



RFP #2024-03

Solano Rail Hub Residential Cluster Suisun City and Fairfield Priority Development (PDA) Plan

Questions & Answers

August 2, 2024

Summary of Responses to Questions from 7/16 Pre-Proposal Meeting

1. Will the study focus on the entire Priority Development Area of the Suisun Waterfront and Heart of Fairfield PDAs or a portion of the PDA areas? If the latter, can you specify the area boundaries of the study?
 - Answer: Maps that show the study boundaries are included as Attachments A and B.

2. Could you provide the list of priority sites that the study will focus on as part of the plan?
 - Answer:
 - i. City of Fairfield
 1. Bank of America Property - a webpage with background reports and documents including the RFP can be found [HERE](#).
 2. Sam Yeto Property
 3. Solano Garbage Property and PG&E Property
 - ii. City of Suisun
 1. 30 acre site
 2. Caltrans Park & Ride Lot
 3. Suisun Site #3
 - iii. Map of these sites are included as Attachments A-H

3. Will the study only focus on the identified priority sites or also look at other opportunity sites?
 - Answer: The study will focus on the identified priority sites with an opportunity to include other adjacent sites.

4. Has technical due diligence already occurred for the identified priority sites or will due diligence be part of the study scope?
 - Answer: The priority sites are at different stages, with some sites ready for a developer and some where no work has been done yet. Available reports related to these sites are included in the response to Question #2.

5. Could you specify which aspects of the study will be at a specific plan level vs a site/development level?

- Answer: The following tasks will occur at a specific plan level:
 - i. Task 2 - Bringing development and planning policies into compliance with MTC and ABAG's Transit Oriented Communities Policy
 - ii. Zoning ordinance language
 - The following tasks will occur at a development/priority site level:
 - i. Tasks 3-7 will evaluate individual parcels for development feasibility
6. How many residential cluster sites will the consultant be studying within the budgeted scope of this project?
- Answer: Around 6-7 sites.
7. Could you share a map of approved or planned development sites in the two PDAs that are not identified priority sites for the study?
- Answer: This map is included as Attachment I.
8. Can you list the existing information available regarding the flooding impacts - e.g. hazard mitigation plans or other regional plans that can be used as reference?
- Answer: The Heart of Fairfield DEIR (see [HERE](#)) and FEIR (see [HERE](#)) may be helpful resources for flooding information.
- For additional questions regarding the resources, please contact the following city staff:
- i. Suisun City – Jim Bermudez, Development Services Director, City of Suisun City (jbermudez@suisun.com)
 - ii. Fairfield – Jonathan Atkinson, Senior Planner, City of Fairfield (jatkinson@fairfield.ca.gov)
 - iii. Solano County - https://www.solanocounty.com/depts/oes/emergency_plans.asp
9. Are you looking for specific changes to the specific plan from the consultant or direction in terms of how the specific plan should be changed? Is there an environmental analysis required for the cities to adopt this study?
- Answer: We are looking for a study that will provide the cities with recommended changes to their PDA specific plan, including drafting specific language and staff reports. The cities of Suisun City and Fairfield will be responsible for the implementation of the report and the associated CEQA process, therefore the environmental analysis is not included in the study scope.
10. Are you looking for actual zoning language?
- Answer: Yes.
11. Does the study include the identification of incentives that are needed to attract developer interest for the priority sites?

