

**ADDENDUM NO. 1  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR THE SOUTHWEST LRT COMMUNITY WORKS  
TRANSITIONAL STATION AREA ACTION PLANS**  
(Proposals due on Monday, September 19, 2011 at 12:00 p.m.)

**NOTICE TO ALL PROPOSERS:**

Please note the following additions, deletions, clarifications, corrections, or modifications to the RFP:

1. In Appendix C Section 1, the following date has been modified:

The Proposal Due date has been extended to September 19, 2011 at 12:00p.m.

**BELOW ARE QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO HENNEPIN COUNTY:**

Q1 Does participation on a study team for the TSAAP project in any way preclude a firm's ability to propose on the SW LRT FEIS/Preliminary Engineering study?

A1 ***This issue is under internal review and a response will be provided to consultants once that review is complete.***

Q2 Will both prime and subconsultant firms that work on this project excluded from consideration for any or all future work along the Southwest Corridor?

A2 ***This issue is under internal review and a response will be provided to consultants once that review is complete.***

Q3. The financial bid is to be submitted in electronic Excel spreadsheet format in addition to the sealed hard copy. How should this be submitted/packaged? Is a single copy of this on a CD adequate?

A3 ***Yes, a single digital bid on CD along with the sealed hard copy bid is preferred.***

Q4 Would an easy to read 10 point font size be acceptable in light of the page count limitation?

A4 ***Please use a 12 point standard font size as requested.***

Q5 The prospect of freight traffic sharing a portion of the LRT Corridor has enormous implications for these transitional station area action plans. Since this issue remains unresolved, what should we assume? Will we need to study the relevant stations with and without freight trains?

A5 ***The analysis should be based upon the conceptual engineering drawings developed as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) selection process.***

Q6 Has there been a Section 106 Review done of potential impacts to historic/cultural resources in or near station areas by construction or operation of the project?

A6 ***Yes. The information will be provided on the ftp site.***

Q7 Will firms certified as small business enterprises under the CERT program be considered small business entities as part of this project?

A7 ***Yes.***

Q8 The RFP specifically notes 3D Visualization as an area of expertise that the Consultant shall have. It isn't explicitly stated where the Client intends this expertise to be utilized. Can we assume that the intention is to use this tool in support of community engagement and outreach?

A8 ***This expertise may be valuable for Community Engagement, but what was intended was to solicit firms who will be able to complete the renderings and perspective drawings for the Transitional Station Area Action Plan task.***

Q9 The RFP precludes contacts with the staff of the HCWT and others serving on the consultant selection committee. Could you please identify the consultant selection committee members?

A9 ***Staff from each of the corridor cities and Hennepin County will constitute the selection committee, although specific reviewers have yet to be determined.***

#### Questions involving TASK 1

Q10 Will a comprehensive list of all of the relevant studies and plans be provided?

A10 ***All relevant studies are listed on pages 13-16 of the RFP and are available on the FTP site. If you have not received log in information or have trouble using the site, please contact [adele.hall@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:adele.hall@co.hennepin.mn.us).***

Q11 Will the selected consultant team be provided the most accurate and up to date parcel-based GIS mapping data from the participating cities, Hennepin County, or Metro GIS?

A11 ***The participating cities and Hennepin County will provide accurate and up-to-date GIS data.***

- Q12 What level of detail will be available within the GIS database that will be provided to the consultant for Task 1, e.g. building data (footprints, number of stories, building height) and site survey data (topography/contours, public utilities, planometrics)?
- A12 ***The level of building data detail will vary slightly between cities. Topographical and public utility data are available for all cities.***
- Q13 Upon becoming familiar with the relevant studies and plans, if deficiencies or data gaps exist, is it your intent for the Consultant to assemble all compatible information or will the appropriate governmental agency respond with providing necessary data?
- A13 ***The appropriate governmental agency will provide necessary data.***
- Q14 Are land values to be calculated on assessed property tax valuation from county records or private-sector market value?
- A14 ***Either approach could be acceptable. If Consultant elects private-sector values, the proposal should indicate method and source used and why that approach is preferred.***

