Date: January 6, 2026
To: All Vendors
Subject: Addendum #3

REFERENCE: **P013-26 ArcGIS ESRI Utility Network Migration**

This Addendum forms part of the contract and clarifies, corrects or modifies original RFP document.

Question 1: Is BPUB planning to upgrade ArcGIS Enterprise and ArcGIS Pro as part of this project?

Answer 1: BPUB would rely on the recommendation of the vendor to determine if an upgrade is needed for ArcGIS Enterprise but we are not currently planning for upgrade. We are currently updating ArcGIS Pro as new versions are made available.

Question 2: Is BPUB prepared to transition from traditional versioning to branch versioning?

Answer 2: BPUB is already doing branch versioning but we are not currently doing edits through published services. Editing published services will be a new process and we would rely on advice from vendor on how to properly configure services to accomplish this.

Question 3: Will ArcMap be fully retired at go-live, or is a transition period expected?

Answer 3: BPUB is aiming to fully retire ArcMap at go-live.

Question 4: Does BPUB expect Electric, Water, and Wastewater to be implemented simultaneously or in phases? Who will be the business owner and sign-off authority for each utility network?

Answer 4: BPUB would like to prioritize Electric, but expects water and wastewater to be migrated to UN within the same project timeline. BPUB GIS department will be the business owner and sign-off authority for each utility network.

Question 5: Are Electric feeders, sources, and normally open points explicitly defined and maintained today? Are there known connectivity, geometry, or data quality issues already identified by BPUB? Is BPUB expecting a custom UN data model, or alignment with the Esri foundational model? Can BPUB share approximate asset counts for electric, water, and wastewater networks?

Answer 5: BPUB does have a functional geometric network for electric. Feeder Id's, sources and open points are defined and maintained. We have identified data quality issues and are working to resolve as many as we can before the project begins. We can share asset counts for electric, water, and wastewater networks to vendors who are selected for evaluation.

Question 6: How are substations currently modeled (single source vs detailed breaker/bus modeling)?

Answer 6: BPUB currently has breakers and buses modeled.

Question 7: Is the network radial, partially looped, or fully looped with normally-open points?

Answer 7: The network if fully looped, with the exception of a few areas that can't be fed from a different source.

Question 8: How is the water network currently organized in terms of pressure zones, supply zones, DMAs, and isolation areas? Are there pressure-reducing valves (PRVs), pump stations, or control valves that define operational boundaries?

Answer 8: BPUB does not currently have a functioning geometric network for water. We do not have defined pressure zones, DMAs or isolation areas. We do snap and draw features to edges and junctions but our GN is not initialized.

Question 9: How is the wastewater network currently organized in terms of gravity flow areas, force main segments, lift station catchments, and treatment plant connections? Do lift stations define operational boundaries or flow control points in daily operations?

Answer 9: BPUB does not currently have a functioning geometric network for wastewater. We do snap and draw features to edges and junctions but our GN is not initialized. Our flow directions are reflective of flow in the field for gravity mains but our lift stations do not define operational boundaries or model flow.

Question 10: Can BPUB provide a list of current integrations (CIS, SCADA, OMS, EAM, field systems)? Is BPUB open to functional re-engineering where exact legacy behavior is not supported? Will GIS be the system of record for network connectivity post go-live?

Answer 10: BPUB currently only has integration between ArcFM designer and Cityworks. We will be implementing OMS next year but we have not built any integrations yet for that project. We do manual data exports to GDB for use of GIS data in the Milsoft Windmil software. Yes, BPUB is open to functional re-engineering if necessary. GIS is currently and will be the system of record for network connectivity post go-live.

Question 11: Which ArcFM components are currently in use (e.g., AutoUpdaters, Workflow Manager, custom tools), and what business processes do they support in daily operations? What kind of ArcFM Support is looking for?

Answer 11: BPUB currently uses auto updaters, workflow manager, session manager, designer, and stored displays. As part of this project, we are wanting to determine if use of ArcFM products will be necessary after go-live.

Question 12: Does BPUB expect bi-directional synchronization between GN and UN?

Answer 12: BPUB would like to discuss and evaluate the various options, we would like to refrain from maintaining two separate databases until go-live.

Question 13: Does BPUB require a formal Test → QA → Production promotion approach?

