



August 14, 2024

RE: FY25-RFP-001 Reimagine DART – Des Moines Area Regional Transit Authority Service Study and Redesign

Questions and Answers

Question: Can you share the questions and DART's responses from the Pre-Proposal Meeting on July 31, 2024?

Answer: Yes, they are attached to this Addendum 1.

Question: You might consider reducing the amount of prescriptive detail in the RFP's description of deliverables. The detail makes it difficult for contractors to propose creative approaches. The level of detail will also drive up cost proposals (as contractors will need to ensure they have budgeted to deliver on every specification). Finally, reducing the prescriptive detail will eliminate some of the contradictions contained in the scope and the description of deliverables as currently written.

Answer: As DART continues to refine its vision for a regional transit system, it has become evident that the evolving goals of the DART Commission require flexibility to effectively integrate them into the Network Redesign and ADA Complementary Service projects. The original Scope of Work intended to ensure that the final deliverables not only meet the project objectives but also align with the strategic priorities that the DART Commission is actively developing.

Given the dynamic nature of these goals, DART recognizes the importance of flexibility in the Proposers' approach to this project. Therefore, the Scope of Work is being amended to place greater responsibility on Proposers to determine the specific tasks and methodologies that will best achieve the desired outcomes. Additionally, the peer system comparison is being made optional, with a primary focus on Network Redesign and ADA Complementary Service updates.

This amendment is designed to foster innovative, tailored solutions that will allow DART to deliver a forward-thinking, sustainable transit network that addresses both current and future needs of the Greater Des Moines region.

Key Changes to the Scope of Work:

1. **Integration of DART Commission's Goals:** Proposers must ensure their approach allows for the incorporation of the DART Commission's developing goals for a regional transit system.
2. **Flexibility in Methodology:** Proposers are encouraged to define and recommend their own approach, tasks, and methodologies to achieve the project's objectives.



3. **Focus Areas:** The primary focus will be on the Network Redesign and ADA Complementary Service updates, with optional inclusion of a peer system comparison and other deliverables.

The amended Scope of Work seeks to align with DART's broader strategic vision, enabling the selection of a Proposer capable of delivering a Firm Fixed Price contract that meets DART's evolving needs. See the attached amended **Section 2 Scope of Work** to the RFP for details including the revised **Section 5 Attachment 7 Pricing Proposal**.

Question: Can DART please clarify which forms need to be completed by subconsultants?

Answer: Attachment 6 CERTIFICATION OF LOWER-TIER PARTICIPANTS (SUBCONTRACTORS) REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION. THIS CERTIFICATION SHALL BE COMPLETED BY ALL SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THIS PROJECT WHICH EXCEEDS \$25,000 OR SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A CRITICAL INFLUENCE ON OR A SUBSTANTIVE CONTROL OVER THE PROJECT.

Question: Does DART want proposers to include Resumes for proposed staff for this project? If so, can they be excluded from the 30-page count?

Answer: Section 1 B. - References including client name, address, contact person, telephone number, email, project start and end date as well as a project description. References should be for similar or related projects that proposed key staff members for this project have worked on. Resumes for key staff members are encouraged and ideally will connect Section 1 B. references illustrating proposed key staff members qualifications and will be scored from Section 3 evaluation criteria. Resumes can be excluded from the 30-page count.

Question: Are the proposal letter, cover, table of contents, and section dividers excluded from the 30-page count?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How are the optional tasks factored into the cost evaluation criteria calculation?

Answer: Optional Tasks will be scored and included in the cost evaluation calculation. Proposers are strongly urged to fully understand Section 3.2 Evaluation Criteria. This is a multi-faceted evaluation using qualitative and quantitative data.

Question: Will DART be able to provide access to any of the following datasets:

- a. fare/mobile ticketing database
- b. latest onboard survey,
- c. granular APC data (in addition to stop ID, include time of day, day of week, month),



d. cash transactions/passes database?

Answer: DART will provide the awarded Contractor with these datasets.

Question: Will DART please consider answering questions as they come in rather than waiting until 8/15? This will ensure proposers have enough time to adjust their proposal and strategy to reflect DART's answers.

Answer: After reviewing the questions, DART decided to amend the Scope of Work, reducing the required deliverables from three to two and providing more flexibility in how the deliverables are achieved. As a result, we were not able to publish responses prior to the deadline of Aug. 15.

