

AUGUST 27, 2018

**RESPONSES TO CONSULTANT INQUIRIES ON THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR GENERAL PLAN 2040 TECHNICAL SERVICES/ DOWNTOWN PRECISE PLAN**

1. The fees listed in the RFP (Table 1) are slightly different than those in Attachment C. Which numbers should prevail? Can you confirm there was no intent to have separate fees?

The numbers in RFP Table 1 are correct and should be used for budgeting purposes. Attachment C was intended only to provide “ballpark” estimates for use by MTC in disbursing the OBAG grant to the City. There is no intent to have separate fees.

2. What are the expected roles of the EIR and the Precise Plan consultants in terms of coordinating efforts of the transportation, infrastructure, economic and other consultants — for example, who will crunch the data for the General Plan and the Precise Plan by various geographies and input units for alternatives, the draft plan, etc. that will be needed by these consultants?

City staff (including the Consulting Project Manager) will have the responsibility for coordinating the transportation, infrastructure, economic, and urban design consultants. The EIR consultant will be responsible for any subconsultants it includes on its team for noise, biology, geology, and other CEQA-related services. The Precise Plan consultant will be responsible for any subconsultants it includes on its team for historic preservation or other technical services related to that Plan (excluding transportation, infrastructure, and economics). Both the EIR consultant and the Precise Plan consultant are expected to work through the City’s project manager (who is effectively serving as a “prime”) to ensure that the transportation, infrastructure, economic, and urban design work products are meeting their needs. City staff (including the project manager) will be responsible for preparing land use-related data (acres, households, jobs) for traffic modeling, alternatives, and other technical analyses needed by the General Plan team. For the Precise Plan, this is generally the responsibility of the consultant.

3. The RFP mentions that the Precise Plan scope also includes Project Management for that plan, as well as "administration and interface with ... transportation, engineering, ... firms." Could you clarify the management line/protocol relative to the Precise Plan? Who will direct these firms and be responsible for their work on the Precise Plan — the City’s Project Manager or the Precise Plan consultant?

The City’s Project Manager will direct the transportation, engineering, economics, and urban design scopes (Scopes 2-5) and manage the associated contracts. With respect to the portion of each of these scopes that relates specifically to the Precise Plan, a more collaborative approach is envisioned and regular participation by the Precise Plan consultant is expected. Staff expects to work with the Precise Plan consultant to ensure that the work produced by these firms meets the Precise Plan consultant’s needs. Direct communication between the Precise Plan consultant and

the City's other consultants is expected, but the Precise Plan consultant would work through the City's project manager in the event that scope modifications are required, or issues of quality control, schedule, etc. arise.

4. What is Barry Miller's role going to be in the proposal review or selection process? Barry has ongoing contractual relationships with some of the potential bidders, which may represent a conflict of interest.

Barry is the City's project manager and point of contact for the RFP process, including receipt and routing of the proposals to the City's reviewers. However, he will not be involved in "scoring" the proposals or determining the shortlisted firms, and he will not participate in the interviews of the shortlisted firms. Once firms are selected, he may be involved in refinements to scope and budget as well as preparation of staff reports for Professional Service Agreements.

5. Can a firm just bid on the General Plan part of the economics scope and not the Precise Plan part? The budget for the economics work on the Precise Plan is not adequate to perform the services provided.

An economics firm can propose on the General Plan-related tasks alone, but may then be at a competitive disadvantage, as the City believes it would be more efficient and economical to have a single economics firm provide services on both plans. With respect to the budget, interested consultants may identify some of the City's requested tasks and/or deliverables as "optional" and indicate the services they believe can be provided for the budget provided. Economic consultants may also modify the City's suggested scope and change the work tasks to reduce the level of effort or deliverables indicated—but should recognize that cost is a factor in scoring proposals (see RFP, page 14—"services proposed relative to project budget").

6. Who will do the Affordable Housing-Anti-Displacement Strategy for the Precise Plan --the economist's budget won't support it.

