ADDENDUM II

SUBJECT: Downtown Accessibility and Mobility Study (RFP 26-079, 6100019667), Scheduled to Close: May 15, 2026; Date of Issue: April 15, 2026

FROM: Julia Webb-Carter, MPA, CIA,
Procurement Manager

DATE: May 12, 2026

THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. II - TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Respondents and bidders shall be responsible for reading the entire addendum. All addenda issued for this solicitation shall be attached to and become part of the solicitation and resulting contract documents for this project. By submitting a response to a City solicitation, respondent/bidder is acknowledging the receipt of this addendum.

By virtue of this addendum, the specifications, requirements and amendments stated below become a permanent addition to the solicitation referenced above.

THE ABOVE MENTIONED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Modified:** RFP Attachment A, Part Two – Experience, Background, and Qualifications Section 4. Experience Matrix for proposed Staff has been replaced as follows:

   4. Experience Matrix for Proposed Staff

   a) Provide a Matrix for Proposed Staff (RFP Exhibit 12 – Matrix Sample Template is posted as a separate document). Please include all proposed team members, Consultant Firm, and Sub-Consultants, indicating demonstrable experience (in years) of each individual proposed on the Organizational Chart or graphic representation of Respondent's proposed team.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 007, PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE:

On April 22, 2026, the City of San Antonio hosted a Pre-Submittal Conference to provide information and clarification for the Downtown Accessibility and Mobility Study. Below is a list of questions that were asked at the pre-submittal conference. The City's official response to the questions asked is as follows:

Question 1: We registered with the San Antonio e-Procurement System (SAePS site, but we have not received a login yet. Could you please confirm when we should expect them?

Response: The registration process can take up to 2 business days for a new registration to be completed. If it's been longer than 2 business days, please contact the Vendor Support team at vendors@sanantonio.gov or 210-207-0118.

Question 2: Does the Local Preference Ordinance apply only to the prime contractor, or can points be awarded through subs as well?

Response: Please refer to Attachment F- Local Preference Program Identification Form Local Preference Program.

Question 3: How will the city define success for this study, particularly around changes in user behavior (mode shift, reduced congestion, improved access experience) vs. traditional metrics like parking utilization?

Response: Success should be defined through a mobility performance framework, not solely parking utilization. The study explicitly prioritizes access, throughput, and user experience over traditional occupancy metrics. Key indicators should include:

- Mode share shifts (e.g., increased transit, rideshare, micromobility use)
- Reduced congestion and improved access flow
- Time-to-park and system efficiency
- Reduction in user friction points (e.g., uncertainty, wayfinding issues)

Parking utilization should still be measured, but as part of a broader system performance lens rather than a primary success metric.

Question 4: Which user groups or scenarios are the highest priority (e.g., event attendees, daily workers, tourists), and should analysis emphasize event conditions over typical day conditions?

Response: The study should prioritize both daily users and event-based scenarios, with particular emphasis on high-demand event conditions due to their outsized impact on system performance. Priority user groups include:

- Event attendees (major driver of peak demand)
- Daily workers and commuters
- Visitors/tourists

The study needs to explicitly evaluate event vs. non-event conditions and define priority use cases during project initiation.

Question 5: Why is the bond requirement in the insurance section?

Response: For this solicitation, there is no bond requirement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 011, RESTRICTIONS OF COMMUNICATION:

Question 6: Please clarify whether exceptions to the terms are allowed and can be included in the proposal document.

Response: The City seeks to contract with a respondent who is willing and able to comply with the terms and conditions of the RFP. Proposals will be scored accordingly. Therefore, any

unwillingness or inability to comply with any "contract terms and conditions" must be clearly noted and described in detail in the Respondent's proposal.

Question 7: Will there be multiple awards, or will only one company be selected?
Response: The City intends to award up to one (1) contract as a result of this solicitation.

Question 8: What internal information will be available to the winner of the proposal?
Response: Respondent should specify the internal information required from The City. The City will do its best to provide this information once the selection is made.

