Buckhead CID LCI Proposal Questions

QUESTION #1: Because 30% level of design can vary significantly, can Buckhead CID further define the purpose and intended use of the design effort for the park/gathering space and streetscape prototype? E.g., is the level of design effort to establish budgetary pricing, create renderings for fundraising, etc?

ANSWER #1: The goal of the 30% level of design is to identify the target land footprint, establish budgetary pricing, identify entitlements and additional approvals needed, and create renderings for fundraising.

QUESTION #2: Does the CID envision this effort primarily as an implementation-focused update to the existing LCI plan, or should the team also evaluate a broader repositioning of Buckhead's office-oriented commercial core toward a more diversified mix of residential, commercial, civic, and recreational uses? How much latitude should the team assume to revisit existing land use and development recommendations?

ANSWER #2: While the core purpose is an implementation focused update to the existing LCI plan, the CID is open to evaluating broader repositioning concepts in target areas.

QUESTION #3: Which recommendations from the 2017 plan have been most difficult to implement, and what barriers—ownership, funding, regulation, agency coordination, or community support—should this effort specifically address?

ANSWER #3: An initial phase of the planning effort will be to review remaining areas for implementation and determine the answers to this question.

QUESTION #4: Is there a page limit for the proposal as a whole or for individual sections (e.g., Approach and Methodology, Resumes, Additional Materials)? Do the cover, cover letter, tabs, resumes and required forms count toward any defined limit?

ANSWER #4: No

QUESTION #5: Can the CID share the relative weighting or point values for the five evaluation criteria?

ANSWER #5: Yes. See below.

Qualifications of the firm to perform the required services, the key personnel to be assigned to perform the services and, the results-oriented track record of the firm.
30% Value

Prior experience of the firm in completing work of this or similar nature.
25% Value

The firm's understanding of Buckhead's professional service needs, the firm's ability to meet those needs in a cost effective and timely manner, and the proposed approach to meeting the CID's needs.
15% Value

The firm's demonstrated understanding of the Buckhead area and a commitment to execute creative, unique, and contextual approaches.
20% Value

The overall structure, content, and quality of the proposal.
10% Value

QUESTION #6: Should the "Budget and Fee Structure by task to = $300,000" be read as a not-to-exceed amount? Should reimbursable expenses (printing, meeting venues, translation, survey, renderings) be included within this amount or shown separately?

ANSWER #6: Not to exceed amount. Everything should be included.

QUESTION #7: What does the CID define as "30% completion" for the streetscape and the gathering place/park?

ANSWER #7: Please see Answer #1.

QUESTION #8: Is a 30% opinion of probable construction cost expected?

ANSWER #8: Yes

QUESTION #9: Has the CID already identified candidate streets or a geographic area for the walkable streetscape focus area/grid, or is selection part of the consultant's scope?

ANSWER #9: BCID has identified candidate streets

QUESTION #10: Is there an approximate maximum length (linear feet) or number of blocks the CID expects to be designed to 30%?

ANSWER #10: No maximum linear footage identified but the target size could be 2-4 blocks.

QUESTION #11: Should the streetscape prototype integrate green infrastructure and tree canopy goals at 30% (e.g., soil cells, bioretention, street trees), and does the CID have target tree canopy or stormwater performance goals?

ANSWER #11: 30% design concepts should at minimum adhere to City of Atlanta requirements for tree canopy and stormwater performance.

QUESTION #12: What stormwater analysis is expected for the park at 30%: a conceptual strategy, or preliminary sizing and calculations consistent with City of Atlanta Department of Watershed Management requirements? Is the park intended to serve a regional or shared stormwater function for surrounding development?

ANSWER #12: The 30% design should include a conceptual stormwater strategy with preliminary sizing sufficient to prepare conceptual budget numbers. The park is not initially intended to provide a shared stormwater function, but the CID is open to this concept if the proposed location lends itself to this opportunity.

QUESTION #13: Are any of the candidate streetscape streets state routes (e.g., the routes shown on Exhibit A-1 as SR 141, SR 237, or US 19) requiring GDOT coordination and design standards, or should the prototype focus on City-owned streets?

ANSWER #13: City-owned streets.

QUESTION #14: Is there existing utility or infrastructure capacity data (water, sewer, power) the CID wants evaluated, given the Task 1 requirement to assess infrastructure and public facilities?

ANSWER #14: Tony?

QUESTION #15: Task 2 says "the Sponsor will conduct an outreach process" and "the Sponsor will schedule" public engagement opportunities. Please clarify the division of responsibilities between the CID and the consultant for planning, logistics, facilitation, materials, notification, and meeting summaries.

ANSWER #15: BCID will handle logistics and will look to the consultant to manage the all additional aspects of the engagement process.

QUESTION #16: Has the CEC project advisor been assigned (see Task 2 – Community Engagement), and can the CID share ARC guidance or templates for the Asset-Based Community Development process expected for this study?

