



CITY of BEAVERTON

4755 S.W. Griffith Drive, P.O. Box 4755, Beaverton, OR 97076 General Information (503) 526-2222 V/TDD

RFP QUESTIONS (FAQ's)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS AND ECONOMIC FACTORS ANALYSIS

Solicitation #: 2368-10B

1. To obtain a better understanding of reasons for the relatively short April 5 preliminary draft deadline, how much revision / filling in gaps do you see as possible between the draft and the final deliverables (by May 31)? We are in a tight schedule for a larger work product, the Civic Plan. We need the data in the near term to begin to understand what type of policy strategies we need to consider. It is expected that revisions will be made between the 2 dates.
2. Item 2.2.1 of Services to Be Provided seems to indicate that information would be on a City-wide basis. Should this be to current City limits, or is there a defined UGB + adjoining expansion/urban reserve areas for which data should be compiled? Is there any need to provide data on a sub-city basis as well? Current city limits is the highest priority. However, if the information is readily available for surrounding areas, a broader look would be useful. The only sub area we are keenly interested in is the central core area.
3. With regard to the 2.2.4.4 Inventory of Suitable Sites, does the City of Beaverton have an existing inventory or GIS data set to be used? Or should the first cut involve review of Metro industrial/commercial inventory data as applicable to Beaverton? We prefer the use of any data that is City of Beaverton specific. Existing City data (Urban Renewal Feasibility Study, Leland Report, etc) can and should be utilized as much as possible.
4. The residual value analysis identified for 2.2.4.4 could require engineering-level, site specific analysis and cost estimating. Does the City have information available for major sites of interest? If not, could this be a subsequent work task or supplemental services item after completion of the initial site inventory? It is likely that the City will have information available for major sites of interest. We are not interested in engineering-level, site specific analysis and cost estimating for these analyses. We are interested in obtaining very broad information about the major sites of interest. Examples would include: access issues, parcelization, floodplain/ other major environmental constraints.
5. The RFP identifies five deliverables (including a fifth which appears to be a compilation of deliverables 1-4). Given the accelerated time line, can the deliverables be rolled together into one composite report (together with an executive summary)? Or do you need separate stand-alone work products as well? A compiled report is fine.
6. Is there an estimate of cost (or range of cost) that the City has budgeted for this project? We have deliberately not specified a project budget as we did not wish to limit respondent creativity or quality of a response by assigning an arbitrary funding limit. We would encourage respondents to consider what needs to be done to provide the best solution to our situation possible rather than the least expensive. Phasing of a total project with costs identified for each phase would be considered an acceptable approach to accomplish this. Overall cost will be a selection criteria, but end product quality and the implementation methodology will weigh more heavily (see Section 4.2.5 Additional Services of the RFP).