I. Introduction

The Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) is a nonprofit, membership organization established in 1994 to serve the needs and interests of metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) nationwide. Federal statutes require, as a condition for spending federal highway or transit funds in urbanized areas, the designation of MPOs. MPOs have responsibility for planning, programming and coordination of federal surface transportation investments. AMPO offers its member MPOs technical assistance and training, conferences and workshops, print and electronic communications, research, a forum for transportation policy development and coalition building, and a variety of other services. The nine-member AMPO Board of Directors is directly elected by the membership.

The Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations Research Foundation (AMPORF), a federal 501(c)(3) organization, is the educational and research foundation of AMPO. AMPORF undertakes work that improves livability and quality of life in cities through metropolitan transportation planning. AMPORF is governed by the AMPO Board of Directors.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) of San Diego, California, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of Oakland, California, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) of Atlanta, Georgia, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) of Seattle, Washington and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) of San Francisco, California (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Agency Partners”) aspire to develop a common transportation modeling platform. A consolidated platform will reduce the overall costs of maintenance and development of innovative new model components associated with isolated model implementations. Each MPO Partner will benefit from enhancements championed by other Agency Partners, and a common platform should expand the modeling knowledge base. The Agency Partners will further benefit from bug fixes, model enhancements, and performance improvements identified and completed by their fellow colleagues.
AMPO and the Agency Partners have committed to a governance structure and funding of a technical program to develop this common platform from 2013 to 2016. Appendix 1 contains a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between AMPO and the Agency Partners.

Phase I of platform development is complete. AMPORF, on behalf of AMPO and the Agency Partners, has issued this Request for Proposals to procure services for Phase II of platform development.

II. Overview of Work

Each Agency Partner currently uses an activity-based model (ABM) system. The common transportation modeling platform under development is based on the Coordinated Travel and Regional Activity Model Platform (CT-RAMP) ABM. The common modeling platform will combine the current CT-RAMP code branches developed for individual MPOs into a consolidated trunk for use by each organization. Once consolidated, an Agency Partner steering committee will determine a development roadmap that best serves the common needs of the Agency Partners.

The core code base (defined by consultant and Agency Partners) at each participating agency shall be identical once the consolidation is complete. The Agency Partners shall only be required to customize parameter and input files specific to their region. The consolidated code trunk shall provide a robust platform to calibrate the model for each region; no changes to compiled libraries shall be required to calibrate a model for a specified region.

Where code branches are necessary for a particular Agency Partner’s implementation, the branches should only extend or implement core model functionality defined in the main trunk. At a minimum, any unique branch functionality shall be present as an unimplemented interface integrated into the main trunk. For example, if SANDAG requires a tolling module outside of the agreed roadmap, the consultant shall define tolling interface hooks in the main trunk and build the SANDAG specific module as a series of classes implementing the trunk interfaces.

III. Work Completed

The common transportation modeling platform is referred to as ActivitySim. Phase I of platform development has been completed. The current ActivitySim implementation can be found at https://github.com/UDST/activitysim. Additional ActivitySim documentation, issues, project wiki, and other information can be found at this GitHub repository. An evaluation of work completed in Phase 1 of ActivitySim development can be found at https://github.com/UDST/activitysim/wiki/Phase-1-Evaluation

ActivitySim is based on the CT-RAMP ABM. The current version of ActivitySim is implemented in Python 2.7. The ActivitySim code base is governed by the GNU Affero General Public License. ActivitySim is based on the CT-RAMP activity-based model platform, which is programmed in Java (currently v1.6) and uses the Java Parallel Processing Framework (JPPF) for distributing
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computing. The CT-RAMP code base is governed by the Apache Software Foundation License Version. The existing CT-RAMP implementation can be found at http://github.com/SANDAG/ABM. The existing code base includes a Maven POM file for compiling the code into a working Java ARchive (JAR).

Core Capabilities

Core capabilities established in Phase I of ActivitySim development include:

Data Handling: ActivitySim operates on two data formats, HDF5 and Open Matrix (OMX). The HDF5 format is used for managing flat files, including land use inputs, synthetic population files, and accessibility files. The OMX format is used for managing network skims. Two key data structures in ActivitySim are pandas.DataFrame and pandas.Series. ORCA is an orchestration/pipeline tool that defines dynamic data sources and connects them to processing functions.

Utility Expression Calculator (UEC) and Configurations: ActivitySim has a UEC configuration system in place. ActivitySim reads in UECs as Pandas DataFrame or Series. There are 3 UEC configuration variations:

- simple choice model UEC
- destination choice model UEC (which combines the destination choice UEC and destination choice alternatives files)
- complex choice model UEC (comprised of 3 files: a csv based UEC with description, a csv based coefficient file and a YAML setting file)

Expression Evaluation: ActivitySim has an expression evaluation system in place. ActivitySim provides two ways to evaluate expressions. Simple expressions are evaluated using DataFrame.eval(). Python expressions, denoted by beginning with the @ character, are evaluated in the context using custom Python’s eval() function.

