



## NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization  
(MetroPlan)

Issued:

5/30/2025

Submittals Due:

7/16/2025 12:00 Noon Local Time

## Table of Contents

Public Notice .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Background .....	4
Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant .....	4
Statement of Work .....	4
Minimum Requirements .....	15
Project Timeline .....	15
RFP Format.....	15
Evaluation Criteria.....	16
Attachments.....	19

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**Safe Streets Master Plan**

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization d/b/a MetroPlan ("MetroPlan") invites qualified respondents to respond to the Request for Proposals (RFP) to prepare a Safe Streets Master Plan on behalf of MetroPlan in partnership with the City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line, and Coconino County. MetroPlan received a Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) supplemental action plan grant from the Federal Highways Administration. The City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line and Coconino County are providing match funds for the grant. SS4A funds are Federal Highway Administration funds and require compliance with all applicable Federal rules. The overall project objective is to produce a transportation system plan that incorporates safe systems approaches into its planning, capital programming, project design process, and guides the implementation of explicit safety projects within the MetroPlan Regional Transportation Safety Plan and related safety documents.

The term of the resulting master contract will be for a four (4) year period with one additional one (1) year period with project task orders delivered on individual timelines.

**Response to Request for Proposals will be received until July 16, 2025, at 1200 noon local time, via email at [planning@metroplanflg.org](mailto:planning@metroplanflg.org)**

**Announcement of Received Proposals will be made July 16, 2025 at 12:00 local time on a Teams meeting at:**

**Meeting ID: 228 015 005 412 5**

**Passcode: eY2qF9xj**

Any proposal received after 12:00 pm local time on the above-stated date will be rejected. Submittals must conform to the prepared Scope of Work within the RFP available at [www.metroplanflg.org](http://www.metroplanflg.org) or by request made to MetroPlan at [planning@metroplanflg.org](mailto:planning@metroplanflg.org)

The proposal email subject shall be in the following format: "RFP Safe Streets Master Plan COMPANY NAME." Within the email, attach the proposal as a PDF document and indicate the name and address of the respondent.

*Tami Suchowiejko*

Tami Suchowiejko, Business Manager

## INTRODUCTION

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization (“MetroPlan”) is the federally designated regional metropolitan planning organization for the City of Flagstaff and portions of Coconino County. MetroPlan has been in existence since 1996. MetroPlan became a non-profit corporation in 2019 and became an independent organization July 1, 2020. The MetroPlan region has a population of about 100,000 people, nearly one-quarter of whom are students at Northern Arizona University (NAU). NAU, the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County and the Flagstaff Unified School District are major employers. Large private and non-profit employers include W.L. Gore, Nestle-Purina, and Northern Arizona Healthcare. Flagstaff is in close proximity to the Grand Canyon, national monuments and cultural attractions. It is also a mountainous region 5,000 feet above and 20-30 degrees cooler than Phoenix. As such, tourism is an important economic sector. The region is served by two interstates, several state highways, and the BNSF transcontinental railroad upon which Amtrak’s Southwest Chief operates. Mountain Line, the regional transit authority, operates an award-winning system.

MetroPlan received a SS4A supplemental safety action plan grant from the Federal Highways Administration. The Safe Streets Master Plan will supplement the Vulnerable Road Users Safety Action Plan, a 2022 SS4A grant, that will combine its focus on vulnerable users with pre-existing safety plans in the region. The City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line, and Coconino County are providing matching funds for the grant. SS4A funds are Federal Highway Administration funds and require compliance with all applicable Federal rules.

## BACKGROUND

MetroPlan is partnering with the City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line, and Coconino County to provide comprehensive guidance on transportation safety intended to reduce fatal and severe injury crashes. This will be achieved by development of a multimodal transportation master plan that is supported by Complete Street Guidelines, communicated by an interactive map tool, and implemented by revisions to local policy, codes and standards.

## SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL GRANT

In 2024, MetroPlan was awarded a Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) supplemental planning grant for \$2,140,000 in federal funds. The City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line, and Coconino County are providing the 5.7% local match (\$535,000) for the grant, bringing the total amount grant award to \$2,675,000. Approximately \$236,000 of that match will be in-kind contributions. Approximately \$400,000 of the grant funds are programmed for local agency staff salary and benefits. A 15% contingency will be held back from the total contract price.

## STATEMENT OF WORK

### **Objectives and components**

MetroPlan, the City of Flagstaff, Mountain Line, and Coconino County (Partners) have partnered to procure a Transportation Master Plan (Plan) to provide clear direction for implementing the City and County Regional Plan (RP) and MetroPlan Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policies. Of particular

importance are policies pertaining to transportation, safety, housing affordability, climate, and accessibility. In recent years, the City declared a climate emergency and housing emergency. That clear direction will, in part, be established through the development of Complete Street Guidelines and transportation-related Code Revisions as part of this endeavor.

The Plan, including the components herein, will be recognized as a centralized and primary source for transportation decision making for City Streets and advisory for County and ADOT roads. Attaining that status will require important investment and broad commitment to resolving policy conflicts and tensions and achieving a unified vision across policy arenas. The Plan will equip local practitioners to effectively improve transportation safety and monitor progress in reducing fatal and serious injuries. It will include monitoring protocols for evaluation of safety performance at the system and project level. The Plan will enable readers to establish a clear understanding of how the Regional Plan transportation policies are to be implemented, what they are intended to achieve, and how they will look when they are complete. With its public process, legislative adoption, and supportive data and analysis the Plan will make the development review process more legally defensible, transparent, predictable, and efficient. It will decrease time periods dedicated to analysis and negotiation and make cost-sharing conclusions easier to reach. The Plan will assist in financial planning and budgeting and include a strong implementation component. The Plan will provide guidance to capital improvement program prioritization and identify near and long-range funding strategies for implementation of projects. It will provide interim or evolutionary solutions useful to achieve system continuity for various modes through phased investment over time. The Plan will address system maintenance costs and funding needs for maintenance and capital.

