STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Automatic Vehicle Location System (AVL) RFP 2016-016

NHDOT Final Responses 3/2/16

Q #	RFP Section / Page #	Paragraph or Reference Language	Vendor Question	NHDOT Response	Response Date	Addendum Reference
1	All pages	Page footer	Is vendor required to submit a copy of RFP doc with each page initialed and dated?	Yes	3/2/2016	
2	General	General	What is the committed State of NH budget funding for this AVL project?	Funds to support this RFP for Fiscal 16 and 17 State's existing budget are available. Funds for State FY 2018, State FY 2019, and State FY 2020 are anticipated to be available upon the availability and continued appropriation of funds in the future operating budget, with the ability to adjust encumbrances between State Fiscal Years through the Budget Office, if needed and justified.	3/2/2016	
3	General	General	Is the intent of the state to purchase wireless (cell carrier) services supporting AVL separately from the AVL solution itself?	This is part of the Vendor's bid within the contract.	3/2/2016	
4	General	General	What would the migration process look like from existing to new?	There are no existing AVL's	3/2/2016	
5	General	General	Is there intent to connect the data received from this system to a constituent facing 511 website or mobile app?	Some of the vehicles will connect to the Bureua of Transportation Systems Management & Operations Advanced Transportation Management System.	3/2/2016	
6	1.2 / p. 10	The Vendor's initial term will begin on the Effective Date and extend through June 30, 2020	Please confirm that the initial term, ending on June 30, 2020, includes the 1 year Warranty Period referred to in Section H-25.8.1.	One year warranty starts after Final System Acceptance	3/2/2016	
7	A-1.1 New Hampshire Highway System / p.26	The New Hampshire Highway System is the public roads system maintained by the NHDOT containing…	Can we get a map of the roads serviced by NH DOT for vehicles to be included in this project?	The provided link is to a map of the roads servied by NHDOT. http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/planning/gis-data-catalog/documents/2016_Tiers1-4.pdf	3/2/2016	
8	APPENDIX C: / p.30	…tracking for a minimum of 65 vehicles of various sizes and configurations. The proposal shall allow for future deployment of more vehicles.	If the State were to include the "full fleet" how many vehicles would be included?	Our full fleet is approximately 525 vehicles.	3/2/2016	
9	C-2.2.3 / p. 33 Compliance Matrix / p. 38 C-6.2.1 / p. 41	The AVL System shall be required to meet specific minimum duration requirements for components and subsystems in continuous operation.	Where are the minimum requirements for MTBF detailed?	Both of these sections will be deleted in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 3 #1 - 4
10	C-2.3 / p. 34	Deliverable Payment Schedule	If the Vendor can apply more advantageous pricing with changes to the Deliverable Payment Schedule, will NHDOT consider an alternate payment schedule in the Vendor's proposal?	Vendors can make suggest changes to the percentages within their Tecnhical proposal. The **Price proposal can not** be changed.	3/2/2016	
11	C-2.4 / p. 37	Preliminary Design Review Meeting: 15 Days from NTP	Should this be 75 days after NTP?	Yes -Preliminary Design Review Meeting should be 75 Days from NTP, this will be address in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 2
12	C-2.4 / p. 38	2 - Existing Functionality; E-EXISTING, M-MODIFY, D-DEVELOP	When it comes to scoring the proposal, how are these various selections weighted against the final scoring criteria?	It's not weighted, Existing is most preferred, Develop is least preferred.	3/2/2016	
13	C-6.2.1 / p. 41	Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF)	What constitutes compliance or non-compliance with this requirement?	This is to be removed, this will be address in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 -4
14	C-6.2.2 / p. 41	Maintenance Performance Requirements	What constitutes compliance or non-compliance with this requirement?	This is to be removed, this will be addressed in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 5
15	C-7.1.3 / p. 42	A location for installations may be provided by NHDOT.	Please clarify whether or not NHDOT will provide a location for installation work. Will the install facility be inside or outside?	NHDOT can provide a facility for inside or outside installations.	3/2/2016	
16	C-7.1.1.17 / p. 44	The system must be accessible and compatible with the NHDOT browser environment, currently Internet Explorer, Firefox, and mobile devices including Apple and Android.	These requirements seem to be both a duplicate and a contradiction to requirements C-3.1.1 / 38 and C-7.3.6 / 49 and C-7.7.4 / 53. Please clarify which requirement applies.	They are not contradictory. IE for desktop, mobile platforms support other browsers.	3/2/2016	