Question 9: How can we ensure that our status as a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), as recognized by the Federal Government, is properly reflected in our proposal? Additionally, we are currently in the process of obtaining HUBZone certification through the Federal Government—how should we indicate this pending designation in our proposal?
Response: The City relies on inclusion in the database of veteran-owned small businesses maintained by the U.S. Small Business Administration to verify VOSB status; however, veteran status may also be confirmed by certification by another public or private entity that uses similar certification procedures.

Respondents may indicate all certification designations in Experience, Background, and Qualifications; however, the Small Business Economic Development Advocacy (SBEDA) program requires that all eligible firms are Small Business Enterprise (SBE) certified via SupplySA. All certifications from other certifying agencies will not be considered for SBEDA eligibility requirements and goals.

Question 10: Can the City clarify whether all mobility components (parking, transit, rideshare, micromobility, walking, curb management, etc.) should be analyzed with equal depth, or if specific modes or user groups should be prioritized in the level of effort?
Response: All mobility components should be analyzed as part of an integrated system, but not necessarily with equal depth. Priority emphasis should be placed on:

- Modes that most influence congestion and parking demand (driving, rideshare, transit)
- Curbside operations (high leverage on access and congestion)
- User decision-making and behavior

The study explicitly frames parking as one component within a multimodal ecosystem, suggesting prioritization should align with system impact rather than equal treatment.

Question 11: What are the primary objectives, decision areas, and success metrics (KPIs) that this study is expected to directly inform?
Response: Primary objectives include:

- Improving overall downtown access and mobility performance
- Enhancing user experience and reducing friction
- Optimizing existing parking and mobility assets
- Supporting economic activity and major events

Key KPIs include:

- Time-to-park
- Mode share
- Occupancy distribution (not just peak)

- User satisfaction
- Revenue per space

These metrics directly inform decisions on infrastructure, policy, pricing, and technology investments.

Question 12: What baseline performance metrics does the City currently use to evaluate mobility system performance?

Response: Traditional metrics include:

- Parking occupancy (typical and peak)
- Turnover and duration
- Number of vehicles served
- Average number of vehicles per parking space
- Average Occupancy in City Parking Facilities

The City does not explicitly have a current baseline performance framework.

Question 13: Can the City provide relevant planning documents (e.g., downtown master plans, development forecasts, event strategies) that must be incorporated into the analysis and recommendations?

Response: The study explicitly requires review of:

- Comprehensive, downtown and district plans
- Transportation and transit plans
- Prior parking and traffic studies
- Relevant policies (zoning, curb regulations, pricing)

These documents can be provided during project initiation.

Question 14: Can the City provide a formal definition or map of the downtown study area and clarify whether adjacent districts should be included?

Response: The study area will be defined in detail during project initiation in coordination with the City, including clarification of:

- Downtown boundaries
- Event zones
- Potential inclusion of adjacent districts

For the purpose of consultant submittal, downtown is defined generally by the I-35 to the north, Hwy 90 on the south, Pine Street on the east, and the railroad on the west.

Question 15: Should the analysis explicitly address variations across time (e.g., peak vs. off-peak, weekday vs. weekend, special events)?

Response: Yes. The analysis is expected to explicitly address:

- Peak vs. off-peak conditions
- Event vs. non-event scenarios
- Temporal demand variation

This is a core requirement of the mobility system assessment.

Question 16: Are there priority corridors, zones, or districts that require deeper or more granular analysis?

Response: Yes. The study should identify and analyze:

- Priority corridors
- High-demand zones
- Congestion and conflict areas (especially curbside)

However, **specific locations are not predefined** and must be identified through analysis. These documents will be provided during project initiation (see question 13).

Question 17: What datasets will the City provide (e.g., parking utilization, traffic counts, transit ridership, curb data, micromobility, event data), and what level of access will be granted?

Response: Expected datasets likely include:

- Parking supply and utilization
- Historical traffic and access patterns
- Transit performance
- Rideshare and curb activity
- Event-related demand data

These datasets will be provided during project initiation.

Question 18: Is the consultant expected to conduct new primary data collection, or primarily rely on existing City data?

Response: It is reasonable to assume that some level of supplemental data collection may be necessary by the consultant.

Question 19: Are respondents permitted or encouraged to incorporate external or proprietary datasets (e.g., mobile location data, behavioral data) into the analysis?