- Answer: Yes, the study would consider developer incentives.
12. Is the intent of this study to create good urbanism around transit or to promote affordable housing as much as possible? Could you elaborate on this because it seems like the market may be getting squeezed because of the affordability component of developments on some level?
- Answer: The primary intent is to encourage new housing developments around each site at higher densities. Some of those sites may have an affordable component.
13. Could you clarify what types of short-term improvements you are looking for for Task 8? Are the improvements specifically to the walkway or connections to the walkway going over the railroad?
- Answer: We are not looking for major physical improvements to the existing pedestrian bridge – the bridge will be upgraded as part of a more comprehensive and long-term project occurring at the Solano Rail Hub station. For purposes of this study, we are looking for short-term improvements, such as lighting, signage and landscaping, to enhance the visibility, safety and walkability to and through the bridge. The scope of this plan does not include any strategies to widen or “touch” the bridge.
14. What is the budget for this study?
- Answer: The budget is \$370,000.
15. The RFP states that the STA will separately open the cost estimate of the top-ranking firm with the right to reject the proposal if it is over the study budget amount. Is there a possibility for the STA to consider a firm with a strong proposal but with a cost proposal over the budget amount?
- Answer: No, the STA does not have additional resources to increase the budget for the study. All cost proposals over the \$370,000 study budget will be rejected.
16. Would you be able to provide a ballpark range of the budget breakdown for each of the tasks in the study? This will help clarify the level of effort and detail for the various tasks.
- Answer: We estimate that this study will involve 25% planning work, 50% development feasibility and 25% for the other tasks.
17. Can we consider a shorter timeline for the scope for the schedule for the work?
- Answer: Yes.
18. What is the relationship between the STA and City planning for this project? Is there an advisory group set up throughout the study process?
- Answer: The STA and Solano EDC will be working closely with the cities of Suisun City, Fairfield and the County of Solano on this project. A project leadership team that consists of planning staff will be created for this work. The STA and Solano EDC will be handling the project management for this effort.

19. The RFP mentions a presentation to the STA Board and SolanoEDC Board, but not to the city councils. Will there be presentations needed to the respective city councils?

- Answer: Yes, we will be requesting a total of four presentations to the two cities with a combination of presentations to their Planning Commission and/or City Council.

20. Will the consultant be preparing one combined report for both cities or one report for each city? And will each city adopt the documents separately?

- Answer: We are asking for a consolidated PDA Plan report, with the exception of Task 2 and Task 7. Task 2 pertains to the TOC Policy and Rezoning so separate reports will need to be developed for each PDA. Task 7 requires two separate sections since the deliverables differ between the two PDAs: a Parcel Consolidation Report will be prepared for the Heart of Fairfield PDA and a Housing Preservation Report for the Suisun Waterfront PDA. Each city will adopt the PDA Plan.

Responses to Questions Submitted via Email

1. It is indicated that there will be separate reports for each PDA, whereas Task 11 only speaks of an “Administrative Draft Plan” and “Final Report” for review by STA staff and other pertinent parties. Please clarify.

- Answer: We are asking for a consolidated PDA Plan report, with the exception of Task 2 and Task 7. Task 2 pertains to the TOC Policy and Rezoning so separate reports will need to be developed for the Suisun Waterfront PDA and the Heart of Fairfield. Task 7 requires two separate sections since the deliverables differ between the two PDAs: a Parcel Consolidation Report will be prepared for the Heart of Fairfield PDA and a Housing Preservation Report for the Suisun Waterfront PDA.

2. Similarly, for each task item will there be a separate deliverable for each PDA, or will there be a single consolidated deliverable? In essence, are these separate projects with similar scopes being done under one contract or is there opportunity for consolidation?

- Answer: We are asking for a consolidated PDA Plan report, with the exception of Task 2 and Task 7. Task 2 pertains to the TOC Policy and Rezoning so separate reports will need to be developed for the Suisun Waterfront PDA and the Heart of Fairfield. Task 7 requires two separate sections since the deliverables differ between the two PDAs: a Parcel Consolidation Report will be prepared for the Heart of Fairfield PDA and a Housing Preservation Report for the Suisun Waterfront PDA.

3. Please clarify the role of staff for the Cities of Suisun and Fairfield vs. the role of STA staff in administering this project and in the review of deliverables.

- Answer: The STA and Solano EDC will be working closely with the cities of Suisun City, Fairfield and the County of Solano on this project. A Project Leadership Team that

consists of planning staff from each agency will be created to guide the development of this plan, with the STA and Solano EDC handling the project management for this effort. The cities of Suisun City and Fairfield, and in some cases the County, will review deliverables that are prepared as part of the plan and provide input to STA and Solano EDC. The STA will serve as the fiscal agent for the project and will handle contracting and invoicing.

