



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Regional Housing and

Transportation Coordination Plan

Requested by
The Mid-America Regional Council

Question and Answer

Updated January 28, 2026

Question and Answer

- Q: Are internal graphics (org chart, etc.) expected to meet the 12-pt TNR font requirement? Likewise the resumes?

A: No, graphics and other aesthetic items (headers, captions, etc.) are not expected to meet the 12-pt Times New Roman font requirement.

- Q: How large a file is your email system able to accommodate?

A: MARC's email system is generally able to handle files up to 15-20 MB. If you have issues submitting a proposal file, alternative submittal processes are acceptable including a OneDrive link, etc.

- Q: For the data request identified in Task 5.1, do you envision MARC staff maintaining this data on an ongoing basis with support from the selected consultant team?

A: All data and mapping tools developed during this study will be maintained interlay by MARC's Data and Digital Services staff once the project timeline is complete (03/2027).

- Q: We appreciate MARC's leadership of the Stakeholder Engagement Efforts as described in Task 2 of the RFP. If the consultant team has a question relative to an existing City policy, zoning, or process, should MARC serve as the primary point of contact?

A: The consultant may contact regional municipalities directly to collect information on policies, zoning code, and other local planning processes.

- Q: For delivery of the Final Report in Task 6, do you anticipate a public presentation of the material in partnership with the consultant team or with the support of the consultant team?

A: MARC anticipates a series of presentations of the Final Report, including but not limited to the Advisory Workgroup, MARC Planning Committees, the Regional Housing Partnership, etc, in addition to potential public meetings. MARC staff will lead many of these engagement activities with support from the consultant team. Depending on the available budget, MARC staff may leverage the consultant to speak at public presentations as needed. The consultant selected for negotiations should expect to include a small budget for Task 2 support as it relates to public engagement.

- Q: Could you please confirm whether the cover page and table of contents count towards the 20-page limit?

A: No, the cover page and table of contents will not count towards the 20 page limit.

- Q: The RFP mentions MARC reserves the right to unbundle components. Question: If MARC chooses to unbundle a task, how will that impact the overall \$300,000 budget ceiling for the remaining tasks?

A: The \$300,000 budget maximum will remain the same regardless of any changes to the scope of work. This amount is outlined in MARC's 2026 Unified Planning Work Program.

- Q: The RFP specifies a "Time-and-Materials" contract. Question: Given the fixed maximum budget, will MARC allow for the conversion to a Firm-Fixed-Price contract upon final negotiation of the scope of work?

A: No, MARC and the selected consultant will enter into a Time-and-Materials contract with an estimated fee sheet for the scope of work. The contract will have a "Not-to-exceed" amount that does not exceed the \$300,000 budget.

- Q: What is the expected geographic and demographic granularity for the analysis and subsequent affordability index? The Texas Housing Affordability Index appears to be limited county, MSA and state.

A: There is no expected granularity for any analysis in Task 1, MARC expects to make this decision based on the data proposed by the selected consultant. For the Texas Household Affordability Index (THAI) analysis in Task 5, this is an internal task being performed by MARC staff.

- Q: Task 3.2 mentions simulating impacts using MARC's land use models. Question: Will the selected consultant be granted direct access to run these models, or will the consultant provide the parameters for MARC staff to execute the simulations?

A: The selected consultant will provide the parameters for MARC staff to execute the simulations based on the potential policy areas outlined in task 3.1. The consultant will coordinate with MARC's Office of Economic Research to run these models. Additionally, the selected consultant may provide simulations from alternative models that they may have access to, however this is not a requirement.

- Q: Are there specific data limitations MARC has encountered in previous updates to "Connected KC 2050" that the consultant should proactively address in the Existing Conditions Report?

A: MARC has not identified any major data gaps. Consultant proposals should highlight additional data that they believe will enhance the Existing Conditions Report.

- Q: Task 2 is labeled as an "Internal MARC Task," yet the consultant is asked to support documentation. Question: Can MARC clarify the expected "level of effort" for the consultant here? For example, will the consultant be expected to design the workshop materials?

A: MARC staff will lead most of Task 2. Depending on the available budget, MARC staff may leverage the selected consultant for various engagement efforts on an as-needed basis. The consultant selected for negotiations should expect to include a small budget for Task 2 support as it relates to public engagement, including but not limited to material preparation, documenting public input, and presenting at public meetings.

- Q: Are there specific equity indicators or "Anti-displacement" metrics MARC prefers to see prioritized during the stakeholder validation process?

A: No, MARC does not have any preferred metrics for these categories.
- Q: The schedule lists interviews for March 4, 2026. Question: Will these interviews be held in-person at the Kansas City office, or is there a virtual option similar to the Pre-Bid Workshop?

