
**Capitol Region Transit Priority Corridors Implementation Strategy
Request for Qualifications
Addendum #1
May 29, 2020**

Submission Protocol Update

Physical submissions (including USB drives) in response to this RFQ will NOT be accepted. The RFQ document has been updated as follows to reflect this change:

Given that current work efforts are predominately being conducted in out-of-office settings, only electronic submissions are being accepted in response to this RFQ. Submissions should be prepared as a single PDF and may be transmitted to Ms. Cara Radzins at cradzins@crcog.org. **No physical submissions (USB drives, paper hardcopies, etc.) will be accepted.** Submissions should be marked in the email subject line with “*RFQ Response: Transit Priority Corridors Implementation Strategy*”.

Statements of Qualifications must be submitted no later than **3:00pm on June 17, 2020**. **Statements received after that time or day will not be considered.** Arrangements for transmission of large files should be made in advance, using the contact information above, as technical difficulties in sending or receiving a submission shall not be a valid reason for missing the deadline.

Questions and Answers

The following is a list of questions received related to the Request for Qualifications for the Capitol Region Transit Priority Corridors Implementation Strategy. The deadline for submitting questions was 3:00pm on May 27, 2020. Responses from CRCOG are noted in red.

On page 1 of the RFP it says that “It is expected that the prime Consultant will be prequalified by CTDOT for Modal Transportation Planning Studies.” However, Modal Transportation Planning Studies does not appear to be a CTDOT qualification category for 2020, and there doesn’t seem to be a comparable category. Will CRCOG consider removing this prequalification requirement?

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. You are correct that CTDOT determined that Modal Transportation Planning Studies do not necessitate prequalification for 2020. As such, CRCOG has removed this requirement, and the RFQ document has been updated to reflect this change.

Please confirm that a price proposal is not required with this submittal.

Correct. Price proposals should NOT be provided. Any submitted price proposals will NOT be considered, as selection for this effort will follow a qualifications-based process.

Please confirm that this submittal requires SF330 Part II forms, but not SF330 Part I forms.

Correct.

Capitol Region Transit Priority Corridors Implementation Strategy: Request for Qualifications Addendum #1

Please confirm that exhibits B and C are required from the prime firm only.

Correct.

Could CRCOG provide a sample contract agreement?

CRCOG will not supply sample contract agreements.

Will there be an interview stage of the procurement, and, if so, do you have a timeframe in mind for interviews?

As noted in the RFQ, “Respondents who submit a response to this RFQ may be required to give an oral presentation to CRCOG... Oral presentations are an option of CRCOG and may or may not be conducted. Such presentations may be conducted either in person or remotely utilizing Zoom, WebEx, or other such service in the event that in-person meetings are not a feasible option at the time oral presentations are being scheduled.” If CRCOG chooses to proceed with interviews, it is anticipated that they would be scheduled in late July or August 2020.

Does CRCOG have a preference for the type(s) of public survey(s) to be developed in Task 2D? Are we correct in assuming that when the RFQ says surveys should reach “as many individuals as possible” you intend that the surveys include both current transit users and non-users?

CRCOG does not have a predetermined expectation for the type(s) of public survey(s) to be developed in Task 2D. We will be looking for the Consultant to make recommendations for the most appropriate and effective surveying methodologies. The target audience will be both current transit users and non-users.

Some of the possible capital improvements listed under Task 4C, such as bus-only lanes, have historically been problematic for some towns in the capitol region. Will the municipal coordination in Task 2F determine the willingness of the various towns, and possibly the State of Connecticut, to accept any or all of these possible improvements?

The purpose of the coordination with municipal officials, CTDOT, and other stakeholders is to ensure that recommendations from this effort are agreeable to the entities with decision-making authority. It is not expected that all of the capital improvements identified as considerations in Task 4C will be appropriate or preferable in every corridor.

Given the interest in bus stop configurations and amenities, what is the status of the regional bus shelter program that envisioned shelter advertising revenue to support maintenance and construction of additional shelters in and around Hartford?

Construction on the first phase of the regional bus shelter program has been completed. At this time, the advertising-supported maintenance program has not been initiated. A second phase of shelter construction is on hold due to funding challenges.

What is the current status of automatic passenger counters (APCs) on CTtransit buses in the Hartford Division? Are all buses equipped with APC technology? If not, approximately what percentage of buses have APCs?

All CTtransit buses in the Hartford Division are equipped with automatic passenger counters (APCs).

Capitol Region Transit Priority Corridors Implementation Strategy: Request for Qualifications Addendum #1

What ridership data is already available to support the review of transit priority corridors in Task 3B? To what extent does CRCOG expect the consultant to collect additional data for this task?

Ridership data – collected by automatic passenger counters (APCs) – will be supplied by *CTtransit*. The consultant will not be expected to collect additional ridership data.

Given the interest in bus stop consolidation in high density arterial corridors, what analyses have already been performed by CRCOG staff or *CTtransit* regarding average boardings and alightings by time of day and by bus stop location? What access to AVL data collected by *CTtransit* will the consultant be given?

CTtransit has done some of this type of analysis on an as-requested basis. While relevant findings will be made available, this level of analysis has not been performed for most of the corridor areas. Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) data from *CTtransit* will be made available to the Consultant for the purposes of performing such analyses.

The CSA devoted considerable attention to the Bradley Flyer and improving other services to access Bradley International Airport. Are we correct that CRCOG does not intend BDL service to be part of this study?

While access to Bradley International Airport is an important transit connection within the Capitol Region, the purpose of this effort is a focus on high-ridership corridors. However, as noted in the RFQ, at the onset of the study “the Consultant will review, analyze, and map current ridership trends to assess whether... additional corridors merit consideration as part of this effort.” While it is not anticipated that a corridor to Bradley International Airport will be identified during this ridership evaluation, it is not inconceivable.

Did CRCOG conduct Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts in 2018 and 2019? If so, will the results be made available to the consultant team?

Yes, CRCOG conducted Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts in 2018 and 2019. Entry of this data into CRCOG’s databases is in the process of being finalized. Results will be made available to the Consultant.

Are there any definite plans for separated bike facilities/cycle tracks along any of the identified transit priority corridors yet?

The [City of Hartford’s Bicycle Plan](#) recommends separated bicycle lanes on Main Street, buffered bicycle lanes on a segment of Farmington Avenue, standard bicycle lanes on Franklin Avenue, and standard bicycle lanes on Park Street west of Pope Park Highway. No bicycle facilities are proposed for Albany Avenue or Park Street east of Pope Park Highway. While Albany Avenue would be a desirable location for bicycle lanes, the ongoing construction project precludes that. Currently, the City has design projects underway for Main Street (Asylum Avenue to Wyllys Street and Earle Street north to the Windsor border) and Franklin Avenue (Maple Avenue to Annawan Street) that may include separated bicycle lanes. In East Hartford, there are existing standard bicycle lanes on Burnside Avenue.