

NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Sub-Area Study – RFP Addendum Pre-Proposal Meeting Summary

Highlights

1. Proposal Submission Deadline **extended to Friday, January 9, 2009 at 4:00 pm.**
2. The budget for the project is \$250,000. Therefore, we would like to see what services can be provided for that budget. However, If there are things that consultants would like to offer; add-ons, additions, or innovative approaches we would entertain but they should clearly be delineated in proposals as option services (or add-ons).
3. For the City's Small Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (SDBE) program, please use the revised attachment with **06/08 revision date**
4. Conflict of Interest language revised as shown in the addendum
5. Reports referenced in the RFP will be posted on the websites the week of December 22. Copies can be made at the City City's Transportation office.

Meeting Transcripts

Mark Ahrendsen, the City Transportation Manger, kick off the meeting by introducing himself and other city employees and the stakeholders in the project. He gave a brief overview of the project, the RFP process and a general timeline.

The submission date for proposals has been moved to **January 9, 2009** in order to not interfere with the holidays. It will be due at 4pm on the January 9, 2009. The entire schedule as a result will be pushed back one week due to the extension of the submission deadline. The general study area is the NC 54 corridor. The eastern edge of the study area is I 40 and the western edge is Fordham Blvd 15/501. This is a very congested area at times and the I40 NC54 interchange is one of the major transportation problems in the whole area. NCDOT has put together some bandaids over the years but that has only bought us some time. There are several developments currently under way along the corridor. Traffic will increase due to those developments. There are more projects on the drawing board in the area and the land use plan for the area calls for more dense development. We expect and encourage the growth and development and in turn the traffic.

He indicated that one element of the MPO long range transportation plan is a fixed guideway service along the corridor. This will be a part of a regional fixed guideway facility that will run from Chapel Hill

through Durham, RTP, RDU, and Raleigh. The MPO and member agencies are generally supportive of development that would support fixed guideway service in the area. This sort of development will also generate a lot more trips that will be on the highway network. We don't want this study to be limited to possible highway improvements. We want the study to cover all forms of transportation. Due to these facts this project will truly be a land use/transportation study – a true land-use/transportation feedback analysis. Essentially, we are looking for a blueprint for integrated land-use and transportation evaluation and solutions.

Another integral part of the study is the need for public involvement. This is not the primary purpose of the study but we want to reach out to those in the study area as well as those that are creating through traffic that originates from both I40 and US15/501. The City wants to have some opportunities for public involvement to see any proposals that are being brought about.

We have a schedule and we would like to stick to it. We do not want this to be a multi year process. Proposals will need to be in by January 9th and then review those by the selection committee. We hope to make a selection, negotiate a contract and begin to proceed with the process by mid February. We hope to get the study under way by March and completed by the fall of next year. We hope to keep this in a fairly compressed timeframe. The schedule is on pages 34 to 36 of the RFP.

Section 5 of the RFP goes over the scope of the project and includes a map of the study area. The map clearly delineates the boundaries of the study area. We are looking for a pretty standard process including an analysis of the existing conditions. This should be followed by an evaluation of alternatives. Next would be a short range and long range implementation schedule. Finally a final report would need to be included. Public involvement opportunities need to be included throughout the process.

There will be a steering committee that will be comprised of various stakeholders in the study area. These stakeholders include the city of Durham, NCDOT, the transit operators (TT, CHT, DATA), the town of Chapel Hill, and possibly others could be added to the steering committee as we see fit. We are under no illusion that there is an easy solution out there. At first glance you may look at this and think that it is fairly limited. You might say you can widen NC54 and throw some transit service in there and that is it. But in this project we really want to look at some innovative solutions, are there other things that we can do to support the type of development that we want to support? It is a strategic corridor due to its proximity to RTP, UNC and Duke. It is ripe for the type of development that we would like to see to support a fixed guideway type of system. But we need to make sure we have a transportation system that is able to support that type of development in the study area.