## **Scope and Deliverables**

The Scope and Deliverables outlined below – the Project Task Orders are generally related to the outline headings - are what MetroPlan and partners believe will result in a superlative Transportation Master Plan and related documents. Consultants are expected to respond to the deliverables in their proposal and are encouraged to offer alternative approaches.

### **1. Adoption Process and Plan Relationships**

Prior to initiating technical work, clear legal and process relationships will be documented between the Master Plan, its component pieces, and the City/County Regional Plan, and supporting documents such as the City Active Transportation Master Plan, Mountain Line's 5-Year Transit Plan, and MetroPlan's Regional Transportation Plan and Vulnerable Road Users Safety Action Plan. The interrelationships will address compliance with ARS, City Charter, and USC/CFR for each document, the relevant needs of respective partners, the process by which each is updated, the influence of those updates on each, and the requisite need and process for amendments to each.

Deliverables:

- Working Paper: Adoption Process and Plan Relationships

### **2. Project Management**

**2.1. Project Management Plan.** Prepare a plan addressing communications, quality control and related matters.

**2.2. Public Participation.** A Public Participation Plan (PPP) will be created by the Consultant using the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) spectrum “Involve” as a framework. The draft PPP will outline public outreach objectives and strategies aligned with key project milestones and meet requirements for identified adoption processes.

**2.2.1.** The Consultant will prepare a summary report of public participation results from the most recently adopted Regional Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, Active Transportation Master Plan, and 5-Year Transit Plan. This report will serve as a starting point for public participation input. It is noted that MetroPlan staff made a similar effort for the on-going Vulnerable Road Users Safety Action Plan.

**2.2.2.** All PPP inputs will be compliant with ASRS Title 9 (Cities – Specific Plan) and City of Flagstaff Codes.

**2.3. Work Breakdown Structure.** Prior to initiating technical work, the Consultant, in cooperation with the Project Managers, will prepare a work breakdown structure to guide production, deliverables and responsibilities – including those for key agency staff - over the duration of the project. The Project Oversight Committee will be consulted on the work breakdown structure especially as it pertains to success indicators, required support or interim approvals from client and stakeholder agencies.

**2.4. ADOT Highway Planning Strategy.** A facilitated discussion will take place early in the process between relevant parties to determine the best approach for planning facilities within, along and across ADOT jurisdictional highways.

**Deliverables:**

- Work Breakdown Structure
- Quality Assurance and Control Plan
- Communications Plan
  - Minimum:
    - Kick-off meeting
    - Weekly email updates to Project Managers
    - Provide monthly written report to Project Managers that includes tracking of tasks, deliverables, time, and budget expenditures to date, monthly invoice, and list of activities planned for coming month.
    - Quarterly presentations to Project Oversight and MetroPlan TAC
    - Biannual presentations to MetroPlan Board and City Council
    - Periodic presentations to the County Board of Supervisors and Mountain Line Board of Directors as needed.
- Conflict Resolution/Escalation Strategy
- ADOT Highways Planning Strategy
- Public Participation Plan – meeting IAP2 Spectrum level “Involve”
- Community Engagement materials and events
- Public Participation Final report – Public Participation Results

### **3. Complete Streets Guidelines (Guidelines)**

A key deliverable of this project will be a comprehensive set of Complete Street Guidelines. The Guidelines are intended to create a universal understanding of expectations for transportation

network development in the region. The Guidelines will be developed within the Smart Growth America Complete Streets Policy Framework. Attention should be paid not only to the context of corridors throughout the City and County but how facilities for all modes maintain continuity across variable contexts.

**3.1 Internal Consistency and Continuity Towards Implementation.** The Guidelines will serve as the building blocks of the Master Plan and foundation for Code and Policy Revisions. Therefore, consistency and compatibility between each of these components is critical to foster clear expectations for transportation network development, the appearance and operation of roads and streets, and project construction. Reiteration between components is expected.

**3.2 Vision, Goals and Objectives.** Using the draft Regional Plan 2045 as basis and beginning point and taking input from stakeholders and the public draft a robust transportation vision, goals and objectives.

**3.3 Detailed Graphics and Cross Sections.** Using detailed graphics, cross sections with dimensions, and other means, the Guidelines will be the primary basis for decision-making for transportation facilities (existing and future). The considerations here include jurisdiction, roadway ownership, land use contexts along corridors from rural to urban, modal priorities, accessibility, emergency services, operations and maintenance, contextual aesthetic standards, and the tools and strategies to succeed in various contexts.

