



ADDENDUM #1
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
No. 2017-005

Effective: September 13, 2016

Project: GIS Stormwater Infrastructure Database Design and Population

Issued By: Procurement Manager 
City of Gaithersburg
Division of Procurement
31 South Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

This addendum (“Addendum”) is incorporated into and made part of the above named Request for Proposals (“Solicitation”). The purpose of this Addendum is to publish the questions asked by Bidders and the City’s answers thereto relative to the Solicitation. The City is not responsible for the content of the questions, and the answers to the questions are based on the interpretation of the questions. Said questions and answers thereto are incorporated herein and attached hereto.

~ END OF ADDENDUM ~

Questions and Answers for RFP 2017 005 – GIS Stormwater Infrastructure Database Design and Population

Page	Section	Question	City Response
-	-	Our business is interested in responding to the above RFP. Is remote attendance possible at the pre-submission?	We allowed remote attendance at the Pre-Submission meeting. The details were published as an Amendment on the City's Procurement website.
-	-	Where can the RFP be obtained?	The RFP can be accessed from the City's procurement website. http://www.gaithersburgmd.gov/government/procurement/current-bids Please click the link for "GIS Stormwater Infrastructure Database Design and Population," then look for "Related Documents."
-	-	Are overseas companies permitted to apply for this tender?	We will accept proposals only from companies that are located within the United States for this RFP.
-	-	How will the public know which Offeror has been awarded the City's contract? Will the name of the contractor awarded be announced somewhere on the City's website?	Contract information will be available to the public after the award. The information will be posted to the City's meeting management website, so this is currently not available. The meeting management website can be accessed from the Mayor and Council meeting webpage: http://www.gaithersburgmd.gov/government/mayor-and-city-council When the contract is presented to the Mayor and Council, the meeting materials will be available for public use. Alternatively, you can also check with Yeon Kim, GIS Division Manager, at ykim@gaithersburgmd.gov approximately one month after close of the RFP.
-	-	Why are you sending this RFP?	For the objective, please see Sections 8.1 and 8.2 of the RFP.
-	-	Why did you include us?	All qualifying companies are invited to offer proposals. Please refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP.
-	-	What is the timeline?	Please see Sections 3.1 and 8.4 of the RFP for the solicitation schedule and project timeline respectively.
-	-	How many firms are competing?	That information will be available upon request after the proposals are received per the Solicitation schedule. The meeting sign-in sheet from the Pre-Submission meeting is available online on the City's Procurement website.
-	-	Is there an incumbent?	No. We do not have a consultant retained for this project.
-	-	What database platform are you currently using?	The City uses Esri geodatabase with Microsoft SQL Server at the back end.
-	-	Where is your data hosted? Will you require new hosting?	The City hosts its own data and does not seek new hosting. Whatever intermediate data the Contractor may create during the process of designing and populating the geodatabase, however, shall be hosted by the Contractor.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
-	-	How large is the current geodatabase?	The current geodatabase can be zipped into a 2MB file. It is a simple database designed over a decade ago and has no topology rules. The City expects that the new design will have topology rules allowing us to enforce that aspect of QA/QC.
-	-	Do you query the database using formal reporting software?	No. We query directly in ArcMap and do not currently require formalized reporting.
-	-	Do you need replication?	No replication is needed at this time.
-	-	Are there any views, triggers, or stored procedures built into the database at this time?	We do not have any custom triggers or stored procedures; however, we do have a view set up for mail merge using BMP Owners and BMP management tables.
-	-	Do you have a preference for place of performance (Contractor on-site or off-site)?	Please provide your own off-site office space.
-	-	Is there a local preference for the RFP?	No, but the City expects the selected Contractor to be able to follow all local regulations and requirements.
-	-	Which build version and platform of Esri ArcGIS is the City currently using? Is the same version planned for the future development of this project or will an upgrade be expected during that timeframe?	The City is currently using Esri ArcGIS version 10.3.1, but will soon be upgrading to version 10.4.1. The upgrade will occur before completion of the project.
-	-	Do you have any preference in terms of database compatibility?	The final deliverable must be Esri format, compatible with whatever version the City is using at the time of delivery (currently 10.3.1, soon to be 10.4.1). The Contractor may use whatever technology it deems fit to design the geodatabase.
