



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**REGIONAL ALTERNATIVES
ANALYSIS**

US-71/Grandview Corridor

**Requested by
Mid-America Regional Council**

October 7th, 2011

Table of Contents

A. Purpose and Introduction	3
B. Background	3
C. Study Area	4
D. Project Management	5
E. Scope of Services	5
I. Alternatives Analysis	5
II. Consultant Scope	6
III. Study Management and Oversight	11
F. Study Schedule	11
G. Proposal Submittal Requirements	12
H. Pre-Proposal Meeting and Question Submittal	14
I. Selection Procedure	14
J. Proposals Evaluation Criteria	15
K. On-Site Presentations	16
L. Contract Award	16
M. Protest Procedures	16
N. Procurement Schedule	16
O. Project Budget	17
Attachment A – Summary of Attachments	18
Attachment B – Affirmative Action Checklist	19
Attachment C – Debarment Certification	20
Attachment D – Certification Regarding Lobbying	21
Attachment E – Intent to Perform as a DBE	22

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

A. PURPOSE AND INTRODUCTION

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is an association of city and county governments and metropolitan planning organizations serving the nine-county Kansas City metropolitan area. MARC is organized as a public not-for-profit organization.

The MARC Board of Directors (the Board) consists of 33 members. Serving on the Board are the chief elected officials from the nine member counties (Wyandotte, Leavenworth, Miami and Johnson in Kansas; Jackson, Cass, Clay, Platte and Ray in Missouri) and six member cities (Overland Park, Kansas; Olathe, Kansas; Kansas City, Kansas; Kansas City, Missouri; Lee's Summit, Missouri and Independence, Missouri), and other representatives of the cities and counties in the region. The Board directs all policy decisions for MARC and meets monthly to discuss issues and act on programs.

Local officials and transit providers throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area have been working on the planning and implementation of an expanded regional transit system. The regional transit plan (Smart Moves) identifies a combination of urban and commuter service needs.

In 2010 MARC, the City of Kansas City, Missouri, Jackson County, and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA) jointly submitted a proposal for Alternatives Analysis funds through the Federal Transit Administration to conduct two separate but coordinated AA processes for a Downtown Corridor in Kansas City and two adjoining Commuter Corridors in Jackson County. The FTA awarded MARC, the primary sponsor of the proposal, \$1.8 million. These two studies are ongoing.

As a follow-up activity Jackson County applied for and received a \$652,200 grant through the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP) to expand the Commuter Corridor Analysis to include an assessment of the US-71/Grandview corridor.

MARC, in coordination with and on behalf of Kansas City, Missouri, Jackson County, Missouri, and the KCATA is seeking proposals from qualified firms to conduct an Alternatives Analysis for the US-71/Grandview Corridor in Jackson County, Missouri. MARC has budgeted \$794,000 for this analysis.

B. BACKGROUND

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA), City of Kansas City, Missouri and Jackson County, Missouri is currently studying three transit corridors as part of the regional transit system; the Rock Island Corridor (regional rail focus), the I-70 Corridor (regional rail focus) and the Downtown Corridor (streetcar focus). The US-71/Grandview AA will expand the ongoing Commuter Corridor Alternatives Analysis in Jackson County and portions of Lafayette and Cass Counties that integrate with the Kansas City, Missouri Downtown Circulator providing essential transportation services and alternatives while also providing opportunities for transit-related economic development near major active centers and town centers.

For the purposes of this Alternatives Analysis, the US-71/Grandview Corridor to be studied runs through multiple jurisdictions. On the northern end, the corridor begins in downtown Kansas City, Missouri's central

business district and runs along the US-71 corridor south to Belton, Missouri. Importantly the corridor also includes the study of adjacent railroad assets in this corridor in addition to connections with both the I-70 corridor and Rock Island corridor services currently being studied.

Local transit service within the US-71 subarea has strong ridership, particularly on the Prospect route which has a ridership of over 5,500 unlinked passenger trips per week (Source: KCATA). However, transit service on US-71 is limited to peak service only and the geographic extent of the service and has been scaled back over the years due to funding constraints and is currently limited to Kansas City, Mo proper. While transit service within the northern part of the study area is stronger than service in the rest of the region, there is a need for better services throughout the corridor and service that may help spur the type of economic development this corridor needs to become more vibrant and sustainable.

