

**State of Idaho
IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP02230)**



HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION CONSULTING SERVICES

OCTOBER 2009

Amendment 01

RFP 02208 is amended in response to timely received vendor questions.

1. What, in ITD's view, were the strengths and weaknesses of the 2007 study?

The study was not officially released for several reasons.

Weaknesses: The study used older allocation data. It was not possible to update the date. The study used a single years worth of data, which could have skewed the results; as opposed to using data from a longer time period.

Strengths: Use of State programs from FHWA allowed ITD to use different input, determine what sensitivity analysis to utilize, and to perform "what if" scenarios.

2. Can you provide further detail on the data sources available for this study? For example, does ITD have current weigh-in-motion data similar to those used in the 2009 Nevada HCAS?

ITD has 24 weigh-in-motion sites that are not POE's. ITD has traffic count information for approximately 10 years, broken down by (24) vehicle types. There is financial cost data for maintenance and construction expenditures. There also are national models for pavement management as well as other indicators available. It may take some time to get the information into a usable format.

3. One procedural question: Can you clarify whether the required signature page should be submitted with the technical proposal or the cost proposal (or both)?

The required signature page should be submitted with the technical proposal. Submitting an original signature page with the cost proposal is also acceptable.

4. Under the Insurance Requirements clause, 1.1.1, we have general aggregate limits. What we do not have is a provision that limits apply separately to the pending contract. We will provide a Certificate of Insurance in amounts required by the Contract. Would that be acceptable?

No. ITD must be added by your insurer as the certificate holder.

5. On page 5 of the proposal it states that "proposals must respond to the RFP requirements by restating the number and text of the requirement." Could you please clarify exactly which requirements this refers to and also whether "text" refers to the headings of RFP sections or includes other text.

Requirements sections 3.1 through 3.2 must be responded to by restating the section number and the complete text of the requirement (not the heading).

6. The RFP states that offerors are required to submit a comprehensive credit report. Does ITD have a preference or recommendation on what agency should provide this report?

No

7. The RFP also requires firm's without audited financial statements to complete Attachment C. Our firm has annual income statements and balance sheets that although not audited are reviewed by an accountant. We can also submit tax returns for the years in question. Would submission of these be an acceptable alternative to completing attachment C?

No.

The following is questions and answers from the pre-proposal conference on 10/20/09, 10:00 a.m. MST, Boise, Idaho

Vendor Attendees: Iteris
BBC Research and Consulting

Question: With regard to the 2007 study, can you identify its strengths and weaknesses?

Answer: The study was not officially released for several reasons.

Weaknesses: The study used older allocation data. It was not possible to update the date. The study used a single years worth of data, which could have skewed the results; as opposed to using data from a longer time period.

Strengths: Use of State programs from FHWA allowed ITD to use different input, determine what sensitivity analysis to utilize, and to perform "what if" scenarios.

Question: Looking at the Nevada study, Nevada used weigh-in-motion data. Can you provide more background on data availability for this study? Are there any gaps?

Answer: ITD has 24 weigh-in-motion sites that are not POE's. ITD has traffic count information for approximately 10 years, broken down by (24) vehicle types. There is financial cost data for maintenance and construction expenditures. There also are national models for pavement management as well as other indicators available. It may take some time to get the information into a usable format.

Question: The RFP discusses broad vehicle classes, not 24. Do we need to provide that level of detail, for 24 vehicle classes?

Answer: ITD would rather have too much detail, and narrow that down, then try to work in reverse. ITD is looking at 5 broad vehicle classes.

Question: What is the term of the contract? The due date does not match up with a two year contract?

Answer: The proposed project plan must meet the June 30, 2010 deadline. The contract will be awarded for two years, as there may be some follow up work.

Question: The RFP allocates 650 points for Section 3.1.1. How are these points broken down in the 6 subsections within 3.1.1?

Answer: The points will be broken down within 3.1.1; however, no further breakdown of points will be provided in the RFP.

Question: In the old report, it seemed that the data didn't fit neatly into the FHWA software; does ITD prefer use of FHWA software?

Answer: It will require work between ITD and the Contractor, to put the data into a proper format.

Question: Can you confirm that the analysis will cover all areas of available funding, Federal, state and local?

Answer: That's correct; all areas of available funding will be included.

Sarah Hilderbrand, CPPO