



March 28, 2014

Addendum 1

RFP # 7548574

Document Scanning, Underground Storage Tank Records

Department of Environmental Management

Closing Date and Time: April 8, 2014, 2:00 PM ET

The closing date and time above have been changed from:

April 3, 2014 at 11:00 AM, ET specified in the original solicitation

Answers to all questions received by the March 20, 2014 deadline are attached below.

NOTICE OF CHANGE

In RFP Section 2, Performance Evaluation, and Section 2B Work Plan, the words "and detailed budget" are hereby deleted. All cost, budget and pricing information should be confined to the sealed cost proposal.

George Welly

Interdepartmental Project Manager

Questions and Answers, RFP 7548574, Scanning Services, UST Files

Question 1. Will the agency be responding to questions as they arrive or responding to all questions at once after the question deadline?

Answer 1. All questions will be answered in this Addendum 1 to the solicitation. No additional questions will be considered.

Question 2. The minimum awarded volume seems to be 400,000 pages. Can the vendor scan as fast as reasonably possible and what would be the maximum conversion schedule the agency could support?

Answer 2. Yes, vendor can work as quickly as they want. The agency and the vendor will negotiate the volume of files absent from the premises in order to balance efficiency and access. The grand total count beyond the 400,000 minimum volume depends on cost.

Question 3. Is the project expected to last a few months or is the agency expecting to have weekly deliveries of a few boxes a week for 52 weeks?

Answer 3. The project will be complete by September 10; see page 5 of the solicitation. Release and recovery of drawer contents will be according to a negotiated schedule balancing efficiency and availability of the files.

Question 4. Can vendors propose to pickup lots of 80-100 boxes and perform weekly digital deliveries with return of originals on the next pickup?

Answer 4. See answer 3.

Question 5. There can be some confusion in the definition of the term "page" as some would define a page to be a single piece of paper with two sides creating two images, while others would define a single piece of paper having data on two sides as two pages. Can the agency define what they mean by a page or consider using the term images and adjust any counts accordingly based on the 10% duplex file estimate?

Answer 5. A page, for the determination of compensation, is one side of one piece of paper.

Question 6. Document re-assembly can be quite expensive as it not only requires the vendor to perform the reassembly, it changes and slows the prep and scanning process considerably. Most all conversion

efforts of this type make the documents publically available on the internet or on a local kiosk and the paper records are moved to long term storage and typically only access in a legal dispute. In lieu of reassembly will the agency consider a solution where vendors box the documents in order with color separator pages between each document and not reassemble the documents. If an original document is requested, then the agency would effectively provide reassembly on demand. At a minimum could the agency consider allowing vendors to respond with reassembly as a separate line item so that the agency can understand the cost impact of requiring it?

Answer 6. Full reassembly is required in the proposals. Paper documents will still be offered for public inspection.

Question 7. If you are requiring reassembly are you expecting to retain the originals?

Answer 7. Yes. Paper documents will still be offered for public inspection.

Question 8. 100% comparison to the original is an extremely rare requirement and can be very costly, it is also very difficult for an agency to confirm it is being performed by a vendor. What is more common is 100% review of the images on the screen with comparison to the original as necessary. The best is to state an accuracy requirement, which statistically cannot be 100%, then ask vendors for their solutions to meet it. The agency may see a considerable cost benefit to allowing 100% screen review vs. 100% comparison to the original. Can the agency consider changing the wording on item G. so that the vendors can provide a base bid with options for higher levels of QC and accuracy rates. If you are retaining the originals the agency might want to consider the cost impact of asking vendors to attempt to find a light section of one page in 990K images.

Answer 8. No, the wording on item G. will remain as is.

Question 9. . Item K requires no compression in a pdf/a file. While the pdf/a specification supports this, it is largely unsupported (even in acrobat) and directly conflicts with the first stated line in the project outcome to make the pdf files accessible to the public. An uncompressed pdf/a file would be unmanageable on the web and perhaps on the agency network. Uncompressed imagery is typically reserved for artwork and photo negatives when scanning from the original. While we see that the samples provided contain photographs, they are reproductions of the original and the pdf files in the example are neither pdf/a nor uncompressed. For documents of this type it is more common to use standard compression to pdf/a, particularly for monochrome imagery as the compression of Group IV tiff is lossless. Most agencies if they have some state requirement to scan as uncompressed will create an uncompressed archive in tiff and a derivative in pdf with compression at standard or lossless compression rates. Can the agency consider revising this requirement?