Answer 13: BPUB generally will perform acceptance testing to ensure that things are working as expected. However, because of our current lack of experience in working within the utility network we would be relying on the selected vendor to perform thorough testing.

Question 14: Does BPUB currently use any ETL or integration tools (e.g., FME, custom scripts, scheduled jobs) for data migration, synchronization, or system integration?

Answer 14: BPUB does not currently use integration tools and would be relying on the vendors expertise.

Question 15: Are licenses for data migration or integration tools (e.g., FME Desktop/Server) available to the project team, or should the vendor assume responsibility for providing required tooling?

Answer 15: BPUB does not currently use integration tools and would be relying on the vendor to provide this for the duration of the project. We can discuss this more during vendor evaluation if needed.

Question 16: Are there any existing custom dashboards, web applications, mobile applications, or map viewers that are expected to be migrated, redesigned, or reconfigured as part of the Utility Network implementation?

Answer 16: BPUB will handle reconfiguration of any dashboards, web applications, etc.

Question 17: Are there any custom-developed applications, add-ins, scripts, or extensions (ArcObjects, Python, .NET, JavaScript) that currently interact with the GIS and are expected to continue post-UN migration?

Answer 17: BPUB does have some custom python scripts and would like help evaluating or redesigning them. Examples include database compression, version reconciling, mass data updates.

Question 18: What is the maximum acceptable edit freeze window during cutover?

Answer 18: BPUB would prefer not to have any edit freeze windows but may be comfortable with up to 2-weeks maximum.

Question 19: Will BPUB provide acceptance test scenarios, or should the vendor define them?

Answer 19: Vendor would be expected to provide these.

Question 20: How many users fall into administrator, power user, and end-user categories?

Answer 20: There are 2-3 administrators, around 10 power users and 20-30 end-users. Most of our users interact with mobile or web applications and would not require training. BPUB can handle training for end users post go-live.

Question 21: What duration of post go-live support is expected (e.g., 30/60/90 days)?

Answer 21: BPUB would prefer a bucket of hours be assigned for post go-live support, typically we see 60-90 hours. We would only expect to be charged for the hours used before the end of the contract.

Question 22: Is it permissible to have a hybrid delivery mode (onsite/offshore mix)? If onsite presence is required what are the roles need to be present onsite and what duration?

Answer 22: BPUB would prefer to have work done remotely.

Question 23: If the selected vendor finds that ArcFM is still required to perform the required work, is BPUB prepared to continue with ArcFM for a solution?

Answer 23: Yes, if it is determined that ArcFM is still required BPUB is prepared to continue with ArcFM.

Question 24: Is the project to be executed completely on-site?

Answer 24: No, BPUB would prefer to have work done remotely.

Question 25: Please confirm whether the migration activities may be executed offshore (outside the Texas/USA geography), subject to the vendor being provided secure remote access to the development environment through Citrix, VDI, or other approved remote access mechanisms, while ensuring that all data remains secured within the BPUB environment and fully compliant with applicable security and regulatory policies.

Answer 25: All vendor network activity must come from USA geography.

Question 26: Does BPUB intend to award a single contract covering both the Utility Network roadmap and full implementation, or is there an option to pause or re-procure after the roadmap phase based on findings and budget approval?

Answer 26: BPUB intends to award a single contract covering both the roadmap and full implementation.

Question 27: Is BPUB expecting formal change-management activities (communications, adoption?

Answer 27: No, BPUB does not require formal change management activities.

Question 28: What level of post-go-live stabilization support is expected (e.g., 30/60/90 days)?

Answer 28: BPUB would prefer a bucket of hours be assigned for post go-live support, typically we see 60-90 hours. We would only expect to be charged for the hours used before the end of the contract.

Question 29: Does BPUB require support after go-live? If so, for what duration?

Answer 29: BPUB would expect support after go-live, preferably a bucket of hours, typically we see 60-90 hours. We would only expect to be charged for the hours used before the end of the contract.

Question 30: Should the proposed Utility Network be deployed on-premises, cloud-hosted, or is BPUB open to hybrid or cloud migration recommendations as part of the roadmap?

Answer 30: BPUB is expecting this to be deployed on-premises. We would be open to cloud migration recommendations as part of the roadmap for future state.

Question 31: Are there any planned system replacements or upgrades that may affect the migration timeline (OMS, CIS, SCADA, WMS, etc.)? How frequently is the production geodatabase updated, and what is the current versioning workflow?

