RFP 19-008 ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL ROADWAY SAFETY OUTCOMES Addendum #1

Date 2/5/2019

PROPOSERS PLEASE TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING CHANGES FOR THE SUBJECT RFP:

- A. Under section XI. PROPOSAL QUESTIONS AND PRE-BID CONFERENCE, the deadline for technical and procedural questions concerning the RFP has been extended to no later than 5:00 PM on Monday, February 11, 2019. Please attach this addendum to the documents in your possession.
- B. This is a summary of answers to the questions received about RFP# 19-008

WRITTEN QUESTIONS RECEIVED PRIOR TO THE PRE-BID CONFERENCE

1. Q: While the RFP states that COG staff (will not) do any collection, compilation, or analysis of the data, will COG provide the Contractor with the appropriate contacts at the member agencies for data collection?

A: Yes.

2. Q: Would COG accept a proposal that shows a prioritized work plan to address the RFP requirements within the stated not-to-exceed amount, with items of lower priority included as part of the additional services task?

A: Yes.

- 3. Section III, Part C and the Task 3 Deliverables both mention the development of a database. Is there a specific database tool/platform that should be utilized?
 - A: COG staff use several database tools. Any commonly used data format is acceptable. What is not acceptable is a proprietary solution that mandates the use of only one type of software.
- 4. Q: Please clarify if Attachment B Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters is required to be submitted with the proposal.
 - A: Yes, it is required.
- 5. Q: If Attachment B is to be submitted with the proposal, please confirm that it is required of the prime contractor only.
 - A: Yes, prime contractor only.
- 6. Q: What years are we studying? RFP only mentions that there was an increase from 2016-2017.
 - A: COG staff expects the contractor to propose which years to study based on their expertise.

RFP 19-008 Analysis of Regional Roadway Safety Outcomes

- 7. Q: Crash data for DC and VA? Crash data from 2015 on is posted online for MD. Is it also posted for VA and DC?
 - A: COG staff will provide contact information to the holders of safety data for each of our member states.
- 8. Q: Work zone data for the MWCOG area? Where would this come from? Does it include dates that would allow us to align it with crash dates?
 - A: Work zones were identified in the RFP as an example of one of many potential factors to be included in the analysis. COG staff expects the contractor to propose which factors are most relevant and, based on their expertise, most likely to provide information useful to the purposes outlined in the RFP.
- 9. Q: What other multi state MPO's are we to use as a peer? Are studies available?
 - A: COG staff have ideas about which MPOs are likely good peers, but are also interested to learn which MPOs the contractor believes are appropriate peers with respect to safety data.
- 10. Q: Task 3 Collection and Analysis of Safety data seems out of order and should happen before Task 2 Determination of TPB standing with Benchmark peers.
 - A: COG staff disagrees. The comparison with peer MPOs is expected to be done at a high level with readily available information.
- 11. Q: It is understood the consultant will request all crash data. Will MWCOG provide contact information for each jurisdiction and a letter confirming we are requesting the data on MWCOG's behalf?
 - A: COG staff will provide contact information. It is not expected that a letter will be required, but if it is COG would provide such a letter.
- 12. Q: Should police reports be reviewed?
 - A: COG staff expects the contractor to determine when or if police reports should be reviewed.
- 13. Q: Please confirm the type of crashes to be analyzed. Based on the scope, it appears that only fatal crashes will be studied.
 - A: COG staff expects the contractor to determine the types of crashes to be analyzed.
- 14. Q: Please provide study years.
 - A: COG staff expects the contractor to propose which years to study based on their expertise.
- 15. Q: Should it be assumed the data should be analyzed for the MWCOG region and not the entire states of Maryland and Virginia.
 - A: COG staff is primarily interested in the safety picture within the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) planning area which includes the District of Columbia as well as Suburban

RFP 19-008 Analysis of Regional Roadway Safety Outcomes

Maryland and Northern Virginia. The COG website provides a map of the jurisdictions included in the TPB planning area.

QUESTIONS RAISED AT THE PRE-BID CONFERENCE

- 16. Q: You mentioned in your presentation that you are looking for crashes that are mainly helping local jurisdictions and the TPB, do the crashes you want studied only include the local roads or should they also include state roadways?
 - A: The study should look at crashes on all public roadways.
- 17. Q: Are you looking for a general look at crashes in the region or more at specific crashes? For example, would you be interested in a particular crash at MD 355 and MD 187 or at crashes more generally?
 - A: COG staff are interested in an understanding of factors contributing to crashes at a regional level and not a review of specific crashes.
- 18. Q: So, you are not going for individual intersections or roadway segments?
 - A: No. We are looking for patterns and contributing factors at a regional level.
- 19. Q: With respect to the monthly presentations to the TPB, would the contractor be expected to make those as part of this project?
 - A: No. COG staff will provide periodic updates to the TPB during the course of the project. The contractor may be asked to provide a final presentation to the TPB near the conclusion of the project.
- 20. Q: Does the DBE certification need to be with the District of Columbia?
 - A: No. The DBE certification can be from any state. (Please note only <u>DBE</u> will be accepted by COG for this purpose).

All other terms and conditions to RFP No. 19-008 remain the same.



	SIGN-IN SHEET RFP #19-008 Pre-Submission Conference January 31, 2019		
PRINT NAME OF REPRESENTATIVE	NAME OF BUSINESS/Agency	EMAIL	PHONE NO.
George Bahouth	Impact Research, LLC	gbahouth@impactresearchinc.com	410-988-4107
Matt Wolniak	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	mwolniak@jmt.com	410 316-22
David Brooks	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	dbrooks@jmttg.com	240-499-5976
Laura Richards	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	LRichards@Camsys.com	301-347-
Eric Tang	VHB	ETang@VHB.com	202-739
Sean Lynn	Washington College GBPva	slynn2@washcoll.edu	443-566- 6364
Cog staff	Paniel Consultants, I.	X CXLI@DCIEngineers	.410-370-53
Rick Konrad		Rkonrad@mwcog.org	
Alieu Turay		aturay@mwcog.org	
Ashley Peay		apeay@mwcog.org	
Jon Schermann Andrew Meese		jschermann@mwcog.org ameese@mwcog.org	
Wattlew Ridges	ay Feural Poers DC	M. rdquaye ferrant	202 854
MATTHEW WOLVER		mwolniah & jmt, com retting & sam schwartz.com tiel @ samschwartz.com	410316- 2278 202-445-

Enc Randon Matthew Gasken

006 604

mgocking mucog.org