

## Questions and Answers – Central Mass Safe Streets for All Action Plan RFP

Posted 5/23/2025 11:30 a.m. EST

### Project Background and Grant Details

**Q1.** The RFP mentions that CMRPC was awarded a SS4A planning grant through U.S. DOT in October 2024. Does CMRPC have a signed grant agreement with FHWA/U.S. DOT for the Central Mass Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Regional Safety Action Plan? Section 6.14 Federal Terms and Assurances on page 24 references FY22 terms and conditions. Due to changes in federal DOT policy and priorities since the October 2024 award date, it would be helpful to understand the federal requirements and CMRPC commitments for the grant award.

**Answer:** The CMRPC has signed a grant agreement with FHWA/ U.S DOT for the Central Massachusetts Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Regional Safety Action Plan. Section 6.14 should be revised to reference FY 23 terms and conditions since the CMRPC SS4A grant was awarded in FY23. The terms and conditions can be found at the following link (<https://www.transportation.gov/grants/ss4a/grant-agreements>).

**Q2.** Please confirm the proposed schedule. Is it correct that the RSAP project time period is about 16 months – July 1, 2025 through November 1, 2026? The RFP notes contract completion by November 1, 2027 – is the additional 1 year period to allow for the final design and bidding of the demonstration project?

**Answer:** Yes, the timeline in the question is correct. The schedule is based on the grant agreement signed with FHWA and is as follows:

#### **Action Plan Schedule**

##### **Milestone Schedule Date**

1. NEPA Completion Date: Completed May 20, 2024, by Division Office
2. Planned Draft Plan Completion Date: February 1, 2026
3. Planned Final Plan Completion Date: May 1, 2026
4. Planned Final Plan Adoption Date: July 1, 2026
5. Planned SS4A Final Report Date: November 1, 2026

#### **Demonstration Activity Schedule**

##### **Milestone Schedule Date**

6. Planned NEPA Completion Date: August 1, 2025
7. Planned Construction Start Date November 1, 2025
8. Planned Evaluation Period End Date: November 1, 2026
9. Planned SS4A Final Report Date: November 1, 2027

**Q27.** Page 29, Task 6- Demonstration Project Can you provide a copy of the original SS4A grant application submitted by CMRPC?

**Answer:** Yes, the application materials are available here [Grant Application Documents](#)

## Scope of Work and Technical Tasks

**Q3.** The Scope of Work Section 7.5 Task 5: Policy and Process Changes & Strategy and Project Selections: Please clarify the consultant role on Page 29 by providing the intended text represented in the placeholders “XXXX”

**Answer:** The text represented by the placeholders “XXXX, XXXX” is the date of performance. The place holder date will be negotiated as part of the contract negotiation process.

**Q5.** Please clarify the level of design and NEPA support expected for the \$50,000 fee allocated to Task 6 for the demonstration project design and support.

**Answer:** The consultant must fulfill the requirements of NEPA by completing the NEPA checklist and preparing documents for submission to the lead agency. MassDOT has offered assistance with sections 7 and 106 of the checklist. It is anticipated that this project will qualify as a categorical exclusion under NEPA. Under Task 6 the \$50,000 budget for the demonstration project in this RFP is for the preliminary design, NEPA filing, final design, preparation of bid documents, post construction performance measurement and reporting. The construction of the demonstration project is funded through a separate portion of the grant and is not included in this RFP.

**Q6.** Can you please clarify the tasks and subtasks specific to the \$50K budget for the Pilot Demonstration Project?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 5.

**Q7.** Prior to "Consultant Role: Lead section" on Pg 30, items 1 and 4 ("Construction Bid Documents and Award" and "Demonstration Project Construction and Implementation") both indicate Contingent on Funding. Consultant Role: Lead Item 7. section on Pg 31 also indicates Final Design is contingent on funding. Can you please confirm whether the consultant scope of work for this project and the \$50,000 demonstration project budget does **not** include final design, bid documents, project construction, implementation, post-construction performance measurement and reporting?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 5 regarding the demonstration project budget. \$37,500 has been obligated by FHWA for preliminary design and NEPA filings and approval. Following NEPA approval an additional \$12,500 is expected to be obligated by FHWA will be available for the final design, preparation of bid documents and post construction performance measurement and report.

Separately, \$150,000 is expected to be obligated by FHWA for the construction phase of the demonstration project that will be put out as a separate bid.

**Q13.** Considering the demonstration project is funded with planning and demonstration dollars, would it be safe to assume the level of effort for activities outlined is reflected to that scale as opposed to a full implementation design?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 5.

