Responses to Pre-proposal Meeting and Emailed Questions

Tucson Modern Streetcar Land Use Request for Proposal

On Thursday, February 23, 2012, Pima Association of Governments (PAG) held a Pre-proposal Meeting for the Tucson Modern Streetcar Land Use Plan Request for Proposal. Below is the list of questions submitted either verbally or in writing at the meeting and PAG’s official response to those questions.

1. **Question:** Will PAG be posting links or information of the prior studies listed on page 2 of Appendix A for prospective bidders to review?

   **Response:** Links to the prior studies have been posted on the PAG website here:

2. **Question:** Will PAG be making the Appendices B, C and D available to prospective bidders as requested in the RFP?

   **Response:** Appendices B, C and D have been posted on the PAG website here:

3. **Question:** Can the 1/4 mile study area boundary be modified in the proposal only after selection/final scope negotiation?

   **Response:** We wanted some flexibility in the study area boundary since a strict ¼ mile boundary would cut some properties in half. The area may be expanded or reduced. Suggestions about expansion or reduction of the study area boundary in the submitted proposals are ok.

4. **Question:** In what manner will PAG and the City cooperate?

   **Response:** We intend to have a technical team of key individuals from the City, PAG and RTA. The team will review plan materials and provide guidance to the consultant on those materials. In addition, key task documents will be sent through the City review process at intervals to ensure everyone is kept informed, including the COT Planning and Development Services Department. There will be updates to the City of Tucson (COT) Mayor and Council as well as the PAG Regional Council.

5. **Question:** How will the consultant interface with the City, for example: information gathering, review of deliverables, and which COT staff to help make things “adoption ready”?

   **Response:** The project manager at PAG, Jennifer O’Connor, will handle the interface process between the consultant, COT and PAG.
6. **Question:** Please describe the anticipated community outreach and engagement process? Are you looking for consultant recommendations?

   **Response:** The COT has set aside a small amount of funding for public participation outside of the Plan budget. The COT will manage the stakeholder group, which will participate and provide comment. Our intention is to use the stakeholder group strategically; the COT will ask the consultant for advice on public participation but the consultant is **not tasked** with conducting the participation process.

7. **Question:** How will stakeholders be engaged?

   **Response:** An initial list of key stakeholders has been identified by PAG and COT. A stakeholders group along the corridor will be asked to review and comment on plan materials. Information will be available to the general public through the PAG website and the stakeholder meetings, where they also will have an opportunity to comment.

8. **Question:** How much community engagement effort should the consultant budget?

   **Response:** The consultant will need to attend meetings of the stakeholder group; therefore, the proposers may want to put meeting time in each of the tasks. However, PAG and the COT will manage the community engagement activities or meetings.

9. **Question:** Task 3 makes reference to “transportation shortcomings” for the West University Neighborhood (WUN) Plan area. Please give a general sense of what those may be.

   **Response:** We hear from both sides that there is adequate parking and not adequate parking. Parking issues may be exacerbated by the streetcar project. There could be increased pedestrian crossings and vehicular traffic on Park Avenue and nearby streets, and overspill of traffic into the West University Neighborhood.

10. **Question:** Can the sign-in list be circulated?


11. **Question:** If developers may or may not add funds, would it be helpful to provide additional tasks in excess of the $307,000?

    **Response:** The consultant may offer optional tasks in their proposal beyond the study’s optional tasks. If the study’s mandatory and optional tasks are addressed by the consultant’s work and additional funding becomes available, PAG, in consultation with the COT, may ask the consultant to complete the consultant’s optional tasks.
12. **Question:** What kind of transportation analysis are you looking for? Do you want VISSIM? Do you want the same level of transportation analysis in all areas of the corridor? What kinds of analysis tools are needed?

**Response:** The transportation analysis task focuses on the Main Gate District, which is bounded by Speedway Blvd., Park Ave., 6th St. and Euclid Ave. The Scope of Work indicates that with the addition of a larger multi-modal population there may be current and future transportation shortcomings that need to be addressed. This area may set precedents for transportation planning in other areas. While there are probably more transportation issues than funding available in the project budget to address them all, we have tried to be strategic in how the scope is structured and what questions we hope to have answered. Our guidance comes from the COT elected officials and their concerns are reflected in the scope. We have a set of goals and concerns that we are asking the consultants to answer to the best of their ability.