Question: The RFP asks for a fixed route network design study, a paratransit study, a contracted-service-delivery study, and a fare study, all finished in slightly more than one year. This is very fast. In our experience, network redesigns, paratransit service changes and fare changes will generate debate and controversy among the public and local officials. Doing them together and doing them fast is likely to make it harder for the public and officials to think clearly about the separate issues in each study. The risk of a negative public impression is higher, and the likelihood of resilient decision-making by officials is lower.

While an analysis of existing conditions could begin immediately in all studies, and while research into peer systems and best practices can also begin quickly, the RFP's makes clear that the decisions made in one study will affect the alternatives considered in the other studies. For example, there are separate choices to be made about the fixed-route network and about paratransit, but the minimum required paratransit service is defined by the final fixed route network. Also, changes to fixed route services and paratransit would inform the impacts of different fare policies, so it won't be possible to analyze the pros-and-cons of fare policies until the services offered in the redesigned network and through paratransit have been settled.

We can therefore see that the plans will need to be developed in sequence rather than in parallel – but within a very short period of time. It is especially short considering that there will need to be at least three, and likely four, rounds of public consultation, based on the specifications in the scope: two rounds specified for the network redesign; one additional round for the subsequent paratransit plan; and a fourth round on fare changes and impacts estimated with the new network and paratransit services in mind.

Can you tell us more about your timelines for these three plans, and any additional deadlines driving those timelines that aren't already mentioned in the RFP?

Answer: We appreciate this feedback and understand we are trying to achieve a significant amount of work within the timeframe we have. Unfortunately, the timeframe is constrained due to current budget constraints. However, we do have flexibility in some of the final deliverables and approach. We have amended the Scope of Work to focus on the deliverables that must be delivered by late November or early December 2025. These deliverables are the Network Redesign and ADA Complementary Service



area parameters. If a consultant strongly believes the fare policy should be done within a different timeframe, we encourage proposers to outline a recommended timeline, approach and rationale for conducting this after finalizing the initial deliverables. If there are any new services proposed as part of the network redesign, the fare will need to be established prior to DART implementing the network redesign in August 2026.

Question: In multiple places the RFP describes DART's intention that public input phases can cover three topics (network redesign, paratransit and fares) to make efficient use of public engagement efforts. You have also mentioned that meetings with the DART Commission should address multiple plans at the same time. However, it is difficult to see how the necessary sequencing of the plans accommodates this.

Task 3 on page 20 specifies "a presentation showing updated boundaries and span for ADA complementary service, consistent with the fixed-route recommendations made in the Executive Summary from Task 2.8." The presentation is to include the results of major planning, analysis and forecasting work on that minimal ADA paratransit scenario.

The next Task, 3.1, specifies the development and analysis of new paratransit service areas or programs. Tasks 3.3 and 3.4 (on page 22) specify public input and a Commission presentation about paratransit.

Elsewhere in the RFP, you write that public input for fixed route plans and ADA paratransit changes should happen simultaneously...Yet Task 3 seems to describe ADA paratransit planning that begins *after all fixed route planning (and public input on fixed routes) has finished*.

The sequence, as specified in the RFP's deliverables, seems to be:

- Task 2: Fixed route planning
 - With two rounds of public input
- Task 2.8: Executive Summary describing a "final redesigned service network" and summarizing two rounds of public input
- Task 3: Minimum ADA paratransit planning, specified to use the 2.8 Executive Summary as a starting point
- Task 3.1: Development of new paratransit areas, options or programs in excess of the minimum, using Task 3 as a starting point
 - With a third round of public input, described in 3.4
- Task 4: Fare study for all modes specified in the other plans; impact on ridership; and impact on revenue.
 - With a fourth round of public input, described in 4.4

On page 12, the RFP states that this process will include two rounds of public input, but the description on page 12 does not seem possible based on the specifications given in later pages.

Can you please confirm that we are correctly understanding the sequence of planning as shown in the bullet list above, and the four distinct times at which public input would be sought?



Answer: We are asking proposers to suggest how to sequence the work to achieve the desired deliverables by the deadline of late November or early December 2025. It is DART's preference that work on the network redesign and paratransit service area occur simultaneously to the extent possible without impacting the quality of work and final outcomes.