Response: It is reasonable to assume that some level of external or proprietary datasets may be necessary by the consultant to complete the study.

Question 20: Does the City expect evaluation of existing technology systems (e.g., smart parking, ITS, curb management platforms)?

Response: Yes. The study explicitly includes evaluation of:

- Parking systems (PARCS)
- Real-time occupancy tools
- Reservation platforms
- LPR enforcement
- Data integration systems

Technology assessment is a defined task.

Question 21: Are predictive modeling, scenario analysis, or real-time analytics capabilities expected as part of the study?

Response: Yes. The study requires:

- Scenario-based modeling
- Future demand forecasting
- Evaluation of different system strategies

Real-time analytics are defined conceptually but not explicitly required as a deliverable.

Question 22: What level and format of stakeholder engagement is expected (e.g., workshops, interviews, public outreach)?

Response: Stakeholder engagement includes ongoing collaboration with City staff and presentation to stakeholders and City Council. This would include community workshops, stakeholder interviews, inter-agency coordination, and public outreach through a community survey. Exact roles and responsibilities related to engagement will be discussed and defined during project initiation.

Question 23: Are there specific stakeholder groups that must be engaged (e.g., transit agencies, business associations, event organizers, property owners)?

Response: Yes.

- City departments
- Transit agencies (e.g., VIA)
- Event stakeholders
- Business/community groups
- Neighborhoods/property owners
- Downtown property and business owners

Question 24: Will the City facilitate stakeholder coordination, or is the consultant expected to lead outreach and engagement?

Response: The consultant is expected to lead outreach and engagement, coordinated with City staff. Staff will support logistics and planning.

Question 25: What level of coordination is expected across City departments and external agencies (e.g., VIA), and should the consultant facilitate cross-agency collaboration?

Response: The consultant is expected to facilitate cross-agency coordination, coordinated with City staff.

Question 26: What deliverable formats are required (e.g., written reports, presentations, GIS data, dashboards), and are there preferred standards or tools?

Response: Required deliverables include:

- Reports (existing conditions, strategy, financials)
- Presentations
- Implementation roadmap
- GIS/data/dashboard (this can be coordinated with the City's GIS team)

Reports and Presentations should be in .pdf format.

Dashboards and Live maps should be comparable with the COSA ESRI enterprise platform.

Question 27: Are interactive dashboards or data visualization tools expected in addition to static reports?

Response: It is reasonable to assume that some interactive dashboards or data visualization tools may be necessary by the consultant to complete the study and articulate their recommendations.

Question 28: Is an implementation roadmap required, including phasing, cost estimates, and funding strategies, or are high-level recommendations sufficient?

Response: Yes, a high-level implementation roadmap is required, including phasing, priorities, dependencies, and financial strategy. The level of detail needed will be provided during project initiation.

.

Question 29: What is the expected cadence and level of detail for interim deliverables and progress reporting?

Response: The consultant can recommend best practices as part of their proposal.

Question 30: What is the anticipated project start date, overall duration, and key milestones from notice to proceed through final deliverables?

Response: Start in May. Draft findings need to be presented to the City Council in September 2026.

Question 31: Are there fixed deadlines tied to major events, Council briefings, or budget cycles that must be incorporated into the schedule?
Response: Draft findings need to be presented to the City Council in September 2026.

Question 32: What are the evaluation criteria and their relative weighting (e.g., technical approach, experience, cost, innovation)?
Response: Please refer to Section 012 of the solicitation document.

Question 33: How will innovation (e.g., advanced analytics, AI, real-time data approaches) be evaluated relative to traditional methodologies?
Response: There are no specific criteria to separate innovation vs traditional methodologies.

Question 34: Are there formatting, page limits, or submission requirements (e.g., file size, revisions, addenda process) that proposers must follow?
Response: No specific formatting is required for this submission.

Question 35: Are there known constraints (e.g., budget, policy, existing vendor contracts, regulatory limitations) that should be considered in developing recommendations?
Response: The study requires identification of risks, assumptions, and constraints. However, specific constraints are not predefined.

Question 36: Are there prior studies or analyses that should be leveraged, and how should they be incorporated into the new study?
Response: Yes. Prior studies (parking, traffic, planning) must be reviewed and incorporated. These documents will be provided during project initiation (refer to question 13).