17	C-7.4.3 / pp. 49-50	This section seems to conflict with several sections in C-7.10.	Should vendor select carrier by highest reporting interval between transmissions as stated in C-7.4.3; or, Wireless carrier approved by the state as stated in C-7.10.1; or, Carrier with best coverage as indicated in C-7.10.3; or, carrier with best service rate plan as indicated in C-7.10.4?	C-7.10.1 will be removed in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 6

Q #	RFP Section / Page #	Paragraph or Reference Language	Vendor Question	NHDOT Response	Response Date	Addendum Reference
18	C-7.7.8 / p. 53	Data access anytime and XML data feeds.	Are the data feeds required to be XML? If so, is there a required data format?	It should be an option, no required format.	3/2/2016	
19	C-7.10 Wireless Carrier / 62	Wireless carrier for data transmission shall be currently approved State wireless vendor.	Does the state expect that the AVL solution be available for use on the carrier of State of NH's Choice?	The vendor may choose any carrier to support the AVL. The vendor shall note in their proposal their proposed wireless carrier. This is being removed in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 6
20	C-7.10 Wireless Carrier / 62	Wireless carrier for data transmission shall be currently approved State wireless vendor.	Can we amend existing NH Wireless Cellular & Data Services contract to include this AVL solution? Would this be a sufficient services, software and hardward contract to meet the needs of this solution?	No, the NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
21	C-7.10 Wireless Carrier / p.62	Wireless carrier for data transmission shall be currently approved State wireless vendor.	Can we provision AVL solution under the new NH Wireless Cellular & Data Services contract under RFP issued January 7, 2016 that is scheduled to be on place April 1, 2016?	No, the NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
22	C-7.10.1 / p. 62	Wireless carrier for data transmission shall be currently approved State wireless vendor	Who is the current state approved wireless vendor? If the state approved wireless vendor changes, are we obligated to change the wireless carrier?	See response to question # 19	3/2/2016	
23	C-7.11.18 / p. 65	AVL type report examples	Are the reports listed requirements, or in this section is the vendor supposed to give examples of their reports and data?	The vendor shall inlcuded sample reports within in their proposal.	3/2/2016	
24	C-8 Vehicle List / p. 69	There are two brine tankers mentioned that show basic AVL capabilities.	Do these trucks have sprayers to dispense brine on the roads? If so does the amount of liquid dispensed need to be monitored?	Yes , the amount being dispensed does not need to be monitored at this time but could be in the future.	3/2/2016	
25	C-8 Vehicle List / pp. 69-71	The Vehicle List includes data for spreader and spreader controller models, but no information on number of plows and whether gate sensors are required.	How many plow blades / gate sensors are to be installed?	At this point in time if the Department installs sensors on the plows it will only be the front plows which presently is 57 vehicles. At this point in time the Department doesn't have gate sensors but may in the future.	3/2/2016	
26	D-12 AVL File Transfers to Others / 75	…temperature, etc. to our Maintenance Decision Support System vendor Iteris for their use.	How does the state use Iteris. Can the state describe the Maintenance Decision Support Iteris is providing?	At this point in time the Department will not be transferring data to MDSS but the Department is interested in the proposed vendors abilities and experience in transferring this type of data.	3/2/2016	
27	G-1.4 / p. 82	NHDOT may issue a letter of Commissioning Acceptance and the respective Warranty Period shall commence as described in Section H-25.8.1: Warranty Period	Please confirm the requirement for commencement of the Warranty Period; is it issuance of the Commissioning Acceptance letter or issuance of Final System Acceptance?	The Warranty Period will begin upon the Final System Acceptance unless otherwsie approved by the NHDOT.	3/2/2016	
28	H-22 / p. 90	Additional provisions set forth in the attached Exhibit C are incorporated herein by reference.	Please confirm that the additional provisions referred to are Appendix C of the RFP and that there is not an additional Exhibit C containing special provisions.	Exhibit C, if needed, can be used in the Final Contract. This is for informational purpose during the RFP process.	3/2/2016	
29	H-25.4 / p. 91	Cost of owner supplied hardware or software shall be subcontracted from the Contract	On a lump sum project, how does NHDOT propose to calculate cost with respect to this provision?	This is being removed in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16.	3/2/2016	#1 - 9
