

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 19-06

COMMUNITY VISIONING AND MASTER LAND USE PLAN

Due: March 7, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Community Visioning and Master Land Use Plan, RFP No. 19-06, on which proposals will be received on/or before the date and time listed above.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes five (5) pages.**

The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document must be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B – City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C – City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening will be rejected as non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Has the City identified a “cap” or other guiding range of dollar amount professional fees that would be acceptable to complete this assignment?

Answer 1: No, the City will utilize responses to the RFP to establish a project budget.

Question 2: Is there a budget or budget range for this project?

Answer 2: No, see Question #1.

Question 3: Are out of state firms encouraged to submit proposals?

Answer 3: Yes.

Question 4: Should we assume the consulting team would prepare the publicity materials for the public events, and city staff handle the logistics (room arrangements) and advertising (state required notices, website updates, distribution of invitations, notices, etc.)?

Answer 4: This level of detail has not been determined; however, generally, the assumptions

identified appear reasonable. Logistics may be more of a shared function.

Question 5: How many public events are you thinking – perhaps one in each quadrant + one downtown? Or drilled down more to the neighborhood level? A few separate stakeholder or focus group meetings?

Answer 5: The City is looking for proposals in this regard, but more neighborhood-level meetings are likely, in addition to stakeholder, focus group, and other methods of engagement.

Question 6: Who would be the primary city staff assigned? How much time do they have available monthly for this project? Assume City staff would attend all the meetings with the consultants, correct?

Answer 6: Staffing is undetermined at this stage, however, Brett Lenart, the Planning Manager will be actively involved. It is anticipated that City Staff will attend the majority of meetings with the consultant.

Question 7: How would you prefer coordination with the consulting team? Meetings or a call every two weeks or something else? Would or could there be a monthly coordination meeting with other departments that have city-wide or other relevant plans or studies that may need to be referenced, summarized or combined?

Answer 7: To be determined, the City looks forward to innovative approaches to coordination and project management.

Question 8: What is the status of the land use mapping available? When was the last inventory created? What GIS platform do you use, ESRI? What level of detail is expected? Would we use the current categories or potentially create new ones?

Answer 8: The City's existing land use layer was last comprehensively updated in 2001. Since that time, the layer has been updated on a site-by-site basis, as development occurs. This mapping is performed in ESRI, and is available, along with other layers in the City's data catalog <https://www.a2gov.org/services/data/Pages/default.aspx>.

Question 9: Would this work include the "Zoning Plan" required by the state statute or would that be done by city staff afterward?

Answer 9: The Zoning Plan is intended to be a component of this project scope.

Question 10: Has a budget been approved in the CIP or does the City Council still need to approve the expenditure?

Answer 10: See Question 1. City Council needs to approve the associated contract.

Question 11: Have you seen other city master plans that you see as a model for what you would like for Ann Arbor?

Answer 11: No particular other master plan is identified as a model.

Question 12: Will the city council adopt the Master Land Use Plan or just the Planning Commission?

Answer 12: City Ordinances require City Council adoption of the Master Land Use Plan.

Question 13: Do you have an idea about how many meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council should be included in the fee? Perhaps a joint meeting or two with the Transportation Commission?

Answer 13: No. Staff anticipates that numerous meetings over the course of the plan development and adoption process will be required. Joint meetings or meetings with other stakeholder boards are possible.

