



Request for Proposals: Market Feasibility and Economic Impact Study Report from Pre-Proposal Conference March 18, 2014

Question 1: The RFP noted that the proposed sports complex is in the southeastern quadrant of the property. Does it encompass all of Tracts VII, IX, and X? It didn't look like the Sports Plan Studio site plan covered that entire area.

Answer: Attachment 3 only encompasses Tracts VIII and IX. This is an initial concept that should not limit any future planning or development concepts. Tract X is also part of the Project Area and could be incorporated into any future development scenarios. Tract VII is already developed.

Question 2: Can you share which firms were on the RFP distribution list?

Answer: The City advertised broadly on its website and on Demand Star, an online bid posting service for business and government. In addition, the City sent targeted invitations to the following (in alphabetical order):

- Avalanche Consulting, Inc.
- Ballard King & Associates, LTD
- Canyon Research Southwest
- CSL International
- Development Strategies
- Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.
- Economic Stewardship
- GreenPlay, LLC
- Hoefer Wysocki
- HVS Convention, Sports, Entertainment, Consulting
- Impact Data Source
- JB Research
- Landplan Engineering
- Real Estate Research Consultants (RERC)
- Real Estate Solution Group (RES)
- Sports Advisory Group (SAG)
- Sports Facility Advisors
- Sports Plan Studio
- Stafford Sports

Question 3: The 6-8 week period to complete the study is reasonable, but is there a specific rationale driving this time frame?

Answer: No. Based on past experience and consultation with other municipalities that recently completed similar studies, the City and EDC determined this timeframe to be adequate for the anticipated scope of work. The City desires this process to move as quickly as possible but will consider schedule adjustments as needed.

Question 4: Will you share the estimated fee budget for the study?

Answer: The City has budgeted \$40,000 in 2014 for professional services to advance development in the Project Area. However, proposers should not be motivated or limited by this amount. The City is first and foremost interested in an honest representation of what scope and fee will best achieve the outcomes expressed in the RFP. Cost is only one criterion of the evaluation process. The City will negotiate a final scope and fee with the most qualified firm/team.

Question 5: On page 3 under D. Economic Impact b. i. “Consider spacing from tenants in neighboring retail centers...” Please explain the intent of the word “spacing.”

Answer: This refers to the distance of the Project Area from other retail centers in close proximity. The study should evaluate potential retail demand in the Project Area in the context of other retailers nearby that may absorb some of that demand. The study should also determine the net impact to existing retail taking into consideration any anticipated cannibalization.

Question 6: The RFP requests a “color visual rendering of the preferred development concept.” In order to do this correctly, an architect must be involved in the process to sketch out various alternative scenarios. However, this is the only reference to a site plan, design, or visual. Do you want an architect/planner involved in the study (which will drive up the cost considerably) or is this a market feasibility and economic impact analysis? Please clarify the exact nature of the “rendering” you would like: is it a drawing to go on the cover, is it a concept cartoon with functional area, or another type of “rendering?”

Answer: The City does not anticipate requiring the involvement of an architect at this stage of the process, though some planning/engineering services may be useful to evaluate development options. The visual rendering should be considered preliminary and along the same vein as Attachment 3: Sports Park Site Layout. The City desires a visual that can be used in presentations following the completion of the study to generate interest from developers or other potential funding partners for the project.

In addition, the RFP specifically encourages respondents to make suggestions to amend the scope of work to achieve the City’s goals. Part of the evaluation criteria includes the proposer’s understanding of the City’s objectives and ability to demonstrate a process that efficiently and effectively achieves the desired outcomes. Reasoned creativity is encouraged.