Question: Please confirm this list of presentations/facilitations with the DART Commission, taken from the deliverables:

- 1.4 Present Peer Comparison to Commission
- 2.3 Present three contrasting network concepts to Commission
- 2.3.2 Facilitate workshop with Commission and present Market Analysis, Service Network Concepts and public input on concepts (in-person)
- 2.6 Present three Preferred Network scaled scenarios to Commission (in-person)
- 2.7 Present results of public input on network redesign to Commission
- 3.3 Facilitate workshop with Commission on paratransit options (in-person)
- 3.4 Present results of public input on paratransit to Commission
- 4.1 Facilitate workshop with Commission on fare system
- 4.3 Facilitate workshop with Commission on fare pricing strategies
- 4.4 Present results of public input on fares to Commission
- 4.6 Present alternative fare collection technologies to Commission
- 5.2 Additional unspecified in-person and virtual presentations

We understand that some of these presentations or facilitated workshops can be combined and could happen in a single event. Can you please confirm that this is the list of presentations and facilitations that contractors should plan for?

Answer: We have amended the Scope of Work to provide more flexibility to consultants to propose an approach for achieving the specified deliverables. The amended scope includes 3 facilitated workshops with the DART Commission. We expect there will be regular updates, including some presentations, to both DART staff and Commission throughout the course of the project. The number of presentations will depend on the proposed approach from the consultant for achieving the specified deliverables. In general, DART staff wants to provide the Commission with opportunities to weigh in and provide direction throughout the process to ensure alignment and buy-in on the final deliverables.

Question: In the deliverable for Task 2.6, the RFP describes the purpose of the presentation to the Commission as "arrive at consensus on scenarios for public input." What is the decision the Commission would be making in this meeting, by consensus? Would they be selecting a single scenario to present for public input? Or would they be specifying changes to each of the scenarios? If they would be giving feedback on the three scenarios at this time, would their feedback trigger revisions to the three scenarios and the associated analysis, maps, etc. before public input is sought?

We have the same question about Task 3.3, which describes a workshop with the Commission about the paratransit scenarios, ending in "consensus on...service areas to



share for public input." Please clarify what decision the Commission would be making in this workshop, or how they would be affecting the paratransit scenario(s) presented to the public.

Answer: We have amended the Scope of Work to provide more flexibility to consultants to propose an approach for achieving the specified deliverables. It is DART's intention to provide the Commission with opportunities to weigh in and provide direction throughout the process to ensure alignment and buy-in on the final deliverables, but we are now asking proposers to recommend a process for achieving the deliverables.

For typical service changes, DART will share the proposed service change with the Commission for discussion prior to sharing with the public for input. Following public input, DART staff provide a summary of feedback received and a final service change recommendation, which may or may not be modified as a result of the feedback, for the Commission to approve.

Question: On Page 7, the RFP states, "DART is in the process of phasing in a new funding formula in which, instead of increasing property tax levies at the same rate up to the cap, each community contributes based on the services it receives and its population." This sets up a potentially circular relationship between network planning and funding: the amount of transit service that can be planned in a given community is determined by the funding level, but the funding level is determined by the amount of transit service there. Will the future service budget (or budgets) for the scenarios be set before design of those scenarios begins?

Answer: The funding formula is not being addressed as part of this scope of work. Service will be planned in communities based on the goals set by the DART Commission and transportation needs of each individual community. The DART Commission can determine separately whether or not to change or modify the funding formula. Initial concepts developed as part of the system redesign will use a status quo budget provided by DART staff. Once a preferred service network is decided on by the DART Commission, DART will provide budget parameters to scale the network, including budget targets for a reduced service network, cost-neutral service network and expanded service network.

Question: For all of the network scenarios created and analyzed, will you need cost factors (such as RH and RM) estimated for each of the 12 jurisdictions individually?

Answer: DART will need RH and RM for each of the 12 jurisdictions for the preferred service network the Commission selects, and then for the final service network the Commission decides to adopt following the second round of public input.

Question: For all of the network scenarios created and analyzed, will you want outcomes (such as population near service, or changes in travel times) analyzed and reported for each of the 12 member jurisdictions individually? Or will measures of the scenarios' costs and benefits at the regional scale be acceptable?



Answer: At minimum, we will need measures of the scenarios' costs and benefits at the regional scale. We would like the measures for each of the 12 member jurisdictions estimated separately as an optional component.

Question: The scope and deliverables refer to fixed route ridership "projections" and "forecasts." What is meant by "projection" or "forecast"? Are these references to the outputs of a predictive model? If so, is there a model already updated for the Des Moines area that is suitable for making transit ridership predictions?