Utility Computation: Utilities are computed using pandas.DataFrame matrix multiplication function dot().

Logit Choice Engines: The only logit choice engine implemented in ActivitySim is the multinomial logit. Implementation of N-level nested logit capabilities are an important goal of Phase II platform development.

Activity Simulations: The simulation of model components are executed as steps registered with ORCA.

Model Component Implementations: As shown in Table 1, 10 out of 29 SANDAG CT-RAMP sub-models are implemented. Two of the 10 implemented models are complete; the other 8 models are partially complete. Although only 10 models are implemented in ActivitySim, some of these models can be transferred to other similar models without significant effort.
transferable models are grouped by: tour destination choices (in blue), tour TOD choices (in green), and tour mode choices (in orange).

**Table 1. Model Component Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CT-RAMP</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Segmentations</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Calculate Accessibilities</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>by mode, plus constant and size term</td>
<td>varies by mode</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pre Auto Ownership</td>
<td>Nested</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0, 1,2,3+</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work from home</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>HOME, NON-HOME</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work location</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>sample 30 from 23002 MGRAs</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School location</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>preschool, K_8, 9_12, Uni</td>
<td>sample 30 from 23002 MGRAs</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Auto Ownership</td>
<td>Nested</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0, 1,2,3+</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parking Provision Model</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Free, Pay, Reimburse</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IE Tour Generation</td>
<td>Binary Logit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CDAP</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>691 alts, combination of HH size, person activity type (M,N,H), and Joint Tour Presence in HH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Man Tour Frequency</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1W,2W,1S,2S,1W1S</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Man Tour TOD</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>work, Uni, School</td>
<td>820 alts, combination of departure and arrival time</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Man Tour Mode</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>3 Man,</td>
<td>26 modes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joint Tour Frequency &amp; Composition</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>150 combination of number of joint tours (max 2), 5 tour purposes, and party composition (3)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Joint tour participation</td>
<td>Binary Logit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Joint Tour Location</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>3 Man,Maint,Disc,AtWork</td>
<td>sample 30 from 23002 MGRAs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Joint Tour TOD</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>Escort, Shop, Maint., Eat, Visi, Disc.</td>
<td>820 alts by combination of departure and arrival time</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Joint Tour Mode</td>
<td>MNL</td>
<td>3 Man,Maint,Disc,AtWork</td>
<td>26 modes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NonMan Tour Frequency</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>8 person types</th>
<th>197 alts by number of tours (5max) and each tour purpose</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NonMan Tour Location</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>Escort, Shop, Maint., Eat, Visi, Disc.</th>
<th>sample 30 from 23002 MGRAs</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NonMan TOD</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>Escort, Shop, Maint., Eat, Visi, Disc.</th>
<th>820 alts by combination of departure and arrival time</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NonMan Mode</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>Maint,Disc,</th>
<th>26 modes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AtWork Sub Tour Frequency</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>7 by number of tours (max 2) and tour purpose</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AtWork Sub Tour Location</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>sample 30 from 23002 MGRAs</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AtWork Sub Tour TOD</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>820 alts by combination of departure and arrival time</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AtWork Sub Tour Mode</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>AtWork</th>
<th>26 modes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop Frequency Choice</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>10 tour types (3 man+6 non-man+1 atWork)</th>
<th>16 alts by combination of number of tours in and out bound (3max)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop Location Choice</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>Man, Non-Man, Discretionary</th>
<th>30 sample zones</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop mode</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>3 Man, Maint, Disc, AtWork</th>
<th>26 modes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop parking</th>
<th>MNL</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>440 downtown zones</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Desired Capabilities**

In order to complete implementation of the ActivitySim platform and model components, the core capabilities need to be expanded to include:

**Mode Choice Logsums:** Mode choice logsums are used in many model components, such as the Coordinated Daily Activity Pattern (CDAP) model, tour location choices, tour TOD choices, and stop location choices. Logsums need to be calculated and fed upstream through the model system. Flexibility to specify and generate additional logsums to support integration with land use models and other tools is also desired.

**Nested Logit Models:** ActivitySim currently includes multi-nominal logit capabilities. An N-level nested logic choice model engine is desired.

**Destination Choice Sampling:** In ActivitySim, *every* destination choice alternative is considered in a Monte Carlo process. An informed alternative sampling procedure is desired.
Inter-Person Activities: ActivitySim does not include the complex inter-person ("intra-household") models found in CT-RAMP. The complexities caused by inter-person activities are in all joint choice models, including joint tour frequency, composition, participation, location, and time of day choices. An important step is to compute available overlapping time window of household members. The process to determine available overlapping window involves multiple decision makers and involves complicated logic. All inter-person capabilities and models currently implemented in the SANDAG CT-RAMP implementation are desired.

Scheduling: Scheduling time-of-day choices depends on available time windows. The allocation of activities to time slots and computing residual time windows are complicated, especially when multiple people are involved. Time window calculation and availability needs are desired.