When Mark was finished he asked if any members of the steering committee had anything to add. David Bonk wanted to mention that he and Felix Nwoko had been working on a possible addendum to the scope of work. He asked Felix if that had been released yet to which Felix replied that it had not but would be one week following the meeting. Felix then explained what the addendum would contain. It will begin with a summary of today's meeting, followed by responses to your questions, and attendance. All questions that they get after today will be posted online with the corresponding answers. Minor changes to the scope will also be included in the addendum as well as additional comments from the town of Chapel Hill as a reference to the Chapel Hill master plan. The schedule changes will also be included in the addendum.

Felix indicated that Bob Martin from the city purchasing department was unable to be at the meeting but he usually talks about the RFP process and what is included in that process. Felix said if you have any problem with the contract language in the RFP that they will need to know beforehand. We

don't want to hire someone and then find out that wholesale changes need to be made to the contract.

Mark wanted to add that they did ask for a price proposal in the RFP but that won't be a determining factor. The budget for the project is **\$250,000**. That is the funding that we have available for the project. What he would like to see is what services can be provided for that type of budget. If there are things that you would like to offer add-ons or additions that would be ok but we are trying to level the playing field for everyone by making you aware of the budget. You are welcome to offer other services for additional costs but there is no guarantee that we will accept that. What are you looking for in the fee proposal? We are looking for cost of the services that you are offering. This meaning the scope of work should match the fee estimate.

Angela Henderson then began to speak from the department of equal opportunity and equity assurance. Her office is responsible for our equal opportunity business program. She helps to make sure that city contracts are fair to firms that are owned by socially and economically disadvantaged people who would like to do business with the city of Durham. We put requirements on projects that are being let out by the city of Durham. There are often goals involved for women and minority owned business to participate. Those goals are not set for this project. But we do encourage participation from firms with these types of owners.

She spoke to how if an entity is certified by the NCDOT, the US small business administration, or the Raleigh Durham Airport authority, then we will accept them and count their participation on a project. You can utilize firms from these three databases or our own but not from HUB unless they are also included in one of these three databases. This is because their programs are very similar to our programs and we feel comfortable utilizing those firms. If you do use a firm from one of those databases we would contact them about filling out certification for the city of Durham as well but it would be an abbreviated version of the certification process. You must submit the documentation for that firm with the proposal. You cant just claim that they are DBE's. You need to have their documentation or a letter saying they are active with one of those three entities to prove they are with one of those three entities.

Even though there are no goals, the one requirement that we do have is that complete the professional services document that has been included with the RFP. On page 6 of the form document, there is a declaration of performance and we just need you to answer those questions and select a designation that fits your firm. These forms are also available on their webpage in writeable format. Page 7 is a participation documentation form, we need everyone to fill this out just in case your firm is an SBDE firm. This form should include you and all your sub consultants that you plan on using in this project with your best estimate at this point. On page 8 is the managerial profile, and this is just basically contact information for the firm and the person that will be project manager from the firm. On the bottom of the form you would need to identify those people who would have a supervisory role in this project and identify whether those people would qualify as being socially or economically disadvantaged based on the legend on the page.

On page 9 we ask that you provide an equal opportunity statement and if your firm already has a policy on this matter you can submit your policy in lieu of a written statement. Page 10 is the employee breakdown form and we are just asking for a breakdown of the demographics of your organization. We want it broken down by income category, ethnicity, race, and gender. If you have one office than you would only need to complete part A of the form. If you have multiple offices and you plan to use people

from more than one then we need consolidated information to be put in part B. If you submit EEO1's to the federal government then you don't need to fill out that form you can just supply us with that. Sub consultants are not included in this form. On page 11 the letter of intent will be filled out if you plan on using an SBDE firm. Use TBD if you are not sure of certain items.

