

RFQ # 15-25 Consulting Services, 2024 Master Plan Evaluation and Update
Addendum 1
October 18, 2024

There were a number of questions about costs. Where costs are provided, please provide the range of costs for each option illustrated.

1. Can you elaborate on your expectations for data visualization? Are you seeking recommendations for technological applications for the City to implement?
We are looking for an innovative approach to understand potential zoning (and other) changes. This is meant as an enhancement to our GIS and 3d modelling with the possibility of real time zoning analysis, at least in the downtown. The City is open to other recommendations or other technological applications.
2. Do you expect engagement to take place in person, virtually, or a combination?
We expect/encourage the majority of the engagement to be in person but also are looking for alternative methods of engagement to reach as many people as possible.
3. Can you confirm that no budget or fee schedule is to be included with the response?
A budget is not required as this is an effort by the City to determine qualifications. An order of magnitude on costs would be helpful but is not required.
4. Who was hired to complete the previous Master Plan? *NBBJ, Nelson Nygaard & Nitsch Engineering*
5. Does the City have preference for a local or in-state vendor?
No
6. In reference to section **2.h**:
“Evaluate whether to expand the existing form-based or character-based section of the zoning ordinance from the core of the downtown to other areas of the City, or ii. Edit and simplify existing code.”
Is this scope item intended to be either/or? If option ii, does this apply to the form/character-based portions of the code specifically?
Yes it is intended to be an analysis of the existing form based and character based zoning. We would be open to recommendations for streamlining or simplifying all parts of the ordinance.
7. In reference to section **4.a.ii**:
“Incorporate a GIS model as a tool to be used in future planning efforts.”
Is this the development of a whole new tool for continual City use in future decision making for sustainability, or is this referring to the use of existing GIS data specifically to inform sustainability planning decisions as part of this planning process only?

Ideally a new tool for City use but please explain/explore options as you see them. This question assumes an evaluation of what we have that may be enhanced/upgraded and/or a new tool to assist with future planning efforts.

8. In reference to section **4.a.iii:**

“Take information from the City’s current GIS and add information about land uses at the property level.”

Does this require plot by plot data generation, entry, and/or modifications to the City GIS data, or simply merging existing data sets?

It will require data generation to incorporate existing land use into the parcel dataset.

9. In reference to section **4.a.iv:**

“Improve zoning models”

What is meant by zoning models? Recommendations for sustainable development guidance in the zoning?

This is intended to better understand (model) existing zoning and allow for visualization of changes.

10. In reference to section **4.b.i:**

“The City is looking for advanced, cutting-edge digital technology and visioning”

Are there specific technologies or platforms that the City prefers to work with?

We would prefer use of existing software such as ESRI compatible software and as appropriate with the MapGeo & OpenGov applications. However, we are open to other applications.

11. In reference to section **4.b.ii:**

“Creative 3d visioning models that improve upon what the City has on its website.”

Is this the creation of a citywide 3D digital model? Or visualizations for select neighborhoods/areas in the service of the comprehensive plan?

This is your opportunity to show us what is possible beyond the existing model located at: [Plan Portsmouth 3D Model \(cityofportsmouth.com\)](http://cityofportsmouth.com). Ideally, a City-wide model that will help to understand and visualize implications of zoning changes or major City infrastructure improvements and developments.

12. In reference to section **4.b.iii:**

“Smart maps”

Is this the implementation of an interactive mapping software platform such as ArcGIS Online StoryMaps or a dashboard? Is this envisioned as a tool for engagement during the process or communicating recommendations of the plan?

Again, this is your opportunity to show what is possible from a data visualization standpoint both with public outreach and with ongoing and future planning efforts.

13. In reference to section **5.a.i.4:**

“Outreach and communications”

What is the extent of outreach and City support on this?

The plan succeeds or fails based on the quality of the public outreach. We expect a robust outreach effort that will inform the entire population as well as business and visitors to Portsmouth. Particular focus should be placed on youth and DEI populations. Staff will be engaged at each level but the outreach should be led by the consultant.

14. Does the 10 page limit apply only to the Letter of Interest including qualifications and experience?

Ten pages is the limit for submission excluding key staff resumes.

15. Should the scoping and cost proposal assume that the consultant budget will be \$250,000 (minus \$10,000 for RPC)? Or should the response include optional additional scope if the budget is increased to \$400,000?

We will not know the full amount until the CIP process is complete. See statement above about range of options and costs. The most useful approach will show itemization of costs for each task or area of work. We would work in tandem with the selected team to understand costs and implications which will inform where to allocate City resources for each component of the plan. Again, this is a qualifications request, so an order of magnitude is appropriate for this response.

Proposers are to acknowledge this addendum within their proposal. Failure to do so may subject a proposer to disqualification.

End of Addendum 1