



# Questions & Answers

## Request for Proposals for Performance Monitoring and Analysis Services

Date: November 19, 2018

To: Interested Firms and Individuals

From: Joe Castiglione, Deputy Director for Technology, Data, and Analysis

Subject: Request for Proposals to Provide Performance Monitoring and Analysis Services (RFP 18/19-06)

The Transportation Authority received the following questions in italics submitted by 5:00 p.m. on November 14, 2018.

*1. Do you have a list of segments that required a floating car run from a prior year?*

The below table lists the 39 segments from the 2017 Congestion Management Program (CMP) that required floating car runs due to insufficient observed INRIX data.

cmp_segid	cmp_name	cmp_from	cmp_to	direction	length
2	2nd St	Brannan	Market	N	0.72
3	2nd St	Market	Brannan	S	0.72
11	5th St	Brannan	Market	N	0.72
12	5th St	Market	Brannan	S	0.72
41	Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S	0.32
46	Broadway	Gough	Larkin	E	0.36
47	Broadway	Larkin	Powell	E	0.55
48	Broadway	Powell	Montgomery	E	0.35
49	Broadway	Montgomery	Embarcadero	E	0.35
50	Broadway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W	0.35
51	Broadway	Montgomery	Powell	W	0.35
52	Broadway	Powell	Larkin	W	0.55
53	Broadway	Larkin	Gough	W	0.36
72	Clay	Kearny	Davis	E	0.38
83	Drumm	Market	Washington	N	0.22
84	Drumm	Washington	Market	S	0.22
86	Duboce/Division	Mission	Potrero	E	0.66
87	Duboce/Division	Potrero	Mission	W	0.66
91	Evans	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S	0.73
92	Evans	3rd	Cesar Chavez	N	0.73
122	Golden Gate	Masonic	Franklin	E	1.37
123	Golden Gate	Franklin	Market	E	0.65

150	Main	Mission	Market	N	0.12
157	Market/Portola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	1.77
180	North Point	Van Ness	Columbus	E	0.38
181	North Point	Columbus	Embarcadero	E	0.61
182	North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W	0.61
183	North Point	Columbus	Van Ness	W	0.38
196	Pine	Market	Kearny	W	0.38
197	Pine	Kearny	Leavenworth	W	0.63
198	Pine	Leavenworth	Franklin	W	0.46
199	Pine	Franklin	Presidio	W	1.27
200	Potrero	Cesar Chavez	21st	N	0.61
201	Potrero	21st	Division	N	0.80
202	Potrero	Division	21st	S	0.80
203	Potrero	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	0.60
229	Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W	0.44
230	West Portal	Sloat	Ulloa	N	0.54
231	West Portal	Ulloa	Sloat	S	0.54

2. The INRIX documentation specifies a two-hour peak, but is that an average of all the travel times over the full two hours, or is it specific to a 15-minute period? How are you extracting out the speed for the two-hour peak period? Are you picking out the worst 15-minute period in that 2-hour period?

The CMP 2017 appendix that was posted on our website was missing Appendix 5. The document has now been updated on our website at the following link:

[https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP\\_2017\\_appendices\\_11.19.18.pdf](https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP_2017_appendices_11.19.18.pdf)

The information about extraction of average speed for peak periods is available in section A.5.3.4 of the appendix (page 9) and the following is a relevant excerpt from it:

“...The hourly average of the one-minute speeds was estimated for each CMP segment for each 15-minute interval in the peak periods. For example, the hourly average speed was estimated from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m., from 6:15 a.m. to 7:15 a.m., and so forth. The hour with lowest average speed was reported as the peak period speed...”

An additional document with more details about level of service (LOS) methodology and INRIX data processing has also been added to our website at the following link:

<https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/Auto%20LOS%20Monitoring%20Methodology.pdf>

3. Has the CMP segment correspondence been updated for the new INRIX XD segments?

No, it was updated during the last CMP cycle when INRIX speed data was available at the Traffic Message Channel (TMC) resolution. Therefore, if INRIX speed data is now available for modified segment geographies, the correspondence needs to be established again. Since there have been changes to INRIX TMCs between CMP cycles in the past, updating the correspondence has usually been a part of the INRIX data processing under Task 3 in the RFP.

