 27,662.50
Second 2013 entry removes the \$31,090,039.37 outlier project.				
2014	104	\$ 5,914,306.72	\$ 879,986.82	\$ 46,211.58
2015	96	\$ 7,860,886.75	\$ 961,876.01	\$ 57,700.00
2015 through 9/15/ 2015 Iowa DOT Letting				

**Q7)** How many projects have the LPAs managed in the past three years?

**R7)** See questions 3 and 6.

**Q8)** How many Iowa DOT/LPA users will need access to the system? Appreciate if you can provide a break-up of the users; example, administrators-10, project managers-50, mobile users-30, etc.

**R8)** For Iowa DOT Users:

Administrators – 5

Project Managers – 40

Read Only – 5-10

Mobile Users – All users will need mobile access

Per LPA:

Project Managers – 1 – 3

Inspectors – 5 - 30

Read Only – 1 - 5

Mobile Users – All users will need mobile access

Per Contractor:

Project Manager – 1 - 3

Field User – 5 - 30 (includes Sub-Contractors the Prime Contractor may add)

Read Only – 10 - 30

Mobile Users – All users will need mobile access

Per Consultant:

Project Manager – 1 - 10

Inspectors – 5 - 20 (includes Sub-Consultants the Prime Consultant may add)

Read Only – 1 - 5

Mobile Users – All users will need mobile access

Administrators will need to have the ability to make changes to any project in the system until it is archived. Iowa DOT Project Managers will need the ability to add or remove access to an LPA user. LPA Project Managers will need the ability to add or remove inspector, Contractor, and Consultant access on a per project basis. Contractor Project Managers will need the ability to add or remove Field User and Sub-Contractors. Consultant Project Managers will need the ability to add or remove Inspector and Sub-Consultant access.

- Q9)** Please provide scenarios where the new system will have to interface with the Iowa DOT's Electronic Reference Library (ERL). Will it just be a link to Iowa DOT's ERL from within the new system or is data exchange expected between the new tool and the ERL?
- R9)** The system needs to link to the ERL. No information is sent back to the ERL. As an example of the data exchange that is necessary, when a specification is called out by item code, it should link back to the appropriate specification so the project inspector can quickly review the specification. The first 4 digits of an item code are the corresponding 4-digit specification section.
- Q10)** Iowa DOT seems to be using several different systems for managing construction contracts. Are you looking for a new system only to streamline the delivery of locally administered federally funded projects? Or, would you be open to using the new system as a single source for the entire contract management lifecycle?
- R10)** We are only looking for a system to streamline the delivery of locally administered projects. The system should be able to administer both Federal and non-Federal projects. DOT administered projects will not use this system at this time.
- Q11)** Do you have a preference for a vendor-hosted (cloud or software-as-service) model versus an on premise deployment? Do you want vendors to propose both options or can we propose one of the two?
- R11)** We prefer vendors propose both options, however; if a solution is only available in one format or the other, we are willing to consider it.
- Q12)** 2.12.2 "The Bidder states that a requirement of the RFP cannot be met." Is this clause applicable to only the system requirements specified in section 3?
- R12)** This applies to the overall RFP. Please also see 2.13 Nonmaterial and Material Variances.