[The Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision \(2008\)](#) identifies the US-71/Grandview corridor as high priority commuter corridor. Given the priority of this corridors and the direct interest of Jackson County to pursue implementation, MARC initiated the Smart Moves Implementation Plan , the most recent effort leading up to this Alternatives Analysis. The Implementation Plan further analyzed components of the Smart Moves concept, including both urban and [commuter corridors](#).

In addition to Smart Moves, the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) undertook the [Kansas City Regional Commuter Rail Study \(2002\)](#) to determine the feasibility of major commuter corridors in the region. Following its completion, MARC began the [I-70 Corridor Transit Alternatives Analysis \(2006\)](#) to further flesh out the I-70 corridor and assess alternatives related traditional commuter rail technology and traditional express bus service.

MARC, KCATA, the City of Kansas City, Mo and Jackson County intend to build extensively off of past work as well as the Commuter Corridor Alternatives Analysis currently underway. The intent will be to use the AA results to help develop a more comprehensive regional commuter corridor system and secure funding for implementation and potentially apply for federal funds--New Starts, Small Starts, or other federal sources.

C. STUDY AREA

Specific consultant activity will be limited to the US-71/Grandview Corridor. A more specific study corridor will be further defined by the Project Partnership Team with input from the study advisory committee.

D. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARC will work with our partners to jointly monitor and guide the planning effort throughout its duration and facilitate integration and coordination with the Downtown Corridor AA. Oversight of the Jackson County Commuter Corridors AA will consist of:

Project Partnership Team:

Jackson County, Kansas City, Missouri, MARC, and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA)

Project Technical Lead:

Jackson County, Missouri and MARC

Study Advisory Committee:

To be convened by the Partnership Team

E. SCOPE OF SERVICES:

I. Alternatives Analysis

The US-71 corridor generally extends from downtown Kansas City, Missouri and runs south along US-71 into northern Cass County. This corridor will need to take into account large commuter sheds near potential stations, activity centers, and major rail and highway rights-of-way. The study will focus on developing a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for commuter-based service within this corridor, and will assess and detail the integration and relationship with the I-70 and Rock Island Corridors currently undergoing study as well as other transit service connections. The study must identify and compare the costs and benefits, environmental and social impacts and financial feasibility of all alternatives identified for assessment.

The purpose of the study will be to determine the preferred alternative including specific alignments for the option best meeting current and future transportation needs while also helping to shape, support and focus future economic development and revitalization of activity centers for each corridor.

The AA will follow the FTA New Starts planning process and identify a specific transportation option that will be the locally preferred alternatives (LPAs) to include in the region's long range transportation plan. This study is to fulfill FTA planning requirements for an Alternatives Analysis in the event that a New Starts fixed guideway project is identified as the preferred transit project. This study is funded in part by the FTA and is to be conducted by requirements of and in cooperation with the FTA.

The consultant must evaluate all reasonable alternatives in a given corridor. The evaluation of the costs, benefits, and impacts should focus on trade-offs between alternatives and provide the information in an easy-to-understand format so that local decision-makers may comprehend the differences between alternatives.

The AA process will involve significant public participation to ensure that the options chosen are consistent with the local communities' input. The study should employ sound technical analysis using

the regional travel demand model or other appropriate means of technical assessment and employ the most recent and state-of-the-art tools for alternative assessment. It is expected that the modeling activities build on model development work currently underway with the Commuter Corridors AA.

Throughout the process the consultant shall share any data analysis steps and document any assumptions made in travel demand modeling or any other data analysis. Travel Demand Model input and output data shall be made available to MARC and the Partnership Team, and consult with the FTA as necessary.

The study will include a specific analysis of financial options for both capital development and long term operation of the commuter transit alternatives. The intent is that the implementation and operation of the LPAs will be funded independently from the current transit system. A variety of new funding mechanisms are to be explored in the study.

In addition to the Partnership Team of MARC, KCATA, KCMO, and Jackson County, a specific commuter corridor stakeholder team will be formed to help guide this study. This will be led by MARC and Jackson County.