Questions involving TASK 2

- Q15 Who will be the primary contact that will coordinate information and resources from the 'partner cities'?
- A15 ***Each city will have a representative on the Project Management Team, who will serve as the contact for information from that city.***
- Q16 Will Patrick Connoy be the County's Project Manager?
- A16 ***Yes.***
- Q17 The RFP indicates that the County may retain the services of a Project Master. Has the Project Master been identified? Will this person take the place of the County's Project Manager or will they supplement the capacity of the Project Manager? Please elaborate on this interface and interface of the Project Master with each respective City.
- A17 ***If a Project Master is retained by the county, the Project Master would assume the role of the Project Manager, working directly with the Project Management Team and the corridor cities. Any Project Master would be contracted under a separate budget and contract from this RFP.***
- Q18 Will the Project Master be directly part of the TSAAP project delivery team? If so, please clarify the Project Master's role.

A18 ***If a Project Master is retained by the county, s/he would work closely with the consultant's project delivery team, but under separate contract and budget.***

Q19 Can we assume that each City will have a single point of contact/project manager?

A19 ***Each city will have a representative on the Project Management Team.***

Q20 Are bi-weekly meetings defined as once every two weeks or twice per month or twice per week?

A20 ***The Project Management Team will meet with the consultant every two weeks.***

Q21 If retained, what role would the Project Master play and is funding for this position outside of the identified project budget amount?

A21 ***See answers 17 and 18 above.***

Questions involving TASK 3

Q22 Please provide the number of meetings expected/required.

A22 ***The method and number of community engagements will vary by station area. The Consultant will develop the Community Engagement Plan in close coordination with the Project Management Team, including number of meetings.***

Q23 Can we assume that the CET is in place and can be used as a conduit for outreach to underserved communities?

A23 ***The Community Engagement Team (CET) is established and will be a strong resource for information on underserved communities and community organizations in the corridor. However, the CET is not undertaking specific engagement efforts related to this project.***

Q24 Have all of the underserved, immigrant, minority and disabled populations been identified along the Southwest Corridor?

A24 ***Some, but not all of these populations have been identified. As noted in the relevant studies section and available on the FTP site, the Metropolitan Council created Southwest LRT corridor demographic maps using census data. However, these maps do not identify specific communities, and additional work remains. The CET and corridor cities will be useful resources in identifying these communities.***

Q25 Have the Community Engagement and public involvement processes to date been summarized? Will all of this information be available to the selected consultant from the Community Engagement team?

A25 ***No, a detailed survey of efforts-to-date has not been compiled. A survey of community engagement practices in general has been completed by each of the corridor cities and is available on the FTP site. The Project Management Team will be the best resource for more specific engagement information.***

Q26 The quantity of community engagements is open-ended and the measures of effectiveness for the community engagements are determined by the Consultant. Are there any objectives and/or criteria for the community engagement plan during this step in the overall process?

A26 ***As stated in the RFP, the objective is to increase participation and decision-making in public processes by underserved populations. The Consultant should be prepared to work jointly with the Project Management Team to develop a Community Engagement Plan that supports this objective.***

Questions involving TASK 4

Q27 Will a separate RFP be issued for this work?

A27 ***No.***

Q28 Will Hennepin County consider proposals just for Optional Task 4?

A28 ***No.***

Q29 May we submit a proposal in response to Task 4 alone?

A29 ***No.***

Q30 If we submit a proposal for Task 4 alone, may we also submit as a sub-consultant for that task on another team's proposal?

A30 ***Proposals for Task 4 alone will not be accepted. However, proposers for Task 4 could propose as part of a team for the entire RFP.***

Q31 Does the fee of \$500,000 include work performed for Task 4?

A31 ***Yes.***

Q32 The RFP identifies a budget for the project of \$500,000. Does this budget include Task 4 which is shown in the RFP as optional?