ANSWER #16: No. The CID will provide this information as soon as it is available.

QUESTION #17: Will the CID host the project website and provide content management, with the consultant supplying content?

ANSWER #17: Yes.

QUESTION #18: Does the CID have existing engagement data (surveys, prior LCI input, Livable Buckhead or neighborhood surveys) that may be used to avoid survey fatigue and supplement new outreach?

ANSWER #18: Yes.

QUESTION #19: What transportation data will the CID provide (traffic counts, turning movement counts, crash data, signal timing, pedestrian/bicycle counts, transit ridership, parking inventory and occupancy)? Is new data collection expected in the consultant's scope?

ANSWER #19: The CID will expect the consultant to provide any transportation data needed.

QUESTION #20: Are there current or planned MARTA projects at the Buckhead and Lenox stations, and recent PATH400/BeltLine alignment or design documents, that the plan must incorporate?

ANSWER #20: The consultant will be expected to coordinate with any existing plans for these projects.

QUESTION #21: For "smart technology," what scope does the CID envision (e.g., adaptive signals, curb management, sensors, real-time wayfinding)? Are there existing CID or City technology initiatives to align with?

ANSWER #21: The CID is interested in consultant's recommendations regarding emerging technologies for traffic mitigation, with a bias for concepts for which the CID could serve as a pilot area.

QUESTION #22: Have candidate locations for the central gathering place/park(s) been identified? Are sites publicly owned, privately owned, or under negotiation, and can the CID share any prior site studies?

ANSWER #22: Some ideas of locations have been considered. Please see especially concepts in the 2017 LCI plan. We are open to additional considerations as well.

QUESTION #23: Should the existing conditions assessment include signage and wayfinding? Can the CID share any previous studies, MARTA initiatives, PATH400 plans, Buckhead CID efforts, or City of Atlanta projects that developed wayfinding recommendations that should be incorporated?

ANSWER #23: No wayfinding needed.

QUESTION #24: Should wayfinding, placemaking, and public realm recommendations be conceptual in nature, or is the CID expecting implementation-ready design guidance and cost estimates? Need clarification on the level of design development for these components.

ANSWER #24: Conceptual in nature.

QUESTION #25: Is the streetscape prototype intended to establish planning recommendations, or should the consultant team develop detailed design guidance for furnishings, gateways, wayfinding, public art, and identity elements?

ANSWER #25: See Answer #1.

QUESTION #26: Does the CID envision the study developing new place-branding recommendations, or should the consultant build upon existing district identities established by Buckhead-area organizations?

ANSWER #26: The CID is open to new place-branding ideas.

QUESTION #27: Should the plan emphasize a unified district identity, or recognize and reinforce the distinct character of individual activity centers and neighborhoods?

ANSWER #27: The preference is for reinforcing the distinct character of individual activity centers, neighborhoods, and smaller gathering spaces, while identifying a proposed, physical heart of the community (i.e, the central gathering place/park).

QUESTION #28: Is the expectation for a comprehensive district-wide wayfinding strategy or masterplan, or the identification of wayfinding opportunities for future implementation?

ANSWER #28: No wayfinding

QUESTION #29: Should recommendations include operational and programming strategies for events and activation, or focus primarily on physical design opportunities?

ANSWER #29: The overall focus is on advancing our plans for the master planning and capital projects for the LCI area, but we are also interested in identifying shorter term activations and pilot projects (such as the prototype streetscape) that support our bias for generating momentum.

QUESTION #30: Does the CID anticipate recommendations for temporary activations and pilot projects that could be deployed prior to major capital investments?

ANSWER #30: Yes- See Answer 29.

QUESTION #31: Submission Deadline: Responses to questions will be posted on Friday, November 6, leaving one week before the November 13 due date. Would the CID consider extending the proposal deadline to allow firms adequate time to incorporate the responses?

ANSWER #31: No.

QUESTION #32: The RFP asks for 30% designs of (1) a central gathering place/park and (2) a prototype walkable streetscape focus area/grid. Have the park site and the streetscape focus area already been identified, and is there an expected size for each, such as acreage or number of blocks?

ANSWER #32: See answers 1, 10, 22.

QUESTION #33: Does the CID follow a particular 30% standard, such as GDOT's PDP or City of Atlanta DOT? Which deliverables are expected, for example plan sheets, typical sections, a preliminary stormwater approach and an opinion of probable cost?

ANSWER #33: See answers 1, 11, 12.

QUESTION #34: DBE Participation: The RFP notes that DBE requirements under 49 CFR Part 26 apply but does not establish a participation goal. Could the CID confirm whether there is a specific DBE goal for this contract?

ANSWER #34: There is not a goal, but encouraged.

QUESTION #35: **Prime eligibility.** Is a single-member LLC eligible to serve as prime if it leads planning and project management and brings on subconsultants for specialized work? Does the CID require a minimum number of in-house staff for the prime?

ANSWER #35: Yes, single prime is eligible to serve as prime and not minimum in-house staff requirement.

