

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION

1. AMENDMENT NUMBER A002	2. DATE ISSUED 01/03/14	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 13
4. ISSUED BY UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY 2113-R CHESAPEAKE BUILDING COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742 POINT OF CONTACT: Bruce D. Brewer TELEPHONE NUMBER: 301-405-5829 FACSIMILE NUMBER: 301-314-9565 ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS: bbrewer@umd.edu	5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)	
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR	7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 83794N	
	7B. DATED 18 November 2013	
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids X is extended per section 9.3 below.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning copy(ies) of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
<p>9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)</p> <p>9.1 This amendment serves to convey the Questions and Answers with regard to the above referenced Request for Proposals.</p> <p>9.2 Contractors are required to write their organization name and FEI number in Block 6 above.</p> <p>9.3 The Proposal Due Date is being extended. The Due Date and Time is revised from Thursday, 16 January 2013 to <u>Wednesday, 22 January 2014 4:30 P.M. E.T.</u></p> <p>9.4 Amendment A002 includes the list of Pre-Proposal Attendees (Attachment A) and Pre-Proposal Conference Materials.</p> <p>9.4 Contractors are required to enter their company name, address and FEI number in block 6, their name in block 10A and sign in Block 10B. By Signing this Amendment, the contractor accepts the incorporation of these revisions, and telefax a signed copy of this amendment to the Undersigned's attention, via 301-314-9565, or via E-Mail attachment (bbrewer@umd.edu).</p> <p>9.5 The attached Amendment A002 Alternate Pricing spreadsheet is conveyed with this amendment as per vendor question #1 below. The only change in this spreadsheet is that cells are unlocked to accommodate alternate cost models. Except as provided herein, all Dates, terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, if any, shall remain in full force and effect.</p>		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)	11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)	
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE (Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)	10C. DATE SIGNED	Bruce D. Brewer

Questions and Answers
UM RFP 83794N Amendment A002

Question 1: A discrepancy was noticed in the SDR2 details. On page 15 of the RFP, the narrative indicates 150 miles of freeway, but the pricing worksheet shows 100 miles in a cell that can't be changed. Please clarify.

Response: *The narrative on page 15 of the RFP for Sample Data Region 2 is amended to read the following, which is consistent with the pricing worksheet.*

The composition of the roadway network within the SDR 2 consists of 100 miles of Freeway and 240 miles of Major Arterials.
The Freeway portion of SDR 2 contains 20 miles with some form of special use lands and 10 miles of a roadway for which TMC codes have not been defined. There are 5 major interchanges (freeway to freeway) in the Freeway network.
Of the Major arterial network, 10 miles lack TMC codes. No Minor arterials are selected for real-time traffic in SDR2.

A pricing worksheet with all cells unlocked is provided as attachment to this amendment. As per the RFP, Section A-2/§I "Alternate Proposals", alternate pricing models are acceptable if offeror's price model differs from that afforded within the RFP initial Excel spreadsheet, offerors may utilize the provided modifiable A002 Alternate Pricing spreadsheet to reflect another cost model, however, (1) the contractor must provide a pricing model in accordance with the structure of the initial Excel spreadsheet (that is a firm price for each Sample Data Region, for each period), and (2) may use the A002 Alternate Pricing Sheet for any alternate pricing model. The Contractor's alternate price model must be sufficiently detailed to enable the University to replicate the price for each of the three sample data regions, and (3), acceptance of either the original pricing model or the alternate price model will be solely at the discretion of the University.

Question 2: Regarding SDR Data Regions: For SDR 1, what amount of the 1000 miles in each arterial category is urban and rural? The details on page 15 of the RFP do not specify this

Response: *For Sample Data Region 1, 60% of arterials are urban, and 40% are rural for both major and minor arterials.*

Question 3: Regarding SDR Data Regions: For SDR 3, the details on pages 15-16 do not specify urban or rural roadway designation for each category. Please advise.

Response: *For Sample Data Region 2 and 3, all roadways are urban*

Question 4: Due to the complexity of the proposal and the timing of question responses in association with the holidays, would you please consider extending the proposal due date to Wednesday, January 22nd?