Complex Logic: In some models such as stop location choice model and the CDAP model, the activity simulation logic is complicated. In the stop location choice model, logical integrity needs to be maintained by inbound/outbound and by tour/trip modes, stop alternative sampling is embedded, logsums are segmented by origin to stop and stop to destination, and mode and parking choices are also embedded in the model. In the CDAP model, utilities for one person, two people interactions, three people interactions, all household members’ interactions, and presence of joint tours all contribute to utilities. The formation of household level CDAP alternatives by combining each member’s choice is complicated. Coding of the complex logic associated with individual model components is desired.

Shadow Pricing: Shadow pricing is used to constrain work and school location choices based on employment and enrollment inputs. Shadow pricing is part of the work/school location choices and is run iteratively to achieve reasonable matches between work/school location choices and employment and enrollment totals. Shadow pricing needs to be implemented in ActivitySim.

Skim Handling: ActivitySim has an OMX-based skim handling system. The current version of ActivitySim has not been tested against large set of skims. In addition, it is desired to have the capability to index multiple skims within a single model For example, the stop location choice model must be able to access two separate skims: one from origin to stop location, and one from stop location to destination. Skim runtime and memory performance assessment is desired, which may require modifications to current skim handling capabilities.

Miscellaneous Requirements

- Phase II of ActivitySim implementation should build upon the framework and capabilities established in Phase I of model development.
- The consolidated model software must support the core CSV, HDF5 and OMX data formats.
- The Agency Partners are interested in deploying future versions of the modeling software in a scalable cloud (or local computing grid) implementation. Ensuring the modeling
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Software is compatible and optimized for a virtual and distributed deployment is a priority.

Agency Partner Governance

The Agency Partners will define a road map of future enhancements as described below. The Agency Partners, with the guidance of the selected vendor, will develop a common work order tool to evaluate and prioritize bug fixes, performance improvements, and model enhancements in a coordinated manner. The work order tool will also be used to schedule software releases among the Agency Partners.

The Agency Partners maintain a common code repository using GitHub. The GitHub issue tracker will be used to manage work orders.

The future road map will be defined through unanimous consensus among the Agency Partners on an annual basis. The Agency Partners, in preparation of each fiscal year (July 1 – June 30), will prepare and unanimously agree on the work plan for the following fiscal year in coordination with the selected vendor. The Agency Partners intend to provide a minimum funding level annually to support this initiative.

If an Agency Partner chooses to prioritize a development task ahead of the agreed upon roadmap, that Agency Partner is fully responsible for funding the task. The selected vendor along with the Agency Partners also must be assured that the additional tasks will not affect the development schedule of the consolidated, agreed upon annual work program. Further, the Agency Partner seeking the improvement must work with the vendor to ensure that any new components are completely integrated into the common code base and are accessible to other Agency Partners.

Potential Enhancements to ActivitySim

The list below provides a general concept of future enhancements the Agency Partners would like to include in the model software development road map. The enhancements are not listed in any order of importance or potential likelihood of implementation, but are merely an illustrative example of the potential opportunities.

The Agency Partners assume code consolidation, testing, and implementation of the ActivitySim Phase 2 enhancements will take approximately one year, during which time little to no enhancements would be requested by the Agency Partners as a whole. Once the initial code consolidation is complete, the Agency Partners will prioritize these future enhancements.

- Dynamic Traffic Assignment and Activity Based Integration
- Spatial Disaggregation Enhancements
- Improved Sensitivity to Non-motorized Transportation Modes
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• Expanded Toll and Revenue Estimating Techniques (specifically dynamically priced facilities)
• Fuel Type and Vehicle Type Add-on to Car Ownership Model
• Improved Freight Flow Coordination with PECAS
• Weekend Model
• Transit Pass Ownership
• FTA New Start Compliance Audit and Related Improvements

IV. Schedule and Contract Value

The Agency Partners estimate one (1) year to complete the development tasks described and to provide the desired functionality. Task 1 in Appendix 2 outlines the scope of work for the first year. The length of this contract is one (1) year.

The Agency Partners have budgeted one hundred and five thousand dollars ($105,000) for this effort. The Agency Partners intend to seek additional funding through each agency’s annual or biannual budgeting process and add these additional funds each fiscal year.

AMPO and the Agency Partners expect the work to commence on or about January 2016. At AMPO and the Agency Partners’ sole option, the contract may be extended for five (5) additional years for work related to building a consolidated travel model software platform.

Total Value of Contract

Over the course of five years, the total value of this contract is anticipated to be up to $750,000. The budget and authorized tasks will depend upon on-going funding from Agency Partners through each agency’s annual or biannual budgeting process. The consortium of Agency Partners may also grow to include more MPOs. As Agency Partners are added, the consortium may adjust the scope of work or funding levels to adequately address new demands.

V. Methodology for Responding to the RFP

Task Order 1 is contained in Appendix 2. Prospective bidders should prepare a methodology and full cost estimate for completing all of the items in the Task Order 1 Scope of Work. Prospective bidders should propose the cost of adequately completing Task Order 1, irrespective of the $105,000 currently allocated. The Agency Partners intend to add additional funds in subsequent fiscal years and these funds can be applied to Task Order 1, if needed.