QUESTION #36: **Project references.** May JFG Cities submit references for LCI projects where we served as a subconsultant to another prime, provided we identify our role and scope of work on each project?

ANSWER #36: Yes.

QUESTION #37: **Insurance and forms.** What insurance coverage and limits must the prime carry, including professional liability? Which insurance certificates, affidavits, and DBE forms are due with the proposal, and which are due at contracting? What E-Verify documentation should a single-member LLC with no employees provide?

ANSWER #37: All at contracting.

QUESTION #38: **Budget for 30% design.** Does the CID have a target percentage of the $300,000 budget for advancing the park and streetscape plans to 30% design, or should each team propose its own allocation?

ANSWER #38: Propose own allocation.

QUESTION #39: **Site selection.** Has the CID already selected any sites for the central gathering place or parks?

ANSWER #39: See answer 22.

QUESTION #40: Budget: Is $300,000 a not-to-exceed amount inclusive of all reimbursable expenses? And should the proposed fee reflect the full $300,000, or only the federal share, with the local match handled separately by the CID?

ANSWER #40: Yes. The maximum budget is $300,000 to include everything.

QUESTION #41: Fee format: Would you prefer a lump sum by task, or hours and rates by task and team member? Since federal funds are involved, will the selected consultant need to provide an audited or FAR-compliant overhead rate?

ANSWER #41: Lump sum by task. No audited or FAR-compliant overhead rate is needed.

QUESTION #42: DBE: Has a DBE participation goal been set for this contract? If so, what is the percentage, and are there specific DBE commitment forms or certifications that should be included with the proposal?

ANSWER #42: No goal, but encouraged.

QUESTION #43: Required forms: Beyond the eight submittal items, are there any forms that must be included at submission (E-Verify affidavit, federal certifications, debarment or lobbying certifications), or will those be collected at contract?

ANSWER #43: Collected at contract.

QUESTION #44: 30% design: For the central gathering place and the streetscape prototype, does the CID have candidate sites in mind, and is survey or topographic data available? Should survey, geotechnical work, and planning-level cost estimates be included in our scope and fee? Should the streetscape design follow City of Atlanta DOT standards, GDOT standards, or both?

ANSWER #44: See answers 13 and 22. Consultant is expected to provide any civil information needed.

QUESTION #45: Prequalification: Are any GDOT consultant prequalification area classes required of the prime or subconsultants for the transportation or 30% design work?

ANSWER #45: No

QUESTION #46: Engagement roles: The scope says the Sponsor will schedule at least three public engagement opportunities. Please confirm whether the CID handles venues, notices, and the project website, with the consultant preparing materials and facilitating.

ANSWER #46: BCID handles venues, notices and project website. Consultant does materials and facilitating.

QUESTION #47: Background materials: Will the 2017 Buckhead ReDefined plan, its action plan and any implementation reports, GIS data, and the ARC 5 Year Implementation Plan template be provided at kickoff?

ANSWER #47: Yes.

QUESTION #48: Format: Is there a page limit or preferred page size for the proposal (for example, whether 11x17 spreads are acceptable), and does the 1-page cover letter count toward any limit?

ANSWER #48: No limit. Any size paper is allowed.

QUESTION #49: References: The RFP asks for up to three similar projects within five years. May references and project examples include work led by our key personnel at prior firms, as long as the firm is clearly identified?

ANSWER #49: Yes.

QUESTION #50: Schedule: The timeline shows the study complete in September 2027 and final documents in November 2027, with all work due by November 19, 2027. Should our schedule target September for the draft plan and November for final adopted documents?

ANSWER #50: Yes, with the September document considered a final draft with only minor refinements remaining.

QUESTION #51: Finalist meetings: Will the December 4 finalist meetings be in person at the CID offices or virtual?

ANSWER #51: In person at BCID offices.

QUESTION #52: Beyond updating the 2017 Buckhead ReDefined LCI Plan, what are the CID's three highest-priority outcomes for this study?

ANSWER #52: See Task 4 – Project Deliverables in the RFP.

QUESTION #53: Does the CID anticipate that the transportation analysis will require new traffic counts, intersection capacity analysis, traffic modeling, or will existing transportation data and previous studies be sufficient?

ANSWER #53: Previous studies sufficient.

QUESTION #54: What level of design detail is expected for the conceptual transportation recommendations and renderings? Should these be planning-level concepts or more detailed preliminary engineering designs?

ANSWER #54: It depends on the existing level of transportation planning from the 2017 plan. We are interested in advancing prior transportation plans to where already prepared, but we recognize that CID and consultant will need to agree at the beginning of design where those areas for advancement occur.

QUESTION #55: What does the CID consider a 30% design deliverable for the park? Should this include conceptual site plans, grading concepts, preliminary stormwater strategies, landscape plans, and cost estimates?

ANSWER #55: See answer 1

QUESTION #56: Where is the park located?

ANSWER #56: See answer 22.