-	-	1. Are covers and tab dividers allowed as part of the proposal? 2. If yes, will they count against page limits?	1. Yes, covers and dividers are allowed. 2. No, they will not count against page limits.
-	-	What is the potential cost range that the City is expecting to spend for completing this project? Are the monies currently budgeted and from what source(s) (i.e. local, state, federal, etc.)?	An internal budget has been established, but cannot be disclosed at this time.
-	-	May a firm propose an alternative option(s) without having to also propose directly to the specific tasks' methodologies outlined/requested in the original RFP?	Alternative options are welcome, but must be proposed in addition to the methodologies outlined in the RFP. The use of proposed alternative methodologies will be at the City's sole discretion.
-	-	Does the City expect the contractor to perform any field verification during the Pilot Area phase of the contract (10 days from Part I Approval), or simply highlight features requiring field verification as such within the database to be conducted after the Pilot?	No field verification is required during the pilot phase, but the Contractor is expected to flag features that may require field verification later on.
-	-	Is the City utilizing Portal for ArcGIS in regards to web app development and hosting?	No, the City currently uses ArcGIS Online.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
-	-	Will remote access to City systems/facilities be possible?	We expect that remote access to the City's database will not be needed. Access can be granted if the need arises.
-	-	Does the City currently integrate any other database systems which communicate, or there is a desire to communicate, with the GIS geodatabase (i.e. Enterprise Asset Management database, O&M database, MS4 compliance and reporting database, Electronic Document Management database)?	We are hoping to implement an asset management system in the future and hope that the new stormwater database will be as compatible with it as possible.
4	3.1 Solicitation Schedule	When will the Questions and Answers document be available?	The City will make questions and answers available by 5pm on Wednesday, September 14, 2016.
5	4.1 Proposal Format and Content	The City's required Proposal Format and Content does not list a Cover Page and Cover/Transmittal Letter as required. Should the Contractor provide a Cover Page and Cover/Transmittal Letter for both the Technical and Price Proposals?	The Contractor may provide a Cover Page and Cover/Transmittal letter but this is not required. This will not count towards the page limits.
6	4.1 Work Plan	What is this summary chart supposed to contain/illustrate?	The summary chart will illustrate the Management Plan showing the responsibility distribution amongst the project members.
6	4.1 Work Plan	The RFP indicates that a summary chart is to be provided. Will an organizational chart be accepted as the summary chart for this section?	No. The purpose of the summary chart is to provide an overview of the six bullet points provided on Page 5 of 39 and Page 6 of 39 under Section 2: Work Plan. The purpose of six (6) pages (maximum) of the remaining section is to provide as much detail as needed to convey the full Work Plan.
6	4.1 Management Plan and Timeline	The Management Plan and Timeline indicates that a summary chart is to be provided. Will a schedule be accepted as the summary chart for this section?	Yes.
10	5.3 Evaluation Criteria	What role will pricing play in the final decision?	The percentages applied to each of the evaluation criteria will be available with the scores upon request after Contract Award/Non-award by the Selection Committee.
10	5.3 Evaluation Criteria	Is there a priority or weighting of the criteria? If yes, can the city please provide this?	The percentages applied to each section will be available with the scores upon request after Contract Award/Non-award by the Selection Committee.