Proposal Structure
Respondents must follow the prescribed format or they shall be deemed nonresponsive. Adherence to the proposal format by all respondents will ensure a fair evaluation and one which can evaluate each response with regard to the needs of AMPORF. Proposals should be prepared as described below.
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Cover:

The cover shall contain the name and location (city, state) of the primary submitting agency and the name and telephone number of the Principal Investigator (PI) bearing primary responsibility for the project.

Introductory Letter:

This letter shall contain the name and address of the primary submitting agency and any proposed subcontractors, as well as the name, address, telephone number, and email address of the PI. The letter must be signed by an officer authorized to bind the respondent contractually as required by this RFP. The letter shall indicate whether there are any conflicts of interest, actual or apparent, that would limit the proposer’s ability to provide the requested services and describe the plan for mitigating such conflicts. The letter shall indicate that the proposal is a firm offer to enter into a contract to perform work related to this RFP for a period of one hundred twenty (120) days from the due date for proposals.

Table of Contents:

List each chapter and appendix.

Chapter 1: Overview and Summary

This section should convey the proposer’s understanding of the nature of the work and the general approach to be taken, and identify any specific considerations. It should include, but not limited to, the following:

- A discussion of the project’s purpose;
- A summary of the approach; and
- Assumptions made in selecting the approach.

Chapter 1 should be no longer than three (3) pages.

Chapter 2: Qualifications of the Firms and Personnel

This section shall provide the professional credentials and experience of the firm and any subcontractors, and the key personnel of all firms proposed for this effort. The absence of such specific information shall be considered as nonresponsive. A maximum of ten (10) pages is allowed for Chapter 2. Standard personnel resumes shall be included in an appendix to the proposal, and do not count towards the 10-page requirement.

Amplification of personnel credentials specific to this RFP is required in this section. Information shall be provided showing:
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- Experience and familiarity with travel demand modeling in MPOs;
- Experience and familiarity with the advanced modeling issues confronting the MPO community, including knowledge of the modeling process.

The research shall be performed under the technical direction of a PI identified in the proposal. It is expected that the PI will be available for the full contract period and will have major involvement in the pursuit of the research objectives.

As timely completion of this project is critical, the respondent shall stipulate its ability to meet the deadlines presented herein.

Chapter 3: Proposed Work Plan and Budget

Provide a proposed scope of work for each item in Task Order 1, including time estimates for completion of project components and an overall project timeline. Provide the names of key staff assigned to each task in the proposed scope of work.

For each item, identify the estimated cost. Budgets shall include the salaries and wages of each employee participating in the task (with fully-loaded cost presented), materials and services, communications, shipping, travel, and any other expected costs. A maximum of fifteen (15) pages is allowed for Chapter 3. Detailed budget tables and related information can be included in an appendix to the proposal, and do not count towards the 15-page requirement.

The respondent shall also identify and explain in this chapter any problem areas and/or potential obstacles to successful completion of Task Order 1.

Chapter 4: References

The proposed Contractor and any Subcontractors shall provide a listing, as well as references, of similar work completed or in progress for other clients. Preferred references will be from work conducted within the last three years. References will include complete contact information (name, title, organization, address, email address, and telephone number). References should include work in which key personnel proposed to AMPORF for this program have served. A maximum of five (5) pages is allowed for Chapter 4.

Appendices: As Needed

VI. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Participation

It is the policy of each of the Agency Partners that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs), as defined in Chapter 49, Part 26 of the Code of Federal Regulations, have the maximum opportunity to participate, either as contractors or as subcontractors, in the performance of
contracts to the extent practical and consistent with the efficient performance of the contract. Among the Agency Partners, ARC currently has the highest DBE goal, 15.1%. Accordingly, AMPORF is adopting ARC’s DBE requirements and goal for this contract.

Appendix 3 contains ARC’s Title VI and DBE Requirements for Prime Contractors and Sub-grant Recipients. Appendix 3 also contains a DBE Utilization Plan form. This form must be completed for each DBE firm participating in this proposal.

Additional information regarding ARC’s DBE Program can be found at http://www.atlantaregional.com/about-us/business-opportunities.

AMPORF will accept a DBE certification from an entity that receives US Department of Transportation funds if the certification specifies compliance under the Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Section 26.

**VII. Method of Proposal Evaluation and Selection**

The Agency Partners and AMPORF project manager will evaluate proposals. The Agency Partners may hold, at AMPORF’s option, a pre-selection meeting with the top ranked respondents. The final recommendation for selection may be made based upon interviews and/or a best and final offer submitted by the respondents, if required by the Agency Partners. AMPORF reserves the right not to convene oral interviews or discussions, and to make the award on the basis of initial proposals. Accordingly, each initial proposal should be submitted on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint.