There are no goals for this project so pages 12 through 14 do not need to be filled out. When you turn in your proposal you will only need to turn in the five documents she covered and the letter of intent if you plan to use an SBDE firm which you will need documentation for. This is very important because we review them before the selection committee looks at them and if they do not include everything she will determine your proposal to be non responsive and it will not advance to the evaluation process. On the web page there are 2 versions of these forms. Make sure to use the newer version which will be identified as an addendum to the previous version. If you have questions contact Angela Henderson.

Mark wanted to reiterate that there is no SDBE requirement but council strongly encourages participation of those firms. SDBE's do not have to only be a sub they can also be a prim and that is strongly encouraged as well.

Mark then opened up the floor for questions about the project from anyone. Are all the studies referenced in the RFP online? Not all of them are online some are and some are not. Between now and next week we post as many as we can online. We don't have electronic versions of some of them that were from a long time ago so we cant post them all.

The RFP talks about the need to collect data but some data may be provided by the city and other entities. For the purpose of our fee estimate should we assume that we will collect all the data or that some of the data is available or what? Figure out what data needs to be collected, and then check with either DOT or the city to see if we have that data. If we have the data that you need we will certainly provide it. The stagecoach Rd study overlaps with this one and could be used for this project because it is a fairly recent study. The addendum will include a matrix of some the data sources that we have. Some of the land use data will be from planning so we will combine it in a matrix online.

You mentioned that there would be a steering committee; who will be making the final decision on the proposal? Will it be the city of Durham? The MPO? The city of Durham will be the contracting agency for this project. The selection committee that will be making the recommendation will include all of the stakeholders involved in the project.

What market analysis has been done in correlation to this study area? We are not sure of any. There could have been some private sector work that has been conducted in the area. We have growth projections in association with our long range plan that can be made available for employment and population but we have not conducted any market analysis. Those growth projections were put together with data from 2006 so some revising may need to be done.

In regards to the conflict of interest statement, is that just one from each team or one from each firm involved? We will discuss that in the addendum but we believe that the city will want the same information from any sub consultants that are used. We are trying to avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest and that will be addressed more in the addendum.

Is David Bonk with Chapel Hill collecting any transit data that may be useful in this study? Every month Chapel Hill has transit ridership data by stop and that is available in real time. We do have projections of future transit demand through the study area. We have future park and ride data at a lot of areas around Chapel Hill including the NC 54 corridor that would be available.

As far as a short term time frame are you looking for 10 years out, 15 years out, or a multitude of years as far as just getting something down or are you looking for just the whole thing? We are

looking for some short term improvements but we are also looking for mid and long term improvements as well. There may be some things that can be done in only a matter of months. Other items maybe more in the 3 to 7 to 10 year time frame. And there may be other improvements that are truly long term such as 10+ years. We are open to how you might propose short, mid, and long term for this project. A good example may be the fixed guideway which if everything goes perfectly we may have up and running sometime around 2023 or 2024. So the question may be what do we do between now and then?

The I40 interchange is past its life span and it looks like any improvements to that may be long term type improvements so maybe more work needs to be done on the corridor first. The NCDOT said they were asked to look at a roundabout at NC54 and Meadowmont. He said unless you are ready for a 3 to 4 lane roundabout you may not want to consider that idea. There may be things that we can do before we do a major renovation to that interchange.

There had been talk about adding an interchange at Farrington Rd and I40 as a part of the Long Range Transportation Plan. The Transportation Advisory Committee decided to get rid of that idea. We just want you to be aware of that. It certainly doesn't mean you can't include it if you see fit. The university and the town have looked at adding a park and ride location closer to I40. One of the issues with this is access. One idea that has been brought up is some slip ramp type things that are separate from the NC54 interchange or possibly some modifications to that interchange to provide access to a park and ride facility.

You have talked a lot about mobility and that LRTP talks a lot about performance measures. Would it be expected that the steering committee would follow a similar path? We have not developed the evaluation criteria. That could be part of the study scope to develop a methodology to measure things.

