

RFQ Questions

Issued: June 26, 2017



City of Indianapolis
Department of Metropolitan Development
Emily C. Mack, Director



Hamilton County Tourism, Inc.
Brenda Myers, President/CEO

**The City of Indianapolis – Department of Metropolitan Development
-and-
Hamilton County Tourism, Inc.
Seek a Request for Qualifications for Professional Services Regarding
Central Indiana White River Regional Strategic Plan**

The following questions were received regarding this RFQ, which closes on July 26th, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. local time. Please utilize this information with that in the RFQ to prepare statements of qualifications. As in the RFQ, “Coordinating Partners” refers to the City of Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development and Hamilton County Tourism, Inc.

Q: Who will the selected consultant have a contract with for the project?

A: Two separate contracts will be issued, one for Marion County with the City of Indianapolis and the other for Hamilton County with Hamilton County Tourism, Inc.

Q: Who will serve as the contractor’s point of contact throughout the project?

A: Brad Beaubien
Administrator of Long-Range Planning
Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis
Email: brad.beaubien@indy.gov
Phone: 317-327-5133

Q: What is the source(s) of funding for the Central Indiana White River Regional Strategic Plan? What is the not-to-exceed budget?

A: As part of the RFQ process, the budget is negotiated after the selection of a preferred qualified vendor. Until a budget is negotiated, the specific funding sources and mix

of sources is not identified, although the Coordinating Partners are confident that known public and philanthropic funding sources are secure.

Q: In 3.8 Deliverables, it is requested that there are at least 200 printed copies of the Strategic Master Plan and at least 5,000 printed copies of the Executive Summary. Will those costs be covered by the City of Indianapolis and Visit Hamilton County or should they be included in the proposer's budget?

A: All printing costs should be included in the proposer's budget.

Q: For 4.5 Relevant Experience, is the three comparable projects per team or per team member?

A: Teams may provide up to three comparable projects per team member, subject to the four page limit.

Q: How is the selection criteria broken out by percentage of points?

What percentage of points are linked to Disadvantaged-Based Business Participation in the selection criteria?

A: Selection criteria is still under development.

Q: Are the percentages listed for City-certified businesses goals or are they mandatory for submitted statements of qualifications?

A: The percentages are goals that the Coordinating Partners take very seriously and will be reflected in the final contracts.

Q: Are statements of qualifications required to include the identification of disadvantaged-based business participation or just a commitment to meet the goals as defined by the City of Indianapolis?

A: For the Statement of Qualifications, a commitment to meeting the goals with City-certified vendors is sufficient. However, this commitment will be reflected in the final contracts and become a legal obligation. If specific vendors are known, please note their DBE status or ability to achieve City-certified DBE status.

Q: What is the estimated timeline for the project?

What is the City's anticipated schedule for teams to complete the desired scope of work?

A: The project approach portion of the Statement of Qualifications should include a proposed timeline. The Coordinating Partners are eager to begin and conclude this planning process so implementation can begin, but a specific timeline or deadline is not determined. The Coordinating Partners will work with the preferred vendor on a proposed timeline.

Q: What is the amount of public engagement is expected on the project? How extensive is the public engagement process to be?

How does the client define “success” in terms of the community outreach, education and engagement? (is it a certain number of focus groups, certain number of stakeholder meetings, etc).

A: Task 3.2.1 outlines specific minimum requirements, which include facilitation of a stakeholder committee, focus/affinity groups, and broader general public engagement. The Coordinating Partners have not established minimum thresholds and seek the expert advice of respondents with experience on similar planning efforts elsewhere. The Coordinating Partners expect robust engagement using multiple engagement methods (meetings, online, social media, partner events, etc.) to maximize meaningful participation that is representative of the demographic and socioeconomic makeup of diverse communities through which the White River flows. It is noteworthy that this diversity also includes rural, suburban, and urban settings, and it is important that all types of communities are targeted for engagement. The Coordinating Partners have a specific commitment to engage communities typically underrepresented in planning processes, including persons of color, low-income households, renter households, immigrant and refugee populations, and those with disabilities.

Q: What is the expected contract start date, following team selection?

A: Third-quarter 2017.

Q: Relative to scope task 3.3.6, have the Coordinating Partners and/or allied agencies/entities undertaken any recent, relevant technical studies concerning low head dam removal?

A: At this time, we are not aware of any dam removal studies. Most if not all of the existing low-head dams serve a water supply function.

Q: Relative to 3.4.3, how many new or enhanced locations are expected?

A: For this specific task, a comprehensive identification of opportunities is expected. There are no numerical thresholds. However, for the following task, 3.4.4, three of these opportunities per county should be explored.

Q: Relative to scope task 3.4.4, will there be three opportunity locations total or three in each county?

A: Three locations per county for a total of six locations.

Q: Relative to scope task 3.4.4, how large or small of a geographic area is anticipated for each of the opportunity locations?

A: This will likely vary based on the type of opportunity and location identified, but in general the size is likely large enough to function as a unique regional destination, or as a component of a unique regional destination, rather than a smaller neighborhood-oriented or local destination.

Q: To whom should we address the cover letter?

A: You may address the cover letter to Mr. Brad Beaubien.

Brad Beaubien
Administrator of Long-Range Planning
Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis
1842 City-County Building
200 E. Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204

Q: What is the proposed project boundary for the master plan study?

A: The Assets and Connectivity Map supplement to the RFQ can be considered the study area for most tasks, unless respondents provide a rationale for a larger area. This area is roughly a 1.5 mile buffer from the river shore for the entire length of the White River in Marion and Hamilton Counties. The exception are tasks under task 3.3 that broaden the study area as noted to the larger White River watershed north of the Marion County southern border.