Response: *Proposal due date is now extended to Wednesday, **January 22, 2014 at 4:30 E.T.***

Question 5: Page 8 indicates the technical proposal must contain:

- Affidavits/Certifications/MBE Compliance forms as follows:
 - Completed and signed Maryland Proposal Affidavit
 - Completed and signed Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure

- Completed and signed Federal Certifications,
- ~~Small Business information as may be required in Sections U/V,~~
- Maryland Affidavit of Living Wage
- ~~Completed Minority Subcontracting Forms, etc).~~
- Required Economic Benefits to Maryland Information
- Any additional support documentation required.

Response: *Bullets 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 are required, bullets 3, 4, and 6 are not required.*

Question 5a: Regarding “completed and signed Federal Certifications,” are these certifications the forms in section K? Are there any other forms?

Response: *Currently, no federal funds are anticipated in this project. Should a task order requiring the use of Federal Funds be implemented, these forms will be conveyed to the Contractor prior to award of the Task Order.*

Question 5b: Regarding “Small business information as may be required in Sections U/V,” will responses need to include this information if an SBE is not being used?

Response: *If the contractor is able to register as a Maryland Small Business it would be useful information. However, being a small business is NOT a requirement and will not be considered during evaluation.*

Question 5c: Regarding “Completed Minority Subcontracting Forms,” will responses need to include this form if a minority business is not included? Is there a template for this form?

Response: *No Minority Subcontracting Forms are required.*

Question 6: Page 8 of the RFP identifies the elements required to be included in the Technical Proposal, including the Solicitation/Contract form (presumably any “Amendment of Solicitation” forms as well if there are any) and several other forms. Is the 75 page limit also stated on page 8 inclusive of these forms, or exclusive?

Response: *The 75 page limit is exclusive of any required standardized forms*

Question 7: What is the priority code for Requirement 3.1.2.7?

Response: *The priority code for 3.1.2.7 is Desirable with explanation (D/E)*

Question 8: Regarding Section 6 (page 35) – Data Ownership and Licensing, we understand the University has updated the terms of the current contract, as well as those proposed in the recent RFI, with the intention of making them more legally clear. We have a questions/suggestion:

Question 8.a: It is not clear from the RFP if we are able in our proposal to suggest small or minor constructive, in our view, changes to section 6 (while supporting the section in general), or if the phrase on page 7 “Contractors must provide response indicating supporting for Data Ownership and Data Licensing provisions in Section C, subsection 6.0” leaves absolutely no room for proposing amendments to Section 6.0 in our proposal. So the initial question is: “Can a proposer include suggested changes to section 6 in its proposal or must any changes occur prior to proposal submittal as an amendment based on responses to questions?”

Response: *As stated on page 74 under technical evaluation, proposals will be evaluated to the extent that the Data Ownership and Data Licensing provisions under section C, subsection 6 can be supported. If the proposed amendments to Data Ownership and Data Licensing are technical in nature and do not impinge or materially impact the intended ability of the Coalition to access and use the traffic data as described in the RFP, then such proposed amendments will be so evaluated. If the proposed amendments are judged to fundamentally impact the ownership and licensing preventing data use as proposed in the RFP, the proposal will be deemed non-supportive of the Data Ownership and Data Licensing clauses in section C, subsection 6.*

Question 8b: If the answer to 3a above is no suggested changes can be included in the proposal, the following suggested change to Section 6 for immediate consideration:

In the first paragraph of Section 6.1, at the end of the sentence “Data Licensees shall have the perpetual right to use the traffic data provided under this contract for transportation planning and operational analyses, performance measures, service and data quality validation analyses, and all other internal organization applications and purposes and to archive all traffic data.” add “so long as the Coalition or a respective Data Licensee is not in material breach of the Contract or Data Use Agreement.” The rationale and objective of this addition is to reflect that perpetual use rights are established so long as the terms of the contract are not breached by the University or the Coalition. The term “perpetual” was not in the recent RFI so this is our first opportunity to suggest this modification.

Response:

As stated in the answer to 8a, this may be included as part of the vendor proposal, and will be evaluated as part of the technical evaluation.

Question 9: Can you describe the structure of the potential traffic data marketplace and how it is currently proposed to function?