- Q13)** 3.5.3.3 “Quality Control”...”migration of data into the enterprise spatial database either at the Iowa DOT or on the successful bidder’s server(s).” What is the expectation from the vendor solution related to this migration? What data is stored in the enterprise (Oracle?) spatial database? Is it a one-way flow of data from the new system into the spatial database?
- R13)** This question appears to refer to section 3.5.1.3, instead of 3.5.3.3 so our answer is based on what is written section 3.5.1.3. Additionally there is no section 3.5.3.3. Our expectation from the vendor’s solution is that spatial coordinates generated by your system are validated to make sure they are within the project’s boundaries. We are not migrating any data into our spatial database. Data will be stored in an enterprise spatial database on either your server or ours, depending on your solution’s hosting referencing. This would be a one-way flow of data to the new system from the proposed application.
- Q14)** 3.5.4 clause 20 “the package must be compatible with the Iowa DOT’s Electronic Records Management System (ERMS)”, is the new tool expected to only archive the completed projects in ERMS or do you expect two-way exchange of data between the systems?
- R14)** This question appear to refer to Section 3.5.4 clause 24 instead of Section 3.5.4, clause 20, so our answer is based on what is written in clause 24. The communication is only one-way at this point. We expect multiple files per project that are content specific, for example, but not limited to, plan sets, material certification, test results, etc. The files should be in a searchable .pdf format.
- Q15)** Inspection Worksheets [http://www.iowadot.gov/Construction\\_Materials/inspection.html](http://www.iowadot.gov/Construction_Materials/inspection.html) - this link has many Microsoft Excel worksheets. Is it a fair assumption to make that Iowa DOT expects the new tool to have digital form for these worksheets?
- R15)** Yes we would like the new tool to have digital forms for these worksheets. We are willing to consider linking to the Excel spreadsheet, however; the system must automatically import the resulting data from the spreadsheet into the system.
- Q16)** If the vendor solution is capable of workflow and routing of documents, would you still want us to use DocExpress for signature and approval?
- R16)** Currently, many of the contractors who bid on DOT project also bid on locally led projects. If a solution is proposed that does not include DocExpress as part of the solution, we would consider the difficulty in having a DocExpress method of electronic document transmission for our DOT administered project and a non-DocExpress method of electronic document transmission for locally led projects. We would do this because we would lose efficiencies with our vendors being required to follow two different methods of administering projects let at the Iowa DOT. We are not ruling out alternatives to DocExpress, but a compelling case would need to be made as we currently have the rights to use DocExpress on our DOT let, locally administered projects.
- Q17)** What is the nature of data integration between the new system and Linear Referencing System (LRS)?
- R17)** At a minimum, the system will use the information provided by TPMS and establish a beginning and end point for entire project that can be utilizes the Linear Referencing System. Any data collected tied to the LRS would need to be exportable to a LPA.

- Q18)** Could you explain the materials procurement process for your contracts?
- R18)** The contractor provides materials that is required by the plans and are in conformance with our Standard Specifications. The project inspector is responsible for ensuring that the Contractor complies with this requirement.
- Q19)** Could you please provide scenarios/examples of how payments are certified and processed at Iowa DOT?
- R19)** The project inspector reviews the work performed in a pay period, prepares a pay estimate form, and forwards it to the Project Engineer for approval. After the Project Engineer's approval, payment is processed by following the process set out in Section 3.5.4, items 20-22. For semi-final and final progress payments, the Contractor approval is also required.
- Q20)** Project Plan: The RFP does not explicitly mention any requirements for solution providers to submit a project plan that typically covers the milestones, deliverables and their completion timelines. Is a project plan required to be submitted? If yes, under which section should it be included? If Nov 25, 2015 is the contract start date, when do you want the new software to go live?
- R20)** See 4.2.15 "Work Plan" and response to Question 4.
- Q21)** Evaluation Criteria: The RFP provides the proposal evaluations criteria but does not include the maximum scores for each criterion or how these criteria will be scored. Could you please share the details?
- R21)** We do not share the weights to the evaluation criteria until the time of the Bid Letting.
- Q22)** Iowa DOT has issued an RFI earlier; could you share the list of the vendors that had responded to the solicitation?
- R22)** The following vendors submitted an RFI response. Gaea Global Technologies, Info Tech, Oracle, PMWeb and Aurigo.
- Q23)** Kindly disclose the budget the Iowa DOT has allocated for this initiative.
- R23)** We will not disclose the budget for this project.
- Q24)** Could Iowa DOT consider granting a one week extension to the submission deadline? We believe this will give all vendors more time to put together quality proposals.
- R24)** No, the bid letting will stay set as is.
- Q25)** Can you advise how the Electronic Construction Contract Administration System project will be funded?
- R25)** We will not share how this project is funded.