4. Please clarify the process of plan adoption. Will there be separate plan adoption presentations and hearings involving the leadership of each City (e.g., Planning Commission, City Council) or only plan adoption presentations and hearings involving the MTA Board, etc.?
 - Answer: We will be requesting a presentation of the final report to the following committees for final adoption of the plan: Suisun City Planning Commission, Suisun City Council, Fairfield Planning Commission, Fairfield City Council, SolanoEDC Board, the STA Technical Advisory Committee and STA Board.
5. Related to the above question, please clarify the number of presentations that the consultant will be required to prepare for and attend related to adoption of the plan(s); for example, how many presentations to “relevant committees” are expected?
 - Answer: There will likely be a total of 6 presentations needed.
6. For Task 2 (TOC Policy and Rezoning) is the consultant only recommending changes to policy and zoning or is the consultant required to provide draft text amendments and prepare for and attend zoning/policy adoption hearings involving each City.
 - Answer: We are looking for a study that will provide the cities with recommended changes to their specific plan, including drafting specific text amendments and staff reports, but the cities of Suisun City and Fairfield will be responsible for the implementation of the report and the associated CEQA process. Therefore, preparing for and attending zoning/policy adoption hearings involving each city is not included in the scope.
7. Please clarify the timeline for Task 2, especially if the consultant is required to draft policy and zoning amendments and participate in zoning/policy adoption hearings. These activities would not align with the proposed timeline which provides only about 1 month for Task 2.
 - Answer: The scope includes drafting policy and zoning amendments but **does not** include the participation in zoning/policy adoption hearings. The timeline for Task 2 will be extended to January 2025.
8. Please clarify the difference between the TOC policy and zoning analysis in Task 2 and the identification and mitigation of regulatory constraints in Task 4.
 - Answer: Task 2 is intended to implement MTC adopted Transit Oriented Communities policies in both the Heart of Fairfield and Suisun City Waterfront specific plans. Task 4 is

focused on the specific sites and to identify any regulatory (as well as physical and financial constraints) issues that could impact the development of each site. An example would be the Surplus Land Act process.

9. Please clarify the difference between Task 5 (Development Strategies) and Task 6 (Site Development). Both describe preparation of a development strategy for publicly owned sites. Is Task 6 intended to illustrate a concept for each site (e.g., land use plan, illustrative site plan, etc.)?

- Answer: Task 6 is to take the information developed in Tasks 3, 4 and 5 and develop a strategy to take these sites to market for development. It should identify steps necessary, the process and implementations steps to bring development interest to each site. This includes strategies to market the site(s).

10. It seems that there are redundancies and unusual timing in some of the task descriptions. Would you be open to reworking the scope tasks and schedule to a more simplified and traditional approach of 1) Site Analysis (Opportunities & Constraints); 2) Site Development Concepts & Feasibility; 3) Implementation Strategies; 4) Final Documentation? If we were to take that approach, would it place our team at a disadvantage in the selection process, or must we maintain the task order as listed in the RFP to meet grant requirements?

- Answer: We are open to reorganizing the scope tasks and schedule as long as the deliverables in the scope remain the same and the deadlines and requirements of the MTC grant are met.

11. Please clarify the type and extent of community engagement activities; for example, number of community meetings anticipated, etc. (Task 9). Would separate engagement activities be required for each PDA or is there opportunity to consolidate engagement activities?

- Answer: We are requesting four in-person meetings for the community engagement task, two meetings early in the study process and two meetings to preview the study recommendations.

12. Please clarify the page limitation for the proposal and what items do not count toward that limitation. The RFP states that the “qualifications” have a ten (10) page limit; because this is a proposal (that will require a fairly detailed scope) and not just a qualifications package would it be possible to raise the page limit?

- Answer: We are increasing the page limit of RFP proposals to 20 pages. This new page limit includes the entire proposal, except for the resumes and transmittal letter. The page limit does not include the cost proposal, which must be submitted in a separate envelope.