Answer 9.

PDF/A is required by the RI Secretary of State. Please refer to :

http://sos.ri.gov/dar_filing/regdocs/released/pdf/SOS/5762.pdf. Section 6.2.3. d (2) permits only

“lossless compression” for Master Files (page 23.) Use of any such derivative product should be identified in the technical proposal, with a justification for its satisfaction of the SOS standard.

Question 10. Item J requires the vendor to provide metadata in the format listed on pdf page 7, however it is unclear what information will be provided by the agency in the excel file detailed in item A, nor does it indicate if the information will be easily identifiable on the document, if it will be on the first page or if the vendor will need to search through the pages for the information. Can the agency provide more information and guidance as to what will be required of the vendor to populate the data into a valid record? Can the agency provide what the records would look like for the samples provided? It appears that at a minimum the vendors will key the APPID from the folder, the document type, description and date and on the samples this is all available on the first page. Is this correct?

Answer 10. This information is usually on first or second page, but vendor would need to search for it.

Question 11. Will the document type be typed on the first page or a standard form that will be easily identifiable, where all other documents will be considered miscellaneous?

Answer 11. Generally, the first couple of pages will contain the document type. The types are listed in technical specifications. If document type is not one of those listed it can be filed under miscellaneous.

Question 12. What will define a document and will vendor staff be able to easily identify where one document ends and the next starts? Is it defined by anything that is stapled or bound? If a report is filed loose in a folder are we to use our best judgment, read through the document, or create each page as a document?

Answer 12. Most documents will be bound or stapled. DEM contact will be able to assist with questions on documents.

Question 13. From the sampling 925k pages spanning 2000 facility files, equates to an average facility file of 462.5 pages. Does a facility file directly relate to a LUST Project which relates to a single hardcopy container which relates to an unique Applications ID, or can there be more than one LUST project to a facility file?

Answer 13. Each LUST project is connected to a facility. If a facility had more than one release then it could have more than one LUST number. (Example: if there was a second release then the LUST numbers would be LS 0001 and LS 0001 A; A is for second release and B would be for a third release) Each LUST number has its own LUST file.

Question 14. Since the indexing to create a valid record is performed at the document level, the vendors need to know at least an estimated number of documents to properly account for the amount of labor associated with creating each record. If the agency is unable to provide an estimate can they consider adding a line item for indexing each document? Just as an example identifying the document type and keying the description of 2 document per facility file would only be 4000 documents and not

require much effort, but if there are 100 documents per facility file that would be 200,000 documents to identify and index which would be a considerable labor requirement.

Answer 14. Typical files contain an average of 20-25 documents, and approximately five percent of the files could contain up to 50 documents or more.

Question 15. Are out of state vendors restricted from responding if they propose a solution to meet the stated requirements for transport, access to the originals and document security?

Answer 15. No.

Question 16. Can companies from outside USA be considered?

Answer 16. Yes, as long as the physical files do not leave the US.

Question 17. Are in-person meetings mandatory?

Answer 17. No.

Question 18. Can tasks be performed outside USA.

Answer 18. Documents cannot leave the United States.

Question 19. Can proposals be submitted via e-mail ?

Answer 19. No.

Question 20. Could you please provide for download an electronic file (Excel) detailing all the LUST Project fields, including LS#/ST#, Property Name, Address, Plover ID#, and Application ID# for the two (2) sample files which were provided via download:

Answer 20.

See attachment A below for examples in the town of Smithfield.

Question 21. For the two (2) sample files which were provided via download (Exhibit B- UST Closure Report.pdf & Exhibit C- Site Investigation Report.pdf), could you please provide the following corresponding information which would be required for the database deliverable:

- (i) FileName
- (ii) Description
- (iii) DocAuthor
- (iv) CreateDate
- (v) DirectoryName
- (vi) SecurityLevel
- (vii) Active
- (viii) AppID

Answer 21. See answer to question 38.

Question 22. Based on the electronic file (Excel) detailing all the LUST Project fields which the Department will be providing to the Vendor, approximately how many reports exist in total?

