

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility Alternatives Analysis
for the
Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (UVLSRPC)
acting on behalf of the
New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT)

1.0 General

Per the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008, a congressional appropriation of \$500,000 was secured to, in part, conduct an alternatives analysis of potential sites and design an Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility. It is anticipated that upon the completion of the alternatives analysis and conceptual design of the facility, the remaining funds from the congressional appropriation will be supplemented with additional federal funding to perform final design and engineering, procure land, and construct the facility. The stipulations for the use of this funding are guided by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations. As outlined in the appropriate FTA regulations, in order for facility design, engineering, and construction funds to be released, an applicant must first provide planning justification, usually through the completion of an alternatives analysis.

The Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility will serve as a passenger terminal for intercity bus transit, provide connections between intercity and local transit, serve as a public park-and-ride facility, and potentially as a hub for public transit and demand-responsive human service transportation coordination. The facility will be located in the Upper Connecticut River Valley of New Hampshire/Vermont, and will directly serve Interstate 89. The selection of a site and scope for this facility will be the result of a comprehensive public participation process and careful analysis of the costs and benefits of alternatives. In addition, the feasibility study will consider the possibility of long-term future rail connections and the potential location of a regional transit dispatch center within the facility. The Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission will be the Project Manager on behalf of the NHDOT and project partners. The scope of work for the development of the alternatives analysis is detailed below.

While cost alone will not be the main basis for selection, comparative costs of the qualified proposals will be a consideration. The project duration will be eight (8) months from the date the contract is signed.

All questions related to this Request for Proposals may be presented in writing, sent by FAX, or e-mailed to:

Christine Walker, Executive Director
Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC
30 Bank Street
Lebanon, NH 03766
Fax: (603) 448-0170
E-mail: cwalker@uvlsrpc.org

Deadline for Submitting Proposals

Ten (10) copies of the proposal must be received by 4:00 PM on **October 23, 2009** clearly marked "Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility- Alternatives Analysis" to

Christine Walker, Executive Director
Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC
30 Bank Street
Lebanon, NH 03766

Proposals or amendments received after this deadline will not be considered. Faxed or e-mailed proposals will not be considered.

2.0 Scope of Services

2.1 Public Involvement

The consultant will work cooperatively with UVLSRPC, Upper Valley Transportation Management Association (UVTMA), and NHDOT to ensure that a comprehensive public involvement process occurs throughout the study, as detailed in the Public Involvement Plan attached to this RFP. The selection of a locally preferred alternative will be dependant upon an extensive public involvement process.

2.2 Purpose and Need

The consultant will review the *Statement of Purpose and Need* for the project, as developed by the Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility Project Advisory Committee. The *Statement of Purpose and Need* shall inform the consultant's work at all stages of the alternatives analysis.

2.3 Transit Operations

The consultant will review previously developed needs studies (if any) for the intercity transit providers, local public transit providers, and the human service transportation providers, where necessary, to ensure that as a minimum the program will include the following:

- ❑ Identification of all providers
- ❑ Description of provider services, users, etc.
- ❑ Evaluation of existing facilities and providers' potential to use the proposed facility
- ❑ Determination of the space needs and requirements of providers
- ❑ Determination of how this facility may affect their ridership in the future
- ❑ Determination of typical daily/annual current and projected passenger usage for intercity bus, local public transit, and human service transportation providers, expected at the facility including boardings, alightings, number of transfers at the location and other intermodal transfer information
- ❑ Determination of parking requirements (current and future)
- ❑ Description of amenities to be provided at the proposed facility
- ❑ Outline of hours of operation and staffing of the facility
- ❑ Determination of potential users of the facility

Where applicable, the consultant shall provide a breakdown for the above items to distinguish between transit and non-transit uses.

2.4 Alternatives Analysis

The consultant will review previous planning studies and efforts in order to document the process used in selecting the alternative locations for the intermodal transportation facility. The consultant may, upon the direction of the Project Advisory Committee, review and analyze alternative sites in both New Hampshire and Vermont. The consultant will review and analyze the costs, benefits and other issues pertaining to at least two sites, and no more than 6 sites in total. The Alternatives Analysis shall provide, for each alternative site, the quantitative and non quantitative impacts specified in the Phases one and two screening and evaluation criteria developed by the Project Advisory Committee and attached to this RFP.

2.5 Issues Identification

The consultant will identify “scoping” issues and possible permit needs in detail for all identified alternative sites. The issues will include at least those in the screening and evaluation criteria referred to above, and the following:

- Consistency with FTA funding requirements
- Consistency with previous public involvement and planning efforts
- Municipal Concerns
- Landowner/Public Concerns
- Historical uses of the property
- Natural Resource Issues
- Cultural/Historical Resource Issues
- Socio/Economic Issues
- Coordination with other Projects
- A.D.A/NH State Standards Compliance
- Hazardous Waste
- Federal, State and Local permit requirements
- Consistency with state downtown investment policies and other applicable State targeted investment policies
- Consistency with Town and Regional Plans
- Consistency with the current New Hampshire Intermodal Transportation Plan and Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan
- Proximity of public water and sewer
- How transit and non-transit parking requirements can be addressed
- Continued operations and maintenance requirements
- Traffic impacts to the highway network
- Impacts to private businesses

Areas of sensitivity will be identified and mapped that include wetlands, historic sites, structures, and districts; archaeological sensitive areas; recreational areas or refuges [4(f) properties]; wilderness areas [6(f) properties]; agricultural land, fish and wildlife habitat; flood plains; endangered species/habitat; and hazardous waste sites. The consultant will document in the report the method used to evaluate the severity of the issue or impact for all identified alternative sites.

