

# **ADDENDUM No. 1**

## **Request for Proposals**

### **Mendocino County**

#### **Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & Engineered Feasibility Study**

Pursuant to the Request for Proposals dated **December 21, 2017**, the deadline to submit written questions about this RFP was January 5, 2018. This Addendum addresses questions received through that date, in the order received.

Q1: “We’ve done very similar projects as this in places like Humboldt County, where we worked with local non-profits such as the Redwood Community Action Agency (RCAA). These groups can help us on the outreach and data collection aspects of these kinds of projects, plus, bring good local knowledge. Do you see any benefit to this type of sub-contractor, and if so, would a group like RCAA or Walk Bike Mendocino be a good addition?”

**Response:** MCOG does not have a preference on whether the outreach and data collection aspects of this project are conducted by local non-profit groups, subcontractors, or the proposing consultant team. It is up to proposers to demonstrate how their proposed team composition and outreach and data collection methodology provides the best value for this project. MCOG will not comment on potential subcontractors.

Q2: “My other question has to do with the level of detail expected in the feasibility and cost estimating aspect of the project. Our engineers are very good at developing planning-level feasibility and cost estimates--but I wanted to see if there was a specific expectation as to the mapping scale to be used in the study.”

**Response:** There are two levels of review called for in the study. The first level will be done in developing the needs inventory and Existing Conditions Report. The scope, dimensions and quantities are expected to be approximate at this level and it is expected that some of this information will be collected remotely. The second level will occur after project prioritization. Once these top candidate projects are selected for each entity, the consultant is expected to provide project level detail sufficient to serve the purpose of a Project Study Report (PSR). That would include the scope, schedule, and planning level costs of the project. The Technical Advisory Group will provide guidance to the consultant regarding the scope and schedule.

Engineered plans are not a product of this study. The proposer may elect to provide standard plans for features such as curb, gutter, sidewalk and pedestrian crossings to clarify the basis of the planning level cost estimate and notes as to locations where non-standard approaches of implementation may be required.

Funding for this study is provided by a Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant made available through Caltrans. Development of fully engineered plans and specifications is an ineligible cost under this program. Engineering that is required (and approved) in this study is limited to that which is necessary to estimate dimensions, quantities and costs to provide planning level cost estimates for each project.

There is no specific requirement regarding the mapping scale for the product.

Q3: “Is the consultant expected to conduct traffic counts (vehicle, pedestrian) as part of this effort? If so, how many locations?”

**Response:** No. We expect that the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will be able to provide estimates based on local knowledge regarding vehicular and pedestrian volumes. MCOG does have pedestrian counting and vehicle equipment available in the event that specific information would be valuable in the project prioritization process. MCOG would incur the cost of any such data collection if necessary.

Q4: “In Task 5.6, the RFP indicates that the number of projects will not exceed 70. Is there a limit to the number of candidate projects identified in the Inventory?”

**Response:** MCOG recognizes that work required would far exceed funding available if the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) did not provide guidance throughout the study. Although a limit of candidate projects has not been established, it is likely that the number of candidate projects will be constrained by funding available in the task for that purpose. Based on public input and local knowledge, TAG members will provide further guidance regarding neighborhoods or districts that should be targeted for study.

Further guidance may prove useful as to what MCOG considers a project. Since the likely funding source to construct projects identified in the study is the Active Transportation Program administered by the California Transportation Commission, it is important to consider the guidelines of that program. For the purpose of this study, a project should not cross jurisdictional lines (city/county) and generally be less than \$1.5 million in total costs. This, according to the draft guidelines, constitutes a Small Project. Rural areas such as the Mendocino region are likely to be more competitive when competing in the Small Project category. A project should combine smaller pedestrian/crossing improvements needed in a geographic area, subject to the advisable \$1.5 million limitation. Again, guidance will be provided throughout the study to ensure viable projects are produced for all five entities, subject to funding constraints.

Q5: “What is their ideal team? What type of firm do they see as prime consultant?”