Question 37: Are there ongoing or planned capital projects or developments that may significantly affect mobility patterns during the study period?
Response: Yes. The study must consider planned development, growth projections, and major projects (e.g., Sports & Entertainment District; Downtown Minor League Baseball Stadium; Main Plaza redevelopment). These developments will be discussed during project initiation.

Question 38: What data privacy, security, or regulatory requirements apply if third-party or user-level data (e.g., mobile or app-based data) is used?
Response: Consultant is responsible for complying with any city data privacy, security, or regulatory requirements.

Question 39: How will the City evaluate success for this study, particularly with respect to improvements in access, user experience, and travel behavior (e.g., mode choice, trip planning), in addition to traditional performance metrics?
Response: Success should be defined through a mobility performance framework, not solely parking utilization. The study explicitly prioritizes access, throughput, and user experience over traditional occupancy metrics. Key indicators should include:

- Mode share shifts (e.g., increased transit, rideshare, micromobility use)
- Reduced congestion and improved access flow
- Time-to-park and system efficiency

- Reduction in user friction points (e.g., uncertainty, wayfinding issues)

Parking utilization should still be measured, but as part of a broader system performance lens rather than a primary success metric.

Question 40: Should the analysis prioritize event-based conditions (e.g., large downtown events) over typical daily conditions, or should both be evaluated equally?

Response: The study should prioritize both daily users and event-based scenarios, with particular emphasis on high-demand event conditions due to their outsized impact on system performance. Priority user groups include:

- Event attendees (major driver of peak demand)
- Daily workers and commuters
- Visitors/tourists

The study needs to explicitly evaluate event vs. non-event conditions and define priority use cases during project initiation.

Question 41: Are there specific user groups the City would like the study to prioritize (e.g., residents, employees, visitors, event attendees, tourists?

Response: Key user groups include event attendees, daily commuters, and visitors/tourists. However, there is no formal prioritization hierarchy defined. The consultant can propose, if appropriate.

Question 42: Are there existing policies, constraints, or priorities related to curbside management (e.g., revenue, enforcement, access hierarchy) that should guide the recommendations?

Response: Yes. The study includes evaluation of curb allocation, access hierarchy, tradeoffs between parking and access, and operational and revenue implications. These policies will be discussed during project initiation.

Question 43: Is the intent for this study to include recommendations for implementation approaches (e.g., pilot programs, communications strategies), or primarily a strategic framework?

Response: Yes. The study requires actionable implementation strategies, including phasing, financial strategy, and operational recommendations, not just a high-level framework.

Question 44: Does the City envision this effort informing a broader, ongoing transportation demand management (TDM) approach for downtown?

Response: Yes. The inclusion of mode shift strategies, pricing, communications, and multimodal optimization will align with a broader Transportation Demand Management (TDM) approach as well as inform short term parking demand and curb management policies.

Question 45: Can the City provide a study area map with an estimated number of block faces and parking facilities?

Response: Please refer to Question 14.

Question 46: Is it acceptable to adjust the timeline to 6 months for the Phase I with a follow-on possibility?

Response: No. Draft findings need to be presented to the City Council in September 2026.

Question 47: Is there a penalty of 20 points for not being local area businesses? Is there a waiver process so that out-of-state businesses are not penalized in the proposal process?

Response: There are no penalties for non-local businesses, and there is no requirement for a waiver

submission. The Local Preference Program allows the award of additional points when multiple evaluation criteria are used in the evaluation criteria. Please refer to Attachment F- Local Preference Program Identification Form Local Preference Program.

Question 48: Are 3 references required within the last 3 years, or can we submit a bid without references?

Response: Reference letters are required for services provided within the past three years. If references are not included, the respondent must provide an explanation. The evaluation committee will review and assess such submissions as part of the overall evaluation process.

_____ Original Signature of Person Authorized to Sign Bid/Contract (Please Sign) _____ Signer's Name (Please Sign) _____ Vendor Name _____ Vendor Address _____ City _____ State, Zip code	Julia Webb-Carter _____ Julia Webb-Carter, MPA, CIA Procurement Manager Finance Department, Procurement Division