12	6.6 Binding Proposal	Given the requirement to complete the project by December 2017, what is the anticipated award date and notice to proceed for this solicitation?	The award and notice to proceed are anticipated to be released in November or December 2016.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
24	8.1 Introduction and Background Information	<p>1. In cases of conflicting source documents that are to be used for stormwater system feature and attribute updates, has the City determined a precedence as to the “best available source” for particular map location and attribute data for each stormwater asset, or would conflicting sources be treated as candidates for field verification?</p> <p>2. Please provide a complete description of the City’s current GIS system capabilities pertaining to: ArcGIS Online or ArcGIS for Server Portal implementation; ArcGIS for Server/SDE/RDBMS software implementation, software versions, and any ArcGIS Server extensions; and ArcGIS Desktop version and desktop extensions.</p>	<p>1. In cases of conflicting documentation, the most recent and/or most complete plans shall be prioritized, according to the Contractor’s best judgment. The City would be available to provide input and background information as necessary. Conflicting sources shall be flagged and will be considered as field verification candidates to be determined by the City.</p> <p>2. The City’s GIS system capabilities are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City has ArcGIS Desktop and ArcGIS Server installed, all in 10.3.1. • We currently have ArcGIS Online for Organization set up with a pool of 16 user accounts. • Standard ArcGIS server is installed in Windows Server 2008 R2 operating system. Enterprise Geodatabase is housed in Microsoft SQL Server 2012. We do not have any ArcGIS server extensions. • For ArcGIS 10.3.1 Desktop, we have floating licenses for the following extensions (number of licenses in parentheses): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3D Analyst (2) ○ Data Reviewer (2) ○ Spatial Analyst (2) ○ Data Interoperability (1)
24	8.1 Introduction and Background Information	<p>1. Your database already contains approximately 600 BMPs, is that correct?</p> <p>2. If so, what remains to be updated for the stormwater geodatabase?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. The Contractor will not likely need to create BMP facilities, but is expected to QC the existing data and correct errors as necessary throughout the scope of the project. BMPs were updated in 2014 and City staff believe they are in good shape. However, we have many other stormwater and storm drain feature classes that could not be addressed at all in the 2014 update. Examples of errors that may be seen are missing inlets, pipes not connecting, inaccurate geometry, and poor or missing attribute data, etc. We are looking for guidance on how to bring these and other feature classes together into a new stormwater geodatabase model that is as complete as possible.</p>
24	8.1 Introduction and Background Information	<p>What is the significance of mentioning the number of BMPs and other feature classes in the current database?</p>	<p>Numbers of features are provided solely as a general reference so that Offerors can gauge the scale of work involved.</p>

Page	Section	Question	City Response
25	8.3 Stormwater Geodatabase	<p>1. The end of the second paragraph in this section mentions that the City's current stormwater feature classes do not reflect the full set of feature classes needed to support the City's database design requirements. Does this mean that the project might involve creating new stormwater features for assets constructed prior to the last inventory update completed in 2014?</p> <p>2. Is this in reference to stormwater feature classes in the Esri LGIM which the City does not have an equivalent feature class? If so, which ones would need to be created, and approximately how many would have to be added for each missing feature class?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the project might involve creating new stormwater features for assets constructed prior to the last inventory update.</p> <p>2. In reference to stormwater feature classes in Esri's LGIM for which the City does not currently have an equivalent feature class, we anticipate the need to add cleanouts, control valves, open drains, and virtual drainlines, but we do not offer this as a complete list. The Contractor shall be responsible for determining the number of features in each missing feature class and for fully populating their attributes.</p>
25	8.3 Stormwater Geodatabase	<p>1. Do the stormwater datasets contain all surface stormwater structures and corresponding pipe network locations (i.e. culverts, headwalls, manholes, inlets, pipes)?</p> <p>2. How many inlets are in your system approximately?</p>	<p>1. The existing stormwater datasets contain multiple structure and pipe network locations; however, additional feature classes may need to be added to the database. Additionally, individual features may be missing or need to be corrected for location or attribute accuracy.</p> <p>2. Approximately 5,500 inlets.</p>
25-29	8.3-8.4; Exhibit E Stormwater Geodatabase	<p>You list a specific number of feature classes. Do you need additional ones?</p>	<p>The Contractor is to review the City's existing database and propose a new stormwater database schema that incorporates the industry's standards and best practices (LGIM, MDE/NPDES database requirements, etc.) while retaining certain essential feature classes identified in Section 8.4 Part I. Please see this section of the RFP for a complete overview.</p>