Answer: The amended Scope of Work no longer requires ridership projections as part of the network redesign. DART's intention is to demonstrate the differences between transit service models and network design decisions at key points in the process and the extent to which different service models achieve the DART Commission's goals, but the proposer has leeway to recommend how best to accomplish that.

Question: Are resumes counted in the 30-page limit?

Answer: No, they are not.

Question: In the scope for the peer review, you specify that you want to see "populations served" reported for each of the peer cities. By "populations served," do you mean the population of the official service area, or do you mean the number of residents within a certain distance of actually-operating transit service?

Answer: The peer comparison has become an optional deliverable. Populations served is a reference to the population of the official service area, so we understand how the population of selected peers compares to Greater Des Moines. It would be helpful to also understand number of residents within a certain distance of transit service.

Question: In the scope for the peer review, you specify "access to jobs" for each of the peer cities. By "access to jobs," do you mean that you would like analyzed the number of jobs the residents of those peer cities (and the DART area) have access to, using the current transit networks in those cities?

Answer: Yes. We would like to understand an estimated number or percentage of total jobs that are accessible within a reasonable distance from transit service (1/2 mile).

Question: Please confirm, and add additional information regarding, the respective roles of DART staff and the contractor in public engagement.

The RFP states that the contractor will be expected to:

- Advise DART on the public outreach and communication plan;
- Develop a public input plan
- Make presentations to stakeholders
- Make presentations to the Commission
- Provide a project webpage
- Create web, flyer and other content
- Develop surveys, meeting agendas or discussion questions

ADDENDUM 1



- Co-lead any in-person meetings or other in-person events with DART staff, make any in-person presentations and do any facilitation called for in the contractor's public input plan.

The RFP states that DART staff can be expected to:

- Develop and implement the strategic communications and outreach plan
- Undertake communication and outreach efforts
- Implement messaging, strategies and materials
- Co-lead any in-person meetings
- Coordinate logistics for public engagement activities
- Collect input

Is this clear description of your expectations for the division of duties between the contractor and DART staff?

Please also specify whether the contractor or DART staff will be responsible for each of these:

- Receiving, storing and responding to inquiries from the public.
- Writing one or multiple public input summaries describing public outreach efforts and input gathered during this initiative.
- Translation or interpretation services if they become necessary.

Answer: DART has amended the optional public input deliverable to focus on consultants identifying and developing methods for collecting feedback. The network redesign and paratransit deliverables include the consultant analyzing public input results and identifying any recommended changes that should be considered to the proposed plans as a result of the feedback. Because the consultant will be analyzing the results, this does include writing one or more public input summaries. DART staff can provide the details describing public outreach efforts and the consulting team will describe the input gathered based on their analysis of the results. DART staff will handle receiving, storing and responding to inquiries from the public as well as translation and interpretations services.

Question: On page 12 you specify that the "updated fare policy" must be compatible with your "current fare collection system." Specifications for that Fare Policy are given in Task 4, concluding with Task 4.5. Task 4.6 is an evaluation of the fare collection system, which would presumably happen after the recommendation of a new Fare Policy in Task 4.5. At the time that work begins for Task 4.6, will the range of possible new fare collection systems be limited to those that support the "updated fare policy" that was already delivered and which was compatible with the *old* fare collection system? If the recommended new fare collection system makes the previously-best-possible fare policy no longer applicable, or makes a better fare policy possible in the future, will the contractor be expected to deliver a second fare *policy* recommendation to go with the recommended new fare *collection* system? Or would that iteration be done in another process outside of this contract?

Answer: No the contractor is not expected to produce a second fare policy to go with the recommended new fare collection system.



Question: In the deliverables for Task 2.5.3, on page 16, you give specifications for the three funding scenarios. For the Smaller Network scenario, it is to include a “step by step guide for network downsizing.” What do you envision in such a guide? Are you looking for sub-scenarios within that scenario, with maps, estimated costs, analysis of outcomes, etc, for each of those multiple sub-scenarios or steps? If so, how many steps?

Answer: We have amended the Scope of Work to provide more flexibility to consultants to propose an approach for achieving the specified deliverables. In the amended network redesign deliverable, we are asking for the consultant to use feedback from the DART Commission on the consultant’s first task of “Explore varying and contrasting service delivery models to demonstrate alternative ways for meeting the goals determined by the DART Commission” to develop the second task of developing “a comprehensive service network that meets regional transportation needs”. After the DART Commission provides feedback on the second task, the consultant will develop three scenarios for varying budget levels, which will be provided by DART. Each scenario should estimate total operating cost, fleet and operator needs to deliver the service, maps of the service area and an analysis of outcomes achieved relative to the goals set by the DART Commission.

