

List of questions and responses for the RFP for the Fairfax Route 104 Gateway Enhancement Study

1. Has there been any additional discussion with regard to the Pedestrian Connectivity Study and what, if any, of the recommendations will be implemented?

One of the recommendations was to investigate traffic calming measures. This study is the next step towards implementing and integrating those recommendations.

2. Is the town seeking other funding sources to implement the priorities outlined in the pedestrian connectivity study at this time?

This is the first step for the Town in exploring streetscaping and traffic calming improvements. The results of this study will help to determine the direction the Town will go in future funding requests.

3. What is your team seeking in a consultant? Skills or process driven?

The consultant team needs to be able to deliver the products requested and carry out all of the necessary tasks to be able to make this process successful. Technical skills will be paramount; but the ability to lead community input events will also be required.

4. Has the town been working with a consultant previously on this project and if so, is there any reason to believe the town wouldn't want to continue that relationship? Is the town putting out this request primarily to meet funding requirements?

The Town has not previously procured a consultant to provide recommendations for streetscaping and traffic calming.

5. We are landscape architects with extensive experience working on transportation related projects. Is it your expectation that a transportation engineer would be on the team as well?

We would expect proposals that are backed by technical knowledge of costs, efficacy, legal issues, and construction challenges.

6. Can you be more specific on the final products desired? For example, the RFP requests the consultant to explore "options for enhancing street and building design" - is the Town anticipating the need for an architect? Also, there is a reference to "landscape improvement projects". Where would these be - beyond the gateway areas or part of the gateway areas?

The project is currently defined as gateways to the two villages and can be further defined once the project is underway. The final product would include conceptual alternatives of the preferred designs and cost estimates of the improvements proposed. All graphics created as a part of the project would also be provided to the Town for future use in an image or pdf format.

7. Has there been a corridor study that addresses some of these issues or any other recent or relevant study for the Town beyond what is listed in the RFP? Have any previous consultants developed concepts for gateways or wayfinding for the Town?

There was a 2005 VT 104/104A Corridor Study completed however it only provided general corridor information and did not suggest specific improvements for gateways or wayfinding. We have had many studies including "non-motorized transportation study". The studies are available at the Fairfax Town Office – Zoning Office.

8. For the Conceptual Alternatives (Task C), can you clarify the geographic area that you envision being covered in graphic plans?

The conceptual alternatives should cover each village gateway as well as corridor within the village as needed to show proposed improvements such as lighting, landscaping or additional infrastructure. We hope the study will help us to determine the most effective part of town to create the gateways.

9. Do you anticipate that the plans would incorporate any recommendations from previous studies (e.g.. pedestrian and bike infrastructure)? If so, is there a specific study among those referenced that we would primarily rely on? Is it available for review?

The 2015 pedestrian Connectivity Study provided a preferred alternative for developing bike and pedestrian improvements between the two village areas. The infrastructure proposed in this study should be considered when conducting the project. The plan is available at the Fairfax Town Office – Zoning Office.

10. Does the Town anticipate that all improvements and focus for the work would be within the ROW or on town owned property? Implementing gateway elements outside of the ROW, particularly if it not very wide, can be a challenge with private property owners.

This discussion has not taken place to date. The Town would expect this topic to be initiated by the consultant team based on land area needed to make improvements.

11. Is your expectation that the scope of work would include designs for welcome signs/banners, vehicular wayfinding signs or pedestrian wayfinding signs? Please clarify the wayfinding component.

If such signs are recommended, we would expect general descriptions of the signs, but designs will not be required. The wayfinding component is secondary to the primary focus on traffic calming.

12. Do you anticipate that the scope of work would include photo-realistic visual simulations of proposed improvements? If so, how many vantage points would you anticipate?

Visualizations of the proposed improvements would be beneficial for continued use by the Town in obtaining public support for proposed alternatives. We request that the consultant propose what they think is most appropriate for the project.