



### Four Corners Specific Plan Request for Proposals (RFP)

### Questions and Responses (Received as of March 4, 2026)

*Note: Where multiple proposers submitted similar questions, they have been consolidated and edited for clarity.*

#### Submittal Requirements

**1. Would it be possible to get a 1-week extension on the overall deadline?**

The City is not offering an extension at this time. A notification will be sent out and posted on the City website if the deadline changes.

**2. Is there a preferred page size or formatting standard (e.g., 8.5" x 11" or 11" x 17") for the proposal submission?**

Proposals should generally be prepared using 8.5" x 11" pages. Proposers may include 11" x 17" pages for graphics, schedules, or other supporting materials if needed.

**3. Does the proposal response need to follow the order listed in the RFP (under Submittal Requirements)?**

No, the proposal does not need to follow the order listed in the RFP.

**4. Is the project scope excluded from the overall page count limitation?**

The project scope is included in the overall page count limitation.

**5. For certain RFP items (such as contract comments or full project cut sheets), can we provide links to separate external documents instead of including the full content in our response, to help meet the 10-page limit? Or can we include these items as appendices that are not counted in the page limit? Are there any additional required forms or certifications beyond the proposal components listed in Section 6?**

Proposals must be concise and limited to 10 pages, excluding covers, tabs, resumes, and required forms. The items listed in Section 6 (e.g., Team Qualifications & Experience, Project Understanding & Approach, Scope of Work & Deliverables, Project Schedule, Budget & Billing Rates, and References) are proposal content and count toward the 10-page limit unless specifically identified as excluded items. There are no additional required forms or certifications for this RFP. External links or appendices may



be included for reference. However, the core proposal content addressing the items in Section 6 must be contained within the 10-page limit.

**6. Does the City’s Contractual Service Agreement count toward the stated page limit?**

The City’s Contractual Services Agreement (Section 9) is provided for reference only and does not need to be completed or submitted with the proposal.

**7. Do the required three municipal references need to be from California jurisdictions, and must they be from projects completed within the past five years, or can earlier projects be included if relevant?**

The municipal clients do not need to be in California. Similar work must be from projects completed within the past five years. If a proposer does not have three references that fully meet these requirements, they should provide the most relevant references available and briefly explain why they do not meet the full criteria.

**8. Is the City amenable to considering modifications to the standard Consulting Services Agreement? If so, should we include our comments in the proposal response?**

Yes, City staff will work with the selected firm on any modification requests to the Contractual Services Agreement. Comments should not be included in the proposal.

**Selection Process**

**9. If interviews are conducted, does the City have an anticipated timeframe for shortlisted firm interviews?**

If interviews are conducted, the City anticipates they would occur in late March or early April.

**Budget & Schedule**

**10. What is the estimated project cost, and are there any identified funding sources for the project?**

The City's 2024-2026 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identified \$350,000 for the Four Corners Area Plan which was the estimated project cost at the time the CIP was approved. There are no additional identified funding sources at this time.

**11. What's driving the project schedule identified in the RFP? Is it grant-funded?**

The project is not currently grant-funded. The timeline is intended to support the City’s goals for implementing relevant policies and programs. Proposers are encouraged to provide input on approaches and a recommended timeline for achieving the project objectives.

**12. Are tentative Planning Commission and City Council hearing dates included in the project schedule identified in the RFP?**

There are currently no tentatively targeted Planning Commission and City Council hearing dates. The City is open to coordinating with the selected firm to identify appropriate hearing dates that align with project milestones and support an efficient review process.

**13. Is environmental review included in the project schedule identified in the RFP?**

Yes. However, the City recognizes that completion of environmental review may influence the overall timeline. Proposers are encouraged to provide input on approaches and timing that would support achieving the project objectives within an effective and realistic schedule.

**14. Is the City open to other approaches that modify the project schedule identified in the RFP?**

The City is open to input from proposers on alternative approaches to achieving the project objectives, including adjustments to the project schedule, if they support an effective and efficient project delivery.