**3.4 Context Sensitivity and Layered Networks.** The Guidelines will reference appropriate system responses to area types, functional classification, and the needs of various modes and functions. This includes emergency response, freight, transit, automobiles, cyclists, pedestrians, micromobility devices, and more. Continuity and connectedness of multimodal facilities should be emphasized. Use of layered networks to achieve system completeness is allowable and may be appropriate within some land use contexts. The Guidelines' land use context descriptions should complement descriptions and mapping of:

**3.4.1** Regional Land Plan land uses

**3.4.2** Current and Future Zoning

**3.5 Quality and Operational Efficacy Metrics.** The Guidelines will articulate a set of context-sensitive metrics and targets to measure infrastructure quality and operational efficacy for modes previously described. The consultant will provide recommendations based on industry best practice and local ability to monitor and maintain. The consultant should begin with evaluation of metrics in current use by each Partner including an evaluation of the use of vehicular Level of Service. Measures must include greenhouse gas emissions.

**3.6 Connectivity Expectations.** The Guidelines will provide minimum and desired connectivity requirements for the modes described. Tools and strategies to increase or improve connectivity within developed areas will also be included.

**3.7 Informed Facility Enhancement Features.** The Guidelines will provide best practice guidance and minimum standards on the inclusion of pedestrian, bicycle and transit facility enhancements, especially those related to the safety of vulnerable users. Such enhancement may include, but are not limited to:

**3.7.1** Pedestrian/Bicycle:

**3.7.1.1** Green paint

**3.7.1.2** Leading pedestrian intervals

**3.7.1.3** Bike-specific signals

**3.7.1.4** Crosswalks - including bid-block crossings, enhancements like refuges, and signals and beacons

**3.7.1.5** Accessibility improvements

**3.7.1.6** Traffic calming features

**3.7.2** Transit:

**3.7.2.1** Bus pullouts

**3.7.2.2** Bus stops

**3.7.2.3** Bus stop amenities

**3.8 Network Segment and Intersection Considerations.** The Guidelines will address both corridors and intersections, providing appropriate treatments for various functional classes, land use contexts, and modal priorities, and the interactions between them including connectivity, signal spacing, and other aspects of access management. Intersection Guidance will address intersection spacing, signal spacing, and access management.

**3.8.1** Intersection Guidance will provide thoughtful guidance for safety-oriented intersection design that addresses crash trends, best safety practices, creates separation in space and time between modes, and maintains acceptable service levels across modes.

**3.8.2** Intersection Guidance will recommend context-sensitive and alternative intersection designs that account for functional class, adjacent land uses and density, surrounding network density, multimodal activity, safety needs, and aesthetic desires set by City policy.

**3.8.3** Intersection Guidance will be completed for multiple combinations of arterials, collectors, and interchange ramps in different contexts identified in the Guidelines.

**3.8.4** Intersection Design will be informed by national research, regional crash trend analysis, and consider the latest technology.

**3.8.5** Intersection Guidance should be scalable based on traffic volumes and turn movements and offer flexibility in relation to fiscal and spatial constraints.

**3.9 Guidance on Adaptability, Phasing and Flexibility.** The Guidelines will illustrate and describe the ‘ideal’ condition for a given context and provide priorities, tools and strategies for adapting the ideal to accommodate physical constraints. The Guidelines will provide implementation phasing strategies and design flexibility, which should include scaled options for relevant travel modes, to meet system continuity expectations when facing fiscal and spatial constraints or incongruities with adjacent facilities.

Deliverables:

- Complete Street Guidelines
  - Working Outline and Format
  - Transportation Vision, Goals, and Objectives – Draft 1
  - Working Draft 1
  - Working Draft 2
  - Final



#### **4. The Transportation Master Plan**

The Master Plan will map out the regional transportation system for all modes. For any given facility it will identify the applicable Complete Street guidance and expected adaptations for that location. The Plan will supplement the end product of the MetroPlan Vulnerable Road Users Safety Action Plan (VRUSAP) which near its completion will unify multiple safety plans including the Regional Transportation Safety Plan, the Active Transportation Master Plan, and VRUSAP. Additionally, the Plan is expected to draw heavily on ADOT's State Highway Safety Plan, Vulnerable Road Users Safety Plan and Active Transportation Safety Action Plan. Implementation of these safety plans more so than new analyses, is expected. Continuity, safety and connectedness of multimodal facilities should be at the forefront of this work. A desired outcome is to create clearer expectations of the respective public agencies and private developer responsibilities for any given area across the Region.

**4.1. Specific Plan Compliant.** The Master Plan will be developed in a way that complies with all State (ARS Title 9) and City requirements for a Specific Plan.

**4.2. Vision, Goals and Objectives.** As iterations of the Guidelines and Master Plan approach completion, revisit the draft Vision, Goals and Objectives and strengthen and clarify the relationship to the Guidelines and Master Plan and support of the Regional Plan.

**4.3. Location-Specific Guidance.** The modal systems developed for the Master Plan will utilize the Complete Street Guidelines to align system expectations with area-type locations mapped in the City/County Regional Plan. System expectations will be established for existing, programmed, and planned regional transportation network components down to the minor collector functional class level. Constraints to achieving the Guidance 'ideal' and based on available GIS data will likewise be mapped.

**4.4. Existing Conditions and Background.** Using metrics and connectivity expectations developed in the Guidelines, and collecting necessary support data the consultant will evaluate the performance of the existing system. Of particular interest is expanding available bicycle and pedestrian data.

**4.5. System Alternatives and Final Recommendation.** The consultant will recommend the number of system alternatives to be considered for evaluation and the process and measures to be used. One alternative will consist of current plans from the partner agencies. System alternatives will be run against a build out scenario and 2045 projection and evaluated against metrics developed in the Guidelines.

