

# Perimeter Community Improvement Districts



Addendum No. 1  
Issue Date: August 5, 2013

## This Addendum shall become and form a part of the Request for Proposals To Provide Travel Demand Model and Traffic Operational Analysis Services

In the event of a conflict between previously released information and the information contained herein, the latter shall control.

**NOTE: A signed acknowledgment of this Addendum (this page) shall be attached to your proposal.**

Firm Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Type Name and Title \_\_\_\_\_

This Addendum, including all articles and corrections listed below, shall become and form a part of the original RFP package and shall be taken into account in preparing your proposal.

### I. Written Questions and Answers:

	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
1.	In reviewing the RFP I have noted that certain GDOT pre-qualification areas listed as required deal with transportation system design rather than model development and application. I was concerned as to the reason these particular categories were included since they do not seem to address the overall scope of work which is the development and application of travel demand and traffic operations models.	The RFP notes that the prime is required to be prequalified by GDOT in area classes 1.10-Traffic Studies, 3.06-Traffic Operations Studies and 3.07-Traffic Operations Design and the team proposed prequalified by GDOT in area classes 1.02-Planning, 3.02-Two Lane or Multi Lane with Curb and Gutter and 3.13-Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians. Phase 2 of the RFP notes that the Scope of Work could include the analysis and evaluation of future proposed alternatives. The required area classes have been identified to address the work required for the Travel Demand Model and any potential work required for the

		analysis and evaluation of future proposed alternatives.
2.	I am doing some research for the above RFP. The project I worked on was a VISSIM/VISSUM model that integrated the VISSIM travel demand model outputs and utilized Dynamic Traffic Assignment and VISSIM for the assignments and simulation. I have also used several hybrids of this approach, and I was also curious if it would be acceptable to propose something along these lines but using Cube for the travel modeling and CORSIM for the operational analysis?	The PCIDs travel model developed through VISSUM may be integrated with the ARC model but exporting the VISSUM model output (daily volumes) and converting them to peak hour volumes for microsimulation through VISSIM is of primary concern. Since so many different variables, field conditions, and other local factors go into developing a microscopic simulation model, a direct export from VISSUM to VISSIM could result in questionable results. The traffic analysis required is for operational evaluation of the alternatives and not for planning purposes. A direct export from VISSUM to VISSIM may fail to achieve this objective. Using Cube to obtain travel demand forecast and subsequently using CORSIM for operational analysis would be acceptable.
3.	I was under the impression that PCID wanted parcel level insight into traffic movements in the CID area, through the use of microsimulation. But the RFP seems to ask for a 4-step traditional modeling process. Can you clarify?	The traditional travel demand modeling will be for the area/region within the PCIDs boundary and microsimulation shall be conducted for a site and/or corridor specific improvement alternatives. Parcel level microsimulation for the entire PCIDs area would not be practical and would require a significant amount of data collection and modeling effort.