**National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board**

RFP 19-015
DEVELOPING THE COG/TPB GEN3 TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTING MODEL

Addendum #1

Date 5/31/2019

RFP 19-015 CORRECTION

Upon reviewing the published RFP, COG staff realized that a section had been left out of the "Content of Proposals". The "Proposal for Gen3 Model (up to 20 pages)" section, shown below, is added on page 39 of the RFP, to address this omission.

"3.   Section 3. Proposal for Gen3 Model (up to 20 pages)

The offeror shall propose a practical plan for developing the Gen3 Model based on the preliminary scope of work discussed in Section VII and the constraints of budget ($900,000) and timeline (three years). The plan should include both technical and management aspects to accommodate the proposed model. In this section of the proposal, the offeror can also discuss ideas for the Gen4 Model, including articulation between the two models, though the focus of the proposal should be on the Gen3 Model. The proposal should address the idea of having two rounds of calibration/validation, or make a compelling case for an alternate approach."

In the original RFP, the "technical proposal" section had included four sections (1-4). In the corrected RFP wording contained here, the "technical proposal" section now includes five sections (1-5). The original sections 3 and 4 are now numbered 4 and 5, respectively.

See attachment A at the end of this document for the full version of Section XI.C. No new RFP document will be issued.

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING OF MAY 28, 2019

Meeting time & location: 2:00 PM to 2:40 PM, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

MEETING ATTENDEES

VENDORS

- AECOM: Krishna Patnam and David Roden
- Cambridge Systematics: Jay Evans*, Feng Liu*, and Gabriel Yu
- Citilabs, Inc.: Chris Simons
- Connetics Transportation Group: Yohan Chang
- EurekaFacts: Priyasmita Roy and Paul Schroeder
- HBA Specto Inc.: John Abraham* and Kevin Stefan*
- INRO Software: Peter Vovsha* and Gaurav Vyas
- Kimley-Horn & Assoc: Jiaxin Tong*
- Michael Baker International: Bill Thomas*
- PTV: Adam Groves and Jongsun Won
- Resource Systems Group, Inc.: Katie Kobylenski* and Ben Stabler*
- Sabra & Associates: Timi Vibal
- Smart Mobility Inc.: Norm Marshal*

COG STAFF

- Sanghyeon Ko, Transportation Engineer II*
- Rick Konrad, Contracts and Purchasing Manager
- Mark Moran, Program Director, Travel Forecasting and Emissions Analysis
- Jacquelyn Sellman, Administrative Assistant

* An asterisk indicates that the person attended the meeting via teleconference.

A. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Konrad welcomed everyone to the pre-proposal meeting for COG Request for Proposals (RFP) #19-015, Consultant Assistance to Develop the Next-Generation Travel Demand Forecasting Model, known as the Gen3 Model, for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) and the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB). The meeting began with introductions of attendees, both in-person and those attending via teleconference.

B. PRESENTATION

Mr. Moran made a brief presentation about the RFP. His presentation slides will be posted on COG Bids and RFPs website (https://www.mwcog.org/purchasing-and-bids/cog-bids-and-rfps/). He noted that the contents of the presentation were drawn from the RFP, so it contains no new information.

C. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

COG staff will prepare a written summary of questions and answers, which will become an addendum to the RFP. The written summary will be uploaded to the COG website as soon as it is ready. Following the meeting, any other questions should be submitted in writing to purchasing@mwcog.org. The deadline for questions is Wednesday, June 12, 2019 at 12:00 noon.

1. Who will be invited to be on the selection committee?

The size and composition of the Technical Selection Committee (TSC) have not yet been decided. A typical COG TSC consists of five people – one representative from each of the following: The District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), and COG. However, bigger selection committees are sometimes used.