II. Consultant Scope

The services of a qualified planning consultant or consultant team are required to conduct the Alternatives Analysis. **A firm with experience in planning, travel forecasting using EMME 2 or 3, an understanding of the costs and benefits of different types of commuter services, fixed guide-way engineering, an understanding of transit development opportunities, an understanding of the Alternatives Analysis and New Starts process, a strong understanding of recent related planning activities and processes, and experience implementing commuter transit systems and commuter and freight rail is a must.**

The consultant will propose a specific detailed work scope and a deliverables list which is to address at a minimum the following areas, as well as any other activities necessary to fulfill the project intent and meet FTA requirements:

a. Review the Corridor and Identify Transportation Issues and Opportunities

Working with MARC, KCATA, KCMO, and Jackson County and others as appropriate, the Consultant team will inventory and review existing conditions, transit services, plans, and projections. The Consultant work will build from recent transportation studies including the ongoing Commuter Corridor and Downtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis Studies, regional Smart Moves plan and recent updates, MARC's urban and suburban corridors plans, the Kansas City Regional Commuter Rail Study, KCATA's Comprehensive Service Analysis, and Transit Service Standards and other local transportation analyses as well as available demographic, land use, socioeconomic, economic and travel market data in keeping with FTA New Starts requirements.

Importantly consideration is to also be given to adopted comprehensive plans, land use strategies, and development plans including MARC's Transportation Outlook 2040, the MARC Board's policy on growth and development, the City's Greater Downtown Area Plan, the City's FOCUS plan, the Rock Island Corridor Coalition research related to bike trail utilization, and other special plans for each city and county, as appropriate. The objective is to identify the corridors' travel and transportation issues needs and problems in addition to opportunities for leveraging improved transportation service to further this wider set of community and regional goals.

b. Develop Project Goals, Objectives and Purpose and Need

The consultant will develop a Purpose and Need Statement and related goals and objectives for the proposed corridors' transportation projects leveraging work and input collected through the ongoing Commuter Corridors Alternatives Analysis in addition to needs and opportunities identified through corridor specific analysis and feedback. These goals and objectives will be used to help evaluate and prioritize alternatives.

c. Identify Alternatives to Address Corridor Transportation Needs

The study will identify a range of concepts and strategies for improving transit service within the corridor. The alternatives proposed in the ongoing Commuter Corridors will be a starting point for the identification of alternatives, but other appropriate options may also be considered. This work will be coordinated closely with the concurrent study of the Commuter Corridors AA to ensure there is consideration given to compatible and coordinated route alignments and service technologies.

d. Screening of Project Alternatives

Screening of promising alternatives will be undertaken to determine those that are most feasible and best support the corridors goals. Consultant will work with the commuter alternatives stakeholder team to develop the evaluation methodology to be used to analyze and compare baseline and promising alternatives in keeping with FTA's New Starts planning process. The evaluation methodology will then be applied to develop the list of promising alternatives for detailed analysis and study.

e. Detailed Alternative Assessment

For each promising alternative consultant will develop detailed project definitions and descriptions including alignments, station locations, operating plans, capital and operating cost estimates, estimates of ridership and transportation benefits, estimates of economic development and related benefits, and other needed factors for the various strategies.

The detailed Capital and Operating Cost estimates developed for each alternative will be in keeping with the FTA standard cost categories. A financial assessment will be made of the alternatives and potential financing mechanisms identified (see below Financial Assessment task). The results will be included in an alternatives report document.

Assessment of the economic development potential of each promising alternative will be an important part of the evaluation process. As part of this effort, the consultant will assist in identifying supportive actions and policies used successfully in other communities to leverage investments in other commuter rail projects to maximize related economic development. The consultant will then recommend appropriate actions and policies related to the commuter corridors and develop an estimation of the economic benefits if fully implemented.