25 & 29	8.3-8.4 Stormwater Geodatabase & Multiple Use Cases/Business Cases	<p>1. Are the X/Y locations of the GIS stormwater datasets inventoried at an acceptable accuracy, or do you expect the consultant to adjust locations by doing field verification?</p> <p>2. What X/Y and Z elevational accuracy is acceptable for this project?</p> <p>3. What coordinate system is acceptable for this project?</p>	<p>1. Location information may need to be field verified by City or Contractor staff depending on Contractor recommendations and City staff's judgement.</p> <p>2. X/Y accuracy should be within 1 foot; Z accuracy should also be within 1 foot if collecting.</p> <p>3. NAD_1983_HARN_StatePlane_Maryland_FIPS_1900_Feet</p>

Page	Section	Question	City Response
26	8.3 Engineering Records	<p>1. What will be the starting point for this inventory update relative to where the previous stormwater update in 2014 left off?</p> <p>1a. Does the City have an index of the new sites added since the last inventory update was completed?</p> <p>1b. Is the selected contractor expected to QA/QC, and possibly modify/update, the GIS inventory updates completed in 2014?</p> <p>1c. What is the intended use of the scanned and geo-referenced sheets from the previous inventory update?</p>	<p>1. The previous update was confined to updating BMP and BMP Drainage Areas only. The scope of this project includes updating the entire SWM database, but it is expected that the work involved in updating the BMP and BMP Drainage Areas will be minimal.</p> <p>1a. Yes. The number of new BMP sites is estimated to be less than 15.</p> <p>1b. If new information comes up, yes.</p> <p>1c. The sheets may be used as needed, as the past project was limited to BMP and BMP Drainage Areas only. The georeferenced sheets may contain data pertinent to this RFP that was not captured previously (e.g. inlets and pipes).</p>
26	8.3 Engineering Records	<p>Please clarify the “incorporation of” the existing engineering files as they relate to the GIS geodatabase model. Specifically, are we:</p> <p>1. Gleaning the attribute information about the stormwater system and populating attribute fields within the stormwater geodatabase?</p> <p>2. Digitizing the location of pipes and structures that are on the engineering plans which are currently missing from the geodatabase?</p> <p>3. Attaching the images of these engineering plans to the appropriate assets?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p>
26	8.3 Engineering Records	<p>Does the City currently relate any non-spatial/non-plan reports or inspection records, etc. to their stormwater features?</p>	<p>The City does not actively link such reports or records to the stormwater database.</p>
26	8.3 Engineering Records	<p>1. In addition to GIS metadata and object data attributes, do the electronic documents have Document Properties Metadata (i.e. designer title block information) associated with them?</p> <p>2. Will this information be desired as part of this project?</p>	<p>1. No, not generally.</p> <p>2. No.</p>
26	8.3 Engineering Records	<p>Are as-built drawings available in CAD format?</p>	<p>No, as-builts are only available as PDF or TIFF files.</p>

Page	Section	Question	City Response
26	8.3 Georeferenced Engineering Plans	There is a statement on page 26 that the City will provide the georeferenced engineering plans. On page 32 it states that the Contractor will georeference the provided plans. Can you confirm that the plans you are providing “are” or “are not” currently georeferenced?	The City will provide the existing georeferenced plans. These were mostly done for the 2014 BMP and BMP Drainage Area project, but the georeferenced plans may contain data pertinent to this RFP that was not captured previously (e.g. inlets and pipes). Additional plans will also be provided that have not been georeferenced that the contractor will be responsible for adding and/or incorporating to the database as needed (i.e. georeferencing or capturing attribute data).
26	8.4	Does the storm drainage information have to be modeled in any way or is it strictly a matter of collecting geometry and attribute data?	The City requires that the data be collected in such a way as to enable modeling in the future, but does not require the Contractor to perform that modeling.
26	8.4	What is the value of the 2014 contract to collect the BMPs?	<p>The 2014 BMP and BMP Drainage Area project has a significantly different scope and the costs may not apply to this project for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2014 contract to collect the BMP data and drainage areas was unique due to an extremely tight timeline of three (3) months. A separate politically-sensitive program was dependent on the timely completion of the project. 2. The update required the creation, population, and novel calculation of a significant number of attributes (>80), which are not required as part of this 2016-2017 database update. <p>With those caveats stated, the contract value was \$69,149.65.</p>
26	8.4 Review Existing Database	Who was the consultant that prepared the ten year old stormwater database?	This is unknown.
27	8.4 Review Existing Database, Current Feature Class Uses	Does the City currently have a program that is being used to model flow? If so, could you provide the program name or network analysis application being used?	The City has no such program.