2.6 Utility and Right-of-Way Research

The consultant will obtain plans from public and private utilities within project limits and all information for present and proposed future facilities will be plotted on drawings to identify potential conflicts. Property ownership and easements will be researched and documented for all identified alternative sites.

2.7 Conceptual Drawings

The consultant will develop conceptual drawings and site plans for each alternative in sufficient detail to facilitate the evaluation of the benefits and constraints of each in order to choose a preferred alternative. The site plan must include the facility, parking, roads, topography, natural features and connections to the highway and transit network as well as other items typically found on a site plan.

2.8 Operational issues

The consultant will research and identify options for the following:

- Ownership and control of the facility
- Operation and maintenance of facility
- Incorporation of public transit/human service transportation coordination capacity within the facility
- Users that have committed to use the facility and what form the commitment takes

2.9 Cost Estimates

The consultant will develop preliminary cost estimates for all alternatives identified in the study in order to budget for design and construction, as well as operation and maintenance, which will include the following:

- Costs to acquire the site
- Design and construction costs
- Operation and maintenance costs

2.10 Preferred Alternative

The consultant, working cooperatively with NHDOT and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), will select a preferred alternative using the results of the Alternatives Analysis and the process detailed in the project's Public Involvement Plan. The preferred alternative must ultimately be one agreed upon by the NHDOT.

The selected alternative will be designed in sufficient detail to begin the permitting process accompanied by design drawings. A schematic/context plan shall be provided which depicts the location of the preferred alternative within the context of its geographic and physical surroundings.

Once the drawings are complete, the plans and related information will be sent by the Project Manager to the resource agencies and the NHDOT (on the traffic impact to the highway network) for written comments. At this time, if deemed necessary, a site visit for resource agencies and NHDOT will be scheduled to review the preferred alternative.

Products:

- Design drawings sufficient to begin the permitting process

- ❑ Schematic/Context Plan
- ❑ Written comments from resource agencies

2.11 Cost Allocation and Funding Sources

The consultant will identify, for the preferred alternative, the following:

- ❑ Cost allocation for capital and long term operating and maintenance costs for both transit and non-transit uses.
- ❑ Public and private sources of funding for identified cost allocations. This will address unmet needs for funding, if any, and what sources are anticipated and/or available to meet these needs.

2.12 Final Report

The consultant will provide (1) twenty-five bound copies of the final report; (2) one unbound original copy of the final report capable of being reproduced by a typical office photo-copier; (3) a digital copy of the final report in a commonly accessible format and medium; and (4) all background information used for and developed through the feasibility study.

Products:

- ❑ Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility Alternatives Analysis Final Report
- ❑ Background information for the Study

3.0 Submittal Requirements

Ten (10) copies of the proposal, to include a technical and cost proposal as separate documents, shall be submitted to:

Christine Walker, Executive Director
Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC
30 Bank Street
Lebanon, NH 03766

Faxed or E-mailed proposals will not be considered. The cost proposals must be in a sealed envelope and clearly labeled with the firm's name, project name and the title "COST PROPOSAL." Proposals should be concise, and must include:

3.1 The Technical proposal must include the following items:

a) Summary

A brief summary of the consultant's understanding of the project and relevant knowledge/experience. Provide information on all collaborators if more than one firm is involved.

b) Work Plan

The approach and detailed work plan proposed to accomplish the scope of services and the manner in which the consultant will work with NHDOT and the Project Manager in coordinating the project. The work plan should be specific as to the use of existing data, new data collection, and traffic modeling to be used to carry out the Alternatives

Analysis. Suggestions for additional work, which may be beneficial to the project, may be considered. Creative approaches to completing the study and any suggested additional work are encouraged.

c) Qualifications

A description of the consultant's qualifications, capabilities, and organizational structure. Identification of the project team including qualifications, experience, and specific responsibilities of the project manager and staff that will be assigned to the project (include a resume for each person).

d) Relevant Work Experience and References

Up to three (3) examples of projects similar in scope and scale completed by the consultant (by the staff that would be assigned to this project). Provide a brief description including completion date, type, budget and scope of project, and contact person with telephone number for reference.

e) Work Schedule

A detailed schedule indicating how the project tasks will be organized to complete the work product in the allotted time frame. Schedule to include a matrix of the project tasks and hours assigned broken down by personnel assigned.

4.0 Cost Proposal

The consultant's proposed budget and cost for completing the feasibility study must be in a **separate** sealed envelope and clearly labeled with the firm's name, project name and the title "COST PROPOSAL." The cost proposal **must** include a task breakdown of project cost by each staff/team member and hours assigned to each staff/team member. The approximate budget for this contract is \$180,000.