**Q14.** What will the length of the demo project be?

**Answer:** The Demonstration project will take place on Beacon Street between Madison Street and Kilby Street in Worcester. The size and scale of the project will be determined by the analysis completed as part of the SS4A planning grant and the results of the stakeholder meetings facilitated by the City of Worcester. Currently there are no preferred treatments or specific locations along the corridor.

**Q15.** Page 29, Section 7.6 – Demonstration Project Limits Could you provide more detail on the physical limits of the demonstration project? For example, how many locations or intersections are included, and what is the approximate length or area of the project?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 14.

**Q28.** Page 29, Task 6 – Demonstration Project Will a survey of the demonstration area be provided?

**Answer:** Any existing data in the area of the demonstration project will be made available to the consultant. A land survey of the area will not be required.

**Q29.** Page 29. Task 6: Demonstration Project. Is there a schedule anticipated for the demonstration project?

**Answer:** Please refer to the answer to question 2.

**Q32.** In Section 7.6- Task 6 Demonstration Project/Overall description. Pg 29. Please clarify this sentence in the first paragraph, which is incomplete: “The consultant shall design prepare bid documents for the demonstration project for.”

**Answer:** The sentence was incomplete and should read “The consultant shall design and prepare bid documents for the demonstration project for the City of Worcester to issue for a competitive bid process.”

## Roles and Responsibilities

**Q9.** Given 40 communities in the region, how many VZAC meetings does CMRPC envision having the consultant attend? Will these be in person or virtual?

**Answer:** VZAC and stakeholder/public meeting logistics and the number of meetings for the consultant to attend will be part of contract negotiations. As described in the RFP, CMRPC staff will facilitate the monthly VZAC meetings and relay all pertinent information on the progress of the plan to the VZAC and other relevant boards such as the CMMPO. CMRPC staff will prepare materials for the VZAC meeting taking existing slides and other materials and repurpose them or generate new materials for the VZAC meetings. The VZAC meetings will be in a virtual format.

**Q10.** As part of Task 3: Stakeholder Public Engagement, how many VZAC anticipated meetings would be held, and how many do you think the Consultant will need to attend?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 9.

**Q11.** As part of Task 3: Stakeholder Public Engagement, can you clarify if you would need consultant support in preparing the individual slide deck materials for what would be presented at the VZAC meeting?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 9.

**Q12.** How many additional stakeholders or public meetings should the consultant plan to attend? Will these be in person or virtual?

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 9.

**Q22.** Are there intentions to have individual one-on-one meetings with each community to really understand local projects underway, such as any safety/multimodal improvements? If so, who would be the responsible party to have these meetings and understand what is happening so that it can be conveyed in Task 2: Existing Conditions Analysis/Safety Needs Assessment? We have found those to be super beneficial for the work we have with our Regional Plan.

**Answer:** Please refer to the response to question 9.

**Q21.** What is the overall public engagement strategy for this project to get the community/residents involved and not just the Stakeholders?

**Answer:** The CMRPC will utilize a range of public outreach and engagement strategies and tools to understand the diverse experiences of road users in the region. We will refer to the CMMPO's Public Participation Plan for guidance.

## Contracting and Fee Proposal Instructions

**Q4.** Please clarify the instructions for the Fee Proposal. Section 3.3 Proposal Submission on Page 10 references sending a hard copy in a sealed envelope. Section 8 Fee Proposal on Page 38 requests a fee proposal under separate cover in a separate PDF.

**Answer:** Please follow the instructions for Fee Proposal found in Section 3.3 Proposal Submission on Page 10. **Delete Section 8 Fee Proposal on Page 38 in its entirety.**

**Q8.** Performance Bond Requirements require the selected consultants to furnish a bond for the planning, stakeholder engagement, and design work. Given that the consultant scope of work does not include construction, would CMRPC be willing to waive this requirement for the selected firm?

**Answer:** No. As stated in Section 6.8 of the RFP, a performance bond in the full amount of the contract is required. The bond must be issued by a surety licensed to do business in Massachusetts and approved by CMRPC. This requirement applies to all services under the contract, including planning, engagement, and design. While we understand performance bonds are not typical for planning work, this contract includes multiple complex deliverables under a federally funded grant, and the performance bond is required to protect CMRPC against the risk of default or non-performance. The bond provides a financial guarantee that the selected consultant will complete the work as agreed, given the size, duration, and significance of the project.

**Q23.** Can CMRPC please confirm that it is acceptable to include proposed contract exceptions with the proposal?

**Answer:** Yes. CMRPC's sample contract is included in the RFP for reference. While proposers may submit suggested exceptions or edits, these will be reviewed at CMRPC's discretion and are not guaranteed to be accepted. As noted in Section 6.1, CMRPC will not accept a proposer's own contract document in place of the sample contract provided.