Question: In the deliverables for Task 2.7, on page 17, you specify “Adjustments to Proposed Service Network Options.” “Proposed Service Network Options” is not a deliverable mentioned previously, at least not using those words. Please clarify which document, or which network scenario(s) and how many of the scenarios, you would want updated based on public input in Task 2.7.

Answer: We have amended the Scope of Work to provide more flexibility to consultants to propose an approach for achieving the specified deliverables and thus removed the task referenced. As it relates to the original task referenced in the question, the amended Scope of Work for the network redesign includes the consultant analyzing public input results and identifying if the feedback warrants any adjustments to the proposed service network that was shared as part of public input.

Question: The description of deliverables for Task 2.9, the System Route Map, refers to “the redesigned network.” However, previous tasks included a set of 3 network scenarios, and Task 2.7 referred to “Proposed Service Network Options.” Can you please clarify which network scenarios DART will want maps delivered for, as described under Task 2.9?

Answer: We have amended the Scope of Work to provide more flexibility to consultants to propose an approach for achieving the specified deliverables and thus removed the task referenced. DART expects to share maps for any proposed network designs that are shared as part of public input. The maps used for public input can be simple visual representations of the proposed service network. The system route map deliverable included in the amended Scope of Work for the network redesign is the detailed system route map file of the final service network adopted by the DART Commission. DART’s preferred file format is Illustrator.



Question: Would the peers compared in the Fare Study be the same set of peers compared for the network redesign?

Answer: There could be some overlap in peer systems used for the Peer Comparison and the Fare Study but they do not have to be the same set of peers. For the network redesign, it is particularly important to select peers that are similar in population size to Greater Des Moines. For the fare study, we want to identify how DART's current fare collection system compares to current industry best practices.

Question: Can you please clarify how the contractor will be paid? Sections 7 and 9 of the sample contract (on Page 62) refer to a "rate schedule" in "Exhibit X," neither of which are provided. Attachment 7 to the RFP is a Pricing Proposal Form in which contractors are to fill in "Task Cost Proposals." How does Attachment 7 relate to the sample contract language?

Answer: See the attached revised Pricing Proposal form. This revised Pricing Proposal aligns with the amended Scope of Work, emphasizing the importance of Proposers developing a detailed and comprehensive approach that results in a Firm Fixed Price contract. Proposers are encouraged to structure their tasks and deliverables in a manner that clearly reflects the cost associated with each aspect of the project to facilitate progress payments, while also allowing for flexibility in response to evolving project needs.

Question: The optional Public Input task will gather input for the optional Fare Policy task, *if* DART opts to do the Fare Policy task. We are assuming that the extra effort related to public outreach, presenting, collecting input and acting on input for the Fare Policy study should be presented *in the cost proposal table for the Fare Policy study* (starting on page 52 of the RFP) rather than in the cost proposal table for the Optional Public Engagement task (which is on page 53). Is that correct?

Answer: DART has amended the scope of the optional public input deliverable to focus only on identifying and developing methods for collecting feedback. Costs to do this should be estimated as part of the optional public input deliverable for the network redesign, paratransit service area and fare policy. Please estimate public input costs separately for each of the deliverables.

Question: The RFP requires that proposers set up task amounts for the main scope of the project, with additional services to be provided on a time and materials basis. Would DART clarify if the main tasks of the project will be billable on a time and materials basis, or if a proposer will invoice monthly progress payment for tasks on a percentage complete basis?

Answer: See the attached revised Pricing Proposal form. This revised Pricing Proposal aligns with the amended Scope of Work, emphasizing the importance of Proposers developing a detailed and comprehensive approach that results in a Firm Fixed Price contract. Proposers are encouraged to structure their tasks and deliverables in a manner that clearly reflects the cost associated with each aspect of the project to

ADDENDUM 1



facilitate progress payments, while also allowing for flexibility in response to evolving project needs.

Question: Are subconsultants required to fill out any of the proposal forms? If so, which forms?

Answer: Attachment 6 CERTIFICATION OF LOWER-TIER PARTICIPANTS (SUBCONTRACTORS) REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION. THIS CERTIFICATION SHALL BE COMPLETED BY ALL SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THIS PROJECT WHICH EXCEEDS \$25,000 OR SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A CRITICAL INFLUENCE ON OR A SUBSTANTIVE CONTROL OVER THE PROJECT.