2. For the proposals, should vendors propose one type of model or several options that could be done within the budget?

A final determination about the model form will be made once a vendor has been selected. In terms of the proposals themselves, it is up to the vendors to decide what they want to propose. If vendors want to propose two options, that is fine. However, there is a specific budget ($900,000) and timeline (three years), so consultants should put forward realistic proposals that meet as many requirements as possible (as spelled out in the Product Requirements Document, which can be found on the COG Bids and RFPs website).[1]

3. What will be the approximate budget for the Gen4 Model?

Nothing can be guaranteed in terms of budget size for the Gen4 Model. According to the strategic plan, the Gen4 Model would be developed over a two-year period. If the annual funding rate is the same as for the Gen3 Model, then one could expect $300,000 per year, or $600,000 over two years. However, the funding level for Gen4 could depend on the success of the Gen3 Model.

4. The RFP proposes two rounds of model calibration and validation. Is the model validation planned for only a past year, or is a future-year validation/sensitivity test planned?

It is presumed that the validation would be done to one or more historical years (e.g., 2007 and 2014) and an out year, such as 2045 to gauge how reasonable the model is in prediction (this is often referred to as a sensitivity test). COG staff does not believe that it is wise to over-calibrate/over-fit a model, such that the model's ability to make useful forecasts is hampered. When a vendor has been selected, the vendor will develop a project management plan (PMP). The vendor and COG staff will then discuss the pros and cons of various approaches.

5. Should we assume that all the data needed for the calibration/validation work is available from COG?

COG will provide all available existing data sources including COG's 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey and the various transit on-board surveys conducted at that time. However, we are also looking to the vendor/consultant to make recommendations about data that should be collected or purchased for either the Gen3 or Gen4 Model development projects. The

---

[1] Mark S. Moran, "Product Requirements Document for the TPB Travel Demand Forecasting Model, Generation 3, the Next-Generation Model" (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, May 25, 2018).

currently adopted, production-use travel demand forecasting model (Ver. 2.3) was calibrated to year-2007 conditions and validated to year-2010 conditions (in 2013)[2] and year-2014 conditions (in 2019).[3]

6. **When will COG's 2017/2018 Regional Travel Survey be available?**

COG's most recent regional travel survey was the 2017/2018 Regional Travel Survey. Data collection ended in December 2018 and the survey is now being cleaned and factored. It is hoped that the survey could be ready for model development use by December 2019, which would mean that it might be available for the some of the model calibration/validation work under this contract.

7. **At the end of the first 1.5 years, does COG expect to have a working model?**

The timeline proposed in the RFP is one proposal. Under that proposal, at the end of 1.5 years, the consultant would deliver a workable model to the COG staff that could be tested and run, even though there would be a second period of 1.5 more years with a second round of calibration and validation. However, COG staff does not expect to use the Gen3 Model in production work, such as the air quality conformity analyses, until the end of the three-year period. During the second round of calibration/validation, any problems identified in the first round would be fixed. Once a consultant has been selected, the consultant and COG staff would prepare an updated timeline, but the three-year time limit should be considered a hard deadline for developing a workable, production-use model.

8. **The RFP notes that, in vendor proposals, COG encourages discussion of the vision for how the Gen4 Model would build upon the Gen3 Model, even though the RFP is focused on the Gen3 Model (p. 12). Where in the proposal should vendors discuss their visions for the Gen4 Model?**

COG staff noted that they would need to investigate this question before responding. Upon reviewing the published RFP, COG staff realized that a section had been left out of the "Content of Proposals" section of the RFP. In the original RFP, the "technical proposal" section had included four sections (1-4). Addendum #1 will address this omission. In the corrected RFP wording contained in Addendum #1, the "technical proposal" section now includes five sections (1-5).

D. ADJOURN

The presentations slides presented in this meeting have been uploaded on COG's Bids and RFPs website (https://www.mwcog.org/assets/1/25/19-015_Pre-proposal_Powerpoint_Presentation.pdf.)