Response: *As per the RFP, “In the event of multiple awards, the University intends to create a Traffic Data marketplace for Coalition Organizations corresponding to multiple levels of capability, quality, pricing and demonstrated ability to deliver. Levels of capability and quality are defined in highly desirable and desirable specifications of Traffic Data.” As the market for outsourced probe data has matured since the first issuance of the VPP project in 2007, the University anticipates the possibility that responses may reflect a range of traffic data products varying in the extent that highly desirable and desirable specifications are met, as well as in the level of confidence (and corresponding risk) that such products can be delivered, and as such a corresponding differentiation in price proposals. Similarly the needs of individual members of the Coalition may vary. Some members may require the highest quality data or specific data product reflected in the highly desirable and desirable specifications, while other Coalition members may only be concerned with cost and require fewer of the highly desirable or desirable specifications.*

If multiple proposals are received that meet mandatory specifications, yet vary in the extent to which highly desirable and desirable specifications are met, and the corresponding price proposals reflect such differences, the University may award multiple contracts.

Question 10: Can you describe the process envisioned for public agencies to select specific vendor(s) and services from the potential traffic data marketplace if multiple awards are granted?

Response: *Question 9 above responds to the process for procurement of data. This procurement is for the provision of data only. No services will be required.*

Question 11: Since traffic and data analytics features are an important augmentation to the performance measurement and management capabilities of I-95 Coalition agencies, is the I-95 Coalition open to considering software offerings that can enhance the Coalition's member agency's data ingestion, analytics and visualization capabilities but may also provide competitive performance management analytics to RITIS?"

Response: *This procurement is for the acquisition of traffic data to support the Vehicle Probe Project, a real-time traffic monitoring system, not for data analytics or performance-measures visualizations.*

Question 12: With the award of this contract, what role will RITIS provide to the Coalition?

Response: *RITIS, specifically the Vehicle Probe Project Suite of tools within RITIS, was initiated to provide an independent (agnostic to the data provider) archive of Vehicle Probe Data for the Coalition, and has since grown to include additional real-time and historic analysis tools. It will continue to be a shared archive of data, real-time probe dashboard, and pooled resource for analysis contingent upon support and funding from other sources.*

Question 13: Can you clarify the types of comparisons desired for requirement "3.1.11.8: Monitoring site shall provide options for comparative speed and comparative congestion views?" Is the intent to compare links, corridors, routes, regions, all the above or something different?

Response: *The intent of 3.1.11.8 is comparing current travel time and speeds to differing thresholds. For example, the color scheme of the color-coded real-time traffic may be based on absolute speed, speed relative to average conditions, speed relative to 85th percentile conditions, speed relative to freeflow speed, etc. It is not intended to compare segments, routes, or regions, rather to compare the performance of the segment to varying speed and congestion thresholds, or within an historical context. For example, a series of color-coding options could be provided within the site. One set of tiles would be color-coded based on speed measurements, one would be color-coded based on deviation from the average, and a third could be color-coded based on deviation from freeflow.*

Question 14: Is Economic Benefits a requirement in the current Contract/RFP?

Response: *Yes.*

Question 15: Have economic benefits have been reported based on the current contract?

Response: *No. Economic Benefits became a requirement subsequent to the current contract award.*

Question 16: Under the current contract, has the vendor received full payment based on quality metrics for all payments?

Response: *The vendor has received full payment for all invoices. On three occasions, offset credit previously earned was utilized in order to receive full payment.*

Question 17: How many situations occurred where quality requirements were not met over the course of the contract?

Response: *The results of the month-to-month validations are posted to the Coalition website. (<http://www.i95coalition.org/i95/Projects/ProjectDatabase/tabid/120/agentType/View/PropertyID/107/Default.aspx>) The basis of payment is determined by a formula that takes into account a representative sample of current validations. The coalition tracks performance based on these aggregate calculations. On three occasions the aggregate performance calculation fell below the quality requirements over the course of the contract.*

Question 18: When did these occur and what was the reason (accuracy, latency)?

Response: *These occurred in Sept 2011, Jan 2012, and Feb 2012. The validation process in affect at that time was based on travel time accuracy. A separate calculation of latency was not performed.*

Question 19: How will latency be measured?

Response: *See attachment 2 of the RFP for an overview of the latency validation process.*

Question 20: Regarding OD and Traffic Volumes:

Question 20a: Can you provide specifics on what different OD products are desired or most useful to the coalition? For example, are you primarily interested in estimating OD pairs specific to the I-95 corridor? Or is there a broader need for OD?