A32 **Yes.**

Q33 Can Hennepin County provide budget guidance for this task? Is the performance of this task included in the \$500,000 project budget?

A33 ***The \$500,000 budget includes Task 4.***

Q34 We assume the fee for this work is in addition to the \$500,000 for the base project. Has a fee range for this work been established? If proposed, should a separate financial bid be prepared for this work or should it be included in the base bid but noted as Optional?

A34 ***No, the fee for Task 4 is included in the \$500,000 budget. As stated in the RFP, the budget should be broken down by task.***

Q35 If Task 4 is completed by a third party it will impact our overall schedule/work plan. If a third party undertakes this work, when can we assume this work will be completed?

A35 ***If a third party consultant completes Task 4, the Project Management Team will coordinate efforts to ensure that Task 4-related work will be available to the TSAAP consultant in a timely manner.***

#### Questions involving TASK 5

Q36 Housing inventory and gap analysis typically relies on census data and property tax data. These data sets may or may not overlap and/or support the project and corridor boundaries. Will data interpolation be acceptable for this housing analysis?

A36 ***Methodology, including data interpolation, should be described in detail as part of the report for this task.***

#### Questions involving TASK 6

Q37 The RFP suggests that station area site plans need to be prepared at the conceptual level. What level is expected for the access/circulation plans?

A37 ***The access/circulations plans also are expected to be prepared at the conceptual level, which will be necessary to integrate them into the TSAAPs.***

#### Questions involving TASK 7

Q38 What is the detail format of deliverables for the infrastructure analysis? Essentially what level of detail will we need to provide in the plans being requested?

- A38 ***As stated in the RFP, the level of detail required for the infrastructure analysis must meet submission standards for city/county Capital Improvement Plans.***
- Q39 Is there a funding source for these local infrastructure improvements, or at least a sense of magnitude for the scale of these improvements?
- A39 ***The magnitude is understood to vary widely for the improvements. The corridor cities are working with the county as part of the Southwest LRT Community Works project to identify funding sources and an investment framework. The TSAAPs are an integral part of this effort.***
- Q40 Are all current capacities (including short term improvements) for all infrastructure (utilities, storm water, sewer, water, sidewalks, trails, roads, wayfinding and lighting) already identified for all governmental jurisdictions and private-sector utilities (gas, electric, telephone, data, etc.)? How much excess capacity already exists?
- A40 ***No. Although much of this information will be available from the corridor cities, there is no compiled master resource for current capacities.***

#### Questions involving TASK 8

- Q41 Please further explain/define what you mean by Action Plans (understand they will include concept and implementation elements). Would these necessarily include zoning recommendations as well? Other elements/topics?
- A41 ***“Action” is intended to emphasize the need for tangible actions that can be taken by project partners in the near term in order to optimize station area access, circulation, and development by the time the LRT is operating. Action Plans could recommend zoning changes, among other changes.***
- Q42 Can you provide more detailed description of the station brochure and its intended use/audience?
- A42 ***Two examples of station brochures are available on the FTP site. The brochure should enable a member of the public or a project partner to understand the most important station features, its location, and the action plan—the outcome of the TSAAPs—for the station. Renderings and diagrams/maps of the station area and next steps or project schedule would likely be included.***
- Q43 Five Minneapolis stations are included in the study. In 2010, Minneapolis conducted station area plans very similar to the TSAAP Study. How involved should the TSAAP work be for each of the Minneapolis stations?
- A43 ***As indicated in the Task Matrix, the TSAAPs for Minneapolis station areas should build significantly upon the existing station area plans, and therefore will not require as much effort as some of the other station areas. However, there may be gaps in the Minneapolis work that must be filled in so there is consistency in the TSAAPs across the corridor.***

Unless expressly modified by Addendum, all other terms and conditions shall remain the same.

Jacqueline M. Boeke  
Hennepin County Purchasing and Contract Services  
August 29, 2011