27	8.4 Review Existing Database, Current Feature Class Uses	Are there flow calculations that exist currently that we will need to incorporate into the GIS geodatabase model? If so, could you provide a sample of the digital data?	There are no such flow calculations.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
27	8.4 BMP Facility and BMP Drainage Areas	<p>1. For this project, are updates to BMP Facilities and BMP Drainage Areas limited to those new sites constructed since December 2014?</p> <p>2. What was the name of the firm that performed the 2014 inventory update?</p>	<p>1. No. The Contractor is expected to QC and add as needed, but the City has been updating these continually so the work is expected to be minimal.</p> <p>2. Versar Inc.</p>
27	8.4 Interface with Enterprise Systems	Are there any asset management programs, or O&M, work order software systems that will need to connect to the geodatabase model? If so, please provide a list of those programs. Is the consultant responsible in this contract to provide the connection of the geodatabase to those programs?	No.
28	8.4 Inlets	<p>1. What year/date is this 5-year inventory project be completed?</p> <p>2. What is the name of the firm doing this work?</p> <p>3. Does this project involve creation of Inlet features and assigning inlet data?</p> <p>3a. If so, is the contractor awarded this project expected to incorporate the inlet inventory data into the stormwater system update?</p> <p>3b. Is the Inlet inventory using an exact replica of the City's inlet feature class, the Esri LGIM inlet feature class schema, or some other schema?</p> <p>3c. Is the contractor performing this 5-year inventory permitted to submit a proposal for this stormwater inventory update?</p>	<p>1. The project is primarily an inspection program and the cycle will be complete in 2021.</p> <p>2. Stormwater Maintenance, LLC.</p> <p>3. Previously unknown inlets are occasionally discovered. At a mutually agreed date toward the end of this project, the City will offer the Contractor for this RFP a list of inlets discovered in Inspection Zone 1.</p> <p>3a. N/A.</p> <p>3b. No. The project involves collecting inspection and location information mostly, along with some additional baseline data.</p> <p>3c. Yes.</p>
28	8.4 Outfall Drainage Areas	Please provide the methodology of applying the outfall features drainage area.	The Contractor will be provided with the methodology used for delineating BMP drainages. Existing plans and GIS data (such as contours and aerial imagery) were used in the methodology.
29	8.4 Core Attributes	Will the consultant be required to assign or develop new unique IDs for any of the feature classes?	Yes, see section 8.4 Part I.A.II.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
29	8.4 Core Attributes	<p>1. Does the deliverable include populating attribute values for every feature in each of the City's stormwater feature classes?</p> <p>1a. If so, do the site plans and engineering records provide the data?</p> <p>1b. In cases where the Esri LGIM stormwater schema has attributes that are not in the City's equivalent stormwater feature class, does the deliverable require adding data values in order to fully implement all of the Esri LGIM stormwater attribute schema?</p>	<p>1 / 1a. The Contractor is expected to populate as much of the attribute data as possible and, in cases where data is missing, provide guidance or assumptions. The available plans will provide a majority of the data.</p> <p>1b. Yes.</p>
30	8.4 MS4 Permit Compliance	<p>1. What is the name of the software vendor, product name, and software version for the City's current asset management and work order management systems?</p> <p>2. What is their database environment?</p> <p>3. Is the City's stormwater GIS data updated by these systems?</p> <p>4. Is the City's current stormwater GIS data used by these systems?</p> <p>5. To what extent is the selected vendor expected to investigate and certify compatibility between these systems and the new stormwater database created during this project?</p>	<p>1. We do not currently have an asset management system. One is planned for future, but has not been implemented yet.</p> <p>2. N/A.</p> <p>3. N/A.</p> <p>4. N/A – but it is likely that an asset system compatible with GIS will be selected.</p> <p>5. N/A.</p>
30	8.4 MS4 Permit Compliance	<p>1. Is the consultant required to link in the Video Inspections per pipe segment within the geodatabase?</p> <p>2. If so, what program is the City using to collect the video?</p> <p>3. Are they associating with the unique identifier within the existing stormwater pipe dataset(s)?</p>	<p>Video inspections have not yet occurred but are planned for the future.</p> <p>1. No.</p> <p>2. N/A.</p> <p>3. N/A.</p>

Page	Section	Question	City Response
31	8.4 Esri's LGIM Stormwater Network	Are the City's stormwater pipe segments oriented in direction of gravity flow?	City staff have sought to orient pipe segments in the direction of gravity flow but not all segments are accurate. The Contractor is to provide complete data, properly oriented in the direction of gravity flow.