Response: *The interests in OD are best explained in Attachment #3 of the RFP. Interest is not limited to I-95, rather across a variety of roads and networks throughout the Coalition.*

Question 20b: Is the coalition considering multiple types OD matrices? Commercial vs commuter? Would there be separate OD matrices developed for different vehicles or socio-demographics?

Response: *See attachment #3. Emphasis in OD applications and OD data are for those that support operations, performance measures, and operations planning. The greater the detail and granularity that can be provided, and the closer to real-time that it can be provided in, the better.*

Question 20c: Will the OD tables be point-to-point (i.e. exit-to-exit) or zone-to-zone based? How many there an estimated origin/destination pairs are anticipated?

Response: *The nature of the OD reporting (point-to-point vs zone-to-zone) will be application dependent. Point-to-point is anticipated to describe major freeway-to-freeway trip distribution, whereas zone-to-zone would be more appropriate for larger scale OD movements. The volume and OD aspects of the RFP are open to vendor innovation and suggestion.*

Question 20d: In the event that new methods for OD/volume estimation are developed, who would own the IP?

Response: *As with the VPP traffic data, ownership of vendor-provided data and any IP developed by the vendor remains with the vendor. The contract will be for provision of data and sufficient rights to archive and use the data for applications consistent with the role of road jurisdictions.*

Question 20e: Will I-95 CC retain ownership rights and IP associated with that data?

Response: *See answer to 20d.*

Question 20f: Will the selected vendor be able to own/license OD/volume data developed for this project to third-parties?

Response: *Yes. Note however, that, as with travel time and OD, once data is purchased in the Coalition, any Coalition member may access and use subject to the contract data license and rights. This includes agencies who become members of the Coalition at a later date. .*

Question 21: Please expand on requirements 3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3 and 3.1.3.4

Response: *Recent research on arterial performance indicates that travel time distributions on arterials are higher in variance and considerably more complex than on freeways, requiring additional parameters to accurately characterize traffic flow. The intent of the 3.1.3.2 through 3.1.3.4 is to encourage vendors to recognize this need and provide products that can accurately characterize such traffic flow. Documents on the I-95 Corridor Coalition's website related to the validation efforts on arterials provide additional insight, as well as research products from FHWA SHRP-II.*

Question 22: Are requirements for 3.1.8.7, 3.1.8.8 and 3.1.8.9 being met under the current project?

Response: *As of July 2013, these requirements were not met under the current VPP project.*

Question 23: “In 2008, the VPP began by providing data on approximately 1500 centerline miles of freeway and 1000 centerline miles of non-freeway roadways. As of January 2013, the VPP had grown so that it reported on over 7000 freeway centerline miles and over 27,000 non-freeway centerline miles.”

Question 23a: What is the minimum coverage and/or maximum coverage? What does the Coalition expect to fund?

Response: *There is no minimum or maximum coverage specifically defined in this RFP. Current coverage is approximately 40,000 centerline miles, combined for both freeway and non-freeway roads in the VPP. Central Coalition funding for the VPP has been limited to the initial core coverage of approximately 2500 miles. The balance has been expansions funded by Coalition members. Central funding for the core 2500 miles will end in June 2014. The Coalition anticipates that coverage will be sustained and expanded by Coalition members.*

Question 23b: Is there a map of the base coverage that can be provided?

Response: *There is no map of base coverage, as ‘base coverage’ is not defined. A map that approximates the current coverage of the VPP is available at http://www.i95coalition.org/i95/Portals/0/Public_Files/uploaded/Vehicle-Probe/VPP%20Next%20Gen%20Enhancements%20Webinar%20-%20Final.pdf Pages 4 and 5.*

Question 23c: How many miles has the coalition currently contracted?

Response: *See answer to 23a*

Question 23d: How much has each state contracted currently?

Response: *See slide 5 from Coalition archive document at http://www.i95coalition.org/i95/Portals/0/Public_Files/uploaded/Vehicle-Probe/VPP%20Next%20Gen%20Enhancements%20Webinar%20-%20Final.pdf This slide provides an estimate of as of the beginning of 2013.*

Question 23e: What is the process for acquiring the real-time traffic data for the required coverage? (Does the coalition purchase this and it becomes available to all members?)