13. **Question:** Please clarify the “marketing” piece – is this a market analysis?

**Response:** The marketing piece is an issue brought up by COT elected officials. Their concerns are about how to best create a land use mix along the streetcar that will promote transit ridership. While there isn’t a specific task dedicated to a market analysis, PAG, in consultation with the COT, will work with the consultant to find ways to incorporate the marketing element into some of the tasks. We will need to work closely with the consultant on focusing on this question. It is a lower priority but it is a priority. This task may just start the “ball rolling.”

14. **Question:** Please clarify the reasoning behind the choice of tasks 4 or 5, and the optional nature of task 6.

**Response:** PAG and the COT were concerned about the cost of the various tasks in relation to the overall study budget and so provided the option in case consultants felt they couldn’t complete all tasks within the budgeted amount. Tasks 4 and 5 are terminus projects and we are looking for new ideas on land use and development in those areas. There are active developers in both areas which are interested in projects. In the future, we need to evaluate if the developers, in those areas, can help supplement some of the planning work that needs to be done.

15. **Question:** Who will decide which tasks will be completed? Will it be PAG jointly with the City and consultant, or is it up to the consultant to propose which tasks will be completed?

**Response:** PAG, with COT concurrence and the consultant’s recommendation, will decide which tasks in the proposal will be completed.
16. **Question:** In addition to the City stakeholder process to be determined at the resolution of the scope, what is the opportunity for the team to expand our community outreach process?

    **Response:** PAG and the City will work with the selected consultant to refine the tasks as part of Task 1. At that time, any task can be revised to better meet the overall goals of the project. However given the limited project budget and resources, PAG and the City are attempting to minimize the costs while maximizing the effectiveness of the community outreach process.

17. **Question:** What are the selection criteria for choosing the consultants? What are the criteria for using interviews?

    **Response:** The evaluation committee will use criteria as provided in Appendix D of the RFP, which includes a combination of project understanding and approach, project team qualifications, relevant experience, and the consultant's resources. Additional information may be requested from “short listed” proposers, if the panel needs additional information in order to award the contract. If there is a close evaluation scoring between proposals, then the evaluation committee may ask the “short listed” proposers to participate in interviews with the evaluation committee.

18. **Question:** What measure(s) will you use to determine the success of the project i.e. adopted code, incentives identified, developer RFQ/P?

    **Response:** There are no measures of success identified.

19. **Question:** What stakeholder groups do you envision including in the process?

    **Response:** An initial list of stakeholder groups has been drafted but no invitations have been sent. The stakeholder group will include a range of stakeholders including neighborhood, business, and university representation.

20. **Question:** What types of model land use code examples has the City/PAG identified?

    **Response:** Some precedents for land use codes are being set now by the Main Gate Overlay District and the Downtown Links Overlay. Initially, the Main Gate Overlay District was part of this RFP but the project has taken off on its own. The Main Gate Overlay District has developed a sort of hybrid form-based code. The Downtown Links Overlay is coming up for public hearing and is also a hybrid form-based code. The consultants can give feedback on these overlays and provide suggestions for improvement. In the future, COT development staff will use the land use documents and we would want them to be understandable to staff. We would like consistency across documents and we would like help keep the number of project documents for the COT development staff to look at under control.
21. **Question:** Is it PAG’s intention to require professional services fee proposals (App C) as part of the SOQ submittal?

   **Response:** Yes, Appendix C is required to be submitted as part of the consultant’s proposal.

22. **Question:** What will be the selection process for the separate City of Tucson contract for stakeholder involvement that is a part of the Plan and was referenced at the pre-proposal meeting February 23? Will it be an open and publicized process, whether it considers all qualified consultants or only those who have been selected as pre-qualified with a current on-call contract for public participation services with the City of Tucson Department of Transportation?

   **Response:** The process will be to look at on-call contracts that Planning and Development Services has with consultants and to also look at the Department of Transportation current on-call contracts. The budget for public participation is very small and staff is now planning to have a larger role in it using some assistance from the consultant as the budget will allow.

23. **Statement:** Marilyn Robinson, Associate Director of the Roy P. Drachman Institute noted that the institute has an interest in participating in this study and emphasized that the students of the college have worked with the Phoenix light rail project on planning development around the rail stations. The institute will not have an exclusive relationship with any one consultant. Ms. Robinson can be reached at 520-621-0854.

   **Response:** PAG will provide this information as part of the questions and responses.