Answer 22. We will provide one report that contains all of the LUST projects and associated fields. It is difficult to approximate how many document types are contained in each file.

Question 23. Approximately how many pages are contained in a report or what is the approximate average range of pages contained in a report?

Answer 23. Each document type can vary from a couple of pages to over one hundred pages.

Question 24. For what purpose is the deadline on September 10th?

Answer 24. Grant expires and the money is no longer available.

Question 25. What is approximate award date and what is the approximate start date?

Answer 25. We anticipate awarding the contract by May 1, 2014.

Question 26. Based on the new RFP schedule, would a pick up on Wednesday and a drop off on Wednesday during business hours be acceptable?

Answer 26. Yes.

Question 27. If the Database delivered by the Vendor is an Excel file, what format/version of Excel is required, i.e. .xls, .xlsx, etc.?

Answer 27.

.xls is preferred.

Question 28. For the Excel file delivered by the Vendor, will this be one (1) Excel file for each batch of multiple PDF/A files, i.e. containing one (1) row for each PDF/A file? Or will this be one (1) Excel file for each single PDF/A file?

Answer 28.

Feel free to put as much of the metadata into a single Excel file as possible. If the number of records exceeds the Excel row limit (depending on the version used) feel free to create multiple excel files.

Question 29. If Department is requesting one (1) Excel file for each batch of multiple PDF/A files, should each batch of PDF/A files be added cumulatively to the same Excel file? Or will each Excel file contain only the PDF/A files for the corresponding batch delivered?

Answer 29.

See answer for 28

Question 30. Which version of PDF/A with no compression is required, i.e. 1A, 1B, etc.?

Answer 30.

Please refer to : http://sos.ri.gov/dar_filing/regdocs/released/pdf/SOS/5762.pdf

Question 31. What file format structure is required for the hard drive on which the deliverables reside, i.e. NTFS?

Answer 31. NTFS

Question 32. Is this work currently outsourced?

Answer 32. No.

Question 33. RFP States: Provide the vendor with an electronic file (excel) detailing all the LUST Project fields, including LS#/ST#, Property name, Address, Plover ID#, and Application ID#; Please define LS# and location on the documents?

Answer 33. a. Please define ST# and location on documents? This is located on file folder.
b. Plover ID# and location on documents? This is not on the documents, but rather it is a database assigned #.

Question 34. Are there page limits for either the technical proposal or the cost proposal?

Answer 34. No. The cost proposal must be entered on the prescribed Attachment B. Additional pages for optional services, section C., can be used.

Question 35. RFP STATES: A database that contains all scanned documents that can be used by the public to search and review all files. Scanned documents must be able to be searched by LS or ST#, facility name, facility address, and Plover ID #. Is the vendor responsible for providing a searchable database interface program (i.e. Image Repository)?

Answer 35.

No – DEM already has a system in place that will allow users to search and view the imaged files.

Question 36. Please define FileName? The document states 50 characters, are there any special naming conventions requested?

Answer 36. Yes, this will be on the excel file provided to the vendor.

Question 37. Please define DocType? The document states 50 characters, are there any special naming conventions requested?

Answer 37. Yes, these are listed under the technical specifications of the RFP.

Question 38. Is the state requesting 2 different files? One used to index the images based upon the LS or ST#, Facility Name, Facility Address and Plover ID# and a second containing the following information?

- FileName – 50 chars
- Description– 50 chars
- DocType– 50 chars, the documents shall be the following:
 - Closure Assessments
 - Site Investigation Reports
 - Corrective Action Plans
 - Groundwater Monitoring reports
 - No Further Action reports (NFA's)
 - Dem Issued Letters
 - Other Letters
 - Miscellaneous
- DocAuthor– 50 chars, nulls allowed
- CreateDate– datetime in mm/dd/yyyy format, the document date
- MIMEType– 100 chars, standard MIMETYPE of image file. If all files will be digitized into a PDF file, the MIMETYPE will be 'application/pdf'
- FileLocation– 100 chars, added by RIDEM after project completion
- DirectoryName– 25 chars, the electronic folder name, value = 'APP<applications.id>' where applications.id will be included in initial Excel file (Folder Name)
- FileServer– 50 chars, added by RIDEM after project completion
- SecurityLevel– 15 chars, options: 'PRIVATE', 'INTERNAL', 'PUBLIC', where PRIVATE is for program staff only, INTERNAL is viewable by DEM, PUBLIC is viewable by anyone. The default for this project is 'PUBLIC'
- Active– 1 char, options: 'Y', 'N', where Y indicates the file is active, N indicates the file is inactive
- AppID– int, value = Applications.ID included in initial Excel file

Answer 38.

