CITY OF DELRAY BEACH
100 N.W. 1ˢᵗ AVENUE, DELRAY BEACH, FL 33444

Solicitation Addendum

Addendum No.:	3
Solicitation No.:	2017-016
Project No.:	N/A
Solicitation Title:	Data Conversion Services
Addendum Date:	December 9, 2016
Purchasing Contact:	Ryan Lingholm

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE MADE AND HEREBY BECOME A PART OF THIS SOLICITATION:

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

Q1. **An answer to an earlier question was "stormwater data contained in GIS". Please explain in detail what you mean by "GIS".**

R1. There are some stormwater points and shape files that have been added to our ESRI GIS system. But, as stated in the Bid documents, the City is unsure of the validity of these points.

Q2. **The response to question 6 in Addendum No. 1 notes that HTE data is used in GIS format by Public Safety. Please elaborate on the current workflow (between HTE and Public Safety GIS) and how this data is currently transferred.**

R2. There is currently no direct workflow to move any data between HTE and GIS. Public Safety is utilizing Palm Beach County GIS addressing data, and the City's Planning & Zoning department is manually entering changes to HTE data into the GIS system.

Q3. **Addendum #1 had a question about Public Safety. The answer touched on addressing. Is the City going to require that the address database utilized by Public Safety follow the NENA NexGen 911/CLDFX Standard? If yes how will City ensure this standard is met?**

R3. The City is not requiring any addressing based on NENA NexGen 911/CLDFX Standard at this time. The addressing data is currently pulled down from Palm Beach County and is utilized in the ESRI Government data model.

Q4. What spatial accuracy does the City desire for the final CAD to GIS deliverable?

R4. Refer to Section 3, Item 2(A)(iii)(5) which states the level of accuracy that is desired by the City.

Q5. Will the Successful Bidder be required to populate attribution from field collections or other source documents following the conversion? If so, what is expected beyond what is stored in CAD currently?

R5. No, the Successful Bidder will not be required to populate attribution from field collections or other source documents following the conversion. Source data is provided in appendix B. Refer to Section 3, Item 2(A)(iii)(3) for additional information.

Q6. Does the City have a preference regarding the database design, such as Esri's LGIM?

R6. Attribute Values should be stored in each feature classes associated table. Each attribute should have its own column. There are no LGIM requirements.

Q7. The solicitation states that bids can be submitted through BidSync or alternatively submitted via hard copy. Is there any advantage/drawback to submitting bids in both formats? Or is BidSync truly the preferred method?

R7. The City encourages the submission of bids electronically via BidSync *OR* hard copy; but not both. The City does not have a preferred submission method.

NOTE: Items that are ~~struck through~~ are deleted. Items that are <u>underlined</u> have been added. All other terms and conditions remain as stated in the ITB.

The Deadline for Delivery of Questions for this Solicitation was December 8, 2016. Therefore, with the exception of process questions, further questions will not receive a response.

End of Addendum

INSTRUCTIONS:
Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged as instructed in the solicitation document. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum may result in the disqualification of Respondent's response.