**Q24.** Can you share the list of consultants that requested the RFP?

**Answer:** No. In accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 30B and public records requirements, CMRPC does not release the list of firms who requested the RFP until after the contract has been awarded. After that point, the procurement file becomes a public record and can be shared.

**Q31.** Page 34 – Fee Proposal Requirements The RFP requests a complete rate schedule and pricing for staff. May we list staff by labor category (e.g., “Project Engineer,” “Planner”) rather than by individual name?

**Answer:** Yes. Proposers may submit staff rate schedules by labor category (e.g., “Project Manager,” “Planner,” etc.). While resumes of key personnel should be included in the technical proposal, the pricing may be categorized by role.

## RFP Edits and Clarifications

**Q16.** Can you clarify if it is expected that the Consultant will be responsible for the branding such as PowerPoint/Word Document and general materials?

**Answer:** The consultant will not be responsible for branding such as PowerPoint/ Word Documents. The CMRPC will develop materials such as a logo and other stationery.

**Q17.** As part of Task 2: Existing Conditions Analysis/Safety Needs Assessment, it is expected that a High Injury Network will be identified, which is typically based on the crash data. It is noted that through the analysis, the Consultant will identify Emphasis Areas/High Risk Corridors/Transit. Will these areas need to be mapped and/or would CMRPC prefer a table format?

**Answer:** Emphasis Areas/High Risk Corridors/Transit areas should be mapped. Any data developed as part of this task should be provided in a format that is compatible with ESRI products – e.g. shapefiles, geodatabase, csv, excel.

**Q18.** As part of Task 6: Demonstration Project, can you clarify who would be responsible for purchasing the materials for this demonstration project along Beacon Street?

**Answer:** The construction of the demonstration project, including materials and professional services, will be paid for through a separate portion of the CMRPC SS4A grant not reflected in this RFP.

**Q26.** Pages 26–28 – Missing Task 4 The sequence of tasks jumps from Task 3 to Task 5. Is Task 4 missing, or was it intentionally omitted? Please confirm and, if applicable, provide the full and corrected list of tasks.

**Answer:** The tasks are incorrectly numbered. The correct numbering of the tasks should be as follows.

- Task 1: Administrative & Leadership and Goal Setting
- Task 2: Existing Conditions Analysis/ Safety Needs Assessment
- Task 3: Stakeholder Public Engagement
- Task 4: Policy and Process Changes & Strategy and Project Selections
- Task 5: Demonstration Project
- Task 6: Final Plan

Proposals will not be penalized for incorrect numbering of tasks.

**Q30.** Pages 29–30, Section 7.6 – Task 6: Demonstration Project – Role Clarification The City of Worcester’s responsibilities are listed as tasks 1–3, followed by a second list starting again at task 1 (Construction Bid Documents and Award), then jumping to task 4. Meanwhile, the Consultant Role begins at task 2 (Baseline Measurement). Could you please clarify the correct task number and responsibilities for each party?

**Answer:** The tasks in section 7.6 Task 6: Demonstration Project (Task 5: Demonstration project and noted in a question and answer above) should be numbered as follows:

City of Worcester Role: Supportive and Oversight

1. Initial Visioning Session
2. Public outreach
3. Demonstration Project Public Information Session
4. Construction Bid Document and Award
5. Demonstration Project Construction and Implementation

Consultant Role: Lead

1. Baseline Measurement
2. Initial Vision Session
3. Preliminary Design
4. Public Outreach
5. NEPA Approval
6. Final Design
7. Construction bid documents and award
8. Demonstration Project Construction and Implementation
9. Demonstration Project Performance Measurement and Reporting
10. Demonstration Project Public Information Session
11. Lessons Learned

Proposals will not be penalized for incorrect numbering.

**Q25.** Page 27, Section 7.3, Task 2 – Consultant Role The list under “Through the analysis the consultant will identify” includes item #2 and #3 both labeled as “High Risk Corridors.” Should item #3 instead refer to “High Risk Intersections” or another distinct category? Please clarify or correct.

**Answer:** Correct Item #3 in section 7.3 Task 2 should be “High risk Intersections (with the highest fatal and severe injury crashes)”

Data, Deliverables and GIS

**Q19.** As part of Task 2: Existing Conditions Analysis/Safety Needs Assessment, is there a preferred number of locations per each community?

**Answer:** There is no preferred number or minimum number of locations per community expected. CMRPC staff would prefer to see a spread of locations identified across the region representing different factors such as urban/rural, crash type/severity, demographic spread.

**Q20.** Since the City of Worcester and the Town of Southbridge have their own safety action plans, can they provide the analysis and GIS files associated with those plans?

**Answer:** The CMRPC is working closely with the City of Worcester as part of this project and the demonstration effort. We will request that the Town of Southbridge and the City of Worcester share any pertinent information.