The Affordable Housing-Anti-Displacement Strategy is the responsibility of the Precise Plan consultant and should be included in the Precise Plan consultant's budget. In the event the Precise Plan consultant does not intend to complete this task, it should indicate an alternative approach. This could include allocating a portion of the stated \$410,000 Precise Plan budget to the City's Economics Consultant, or indicating a greater role for City staff.

7. Can the economist provide a detailed PowerPoint slide deck of its findings in lieu of a detailed narrative report, as described in Scope 4?

The City welcomes creative approaches to presentation of data and findings as a response to budget constraints, and would accept this approach provided the information meets the needs of the City and its consultants.

8. Can a firm just bid on the Urban Design Scope, or does it have to be the same firm as the Precise Plan?

Yes, a firm may bid on the Urban Design scope alone (Scope 5). The CEQA firm also may bid on Scope 5, if it has the capacity to address community design, public realm, and aesthetics policy issues.

9. Can a consultant submit for a portion of this RFP (ex: Economic and Fiscal Service Category), without offering a team or expertise for all other Service Categories?

Yes. The City strongly encourages independent submittals from firms bidding in the economic and fiscal service category (Scope 4).

10. Will the firm that is currently developing the new transportation activity model be the only one eligible to run the model? Or would other firms have access to the model per some agreement with TAM to extract VMT and volumes?

Historically, TAM has limited the ability of consultants to use its model and required cost-sharing agreements so that TAM's own consultants can run the model with land use inputs provided by cities. However, the City of San Rafael will be requesting that TAM provide its General Plan consultants with direct access to the model—this is a policy decision yet to be approved by TAM. For the purposes of this proposal, traffic consultants should assume that they will have model access. In the event this is not the case, we will work with TAM to develop a cost-sharing agreement and adjust the proposed budget accordingly.

11. Is the cost for all traffic counts (60 intersections and 40 roadway segments) to be included in the overall maximum \$180,000 transportation budget? What time periods should the intersection counts cover?

Yes, the budget for transportation services is intended to include the requested traffic counts. Consultants may propose modifications to the City's scope or identify requested services as "optional" tasks, keeping in mind that cost is a factor in the scoring of proposals (see RFP page 14). Intersection counts should generally cover 7-9 AM and 4-6 PM peak periods.

12. Per the RFP, it is anticipated that some of the analysis will rely on TAM's new demand model. This model is currently under development by TAM with support from a specific firm. Will the completed model be available for other qualified firms to use?

See response to #10.

13. For firms submitting on Scope 6 (graphics, facilitation, etc.)—since this only requires an SOQ and not a full proposal, is it OK to just to submit a PDF on a flash drive (or through email) or would you like to have the three hard copies as well?

For firms bidding on Scope 6 only, we will accept an SOQ sent via email in .pdf format, and will waive the requirement for hard copies and a flash drive. However,

such SOQs should not exceed 10 MB in file size. If the SOQ for Scope 6 is larger than 10 MB, we will accept a flash drive in lieu of the paper copies. Firms bidding on Scopes 1-5 and/or Scope 7 are still required to provide three paper copies plus a flash drive.

14. Should the proposal for Transportation services be a single document that addresses both Scope 2 (Transportation) and Task 5 of Scope 7 (Downtown Precise Plan)?

Yes. Please note that Task 5 of Scope 7 is already embedded in Scope 2 (Task 4.4). The City's preference is to receive a single proposal for transportation services covering both the General Plan and the Precise Plan.

15. Task 5.1 of Scope 7 (Downtown Precise Plan) calls for the analysis to “document the physical characteristics of the Downtown street network, such as road width, signalization, crosswalk locations, and sidewalks”. Does the City Public Works Department have this information in GIS format or should the consultant assume that this data will need to be collected as part of Scope 7?

