

Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (VTPO)
Corridor Improvement Program (CIP) PHASE I: Assessment of US 1/SR 5 RFP
Questions and Responses

1.) Can you please clarify the following: “A table of estimates outlining anticipated staff involvement and labor hours required for completion of tasks as well as any additional expenses that might be incurred.”?

- Is the TPO requesting just a man-hour estimate?
We are requesting a table of labor hour estimates to be broken out by staff for each. Labor rates should not be provided.
- With regard to “additional” expenses, can the TPO clarify what expenses are already expected so we can better understand what might be considered as “additional”?
“Additional expenses” - are any tasks or activities outside the proposed scope of services. These will be discussed in greater detail during presentations and during negotiations.

2.) With regard to providing three (3) work products, is the TPO asking that actual hard copies/digital copies of previous studies/reports be included in the proposal?

The TPO is requesting a listing of “similar work products” with significant detail to describe the work efforts. Web links can also be provided for the full reports (if available). We are not looking for actual copies of the completed studies/reports.

3.) At the pre-proposal meeting, a budget of \$125,000 - \$150,000 per study was referenced. The TIP amendments discussed at yesterday’s CAC and TCC meetings included funding for the CIP in the amount of \$67,000 +/- . Please clarify the apparent budget discrepancy for the US 1 study.

Adequate funds are available to support the project as stated in the pre-proposal meeting.

4.) A draft concept dated 3/14/2011 for the CIP was included in the CAC and TCC agendas. In the concept plan, the scope includes a field review to document existing conditions including lane width, turn lanes and driveways, paved shoulders, bike lanes, medians, transit stops and amenities, and generalized land use characteristics. Specifically identify safety and operational concerns within the corridor such as lighting deficiencies, failing intersections, lack of curb cuts, inadequate pavement marking, ADA issues, access management concerns, etc. The scope dated August 8, 2011 mentions these items but does not specifically reference a field review. Rather, the scope references that all data is to be collected from existing sources. Which document is correct?

The scope dated August 8, 2011 as referenced in the RFP is the correct document. There are available resources to complete the existing conditions inventory (i.e. FDOT’s Video log, Volusia County’s LIDAR and aerials etc.)