

County of Kane PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

Theresa Dobersztyń, C.P.M., CPPB
Director of Purchasing

719 S. Batavia Avenue, Bldg. A.
Geneva, Illinois 60134
Telephone: (630) 232-5929
Fax: (630) 208-5107



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) ADDENDUM 2 RESPONSES TO PROPOSER QUESTIONS

DATE: February 23, 2017

RFP No. & Title: 15-017, Adaptive Signal Control Technology (ASCT) System
Randall Road (County Highway 34)
Big Timber Road to Huntley Road (County Highway 30)
County Section Number: 14-00441-00-TL

QUESTION AND RESPONSE:

1. Do you want the proposal tabs to be exactly like your list on page 1?
 - a. Signed Proposal Response Form**
 - b. Scope of Services Response
 - c. Qualifications / Resumes
 - d. Cost Proposal (Bind separate from other sections in Proposal)
 - e. Reference Form
 - f. Certificate of Insurance
 - g. Contractor Disclosure Statement

Response to (1): As outlined in page 29 of 33 of the RFP, the listed sections are correct. Please also read through Header “V. Proposal Requirements” for additional details to be covered within each section. Finally, since the cost proposal is to be bound separately, a mostly blank single page can be inserted which simply indicates to “See Separate Cost Proposal, Bound separately but included as part of this proposal”.

**as part of “Response to (3)” a Blank ACCEPTANCE form can be included at the end of the Signed Proposal Response Form

2. The Contractor Disclosure Statement – do you want us to fill out a letter exactly like the same (page 33) and have it notarized?

Response to (2): Yes. For simplicity, a letter following the same format is preferred; however, if the same information, as shown in the sample document, is conveyed and notarized in a similar format, the document is most likely to be received as acceptable. The County will work with the successful proposer/respondent if the submitted disclosure statement requires formatting adjustments.

3. Do we [the respondent] fill out the Acceptance form (page 4)?

Response to (3): No, but include the blank form “as-is” in your proposal response. The Form labeled “ACCEPTANCE” shall be included at the end of the signed “Proposal Response Form” as seen on page 3 of 33 of the RFP packet. For additional clarification and background, should a single proposal be chosen to be in the best interest of the County, The ACCEPTANCE form will be presented (along with the rest of the proposal) to the County Board Chairman and he would consider and ultimately sign off on the ACCEPTANCE form.

4. Would it be possible to provide the current signal timing plans for these intersections?

Response to (4): Yes, the link provided to respondents as part of this addendum will include additional documents which better outline timing plan data for each intersection in order to provide a better understanding of current signal operations. The timing data is based upon our records and is subject to prior field adjustments. Split logger data will also be provided.

5. Are there additional sources of information about peak time turning counts at some or all of these intersections that could be made available?

Response to (5): No turning movement count data is available. Data available from our central system’s split logger will be provided to help convey a better understanding about the corridor and the current utilization of the existing signal timings. Please be advised that referencing the website: <http://www.gettingaroundillinois.com/gai.htm?mt=aadt> can provide historical annual average daily traffic (AADT) information for all of the Randall Road segments and a few of the side streets. Another independent AADT count map is also available from Kane County’s web site: <http://kdot.countyofkane.org/Publications/AADT%202015.pdf>. It should also be noted that if traffic counts are required in order to properly assist in the selected Vendor’s ASCT deployment and implementation along this corridor then these traffic count costs should be included in your cost proposal. Detailed AADT reports for locations near project limits will be provided.

6. Is it required that the proposed ASCT must be compatible with M50/M60, ASC3, Cobalt, and Intelight or can they take exception with any of the controllers listed?

Response to (6): The purpose of stating controller compatibility comes in the forms of many direct and indirect reasons. The Proposed ASCT solution should work tangentially with our central system software, TransSuite. TransSuite is engineered by TransCore and they work with many manufacturers of controllers in incorporating their Management Information Base (MIB) information to allow for TransSuite users to make use of a variety of available controllers on the market. These listed controllers are current and future iterations of the controllers commonly distributed in our region. Should a respondent take exception to any of the listed controllers, they shall identify the specific incompatibilities and provide as much information as part of their proposal response and work plan behind why Kane County should allow the exception.