**15. Does the City anticipate having a dedicated internal "Review Strike Team" or an expedited turnaround protocol for staff reviews?**

The City does not currently have a dedicated internal "Review Strike Team" or formal expedited review protocol in place. Staff will work to coordinate reviews efficiently, and the City welcomes input from proposers on approaches to support timely review and feedback throughout the project.

**16. While not explicitly scored in the RFP, MTC and regional funding partners often encourage the inclusion of Minority, Disadvantaged, and Small Business Enterprises: Does the City have any voluntary goals or informational reporting requirements for MBE/DBE participation for this project? Given the current federal transition regarding DBE certifications, is there a specific local or regional preference the City would like to see reflected in our team composition?**

The City does not currently have established voluntary goals or reporting requirements for MBE/DBE participation for this project. The City does not currently have an established local or regional preference regarding MBE/DBE participation for this project.

**Existing Conditions & Development Context**

**17. Is there development activity in this area?**

The area has experienced changes in land use and tenant improvements, including both interior and exterior building modifications, but has not seen significant new development in recent years.

**18. What level of utility information is available from the City? Will the civil consultant need to conduct new computer modeling?**

Available data will be provided to the selected firm including available GIS utility location information on and as-built drawings (if requested). Proposers should include the development of new computer modeling in their scope if they determine it is necessary. Note that some data and information could be obtained from applicable utility agencies.

### **Plan Boundaries**

- 19. The RFP notes that the Specific Plan boundary may be refined during the process. Does the City anticipate expansion toward the Ardenwood transit facilities or other adjacent areas, or should proposals assume a primary focus on the existing Four Corners commercial area?**

The preliminary boundary for the Specific Plan is from the 1990 Four Corners Area Plan. The primary focus will be the existing Four Corners commercial area. However, the City is open to refining or expanding the Specific Plan boundaries, in consultation with the selected firm, if doing so would help achieve the goals of the project, including consistency with applicable plans and policies.

### **Community Engagement**

- 20. Beyond the three public engagement events identified, does the City anticipate forming a standing advisory committee or stakeholder working group, or should engagement primarily occur through workshops and targeted stakeholder outreach?**

The City currently anticipates that engagement will primarily occur through the public engagement events and targeted stakeholder outreach. However, the City could be open to the formation of a standing advisory committee or stakeholder working group if recommended by the selected firm and determined to be beneficial to the planning process.

- 21. The scope notes that the consultant will conduct up to three engagement events and prepare a project website or webpage. Beyond these activities, will the City lead broader outreach efforts (e.g., community notifications, mailing lists, stakeholder coordination), or should the consultant team assume responsibility for these outreach components as part of Task 3: Community & Stakeholder Engagement?**

The selected firm will be responsible for planning and conducting the engagement activities identified in Task 3, including preparing materials, facilitating engagement events, and identifying and engaging with key stakeholders. The City will support outreach efforts as needed, such as assisting with preparing mailing lists and community notifications, sharing information through City communication channels, and helping coordinate with stakeholders when needed. Proposers may identify additional outreach strategies if they believe they would support the project's engagement objectives.

### **Environmental Review**

- 22. The RFP lists CEQA support as an optional task. Does the City currently anticipate leading environmental review internally, or should consultant teams assume potential responsibility for preparation of CEQA documentation?**

The City will serve as the lead agency for the project. Preparation of CEQA documentation may be completed either by one of the City's on-call environmental consultants or by the selected firm. As noted in the RFP, preparation of CEQA documentation may be requested as an optional task, and firms do not need to assume responsibility for CEQA document preparation as part of the base scope.

- 23. Task 5 includes “technical support and plan content needed for City-level environmental review.” Does this consist of providing the plan and buildout information for the CEQA project description, or is the task providing technical support for the CEQA analysis such as Air Quality/GHG, cultural resources, or other specialized studies? If the latter, please specify the requested studies.**

Task 5 involves recommending an appropriate CEQA approach for the Specific Plan and providing technical support and plan content for City-led environmental review. Preparation of technical studies may be requested by the City as an optional task.

- 24. What in-house CEQA capacity should we assume on the part of the City?**

The City has limited in-house CEQA capacity. Task 5 focuses on providing technical support and plan content for City-led environmental review, while preparation of CEQA studies and documentation would be requested as an optional task and may be completed by either the City's on-call environmental consultants or the selected firm.