A: MARC prefers to host these interviews in person, but accommodations can be made to host them via Teams or Zoom.
- Q: Task 5.1 mentions developing data/mapping tools for MARC to maintain. Question: Does MARC have a preferred software environment (e.g., Esri/ArcGIS Online) for these tools to ensure they are compatible with existing internal systems?

A: MARC utilizes ESRI products for most data and mapping tools.
- Q: Does all text in the proposal need to be size 12-point font, or can tables and/or headers deviate from this requirement?

A: No, graphics and other aesthetic items (headers, captions, etc.) are not expected to meet the 12-pt Times New Roman font requirement.
- Q: During the pre-bid workshop, MARC staff indicated that the budget is not required for the proposal. Can MARC please confirm that neither a budget nor a rate sheet is required for the submission?

A: No budget or rate sheet is required for submission.
- Q: Should Task 1 maps be delivered as data files (shapefiles, GeoJSON) that MARC imports into their systems, or does MARC expect the consultant to publish and configure layers directly in MARC's ArcGIS Online environment?

A: Data and maps developed during Task 1 should be formatted as data files that can be shared with MARC staff.
- Q: The RFP states Task 2 is an internal MARC task. Can MARC please clarify the role of the consultant in Task 2, Stakeholder Engagement, including whether "documenting results and writing content related to findings from engagement" requires the consultant to participate in in-person meeting?

A: For Task 2, MARC staff will lead in-person meetings. Depending on availability and schedule, MARC may ask the consultant to participate in engagement activities as needed. Following engagement activities, MARC will share findings public comments with the consultant to incorporate into the final plan. The consultant selected for negotiations should expect to include a small budget for Task 2 support as it relates to public engagement.

- Q: Task 3.2 says “To the extent possible, simulate the impact of implementing proposed strategies using MARC’s land use models.” Can you clarify if the consultant is expected to run these simulations directly, or provide scenario parameters and methodology guidance for MARC staff to run?

A: For MARC’s land-use model, the selected consultant will provide parameters based on the policy areas listed in Task 3 in coordination with MARC’s Office of Economic Research. Additionally, the consultant may run these simulations directly, to the extent possible with tools available to the consultant, and document the methodology with the final plan.

- Q: Task 5 references "data/mapping tools" that MARC can maintain. Does this refer to documentation and templates for replicating Task 1 analysis, or is MARC expecting custom software/tool development?

A: This refers to any data and maps developed during Task 1. This includes sharing the data files and documenting the methodology used in Task 1 analysis so that MARC can replicate it in the future.

- Q: Regarding the Regional Travel Model, what model outputs will MARC provide to the consultant?

A: MARC’s Travel Demand Forecast displays the base year model assignment, future traffic volume forecasts, and relevant socio-economic data summarized by Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) for the MARC planning area. The model assignment includes: Trip generation, Trip distribution, Mode choice, and Traffic assignment. More information can be found here: <https://www.marc.org/transportation/transportation-programs/travel-demand-forecast-model>

- Q: Could MARC provide additional guidance on the expected level of specificity and granularity for the policy, funding, and business-plan recommendations? In particular, what level of local coordination and jurisdictional adoption is MARC envisioning, and how should proposers frame expectations around local feedback, implementation responsibility, and policy compliance or alignment across member jurisdictions?

A: Proposals should include goals and strategies that can be adopted by MARC (pertaining to Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) authority and responsibilities), as well as goals and strategies that MARC could encourage local jurisdictions to adopt throughout the engagement process.

- Q: Could MARC clarify the land use allocation and modeling framework currently in use for purposes of strategy simulation? Specifically, what land use model is MARC using today, and is MARC anticipating that the adopted goals and strategies could result in changes to that model or its assumptions? Additionally, at what spatial resolution should proposers assume simulations will occur (e.g., TAZ-level, parcel-level, or another geography)?

A: MARC would like to build out the capacity to see the effect of these goals and strategies on the forecast if they are pursued and achieved. The methodology for MARC’s Land Use Forecast can be found here:

<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/6972f3ccdf2e458f9d98d9d87325fed2>

- Q: With respect to the proposed toolkit for assessing housing and transportation affordability at the local level, could MARC elaborate on the intended functionality and level of customization? In particular, what gaps does MARC see in existing tools such as the H+T Index or similar models, and is the expectation for a new custom model, an assumptions-testing framework layered on existing indices, or a decision-support tool that integrates MARC-specific data and policy levers?

A: This is an internal task - MARC staff are currently working to develop these tools and do not have any particular gaps identified at this time. Consultants are welcome to propose how MARC could approach this toolkit, but it is not required.