



## Addendum

Addendum Number:	1
Addendum Date:	January 14, 2025
Project Name:	Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan Update
Project Number:	N/A.
Prepared By:	Emily Egan / Craig Failor
To:	All RFP Recipients

This addendum does not amend the original RFP.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of any and all addenda as required by the General Requirements of the RFP and in Section 4 of this document. The acknowledgement page should be signed and included in the proposal document.

All requirements of the Contract Documents remain unchanged.

### Part 1 – Amendments to the RFP - None

### Part 2 – Attachments - None

### Part 3 – Questions & Answers

- 1.) We cannot find any definition of “Item V. Proposal Submittals” out specified on page 2. Is there another document that outlines what materials are required in addition to the forms included in the RFP?
  - a. ANSWER: *The Section V. lists items to be submitted under the title, “Statement of Work to be Performed”, page 5 of the RFP.*
- 2.) Are there any DBE participation goals established for the project?
  - a. ANSWER: *No. However, it is important and encouraged that DBE or WBE firms submit proposals for this project.*
- 3.) Can you share the budget for the project?
  - a. ANSWER: *The total budget is divided between the City of Berwyn and Village of Oak Park. A \$100,000 total has been set.*
- 4.) Is there a preference for firms with prior experience working with the Village of Oak Park or City of Berwyn?
  - a. ANSWER: *No.*
- 5.) Would the project owners be amenable to a "tactical" planning approach?
  - a. ANSWER: *Yes, this is an acceptable but not exclusive approach type.*
- 6.) How will Contractor proposals be scored and evaluated?
  - a. ANSWER: *Staff evaluation will be based on a firm’s experience with similar projects, proposal methodology, public engagement approach, demonstration of the understanding of the connection between economic vitality and land use and Planning principals, response to RFP requirements and firm expertise.*
- 7.) Is there a preferred or maximum page length for the proposal?
  - a. ANSWER: *No more than 100 pages.*
- 8.) Are there specific formatting guidelines, such as font size, margins, or document structure, that we should follow?
  - a. ANSWER: *No, not for the RFP response, but we may conduct interviews to discuss for the final product.*
- 9.) Could you clarify the type of experience or qualifications you are prioritizing in the evaluation process?
  - a. ANSWER: *See response to # 6 above.*
- 10.) Are there particular projects or skill sets that would make a team stand out?

- a. ANSWER: *See response to #6 above.*
- 11.) In Part A of Engagement Objectives, the RFP refers to the Economic Vitality Plan and Strategic Financial Plan currently in process within the Village and leveraging work already conducted by Camion. Will draft deliverables or similar resources be available for use by potential respondents?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes, once publicly available.*
- 12.) Can you please confirm that the Professional Services Agreement was provided for informational purposes only?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes.*
- 13.) Can you please confirm which forms need to be filled out by a) the prime respondent only and b) all firms represented in the RFP?
- a. ANSWER: *No forms are to be completed at this time. These are examples for the selected firm.*
- 14.) Will the Village's consultant Camion be reasonably available to answer questions during the project stages?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes. We can make the contact if needed.*
- 15.) Please provide clarification about the level of coordination expected with IDOT?
- a. ANSWER: *There is not expectation of coordination with IDOT for this project.*
- 16.) Have there been recent similar projects to this that were well- or not well-received?
- a. ANSWER: *The 2005 adopted plan was extremely well received. A similar project for North Avenue with the City of Chicago was also received very well. The plan can be found on our website under Planning & Urban Design.*
- 17.) Would new roadway configurations be considered, as appropriate?
- a. ANSWER: *No.*
- 18.) What data is available for non-motorists?
- a. ANSWER: *Very limited. The Village does not keep pedestrian counts.*
- 19.) Is there an expectation for public engagement including number of workshops, survey, etc.?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes, but we don't not have the exact numbers at this time. We will evaluate each proposal's, but may need to negotiation for more if not satisfactory for the project.*
- 20.) Have the municipalities identified a steering or advisory committee for the project? Is this desired?
- a. ANSWER: *No not at this time. We will however wish to do so.*
- 21.) Is there current information and data on the corridor including GIS, traffic, bike and pedestrian counts, roadway geometry, and other spatial or evaluative data sets that can be shared with the selected consultant?
- a. ANSWER: *In short, yes. We can provide when needed.*
- 22.) Has a market analysis been completed in recent history for the project area?
- a. ANSWER: *No*
- 23.) Is a detailed budget required for the proposal?
- a. ANSWER: *A fairly detailed budget would be helpful, but can be discussed further upon selection.*
- 24.) Is there any flexibility on overall approach and project timeline (which is fairly aggressive)?
- a. ANSWER: *We wish to keep to this timeline as much as possible as we have other initiatives to pursue this fiscal year, but we understand there may need to be some flexibility in all such projects.*
- 25.) Would it be permissible to include additional qualifications, such as a firm overview, resumes, and relevant project experience, alongside the completion of Sections V through IX?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes, that would be appropriate.*
- 26.) Is there any legislative, funding, or planning milestone driving the project timeline?
- a. ANSWER: *No, the funding is through municipal budgets.*
- 27.) Are the Communities open to a proposal for a slightly longer project schedule?
- a. ANSWER: *It would be best to keep with the proposed schedule as other projects are anticipated for us this fiscal year. However, we understand scheduled need to change at times.*
- 28.) What does coordination between the Village of Oak Park and the City of Berwyn currently look like? Are the project managers for this initiative already meeting and coordinating regularly? Do City engineers/DPW frequently collaborate?
- a. ANSWER: *We are in close communication, but are too preliminary at this point to start meeting regularly on this project, but we anticipate all efforts, plus, mentioned will be conducted.*

