

TPM Pooled Fund conference call meeting notes

Date: Wednesday, November 2, 2016

Attendees: Christos Xenophontos RIDOT; Matt Hardy AASHTO; Deanna Belden MnDOT; Terri Holley OKDOT; Scott Young CDOT; Daniella Bremer WashDOT; Michael Henry Arkansas; Kevin Freeman, Caltrans; Coleen Kissane, Ed Block, CT; Rachel Roper Hawaii; Imad Aleithawe Mississippi; Giri NJ; Chris Clark Oahu MPO; Lori Fisetta RIDOT; Chad Silva Texas; Lori Richter WisDOT;

1. Scope of Work – Christos

No tweaks were received on the scope via email. Matt tried to structure RFP as outcome based. Clarification on gap analysis – idea is to document what training exists that can help a state or MPO implement performance based transportation program. Also document what kind of training is being planned. Consultant should identify the gaps and then work with pooled fund members to determine what is needed to address it.

Concern – so much material is being developed right now, only want the pooled fund to pay for original work. Address gaps in a prioritized manner.

Matt will add some more detail to the outcomes we are looking for, but will not be prescriptive.

Lori Richter's feedback on procurement. At October meeting we talked about building off of the TAM portal. Could we do a sole source with that vendor?

Do we want to sole source just the clearing house, or both items in the scope? Clarification, there are other vendors out there who could do this work, so we actually mean single source. Staged deliverables for the rest of the pooled fund items.

Decision: Group agrees we should single source the TPM Information Clearinghouse. RFP #1 single source to existing contractor.

Now to rest of the work of the pooled fund:

Matt could re-write the RFP for item number 2 TPM Knowledge Development to include 2.1 KSA Gap analysis, 2.2 training development and 2.3 training implementation be bundled together.

Daniella would prefer item 2.1 go out separately, so we may get more vendors proposing/fresh ideas.

Concern that with a small contract we wouldn't get as many proposers. We do have the flexibility to stop a contract and re-bid if we don't like the product after the gap analysis. Benefit – keeps the focus on the end game, the ultimate implementation.

Challenge from Christos – between now and December, identify people to inform when the RFP goes out.

Decision: Bundle #2 together knowing we can stop the work after 2.1 if we are not satisfied and re-bid 2.2 and 2.3.

2. Additional ideas – Matt

Excel spreadsheet started by Karen Miller of Missouri. Idea to have contractor make a more robust tool that is customized to the organization. This is a possibility for this project or for a re-scoped NCHRP 20-24(104).

Gap analysis – Matt believes it will be valuable for cataloging all the resources out there; the two contractors will need to play in the sandbox together. Will make reference in the RFP.