In evaluating the proposals, the following factors will be considered, with points awarded up to the maximum shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Qualifications of firm and key personnel.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written communication skills based on proposal.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach to completing the project, including but not limited to:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding of the needs, requirements, and timeline;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed approach to tasks, ability to anticipate and respond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to potential challenges, strategy for managing resources, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach to quality control and quality assurances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cost effectiveness, including hourly rates, basis for escalation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over term of contracts, reasonableness, and appropriateness of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preliminary task budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Total Points</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This RFP does not commit AMPORF to award a contract or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a proposal in response to the RFP. AMPORF reserves the right to accept or reject all proposals submitted, waive minor irregularities, request additional information, and negotiate with any or all proposers.

VIII. Notification and Additional Information

A pre-briefing conference call will be held at 2:00 pm EDT on the afternoon of 10/16/2015. Proposers may notify Bill Keyrouze at bkeyrouze@ampo.org by 5:00 pm EDT on 10/14/2015 if they are interested in participating in this call. Teleconference information will be provided to all firms and individuals who have provided notification of their intent to bid.

Questions

All questions and contact regarding the RFP must be directed to the AMPORF project manager, Bill Keyrouze, and not to the Agency Partners. Questions may be sent to bkeyrouze@ampo.org until seven calendar days prior to the proposal due date. All questions received, and responses by AMPORF, will be posted weekly at http://www.ampo.org/amporf-rfp-2015/.

Submission Date and Contact

Project proposals must be received no later than 5:00 pm EDT on 10/30/2015.

This deadline for receiving proposals is rigid, and extensions will not be granted. In order to be considered, proposals must be received not later than the deadline shown. Without exception, all proposals arriving after the deadline shown on the project statement will be rejected. Proposers may withdraw their proposals at any time.

Proposals must be sent via email to Bill Keyrouze at bkeyrouze@ampo.org. Confirmation of receipt will be provided.
Appendix 1 – Memorandum of Agreement

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT
SANDAG AGREEMENT 5004156

This Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") is made and entered into this 1st day of June 2013, by and between the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) of Atlanta, Georgia, and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) of San Diego, California, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of Oakland, California (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "MPO Partners") and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of Washington, DC (hereinafter referred to as "AMPO").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the MPO Partners are responsible for providing travel modeling services for their respective metropolitan areas; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Partners desire to use a common travel model software platform for the implementation of their travel models; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Partners do not have the expertise and resources necessary to efficiently develop, maintain, and improve travel model software; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Partners believe it is cost effective and efficient to share costs to obtain the technical services needed for a project to develop, maintain, and improve travel model software ("Model Software Project"); and

WHEREAS, AMPO has the experience and ability to procure services for and manage a technical program on behalf of the MPO Partners, and in particular, the Model Software Project; and

WHEREAS, by entering into this MOA, the MPO Partners and AMPO intend to describe their respective responsibilities and establish a joint cooperative structure for their participation in the Model Software Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Coordination and Direction of the Model Software Project

   a. The MPO Partners shall have the authority to direct all work performed under this MOA, including but not limited to, determining the services necessary to perform the Model Software Project, the process for procuring services related to the Model Software Project, the scope(s) of work related to the Model Software Project, the budget for the Model Software Project, the sufficiency of deliverables related to the Model Software Project, and the term of contracts entered into for purposes related to the Model Software Project.
b. AMPO shall have the authority to procure services and enter into and administer contracts related to the Project on behalf and at the direction of the MPO Partners.

c. The MPO Partners shall attempt to reach a consensus on all decisions; when unanimity cannot be reached, a vote will be taken of all members and a simple majority of members will carry; and the MPO Partners shall reach agreement on the procedures for such a vote.

2. Duties of MPO Partners

a. Subject to the availability of funding and approval of their respective governing bodies, the MPO Partners agree to provide funding for their respective shares of costs related to the Model Software Project in a timely manner.

b. The MPO Partners agree to attend all meetings related to the Model Software Project, via conference call, after reasonable prior notice.

c. The MPO Partners agree to provide direction to AMPO in good faith and cooperation to achieve the objectives of this MOA.

3. Duties of AMPO

a. AMPO agrees to procure at the direction of the MPO Partners and contract with consultants selected by the MPO Partners to collect deliverables as generally described in Attachment 1 - Deliverables.

b. AMPO agrees to establish a 15.1 percent Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal for this procurement.

c. AMPO agrees to monitor the progress of consultant work and provide information on such progress to the MPO Partners.

d. AMPO agrees to call, schedule, and chair meetings, including those deemed necessary by the MPO Partners, and provide meeting notices and working agendas.

e. AMPO agrees to coordinate and communicate with consultants and MPO Partners.

f. AMPO agrees to receive invoices from consultants and process appropriate payments in a timely manner.

g. AMPO agrees to maintain billing accounts and financial records during and for three (3) years after the completion of this MOA and to produce same to the MPO Partners upon request.

h. AMPO agrees to abide by all federal contracting standards related to the use of money and resources from the United States Federal Government.
i. AMPO will provide a draft Request for Proposals to the MPO Partners for review and approval prior to issuance.

j. AMPO will provide a complete draft consultant contract to the MPO Partners for review and approval prior to execution.

