

Sharon Strouse, Executive Director, National Scenic Byway Foundation

Re: Corridor Solutions

- CS is experienced with local issues and conflicts. They recognize that much opposition to Byways is rooted in lack of familiarity with the program and are able to speak to the positive impacts of Byways and actual effects.
- Wanda (CS) and Sharon are currently working with native and indigenous groups on Byway planning.
- Wanda used to work at the National Scenic Byway Resource Center before it was closed in 2012. She has an understanding of the background and history of this program that is helpful.
- She is passionate about the program and has done RV traveling in her own time to test the experience of Byway visitors who use that mode of transit.
- Wendy understands the need to adapt the Byway program and its purpose. Sharon and Wendy are working on an update to the federal interim policy for Byways that acknowledges they used to be focused on tourism, but have a new role in protection and preservation. An example of this is maintaining viewsheds - this didn't used to be addressed, but there's now a push to incorporate a landscape architecture perspective in order to preserve the scenic value.
- CS recognizes that "one size doesn't fit all" when it comes to Byways. They are interested in finding a balance between communities (eg: if one community isn't interested in hotels or an RV park, maybe another is).
- They are very mindful of the visitor and resident experiences. The focus is on how those experiences can be improved and enhanced.
- If we can stick to timelines, CS can stick to timelines. Usually, the challenge is in coordinating a number of partners and ensuring they complete tasks in a timely manner. All responsibilities assigned specifically to Wendy will be completed on time.
- With regards to providing a usable/actionable document, CS will do an exceptional job at that, but it will be up to us to actualize it. Her final product will include an implementation plan with specific partners assigned responsibilities.
- CS will lay out numerous possibilities based on expertise, surveys, ground truthing, stakeholder interviews, etc. It will then fall to us to define priorities.
- When asked how well Wanda would be able to work with an informal group, Sharon clarified that there are very few singularly-focused Byway groups (non-profits, etc). Byway management runs the gamut and Wanda has experience with all types.

- With regards to price, Sharon encouraged us to negotiate with Wanda directly if we had issues or questions. She is amenable.

Patty Wise, City Councillor, La Verkin

Re: MetroAnalytics

- MetroAnalytics was good, thorough, and responsible. The study they completed was comprehensive and easy to understand. They had sufficient expertise for the work.
- They provided a document that was balanced about 50/50 between dropping standardized text into a template and accommodating the specific needs of La Verkin.
- There were no public meetings associated with this project, but that was due more to a lack of funds and public meeting requirements. They were receptive to having as many folks attend the meetings as LVC desired.
- At this time, nothing substantial has come out of the study, other than a Master Transportation Plan update, but that is attributed to LVC current positioning. They did provide actionable steps.
- They had a team of about 4-5 working on the project and were good with the timeline and budget.
- LVC never felt like the plan was lacking because they weren't there in-person.

Tanner Anderson, Planner, Albany GA

Re: MetroAnalytics

- Their project manager is excellent. They had a staff transition partway through the project that meant switching project managers and the new person handled the transition exceptionally well.
- Their data collection and GIS work is very detail-oriented. They're willing to dive in as deep as you'd like, provided funding is available.
- The state of Georgia required modeling for the Transportation Plan - essentially, an evaluation of which projects will actually improve roadways. Georgia's DOT has some outdated modeling software in place, but Metro was able to adapt.
- The public outreach portion of this project has been managed through a local subcontractor.
- This project has been coordinated by the MPO, which crosses 4 different jurisdictions. Metro has done well handling the different organizations. They've had

to collect data from a variety of sources and transfer/compile it, but have had no issues doing that.

- The project prioritization piece has been key. Georgia is very dependent on federal funding to move projects forward and Metro has been good at identifying and figuring out how to leverage other funding sources.
- Beyond the Transportation Master Plan, they also worked on a Resiliency Plan for the MPO. That product did feel somewhat like a copy-pasted product and contained a lot of technical jargon which had to be revised. They copied a lot over from the Transportation Plan. That being said, Resiliency Plans are a relatively new requirement from GDOT so it was new territory for them and they might have just been leaning on past successes more than usual.
- They had 5 or 6 subconsultants as part of the Transportation Plan, all with different areas of expertise. They understood the limits of their knowledge and brought on appropriate support.
- There is an established adoption date for this plan (set by the state). They received a Notice to Proceed in July 2023 and sent out a draft in August 2024. There was a slow start, but attributed largely to GDOT's contracting process.

Chris Hall, Region 4 Planner, UDOT

RE: Both Proposals

- In reading these two documents, Corridor Solutions had the better proposal and much more experience. For a project like this, experience carries a lot of weight. They also provided assurance around the need for local knowledge by contracting with Avenue Consultants. Avenue is competent, local, and has listed Sharice for public outreach.
- Chris has worked with MetroAnalytics once and WCG a handful of times. With regards to the Corridor Solutions proposal, his experience is primarily with Avenue.
- The Metro proposal lacked a clear demonstration of their experience in similar projects.
- For the project in Virgin, MetroAnalytics made sure they understood everything so they could tailor the final product. They also did good public outreach, but they have engineers/planners do that work. In comparison, Corridor Solutions assigned a specific, experienced person to do public engagement/outreach.
- The Corridor Management Plans that Corridor Solutions provided seemed to address community needs well.

- Regarding the ZRC's unique organizational structure, Chris felt both consultants could adapt. Both have experience gathering input from a wide range of people, including multiple groups with conflicting opinions. UDOT worked with both Avenue and Metro on projects that had controversial elements and they all handled those situations well.
- Both were also good with budget and timeline. If there's a set budget in a contract, they will both adhere to it.
- In closure, Corridor Solutions seems to be the better choice for this specific project, given their extensive experience with CMP's.