4. Is the Transportation Authority open to using data sources, processes, or metrics that are different from those in the RFP? For example:

- The use of General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS)-real-time instead of automatic passenger counter/ automatic vehicle location (APC/AVL) (<https://developers.google.com/transit/gtfs-realtime/>)
- Using R instead of Python scripts

Consistency with prior year methods is required. However, the Transportation Authority is open to “testing/validating” alternative methods for potential use in future CMP updates. Using Python is a requirement.

5. In the 2017 CMP, which CMP segments were collected using floating car surveys? This information did not appear to be shown in the appendices.

Please see response to Question #1.

6. For segments where floating cars were used, what was the frequency and number of days for performing the data collection? For example, runs starting every 15-minutes over a three-day period for the peak period?

The floating car surveys were done on one typical weekday for each segment. There were four runs made about 30 minutes apart for each AM and PM two-hour periods.

7. There does not appear to be an appendix in the 2017 CMP containing a description of the data processing for the INRIX data. Can you provide a methodology for how INRIX is processed for this CMP?

Please see response to Question #2.

8. Under Task 3 of the RFP, it refers to “48 half-hour machine count locations” and “48 half-hour turning movement counts”. It is not clear whether 48 refers to the number of locations at which counts are to be conducted, or to the duration of those counts. Can you please explain what you mean by each of these phrases?

The 48 in the RFP refers to 48 half-hour periods in the entire 24-hour day. Please see Appendix 9 (Multimodal Counts Data) in the 2017 CMP for details on the count locations:

[https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP\\_2017\\_appendices\\_11.19.18.pdf](https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP_2017_appendices_11.19.18.pdf)

9. Can you please provide an estimate of how many counts of each type we should budget for?

Please see Appendix 9 (Multimodal Counts Data) in the 2017 CMP for details on count locations: [https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP\\_2017\\_appendices\\_11.19.18.pdf](https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Modeling/CMP_2017_appendices_11.19.18.pdf)

In 2017, multimodal (autos, pedestrians, and bikes) intersection (turning movement) counts were conducted at 14 locations during AM and PM peak two-hour periods. Mid-block/ADT/mainline counts were conducted at 28 locations for at least three weekdays (Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday) during the monitoring period. In addition, for 4 of the 28 locations, mainline counts were also collected for a Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

*10. Would Side Fire radar units be acceptable for segment volume counts where higher speed/high volume conditions create a safety concern?*

The Transportation Authority is open to considering alternative data collection methods provided their performance is documented/validated.

*11. Will the Transportation Authority make the INRIX data available for proposers so we can review the coverage and sample size.*

INRIX data will be provided to the selected consultant after contract award, under a non-disclosure agreement. INRIX data will not be provided prior to the contract award.

*12. The RFP mentions that “selected consultant will provide Python scripts” (Page 5, line 23). Is using Python to post process INRIX data a requirement or can the selected consultant propose to use another software (open source)?*

Using Python is a requirement.

*13. Is the Transportation Authority considering (now or in future) adding micro-mobility sources such as electric scooters and bike to the monitoring program?*

Currently we are not considering that but are interested in hearing ideas about whether and how micro-mobility sources might be considered in future CMP updates.

*14. On page 9, the RFP states that a Project Manager, Selection Process Lead and Negotiating Officer must be included. Please confirm whether the Selection Process Lead needs signature authority.*

No, the Selected Process Lead does not need signature authority, however as stated on page 9 of the RFP, the cover letter “must be signed by a person authorized by your firm to perform the commitments contained in the proposal”.

*For more information regarding the RFP, visit the Transportation Authority’s website: [www.sfcta.org/contracting](http://www.sfcta.org/contracting)*