7. **Has the City [/County] Verified with all controller vendors/types listed in the RFP, that they'll support non-proprietary adaptive solutions; was a commitment from the controller vendors to support the final selected adaptive system supplier?**

Response to (7): The County does not determine the means and methods a proposer's ASCT solution will use to convey and deliver adaptive operations; as such, there is no need for the county to seek commitments from these controller vendors. Proposers are allowed the flexibility to propose alternate controller hardware which is different from the controller hardware currently running the individual signalized intersection locations so long as the proposed controller is compatible and is supported by our central system software, TransSuite. If the proposed controller hardware is not a make/model listed within the RFP, the respondent shall identify the specific incompatibilities and provide as much information as part of their proposal response and work plan behind why Kane County should allow the exception. Regarding general support, there should be an understanding of which components (both hardware and software) makes up the ASCT solution and which parts make up non-ASCT functions. Should a proposer's ASCT solution present modifications to existing hardware, it should be detailed in the subsequent engineering plans (to be developed with the aid of the successful proposer). Subsequently, in advance of ASCT construction/implementation, revised cabinet prints and other important reference drawings will need to be produced for records and printed copy supplied for each signal cabinet location. The ASCT proposer / manufacturer should be capable of servicing the parts of the ASCT solution which may be proprietary in nature or existing hardware/software as modified to perform adaptive functions as proposed.

8. **Are McCain Omni/ATC or Peek controllers excluded as options?**

Response to (8): The listed controllers of this question are simply not common hardware for our county and would be less preferred than other options mentioned in the RFP. See "Response to (6)" for more details.

9. Are there any specific requirements for cabinet type to be used (desired), existing cabinets that are being utilized, or future cabinets that need to be supported?

Response to (9): All existing cabinets in the RFP corridor limits are NEMA / shelf style cabinets, see “Attachment F” of the RFP document for photographic documentation of existing cabinets and their TS-1 or TS-2 hybrid configuration. Should a proposer require additional space or a new cabinet all together, a NEMA TS 2 style cabinet along with side mount battery backup system would be preferred as detailed to Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) standards***. Estimated costs for cabinet replacement should also be included in the cost proposal. The cabinet should be fully capable of running either the adaptive functions outlined in the RFP or the ability to switch back to central system based on Time-of-Day operation as commanded/scheduled through TransSuite.

*** Specification details should not be required until the design stage after selection of successful vendor but should the proposer desire to see details regarding IDOT specifications, they can be found here:

<http://www.idot.illinois.gov/Assets/uploads/files/Doing-Business/Manuals-Guides-&-Handbooks/Highways/Construction/Standard-Specifications/Standard%20Specifications%20for%20Road%20and%20Bridge%20Construction%202016.pdf>

or

<http://www.idot.illinois.gov/doing-business/procurements/engineering-architectural-professional-services/Consultants-Resources/>

10. Is there any previous system evaluation reports available to review that might help determine current operations of the corridor?

Response to (10): Review of “Appendix B: Concept of Operations” will provide some background information on the current operations of the existing system. Signal Timing Information as well as split logger data will be provided to further help outline the current operations of the system.

11. What “future” TSP is planned? Is it going to be a separate operating system, or is envisioned as a system coexisting with the ASCT (with functionality provided by the controller), or the ASCT must provide the TSP functionality?

Response to (11): Review of “Appendix B: Concept of Operations” will provide some background on TSP functionality desired. A recent PACE project has expanded service with a “Park-n-Ride” facility off of Randall and Point which regularly enters and leaves the Park-n-Ride facility to and from I-90. The desirability would be for TSP to potentially coexist alongside the ASCT, the intent is not for this proposal to deliver TSP functionality or detection. Rather for TSP to be reasonably accommodated during adaptive operations without completely re-engineering or disabling of the ASCT when or if a TSP specific project comes in subsequent to this project. TSP accommodations are not a mandatory requirement which is why we describe this as desirable.

12. When planning for the detection for the new ASCT, does the new detection plan need to consider TSP requirements?

Response to (12): No, see “Response to (11)” for further details.

13. Is any DBE participation required or favored in the scoring?

Response to (13): DBE participation is **not** required or favored in scoring.

Here are some additional clarifications for the evaluation and score ranking of the cost proposal. Take this response as general guidance and not in any way language that would supersede language in the RFP document.