##### **4.5.1. System Alternatives Elements**

**4.5.1.1.** Layered Network Planning with modal system density based on Guidelines

**4.5.1.2.** Highways, Roads and Streets Network

**4.5.1.3.** Active Transportation and Micromobility Systems

**4.5.1.4.** Transit System including stops and transfer locations

**4.5.1.5.** Freight Needs and Truck Routes

**4.5.1.6.** Intersection design – preferred intersection design concepts for major intersections in the City.

**4.5.1.7.** Emergency Services – regular checks against emergency service access needs and code compliance.

**4.5.2.** Preemptive Traffic Calming program – identify roads as eligible or ineligible for calming applications

- 4.5.3. Concept layout for major intersections based on criteria and fit to expected right-of-way
- 4.5.4. Analysis policy for intersection control evaluation (i.e., roundabout vs. signal)
- 4.5.5. Address parking where it is recommended for removal to accommodate another mode; or parking circulation is observed creating congestion, safety, emissions or other problems; or there is a compelling and urgent economic driver identified (i.e., tour bus, delivery).
- 4.5.6. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Fiber Optic Considerations. The final Master Plan will include a plan for future ITS infrastructure including the fiber optic networks required to support it to inform construction and development projects. The ITS plan will relate to the Statewide ITS Architecture and should address:
  - 4.5.6.1. Future accommodation of automated and connected vehicles (AV/CV)
  - 4.5.6.2. Recommendations for adaptive versus responsive traffic signal operations for ADOT and City traffic signals
  - 4.5.6.3. City Traffic Operations Center (TOC) costs, benefits, advantages and disadvantages
- 4.5.7. ITS and TOC interoperability and/or communications with ADOT systems
- 4.5.8. Evaluation Process and Criteria
- 4.6 **Examination/Documentation of Study Areas.** The Master Plan will evaluate several major planning efforts set forth by the Regional Plan, MetroPlan Regional Transportation Plan and other planning documents in the context of new system plan alternatives and clearly document their status within the final recommendation. This is also an opportunity for previously conducted planning efforts to be referenced from a single, streamlined location. Projects to be documented include but are not limited to:
  - 4.5.1 Babbitt/Switzer/John Wesley Powell
  - 4.5.2 Lone Tree Traffic Interchange
  - 4.5.3 Lone Tree Corridor Plan
  - 4.5.4 Woody Mountain Traffic Interchange
  - 4.5.5 Milton and US 180 Corridor Master Plans
  - 4.5.6 Metz Walk-Plaza Way connection
  - 4.5.7 Clay Wash-La Plaza Vieja Extension
  - 4.5.8 I-40/I-17 Southwest Quadrant road network
  - 4.5.9 Route 66/NAU Entrance
  - 4.5.10 Ponderosa Parkway to McMillan Mesa
  - 4.5.11 John Wesley Powell alignments
  - 4.5.12 89 bypass (documentation of recent decisions)
- 4.7. **Capital Improvements Supplement.** The Master Plan will aid Partners in the prioritization of projects within their respective Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for the next 15 years. Such aid will include ready access to relevant performance criteria and the data to support them. A hypothetical CIP will be developed and CIP priorities and processes ultimately will be defined by the respective Partners outside of the Plan. Infrastructure elements and performance measures may include but are not limited to:
  - 4.7.1. Infrastructure
    - 4.7.1.1. Roads, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure
    - 4.7.1.2. Intersections
    - 4.7.1.3. Trails
    - 4.7.1.4. Bus Stops

#### **4.7.2. Performance Criteria**

**4.7.2.1.** Relate to Guidelines section 3.5 Quality and Operational Efficacy Metrics.

**4.8. Roads and Streets Operations and Maintenance Recommendations.** The Master Plan will provide guidance to the City and County Public Works divisions about routine maintenance and operations activities and schedules needed for safe and efficient transportation. Specific attention will be paid to signal timing, snow plowing, winter parking management, ice mitigation, striping and street markings, closures and detours, and signage. All activities must be compliant with relevant MUTCD standards. Costs associated with specified activities should be developed for use by the Public Works Divisions in submitting funding requests for roads and streets operations and maintenance together with generalized operations and maintenance costs for the departments.

**4.9. ADA Accessibility Improvements.** The Master Plan should provide recommendations on improving accessible and adaptive facilities and establish the outline of an ADA Transition Plan for the City transportation system and County system within the planning area, so that planning level costs may be estimated.

**4.10. MetroPlan Regional Transportation Demand Model (RTDM) Update.** The Consultant will evaluate the RTDM and recommend how it is to be used in transportation master plan system development and evaluation. Upon acceptance of the recommendations, consultant is expected to produce models for the Forecast Year 2045 scenarios and a build-out scenario.

**4.10.1.** RTDM Base Model Update. The consultant will review the MetroPlan 2023 model and update it to a calibrated 2024 base year condition, or 2025 if data are readily available, for use in the master planning effort.

#### **Deliverables:**

- Validated and calibrated 2024 Base Year TransCAD model
- Background and Existing Conditions Report
- Vision, Goals and Objectives - Final
- System Metrics and Data Needs Report
  - All data to become the property of MetroPlan unless identified as proprietary in nature
- Alternatives Systems Development and Analysis Report
- Preferred System Recommendations
  - Active Transportation Master Plan update

### **5. Regional Plan Policy, Engineering Standards and Code Revisions**

This section refers to the Regional Plan, Engineering Standards, Subdivision Standards, Zoning Codes, Fire Codes and other regulations impacting transportation facility design, operations, and maintenance. Revisions will be drafted for the City and recommended for the County.

