

May 19, 2014

David Brotzman, Executive Director
VT Center for Geographic Information
58 S. Main St, Suite 2
Waterbury, VT 05676

Dear Mr. Brotzman:

Fountains Spatial, Inc. (FSI) is pleased to submit information in response to your agency's *VT Open GeoData Portal* RFI.

Located in Montpelier, VT and Schenectady, NY, FSI is one of the Northeast's leading Geographic Information System consulting companies, with over 100 years of combined experience in the development and application of GIS technologies. We have successfully designed, developed, deployed, and hosted a wide array of web based spatially enabled applications over our long tenure. FSI has broad-based experience with a range of vendor products including deep experience with the entire suite of Esri products, many of which are used in a number of other Vermont agencies and departments including VTrans, DPS, and E911.

Given the inability to request confidentiality for our submission, the information we have provided describes the general approach we would recommend for this project. Similarly, our costs estimates are simply ballpark figures provided to give you an approximate range of potential costs at this time. It is our intent to provide you with useful feedback while ensuring that any eventual proposal for this project would be uniquely our own. Should VCGI release an RFP for this project, FSI would be very interested in providing your agency with an in-depth proposal.

We hope that the enclosed document provides VCGI with valuable information on our proposed approach for this project. If you have any questions or need clarification on any issue, please contact me at our Montpelier office.

Regards,



Mark Haberle, Sr. Project Manager
Fountains Spatial, Inc.

7 SUMMARY RESPONSE FORM – APPENDIX I

Responders to this RFI are asked to complete the following table along with any necessary attachments.

Question	Response
Company name Parent company	Fountains Spatial, Inc.
Company address	137 Jay St., Schenectady, NY 12305
Name of person responsible for the information contained in this RFI	Mark Haberle
Telephone number Fax number Email address Web page	802-223-8644 802-229-2125 MarkHarberle@fountainsamerica.com www.fountainsspatial.com
Company location: Corporate office Local offices	137 Jay St., Schenectady, NY 7 Green Mountain Dr., Montpelier, VT
Please provide your recommendations on the system solution design for a VT Open GeoData Portal that would support the requirements articulated in this RFI. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any functional requirements that you believe could be especially challenging or costly to implement? 	Please include as attachment Maximum of 10 pages See Attachment 1.
Are you proposing to use a Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COS), Open Source, custom, and/or hybrid solution?	See Attachment 1.
Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would you offer formal user training? • What type of courses do you run and what is their duration? • What level of training would you recommend? 	See Attachment 1.
Please provide details of how the product is supported. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What levels of support is available, definition of each level and what are the hours of operation and response times? • Does support include product updates, as well as bug fixes at no extra charge? 	See Attachment 1.
Please summarize the total costs of your proposed solution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total estimated cost of proposed solution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Year 1 – Build and Deploy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Combined estimate for all requirements under Section 6.1 	Please include as attachment Maximum of 2 pages See Attachment 2.

Question	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Combined estimate for all requirements under Section 7.2 – APPENDIX II ▪ Other costs itemized for Year 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Year 2 – Support and Maintenance (itemized) ○ Year 3 – Support and Maintenance (itemized) • What are the estimated licensing costs (if any) for individual parts of the solution? • What are your consultancy rates to help with implementation and/or customization? • What do you charge for training? • What are the estimated maintenance and support costs on an annual basis? Does it include software updates/upgrades? 	<p>See Attachment 2.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1

Recommendations on the System Solution Design

FSI would recommend deploying an appropriately scaled instance of ArcGIS Server Advanced Enterprise with the Portal for ArcGIS Server Extension. Other potential ArcGIS Server extensions that may be proposed include Data Interoperability, Data Reviewer, and Image.

There is much that needs refinement (specific to the stated requirements), therefore the entire list is essentially challenging and, potentially, costly to implement. The following are a few select areas where this is apparent and FSI would warn that the scope of this effort is significant.

6.1 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

User Stories

- H-12 – Specifically acquisition, organization, and quality control for publishing.
- M-11 – Specifically archival and access methodologies/workflows.
- M-16 – Depends on the state of the data’s current metadata – if any.
- M-20 – Depends on the scope of the format and projections.
- M-22 – Implies user state management. The scope of this needs definition.
- M-36, 37, 38 – Depends on the consistency, accessibility, availability, etc. of the participating RPCs, Towns, agencies data and ability to participate.
- M-41 - “Capabilities” needs definition.
- M-42, 43 – Will require use restrictions/governance (bandwidth monitoring, revenue generation, etc.)
- M-53 – “Google fast” needs definition and will only work if data can be served in that fashion (i.e., pre-baked cached tiles versus rendered vectors.)
- M-55 – Will require detail definition – this is a very open-ended requirement.

Publisher Stories

- H-5 – Depending on the full scope this can be a significant maintenance effort.
- H-17 – Will require significant governance and administration.
- H-30 – Depends on the scope and nature of these procedures.
- H-31 – Scope and frequency of the harvest needs definition.

6.2 SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND PRIVACY PROTECTION

Integration with existing architectures at VCGI, DII, or off-site will need to be taken into account. Depending on the technology stack in place for these assets, it may be a significant implementation effort.

Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS), Open Source, Custom, and/or hybrid solution?

FSI would propose the Portal for ArcGIS Server as an inclusive commercially available off-the-shelf platform for deploying the solution. However, deployment would require substantial installation, configuration, and customization to meet specific security, integration, functional, protocol, and administrative needs.

Training

FSI would propose offering formal training for publishers and system administrator-owners. In addition FSI would propose train-the-trainer sessions to facilitate a self-directed training plan implemented by VCGI for general users. FSI training would be custom sessions and scoped according to the complexity and need.

Product Support

The core software proposed is supported by Esri. Their support systems are extremely mature and aligned to such a project. FSI, in turn, would implementation time lines for identified items.

ATTACHMENT 2

Total Cost Estimates¹

Year 1: Build and deploy

Bullet 1: \$150,000.00 - \$350,000.00

Bullet 2: \$50,000.00 - \$100,000.00

Year 2: Support and Maintenance - \$50,000.00 +/-

Year 3: Support and Maintenance - \$50,000.00 +/-

Licensing costs are unknown as VCGI and the State of Vermont likely can obtain (or already have) licenses under their own SLAs. More accurate licensing costs can be determined after the Q&A period of the formal RFP. As a custom deployment of COTS software there are no additional licensing fees beyond those of the core underlying software product(s).

Consultancy rates: \$125.00/hour

Training: \$125.00/hour for the development of training materials (PowerPoints and manuals), and for classroom training at client sites.

It is unclear if "estimated maintenance and support costs" are different from Support and Maintenance noted above. Software maintenance costs can be better estimated after the Q&A period of the formal RFP when the exact version and license requirements are known. Presuming a maintenance structure like that offered by Esri, this would include software updates and upgrades

¹ *These figures are estimates, and should not be considered in any way to be part of a bid. Pricing estimates are based on current Esri pricing structures, and are subject to change. The cost estimate ranges provided are extreme so as to cover the potential scope of the final RFP.*