ADDENDUM NO. ONE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

PAVEMENT ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE

PROJECT NO. 291-23

CITY OF THORNTON, CO

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: September 21, 2023

PURPOSE: To provide additional information and clarification to the solicitation documents for the above-referenced Project.

1.   The following questions and answers are provided for additional clarification to the RFP.

Question # 1:   Is Thornton's estimated budget of $75,000 for the total project of 421 centerlane miles, or an annual budget?

Answer # 1:   This is the amount budgeted for the first year of the Project.

Question # 2:   Can Thornton supply the centerline mileage broken down by functional classification (i.e., arterials, collectors, residential)?

Answer # 2:   Not at this time without further work and time being involved by Thornton's GIS department. However, that information will be able to be provided by our GIS department upon award.

Question # 3:   How will we be notified of Thornton's decision?

Answer # 3:   The Thornton Purchasing Division will provide an emailed Notice of Regret or a Notice of Award, depending on the outcome.

Question # 4:   Due to the answer deadline (September 22nd) being so close to the RFP deadline (October 2nd), would Thornton be willing to extend the RFP deadline?

Answer # 4:   At this time, Thornton does not anticipate extending the RFP deadline.

Question # 5:   If we propose a system that exceeds the estimated budget, will that disqualify us from further evaluation?

Answer # 5: **No. Pricing is only one (1) of the evaluation criteria for this RFP.**

Question # 6: From Section, E.11 – Evaluation Criteria, what percentages or weights are assigned to each item?

Answer # 6: **Thornton has not assigned individual specific weights or percentages to the Evaluation Criteria listed within Section E.11.**

Question # 7: From Section D.3 – Reimbursable Expenses, is it acceptable to estimate these expenses based on a percentage of direct cost?

Answer # 7: Estimations of proposal pricing for final submission and evaluation are not acceptable. A Vendor's submitted proposal pricing is considered a not-to-exceed price.

Question # 8: If the agreement does not begin until January, how does Thornton propose to handle this situation, since most roads will be covered by ice and/or snow?

Answer # 8: **If a proposing Vendor is able to provide this solution in 2023 after an agreement has been signed, then that is acceptable. Otherwise, Thornton typically will rate the streets in late fall. If the timing for 2023 does not work out, then the first rating cycle would be performed in late fall 2024.**

Question # 9: Is Thornton able to share any detailed data on the construction of your roads over the past twenty (20) years? As-build plans, etc.?

Answer # 9: **The Streets Division of Thornton's Infrastructure Department does not currently view as-built data to be useful, as the as-built data is limited and many streets have been widened, overlayed and/or treated at least once during their lifespan.**

Question # 10: Does Thornton have an overall development plan that can be shared that documents the expansion of the road network over the next 3-10 years?

Answer # 10: **The City Development Department is the holder of these plans and is not participating in this RFP. The Streets Division does not have immediate access to these documents, nor does the Streets Division find these to be germane to this RFP as the plans may be altered by the City Development Department prior to implementation of actual roadways.**

Question # 11: What basis does Thornton use to specify construction requirements for their roads and streets?

Answer # 11: The City Development Department has original sets of

Standards and Specifications. The Thornton Streets Division for the Street Rehab program references these documents and may amend these documents based on their current paving needs. The original sets can be found on the Thornton City Development website at: https://www.thorntonco.gov/government/citydevelopment/Pages/default.aspx

Question # 12: Are there any requirements of a native mobile or web application?

Answer # 12: See the Requirements Traceability Matrix document that is titled "291-23 RFP Appendix No. 1 RTM 08-23-23".

Question # 13: Will Mobile be used in a connected or disconnected mode?

Answer # 13: The application and its use in the field will depend upon the connectivity of a mobile device.

Question # 14: Was a Request for Information (RFI) released for this same project? If so, can you please list the respondents?

Answer # 14: No RFI was released by the Thornton Purchasing Division prior to the release of this RFP.

Question # 15: What electronics are available in the field? Is there a standard for electronics in the field to employees or do they use personal devices?