- 29.) Will the City of Berwyn have a staff member assigned to this project or will the primary Berwyn stakeholder be the Berwyn Development Corporation (BDC)?
- a. ANSWER: *At this time, we understand BDC will be the project contact for Berwyn.*
- 30.) Can you share a little more about the key priorities for types of plan recommendations? For example: policy and zoning, programs, community branding/identity, streetscape/urban design, business attraction campaign, etc.
- a. ANSWER: *The project is intended to provide an update to the previous Plan for the corridor and include traditional land-use, zoning analysis and more that is commonly seen in a corridor Plan. Additionally, a review of economic development / vitality policies, which may include streetscaping, and business and residential attraction campaigns is sought.*
- 31.) Can you explain the difference between these two Required Reports: Assessment of the corridor's condition and context in the region and SWOT Analysis?
- a. ANSWER: *The corridor has several different municipalities and stakeholder groups. It is a regional asset and should be viewed in a regional context. Similar information may be in both, but a focus of the current plan's implementation and progress should be included in the assessment of the corridor's condition and context report.*
- 32.) Is this plan update examining the streetscape within the curbs?
- a. ANSWER: *This is not a primary initiative of this project, but if upgrades or enhancements are needed, it should be stated.*
- 33.) Have the Village and/or City identified any priority sites that you hope this plan will specifically address?
- a. ANSWER: *Not fully, but we each have experience with challenged areas that would need special attention and/or innovative solutions for development.*
- 34.) Of the strategies for implementing the 2005 Roosevelt Road plan that have been accomplished, which are considered to be the most significant?
- a. ANSWER: *All developments that have occurred on Roosevelt Road have been significant. This is a corridor that has many constraints and hurdles.*
- 35.) What objectives from the 2005 Roosevelt Road plan have been the most challenging to make progress toward?
- a. ANSWER: *One of the most challenging is the lack of economic development incentives.*
- 36.) What concerns about the corridor do the communities most often hear from residents and businesses?
- a. ANSWER: *A better mix of commercial businesses and those that support the neighborhoods are needed. The pedestrian and non-motorized vehicles may have challenges with a high-traffic volume corridor.*
- 37.) Engagement, as listed in the RFP, can be done in many ways. Does the committee have a targeted level of engagement opportunities or otherwise a budget for this work to best fit our response?
- a. ANSWER: *We expect a high level of public engagement that can be accomplished within the proposed budget.*
- 38.) Can staff help assemble lists of individuals which may be great to reach out to for the public engagement piece of the project?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes.*
- 39.) Does the RFP expect social media account or websites in addition to accounts already in use? Or can the respondent assume use of existing social media/websites but with new content for this project?
- a. ANSWER: *Most Communication efforts will be coordinated with the Oak Park Communications Department and the BDC. These efforts will be supported by staff. We will need to discuss if hosting a website or page is most appropriate since there will be two communities involved.*
- 40.) Can you confirm that this a collaborative project between different municipalities?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes, at this time Oak Park and Berwyn are the two municipalities subject to the project. We have been in touch with Cicero, and Chicago, but cannot confirm their exact type of involvement at this time.*
- 41.) Our MBE/WBE application is in progress. Can we self-identify for Section VIII and indicate as such?
- a. ANSWER: *Yes.*

- 42.) Can the Village please provide more information on the expected scope of work for the form-based code?  
 We are reading this as a high-level analysis of the FBC application, not a rewrite of the code. Is that correct?
- a. ANSWER: *In general, it would be more of a review of how its working and should/could it be strengthened or not.*
- 43.) Can you share the expected outputs for the intended scope for the project? For example, are you looking for new roadway configurations, place-making strategies, land use proposals and development strategies in the plan? Other?
- a. ANSWER: *The project should focus on economic development strategies and that impacts zoning, etc. Less attention should be paid to the roadway itself. Reviewing streetscape for upgrades, enhancements, placemaking opportunities is appropriate.*
- 44.) How are you defining similar corridors (Section IV/F, "how it compares to similar corridors in the region"? Is that from a business composition perspective? Demographics? Traffic counts? A mix of these? Other?
- a. ANSWER: *This statement is more associated with business / residential composition.*
- 45.) When you refer to the region (Section IV/D, "Analyze[...] historic patterns of urbanism and economic development in the surrounding region."), how wide of a region are they thinking?
- a. ANSWER: *The Chicagoland area is sufficient.*

## Part 4 – Acknowledgement

I acknowledge the receipt of this addendum for the referenced project by signing the acknowledgement and returning it with the proposal. This acknowledgement must be signed and included with proposal.

Addendum Number:	
Date:	
Name:	
Signature:	
Company:	

End of Addendum