Question: Are the proposal covers (front & back), table of contents, and section dividers excluded from the 30-page limit?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Does the proposal letter count toward the page limit?

Answer: No.

Question: Can you confirm that attachments 1-11 are *all* considered required?

Answer: Yes, these are required.

Question: If we include resumes, would they count toward the page limit? If so, are we encouraged to provide them in an appendix?

Answer: No, they do not count toward the page limit. You can provide them where they fit best within your Proposal.

Question: Please confirm that the pricing sheet should be included in section D with other required forms (and not separate).

Answer: You can include them. The evaluation committee will not see pricing until after the technical scoring is complete.

Question: Are electronic signatures acceptable for forms?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How should this study relate to DART's 2022 Transit Optimization Study and the City's 2024 Multimodal Transit Strategy?

Answer: If these studies are helpful background and context, the consultant team is welcome to reference them. However, DART is seeking a consultant to complete an entire network redesign, which was not the purpose of the Transit Optimization Study.



Question: Is Via considered conflicted out of this opportunity due to being hired by the City of Des Moines to study Multimodal Transit Strategy?

Answer: The City of Des Moines study is a separate independent project. VIA has not and is not developing the scope of work in this RFP, thus they are not restricted from Proposing.

Question: In the pre-proposal meeting, staff indicated that the Commission would set revenue levels to constrain network planning – however, the RFP requests scenarios featuring a reduced budget, current budget, and potential growth budget. Can you confirm which is correct and whether the funding strategy will need to be addressed in the project?

Answer: DART staff will provide a status quo budget for initial exploratory exercises. DART staff will also provide budget parameters for a reduced funding, a cost-neutral, and an expanded budget scenario so the consultant can demonstrate the selected service network at three different scales as outlined in the amended scope of work for the network redesign.

Question: How will DART determine whether to include the optional public engagement task?

Answer: A determination will be made based on available budget and quality of the public input proposal.

Question: Can DART share the planned budget for this project?

Answer: Proposers who bring the best overall value, including optional deliverables, within the budget range of \$750,000-\$1,000,000 will put themselves in the competitive range for interviews.

Question: Can you please identify what Attachments are necessary/required for Subconsultants to complete, if any, beyond Attachment 6+ 7?

Answer: Attachment 6 CERTIFICATION OF LOWER-TIER PARTICIPANTS (SUBCONTRACTORS) REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION. THIS CERTIFICATION SHALL BE COMPLETED BY ALL SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THIS PROJECT WHICH EXCEEDS \$25,000 OR SUBCONTRACTORS WHICH WILL HAVE A CRITICAL INFLUENCE ON OR A SUBSTANTIVE CONTROL OVER THE PROJECT.

End of Questions and Answers.

Reimagine DART RFP Questions for Pre-Proposal Meeting July 31, 2024:

High-Level Question on RFP Sequence and Structure

- **Question:** Is there a sequence to address network redesign, paratransit, and fares, or are scenarios involving all these elements considered simultaneously?
- **Response:** The consultant is expected to propose how to accomplish these tasks that will yield the best outcomes within the timeframes provided in the RFP. It is DART's preference to collect public input and implement changes on the network redesign, paratransit service area and fares at the same time, if possible. The fare analysis and fare policy recommendation are optional because while DART would like to update its fare policy, this deliverable does not have to be complete by late November or early December 2025 like the network redesign and Paratransit service area.

Service Scenarios and Cost Structures

- **Question:** Will the service network concepts differ by overall quantity of service or other factors?
- **Response:** Prior to Task 2: Network Redesign, DART staff will convey priorities and/or goals for what the DART Commission would like a public transit system to achieve. Initial service network concepts from the consultant should focus on different service strategies that could accomplish those priorities or goals based on an estimated budget provided by DART—the idea being that the Commission can respond to the various pros and cons of these concepts and modal mixes before the details are applied to the Greater Des Moines region. The consultant will then develop a preferred service network design (Task 2.5 in the original RFP). DART staff will provide three budget targets, which are still being finalized but likely include a reduced budget, a cost-neutral budget and a growth budget. The consultant should be prepared to develop three versions of the preferred service network design that align with each of the budget scenarios.