4. Cost Share by the MPO Partners

a. Subject to annual budget decisions and the approval of their respective governing bodies, each of the MPO Partners intends to provide $27,500 (twenty-seven thousand five hundred dollars) in Year 1, $35,000 (thirty-five thousand dollars) in Year 2, and $35,000 (thirty-five thousand dollars) in Year 3.

b. The parties intend that AMPO shall receive compensation for its duties as generally described herein with respect to the Model Software Project and in an amount that will be determined, which will not exceed 10 percent (10%) of the funding amount of total project costs. AMPO compensation shall be apportioned from the funding described in 4a.

c. The parties intend for AMPO to invoice each MPO once annually for the funding described in 4a. The MPO Partners will review and advise AMPO on contracted deliverables for approval of payments throughout the life of the project. AMPO shall submit the first invoice upon execution of this MOA. AMPO will invoice each of the MPO Partners annually on January 1, 2014, and January 1, 2015, for the second and third year’s funding. AMPO will not enter into a contract with a selected vendor until payment is received from each partner.

d. The MPO Partners agree that the cost of all work related to the Model Software Project shall be shared equally.

e. The MPO Partners agree that AMPO shall not be responsible for fronting funds for billings of consultants retained for the Model Software Project.

5. General Provisions

a. All obligations of the parties hereto under this MOA are subject to the appropriation of resources by their respective governing bodies.

b. Nothing in this MOA shall be construed as empowering any party hereto to exercise any function properly residing with any other party hereto.

c. To the extent allowed by law, each party shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the other parties and their officers, officials, governing board members, employees, and agents from and against any and all liability, loss, damage, expense, cost, including without limitation, cost and fees of litigation (including reasonable attorneys' fees), of every nature to the extent such liability, loss, damage, expense, or costs arise out of, or are in any way connected to, any actions of indemnifying party’s officers, agents, contractors, and
employees related to this Agreement, except for the sole negligence or willful misconduct of the party seeking indemnification. This indemnity shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

6. Term

a. This MOA shall become effective as of the date first written above and shall continue in full force and affect until December 31, 2015. Each of the MPO Partners acknowledges that AMPO's performance hereunder is expressly conditioned upon the continued cooperation of all MPO Partners.

b. This MOA may be terminated by any party at any time by providing written notice to all other parties upon thirty (30) days written notice to all other parties hereto.

c. All notices or other communications to the MPO Partners and AMPO shall be deemed given when made in writing and delivered, mailed, emailed, or faxed to such party at their respective addresses as follows:

To MTC:  
Attention: David Ory  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
Email: *** @ **  
Phone: (510) 817-5735

To SANDAG:  
Attention: Clint Daniels  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Email: clint @ * **  
Phone: (619) 699-6946

To ARC:  
Attention: Guy Rousseau  
Atlanta Regional Commission  
40 Courtyard Street, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30363-2538  
Email: ill tar in l  
Phone: (404) 463-3274

To AMPO:  
Rich Denbow  
Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 345  
Washington, DC 20001  
Email: *** @ m r  
Phone: (202) 624-3680
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have here-to executed this MOA as of the date first above written.

ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS
By: 
Name: DELANIA HARDY
Title: Executive Director

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
By: 
Name: STEVE HEMINGER
Title: Executive Director

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL PLANNING VENTURES
By: 
Name: 
Title: Executive Director

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION
By: 
Name: DOUGLAS R. HOOKER
Title: Executive Director
ATTACHMENT 1
DELIVERABLES
FOR
CONSOLIDATED CT-RAMP DEVELOPMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

• Memo outlining the common and unique components of each Coordinated Travel - Regional Activity-Based Modeling Platform (CT-RAMP) implementation.
• Unified Modeling Language Diagrams including Object Diagrams, Activity Diagrams, and Use Cases necessary to convey the new software architecture and engineering design.
• Recommendations to partner MPOs for data or business process enhancements necessary to consolidate CT-RAMP implementations.
• Recommend and implement a testing framework and continuous integration platform for the new software.
• Project backlog identifying all tasks necessary to develop a consolidated CT-RAMP software package.
• Framework for releasing new version of CT-RAMP compatible with the model system integration needs of each partner MPO.
• Fully functional integrated CT-RAMP implementation that meets the goals and objectives laid out by the partner MPOs.
• Complete Application Programming Interface documentation of integrated CT-RAMP implementation.
• Integrated CT-RAMP End User Guide.
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE
DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

THIS Amendment No. 1 to the Memorandum of Agreement between the Atlanta Regional
Commission (ARC) of Atlanta, Georgia, and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) of
San Diego, California, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of Oakland, California,
and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of Washington, DC (AMPO)(collectively
referred to herein as the "Parties"), dated June 1, 2013 ("Agreement"), is made and entered into as of
October 1, 2014.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to add the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and the San
Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) to the cooperative effort as MPO Partners under the
Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the SFCTA is not a metropolitan planning agency (or MPO); and

WHEREAS, AMPO has established the AMPO Research Foundation (AMPORF) as a 501c3
organization and received official IRS designation creating an entity within AMPO that can receive
foundation funding for research activities; and

WHEREAS, AMPO has assigned this cooperative effort to AMPORF, and AMPORF released
the request for proposal to complete the deliverables described in Attachment 1 and entered into a
contract with the selected vendor.