31	8.4 Neighboring Jurisdictions' Databases	Does any of the City's stormwater system connect to any of the surrounding stormwater systems such that database interoperability is required between systems?	No.
31	8.4 Neighboring Jurisdictions' Databases	Should the cost of evaluating neighboring jurisdictions' MS4 databases be included in the proposal?	The Offeror may call out the cost of evaluation as a separate task as it deems fit. Certain Offerors may already have such knowledge and consider it unnecessary to call this out separately. This is entirely optional.
31	8.4 Phase II Database Model	Can you confirm that the consultant will design the geodatabase to meet Phase I standard even though the City is rated as a Phase II permit holder?	That is correct.
31	8.4	Is the Contractor responsible for setting up apps linked to the LGIM?	No, the Contractor will not be required to set up any applications linked to the LGIM.
32	8.4 Georeferenced Engineering Plans	We are assuming that there is a total of 5,000 engineering plan sheets that need to be georeferenced and have their attribute information populated into the geodatabase per stormwater asset. Is that a correct assumption?	As of September 2016, there are 3,877 files distributed across 441 folders organized by site. Some duplicates are anticipated. These files consist of plan views, details, and other documents that may contain information pertinent to the project. Some files may have multiple pages or sheets, and others may only consist of one page or sheet.
32	8.4 Georeferenced Engineering Plans	Do we need to georeference and link all scans provided by the City, and then return those georeferenced linked scans to the City?	The City wishes to receive the georeferenced scans. Having them linked in the stormwater database would be ideal. However, it is only necessary to georeference those scans needed for capturing features.
32	8.4 Georeferenced Engineering Plans	How many plan sheets (not detail sheets) are not georeferenced for the 275 sites?	We do not have exact counts. From the BMP facilities and BMP drainage update project, we have 291 plans georeferenced for 275 sites. There are additional sites that include storm drain infrastructure, but do not have any BMPs.
32-33	8.4 Manholes	What about manholes? Do we need to verify their accuracy?	Manhole features are included in the current geodatabase and considered essential. As with all feature classes, the Contractor is expected to QC the existing data and correct errors and omissions as necessary throughout the scope of the project.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Geometry	In the current City SWM Database, BMP facilities are only represented as point features. Does the City expect the contractor to produce facility footprint features (polygons) for each of the BMP facility locations (new and existing)?	We anticipate that some BMP facilities might need to be collected as polygon features corresponding with the LGIM model, but the majority will likely remain as point features.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Geometry	If an outfall of a feature within the City is outside the City boundary, does the capture of features end at jurisdictional (City) boundaries or continue to the outfall?	The Contractor is expected to continue to the outfall.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	<p>“As of 08/15/16, there are approximately 5,000 engineering and planning files, pertaining to 275 stormwater sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many of these have been scanned, and how many need to be scanned? 2. How many of these have been georeferenced and how many remain to be georeferenced? 3. Wouldn't the count of 5,000 engineering and planning files for 275 stormwater sites suggest an average of 18 engineering and planning documents per site, rather than the average of 10 sheets per site mentioned at the top of page 266? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All plans have been scanned. 2. There are 291 georeferenced plans cataloged in the database. <p>As of September 14, 2016, there are 3,877 files distributed across 441 folders organized by site. All files will be provided to the Contractor, who is to review and determine which sheets need to be georeferenced (some sheets pertain to elevation data, not plan views).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The 3,877 files provided above includes plans, computation tables, detail sheets, etc. The estimated average of "10 sheets per site" refers only to plans and was provided only as a preliminary assessment to convey the variety of the files to be provided. Some files may have multiple pages or sheets, and others may only consist of one page or sheet.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	<p>The RFP states that we are to “assume that none of the data has been verified and that all data will need to be created from scratch.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this statement referencing the attributes listed on page 29, or are there additional attributes that need to be created/populated? 2. Will all existing stormwater feature attributes need to be reviewed and possibility edited to correct attribute errors? 3. Will all existing stormwater feature geometry need to be reviewed and possibility edited to change asset type or reposition assets to improve alignment based on digital orthophotos and scanned plans? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There could be additional attributes to create and/or populate. 2. Yes. 3. Yes.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	To what extent (if any) is the Contractor required to populate MDE attributes related to PE, Impervious Area, Runoff Curves, Permits, Credits, etc.?	The existing database already contains most of this data, having been captured as part of 2014 BMP update. However, limited updates to these fields (including derived fields) may be required for the BMP feature class only.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