General Guidance to (13):

The range in the required (or desired, or optimal) input (detectors or other data collectors), and the range in the required hardware or existing infrastructure modifications to accommodate a proposer's ASCT can produce vastly different total costs to implement. It is similarly recognized that the proprietary hardware, design assistance, and software/licenses as produced or performed by / from the ASCT developer/manufacturer are the items which a proposer would have better information for in conveying accurate costs. Since Kane County desires a system which can perform optimally, the desired/required number of additional detection devices and the anticipated extra “non-proprietary” items such as traffic signal cabinets, underground conduits, cables, poles, detectors can significantly impact the anticipated total cost in delivering a fully functional ASCT and these combined cost should be considered as a whole. If the proposer wishes to have various sub totals or “build alternates” in their cost proposal to outline various “tiers” of additional cost for additional detection say for “minimal”, “desirable”, and/or “Optimal” additional detectors, this could be considered acceptable provided some background is provided behind the additional detection goals and/or locations and/or benefits that are being achieved by each tier of pricing.

Final negotiations with the successful vendor on the cost proposal will not include “non-proprietary” items since those items will be specified, and constructed as part of a subsequent low-bid construction contract (of which the successful Proposer will help design). The final negotiated cost proposal from this RFP will be written into a lump sum payment as a line item in the subsequently designed plan which is then publically advertised as a low bid construction contract.

Should a proposer desire assistance in estimating prices for the “non-proprietary” items, Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) makes publicly available the “Pay Item Report with Awarded Prices” for various standard pay items such as detector loops, cabinets, conduits, etc. This information is categorized by letting dates and can be viewed here:

<http://www.idot.illinois.gov/home/resources/Archives/transportation-bulletin-archives>

(Please note to use values for “DIST 1” for even greater cost estimating accuracy)

14. Can a copy of the formal contract to be used to execute with the successful bidder be provided for review?

Response to (14): Yes, typical language used in the formal contract will be provided in the same location where the RFP was downloaded from. It should be noted that the RFP document as well as the proposal received from the successful respondent also become part of the final contract. The example language is also subject to revisions prior to final signatures.

15. The Term indicated on the first page notes 2 years + three 1 year options. Page 22 IV states the term as 12 months with option to extend for additional 24 months, which of these is accurate?

Response to (15): The accurate terms will be for 2 years + three optional 1 year renewal periods.

16. Due to the technical nature of the proposal, the number of requirements to respond to (31 pages), and subsequent operational details (116 page) to review; would the client, in the interest of allowing bidders more time to prepare their proposals, be open to at least a two week extension on the deadline?

Response to (16): While the County believes that 4 weeks is a sufficient length of time to review, prepare, and submit proposals. The County also finds it would be in the best interest for all parties involved to consider an extension on the submittal deadline. The County is therefore providing a 2 week extension on the deadline to submit proposals.

The RFP Due Date & Time shall be amended to be **2:00pm Central Time on March 17th, 2017**
This new date shall apply to all sections of the RFP which previously indicated a March 3rd, 2017 date (or other equivalent format)

The intent of this change is to encourage additional proposal submissions as well as higher quality proposal submissions.

Summary of Documents being provided through website downloads:

- Example Contract (to be drafted between Kane County and Successful Proposer)
- Traffic Signal Timing for each signalized intersection – Split Logger Data
- Split Logger Data Legend – Pages from TransSuite’s User Manual
- Traffic Signal Timing for each signalized intersection – Controller Configuration
- Updated “Attachment E” Page – Summarizes Signal groups and Existing Time of Day plans
- Kane County DOT – 2015 AADT Map
- Kane County DOT – 2015 AADT Detail Reports for counts near project limits

Confidentiality Statement:

These documents and any attachments as shared by the County as part of this Request for Proposal (RFP) process contain confidential information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) for the intended purpose of aiding with the RFP response. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination or distribution of this information is strictly prohibited unless prior written approval is provided by a County official.

Request for Acknowledgement:

Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum In the space provided on Page 3 of the Proposal document. Thank you for your interest in the Kane County procurement process.

Sincerely,

Maria C. Calamia

Maria C. Calamia, CPPB

Assistant Director of Purchasing