Impacts on existing automobile traffic, parking and downtown access will be identified. In addition, an assessment should be completed of existing transit services and recommendations regarding reconfiguration of service or additions of service, particularly for rider distribution, in conjunction with each promising alternative and the results included with the final definition of alternatives.

f. Ridership Forecasts

Ridership forecasting will be done by the Consultant using the EMME regional travel demand model and will build off and leverage model development activities currently underway through the Commuter Corridors Alternatives Analysis. Ridership forecasts will assess the projected ridership based on the travel demand model or other assessment techniques, in conjunction with reasonable assumptions concerning land use, economic development, and population and job growth. MARC, through prior study efforts, has completed recent work to modify the existing regional travel model to forecast ridership. The consultant should consider supplementing formal ridership assessment with additional alternative assessment methods and approaches to further strengthen the technical analysis and serve as an additional point of information.

The consultant will be responsible for creating a reasonable course of action for producing a final product that is capable of fulfilling FTA's requirements, and for producing forecasts that will be acceptable to FTA for a New or Small Starts project evaluation. The consultant is expected to interact with FTA, MARC and JACKSON COUNTY, and the FTA as needed in this process.

Ridership Model must consider statistical relationships between ridership and characteristics of transit services and tripmakers.

Ridership forecasting models should incorporate the following variables which will influence ridership:

- Station area population, employment and income
- Feeder bus service level
- Parking supplies
- Train frequency
- Train vehicle type, train speed
- Trip maker characteristics
- Transit service characteristics
- Model must consider future growth in and around stations

Trip maker characteristics include:

Auto ownership, residential density, income, workers per household, distance to CBD and employment density

Transit service characteristics include:

Travel time, travel cost, parking cost, accessibility (station location), and train frequencies.

g. Operational Plans

Develop operation plans for the alternatives that advance from the screening process. The operational plans shall integrate and build off of the operational plans emerging from the ongoing Commuter Corridor Alternatives Analysis and reflect the desire for an integrated multi-corridor service operation. Operational plans related to both near-term and long-term service strategies must also be developed. The operation plans must include:

1. Service Standards
2. Station Locations
3. Travel times
4. Headway (by time period)
5. Fare structure
6. Hours of service
7. Type of vehicles required
8. Peak load capacity
9. Vehicle miles travelled
10. Vehicle hours traveled

h. Technical Methods

Consultant will propose the technical methods required to develop the information needed to characterize the alternatives in support of an LPA selection. It is expected that a plan will be developed for conducting the required before and after studies and data will be prepared with this in mind.

i. Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

The Consultant shall perform an evaluation of TOD opportunities within the corridor. This investigation shall reflect FTA guidance regarding TOD and any new guidance developed by the Department regarding TOD. The Consultant shall work closely with the local and state jurisdictions, including Jackson County and MARC in identifying these TOD opportunities. All potential TOD's should reflect the values of the community, encourage public participation, and meet MARC/County's objectives for increasing ridership and providing alternatives to the automobile in the study area.

The evaluation of TOD opportunities shall be conducted in two phases. The first phase Evaluation shall identify opportunities and constraints related to TOD within potential station areas. This evaluation shall consider physical, political, and institutional barriers and opportunities to TOD. During this first phase evaluation, demographics, market potential, existing land use, multimodal access and other elements influencing development shall be identified.

This phase will also document the status of station area planning efforts by local jurisdictions and potential new development adjacent to the corridor/station area. The results of the phase one evaluation shall include an identification of the range of TOD opportunities at station areas within the corridor.

During the second phase of evaluation, a specific action item list shall be developed that Identifies the next steps required to move the station area planning at high potential stations further in the development process. The action item list will include a description of the proposed action, the entity responsible and a timeframe for the implementation of the action.

Next steps in the development process may include (but are not limited to):

1. Station area planning
2. Preliminary site planning
3. Advanced site planning
4. Zoning and land use regulation changes to promote the implementation of TOD

5. Infrastructure improvements to enhance multimodal connections to the station area and encourage TOD
6. Financial or regulatory incentive tools that should be utilized by the local jurisdiction to encourage TOD such as tax increment financing
7. Identification of private sector partners

j. NEPA Compliance and Environmental Analysis

It is expected that an environmental analysis and screening will be conducted to identify any significant potential impacts of each alternative, and that the environmental analysis and screening will initiate and prepare documentation in keeping with NEPA requirements, 4(f), 106, and other environmental requirements. Given the nature of the corridor and the likely alternatives which consist of services and facilities within existing urban street right-of-way and within existing rail corridors the consultant will establish the necessary environmental classification relative to each segment of independent utility, advance Documented Categorical Exclusions (DCE) determinations and other environmental clearances where deemed necessary, appropriate, and feasible. Develop a detailed environmental scope of work related to follow-up study if required.