**5.1. Continuity from Guidance to Implementation.** Continuity from guidance to implementation tools is a core component of this Plan. The goals, policies, and recommendations set forth in the Complete Streets Guidelines, the Master Plan, and other City of Flagstaff Planning documents including the Regional Plan, Active Transportation Master Plan, etc. must be feasible and

authorized through representation in the engineering standards, zoning codes, subdivision ordinance, and other pertinent codes and regulations.

**5.2. Review and Update of Existing Codes and Standards.** Building on the City's Code Analysis Project (CAP), a review of existing regulations will be conducted to identify changes required to implement the Complete Street Guidelines and improve safety outcomes. This includes, but is not limited to, existing cross sections by functional class, on street parking, turning lanes, median widths, lane widths, intersection design, bike lanes, traffic calming features, protected intersections, and minimum connectivity expectations across modal networks. Including but not limited to:

**5.2.1. Engineering Standards**

- 5.2.1.1. Cross sections**
- 5.2.1.2. On street parking applicability**
- 5.2.1.3. Turning lanes**
- 5.2.1.4. Median Widths**
- 5.2.1.5. Lane Widths**
- 5.2.1.6. Bike Lanes**
- 5.2.1.7. Traffic Calming features**
- 5.2.1.8. Access Management features**

**5.2.2. Internal Process**

- 5.2.2.1. Green Paint**
- 5.2.2.2. Leading Pedestrian Intervals**
- 5.2.2.3. Bike Signals**
- 5.2.2.4. Crosswalks**
- 5.2.2.5. Two stage left turn boxes**
- 5.2.2.6. Actuated Pedestrian Crossings**
- 5.2.2.7. Detection**
- 5.2.2.8. Push Buttons/feedback/APS**
- 5.2.2.9. Traffic Calming best practices**

**5.3. Address Missing Standards Early On.** For some of the infrastructure components identified above, the City currently lacks a standard altogether (example: protected intersections). Identifying and filling these missing standard gaps, especially those pertaining to safety, early in the process to inform ongoing development throughout the term of this project is a desire of City staff. This may be executed by identifying a first phase of engineering standard recommendations and revisions for prioritized facilities, followed by a second phase later in the project.

**5.4. Revised City Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Process.** Revisions to codes and standards will update and streamline the City's TIA process. The revisions should emphasize safety analysis and meeting safety requirements. Improvements should streamline the TIA process by identifying developer and City expectations and responsibilities. The revision should reference resources within the Guidelines and Master Plan that to the greatest degree practical identify for the developer and City the inputs, expectations, responsibilities, planned and programmed projects, and those roadways for which cross-sections are not subject to change. The revision should include all modes for analysis and mitigation. The revised process will provide clear

guidance on the role of the Regional Transportation Demand Model in the TIA process. The revised process should provide strong guidance for:

**5.4.1.** Determination of proportional share

**5.4.2.** Utilization of offsets including participation in Travel Demand Management programs, impact fees, incentives and other funding mechanisms

**5.4.3.** Vehicle Miles Traveled and other metrics

**5.5. Cost Analysis of Recommended Changes.** A cost analysis of a complete package of recommended changes should be done to understand impacts on development.

#### Deliverables

- City of Flagstaff Regional Plan policy amendment language
- City of Flagstaff Engineering Standards amendment language
- City of Flagstaff Zoning Code amendment language
- City of Flagstaff Subdivision Standards amendment language
- City of Flagstaff revised Transportation Impact Analysis process
- Impact to development cost assessment
- Recommended amendments to County ordinances and codes to advance Master Plan implementation

## 6. Interactive Map Tool

**6.1. Powerful Mapping Interface.** It is the desire of stakeholders to have an interactive mapping tool in place at the end of this work which provides a geospatial interface for easily accessing relevant information in and supporting the Guidelines, Master Plan, Engineering Standards, Zoning Code, Fire Code, etc. for any given roadway network segment or intersection and the identification of planned and programmed capital projects including prioritization elements. This interface would benefit public and private practitioners as well as members of the public. Products should be ready for PDF and analog production and translation for use during and after Plan production.

**6.2. Thorough Network.** This tool should map functional classes down to the minor collector and commercial local street level, with easy access to general descriptions for local roads at the district or neighborhood level.

**6.3. Built for the City System.** The consultant should work with City of Flagstaff IT personnel to ensure the product operates within existing data management systems. The consultant should also provide clear documentation for upkeep and maintenance practices of this interactive tool.

**6.3.1.** Reviewed systematically throughout its development for long-term maintenance of the tool including:

**6.3.1.1.** Access to and sustainability of critical data sources

**6.3.1.2.** Technical and resource capacity of staff to update analyses or budgetarily to employ consultants on a timely basis.

**6.3.1.3.** Opportunities for workflow development to efficiently provide data.

#### **6.4. Establish Online Reference Library**

**6.4.1.** Work with Project Managers to curate materials reviewed during the Plan process for inclusion in an on-line reference library. References can be stored or linked PDF documents.

## Deliverables

- Interactive Map Tool
- Online Reference Library

## 7. Implementation Plan

**7.1. Funding Strategies & Projections.** The Plan will assist in financial planning and budgeting and include a strong implementation component. This includes cost estimating for public capital projects and for expected private sector investments by more completely describing needed facilities and anticipating or projecting needed capacity improvements across modes. The Plan will provide guidance to capital improvement program prioritization. It will provide interim or evolutionary solutions useful to achieve system continuity for various modes through phased investment over time. This will be useful in avoiding disjointed systems and managing capital and maintenance resources. The Plan will address system maintenance costs and funding needs for maintenance and capital. The implementation plan will cover both aspirational and fiscally constrained strategies and projections. The former will apply to the City Master Plan and the latter to support the MetroPlan Regional Transportation Plan. Fiscal constraint will include projections on current tax initiatives and reasonable assumptions about future tax initiatives. The implementation plan should identify gaps in projected needs and current funding and the means to close those gaps.