Does the 2023 light rail have a definite route planned? There is nothing definite about light rail. The only thing we know is that 2023 is a reasonable implementation date assuming funding is available. If we had the funding and the work started in the next couple of years than it would be expected to be brought on line by 2023. Some projects including the one at Meadowmont have been in contact with TT to determine where the easements are and how large they are in a way to plan for light rail in the future and to not encroach on the opportunity. The project still has a lot of hurdles but it does have standing with the local governments which is a major step in its development.

NCDOT has a corridor study for access to the Lee Village that includes keeping the easement open for light rail development if you are interested in looking at that. NCDOT would like all questions and correspondence routed through Felix Nwoko like everyone else so that there is a consistent source of communication. They want to remind everyone to not spend all of their time on the I40/NC54 interchange. This project is for the entire 4 mile segment and not just a couple of thousand feet at the interchange.

Chapel Hill has a project coming out of the ground right now that has to provide for improvement to the transportation infrastructure as part of their approval process. It would be expected that firm that wins the project would speak with the jurisdictions to see what projects are approved and what improvements they will be providing. The southwest Durham collector street plan is also in the area and can be looked at.

Will these studies be on the internet? The collector street plan is already on the dchcmpo.org website. We have 2 websites and the RFP and the addendum will be placed on both the city website and the MPO website. If you are looking for the reports the best place to go would be the MPO website. You won't find the collector street plan or the LRTP or other projects on the city website. Those will only be found on the MPO website.

Felix Nwoko will be the project manager for this project and everything will need to be funneled through him. We want to be consistent and that is the best way to do that. Direct all items to the 4th

floor of city hall.

Could you talk about what you are looking for on the land use side? We are looking for you on that. You know what the current plans are and the level of development associated with those plans and the traffic that will be associated with that and in turn the plans that will need to be developed. You are welcome to recommend what land use changes might need to be made to better support the transportation infrastructure. I am more specifically referencing the design guidelines you list as a deliverable. Ok well that is one that we will have to get back to you on then. We will update that more in the addendum. We were also talking more about density of development and not specific types of development.

David Bonk wanted to add that we are looking at what are the tradeoffs between more dense/less dense developments. Or maybe what would more mixed use development mean for the area?

There was a question posed at the pre-proposal meeting for the 54/40 corridor project regarding the scope of "design guidelines" that the consultants were going to be expected to address. Here is my response from a planning perspective (it's a first draft, so feel free to edit):

We are most interested in the proper intensity to be accommodated at adopted level of service standards within the recommended transportation options. We are also looking for guidance on properly incorporating park-and-ride facilities within the corridor that may service commuters to off-site final destinations (UNC through a bus connection, RTP/Duke through a carpool, bus or future light rail connection, e.g.). There is in-house knowledge of transit-oriented development principles, so suggestions for incorporating TOD models and integration of future light rail stops into development design should not be a major focus on this element.

- [f] a condition that the proposal submitted was independently arrived at, without collusion, under penalty of perjury, and
- [g] that their offers will remain open and valid for at least 90 days.

By signature on their proposal, responders also certify that programs, services, and activities provided to the general public under the resulting contract are in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the regulations issued thereunder by the federal government.

If any responder fails to comply with [a] through [g] of this paragraph, the City of Durham reserves the right to disregard the proposal, terminate the contract, or consider the contractor in default.