Some of this data exists in the City's GIS (for example, traffic signal locations), some exists but is not in GIS format, and some is rough or incomplete. In any event, we do not expect the transportation consultant to perform original field work related to these topic areas. Rather, the consultant would utilize existing data and report out key findings, as has been done in prior Downtown Plans for San Rafael. In the event the need for supplemental field work (or data collection via aerial photos, etc.) is identified, the City will determine whether this information can be collected through a staff-led effort or requires an expanded scope.

16. Does the City Public Works Department have a database of traffic counts collected in the past 5 years? If yes, can you identify the year the data was collected and the general extent?

The City has data from recent traffic counts and can compile this information in a format that may be useful to the transportation consultant. The data is not currently consolidated in a single data base and covers multiple time periods and durations, but could be helpful as a benchmark for planning purposes. We do not expect that this data will substantially reduce the extent or cost of the traffic counts we would like prepared for the General Plan and/or Downtown Precise Plan.

17. Do the OBAG funds trigger any federal environmental review process looking at project impacts (such as Section 106 or 4f)?

No. The use of OBAG funds for the Downtown Precise Plan does not trigger a federal environmental review of the types referenced here.

18. Is there an existing historic context statement for San Rafael and do DPR 523 forms exist for the 1986 historic resource survey? Is there a report associated with the survey?

The 1986 survey was an update to a survey completed in 1976-78 by a historic preservation consultant. We are not aware of a historic context statement or final report; however, DPR 523 forms were completed in 1976-78 for most of the properties surveyed and are still available in paper and digital (scanned) form.

19. Is the look back period for the historic survey update 45 years instead of 50 (based on CEQA recommendations)?

The City's expectation is that a 50-year look back period will be used. However, Task 4 of Scope 7 indicates that the preservation consultant will develop a methodology for the survey, and this threshold could be revisited at that time.

20. Please confirm that the CEQA consultant will not need to prepare findings of fact or statement of overriding considerations as part of the scope of work.

See page A-19 of the Scope of Work (Attachment A). In the final paragraph under Task 6.1, the text indicates that the scope should include preparation of a statement of overriding consideration and findings on the EIR, as required by CEQA. If the consultant believes this should be excluded and/or assigned to City staff, please provide an explanation in the Approach section.

21. Scope 1 Task 7 states that the “consultant will be expected to attend regular project management and work progress meetings.” Can you provide an estimated number of meetings, anticipated frequency, and whether they will be face to face or conference calls, or a combination of each?

We would expect a combination of face to face meetings and conference calls, occurring at varying frequency (but not less than once a month) throughout the project. During major production periods (e.g, preparing the Draft EIR), weekly or bi-weekly communication is expected.

22. Please clarify whether the title of Scope 5 is “Urban Design” or “Community Design Services”, as it is referred to as both in the RFP and Attachment A, and although defined, there is a difference in the implication of both titles.

The official title of Scope 5 is “Community Design.” We have used the term interchangeably with Urban Design as most of the firms providing the requested services identify themselves as “urban designers.”

23. Attachment A of the RFP, Task 5.2: Confirm thresholds of significance states that a draft set of criteria should be prepared for each topical issue covered by the DEIR, and cites multiple potential sources.
- Would the new thresholds have to be adopted by the City Council?
 - Should the thresholds incorporate upcoming changes to CEQA Appendix?

- a. *We would expect the thresholds to be adopted by the City Council as part of their action to certify the General Plan FEIR when it is completed; we do not anticipate a separate action by the Council prior to the EIR's preparation in which CEQA thresholds are adopted.*
 - b. *We would expect the thresholds to reflect the CEQA Appendix in effect at the time the Notice of Preparation is prepared—depending on timing, this may or may not incorporate proposed changes.*
24. Will the Climate Action Plan undergo its own CEQA clearance process, or will it have to be included as part of the General Plan EIR?

The Climate Action Plan will likely receive CEQA clearance through an Addendum to the 2020 General Plan EIR, as it is expected to be adopted by the City Council in late 2018, roughly 18 months before the 2040 General Plan is adopted.