North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)
Flooded Road Information Systems Project
Request for Proposals

Questions
(Received as of February 7, 2025)

Question #1: Can you clarify why pricing is being requested in this scenario? Based on our understanding, this still falls under engineering services, which would typically preclude pricing discussions.

Response: NCTCOG has reviewed and evaluated the scope of work and does not believe there are engineering elements. However, to address the questions raised, NCTCOG has decided to update the procurement to be a qualifications-based procurement. Therefore, NCTCOG is no longer requesting a pricing proposal as part of a proposers submission.

Question #2: What historical data is available (flooding reports/complaints, precip, soils)?

Response:

Question #3: What real-time data is available, through sensors, etc; what's the coverage of these data inputs?

Response:

Question #4: Data architecture of real-time/sensors?

Response:

Question #5: What's the goal/target to predict

a. Rainfall?
b. Roads flooding?
c. Both?

Response:

Question #6: Can the proposal due date be extended by a few weeks?

Response:

Question #7: After the two-year period of this project, is this expected to be an ongoing funded and supported system?

Response:

Question #8: Is this system intended to be a replacement for flood warning system by individual COG members or a separated independent system from those existing systems?

Response:

Question #9: How does the scope of this effort relate to the NCTCOG Transportation and Stormwater Infrastructure (TSI) Hydrologic & Hydraulic Assessment project?

Response:

Question #10: Does the scope of this project include developing hydrologic and hydraulic modeling software?

Response:

Question #11: Task2D refers to a "... feedback comparison system ..." and the ability "... to recalibrate the software program model. Each model revision will provide greater accuracy for future events." Does NCTCOG require the consultant to recalibrate the software within the duration of this contract or design the software so it is capable of automatic recalibration in the future?

Response:

Question #12: Does NCTCOG require software to utilize Artificial Intelligence and/or Machine Learning methods?

Response:

Question #13: Does NCTCOG expect the consultant to develop new software or use publicly available software?

Response:

Question #14: Can commercially available proprietary software be used?

Response:

Question #15: Does NCTCOG require ownership of the software source code?

Response:

Question #16: What is the source of funding for this project?

Response:

Question #17: Does NCTCOG believe that the scope of this solicitation does not qualify as engineering services requiring a Qualifications Based Selection (QBS)?

Response: Please see response to Question #1.

Question #18: Does NCTCOG intend to operate and maintain the software after completion of this project? And does NCTCOG anticipate future funding for operations and maintenance of the software?

Question #19: From previous contracts with NCTCOG, your terms and conditions are non-negotiable. Please confirm that this is still the case.

Response:

Question #20: What scale or resolution of roadway flooding from major highways to residential streets does the NCTCOG require for the flooded roads information system to provide?

Response:

Question #21: Task 2A: Does NCTCOG have any existing data ready/expected for use or is this fully for the consultant to find?

Response:

Question #22: Task 2B: What is the anticipated lead-time for warnings during real-time conditions monitoring?

Response:

Question #23: Will the software system also feed information to the TxDOT Lonestar system or systems that feed into the TxDOT Drive Texas website?"

Response:

Question #24: Can the public dissemination component leverage probabilistic information? For example, is it acceptable to communicate that “XX road is likely to be closed due to predicted conditions” or does the communication system require deterministic predictions?

Response:

Question #25: Do you expect usage of any specific or existing flood models or other tools for use towards this software development?

Response:

Question #26: In reference to the Disadvantaged Business requirement. Can you explain if this is a hard requirement or a good faith requirement?

Response:

Question #27: Is there a directory of Disadvantaged Businesses?

Response:

Question #28: Will NCTCOG provide support for data collection, such as facilitating contact with existing data providers (if applicable)?

Response:

Question #29: Does NCTCOG have existing agreements with third-party data providers, such as weather services or transportation agencies, that the Consultant can leverage?

Response:

Question #30: Will the Consultant be responsible for the cost of data acquisition, or will NCTCOG provide funding or access to required data sources?

Response:

Question #31: How will the collected data – real-time data access be managed after the contract ends?

Response:

Question #32: What are the expectations for ongoing system maintenance and updates after the project is completed?

Response:

Question #33: Will NCTCOG define specific thresholds (e.g., flood depth, road closure criteria, or standing water levels) for triggering alerts in the system?

Response:

Question #34: What level of access will NCTCOG have to the software source code and data models developed during the project?

Response:

Question #35: Are there any preferred data formats or integration requirements for external systems such as Waze, Google Maps, or 511DFW?

Response:

Question #36: Will the Consultant be responsible for public outreach and training, or will NCTCOG handle awareness efforts regarding the new system?

Response:

Question #37: Will the Consultant need to ensure compliance with specific cybersecurity or data privacy regulations for handling flood risk and transportation data?

Response:

Question #38: What type of flooding should be covered by the flood warning system – pluvial, fluvial or both?

Response:

Question #39: Should the software system be deployed within gauged watersheds only? Or do you require deployment in ungauged watersheds?

Response:

Question #40: Does NCTCOG maintain any internal GIS portals, dashboards, or existing flood-detection platforms that need direct integration?

Response:

Question #41: Are open-source GIS applications acceptable or is a commercial GIS solution preferred?

Response:

Question #42: Would the software program's flood results be shared with each city and county or would this be limited to within the NCTCOG GIS system?

Response:

Question #43: Do all counties within NCTCOG already have their own bespoke operational flood warning system in place?

Response:

Question #44: Is there a current master spatial file (i.e. vector layer) which represents all features / elements of the NCTCOG transportation network?

Response:

Question #45: Does this network include data on bridge deck heights?

Response:

Question #46: Who will be the end users of the Software? County Representatives? Engineers? Emergency management personnel?

Response:

Question #47: The RFP references artificial intelligence programs. Does NCTCOG prefer a hydrology and hydraulics modeling approach which also leverages Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning assuming this approach is calibrated, validated and demonstrates accuracy comparable to a solely physics based H&H approach?

Response:

Question #48: Task 2A requires maps of the aggregated data. Does NCTCOG expect these maps to be digital and/or dynamic and delivered into a GIS system or printed?

Response:

Question #49: Does the NCTCOG have historic data on road closures and flood locations to validate against?

Response:

Question #50: Does NCTCOG have historic data on high water marks from previous flood events?

Response:

Question #51: Does NCTCOG have historic Pin2flood pin locations available for validation?

Response:

Question #52: How will ground truth data about new flood events be collected? Ie. Which roads are inundated?

Response:

Question #53: Does this data gathering fall to the Consultant, or will local resources be used to gather the ground truth data and supply this to the Consultant?

Response:

Question #54: What current tools are used to disseminate warnings to first responders?

Response:

Question #55: For task 2e. will the next version of 511DFW provide push notifications?

Response:

Question #56: For Task 2B. (real-time flood data), how frequently must updates occur? (e.g., every 5 minutes, 15 minutes, hourly)?

Response:

Question #57: Are there any defined IT security or privacy requirements for the application?

Response:

Question #58: Is the solution required to be hosted on premises, or will a cloud hosted solution be acceptable?

Response:

Question #59: For task 2D, what is the preferred method for reporting model accuracy?

Response:

Question #60: What key performance indicators (KPIs) or success metrics will define a "successful" flood warning system?

Response:

Question #61: Is there a mechanism for extending the scope if additional funding becomes available?

Response:

Question #62: The RFP calls for an 18-24 month timeline. Are there any mandatory interim milestones or deliverables (e.g., pilot test at 12 months)?