Modification of Proposals

Modifications to proposals received prior to the submission deadline will be accepted, and must be submitted in a sealed envelope identifying the name and address of the consultant and clearly marked "Modification to Proposal – Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility Alternatives Analysis."

Ten (10) copies of modifications to the proposal shall be submitted. Modifications shall include insertion pages or replacement pages and a transmittal letter explaining and indexing the modifications.

Selection Process

Upon release of this RFP, the Project Manager will form a Consultant Selection Committee who will be responsible for the review of project proposals and the selection of a qualified project consultant. All Proposals will be opened after the "Deadline for Submitting Proposals", in the presence of one or more witnesses, and a register of all applications will be prepared. The proposal opening shall not be open to the public.

Proposals will be evaluated based on technical merit and on the criteria listed below. Finalists may be interviewed as part of the evaluation process. After the evaluation and interviews are completed, the Consultant Selection Committee will rank the finalists and provide a recommendation to NHDOT and the Public Advisory Committee at their November 13, 2009

meeting. The top-ranked proposal approved by NHDOT and the Public Advisory Committee will be invited to negotiate a contract with the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission. If negotiations fail, the second ranked proposal will be invited to negotiate a contract with the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission. The Selection Committee reserves the right to select the individuals or firms which in its sole judgement best meet the needs of the project and the Upper Valley region. The consultant should be prepared to begin work on **November 13, 2009** and must complete the project by **June 30, 2010**.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Submission of a complete proposal with the consultant's approach to the project, which contains all information, services, and requirements in this RFP.
2. Thoroughness and comprehensiveness of services consultant proposes to provide.
3. Stated ability to execute a contract within 6 weeks of selection, and to perform and complete all work as indicated in the Scope of Services by **June 30, 2010**.
4. Overall firm experience and past performance on similar projects.
5. Stated ability to appear for an interview, if requested.
6. Adequate assigned resources and staffing to do the work.
7. Concept and process creativity.
8. Comparative costs of the proposals may be considered, but will not be the main basis for selection.

Project Manager's responsibilities during the Project

1. Facilitate the formation and activities of the Consultant Selection Committee responsible for reviewing and selecting a project consultant for this feasibility study.
2. Coordinate administrative tasks with the consultant and NHDOT regarding meetings, agendas, and related tasks.
3. On behalf of the NHDOT, enter into an agreement with the selected consultant; manage and administer project activities with the consultant and NHDOT officials as necessary.
4. Help coordinate public participation throughout the duration of project.
5. Review draft documents and provide recommendations.

Miscellaneous

1. Claims and Insurance Requirements – The consultant shall, at its sole expense, obtain and maintain in force liability insurance and shall be solely responsible for all claims of whatever nature arising out of the rendering of services during the term of the contract. The following insurance shall be required:
 - a. Commercial or comprehensive general liability insurance including contractual coverage, for all claims of bodily injury, death, or property damage, in policy amounts of not less than \$250,000 per occurrence and \$2,000,000 in aggregate (The consultant shall indemnify and hold harmless the UVLSRPC, the NHDOT, and affected communities); and
 - b. Comprehensive automobile liability insurance covering all motor vehicles, including owned, hired, borrowed, and non-owned vehicles, for all claims of bodily injury, death, or property damage, in policy amounts of not less than \$500,000 combined single limit; and
 - c. Professional liability (errors and omissions) insurance coverage of not less than \$2,000,000 in the aggregate. If coverage is "claims-made", the period to report claims shall extend for not less than three years from the date of substantial completion of the contract. No retention (deductible) shall be more than \$25,000; and
 - d. Workers' compensation and employer's liability insurance as required by law.

2. Equal Opportunity – UVLSRPC and NHDOT are Equal Opportunity Employers. The selection of a consultant shall be made without regard to race, color, sex, age, religion, national origin, or political affiliation. UVLSRPC and NHDOT encourage proposals from qualified Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE). The DBE goal for this project is 8%.
3. UVLSRPC reserves the right to withdraw this Request for Proposals, to accept or reject any or all proposals, to advertise for new proposals if it is in the best interest of the NHDOT and UVLSRPC to do so and to award a contract as deemed to be in the best interest of the NHDOT.
4. Compliance with Law – The selected consultant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations in the performance of service. The selected consultant must be certified to conduct business legally in the State of New Hampshire.
5. All proposals submitted in response to this RFP become the property of the UVLSRPC. The UVLSRPC has the right to disclose information contained in the proposals after an award has been made. Cost proposals will not be made public. All reports, documents and materials developed by the consultant for this project shall be considered public information and shall be the property of the UVLSRPC and NHDOT. All products, both paper and digital, and borrowed materials shall be delivered to the Project Manager prior to final payment.
6. Consultant will be required to utilize all previous studies regarding the Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility, to the extent possible, in the development of the plan. The consultant will conduct the study with consideration to the greater community goals and vision identified in previous public involvement and planning efforts.