

ADDENDUM No. 1
RFP 866, Ann Arbor Station Environmental Review
City of Ann Arbor
Due: Monday, July 22, 2013, by 11:00 AM EDT

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Ann Arbor Station Environmental Review, RFP No. 866, on which proposals will be received on or before Monday, July 22, 2013, by 11:00 AM EDT.

The information contained herein is being provided to assist potential respondents in the review of the RFP. This Addendum includes 4 pages.

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.

Questions and Answers

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP.

Q. Does RFP 866 Ann Arbor Station Environmental Review replace RFP 847 Ann Arbor Station Conceptual Design and Environmental Review?

A. Yes.

Q. Can the building be placed over the tracks?

A. This project contains no categorical prohibitions on such placement, however there may be federal, state, or other restrictions that apply.

Q. Is there a height limit on buildings in that area?

A. Height limits may depend on zoning or other requirements that are specific to each alternative site. The present Ann Arbor Station site, which the contractor will be required to analyze, is zoned M1, which has a height limitation of 35 feet.

Q. Is there any limitation on the number of alternative sites that can be studied? Is there any limitation on the number of different concepts that will be studied?

A. No, however the contractor must analyze a no-build alternative, reuse of the existing site, and other sites, as appropriate. See RFP 866, page 12, Subtask 3.1.

Q. Are there any preferred sites to be explored?

Q. Will the City provide the alternate sites we are to consider?

A. No. The contractor must determine appropriate alternative sites, although the contractor will consult with the City and other stakeholders. See RFP 866, page 12, Subtask 3.1.

Q. What is the minimum length of platform that will be studied?

A. Minimum platform length will be determined during the programming phase consistent with AMTRAK requirements.

Q. Will existing grade crossings near anticipated station sites be allowed?

A. At-grade crossings are subject to federal and state requirements and approval processes.

Q. Is there anticipation that this territory will be electrified?

A. No, this rail line is not anticipated to be electrified at this time.

Q. Is the City of Ann Arbor exploring the purchase of the DTE property recently remediated north of the current Amtrak station?

A. The City currently has no plan to acquire additional property for this project. If the contractor determines that additional property is required or recommended for specific sites, this should be noted in the alternatives analysis.

Q. Please clarify proposed responsibilities related to a project website: The RFP indicates that the contractor will be responsible for “development and maintenance of a Project website” (Task 2) but also indicates that “the Project website will be hosted on the City’s web page” (Subtask 2.4).

A. The selected contractor will be responsible for developing project website content in consultation with City staff. The content will be hosted on the City’s Project web page.

Q. Is it possible to obtain the draft environmental study previously prepared for this station?

Q. Based on previous studies to date, what parcel locations are likely to be included in the alternatives analysis and conceptual design tasks?

Q. What baseline information from the previous alternatives and NEPA studies will be available for use by the selected consultant? Which of these items will need to be updated vs. can be used without updating? Possible items we have in mind could include: ridership projections, site trip generation, parking calculations, traffic count data, concept designs, technical analyses, cost estimates, social/economic/environmental data, base mapping, etc.

A. Prior analysis and data regarding Ann Arbor Station is available on the City’s website at: <http://www.a2gov.org/government/pages/fuller.aspx>. A previous environmental study and alternatives analysis exists only in draft form and was not finalized or accepted. This draft is available upon request as background information only. This project is intended to identify alternative sites based upon the criteria listed in RFP 866. Criteria and assumptions relied upon in the previous draft study should not be presumed to be applicable to this project. All data for the current project must be developed based on current conditions.

Q. Can you describe the likely process and participants for approving project decisions on station location options? For example, Task 3.2 states “After gathering feedback from stakeholders and the public, the contractor will identify a preferred site and design.” Will the preferred designs be approved by the City of Ann Arbor, MDOT, etc?

A. There is no formal approval of the preferred site and design. The contractor will identify and evaluate potential sites with stakeholder and public review and input. Once the input has been evaluated, the contractor will recommend a preferred alternative to be carried into the environmental review process. It is expected that the contractor will work closely with the City and other stakeholders throughout the process to evaluate alternative sites.

Q. Would the following be included in the 15 page (two-sided) limit: a recyclable cover sheet, divider sheets, cover letter, table of contents, or resumes?

A. A cover sheet, divider sheets, table of contents, and resumes would not be counted against the limit. A cover letter would count towards the limit.

Q. For the purposes of estimating our hours in the Work Plan, how many build alternatives should we assume will be developed and evaluated?

A. One of the project’s requirements is to determine the number of alternative sites to be considered, therefore the City cannot provide a prospective estimate. Respondents may describe any assumptions regarding number of alternatives to be considered in their proposals.

Q. What level of analysis is anticipated related to site utilities?

A. As this is the conceptual design phase, a detailed analysis is not expected. The contractor will be expected to identify the type, size, and location of utilities in proximity to potential sites. The contractor should also generally identify any alterations, additions, or conflicts that may need to be addressed at each site.

Q. Page 14 of the RFP (under Task 4 heading) mentions that the project may require preparation of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, or environmental impact statements. We recognize that the type of document needed to satisfy NEPA requirements may be unknown at this time. However, for the purposes of writing our project approach/understanding narrative and estimating hours/schedule dates for the work plan, should we assume a particular level of NEPA document will be needed?

A. Respondents should not assume any particular level of environmental documentation will be sufficient. Appropriate environmental documentation will be determined by site conditions.

Q. The current Cooperative Agreement and Statement of Work attached to the RFP lists

the period of performance end date as 8/29/2013. Has the end date in the Cooperative Agreement and SOW been amended.

A. The City and MDOT have formally requested an extension.

Q. How will the City provide maximum practicable opportunities for small businesses, including service disabled veteran owned small business according to page 63 of this RFP?

A. The City is under contract with MDOT to undertake this project and MDOT's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise ("DBE") program has been notified of this project. This project's RFP has been posted to the MDOT website for access by DBE certified businesses.