1.15 Conflict of Interest -Revised

Each proposal shall include an affidavit from the firm and all subconsultants that are purposed to work on the contract affirming that the firm and all subconsultant(s) have no current or potential conflicts of interest in performing the services requested and will agree to avoid such conflicts during the term of the contract with the City of Durham. For the purposes of this RFP, and the evaluation procedures to be used in selecting the most qualified firm, a “conflict of interest” is defined specifically as (1)(a) having an existing or probable contractual relationship with, or (b) having a financial interest with or in either, (2)(a) a property owner within the defined NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Subarea Study, or (b) a developer or individual, including any real property investor, having any direct or indirect financial interest in any of the properties within the defined NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Subarea Study. Such conflicts of interest exclude any relationship the firm or subconsultants may have with other government transportation entities. The Firm shall also disclose information relating to any work that was performed under contract by it or its subconsultants completed within the last 5 years involving properties within or contiguous to the defined NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Subarea Study, including a description of (1) the nature and purpose of the work performed, and (2) the client name. The Durham City Council reserves the right to cancel the award if any interest disclosed from any source could either give the appearance of a conflict or cause speculation as to the objectivity of the program to be developed by the responder. The City Council’s determination regarding any questions of conflict of interest shall be final.

1.16 Right to Inspect Place of Business

At reasonable times, the City of Durham may inspect those areas of the contractor's place of business that are related to the performance of a contract. If the City makes such an inspection, the contractor must provide reasonable assistance.

Attachment 3

Conflict of Interest Affidavit

State of _____

Affidavit

County of _____

I, _____, on behalf, and as authorized representative of, _____ (hereinafter, "Consulting Firm"), affirm and attest that the Consulting Firm has no financial or contractual interest with any developer, individual or property owner having direct or indirect interest in any property within the study area and that the Consulting Firm is not committed to a project in the study that will may bias the analysis of the proposed NC54/I40 Corridor/Sub-area study project. I further affirm and consent that the firm **Will Not** contract with a developer, individual or property owner having any financial property interests in the study during the duration of the study. The foregoing statement excludes any contractual or financial relationship with a governmental transportation related entity. The duration of the study shall be from notice to proceed to the adoption of the study.

Affiant

Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me this _____ day of _____, 200____.

Official Seal
Notary Public

My commission expires _____, 200____.

RFP for the NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Sub-Area Study

Pre-Proposal Conference - Tuesday, December 9, 2009, 2:30 pm

#	Name	Firm	Address	Phone	Email
1	Dawn Vallieres	John Davenport Engineering	305 W. 4th St. W-5, NC 27101	336-744-1636	d.vallieres@davenport-engineering.com
2	Sreekanth (sum) Nandagiri	Earth Tech AECOM	701 CORPORATE CENTER DRIVE SUITE 485, RALEIGH, NC-27607	919-256-6313	SREEKANTH.NANDAGIRI@AECOM.COM
3	Frank Vick	Parsons	5540 Centerview Dr. Suite 217 Raleigh, N.C.	919-851-1341	frankm.vick@parsons.com
4	SAJJAD ALAM	Parsons	4	919-851-1346	Sajjad.Alam@Parsons.com
5	Radha Krishna Swayampakala	R.S.E.H	8008 Corporate Center Dr. #400, Charlotte	704-940-3888	radha.swayampakala@rselh.com
6	JAN ANDERSON	JKA	3504 Castlelains Dr. Charlotte NC 28226	704-567-9593	jan@jka-engineering.com
7	CHAD CRITCHER	R S & H	8008 CORP. CTR. DR. #410 CHARLOTTE	704 940 4718	CHAD.CRITCHER@RSANDH.COM
8	Matt Pickens	Wilbur Smith Assocs	421 Fayetteville St suite 1303 Raleigh, NC 27601	919-755-0583	JPickens@wilbur-smith.com
9	MUSHTAQUR RAHMAN	Parsons Brinckerhoff	909 Aviation Hwy	919-468-2133	Rahmanmus@pbworld.com
10	Jeff Hochanadel	SEPI Engineering Group	1025 Wade Ave (Raleigh) NC 27605	919-789-9977	jhochanadel@sepiengineering.com
11	Coland Robins	Parsons Brinckerhoff	709 Aviation Hwy	919-468-2419	colandrobins@pbworld.com
12	Whaley Lanham	City of Durham		560-4366	
13	Glenn Walters	DESIGN WORKSHOP	7 BUCKINGHAM CT ASHEVILLE NC	828-280-9637	glennwalters@designworkshop.com
14	John Burris	HNTB	343 E. Six Forks Rd., Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27609	919-424-0883	jburriss@hntb.com
15	Ruth Boasynore	VMB	101 Walnut St Waterbury MA 02492	617-924-1780	rboasynore@vmb.com
16	Fred Bruchoff	Kinley-Horn	300 Westgate Park Dr Raleigh NC	919-677-2000	fred.bruchoff@kinley-horn.com
17					
18					
19					
20					