---

[2] Ronald Milone to Files, "2010 Validation of the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model," Memorandum, June 30, 2013, https://www.mwcog.org/transportation/data-and-tools/modeling/model-documentation/.
[3] Feng Xie to Dusan Vuksan and Mark Moran, "Year-2014 Validation of TPB's Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model," Memorandum, March 12, 2019.

Attachment A

Replace XI. Content of proposals Section C in its entirety…

C.   Technical proposal

1.   Section 1. Qualifications of the firm and key personnel (10 pages, excluding resumes)

This section shall provide the professional credentials and expertise of the Offeror and key personnel assigned to this project. This shall include a demonstration of the offerors' understanding of the required scope of services and a demonstration of the offeror's and its proposed personnel's capability to perform the required services described in the scope of work. The beginning of this RFP noted the expected qualifications of proposers/offerors (Section VI). This section of the proposal should also note the degree to which the listed staff have availability during the period of the contract (e.g., estimated percentage that key staff would allocate to this project versus other projects they have). The proposal should include resumes of personnel (no more than three pages per person). Below are some examples of typical labor categories:

1.   Program Manager
2.   Project Manager
3.   Planner, Jr.
4.   Planner, Mid
5.   Planner, Senior
6.   Engineer, Jr.
7.   Engineer, Mid
8.   Engineer, Sr.
9.   Data Scientist
10.   Statistical Survey Analyst
11.   Geospatial analyst
12.   Web Developer/Content Manager
13.   Graphic Designer
14.   Technical Editor
15.   Technical Writer

2.   Section 2. Past Performance (up to 20 pages)

For two projects comparable to the Gen3 Model development project, provide a description of what was done to develop the new model, the successes and challenges that were encountered, and the roles of the various firms and agencies in the effort. Each description of past performance should be no more than 10 pages long, for a total of no more than 20 pages for both examples. Projects included in this section ideally should have been completed within the past five years.

3.   Section 3. Proposal for Gen3 Model (up to 20 pages)

The offeror shall propose a practical plan for developing the Gen3 Model based on the preliminary scope of work discussed in Section VII and the constraints of budget ($900,000) and timeline (three years). The plan should include both technical and

management aspects to accommodate the proposed model. In this section of the proposal, the offeror can also discuss ideas for the Gen4 Model, including articulation between the two models, though the focus of the proposal should be on the Gen3 Model. The proposal should address the idea of having two rounds of calibration/validation, or make a compelling case for an alternate approach.

4.   Section 4. Project management plan (10 pages)

Task 1 of the contract will be for the consultant to develop a project management plan (PMP) that outlines a proposed work plan and schedule. For proposals in response to this RFP, offerors shall develop an abbreviated PMP that can be expanded upon once the contract is begun. The abbreviated PMP shall delineate roles and responsibilities for the various team members and establish communication protocols, including in-person meetings, teleconferences, and web-based meetings. Under the contract, the consultant will prepare and submit monthly progress reports, task-based invoices (typically monthly), and any supporting documentation. The PMP shall suggest ways that the TPB staff can be involved in each major task, so that TPB staff will understand the new model and be able to support it. To achieve this goal, the consultant, in coordination with TPB staff, should identify which developmental tasks or subtasks TPB staff can assist with, keeping in mind that the consultant has the lead role for most, if not all, major tasks.

Timely completion of the Gen3 Model development is of critical importance. Offerors are to provide a brief description of their current projects and the availability of key personnel proposed to support the Gen3 Model development project.

5.   Section 5. References of the contractor and any subcontractor(s) (no more than 1 page of narrative, excluding completed Attachment D Form)

   a. The proposed Contractor and any Subcontractor(s) shall provide at least three (3) references who COG may contact regarding similar work performed.
   b. Offerors may provide letters of reference from previous relevant clients. Names, titles, addresses, email addresses, and telephone numbers shall be included for each reference.
   c. All three of these references shall include work in which the key personnel proposed to COG have been assigned.