k. Financial Assessment

Consultant will conduct an analysis of financing options to support the preferred strategies in each corridor building off of work to be completed through the ongoing Commuter Corridors AA. Financing for both development and construction (Capital) and ongoing operations and maintenance must be analyzed. Private funding options and public-private partnership options will be explored along with federal grant funding opportunities. New local funding sources are to be examined - the locally preferred alternatives are to be financed from sources other than the existing dedicated transit sales taxes and without sacrificing existing transit services.

l. Identification and Refinement of Preferred Alternatives

The goal of the evaluation process is to select a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for the US-71/Grandview Corridor. The consultant will develop and apply the evaluation methodology consistent with FTA guidance and New Starts criteria with provision for significant community involvement and participation leading to an LPA decision.

m. FTA Documentation

Consultant will develop documentation necessary to submit the LPA(s) to the FTA for project evaluation and rating, based on specific FTA documentation requirements.

n. Public Participation and Education Efforts

The consultant will build off and integrate into existing public communications processes already underway through the Commuter Corridors AA. The consultant will prepare a supportive public participation strategy according to MARC's Public Participation Plan and under the direction of the technical management and commuter corridor stakeholder teams to involve the community and interested stakeholders in the AA planning study process. Consultant team will track issues raised by the public and incorporate questions, concerns, issues and responses into ongoing communications when and where appropriate.

As a regional planning agency, MARC desires to involve all regional stakeholders. Engaging all regional stakeholders will involve extensive effort and effective communication skills. MARC seeks a consultant (or sub-consultant) that has a proven track record of engaging communities in the discussion of high-capacity transit. The consultant must have the skills to communicate effectively with project stakeholders and local officials during the AA process.

III. Study Management and Oversight

An executive team from MARC, KCATA, KCMO and Jackson County will provide overall coordinating guidance on this AA. A technical team led by MARC and Jackson County will oversee this commuter corridor AA study and work with the consultant team on daily basis. This team will include staff from KCATA, the City of Kansas City, MO, Jackson County and MARC. A stakeholder group led by the MARC and Jackson County will also be used to assist in guiding the project and is expected to include appropriate representatives from affected jurisdictions transit and economic development leaders, etc. Consultant will assist in the formation and management of the teams and attend meetings.

In addition to the meetings specifically described in this section, the Consultant will attend or conduct progress meetings, with the project team to properly coordinate the development of the study and will meet periodically with the FTA to discuss the study as requested. The Consultant will prepare presentations for and provide regular updates to various MARC and KCATA transportation committees and to other local jurisdictions and groups, as appropriate.

a. Reports and Deliverables

Consultant will propose a list of deliverables and a schedule with key milestones and dates for submission of deliverables to the technical management team. Draft versions of most documents will be required and all documents will need to be structured for electronic submission. Consultant will assist in any reports to the FTA including, if deemed necessary, information for FTA's annual New Starts Report.

F. STUDY SCHEDULE

The Partnership Team desires to advance and complete the study in timely and expedited manner, while allowing sufficient time to complete the technical analysis in a manner and detail necessary and complying with FTA process requirements and required federal reviews. In crafting a proposal consultants (or teams) should reflect an estimated schedule based on these considerations with the goal of completing the project within twelve (12) months from the date of initiation.

G. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

To be eligible for consideration *one electronic* (PDF) and **10** hard copies (maximum of 20 pages) of the response to the RFP must be received by MARC no later than **noon, 12 PM CST, Friday, October 28th, 2011**. Late submittals will not be considered and will be returned to submitter unopened. The envelope package should be marked “**Regional Alternatives Analysis: US-71/Grandview Corridor.**”

Mail: Mid – America Regional Council
600 Broadway, Suite 200
Kansas City, MO 64105 – 1554
Attn. **Tom Gerend, Asst. Director of Transportation**

Email: tgerend@marc.org

It is the responsibility of the person submitting the proposal by email to ensure that the proposal has been received by the appropriate MARC staff, and not blocked by a spam filter or rejected because of large attachments. To confirm receipt, you may contact Tom Gerend at tgerend@marc.org or 816/474-4240.