Answer 31: BPUB will be going through OMS implementation possibly towards the end of October 2026 but we will have OMS vendor support for any GIS setup that needs to be done.

Question 32: Which ArcFM tools, extensions, or custom models are considered business critical?

Answer 32: BPUB electric engineering department uses ArcFM designer and GIS department uses ArcFM tools for creation of sessions, editing, and maintenance of electric connectivity.

Question 33: Does BPUB anticipate direct involvement from Esri Professional Services, or is the selected vendor expected to act as the primary Esri delivery interface?

Answer 33: BPUB will maintain contact with ESRI account manager and work with them to get necessary licenses or products.

Question 34: Please provide a comprehensive list of all current integrations, customizations, and third-party applications that interact with the existing GIS system.

Answer 34: Already listed in RFP and answered in previous questions.

Question 35: Are there blackout periods or operational constraints that limit migration windows?

Answer 35: BPUB expects that migration work be done in development servers so that current environment is uninterrupted.

Question 36: What level of downtime is acceptable during go live?

Answer 36: BPUB would need clarification on definition of downtime. Is this an edit freeze or complete unavailability of GIS.

Question 37: Are water/wastewater pressure zones or basins already defined, or must they be derived during the project?

Answer 37: BPUB does not currently have a functioning geometric network for water/wastewater. We do not have defined pressure zones, DMAs or isolation areas. We do have historical WaterGEMS data that we could potentially use to define pressure zones.

Question 38: Whether historical/as-built data is included in scope. Should historical/as-built data be fully migrated into Utility Network, archived, or selectively retained?

Answer 38: BPUB does require editing services other than potential data cleanup.

Question 39: Is BPUB expecting a single cutover, or would a staged or feeder-by-feeder rollout be acceptable, particularly for Electric?

Answer 39: BPUB would prefer a single cutover but is open to considering vendor recommendations/strategies.

Question 40: Please confirm whether any annotation (simple or feature-linked), dimensions, or cross-section data are included in the scope of migration.

Answer 40: BPUB does have annotation features but nothing extensive.

Question 41: Please confirm whether there are any non-network datasets to be migrated; if so, kindly provide the list of datasets included in the migration scope.

Answer 41: BPUB does have other non-network datasets. Examples of these are; parcels, centerline, easements, city limits, etc.

Question 42: Are there any parallel initiatives that may impact GIS data (AMI rollout, grid modernization, field validations)?

Answer 42: BPUB will be going through OMS implementation possibly towards the end of October 2026 but we will have OMS vendor support for any GIS setup that needs to be done.

Question 43: Are there any regulatory, operational, or capital program milestones (e.g., OMS upgrades, construction programs) that must be coordinated with the UN migration?

Answer 43: See answer 42.

Question 44: What is the anticipated number of BPUB staff to be trained in both the administrator and end-user training sessions?

Answer 44: BPUB expects training for between 10-15 users. These will be train-the-trainer style sessions.

Question 45: Should the proposal include training and validation for mobile/field workflows (Field Maps, Workforce, Survey123) integrated with Utility Network?

Answer 45: BPUB would like to see introductory training for mobile workflows (field maps only) that overview any changes we can expect post migration.

Question 46: Does every vendor need to enclose the Debarment Certificate, Conflict of Interest Questionnaire, Residential Certificate, House Bill 89 verification, and State Law Verification? Or is it required only for vendors who received legal notice?

Answer 46: If submitting a response, all forms must be completed, signed and included with response.

Question 47: Can add-on services include future integration, advanced analytics, or UN enhancements, or should they be limited strictly to migration-related tasks?

Answer 47: Yes, add-on services can include additional recommended items.

Question 48: Will BPUB place a higher value on multi-utility UN implementations versus single-utility (electric-only) projects?

Answer 48: No, BPUB will evaluate all proposals equally.

The signature of the company agent, for the acknowledgement of this addendum, shall be required. **Complete information below and return via e-mail to: dsolitaire@brownsville-pub.com.**

 I hereby acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

Company: _____

Agent Name: _____

Agent Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip:** _____

Phone Number: _____ **E-mail address:** _____

If you have any further questions about the RFP, call 956-983-6366.

BY: *Diane Solitaire*
      Purchasing Department