Response: *Contracts are structured a “Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite Quantity” (IDIQ), and task orders are issued in order to provide real-time traffic data in accordance with the contract. Any traffic data procured through the contract is available to all Coalition members.*

Question 23f: What is the process for acquiring additional coverage beyond the basic coverage?

Response: *See 23e.*

Question 23g: Is this additional coverage initiated by states or the coalition?

Response: *See answer to 23a. Coalition members provide funding to acquire coverage in their jurisdictions. All contract administration is performed by University of Maryland.*

Question 23h: Is it paid for by the individual state(s) requesting coverage or by a pool of funds through the Coalition?

Response: *The method Coalition members use to provide funding to expand coverage varies.*

Question 24: In what types of ways could split awards be made?

Response: *See answer to question 9 and 23e.*

Question 25: Could split awards be made for real-time traffic data (passenger, truck, geographically i.e. by state)?

Response: *See answer to question 9.*

Question 26: Could split awards be made by type of data (real-time traffic, volume, OD)?

Response: *See answer to question 9. UMD anticipates awarding the Volume and OD portions of the contract independent of the travel time and speed. One or more vendors may be awarded a contract for the travel time and speed data. The award/s for the volume and OD is dependent on the quality and value of the proposals received and available budget. A different vendor may be awarded the contract for volume data, and another vendor may be awarded a contract for the OD data.*

Question 27: 6.6 Data provided by the Contractor will be incorporated into the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Transportation Laboratory's Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS). RITIS is an automated data sharing, dissemination, and archiving system that includes many performance measure, dashboard, and visual analytics tools that help agencies to gain situational awareness, measure performance, and communicate information between agencies and to the public. Access to Contractor traffic data and derivative works in RITIS requires active Data Use Agreement as discussed herein." P37

We understand the coalition has already invested in an archive and website for the VPP through RITIS

Question 27a: Can a data provider expect to use this site or shall data providers develop their own websites?

Response: *The data from the VPP flows into the VPP Suite hosted in RITIS and its associate tools and utilities. However, the VPP Suite is downstream, independent, and separately funded from the VPP, similar to other Coalition member data and operations systems into which VPP data is currently integrated. The functionality of the VPP is managed and funded independently from the VPP Suite.*

The vendor provided monitoring site is considered a critical part of the VPP. A recent survey of Coalition members indicated that a large majority are currently using the vendor provided monitoring site for

operations monitoring. (see http://www.i95coalition.org/i95/Portals/0/Public_Files/uploaded/Vehicle-Probe/16apr13-VPP%20webcast-final.pdf starting on slide #48) The vendor archive also remains critical as the vital fallback source should downstream archive mechanisms fail. As such, the required monitoring site and archive specifications remain in effect.

However, given the utility provided by the VPP Suite and other Coalition member websites, the requirement for extensibility of the vendor provided monitoring website can be relaxed. Specification 3.1.11.2 is amended to read, “The website shall have the capacity to initially support up to 150 concurrent users with the ability to scale to 400 concurrent users if needed.”

Question 27b: Does the Coalition see value in having a single portal for all probe data for situational awareness or are multiple sites acceptable?

Response: See discussion in 27a. Each vendor awarded a contract for real-time traffic data is required to provide a monitoring site that reflects the status of their system as specified, enabling direct visibility and accountability of data as well as situational awareness of traffic conditions.

Question 27c: If the coalition does make multiple awards, is the expectation that there will be multiple websites?

Response: See 27a and 27b.

Question 27d: Will each state determine if it wants to use the RITIS or the website provided as a part of this RFP?

Response: See 27a and 27b.

Question 27e: How many states already have their own website and would prefer to continue using their current site? How many states are looking for new solutions for display and analytics?

Response: See 27a and 27b.

Question 28: “Monitoring site shall provide visual display of traffic data for all roadways in Coverage Area. This includes roadways for which real-time Traffic Data is under contract as well as **non-contracted roadways** in the Coverage Area.” What non-contracted roadways are expected?

Response: For example, if a vendor has traffic data available on freeways as well as principal arterials within a jurisdiction, and the jurisdiction contracts only for freeway real-time traffic data feed, the vendor may also provide visual display of traffic for the principal arterials along with the freeways on the monitoring site (just visual, no access to archive or data).

