

Questions and Answers regarding the Clear Roads RFP “Identifying the Parameters for Effective Implementation of Liquid-only Plow Routes”

11/17/09

1. *Just want to make sure when you say “liquid-only” that you mean this in the strict sense. For a given route, when anti-icing is employed, for many storms the effective result is that the storm is handled with “liquid-only”. However, there may be some storms (maybe a very small number) where granular material would be used when de-icing is required. This route, then would not be considered liquid-only even though it almost always is liquid-only. Is that a correct understanding of your use of the term?*

What this study is attempting to help us better understand is the effectiveness of liquid-only treatments during the storm (no granular material).

2. *A follow-up question assuming that the assumption in question #1 above was correct. We would like to run this proposed research approach by you. We want to make sure this two-pronged approach is acceptable to you:*
 - *Tap into and utilize the larger set of existing research for liquid anti-icing because liquid anti-icing results in liquid-only applications for many storm situations (because de-icing is not required)*
 - *Also research the smaller set of existing research that focuses on **strictly** liquid-only routes that require that **no** granular material be used even when de-icing is required.*

Clear Roads is not interested in smaller storms where a traditional anti-icing treatment (pre-storm liquid treatment) carries you through the event. The second bullet is the focus of this project, however it is acceptable to tap into what we know about traditional anti-icing treatments and how that affects the follow-up liquid treatments.

3. *Task 4 includes coordination of the collection of field findings for 2009-10 (this winter). This coordination needs to relatively soon I think. So, the question is when should we assume the project start date will be?*

February 1st is the target start date. We can discuss timeframes once the contract is awarded.

4. *Will there be any opportunities to work with your agency and it’s relationships with local/state offices to send obtain email lists for i.e. survey questionnaires. For example, we recently utilized the Minnesota State Aid office for this purpose for another winter maintenance project.*

Clear Roads will provide you with the names of those entities that we understand may be using liquid-only routes. You will also have access to contacts at Clear Roads member states. We assume that additional contacts should also result from the research conducted in Tasks 1 and 2.

Questions and Answers regarding the Clear Roads RFP “Identifying the Parameters for Effective Implementation of Liquid-only Plow Routes”

11/17/09

5. *We have recently have had very good success in engaging agency supervisors and front-line staff in open discussions about winter maintenance as part of another project. I assume that for Task 3, we could coordinate small group meetings for these interviews if possible in conjunction with i.e. phone interviews. Is that correct?*

Yes.

6. *Do you have any sense on how big you would like the interview pool for Task 3 or is that per our discretion?*

Task 3 should actually read “The contractor will conduct interviews with front-line staff and/or supervisors from experienced agencies identified in Task 2.” Therefore, it really depends on how many entities are successfully using this strategy. If we can get at least a half-dozen or so, representing some different geographic areas, that would provide us with enough diversity.

7. *When I read Task 4 I get the sense that we should be working with identified agencies to help suggest additional data that could be collected and observations made during the 2009-2010 winter (this winter). Is it correct to assume that we would be working with agencies to [generally] suggest additional data/observations to help close gaps, answer questions. With the additional data/observations taking place in the future winters i.e. 2010-2011, etc. Is that correct?*

Task 4 is assuring that the final report includes the most up-to-date information on liquid routes. It would be reasonable to assume that some of the information collected would help identify or shape the recommendations for Task 5, which would then be considered by Clear Roads for a possible, separate task, field test effort in 2010-2011.

8. *In regard to the Webinar (if we use that) is it okay to assume that the Webinar could be a presentation type Webinar (i.e. powerpoint) on the web along with audio discussion meeting?*

Yes

9. *If we decided to host a face-to-face meeting as opposed to a Webinar, do you know where we can assume the approximate location (City) the meeting should be held? Would you like us to specify which approach we will use (Webinar or face-to-face) in the proposal?*

You do not need to specify this, since either is appropriate. Face-to-face meetings are usually held in conjunction with Clear Roads winter or summer meetings and the location varies.

Questions and Answers regarding the Clear Roads RFP “Identifying the Parameters for Effective Implementation of Liquid-only Plow Routes”

11/17/09

10. *In regard to the TAC phone meetings. Just trying to get an idea of size. What do you think the TAC size will be approximately?*

17 members

11. *In regard to submitting the 50 hard copies of the final documents. Just verifying – we only need to submit electronically and all hardcopy publishing will be by Clear Roads and all distribution to members, libraries, etc. also will be by Clear Roads*

Correct. You do not need to account for the cost of the printing.

12. *Is there any reason why we should not submit the proposal early? That is, do you foresee there could be clarifications or minor changes of the proposal, etc.*

The scope of the project will not change, but we can't predict what clarifications other parties may request.

13. *When I read Task 4 I get the sense that we should be working with identified agencies to help suggest additional data that could be collected and observations made during the 2009-2010 winter (this winter). Is it correct to assume that we would be working with agencies to [generally] suggest additional data/observations to help close gaps, answer questions. With the additional data/observations taking place in the future winters i.e. 2010-2011, etc. Is that correct?*

Task 4 is assuring that the final report includes the most up-to-date information on liquid routes. It would be reasonable to assume that some of the information collected would help identify or shape the recommendations for Task 5, which would then be considered by Clear Roads for a possible, separate task, field test effort in 2010-2011.

14. *What kind of PI ratio do you prefer? A high PI ratio (one person focus) or lower PI ratio (team approach)?*

It's up to the proposer to decide how to assemble the investigative team for the project and to present the intended approach in the proposal.