Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise - Traffic and Revenue Consultant Services for the Interstate 70 Mountain Corridor

RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

March 15, 2013

In accordance with Section 1.5 of the RFP for the Project, the HPTE has received the following questions from Prospective Proposers' and hereby issue the following response to each question.

QUESTION #	SECTION	QUESTION / COMMENT FROM PROPOSER	HPTE RESPONSE
1	General	Several Prospective Proposers asked essentially the same question: Can the role your project consultant Parsons will take in this part of the work be clarified? Would they effectively be owners engineer or would it be more of a joint effort with the appointed T & R team.	Parsons will serve as CDOT's engineering consultant for this project and as directed by CDOT, they will provide meeting assistance and technical support to the PLT and guide the team through the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process for this life cycle phase. Parsons will also refine design concepts and estimates to provide data to support development of options included in CDOT's I-70 Traffic and Revenue study. The corridor engineering team and the co-development team are the same entity (Parsons and their sub-consultants).
2	General	Several Prospective Proposers asked essentially the same question: Does the cover letter count against the 25 page limit?	No. Cover letters and section dividers will not count towards the 25 page limit.
3	General	Several Prospective Proposers asked essentially the same question: Does one double-sided page count as one page or two pages?	Each double sided page will be considered **two** (2) pages.
4	1.34(E)	Can the desired base year of the demand model be clarified - there is mention of 2008, 2010 and 2013? Or alternatively would you be open to recommendations from the proposers for this work?	While much data (i.e. US Census, DRCOG Travel Model) are available and suggest 2010 as a good base year of demand, there is some flexibility to the base year definition for this work. Page 15 of the RFP references a 2008 base year, consistent with prior traffic work. The AGS study has collected origin-destination (O-D) information from a cell phone provider for 2011, for an area covering I-70, Eagle Airport to DIA and Fort Collins to Pueblo. The AGS study has also collected Stated Preference Survey data for trips in during both late fall (Oct-Nov 2012) and early ski season (Nov-Dec 2012).

5	1.34(G)(5)	The forecast year for modeling of the Project scenarios is shown as 2021, is it up to the T & R team to recommend other forecast years under " other scenarios " ? For a long term concession it would be normal to model the design year (+ 20 years from opening) and perhaps the last year that Socio-economic and GDP forecasts were made by the MPO .	CDOT will consider other forecast years. Page 14 describes socioeconomic analysis needed for short (2025) and long term (2040), consistent with anticipated 10-year (2015-2025) and long-range (2040) horizons for the Statewide Plan, and consistent with many MPO updates to their Regional Transportation Plans to a 2040 horizon year. Page 15 anticipated 2021 as the opening year for managed lanes, and 2025 would also be an acceptable horizon year, representing a hypothetical 5th year of managed lane operations.
6	1.34(G)(6) and 1.34(G)(12)	We are assessing the level of effort potentially involved in several tasks under this RFP, understanding that HPTE already has Parsons on board in the role of corridor engineering support and/or co-development team member (e.g., different parts of the RFP imply these potentially different roles), and that HPTE has recently hired a financial advisor. Our questions related to two specific RFP tasks include: • Task 6, Traffic Model Refinement (our question is related to the last three bullets: toll collection technology, enforcement mechanisms, and cost estimating). It would seem these tasks would be more relevant to the existing Parsons contract than a traffic and revenue study. What additional work would this traffic and revenue study need to do that Parsons has not, or will not do? • Task 12, Financial Analysis. This	• Parsons will provide the items described (toll collection technology, enforcement mechanisms, and cost estimating). • The T&R Consultant will be assisting the CDOT Financial Advisory team in understanding the financial impacts associated with each of the proposed lane configurations.

		task, as described in the RFP, is a relatively bare-bones analysis of bonding capacity. A potential P3 would almost certainly have a more complicated financial structure, making the bare-bones analysis potentially misleading. What analysis needs to be done as part of this contract that might not be provided by HPTE's financial advisor?	
7	1.34(G)(7)	Can it be confirmed that all model and data files will be available to the T & R team?	Confirmed
8	1.34(G)(7)	On page 14, second paragraph, does that mean a base year model validation?	Yes.
9	1.34(G)(11)	Is the T & R team constrained to only 2 sensitivity tests? Or could more be recommended?	HPTE and CDOT are open to considering additional sensitivity tests.
10	1.34(G)(12)	In the Financial analysis, is the T & R team required to estimate the project financial net present value , that would include the 30(say) year whole life cycle costs? Related to that, who will be responsible for estimating the Capital costs and the lifecycle O & M costs?	Parsons will refine design concepts and estimates to provide cost data to support development of options included in CDOT's I-70 Traffic and Revenue study. This includes capital costs, and lifecycle O&M costs.
11	4.3	Could there be a time problem if new survey data was required for the Skiing recreational period as the appointment of the T & R team is in May 2013?	If there is compelling reasons to collect data during the winter 2013/2014 ski season, HPTE and CDOT will consider delaying the process and T&R deliverables.