Question 29: There are a number of sections that have “Reserved”. Is that intentional?

Response: Yes. “Reserved” represents contract clauses in the Universities RFP template which are not applicable to this procurement, yet retain the numbering sequence for standardization purposes.

Question 30: Section 4.0 indicates contractors must provide at least 2 references and then lists three templates for references 1, 2, and 3. Does this mean there is a maximum of 3 references?

Response: *There is no maximum.*

Question 31: The RFP calls for a fixed price model, yet UMD has stated verbally that Coalition members can negotiate pricing independently. Can Coalition members negotiate the pricing as posted by UMD?

Response: *This is a fixed price model. Coalition members expanding coverage under this contract do NOT negotiate pricing independently.*

Question 32: RFP Section 3.1.11 – it would seem that the requirement for a website allowing Coalition members to monitor traffic data is redundant to the capability currently provided by RITIS. Given this circumstance, would UMD consider changing the Priority Code to something other than “mandatory”?

Response: *See 27a.*

Question 33: RFP Section 3.1.10.4 and 3.1.11.4 – what is the difference between these requirements?

Response: *3.1.10.4 specifies the archive, 3.1.11.4 specifies that it must be available through the monitoring site.*

Question 34: RFP Section 3.1.2.7 – what is the Priority Code for this item?

Response: *The priority code for 3.1.2.7 is Desirable with explanation (D/E)*

Question 35: Due to staffing demands over the Holidays we respectfully request an extension to the RFP submission deadline.

Response: *See answer to 2.*

Question 36: Can the requirement to provide 25 hard copies for the RFP response be reduced?

Response: *No. The 25 copies are required for Evaluation Committee and other Procurement Requirements.*

Question 37: After contract award(s) will UMD consider adding vendors at a later time? For example if a new vendor appears in 2015 with an innovative technology for real time traffic data that was not given an award in 2014 can UMD add them to the contract if it is in the best interests of the Coalition?

Response: *No. Once contracts are awarded- no additional contracts will be awarded.*

Question 38: Will UMD use a numerical grading system to provide empirical weighting to the selection criteria and if so can UMD share this with proposers prior to the RFP submission date? For example:

Technical Proposal: **Possible 100 points Max Score**

1. Demonstration of a full understanding of the RFP, and the demonstration of ability to meet all mandatory requirements for the provision of Traffic Data for the various roadway types = **20 points max score**
2. Demonstration of ability to meet the highly desirable (HD) technical requirements as specified in Section C, subsection 3.1, categories 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. =**20 points max score**
3. Demonstration of ability to meet the highly desirable (HD) technical requirements as specified in Section C, subsection 3.1, categories 2, 3, 10, and 11. =**20 points max score**
4. Demonstration of the extent to which project risk can be minimized and/or mitigated. =**10 points max score**
5. Demonstration of ability to meet desirable technical requirements (D) as specified in Section C, subsection 3.1, categories 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. =**10 points max score**
6. Demonstration of ability to meet desirable (D) technical requirements as specified in Section C, subsection 3.1, categories 2, 3, 10, and 11. = **10 points max score**

Economic benefits to Maryland, category 12.= **10 points max score**

Response: *Evaluations will not be conducted utilizing point scores.*

Question 39: Can you please clarify whether submittal of a proposal establishes full acknowledgement and acceptance of the terms and conditions as stated in the RFP, or can the selected vendor(s) anticipate a formal contract?

Response: *The RFP, Amendments, Clarifications, Technical and Financial proposal including any pertinent supporting information constitute the contract.*

Question 40: Please describe what states will do if there is a gap between the end date of the current contract and the decision and/or availability of the new contract.

Response: *The current contract will likely be extended.*

Question 41: The following item is missing a priority code. Please provide.

3.1.2.7	Predictive travel time that provides anticipated roadway condition into the future. For example, data feed may provide anticipated travel time and/or speed for the roadway 15 minutes, 30 minutes, and/or 1 hour into the future.	
---------	--	--

Response: *The priority code for 3.1.2.7 is Desirable with explanation (D/E)*

Question 42: In the matrix in section 3.1, what are the appropriate response codes for the response code column in the matrix?

Response: *No response is required in this column.*