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to amend the Agreement as described in this Amendment 1.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree to modify the Agreement as follows:

1. PSRC and SFCTA shall be added as partners to the Agreement and shall be listed in Article 6.
2. Recognizing that partner agency SFCTA is not an MPO, all references to "MPO Partners" shall
   be replaced with "Agency Partners".
3. Recognizing AMPO assigned AMPORF this effort, all references to "AMPO" in the Agreement
   shall be replaced with "AMPORF".
4. Article 4(a) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:
   a. Subject to annual budget decisions and the approval of their respective governing bodies, the
      Agency Partners identified in 6(c)(i), MTC, 6(c)(ii), SANDAG, and 6(c)(iii), ARC, intend to
      provide $27,500 (twenty-seven thousand five hundred dollars) in Year 1 and $35,000 (thirty-five
      thousand dollars) in Year 2.
5. The following is added to Article 4 as 4(f):
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f. Subject to annual budget decisions and the approval of their respective governing bodies, the Agency Partners identified in 6(c)(iv), PSRC, and 6(c)(v), SFTCA, intend to provide $52,500 each in Year 3.

6. Article 6(c) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

c. All notices or other communications to the Agency Partners and AMPO shall be deemed given when made in writing and delivered, mailed, emailed, or faxed to such party at their respective addresses as follows:

i. To MTC:  
   Attention: David Ory  
   Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
   101 Eighth Street  
   Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
   Email: DOry@mtc.ca.gov  
   Phone: (510) 817-5753

ii. To SANDAG:  
    Attention: Clint Daniels  
    San Diego Association of Governments  
    401 B Street, Suite 800  
    San Diego, CA 92101  
    Email: Clint.Daniels@sandag.org

iii. To ARC:  
     Attention: Guy Rousseau  
     Atlanta Regional Commission  
     40 Courtland Street, NE  
     Atlanta, GA 30303-2538  
     Email: G Rousseau@AtlantaRegional.com

iv. To PSRC:  
    Attention: Billy Charlton  
    Puget Sound Regional Council  
    1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
    Seattle, WA 98104  
    Email: BCharlton@psrc.org

v. To SFCTA:  
   Attention: Elizabeth Sall  
   San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
   1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor  
   San Francisco, CA 94103  
   Email: Elizabeth.Sall@sfcta.org

6. Attachment 1 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

ATTACHMENT 1

DELIVERABLES FOR CONSOLIDATED TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE
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- Memorandum outlining the common and unique components of the existing Agency Partner implementations.
- Unified Modeling Language Diagrams including Object Diagrams, Activity Diagrams, and Use Cases necessary to convey the new software architecture and engineering design.
- Recommendations to Agency Partners for data and/or business process enhancements necessary to consolidate existing travel model implementations.
- Recommend and implement a testing framework and continuous integration platform for the new software.
- Project backlog identifying all tasks necessary to develop a consolidated travel model software package.
- Framework for releasing new versions of the software compatible with the model system integration needs of each Agency Partner.
- Fully functional software that meets the goals and objectives laid out by the Agency Partners.
- Complete Application Programming Interface documentation of new software.
- Software Users Guide.

7. Unless otherwise stated in this Amendment 1, all other terms and conditions of the Agreement remain in full force and effect.

8. This Amendment 1 may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the Agreement has been executed by the parties hereto as of the day and year first written above. This Amendment may be executed in counterparts by each party hereto and shall be effective as the effective date shown above.

Counterpart 1 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS

By: [Signature]

Name: DELANIA HARDY

Title: Executive Director
Counterpart 2 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
By: ____________________________

Name: STEVE HEMINGER

Title: Executive Director
Counterpart 3 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
By: [Signature]
Name: GARY L. GALLEGOS
Title: Executive Director
Counterpart 4 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

By:  

Name: DOUGLAS R. HOOKER

Title: Executive Director
Counterpart 5 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL

By: [Signature]

Name: JOSH BROWN

Title: Executive Director
Counterpart 6 of 6 to AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE TRAVEL MODEL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
By: ______________________
Name: TILLY CHANG
Title: Executive Director
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Appendix 2 – Scope of Work & Deliverables