Answer # 15: The Thornton IT Division provides all electronics for field use. The current standards are a tablet or a rugged Dell laptop, either of which can be data capable.

Question # 16: Your RFP states that your GIS information is in ArcGIS version 10.7. Does Thornton anticipate upgrading this in the future?

Answer # 16: Thornton is currently on Enterprise version 10.8 and ArcMap desktop version 10.7.

Question # 17: Who are your End Users and how many will be using the system?

Answer # 17: Please read Section B.9 – Licensing of the main RFP document.

Question # 18: Did a 3rd party help prepare this RFP? Are they on the selection committee? Are they advising the selection committee? What type of entity are they?

Answer # 18: No 3rd party was used in the creation of this RFP.

Question # 19: Did you have demos of solutions that meet your requirements before? What did you like and dislike about them?

Answer # 19: Proposing Vendors are to put their best product forward based on what they feel best meets/exceeds Thornton's needs from this RFP, including if Thornton elects to have proposing Vendors provide software demos of their proposed solution.

Question # 20: Would you accept features that are on the Vendor's roadmap to be developed as part of this implementation?

Answer # 20: Proposing Vendors are to put their best product forward based on what they feel best meets/exceeds Thornton's needs from this RFP.

Question # 21: Would Thornton be open to a semi-automated pavement condition assessment methodology instead of a windshield survey?

Answer # 21: Please refer to answer no. 20 above.

Question # 22: Is 421 centerlane miles the entire road network? If so, are we only proposing on 1/3 of that?

Answer # 22: The entire network is 421 centerlane miles. Yearly surveys of 1/3 of the paved roadway network are expected each year, thus completing the entire network every three years (year 1 – 1/3, year 2 – 1/3, and year 3 – 1/3). The Vendor's proposed pricing for a Pavement Assessment should be for the cost to survey the entire network. Thornton will assume the Vendor's proposed cost to survey the entire network will be broken up over a three (3) year period.

Example – Vendor's proposed pavement assessment cost = $45,000. Thornton assumes cost for year 1 = $15,000, year 2 = $15,000, and year 3 = $15,000.

Question # 23: Can Thornton provide the existing pavement database? If not, at least the total number of segments Thornton has for their pavement network?

Answer # 23: Thornton will be able to provide access to the existing database and the total number of segments to the awarded Vendor, however, Thornton is seeking for the awarded Vendor to provide guidance on how they assess the roadways and what constitutes a segment within the Vendor's solution.

Question # 24: What is the timeline/deadline that Thornton expects for the data to be delivered?

Answer # 24: **Within the calendar year in which the survey is conducted.**

Question # 25: Is Thornton looking for a traffic sign inventory as an alternative bid? If so, what schema is Thornton looking for?

Answer # 25: **No. Please note RTM ID # 8.1 from Appendix No. 1. These additional features are "nice to haves" but are <u>not</u> kill cards if the Vendor's solution does not currently offer the ability.**

Question # 26: From Section B.1 – Current State, is there any commonality between the older database that no longer meets Thornton's growing needs and the historical GIS data?

Answer # 26: **Yes, network & segments ratings are reflected in GIS and segment ratings have been collected in GIS for several years.**

Question # 27: Is there any fiscal year time constraints for the pavement management software platform to meet budgetary requirements?

Answer # 27: **Please refer to answer no. 24 above.**

Question # 28: With the 10th year of an agreement not completing a full 1/3 per year collection cycle, is the total 421 miles to be collected in the first year and then perform a pavement collection of 1/3 per year the following nine years or is it as indicated in Section B.1 Current State that the collection of the data will be 1/3 of centerlane miles per year for 10 years?

Answer # 28: **Please refer to Section B.1 – Current State. The total number of years for the agreement will not affect the timing of the agreed upon services with the awarded Vendor.**

Question # 29: Does Thornton currently utilize any Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system (e.g., Lucity, Cartegraph, CitiWorks, etc.) for the management of their current pavement needs?

Answer # 29: **No, we do not.**

2. All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged except as provided by this Addendum. Proposing firms must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their Proposal.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. ONE

Megan deGrood, CPPB   Date
Purchasing Manager