The following items must be addressed in all proposals:

1. **SCOPE OF WORK:** Proposals should include a recommended Scope of Work consistent with elements outlined in Section II and an emphasis on a preferred and/or recommended approach. Proposers’ recommendations will demonstrate and propose strategies that exemplify best practices in planning, designing, modeling, and implementing commuter corridor services. Respondents must provide a conceptual scope of work including specific methodologies and/or approaches that will be used to develop and formalize a locally preferred alternative. Innovative approaches for completion of the Scope of Work are encouraged.
 - a. Overview and rationale of project approach.
 - b. The name and address of the contracting firm, together with the name, telephone and fax number, and e-mail address of the primary contact person for purposes of this proposal
 - c. A listing of all proposed subcontractors, if any.
 - d. A conceptual project schedule.
 - e. See Attachments A and B.

2. **QUALIFICATIONS:** Proposals should indicate general and specific qualification of the proposer in planning, engineering, project implementation, environmental review, disciplines appropriate to this project, and specifically convey the role of the proposer in each case cited. **An emphasis and priority in evaluation will be placed on firms with qualifications and experience that have resulted in successful implementation (engineering, construction, and operations) of comparable systems and firms that have a familiarity with the local transit environment and recent transit planning activities, including the Downtown and Commuter Corridors Alternatives Analysis.** A brief narrative (three pages maximum) may also be included regarding the firm’s capabilities to carry out this AA, including special

assets, areas of expertise, analytical tools, and data sources, etc. to which the firm may have access.

Proposals shall include:

- a. A listing and summary of similar projects undertaken within the last five (5) year, by proposing firm and/or its subcontractors, showing contract amounts, description of work performed, client contact persons, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses;
- b. Resumes of key professional staff who will be assigned to this project;
- c. Description of the existing and anticipated workload of individuals assigned to this project during the period of this study. Any reassignment of designated key staff shall not occur without mutual consultation and the consent of MARC.
- d. References

3. **DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) REQUIREMENTS AND PARTICIPATION:** MARC encourages all qualified businesses to submit letters of interest as prime contractors, subcontractors or joint ventures. Women and/or minority owned business are encouraged to submit proposals. DBE firms must be certified through an approved USDOT DBE program in order to be counted as participation toward any established DBE Goal.

DBE PROPOSERS SHOULD SUBMIT, WITH THEIR PROPOSALS, INTENT TO PERFORM As A Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE), Attachment F, for each proposed DBE contractor, subcontractor, or joint venture.

MARC's DBE goal for this project is **14%**.

4. **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CHECKLIST:** If applicable, proposers must complete and enclose with their proposal company's Affirmative Action Plan (see Attachment C Affirmative Action Checklist).
5. **CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT:** Each proposer is required to certify by signing the "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion" (Attachment D). "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion" is a certification that the proposer is not on the U.S. Comptroller General's Consolidated Lists of Persons or Firms Currently Debarred for Violations of Various Contracts Incorporating Labor Standards Provisions.
6. **CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING:** See Attachment E.

H. PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING AND QUESTION SUBMITTAL

MARC will host a pre-proposal meeting for all interested consultants teams to ask questions and gain clarity around any elements or requirements of this RFP.

When: Monday, October 24st, 2011 at 9:30 a.m.

Where: Mid America Regional Council
600 Broadway, Ste. 200
Kansas City, Mo 64105
Broadway Room, 1st Floor

All questions/requests for clarifications must be submitted to MARC by **October 25th, 2011 at 12:00pm**

Please submit questions in writing to **Karen Clawson** at kclawson@marc.org.

MARC will post all question, answers and clarifications to <http://www.marc.org/rfp.htm>.