Tasks

1) Implement N-level nested logit capabilities
2) Implement procedures to intelligently sample destination choices
3) Implement procedures to fix random number sequences to make stochastic model results reproducible
4) Implement procedures to trace specific sets of households and persons through the model system to aid in debugging efforts
5) Complete implementation all inter-person joint activity generation models
6) Complete implementation of mandatory and non-mandatory, individual and joint time-of-day choice, including:
   a. Feedback of mode choice logsums,
   b. Time window availability
7) Complete implementation of the tour and trip mode choice models, including:
   a. Handling of all necessary skim tables,
   b. “On the fly” transit best path finding,
   c. Handling of N-level nested logit
8) Complete implementation of destination choice, including:
   a. Feedback of mode choice logsums,
   b. Intelligent sampling,
   c. Shadow pricing
9) Complete implementation of accessibility measure that incorporate mode choice logsums and destination choice-like functionality
10) Test software elements such as the MNL and nested logit engines, expression evaluation, and utility and probability calculations.
11) Implement parallel computation platform

Deliverables

1) Software implementation of model set for Phase 2 in GitHub repository with continuous integration using TravisCI and unit test coverage in Coveralls
2) Conda/PIP installer of ActivitySim version 0.2
3) API documentation
4) Online user guide outlining model configuration, model setup, data access, and general usage.
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Appendix 3 – Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Participation

Atlanta Regional Commission Title VI and DBE Requirements For Prime Contractors and Sub-grant Recipients

TITLE VI

ARC, in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 252, 42 U.S.C. 2000D to 2000D4, and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Department of Transportation Subtitle A, Office of the Secretary, Part 21, Nondiscrimination in Federally assisted programs of the Department of Transportation, issued pursuant to such Act, hereby notifies all Respondents that it will affirmatively insure that in any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, minority business enterprises shall be afforded full opportunity to submit proposals in response to this invitation and shall not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, handicap, or national origin in consideration for an award.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION

Overall DBE Goal: As part of its DBE Plan, ARC has an established overall goal of 15.1 percent.

Program Intent. ARC has established a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program in accordance with regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 49 CFR Part 26 ("Part 26" or "DBE Regulations"). ARC has received federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation for this contract opportunity, and as a condition of receiving this assistance, ARC has signed an assurance that it will comply with Part 26.

It is the policy of ARC to ensure that DBEs, as defined in Part 26, have an equal opportunity to participate in its DOT-assisted contracting opportunities. It is also ARC’s policy:

(a) To ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts in the Department’s highway, transit, and airport financial assistance programs;
(b) To create a level playing field on which DBEs can compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts;
(c) To ensure that the Department's DBE program is narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law;
(d) To ensure that only firms that fully meet this part's eligibility standards are permitted to participate as DBEs;
(e) To help remove barriers to the participation of DBEs in DOT-assisted contracts; and
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(f) To assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the marketplace outside the DBE program.

**Definitions.** Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) as used in this Contract shall have the same meaning as defined in 49 CFR Part 26. A DBE is a firm in which one or more individuals who are women or eligible minorities own and control at least 51% of the firm.

**Compliance.** All Bidders/Proposers, potential contractors, or subcontractors for this Contract are hereby notified that failure to carry out the policy and the DBE obligations, as set forth above, shall constitute a breach of Contract which may result in termination of the Contract or such other remedy as deemed appropriate by ARC.

**Prompt Payment Requirement.** In the event of contract award, the prime contractor agrees to pay each subcontractor under the prime contract for satisfactory performance of its contract no later than 30 days from the receipt of each payment the prime contract receives from ARC. The prime contractor agrees further to return retainage payments to each subcontractor within 10 days after the subcontractors work is satisfactorily completed. Any delay or postponement of payment from the above referenced time frame may occur only for good cause following written approval of ARC. This clause applies to both DBE and non-DBE subcontracts.

Any contractor found not to be in compliance with this clause will be considered in breach of contract and any further payments will be withheld until corrective action is taken. If contractor does not take corrective action, contractor may be subject to contract termination.

**Substitution.** The Bidder shall make a good faith effort to replace a DBE Subcontractor that is unable to perform successfully with another DBE Subcontractor. Substitution must be coordinated and approved by ARC.

**Documentation.** The Bidder/Proposer shall establish and maintain records and submit regular reports, as required, which will identify and assess progress in achieving DBE subcontract levels and other DBE affirmative action efforts.

Additional information on ARC’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program can be obtained from Christopher Burke, Contract & Grants Officer, Financial Services Division, Atlanta Regional Commission, 40 Courtland Street, Atlanta, GA 30303, 404-463-3162, cburke@atlantaregional.com.
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DBE UTILIZATION PLAN (Complete this form for each DBE firm participating in this proposal. If no DBE firms are participating or the overall goal is not met, please attach evidence of good faith efforts to meet the goal.)

Name of bidder/offeror's firm: ________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________

City: ____________________________ State: _____ Zip: _____

Name of DBE firm: ________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________

City: ____________________________ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: ____________________________

Description of work to be performed by DBE firm:

---------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------

The bidder/offeror is committed to utilizing the above-named DBE firm for the work described above. The estimated dollar value of this work is $____________.

Affirmation

The above-named DBE firm affirms that it will perform the portion of the contract for the estimated dollar value as stated above.

By ________________________________

(Signature)

__________________________________________

>Title)

If the bidder/offeror does not receive award of the prime contract, any and all representations in this DBE Utilization Plan shall be null and void.