Public Input and Consultant Responsibilities

- **Question:** Can DART provide clarification on the public input being an optional task and its impact?
- **Response:** It is our belief as we think about the scale of this change that public input will need to be collected twice during the network redesign, paratransit evaluation and potential fare policy analysis process. The aspects of public input that are already included in the network redesign, paratransit service area and fare policy deliverables include analyzing the results, reporting on findings and recommending any adjustments to proposals based on the feedback collected.

The optional public input deliverables have been amended to include identifying and developing methods for collecting feedback. DART staff will lead other aspects of public input.

Commission Voting and Decision Process

- **Question:** How does Commission voting work, especially regarding Des Moines' influence?
- **Response:** Each member of the Commission shall have one (1) vote with majority approval of a quorum (1/2 of members). There are two exceptions to this.
 - Some actions require affirmative votes of at least 2/3 of members present. This includes:
 - Establish, relocate or discontinue a vehicle route or any portion of a vehicle route
 - Alter the fare schedule
 - Approve a budget or add a new Participating Community
 - Any community can request a weighted vote based 1 vote/ 25,000 population for matters regarding the budget, funding, transit service levels and Commission composition. To enact this option, any Commissioner can request with 7 days' notice, and it would require affirmative votes of 3/4's of the members present to pass.

Alternative Approaches Clarification

- **Question:** Is DART open to alternative approaches if the shared vision work outcomes differ from expectations?
- **Response:** DART has amended the scope of work to provide more flexibility on the approach to achieving the specified deliverables.

Public Input Option

- **Question:** How will public input responsibilities be handled if the public input option is not selected?
- **Response:** DART staff will handle the planning and execution of public input activities, with the consultant analyzing the results and incorporating feedback into proposals as appropriate.

Local Public Outreach Firms

- **Question:** Providing a list of local public outreach firms to bidders would be helpful.
- **Response:** For the sake of fairness, DART will not be recommending any specific local firms.

Process for Announcing Consultant Selection:

- **Question:** Will consultants be notified of recommended consultant for award prior to the Commission meeting?
- **Response:** The Intent to Award will be communicated to all consultants who submit proposals before the full Commission approval on October 8, 2024.

Request for Additional Reimagine DART Information:

- **Question:** Will there be links or attachments to any public documents about Reimagine DART discussions leading to the current process would be beneficial for bidders.
- **Response:** DART will provide final public documents related to Reimagine DART as attachments with Questions and Answer Addendum.

Amended Scope of Work and Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Reimagine DART

Objective:

DART seeks proposals from experienced consulting firms to develop a reimagined transit service network for Greater Des Moines. This project will establish a sustainable 10-year vision for public transit, focusing on optimizing service delivery, ensuring ADA compliance, and addressing the evolving needs of the region.

Project Goals:

1. **Network Redesign:** Develop a fresh approach to the transit service network, unconstrained by DART's existing models, aligning with regional growth and community needs.
2. **ADA Complementary Service:** Recommend updated ADA service boundaries and options that balance accessibility and cost-effectiveness.

Proposer's Role:

The Proposer will be responsible for determining the most effective tasks and methodologies to achieve the desired outcomes. The scope of work should focus on delivering a Firm Fixed Price contract for the primary deliverables, with the flexibility to include optional services as outlined below as well.

Important Context:

DART member communities do not have consensus on goals for regional transit. See member community survey report for more information. The DART Commission is participating in facilitated workshops in August, September and October to identify 3 or 4 key outcomes we are trying to achieve through our investment in regional transit and how they will be measured. These 3-4 outcomes will be shared with the consulting team hired for Reimagine DART and should direct the goals and deliverables such that the network redesign is evaluated by the extent to which it achieves the established outcomes.

Primary Deliverables:

1. **Network Redesign:**
 - Explore varying and contrasting service delivery models to demonstrate alternative ways for meeting the goals determined by the DART Commission. This task should generate feedback and direction from the DART Commission to inform the next task.
 - Develop a comprehensive service network that meets regional transportation needs.
 - Use comprehensive service network developed to provide three scenarios for varying budget levels (DART will provide budget targets for a reduced, current, potential growth), and model cost to maintain each scenario for 10 years. Each scenario should estimate total operating cost, fleet and operator needs to deliver the service, maps of the service area and an analysis of the outcomes achieved relative to the goals set by the DART Commission.

- Propose who should deliver services (public vs. private providers).
- Provide service-design standards for each type of service provided.
- Analyze public input results and identify any recommended changes to proposed plans based on the feedback.
- Provide a detailed system map file for the final network redesign in a DART preapproved original file format. The preferred file format is Illustrator.