RFP for the NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Sub-Area Study

Pre-Proposal Conference - Tuesday, December 9, 2009, 2:30 pm

#	Name	Firm	Address	Phone	Email
1	Nathan Phillips	Gibson Engineers	PO Box 700 Fugate Valley	919-552-2253	nathan.phillips@gibsonengineers.com
2	Scott LAWE	THE LEWIS BERGER GROUP	1001 WARE AVE, Ste. 400	919 866 3412	slawe@lewisberger.com
3	W. Thomas	Balcer	1304 Concourse Dr. Ste 200	410-682-3450	bthomas@mbalcercorp.com
4	RICHARD PETERSEN	GRANTHAM	123 N. GRANTHAM	704-333-0325	RICHARDPETERSEN@GRANTHAM.COM
5	Steve Browde	H.W. Lochner	2840 Plaza Pl. Suite 202 Raleigh, NC 27612	(919) 571-7111	sbrowde@hwochner.com
6	Brian Byfield	"	"	"	bbyfield@hwochner.com
7	G. WARE WARE	KOZDUSZ TRANS. CO.	800 W. Hill St. 1/2 202 CLT	980-321-0202	www.kozduszkublians.com
8	Tony Sease	Civitech	1107-B West Main, Durham	919-338-1050	tony@civitech.com
9	DAVID BOKK	Town of Chapel Hill		919-5064	dbokk@townofchapelhill.org
10	DAN JEWELL	Coulter Jewell Harris	111 W. Main, Durham	402-0308	djewell@cjha.com
11	JAMES DUNLAP	NC DOT	750 N GREENFIELD PARK	919 662 4342	jdunlap@ncdot.gov
12	Travis Braswell	NC DOT	750 N. Greenfield Park Garner	919-661-5956	tbraswell@ncdot.gov
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

RFP for the NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Sub-Area Study
Pre-Proposal Conference - Tuesday, December 9, 2009, 2:30 pm

#	Name	Firm	Address	Phone	Email
1	DAVID GRIFFIN	URS CORP	1600 Primmeter Park #400 Morrisville, NC 27560	919-461-1446	david_griffin@urscorp.com
2	Jill Gurak	PBS&J	1616 E. Millbrook Rd Raleigh, NC 27609	919 876 6888	jsgurak@pbsj.com
3	EDDIE MCFALLS	EARTH TECH AECOM	701 CORPORATE CENTER DR RALEIGH, NC 27606	919 854-6211	eddie.mcfalls@aecom.com
4	Mike Surasky	WSP Se ls	14501 western Parkway, Ste 100 Cary, NC 27513	919-678-0035	mike.surasky@wspse ls.com
5	Red Florence	Haden Stanziale	3300 W. Main, 900 Burlington, NC 27205	" 286.7440	rflorence@hadenstanziale.com
6	Bill Wipensch	Renaissance Planning	209 6th St Charlotteville, VA	434 826 2534	cpwipensc@arties-that-work.com
7	Bill Hood	Baker	8000 Leggett Cntry Way Suite 200 Cary, NC 27518	919 459 9000	bhood@mbakercorp.com
8	John Grant	HNTB	343 E. S. W. Forks Rd. Raleigh, NC 27609	919-546-8997	JGrant@HNTB.com
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					