I. SELECTION PROCEDURE

If necessary, a short list, of not more than five (5) and no less than two (2), proposers and/or proposer teams will be short-listed on or about November 4th, 2011 by MARC, after MARC and the study's selection committee analyzes all proposal information. Short-list proposers should be available for interviews and/or presentations the week of November 7th, 2011. The final selection of a Contractor is contingent upon approval by the MARC Board of Directors. MARC reserves the right to negotiate a contract, including a scope of work, and contract price, with any proposers or other qualified party.

This Request for Proposal does not commit MARC to award a contract, to pay any cost incurred in preparation of a response to this Request, or to procure or contract for services or supplies. MARC reserves the right to accept or reject any and all responses received as a result of this Request, or cancel this Request in part or in its entirety if it is in the best interests of MARC to do so. Proposers shall not offer any gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value to any officer, employee, agent, or director of MARC for the purpose of influencing favorable disposition toward either their proposal or any other proposal submitted as a result of the Request for Proposal.

MARC reserves the right to amend, consolidate, expand, cancel, delete, or request additional consulting services for one or more of the project's Scope of Work activities if MARC deemed that such activity is advantageous to MARC and the successful completion of the project. MARC reserves the right to suggest to any or all proposers to the Request for Proposal that such proposers form into teams of consulting firms or organizations deemed to be advantageous to MARC in performing the Scope of Work. MARC will suggest such formation when such relationships appear to offer combinations of expertise or abilities not otherwise available. Proposers have the right to refuse to enter into any suggested relationships.

All Proposals submitted hereunder become the exclusive property of MARC.

J. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The proposals submitted by each Contractor, Firm, or Contractor Team, will be evaluated according to the following factors:

US-71/Grandview Alternatives Analysis			
PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET			
		Total	Score
Understanding and Approach	Understanding of the nature of the project and clarity of proposed approach .	35	
KC Regional/Local Understanding	✓ Understanding of regional transit vision and strong familiarity with Regional AA activities currently underway.		
AA Understanding	✓ Understanding key concepts, techniques, evaluation procedures, and best practices related to transit corridor planning, implementation, and the AA process.		
Clarity of Proposal	✓ General organization and clarity of the proposal		
Technical Competence	Specialized experience and technical competence of the contractor and assigned staff relative to the scope of work and task requirements outlined in RFP.	35	
Overall Competence of Proposing Team	✓ Experience of the prime contractor and subcontractors related to planning, design, and implementation of comparable transit projects.		
Management Competence	✓ Experience of the Project Manager		
Other	✓ Experience of other assigned individuals		
Project Management	Schedule of staff persons and hours commitment	15	
DBE % of Effort	✓ % of Effort for DBE Services		
Project Schedule and timeliness of products	✓ Project schedule and timeliness of products		
References/Work experience	References reflecting previous work experience of the project team and satisfactory accomplishment of contractor responsibilities.	15	
Quality of final products	✓ Quality of final product		
Meet schedules and deadlines	✓ Ability to meet work schedules		
Responsiveness to Client	✓ Responsiveness to client input and needs		
Score		100	

K. ON-SITE PRESENTATIONS

The project selection team may require oral presentation of those firms identified on the proposer's short list. Presentations will be held at MARC or a site designated by MARC.

L. CONTRACT AWARD

MARC will notify the selected candidate by telephone, e-mail and in writing. Following verbal notification, MARC will negotiate a standard professional service agreement with the selected candidate. The selected candidate's proposal will be incorporated by reference in the contract. Additionally, MARC will notify, in writing, the candidates who are not selected.

M. PROTEST PROCEDURES

In the course of this solicitation for proposals and the selection process, a proposer (bidder or offer or whose direct economic interest would be affected by the award of the contract) may file a protest when in the proposer's opinion, actions were taken by MARC staff and /or the selection committee which could unfairly affect the outcome of the selection procedure. All protest should be in writing and directed to Mr. Mell Henderson, Director of Transportation, Mid – America Regional Council, 600 Broadway, *Suite 200* Kansas City, MO 64105. Protest should be made immediately upon occurrence of the incident in question but no later than three (3) days after the proposer receives notification of the outcome of the section procedure. The protest should clearly state the grounds for such a protest.