- 25. In light of recent discussions regarding sea-level rise and groundwater emergence in Newark, will the City be providing updated hydraulic or groundwater modeling data to the selected team, or should we assume the development of new baseline resilience modeling is part of the technical scope?**

Available data will be provided to the selected firm such as data from the recently completed Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Strategy Report and Vulnerability and Risk Assessment Report (available [here](#)). Proposers should include the development of new baseline resilience modeling in their scope if they determine it is necessary.

### **Technical Analysis**

- 26. Has the City identified an anticipated TOC Policy classification or compliance level for planning purposes, or should the consultant team evaluate alternative compliance scenarios as part of the planning process?**

Based on the locations of the planned Ardenwood Capitol Corridor station and California State Route 84 (SR-84) Intermodal Bus Facility, most of the Plan area could be subject to Tier 3 or Tier 4 TOC Policy requirements. The City expects the selected firm to confirm the TOC Policy requirements and provide potential compliance scenarios and recommendations based on their analysis.

- 27. The scope references high-level development feasibility analysis for representative opportunity sites. Should this analysis be conceptual/policy-calibrating in nature, or is the City expecting detailed financial pro forma modeling?**

The City anticipates that the development feasibility analysis will be conducted at a high-level to inform planning and policy considerations. The intent is to evaluate representative opportunity sites to help calibrate land use assumptions, development potential, and implementation strategies. Detailed financial pro forma modeling is not expected at this stage, but if determined to be beneficial later in the process, it could be considered as an optional task.

**28. Should the Specific Plan include conceptual infrastructure or streetscape improvements for Newark Boulevard and Jarvis Avenue, or are these corridors assumed to be outside the scope of improvement planning?**

The Specific Plan is expected to include schematic urban design concepts that illustrate the preferred development framework. This may include schematic streetscape design concepts and a conceptual land and infrastructure plan, as described in Task 4. The City anticipates that these concepts will encompass conceptual infrastructure and streetscape improvements for Newark Boulevard and Jarvis Avenue.

**29. For the three representative opportunity sites included in the development feasibility analysis, will the City identify preferred sites, or should the consultant team select them during the existing conditions analysis?**

The City will assist the selected firm in identifying preferred sites for the development feasibility analysis. The selected firm will also be asked to recommend sites based on their analysis.

**30. Does the City envision the Specific Plan identifying priority catalyst sites, opportunity areas, or early implementation strategies to help initiate redevelopment in the Four Corners area?**

Yes, the City envisions that the Specific Plan may identify priority catalyst sites, opportunity areas, and early implementation strategies to help guide redevelopment in the Four Corners area. The level of detail for these strategies can be informed by the selected firm's analysis and recommendations.

**31. Does the City have a target residential unit count for this Specific Plan to meet/analyze? How much additional development is envisioned for the Plan area? The Housing Element (Program H2.3) identifies that 360 units could be developed in the Four Corners area.**

Housing Element Program H2.3 identifies a planning assumption of approximately 360 residential units in the Four Corners area. Proposers should assume this as the current planning target unless analysis suggests an alternative approach.

**32. Should we assume that the Specific Plan area will have new tailored objective design standards that would supersede those being drafted as part of the ongoing citywide ODS effort?**

The City anticipates building upon the Objective Design Standards currently in development and may apply supplemental standards in the Specific Plan area. The City will consult with the selected firm on an appropriate strategy.

## **Plan Implementation**

- 33. Is the City anticipating concurrent zoning amendments or adoption of development standards alongside the Specific Plan adoption, or would those actions occur as a subsequent implementation phase?**

The City anticipates that concurrent zoning amendments or adoption of development standards could occur with Specific Plan adoption. However, the timing and approach will be determined in consultation with the selected firm to identify the most effective implementation strategy.

## **Future Eligibility**

- 34. Would serving a role in the Specific Plan impact a firm's eligibility to serve as an applicant or architect for future development proposals within the Plan area?**

A firm's participation in preparation of the Specific Plan would not preclude eligibility to submit or participate in future development proposals within the Plan area.