



Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 1900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

November 16, 2023

Attention: Andy Penick, Purchasing Manager
Post Office Drawer 1435
Gainesville, GA 30503

Dear Andy,

Reference: RFQ/P #44-014 Request for Clarification (November 10, 2023)

This letter provides a response to the County's request for clarification on Stantec's price proposal for the aforementioned RFQ. We have completed the cost proposal matrix as requested for required and optional items, and we have also provided additional explanations and detail on cost assumptions. To make this easier to understand, we have taken the liberty of numbering each of the required items and optional items in the order they are listed in their respective tables. Following the tables, we provide additional information explaining level of effort.

We would like to note that the required items in the table represent a generally more expansive scope of work than what we discussed with the interview team on our October 31 interview. These were not all items explicitly identified in the original RFQ, and had we understood that these were desired items, it is conceivable that we would have offered a different cost proposal. With a refined understanding of the City of Flowery Branch's desires for the study since the October interview, we are offering an original fee estimate that corresponds to our submitted fee in early October, and different fee estimates that reflect the expanded scope of services noted in the County's November 10 request. As stated above, our additional detail explains these differences.

Thank you again for your interest in Stantec and for your thorough consideration of our team's approach and qualifications. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joel F. Mann".

Joel Mann

Phone: 770-492-2624
Email: joel.mann@stantec.com

Attachment: Original Request for Clarification

Request for Clarifications on Stantec Fee Proposal

RFQ/P #44-014

The Required Items listed in the table on the following page are taken from the November 10, 2023 request for clarifications. As noted in our cover letter, this scope appears to expand services beyond what we discussed in the initial fee estimate, namely around a desire to incorporate traffic counts more closely into the

Our interview discussion also proposed a total of three counting periods (such as 4 PM to 7 PM on a given day of the week), which we envisioned to include a mix of weekend, weekday, and special event periods. The required items in the table here call for six individual counts, and it is unclear if these are to be on different days (for example, if the two 'typical weekdays' should be different weekdays, or two different times of the same day). With some special events described by City staff as having attendance of up to 5,000, we estimate that capturing parking occupancy during such an event could be an extensive endeavor reaching beyond the basic study area originally provided in the RFP.

The request for clarification also seems to suggest that the City desires to conduct traffic counts, though the City's desired focus for analysis of that traffic data is not immediately apparent. There is also no specific reference to an analysis, although we assume that is desired (as traffic data has limited application if it is not interpreted and analyzed with regard to current conditions and the challenges and opportunities in current traffic operations). Different analysis methodologies may call for different types of traffic data, and there are significant differences in cost to these different types of data. For instance, bi-directional daily traffic counts covering a 24-hour period are typically priced lower than intersection turning movement counts that capture peak hours only. However, each has its purpose: daily traffic counts do not readily allow an understanding of potential congestion and delay, but they do allow an understanding of how traffic volumes increase and decrease throughout a day. Intersection-based counts do allow more of a measure of congestion and delay, and thus challenges to traffic operations, but they focus only on a small period of the day to be consistent with the industry methodology for intersection-based traffic analysis. Without having more information on the City's desired objectives for collecting traffic count information, it is difficult to provide an accurate fee estimate. We explain the assumptions behind our fee in the notes following the tables.

The required and optional tables begin on the following page.

Cost Matrix of Required Items

Item	Description	Scope of work as described in October 31 Interview	Scope of work as described in November 10 request for detail, parking counts only	Scope of work as described in November 10 request for detail, parking and traffic counts and analysis
1	Review future development plans	\$600	\$600	\$600
2	Review and document existing downtown parking infrastructure, conduct 6 traffic counts of downtown (2 on typical weekdays, 2 on typical weekend days, and 2 during events). Validate reasonableness collected counts with staff	\$5,500	\$11,500	\$39,000
3	Intercept public input on downtown mobility and parking (whether by survey, open house, or intercept event)	\$3,400	\$3,400	\$3,400
4	Identify ideal locations for future parking infrastructure (whether it be on street, gravel or paved lots, or parking decks)	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$4,800
5	Conduct an analysis of existing street layouts	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
6	Identify potential changes to street layout or grid to improve mobility through downtown (whether it be intersection improvements, road diets, conversion to one-way traffic, etc.)	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400
7	Work with City and Consultant staff regarding findings	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,500
8	Provide reasonable cost estimates for all proposed projects and improvements	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,600
9	List any funding mechanisms the City can consider to implement said projects	\$800	\$800	\$800
10	Present strategy of shared parking management	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800
11	Present findings to Flowery Branch City Council	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
12	Other/Not Mentioned:	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL FEE FOR EACH SCOPE ITERATION		\$24,500	\$30,500	\$58,900

Required Items: Detail and Assumptions for Fee Proposal Amounts

Item 1: This will be a concise review to determine overall development program and its expected impacts on traffic and parking, also noting key access points, additions to street network, and any proposals for parking supply.

Item 2: As discussed in the October 31 interview, this portion of the scope we described focused on parking inventory and occupancy data collection, with occupancy observed over three time periods representing different conditions of activity in downtown. This did not originally include traffic data collection.

If we considered six days of parking counts, this fee amount from our original proposal would be doubled, as this assumes twice the number of observation periods for parking. All parking counts include summary and documentation of the data, including capturing both inventory and occupancy data in a geographic information systems (GIS) database that will be provided to the City as a deliverable.