-	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	<p>For the purposes of populating the attribute "Maintenance Responsibility," will this information be available on the plan sheets provided by the City?</p> <p>In the case where the information is not available on the plan sheets, should the contractor assume that the asset is owned and maintained by the City?</p>	<p>If this information is available on the plan sheets provided by the City, the Contractor is expected to capture it.</p> <p>If the information is not available or unclear, the contractor should flag the asset/attribute and follow up with City staff for clarification.</p>
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	Will we need to verify BMP drainage areas?	The Contractor is expected to QC the existing data and correct as necessary throughout the scope of the project. Outfall drainage areas are also included in the stormwater database and are likely to contain more errors.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	Will we need to use new LiDAR data to verify BMP drainage areas?	The City will provide the Contractor with contour and LiDAR data, but it is up to the Contractor to determine its own verification methodology.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	There are approximately 275 stormwater sites but 600 BMPs. What accounts for this discrepancy?	There may be multiple BMPs per site.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	Are the 275 stormwater sites BMP sites?	No. Stormwater sites may contain multiple BMP facilities; they are not equivalent to BMP facility drainage areas. However, all of the 275 stormwater sites with georeferenced plans contain one or more BMPs. Additional sites included in this update will include storm drain infrastructure only.
33	8.4 Populate Stormwater Feature Attributes	For BMPs after 2014, should we add them?	We have been updating BMPs in-house since 2014, but their attribute data might be incomplete. The Contractor is expected to QC the existing BMPs and correct errors as necessary throughout the scope of the project.
33	8.4 Perform QA/QC	<p>1. Does the City have a license for the ArcGIS Data Reviewer Extension?</p> <p>2. Does the City have a current QA/QC plan that is used for stormwater GIS data? If so, can we obtain a copy of the plan?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. The City does not have such a plan.</p>
33	8.4 Perform QA/QC	<p>1. Are the engineering plans deemed the most accurate information to be used for QA/QC on geodatabase to determine the correct positional accuracy and pipe network/flow direction?</p> <p>2. If data is missing from those plans, would we then invoke field verification processes outlined on page 36?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p>

Page	Section	Question	City Response
33	8.4 Engineering Records	The RFP mentions that there are approximately 5,000 engineering and planning files. If the files are PDF or TIFF format, how many pages are included in each file? Is there one page per file?	The page count varies. Some files may consist of several pages or sheets while others may have only one.
34	8.4	Once the methodology is approved, we have ten days to complete the pilot task. 1. Do you have a pilot area selected? 2. If so, how many features does it include?	1. Yes. Please refer to the sample stormwater database provided as Exhibit E. 2. The pilot area contains about 250 inlets and several BMP facilities.
34	8.4 Attribute accuracy	In Part III, we are instructed that a data entry error rate must be calculated, but it seems the only acceptable error rate is zero. Is that right?	Yes. If there are attribute errors in the first batch sampled, those errors are to be corrected and the sampling/QC process repeated until a randomly selected sample contains no errors.
36	8.4 Field Verification	1. Is use of a Trimble GeoXH or equivalent receiver a requirement for conducting field verification? 2. Is the City offering use of its GPS equipment to the consultant selected for this project? 3. Is 1 foot positional accuracy a requirement for field verification?	1. Yes. 2. No. 3. Yes.
36	8.4 Field Verification	Why are there such large increments of features for costing field verification?	The original intent of the ranges is for the Contractor to consider benefitting from an economy of scale or factoring in mobilization costs, if applicable. If this does not apply, please provide the same unit cost across all brackets.