**7.1.1.** Public. Aspirational funding strategies should include potential grant projects at the federal, state, and private foundation level. Innovative practices such as Transit Utility Fees should be explored.

**7.1.1.1.** Role of private funding and investment. Private funding could include estimates for traditional edge improvements, negotiated development agreements, and public private partnerships. Strategies to examine will include development impact fees and districts.

**7.2. Cost Projections.** Planning level cost estimates including for right-of-way are expected for capital and operations and maintenance for the modes described. Projections should be suitable for use in operations, capital planning, private development negotiations, and future tax elections. This will work to provide a concise description of developer responsibilities and be used to streamline negotiation processes and developer expectations.

**7.3. Financing Tool & Partnerships.** Both traditional and innovative financing strategies should be addressed.

**7.4. Project Prioritization and Phasing Strategies.** A 20-year program for the RTP will be developed based on a prioritization scheme developed for the Plan. Reasonable inflation and financing cost assumptions will be incorporated. Phasing, especially to protect the potential for longer-term projects will be considered.

## Deliverables

- Implementation Plan
  - Financial Plan
    - Public and private funding projections
    - Available and recommended financing techniques
    - Grant availability, probability and strategic applications

- Project cost estimates
- Maintenance cost estimates
- Fiscally-constrained 20-year program for use in MetroPlan Regional Transportation Plan

**8. Add-on Alternative:** MetroPlan is holding 15% of the grant and matching funds in contingency to cover unexpected needs within the scope. MetroPlan invites consultants to offer recommendations for added value to the Plan should funds remain.

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

MetroPlan is seeking Proposals from Transportation Planning Professionals (“TPP”) to provide Planning Services on a task order basis to prepare the Safe Streets Master Plan and related components. The firm awarded may include subconsultants. Technical team disciplines may include transportation planning, public engagement, civil design, data analysis, traffic engineering, financial expertise, code revisions and policy development.

## PROJECT TIMELINE

The approximate start date for this project is **November 20, 2025**.

May 30, 2025	RFP Released
June 11, 2025	RFP pre-proposal meeting via Teams Meeting ID: 258 250 986 041 Passcode: s8op3cV6
June 16, 2025	RFP written questions due by 12:00 noon
June 20, 2025	Answers posted to MetroPlan website
July 16, 2025	Responses to RFP are due by 12:00 noon Teams meeting Meeting ID: 228 015 005 412 5 Passcode: eY2qF9xj
August 8, 2025	Responses to RFPs reviewed and ranked
August 18-22, 2025	Interviews may be conducted by the selection committee
August 29, 2025	Final selection
September 2025	Scope and Fee negotiations
November 6, 2025	Contract Award – MetroPlan Executive Board
November 20, 2025	Notice to proceed

## PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposals will be formatted to standard 8 1/2” x 11” page with 1” margins. The font will be no less than 12 pt. The page count will not exceed thirty (30) pages excluding a one (1) page cover letter and table of contents. Also excluded may be two (2) page resumes for each discipline leader to be placed in an appendix. The outline of the document will follow the order of the evaluation criteria provided below.

## **Preparation**

To be considered, proposals must include signed certification forms (Attachments B, C, and D) or will be deemed non-responsive.

All costs incurred for proposal preparation, presentation, or contract negotiations are the responsibility of the CONTRACTOR. MetroPlan will not pay for any information solicited or received.

## **Review Process**

A multi-agency evaluation committee of five (5) or more people, established by MetroPlan, will assess the RFPs received. The committee may select an RFP without further discussion or may determine that no RFP meets the needs of MetroPlan. During the evaluation process and selection process, committee members may not disclose information from one prospective firm to another prospective firm. All information provided by prospective firms shall remain confidential after the conclusion of the procurement process, to the extent possible by law.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **Statement of Proposals**

#### **A. Experience of Assigned Staff (20) – Limit 4 projects**

- 1) Special consideration will be given to Respondents that have provided Services that are like the Project. A similar project for the proposers of this RFP may be:
  - a. Completed within the last five (5) years;
  - b. Completed for a community of similar scale and climate to Flagstaff, Arizona;
  - c. Comprised of multiple, inter-related components;
  - d. Involved multiple jurisdictions and disciplines

#### **B. Staff Resumes (30) – Max 1 page for discipline leaders, 1/3 page for support staff**

- 1) Team organization chart, including subconsultants
- 2) Team member resumes. Reviewers will take note of the Team's project management and policy conflict resolution skills.
- 3) Previous project team members' experience working together on any relevant projects
- 4) Apparent resources and capacity to meet the needs of this project, including Team continuity throughout the project

#### **C. Project Understanding and Project Approach (30)**

- 1) Philosophy and approach
- 2) Sufficient detail and information to have a good understanding of the Respondent's approach to performing the work including a high-level work plan and high-level public participation plan.
- 3) Innovative and best practices to improve the deliverables and approach



#### **D. Value and Fee Proposal (20)**

- 1) Cost in tabular form by personnel, pay rate, and hours by task for the prime and any subconsultant with services more than \$100,000, also showing direct costs including estimated travel. Costs for other subconsultants may be shown as cost by task.
- 2) Hours and quality of staff committed to the different tasks

#### **Interviews**

After evaluation of the responses to the RFP, a shortlist of up to three (3) teams will be determined based upon the ranking of the Review Committee members. A presentation/interview session with the shortlisted teams *may* comprise the second half of the evaluation/selection process and clarifications on the scope of work will be specified prior to the interview.