With the six traffic and parking counts requested in the November 10 additional request, we have increased this amount to capture parking activity over six different days. With the addition of traffic data collection, this also includes intersection turning movement counts at up to five (5) intersections in downtown with two daily traffic counts at two (2) locations. With each of these occurring on six different days, the costs for data collection alone are significant and based on the following assumptions:

- Turning movement counts capturing morning peak and afternoon peak conditions are in the range of \$600 per intersection, and daily traffic counts are approximately \$250 per location. With five intersections per day of collection (\$3,000 per day) and two daily traffic counts per day (\$500 per day), the total amount dedicated to data collection is estimated to be \$21,000 (\$3,500 per day over six separate days).
- Large special events may require different locations to be considered for traffic, especially if the City closes key streets or intersections during these events. This is not clear to us, and therefore we are unable to provide a specific set of locations.
- This leaves a fee estimate of \$6,500, or between 30 and 50 hours of staff time, to perform a succinct and focused analysis of this traffic data and expected impacts of new development. This will be oriented to understanding overall traffic operations and noting where critical challenges are needed. We do not have clear indication that this is the City's desired outcome from the traffic data collection task, but this is a conventional type of service (a traffic impact and operations analysis) that justifies the collection of data. Without this, it is not clear to us how data would be used, as traffic data and parking occupancy do not always follow parallel patterns.

It is important to note that the presence of State Route 13 adjacent to Flowery Branch's downtown core district means that any traffic analysis may require coordination with the Georgia Department of Transportation. We have assumed that our team will be asked to take on that coordination and this is reflected in the analysis portion of this item.

Item 3: This could include either participation at a downtown special event (using such approaches as a table or booth to display information and interact with participants) or a special public open house dedicated to the parking study. The fee amount includes staff time for participation, as well as preparation of display and information materials, and summary and documentation of the input received at the event. It does not include a survey.

Item 4: It is not known to our team the degree to which potential future development would provide additional parking, nor is it currently known whether additional parking will be needed. With these conditions in mind, this task would include suggested approaches for management of existing and

forthcoming development-related parking as well as potential locations for new parking *if our team determines that additional parking is needed*. This task will include presentation of the type of analysis we presented in the October 31 interview, wherein we compared observed parking levels in current conditions with the expected amount of parking that current land uses would be expected to generate. We will consider development inputs (from Item 1) as well as the observed parking activity (in Item 2) as a baseline for estimating future parking needs. Critically, though, this item will also speak to management-based approaches that ensure any new parking investments serve downtown to their best ability.

Item 5: This will include an assessment of current street sections and will build on the traffic analysis developed in the full-scope iteration of Item 2 to identify any potential challenges with circulation or parking accommodation. From our team's in-person observation of downtown, the current parking supply and traffic capacity on streets does not appear heavily used during typical daytimes, so this assessment will need to draw from findings in Item 2 to understand how this may vary in different conditions and periods of activity.

Item 6: This will be a high-level diagram of a recommended downtown street network configuration with conceptual illustrations of street cross-sections that would make up key downtown streets. It will include a downtown diagram map and up to five (5) different cross-sections.

Item 7: This will include up to three (3) virtual meetings with staff to discuss findings and gather feedback and direction from staff.

Item 8: We will use planning-level cost estimates for street-based enhancements and off-street parking enhancements and construction, as applicable. These will not include the full level of detail of a typical Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC), but will be drawn from the most current available information on material and item costs that factor into these OPCs.

Item 9: This will constitute a high-level review (3-4 hours of staff time) of available funding sources and general applicability. We will provide basic guidance on what constitutes competitiveness for any competitive funding sources.

Item 10: Parking management approaches will have been explored and largely articulated in other items; this item will include up to three (3) meetings with a City leadership team with a composition of its choosing (for instance, this may include elected officials, City executive management, or key City partners and stakeholders, as the City deems appropriate).

Item 11: This will include development of a presentation and one (1) presentation to the Flowery Branch City Council.

Cost Matrix of Optional Items

Item	Description	Fee Estimate
O-1	Large event planning guide for Flowery Branch (where to route traffic, implement temporary traffic changes, etc.)	\$15,000
O-2	Provide EV charger installment suggestions	\$2,500
O-3	Needs analysis for additional sidewalks and/or other pedestrian safety measures	\$5,000
TOTAL FEE FOR OPTIONAL ITEMS		\$22,500

Optional Items: Detail and Assumptions for Fee Proposal Amounts

Item O-1: It is unclear to our team what level of detail the City expects from an event management plan. These can be extensive, involving detailed road closure information, traffic control and signal timing plans, and detailed person-hour assessments and operational plans on how personnel should implement plans in real-time events. They may also take a more simple and high-level approach with basic guidance points. Based on our understanding of the potential scale of Flowery Branch’s largest events, this plan would reflect a level of detail somewhere between these two levels. It is expected to provide detailed route changes, street closure recommendations, and basic operational parameters for staging one smaller event and one larger event, to be determined by the City. It will also include coordination with the Georgia Department of Transportation for any event-based operations affecting sections of State Route 13 or its intersections, but our efforts will not include applying for or securing any permits from GDOT or receiving official approval.

Item O-2: As discussed in the October 31 interview, there are different levels of detail that this guidance could represent. This guidance will be high-level and provide best-practice information on potential changes to land development regulations and zoning ordinances, as well as best practice information on how to locate electric vehicle charging facilities in parking garages and lots. This will not include a detailed suggested map of locations, as numerous factors may make this map difficult or impractical to implement.

Item O-3: This is another item that could take on a high-level approach or take on significant detail to outline needs. The service proposed here would take a high-level approach (with between 25 and 35 consultant hours) to identify gaps and deficiencies in existing pedestrian infrastructure, including sidewalks, railroad crossings, intersection crossings, and traffic control oriented to pedestrians (such as pedestrian signals at intersections and flashing-beacon mid-block crossings). Based on the findings of other items, this item will recommend locations and potential design treatments to improve pedestrian safety, with planning-level cost estimates. This will not include a detailed review of safety data or collection of pedestrian counts.