
ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

To the REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Issued by:

The Point of the Mountain Development Commission

CONSULTING SERVICES

RFP No. PMDC 2016-01

ADDENDUM # 2

August 5, 2016

This Addendum modifies the Request for Proposals, RFP No. PMDC 2016-01 (“RFP”), issued by the Point of the Mountain Development Commission on July 14, 2016.

The RFP is supplemented by the following additional information in response to the questions indicated:

Question 1: Does the Point of the Mountain Development Commission plan to provide relevant and current data regarding employment, demographics, real estate activity, traffic, etc.? If so, is the data available in GIS format?

Answer to Question 1: The COMMISSION does not plan to provide the data. The COMMISSION expects the CONSULTANT to gather from reliable sources any relevant data necessary to provide the CONSULTING SERVICES. Much of the needed information is likely available from various public entities, including the state (e.g., Department of Workforce Services, Department of Transportation, Governor’s Office of Economic Development, etc.), regional organizations (e.g., Wasatch Front Regional Council, Utah Transit Authority, etc.), and local government entities. In addition, as indicated in Addendum # 1, the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute (“INSTITUTE”) of the University of Utah has agreed to provide the COMMISSION access to several resources at no cost. These resources will be available to the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT may be able to acquire additional needed data from the INSTITUTE for a fee. The COMMISSION will provide reasonable assistance to identify these organizations and to introduce the CONSULTANT to these organizations to facilitate data collection. The availability of GIS data will likely vary from source to source.

Question 2: Does the Commission plan to participate in this effort in an “active-partner” role, or more of a guidance role?

Answer to Question 2: The COMMISSION anticipates that there will be frequent, substantial, and regular communication and coordination between the COMMISSION--primarily through its chairs and staff--and the CONSULTANT. The COMMISSION intends to meet as frequently as necessary to receive updates and reports from the CONSULTANT; to provide direction to the CONSULTANT; to engage in public outreach and stakeholder collaboration efforts; and to work on the process of formulating recommendations, consistent with the COMMISSION’s statutory responsibilities.

Question 3: To what extent do you predict local officials will be willing and available to work with the consultant throughout the phases?

Answer to Question 3: Although the COMMISSION has no direct authority over any local government entity and cannot accurately predict the willingness and availability of local government officials to participate in the process outlined in the RFP, the COMMISSION anticipates that officials from affected local government entities will have a high interest in assisting the COMMISSION and the CONSULTANT to effectively and successfully discharge the COMMISSION’s responsibilities. Several members of the COMMISSION are officials from local government entities whose communities will potentially be directly affected by the COMMISSION’s work. These members have expressed a strong desire to see the COMMISSION successfully fulfill its responsibilities.

Question 4: Are teaming relationships with local engineering/planning firms allowed/encouraged?

Answer to Question 4: Teaming with a local engineering, planning, or other firm is certainly allowed. As stated in Section VII. 6 of the RFP, a RESPONDER from Utah will not be given a preference over a RESPONDER from outside Utah. Likewise, a RESPONDER who teams with a Utah engineering, planning, or other firm will not for that reason alone be given a preference over a RESPONDER who does not team with a Utah firm. A proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria described in Section VI of the RFP, including the qualifications, experience, and expertise of the RESPONDER and all individuals who will work with or for the RESPONDER to provide CONSULTING SERVICES.

Question 5: Will it be appropriate and acceptable to utilize options and examples, both from a US and European perspective? In addition to presenting examples that have been successful in the USA, may we provide examples that have been successfully implemented in European communities?

Answer to Question 5: The COMMISSION is willing to consider examples of successful projects in comparable communities regardless of their location. The COMMISSION is more interested in the quality and relevance of comparable projects than in their location. As stated in Section VII. 3 of the RFP, the COMMISSION seeks a highly qualified consultant or team of highly qualified consultants with a global perspective and sufficient experience and expertise to provide CONSULTING SERVICES.

Question 6: If we wish to place one or two of our specialists at the Utah Commission's office to facilitate communication and planning efforts, can the commission accommodate one or two offices on a temporary basis during the duration of the project?

Answer to Question 6: No. Except for the transitory use of conference rooms and similar facilities, the CONSULTANT will be expected to provide its own office space.

Question 7: Would the Commission allow for establishing a web-based communication portal accessible by the general public for public notices and communications?

Answer to Question 7: Yes. However, there are already public notice mechanisms in place, including notices of COMMISSION meetings provided by COMMISSION staff on the website of the Utah Legislature and on a state public meeting notice website, and potentially a dedicated webpage for information about COMMISSION activities. The CONSULTANT will be expected to work closely with the COMMISSION or its chairs or staff to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and to ensure an efficient and effective public communication process.

Question 8: A similar secure web-based portal (not available to the general public) can also be established for information exchange between the consultant(s), Commission and additional stakeholders the Commission would like to engage on a routine basis. Is this an approach we may present in our proposal as a value-added communication tool?

Answer to Question 8: Yes. Also, see answers to Questions 7 and 9. Information on any such secure portal may be subject to the provisions of Utah Code Title 63G, Chapter 2, Government Records Access and Management Act.

Question 9: Is the commission interested in approaches which could create beneficial outcomes that would create a federal tax advantage for property development? If so, may we present this option in our proposal?

Answer to Question 9: A RESPONDER may include in its proposal any option or feature the RESPONDER believes will enhance the proposal and more fully meet the criteria described in Section VI of the RFP. As stated in Section VII. 5 of the RFP, the RFP is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant, important, or essential information.

Question 10: Would the Commission be available to tour some projects in Europe? Could the expenses for this travel be included as part of the overall engagement budget that we could/should factor into our proposal?

Answer to Question 10: The COMMISSION does not intend to travel to Europe. The CONSULTANT will be expected to use other means to inform the COMMISSION about any comparable projects of interest.

Question 11: Is there adequate, up-to-date base data (demographics, land use, zoning, environmental, infrastructure, etc.) for the potential study area available. If so, what is the state of that data? Is most of it already in GIS format?

Answer to Question 11: See answer to Question 1.

Question 12: Should the cover page with the responder summary information and the certification page (indicating that neither the respondent nor any of its principles are currently debarred or otherwise ineligible to respond to the RFP) be counted toward the RFP's 30 page limit?

Answer to Question 12: The entire proposal should stay within the 30-page limit described in Section V. 3 of the RFP. The required certification does not need to be on its own separate page.

Question 13: Can new consultants or advisors be hired on to contribute later in the development and implementation process by the team that is awarded the RFP, or would that require a new RFP to be issued?

Answer to Question 13: In its proposal, a RESPONDER should identify all firms or individuals expected to provide any part of the CONSULTING SERVICES. As stated in Section VI of the RFP, the qualifications, experience, and expertise of those who will work with the RESPONDER to provide CONSULTING SERVICES are important elements of the criteria by which the RESPONDER's proposal will be evaluated. If, in the course of the CONSULTANT providing CONSULTING SERVICES, the CONSULTANT and COMMISSION determine together that the services of an individual or firm not previously identified by the CONSULTANT in its proposal are needed, the CONSULTANT will be expected to engage that individual or firm, subject to the COMMISSION's approval, to assist the CONSULTANT to provide CONSULTING SERVICES within the scope and budget described in the RFP.

If this question is asking about services needed to implement recommendations made by the COMMISSION, those services are outside the scope of the COMMISSION's statutory authority and responsibilities and outside the scope of the RFP.