30	G-1.6 / p. 83	The proposal shall provide certification that their Software and System environment has undergone penetration testing in accordance with current recommendations from a recognized industry standards organization, such as the U.S. Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards Technology (NIST).	NIST standards regarding penetration testing are written so as to allow for varying scope and rigor of testing (Reference NIST 800-53A Rev 4). Can clarification be provided as to the scope and rigor of the required testing?	G-1.6 Security Review and Testing shall be replaced to reflect the following in Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16. **In their proposal, the Vendor must acknowledge their responsibilities for security testing, including penetration testing. The Contractor shall define their assumptions with regard to scope and rigor as it pertains to the specifics of their proposal.** **Testing shall be performed prior to Initial Acceptance Test, and is a prerequisite to acceptance. The Vendor shall provide results of all security testing to the Department of Transportation/Department of Information Technology for review and acceptance prior to Initial Acceptance Test**.	3/2/2016	#1 - 8
31	H-25.8.2.4 / p. 94	The Vendor shall warrant that the Software shall not contain any viruses, etc.	Vendor requests that this warranty be deleted for COTS Software, unless such warranty is available from the COTS supplier.	The NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
32	H-25.8.3 / p. 96	The State has the right to return the Vendor's product and receive a refund for all amounts paid to the Vendor based on Vendor's failure to correct a Deficiency within 5 business days during the Warranty Period.	Vendor request that the express right to return the product during the Warranty Period for a refund be deleted from the Contract, in favor of reliance on the Termination for Default provisions in H-25.12.1.	The NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
33	H-25.10.11 / p. 100	Confidentiality provisions survive the termination of the Contract.	Vendor requests that an expiration date be provided for these obligations, e.g. 7 years.	The NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
34	H-25.11.8 / p. 104	The Performance Bond shall be maintained by the Vendor...until Final System Acceptance or start of the Warranty Period as approved by NHDOT.	Please confirm that these are the same date; i.e. the Warranty Period commences upon the Final System Acceptance.	Yes - The Warranty Period starts when Final Systems Acceptance has occurred unless approved by NHDOT. See H-25.8.1	3/2/2016	
35	H-25.12.1(b) /p.105	It is our understanding from the language that, in the Event of Default all payments are suspended and any payments that accrue during the cure period will never be paid to the Vendor.	Since this Contract contains a milestone payment schedule, Vendor requests that this provision be deleted so that Vendor can continue to achieve milestones for payment while implementing the required cure if possible.	The NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	

Q #	RFP Section / Page #	Paragraph or Reference Language	Vendor Question	NHDOT Response	Response Date	Addendum Reference
36	Appendix K: Information Technology Requirements / pp. 133-141	Essentially every item in this appendix is marked as Mandatory.	As the State is aware, today, few companies maintain their own in-house servers, instead relying on companies like Amazon, Rackspace and other companies with worldwide redundant highly secure hosting services. Unfortunately, using this technology, a number of the mandatory requirements are impossible for the Vendor to control. What impact does non-compliance on these items have on the vendors scoring for the RFP?	The NHDOT must respectfully decline this request for modification.	3/2/2016	
37	K-4.9 / p. 137	The Vendor shall authorize the State to perform scheduled and random security audits, including vulnerability assessments, of the Vendor' hosting infrastructure and/or the application upon request.	Can you provide the expected frequency of scheduled security audits? Also expectation of total audits both scheduled and random on an annual basis?	Scheduled audits shall occur once a year.	3/2/2016	
38	T-6 / p. 140		Please clarify a required browser – Internet Explorer 8 is no longer supported by Microsoft.	I.E. 10	3/2/2016	
39			What method is there to quote value added options that exceed the specification and have additional costs but may have value to the State?	The following new question #13 will be part of Addendum #1 anticipated to be finalize on 3-4-16. "Vendor's AVL solutions may included other options i.e. vehicle cameras, MDSS data etc. not required in the RFP, please explain these options within your system and provide an approximate cost. This cost will not be part of the scoring."	3/2/2016	#1 - 7