13. What is the timeline for the Solano Rail Hub to be fully operational as imagined in the State Rail Plan?

- Answer: The Solano Rail Hub Project is envisioned to be fully operational over the long-term time horizon of the California State Rail Plan, which is anticipated to occur by 2050.
14. On page 15-17 (exhibit 10-H1) does each subconsultant fill out the form along with the prime for their portion of the contract?
- Answer: Yes, that is correct. The prime consultant will need to complete 10-H1, if this is the cost proposal they are using and list all of the participating subs in line item M. Each subconsultant will also need to fill out this form.
15. Can we ignore filling out page 18-23 as it is for on call contracts and geotechnical testing consultants only?
- Answer: Exhibits 10-H1 through 10-H3 (pages 15-23) are types of cost proposals. If Exhibit 10-H1 (Cost plus Fixed Fee/Lump Sum/Fixed Price Contracts) is being utilized, then – yes – pages 18-23 can be ignored.
16. On page 26, (exhibit 10-O1) does each subconsultant who is a DBE fill out this form if they are on our team?
- Answer: Only the prime consultant needs to complete/submit this form. Please list all of the participating sub DBE firms in line item 7.
17. On page 28, (exhibit 10-O2) is this form a roll up that the PRIME fills out of all the subs we have who are on our team who are DBE's?
- Answer: Same as Exhibit 10-O1 but submitted as part of contract execution by the prime consultant listing all the sub DBE firms participating in line item 7. DBE goal must be consistent with 10-O1.
18. To confirm, we don't have to fill out pages 30-32 (exhibit 15-H) because we are exceeding the DBE requirement on our team already?
- Answer: Yes, that is correct.
19. On page 33-34; we have not been awarded the contract yet, and so we do not have to fill out this form until we complete work, correct?
- Answer: That is correct. The 10-O2 DBE form is not due until the contract award is executed, as referenced in 10-I Notice to Proposers DBE Information, Item 3. Only the 10-O1 DBE form needs to be attached to the consultant team's proposal. This was incorrectly stated in the RFP.
20. Could you please provide the project boundary on the aerial image and specify which parcels are subject to RFP #2024-03?
- Answer: The maps with this information are included as Attachments A and B.
21. Our read of the RFP is that the 10-page limit applies to *all* of the following sections: Project Understanding, Approach and Management Plan, Qualifications and Experience, Staffing Plan, Work Plan and Schedule, Cost Control, Additional Relevant Information, and References. Can you confirm? If that's the case, would STA consider adjusting this limit? Given the request for a detailed work plan, I imagine this section alone could account for 3-5 pages.

- Answer: We are increasing the page limit of RFP proposals to 20 pages. This new page limit includes the entire proposal, except for the resumes and transmittal letter. The page limit does not include the cost proposal, which must be submitted in a separate envelope.
22. Regarding the 12 meetings between consultant and project team, can these be virtual meetings?
- Answer: Yes, these check in meetings between the consultant and project team will be virtual meetings
23. Can you confirm the total number of publicly-owned sites to be reviewed in Task 5?
- Answer: There is a total of six publicly-owned sites to be reviewed in Task 5.
24. Will the public workshops be virtual or in-person meetings? Will translation be required?
- Answer: We are requesting four in-person meetings for the community engagement task, two meetings early in the study process and two meetings to preview and get feedback on the study recommendations.



**Suisun City
Rail Station**

Site #1

Highway 12

Site #2

Lotz Way

CMC Center Blvd.

Main Street

Site #3

Cordelia St

PDA Boundary

1/2 Mile
Radius from
Train Station

Attachment B

1/2 Mile
Radius from
Train Station

Study Area
Boundary

PDA Boundary



Site #1

Empire St.
Texas Street

Delaware St.
Site #2

Broadway St.

Site #3

Illinois St.

Ohio St.

West Texas Street

Woolner Ave.

Pennsylvania Street

Union Ave.

Suisun City
Rail Station

Empire Street

Great Jones Street

Taylor Street

**Fairfield
Site #1
Former B of A
Property**

Texas Street

Delaware Street

Taylor Street

Madison Street

**Fairfield
Site #2
Former Sam Yeto School
Property**

Broadway Street

Ohio Street

**Fairfield
Site #3
Former Garbage Company
Property**

Railroad Tracks

Webster Street

Highway 12



Railroad Tracks

Railroad Ave.

Marina Blvd.

**Suisun City
Site #1
30 ac. Vacant Site**

Highway 12 Off Ramp



Highway 12 Off Ramp

Main Street



**Suisun City
Site #2
CalTrans Park and Ride Lot**

Lotz Way

**Suisun City
Site #3**

Main Street

Harbour Park Dr.

Whispering Bay Ln.

Marina Circle