Upon receipt of the protest, MARC's Director of Transportation will review the actual procedures followed during the selection process and the documentation available. If it is determined the action(s) unfairly changed the outcome of the process, notifications with the selected proposer will cease until the matter is resolved.

N. PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

The following is a tentative schedule for the Contractor selection process:

KANSAS CITY REGIONAL ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS	
PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE	
US-71/Grandview Alternatives Analysis	
Activities	Schedule
RFP issued	October 7th, 2011 on Demand Star & MARC Website
Preproposal Conference	October 24th, 9:30 AM, MARC
Proposals Due	October 28th, 2011 – <i>no later than Noon, 12pm CST</i>
Short List Announced	November 4th, 2011
Interviews	Week of November 7th, 2011
Selection	Week of November 14th, 2011
Contract Execution/ Notice to proceed	TBD after contract negotiation - Tentative MARC Board Authorization November 22nd
Project Completion	TBD after contract negotiation

O. PROJECT BUDGET

The level of funding for this project is based on existing funds available for this study.

- . Total amount: **(\$794,000)**
- . Period of Performance – **(12 months or less)**

Both the project budget and the period of performance are subject to change based on the availability of funds or other unforeseen events or activities.

ATTACHMENT A

1. Complete the AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CHECKLIST Attachment B.
2. Complete the CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING Attachment C.
3. Complete the CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY, AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION Attachment D.
4. Complete the INTENT TO PERFORM AS A DISADVANTAGE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE). If Contractor elects to perform as a DBE Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT B

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CHECKLIST:

Federal regulations require that any firm 50 or more employees soliciting an assisted federally funded contract must have an affirmative action program. If applicable, please provide a brief response to the following items that would typically be covered in any such program. You may provide a copy of your program and reference appropriate pages.

1. Date plan was adopted
2. Name of Affirmative Action Officer
3. Statement of commitment to affirmative action by the chief executive officer
4. Designation of an affirmative action officer, of assignment of specific responsibilities and to whom the officer reports.
5. Outreach recruitment
6. Job analysis and restructuring to meet affirmative action goals
7. Validation and revision of examinations, educational requirements, and any other screening requirements.
8. Upgrading and training programs
9. Internal complaint procedure
10. Initiating and insuring supervisory compliance with affirmative action program
11. Survey and analysis of entire staff by department and job classification and progress report system
12. Recruitment and promotion plans (including goals and time tables)

ATTACHMENT C

**Certification Regarding Debarment,
Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion**

This Certification is required by the regulation implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 29 CFR Part 98 Section 98.510, Participants' responsibilities. The Regulations are published as Part II of the June 1985, Federal Register (pages 33, 036-33, 043)

Read instructions for Certification below prior to completing this certification.

1. The prospective proposer certifies, by submission of this proposal that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participating in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

2. Where the prospective proposer is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective proposer shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Date Signed – Authorized Representative

Title of Authorized Representative

Instructions for Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion:

1. By signing and submitting this agreement, the proposer is providing the certification as set below.

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the proposer knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department, or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

ATTACHMENT D

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersign, to any person influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal or Federally assisted contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form – LLL, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with its instructions.

. The undersign shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents of all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grant, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 32, US Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less that \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

(Name of Entity)

(Name and Title of Authorized Official)

(Signature of above Official)

(Date)

ATTACHMENT E

INTENT TO PERFORM AS A DISADVANTAGE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE)

Project Title and Description:

The undersigned intends to perform work in connection with the above project as (check one):

Prime Contractor Subcontractor
 Joint Venture Other (please specify) _____

If applicable name of prime contractor or joint venture partner:

The DBE status of the undersigned is confirmed by a DBE Certification from one or all of the following (please provide copy of current Certification Certificate):

- MRCC (Missouri Regional Certification Committee)
- KDOT
- MoDOT
- City of Kansas City Missouri
- Kansas City Area Transportation Agency (KCATA)
- Other (please specify) _____
(MARC may require additional certification documentation)

The undersigned is prepared to perform the following described work in connection with the above project (attach additional sheet in needed),

at the following price _____

Date Name of DBE Firm

By: _____
Signature of DBE Firm's Authorized Representative

(Please Print Names of Authorized Representative)