- Question 14: Is there a DBE or WBE requirement or preference?
Answer 14: The City encourages DBE and WBE submitters, but does not provide any specific scoring or selection preference for such firms.
- Question 15: Is there a preference to select firms with offices in Ann Arbor?
Answer 15: No.
- Question 16: Is there a preference to select firms with offices in Washtenaw County?
Answer 16: No.
- Question 17: Is there a preference to select firms with offices in Michigan?
Answer 17: No.
- Question 18: Do you see value in selecting a firm with experience working with peer communities outside of the State?
Answer 18: Yes.
- Question 19: How important is it to demonstrate an understanding of State of Michigan planning and zoning practices?
Answer 19: Moderately important.
- Question 20: Is it the City's expectation that this plan will replace all 8 plans and 18 resource documents? Or will these documents still be sub-area plans / City policy?
Answer 20: This will be determined through the project scope. Generally, the goal is to consolidate as many of the plans and resources as is logical to result in a more concise, comprehensive document.
- Question 21: Do you anticipate participation and resources (staff or otherwise) from the University of Michigan in completing this process?
Answer 21: Nothing is specifically identified, but this is a likely possibility. No quantification and/or identification of scope has been identified to date.
- Question 22: With the review of the architectural design guidelines, do you expect any new guidelines to be developed as part of the process or is this outside of the project scope?
Answer 22: This should be incorporated into the process.
- Question 23: What percent of the scope / work plan should be dedicated to community engagement?
Answer 23: See Question 13. The City is looking for extensive and creative public engagement, but has not identified a percentage of scope or work plan.
- Question 24: Do you expect that City planning staff will be a partner with the consultant team in completing community engagement? Do you have an FTE estimate for City staffing allocation to community engagement?
Answer 24: Yes, but no FTE estimate has been identified.
- Question 25: When you complete internal planning processes what percent of your staff time allocation is dedicated to analysis / engagement / plan production?
Answer 25: This varies upon the process.
- Question 26: What is the anticipated budget allocation for the 2-year project timeline?
Answer 26: See Questions 1 and 10.

- Question 27: Do you have a budget for the 2-year project timeline?
Answer 27: See Questions 1 and 10.
- Question 28: Are expenses reimbursable and will they be a part of the fee evaluation?
Answer 28: Pricing structure of the proposal is at the discretion of the submitter. As the City will utilize the proposals for overall budget, any work plan and cost proposal should specifically identify estimated reimbursable and additional meeting expenses.
- Question 29: Would the City consider one or more public Charrette(s) (interactive workshop) an appropriate process for this proposal and method of community engagement?
Answer 29: Yes.
- Question 30: Has the City separately engaged other disciplines/consultants relevant to this proposal? or, is there an expectation that the selected consultant engage all other disciplines? i.e retail, transport, historic conservation, environment/ sustainability, civic engineering/infrastructure etc.
Answer 30: No, the City has not engage other consultants relevant to this proposal. Other work is underway in the City under different scopes however, notably a Transportation Plan Update with Sam Schwartz Engineering. The City has many of these disciplines represented by staff as well.
- Question 31: What existing social media platforms and electronic delivery services does the City currently utilize?
Answer 31: The City currently utilizes Twitter, Gov Delivery (rss feeds), Facebook, LinkedIn, and NextDoor.
- Question 32: What is the anticipated number of public and stakeholder meetings?, and with which entities?
Answer 32: See Questions 5, 13, and 23.
- Question 33: Could the City clarify what is meant by the 'project area? ie. within the City boundary, the County, the State etc.?
Answer 33: "Project Area" is intended to communicate the discipline of community engagement and master land use planning, not a geographic area.
- Question 34: Is there a minimum or maximum number of projects to be listed [to document experience with similar projects]?
Answer 34: No.
- Question 35: does the City require a selection of references, or a reference for every project example included?
Answer 35: A reference should be provided for each project experience example.
- Question 36: What timeframe is considered 'recently completed'?
Answer 36: Within the last 3-5 years.
- Question 37: Page 14 subsection C, "Proposed Work Plan", the RFP makes reference to 'Data Collection'. Would the City clarify what data collection the Consultant is required to undertake as part of this project? i.e. transportation/traffic counts / analysis, demographics, housing market analysis, retail/commercial studies, water/drainage/infrastructure assessments etc.?
Answer 37: The City has not identified a specific list of data collection, and looks to proposals to help identify and scope required information. Generally, public transit and vehicle counts are widely available, non-motorized traffic counts less available; demographics limited to census sources; extensive utility inventory is available. Housing market and retail/commercial studies are not available.

Question 38: Is there an allocated budget or estimated fee for the scope specified in this RFP?
If so, can it be made known to applicants?

Answer 38: See Questions 1 and 10.

Question 39: What assumptions may respondents make regarding expenses to be accounted by the Consultant versus costs directly shouldered by the City? i.e. meetings spaces, meals, flights, accommodation etc.

Answer 39: See Question 28.

Question 40: With reference to Page 15, 30 sheet (60 sides) maximum page count, are project examples / work samples included in this limit?

Answer 40: Yes. Summaries with links to webpages that describe projects are acceptable.

Question 41: Has a consultant fee or fee range been identified for this project?

Answer 41: See Questions 1 and 10.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.