- 1) Finalist Respondents Team Interview (Maximum 40 Points): MetroPlan may provide interview questions in advance to Respondents. MetroPlan's Selection Committee will evaluate interviews based on the team's responses to questions, ability to effectively communicate, and the Committee's assessment of the team's ability to work successfully with each other and MetroPlan staff. MetroPlan may also ask Respondents to submit written responses to some questions in advance of the interviews.
- 2) Strategic Fit (Maximum 60 Points): MetroPlan will evaluate proposed solutions based on overall best fit with MetroPlan goals and objectives. The Committee will consider solution simplicity, overall alignment with the requirements set forth in the RFP, as well as compliance with contract terms and conditions and any and all additional findings from MetroPlan's due diligence process.

#### **Submittals**

One (1) electronic PDF copy of the complete response to RFP should be emailed to [planning@metroplanflg.org](mailto:planning@metroplanflg.org) by **July 16, 2025, at 12:00 noon local time**. *Submitted proposals become the property of MetroPlan.*

#### **Late Proposals**

Any proposal received after **12:00 noon local time on July 16, 2025**, will not be considered.

The MetroPlan Executive Board reserves the right to reject all RFPs, or any part thereof; to accept any RFP or any part thereof, or to waive any informalities when it is deemed to be in MetroPlan's best interest.

#### **Withdrawal of RFPs**

RFPs may be withdrawn by written notice received at any time prior to the award.

**Responsibilities/Compliance**

The selected respondent (“Respondent”) shall comply with all federal third-party agreements and Title VI assurances, including but not limited to, the Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 2, IJA.

**Funding**

MetroPlan is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (“MPO”) for the Flagstaff, Arizona Urbanized Area, and has available Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) and Federal Transit Authority (“FTA”) federal fund allocations.

The project in this solicitation is funded with federal funds through the Federal Highway Administration and will be administered in accordance with 2 CFR 200.321, to assure that the work is being managed and performed satisfactorily and that time schedules are being met. The Respondent and any sub-contractor(s) shall cooperate with such monitoring as requested.

**Additional Terms and Conditions**

1. This solicitation does not commit METROPLAN to award an Agreement or to pay for costs associated with the preparation of the RFP or pre-agreement expenses.
2. METROPLAN reserves the right to make an award considered to be in the best interest of the region.
3. METROPLAN reserves the right to accept or reject any or all RFP responses received, to cancel all or part of the RFP, or to negotiate with all qualified firms.
4. METROPLAN may, at its discretion, require additional terms and conditions at the time the final Agreement is negotiated. The additional terms and conditions would be for clarification of particular language or correcting errors in the RFP including, for example, omissions or misstatements that are discovered.
5. No prior, current, or post-award verbal agreement(s) with any officer or employee of METROPLAN shall affect, modify, or supersede any terms or modifications of this RFP.
6. The Respondent chosen may be required to submit revisions of their responses because of negotiations.
7. The selected Respondent will be required to furnish evidence of insurance coverage to include, but not limited to Professional Liability, Workers Compensation, and Automobile. Set limits will be provided at contract negotiations.
8. The selected Respondent and any sub-contractors shall possess any necessary Arizona licenses and permits necessary to operate in the State and shall provide evidence of such to METROPLAN.
9. The selected Respondent and any sub-contractors shall not assign or subcontract services or responsibilities without prior written approval from METROPLAN.
10. Any changes to the response requirements will be made by a written addendum. METROPLAN reserves the right to waive any minor irregularities, informalities, or oversights in the RFP documents, or any corresponding responses that do not materially affect or alter the intent and

purpose of the RFP, which is not in violation of Arizona or Federal Government rules, laws, and regulations.

11. All materials and data used for this study are the property of METROPLAN.
12. The selected Respondent shall not release any material, report, or other document related to this project without the written approval of METROPLAN. The Respondent shall not present information related to this project without the written approval of METROPLAN.
13. The selected Respondent shall always comply with all applicable Federal Funding Agency regulations, policies, procedures, and directives, as they may be amended or promulgated from time to time during the term of this contract. Respondent's failure to comply shall constitute a material breach of this contract.
14. METROPLAN reserves the right to engage in a contract extension with the selected Respondent should additional funding become available.
15. Reaching Project Objectives: Tasks in scope are designed to accomplish project objectives. If, after the award, critical tasks or products must be changed or be added to the approved work plan to reach the stated objectives, a revised work plan and a budget that clearly demonstrates the original scope, the changes needed, and a justification for the changes shall be submitted. Such a modification must be requested by the METROPLAN project manager, and appropriate budget approvals must be obtained, and a revised contract / amendment and/or purchase order must be issued prior to engaging in the work. METROPLAN reserves the right to remove or reduce any tasks during the life of the project that are deemed unnecessary or no longer necessary to reach the project objectives. In the event the Respondent has already begun working on removed or reduced tasks that were scheduled or approved by the project manager to already begin, METROPLAN will reimburse that portion of the costs sufficient to make the Respondent whole, as required in federal regulations.

## ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Sample task order contract available at [www.metroplanflg.org](http://www.metroplanflg.org). A sample master contract for this project will be provided at the pre-proposal meeting.

Attachment B – Consultant Certification

Attachment C – DBE Goal Assurance (not required; not included)

Attachment D – Lobbying Certification

ATTACHMENT B - CONSULTANT CERTIFICATION FORM

CONSULTANT CERTIFICATION FORM

Please read the statements below. Responders to this RFP are **required to sign and return with their response the "Request for Proposal Certification Form"** that are included herein on the next page.

***Failure to sign and submit the certification form specified in this RFP, with the RFP, will result in the RFP being rejected.***

**Request for Proposal Certification Form**

Contract #:

Consultant Name:

**Please read the statements below. The statements are to ensure Consultants are aware and in agreement with Federal, and State guidelines related to the award of this contract. Consultants shall submit this Certification Form attached to each Proposal for each RFP advertised, as revisions to the form may occur from time to time. Failure to sign and submit the certification form specified in this RFP with the Proposal will result in the Proposal being rejected.**

**Submission of the Proposal by the Consultant certifies that to the best of its knowledge:**

1.	The Consultant and its sub-consultants have not engaged in collusion with respect to the contract under consideration.
2.	The Consultant, its principals and sub-consultants have not been suspended or debarred from doing business with any government entity. 2 CFR 200, Subpart F, Appendix II and 23 CFR 121 (J)
3.	The Consultant shall have the proper Arizona license(s) and registration(s) for services to be performed under this contract. Furthermore, the Consultant shall ensure that all Sub- consultants have the proper Arizona license(s) and registration(s) for services to be performed under this contract. Key members of the Project Team, including sub-consultants, are currently licensed to provide the required services as requested in the RFP package.
4.	The Consultant's signature on any RFP or contract constitutes an authorization to METROPLAN to ascertain the eligibility of the Consultant, its principals and subconsultants to enter into contract with METROPLAN and with any other governmental agency.
5.	The Consultant's Project Team members are employed or sub-contracted by the Consultant on the date of submittal.
6.	All information and statements written in the proposal are true and accurate and that METROPLAN reserves the right to investigate, as deemed appropriate, to verify information contained in proposals.
7.	Consultant shall procure and maintain, for the duration of the contract, insurance against claims for injuries to persons or damages to property which may arise from, or in conjunction with, the performance of the work hereunder by the Consultant, its agents representatives or employees. Insurance requirements can be found as Exhibit C in the sample contract.
8.	No Federally appropriated funds have been paid or shall be paid, by or on behalf of the Consultant for the purpose of lobbying. 2 CFR 200, Subpart F, Appendix II (I)

ATTACHMENT B - CONSULTANT CERTIFICATION FORM

9.	If project is funded with Federal Aid funds, the Consultant affirmatively ensures that in any subcontract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, minority business enterprises shall be afforded full opportunity to submit proposals/bids in response to this invitation and shall not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C 2000d to 2000d-4 and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Department of Transportation, Subtitle A, Office of the Secretary, Part 21, Nondiscrimination in Federally-assisted programs of the Department of Transportation.
10.	The Consultant will utilize all Project Team members, sub-consultants and DBE firms, if applicable, submitted in the RFP, and will not add other Project Team members or sub-consultants, unless the Consultant has received prior written approval from METROPLAN.
11.	The Consultant shall meet its DBE goal commitment and any other DBE commitments as stated in its RFP proposal or Cost Proposal; and shall report on a timely basis its DBE utilization as detailed in the contract.
12.	If selected, the Consultant is committed to satisfactorily carry out the Consultant's commitments as detailed in the contract and its RFP proposal.
13.	The Consultant is required to comply with all applicable standards, orders or requirements issued under Section 306 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857 (h)), Section 508 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1368).
14.	The Consultant is required to comply with mandatory standards and policies, as applicable, relating to energy efficiency.
15.	The Consultant agrees that it will comply with the provisions of the Drug-Free Work Place Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-690, Title V, subtitle D; U.S.C. § 701 et seq.) and maintain a drug and alcohol-free work place.
16.	MetroPlan, in accordance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252.42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d-4) and the Regulations, hereby notifies all bidders that it will affirmatively ensure that any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, disadvantaged business enterprises will be afforded full and fair opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in consideration for an award.
17.	In Compliance with 49 CFR Part 26.11, the Consultant is required to register with the AZ UTRACS web portal and complete the Online Bidder's List. <b>Please Note:</b> any firm being awarded work as a prime or sub-consultant on a federally funded project must be AZ UTRACS registered. <b>Failure to submit the corresponding Bidder's List email confirmation as part of the Proposal will result in rejection of the proposal. (MPDG218177-500.1)</b>
18.	The Consultant agrees to comply with all Federal and State requirements listed in the section titled "Federal Third Part Agreement: Applicable Laws and Regulations."

*I hereby certify that I have read and agree to adhere to the statements above and that the statements are true to the best of my knowledge as a condition of award of this contract.*

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_ Print Title \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Print Proposing Consultant Firm Name \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHMENT D – LOBBYING CERTIFICATION

ATTACHMENT D -  
Lobbying Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements  
Pursuant to 49 CFR 20, Subpart F, Appendix A

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

---

SIGNATURE

---

DATE

---

TITLE

***Please indicate here if you are required to submit Standard Form LLL as required in item (2) above:***      ☐ Yes      ☐ No