**Response:** The final product of this study requires a combination of skills. Transportation planning, administration, management, public outreach, research, mapping, and engineering are likely to be the mix of disciplines needed to produce a successful product. There is unlikely to be

a single “ideal team” since skills within consulting firms tend to overlap several disciplines. There is no direction regarding the nature of the “prime consultant”. It is noted however, that the funding source is a planning grant and engineering is limited to that which is needed to produce viable projects and planning level costs.

Q6: “On Task 4.2 - Advertising workshops - Would MCOG be responsible for mailing or distribution/posting of informational flyers if that is an effective means of advertising workshops?”

**Response:** No, the consultant team will be fully responsible for performing this task, and the proposal should include all direct costs (e.g. postage, advertising, printing, workshop space rental, light refreshments for community workshops, etc.) associated with this task. MCOG staff will provide existing information such as e-mail and contact information for local government and agency groups.

Q7A: “The Ped Needs Assessment in the new ATP includes a table of "Short Range Priority Improvement" projects, as well as cost estimates and GIS maps of them. The overarching question is where the Ped Needs Study picks up in relation to the ATP Ped Needs?”

**Response:** This Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & EFS will be a more thorough effort than the Short Range projects identified in the Active Transportation Plan. Although the ATP identifies Short Range priority projects for each entity, this comprehensive needs inventory is expected to result in a larger list of candidate projects for each jurisdiction. The final list of priority projects (requiring planning level cost estimates) may or may not include the projects listed in the Short Range Plan, depending on the prioritization methodology that is developed under this planning effort.

Q7B: “For example, can we assume these priority ped projects cover the prior adopted plans for these locales, or will we need to review and reference the prior plans re. ped improvements that may have been contained in them?”

**Response:** No, this assumption cannot be made. Task 3.1 indicates the need to “gather and review existing data .....identified in prior planning studies...” Pedestrian projects identified in the new ATP are derived from a number of planning products over a number of years, supported by various levels of detail. Previously identified projects will be reviewed as well as newly identified projects. All identified pedestrian projects will be prioritized based on criteria established in this study.

Q7C: “And do we absorb the scope and cost estimates for the ATP short-range ped improvements into the study, or are we expected to review and possibly refine them?”

**Response:** The Short Range projects listed in the Active Transportation Plan may or may not end up being included in the list of prioritized projects in this EFS, depending on the

prioritization methodology adopted during this process. Any planning level cost estimates included in this study should be a result of work performed under this study. Since some of the costs estimates in the ATP range as far back as 10 years, new estimates will be needed for those projects that become priority projects.

Q8: “Does MCOG, Caltrans, County or cities have inventories of sidewalks and other ped facilities (especially in GIS, or CAD or other digital form that would facilitate incorporation into GIS?”

**Response:** MCOG staff is unaware of the existence of any such inventories.

Q9: “The 2014 Safe Routes to School Plan has plans for improvements at 5 pilot schools. Are these plans and other SR2S needs to be reflected in the Ped Needs Study, and are there any subsequent plans or studies for other schools?”

**Response:** Yes, the Countywide Safe Routes to School Plan, as well as Safe Routes to School plans for the cities of Ukiah, Willits, and Fort Bragg should be reflected in this study.

Q10: (1) “Can MCOG provide additional information on the amount, level and form of data available to be provided to the consultant related to existing inventory of pedestrian facilities? Specifically: Will information be provided in manipulable digital forms such as GIS files, EXCEL tables and WORD documents? What is the approximate extent of the information (does it cover 20% or 80% of the project areas?” (2) “Will all the information be provide to the consultant through MCOG?”

**Response:** (1) The information available is expected to be in the format of printed studies or reports (possibly electronic versions). The existence of manipulable GIS or EXCEL files from local agencies is expected to be minimal, thus the need for this comprehensive countywide inventory. (2) No, the consultant is expected to work directly with local agencies to obtain existing studies, reports, and data. MCOG will provide any relevant information produced by MCOG.

Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director  
Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner  
Mendocino Council of Governments  
[lellard@dbcteam.net](mailto:lellard@dbcteam.net)

*Dated 1/12/2018*