2. **ADA Complementary Service Update:**

- Review and recommend updates to ADA Complementary and Premium Paratransit services.
- Provide cost and ridership estimates for various scenarios.
- Propose who should deliver services (public vs. private providers)
- Analyze public input results and identify any recommended changes to proposed plans based on the feedback.
- Provide a map of the final paratransit service area in a DART preapproved original file format.

3. **3 Facilitated Workshops with the DART Commission**

- Proposers should plan to hold 3 facilitated workshops with the DART Commission to ensure the Commission has an opportunity to weigh in and provide feedback throughout the process.

Optional Deliverables:

- **Peer System Comparison:** Although optional, this comparison may be included to provide context for the redesign process.
- **Fare Policy Recommendation:** Propose a simplified fare structure aligned with the redesigned network that maximizes fare revenue while maintaining affordability to ensure fares do not deter public transit use.
 - An updated fare policy would need to be compatible with DART's existing fare collection technologies.
 - DART is interested in updating its fare collection system and would like proposers to include an estimated cost for providing a recommendation to update our fare collection system.
- **Public Input:** Identify and develop methods to collect public feedback on proposed changes during two rounds of public input.

Proposer's Approach:

Proposers must submit their approach to:

- **Innovate:** Present creative and bold strategies that leverage emerging technologies and align with post-pandemic travel patterns.
- **Customize:** Tailor the approach to DART's specific regional needs and constraints.
- **Engage Stakeholders:** Outline a plan for engaging with the DART Commission, staff, and key regional stakeholders, ensuring alignment with the Commission's developing goals.
- **Proposed Timeline:** Clarity and realism of proposed timeline, including all deliverables, to ensure the DART Commission makes a final decision on the network redesign and Paratransit service area by mid- to late-November 2025. Include proposed mitigation strategies.

Technical Evaluation Criteria:

Technical Proposals will be evaluated based on the Proposer's ability to:

- Provide a clear and practical approach to the project and ensure flexibility to incorporate the DART's Commission evolving goals. (70 Points)
- Demonstrate qualifications and experience with similar transit projects. (40 Points)
- Offer a realistic timeline to meet DART's key indicated dates (30 Points)

**SECTION 5:
ATTACHMENTS**



**AMENDMENT 1
ATTACHMENT 7
REVISED PRICING PROPOSAL**

This revised Pricing Proposal aligns with the amended Scope of Work, emphasizing the importance of Proposers developing a detailed and comprehensive approach that results in a Firm Fixed Price contract. Proposers are encouraged to structure their tasks and deliverables in a manner that clearly reflects the cost associated with each aspect of the project to facilitate progress payments, while also allowing for flexibility in response to evolving project needs.

Firm Fixed Price Deliverables:

Proposers are to provide an all-inclusive Firm Fixed Price for each primary deliverable outlined in the Scope of Work. This includes:

1. Network Redesign Deliverable
2. ADA Complementary Service Update Deliverable
3. 3 Facilitated Workshops with the DART Commission
4. Optional Peer System Comparison Deliverable
5. Optional Fare Policy Recommendation Deliverable
6. Optional Public Input Deliverable

For each deliverable, Proposers are to break down the costs for each task associated with achieving the deliverable using the following table structure:

Deliverable	Task Firm Fixed Price Cost
Task 1	\$ _____
Task 2	\$ _____
Task 3	\$ _____
Add Additional Task for the Deliverable as Needed	\$ _____

Additional Services:

Proposers must include their direct labor fixed hourly rates that will be used to negotiate additional services not currently contemplated but that may become necessary to successfully complete the

SECTION 5: ATTACHMENTS



project. All additional services must comply with federal requirements under 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart D 200.318(j).

Direct Labor Fixed Hourly Rate:

- Position _____ Rate \$ _____ (_% wages _% G&A _% Profit)
- [Add additional lines as needed for each position]

Clarification for Proposers:

Proposers are expected to develop their approach and corresponding tasks with a focus on delivering a comprehensive solution that adheres to the fixed pricing structure. This should include:

- A clear methodology and breakdown of tasks for each deliverable including optional ones.
- Flexibility in approach to incorporate the evolving goals of the DART Commission.
- A structured and transparent pricing model that ensures all aspects of the project are covered under a Firm Fixed Price contract.

The resulting contract will include provisions for the negotiation of additional services under specific circumstances, ensuring compliance with federal contracting requirements.