The list above is the metadata for the digitized files. It is only file (beyond the actual digitized files themselves) required from the vendor. Note: that DEM will tweak the metadata requirements a bit and provide the actual folder name to be used. We'll discuss this further with the vendor awarded the contract.

Question 39. RFP states: Microfilm for all scanned documents must also be made available and itemized by LS or ST#, facility name, facility address, and Plover id#. What type/length microfilm is expected?

Answer 39. All vendors must comply with the Rhode Island Secretary of State's microfilm standards. Please see: http://sos.ri.gov/documents/archives/regdocs/released/pdf/SOS/SOS_3391.pdf
If type/length is not covered in the standards vendor should specify its own standard product in the technical proposal.

Question 40. Is the provided index for Microfilm to be contained in one file with the Image Indexes?

Answer 40. All vendors must comply with the Rhode Island Secretary of State's microfilm standards. Please see: http://sos.ri.gov/documents/archives/regdocs/released/pdf/SOS/SOS_3391.pdf

Question 41. Do you want single level blipping for the microfilm?

Answer 41. All vendors must comply with the Rhode Island Secretary of State's microfilm standards. Please see: http://sos.ri.gov/documents/archives/regdocs/released/pdf/SOS/SOS_3391.pdf

Question 42. The RFP states that five percent of the documents are color. However, the provided examples show a larger percentage in color. Does the state expect all pages to be scanned in color to accommodate the co-mingled color pages or does the state expect all images to be scanned as Bi-Tonal?

Answer 42. No. Bi-Tonal is preferred.

Question 43. Please provide the reason why the prior RFP # 7541374 was cancelled.

Answer 43. The lack of volume categories for pricing in the solicitation design resulted in a project cost greater than available resources.

Question 44. Page 12, Section 6 indicates that the technical and cost proposals be submitted separately; however, Page 9, Item B. Project Work Plan requests that the work plan provide a detailed budget. It is assumed that the budget would be based upon the contractors cost proposal and thus we are seeking clarification on whether any cost or budget data should be included in the technical approach of the proposal?

Answer 44. In Section B Work Plan, on page 9, the words “and detailed budget” are hereby deleted. All cost, budget and pricing information should be confined to the sealed cost proposal.

Question 45. Page 6, Section 2, Item E, notes that document will be returned in the original bound condition. For bound documents, must the binding be exactly the same as original? For instance, could a document that initially had a “comb” binding be bound or clipped in a way as to still be available for “direct public examination”?

Answer 45. Yes, binding must be same as original.

Question 46. Page 6, Section 2, Item D, notes files will be returned in the condition they were picked up. Each record is to be assigned a coding number. Is it necessary to record that on the physical file as well? Are there hard copy label requirements? For example, do the hard copy documents need to be labeled with unique document identifier to allow for cross referencing with the electronic files?

Answer 46. Vendor is not required to record coding # on the physical file.

Question 47. Request verification that all labor, travel, and other direct costs for all tasks under this RFP (such as database creation, training, monthly reporting, weekly meetings) should be included into the per page unit. Or, shall tasks outside of scanning be provided as separate items in the cost proposal?

Answer 47. All costs to complete the project should be included in the cost proposal per page pricing.

Question 48. The RFP notes that the database will be in a SQL Server/Access/Excel format. Contractor respectfully requests further details on the database requirements. Specifically, are all three formats required? Or, does RIDEM prefer one specific format?

Answer 48.

We are leaving it to the vendor to choose the format that suit them as we can work with all three formats. The format we prefer, however, is Excel for its ease of use and portability.

Question 49. Some types of bindings cannot be removed without destroying the binding. In this case can we rebind with a binder clip, a staple or some other easy type of binding? An example would be spiral coil binding, saddle stitching, velo binding or perfect binding.