36	8.4 Field Verification	For the field verification task using the tiered count breakdown, should the Offeror use the total feature counts within the City-provided example database as a baseline for estimating the maximum number of features the City may require to be field verified?	The Offeror is permitted to determining a potential maximum in this manner. However, the City expects field verification to be done only for a minority of features and only when absolutely necessary. The City's intent is to minimize field verification as much as possible.
36	8.4 Field Verification	How do we account for not knowing how many features are to be verified in the RFP?	The number of features will be determined during the course of the project. The price proposal addresses this initial uncertainty by allowing for unit costs.
36	8.4 Field Verification	Will field investigation require inspections and/or collection of information such as manhole/pipe inverts?	The Contractor is not expected to perform inspections or collect information on inverts deeper than ten feet. Field verification may potentially be required for features closer to the surface than this, but many of these may be gleaned from plans. Features deeper than ten feet may be field verified by City staff.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
36-39	8.4 Field Verification	1. Does the City have right of entry onto private property for field visits? 2. Will the same right of entry be extended to the Contractor?	1. Yes. 2. Yes. The City can provide the Contractor with a letter extending them that authority.
36-39	8.4 Field Verification	There are two scenarios for field verification – one performed by the Contractor, the other by the City. Is it possible to use both?	A hybrid approach is possible but requires amending the RFP. Once the winning proposal is selected and the contract is under negotiation the City will decide which methodology to accept.
36-39	8.4 Field Verification	If a hybrid approach for field verification is taken, what is the City's staff capacity?	The City could provide at least one staff member and potentially others to assist.
-	8.4 Field Verification	You assume 50 features per day for field verification. How many staff members does this assume?	Two if working in a confined area per OSHA requirements; otherwise one.
36	8.4	Will the Contractor be given Publisher-level access to ArcGIS Server for using Collector, etc.?	The City assumes many Offerors will already have this capability but we are willing to accommodate.
36	8.4	The RFP states that the City's ArcGIS Server can be utilized for field verification using a mobile app, but you mentioned that you assumed the Contractor would have their own Publisher access. You also mentioned that the City plans on hosting all of the data for the project. For field verification using an app such as Collector, would you want map service and web maps published on the Contractor's server or the City's server?	The City can accommodate either option.
1 of 3	Exhibit A Task Order Cost Tabulation Sheet	There is no line item for migrating the City's current stormwater feature class schema to the new stormwater schema once the schema is finalized. Should that cost be factored into "Part I Task C Develop and Finalize Schema"?	Yes.
1 of 3	Exhibit A Task Order Cost Tabulation Sheet	Is this a time and material contract with a not-to-exceed cap, or an all-inclusive lump sum contract?	Tasks 1, 2 and 5 are lump sum. Tasks 3 and 4 are optional based on unit prices.
1 & 2 of 3	Exhibit A	Do we fill out all the cost brackets?	Yes.
-	Exhibit E	Is it required to update "Illicit Discharge" feature class for discharge and tests of pollutant?	If the City and/or Contractor deems it appropriate to retain the Illicit Discharge feature class, the Contractor is expected to incorporate the feature class in the schema's design. It is likely that the existing attributes will need to be retained/expanded. However, the Contractor is not responsible for populating this feature class.

Page	Section	Question	City Response
-	Exhibit E	<p>Can the City please confirm that the following files are the only files included on the CD provided during the Pre-Submission Meeting on 7 September 2016:</p> <p>a. Gaithersburg_Stormwater.gbd with the following feature classes/tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. QuinceOrchardPark ii. BMP_Facilities iii. BMP_Facility_Drainage_Areas iv. Culverts v. Headwalls vi. Illicit_Discharge vii. Inlets viii. Inspection_Zones ix. Manholes x. Outfall_Drainage_Areas xi. Outfalls xii. Pipes xiii. Plan_Boundaries xiv. BMP_PlanBoundary_Relationships xv. BMPstoRelationshipTable xvi. Gaithersburg_Boundary xvii. RelationshipTableToPlanBoundaries xviii. TBLManagementCompanies xix. TBLOwners <p>b. GaithersburgGISDataAgreements.pdf</p> <p>c. ReadMe.doc</p> <p>d. Stormwater_20160417.MXD</p>	That is correct.