Answer 49. If binding gets destroyed then document must be bound another way before returning (no binding clips).

Question 50. If reports are perfect bound or saddle stitched can we shear the reports for scanning if it does not cut data or should we be prepared to scan these on a flatbed scanner. Can the agency identify the frequency of these and can these be handled as an exception if they are to be flatbed scanned and can you provide a line item for flatbed scanning and an estimate of the quantity?

Answer 50. At this time there does not appear to be any files that are perfect bound or saddle stiched; however, if they exist you can shear as long as data is not compromised and document is rebound before it is returned.

Question 51. Will the state consider accepting a sFTP file transfer instead of data transfer on hard drive?

Answer 51. No. Data transfer to hard drive is required.

Question 52. Will the agency consider an onsite solution since the volume described requires only a small workspace?

Answer 52. No, the agency will not consider an onsite solution.

Attachment A

LUST_Sites_in_Smithfield_for_Sc

SITE ID	APP ID	PROJECT ID	FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY
1852	17063	3101-LS	MOBIL	354 PUTNAM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
3259	17064	3102-LS	RIARMY NAT'L GUARD/SUPPORT MAINT. SHOP	GEORGE WASHINGTON HWY	SMITHFIELD
1547	17065	3103-LS	APPLE VALLEY SUNOCO #0013-0401	101 PLEASANT VIEW AVE	SMITHFIELD
880	36314	3105-LS	SMITHFIELD WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY	20 ESMOND MILL DR	SMITHFIELD
3494	16704	3106-LS	GEORGIAVILLE REALTY	15 HIGGINS ST	SMITHFIELD
1078	16705	3107-LS	BRYANT UNIVERSITY	1150 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1687	16707	3111-LS	HESS #39206	263 PUTNAM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1078	16708	3113-LS	BRYANT UNIVERSITY	1150 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1078	16708	3113-LS	BRYANT UNIVERSITY	1150 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1601	35403	3114A-LS	CHESTER'S SERVICE STATION	351 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1601	16709	3114-LS	CHESTER'S SERVICE STATION	351 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
6367	17228	3115-LS	ROUTE 5 AUTO REPAIR	38 SANDERSON ST	SMITHFIELD
6718	16904	3116-LS	COMMERCIAL BUILDING	420 GEORGE WASHINGTON HWY	SMITHFIELD
3408	17228	3117-LS	STEERE ORCHARDS	150 AUSTIN AVE	SMITHFIELD
3566	17348	3118-LS	B.T. EQUIPMENT COMPANY	LYDIA ANN RD	SMITHFIELD
1604	33269	3119A-LS	7-ELEVEN #32614	970 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1604	17349	3119-LS	7-ELEVEN #32614	970 DOUGLAS PIKE	SMITHFIELD
3737	17350	3120-LS	SMITHFIELD PEAT CO. INC.	295 WASHINGTON HWY	SMITHFIELD
1537	17519	3122-LS	GLOBAL MONTELO GROUP #208	471 PUTNAM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
2309	17509	3123-LS	B & E TRANSPORTATION, INC.	7 LEVI LN	SMITHFIELD
4595	17521	3124-LS	SMITHFIELD SERVICE	161 FARNUM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
6947	17531	3125-LS	MATTEO FARMS	90 SWAN RD	SMITHFIELD
880	17646	3127-LS	SMITHFIELD WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY	20 ESMOND MILL DR	SMITHFIELD
2491	17648	3129-LS	SMITHFIELD TOWN HALL	64 FARNUM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
1939	29442	3131-LS	ROUTE 44 SERVICE CENTER	270 PUTNAM AVE	SMITHFIELD
7761	28362	3132-LS	SMITHFIELD CHEMICAL INDUSTRIAL DUMP	DEERFIELD DR	SMITHFIELD
1613	28353	3133-LS	CORY'S SERVICE STATION	676 PUTNAM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
7713	28384	3134-LS	GORDON ROWLEY RESIDENCE	200 FARNUM PIKE	SMITHFIELD
9829	38867	3138-LS	VICTORY ENTERPRISES	1 RESERVOIR AVE	SMITHFIELD
7028	17666	3835-LS	COMMERCE STREET PUMPING STATION	COMMERCE ST	SMITHFIELD

Site ID = Plover ID