

Questions and Answers in regard to Delaware County and City of Muncie Ordinance Revision RFP

Question #1: Could you please confirm that the DMMPC's intent is to have a single Steering Committee to serve both projects?

Answer #1: Our intent will be to have 2 separate Steering Committees, one for City of Muncie and one for Delaware County. The process will involve elected officials and stakeholders from each jurisdiction to focus on only their jurisdiction.

Question #2: Given the goal of simultaneous development of two documents, are there specific budget expectations regarding the proportional cost allocated to the Diagnostic Review versus the Drafting Phase, considering that Drafting Phase will inform the content of both final documents?

Answer #2: At this time, we have no specific budget expectations regarding proportional costs.

Question #3: To ensure that simultaneous development efficiently addresses both jurisdictions, are there specific, high-priority regulatory areas (e.g., subdivision standards, site development standards, or development procedures) where the DMMPC considers alignment between the two UDOs to be most feasible?

Answer #3: I believe there will be areas where there is alignment, but development will need to be catered to the abilities of the different jurisdictions. There is a different make-up of administrative duties based on the jurisdiction. Our office performs the planning and land use for both jurisdictions, but we house the Building Commissioner for Delaware County only. The City of Muncie Building Commissioner is separate and has his own staff.

Question #4: The evaluation scoring allocates 15 points to "Cost Appropriateness". What specific metrics or elements beyond the total cost are prioritized when determining the appropriateness of the fee proposal (e.g., allocation towards specific phases like Public Engagement or Legal Consultation)?

Answer #4: Yes, Cost Appropriateness will factor in hourly fees of those involved in the project, capacity of their time that they can devote to the project, level of engagement that is agreed upon for public engagement and stakeholder engagement, legal consultation, etc.)

Question #5: Could the DMMPC please share the total anticipated consultant budget for the project?

Answer #5: We do not have a set anticipated budget. We discussed some initial estimations of \$100,000 to \$125,000 for each UDO, but have no definitive anticipated budget, and plan to discuss each jurisdiction based on the proposals received.

Question #6: What is the budget range for this project? It makes it easier to tailor our scope and fee based on your resources.

Answer #6: We do not have a set anticipated budget. We discussed some initial estimations of \$100,000 to \$125,000 each UDO, but have no definitive anticipated budget, and plan to discuss with each jurisdiction based on the proposals received.

Question #7: Do we need our own attorney on the team, or will we be able to consult with the Plan Commission's attorney?

Answer #7: We would like for the proposals to include fees for the firms to complete legal review. An attorney on the team is not necessary, but overall legal input, consultation, and review should be provided by the firm.

Question #8: Who will comprise the selection committee and project steering committee? How many members will be on each?

Answer #8: The selection committee and the steering committees have not been finalized yet.

Question #9: Do you think we will need to develop subcommittees based on certain topics?

Answer #9: Subcommittees could be developed for certain topics if the need arises. The initial plan will be to develop separate steering committees for each jurisdiction covering a wide berth of experts on all topics.

Question #10: Given that you want to have 2 harmonious documents for each jurisdiction, have you considered combining the two UDOs into 1 UDO for the city and county?

Answer #10: The preference is an UDO for each jurisdiction. The information gathering and stakeholder investment input will come from the stakeholders and agencies within each jurisdiction.

Question #11: What are your expectations regarding public engagement process? Is there anything specific you want to make sure that we include?

Answer #11: Public engagement expectation is maybe around 2 per jurisdiction, with the opportunity for some of our regular public meetings to include discussions and hear public comments.

Question #12: Will the staff take care of noticing meetings, securing venues for meetings, etc.?

Answer #12: The DMMPC staff can take care of meeting notice and securing venues.

Question #13: Do you have a way to identify undeserved and disadvantaged populations?

Answer #13: The current Census would be our tool of identifying undeserved and disadvantaged populations.

Question #14: Do you have someone available who can translate information into Spanish or do we need to have that on our team? Are there other languages that we should incorporate?

Answer #14: The DMMPC does not have a Spanish translator on staff, we utilize the services of Ball State University when needed. That will not be a requirement of the firm.

Question #15: How available is the DMMPC staff to assist with certain tasks of the project?

Answer #15: The DMMPC staff will assist as much as possible with the tasks of this project. Our current staff consists of 9 employees with a very high workload. We would like to be involved as much as possible in this important process and will make ourselves available. Many important stakeholders have also expressed the desire to be actively involved.

Question #16: How do you currently treat Ball State from a zoning perspective?

Answer #16: Ball State is treated as the University Village Overlay District currently. The regulations are outlined in Article XXX Section 8, beginning on page 116 of the current City Ordinance. There is also a Village Review Committee that oversees all development in this area in addition to our office.

Question #17: What is the total project budget or anticipated budget range allocated for this project? Understanding the available budget will help ensure our proposal is appropriately scoped and competitive.

Answer #17: We do not have a set anticipated budget. We discussed some initial estimations of \$100,000 to \$125,000 for each UDO, but have no definitive anticipated budget, and plan to discuss with each jurisdiction based on the proposals received.

Question #18: Should the UDOs be substantially similar between jurisdictions with jurisdiction-specific modifications, or are you seeking two independently tailored documents? Are there areas where they should be:

- Identical (definitions, general procedures, measurement standards, etc.)?
- Similar but adapted (residential districts, dimensional standards, etc.)?
- Substantially different (agricultural uses, urban design standards, etc.)?

Answer #18: I think similar but adapted will be our overall goal. Our intent will be to have 2 separate Steering Committees to focus on different needs of each jurisdiction.

Question #19: Are there hot-button issues or topics that must be addressed in the UDOs?

Answer #19: Current hot-button issues include Commercial Solar Facilities (County recently adopted a Solar section in current ordinance for a proposed “Special Use”). Other new issues arising in the area include home based businesses, regulations on zones permitting farm animals, emerging commercial developments such as data centers, power facilities, activities that were not around during the development of the 1973 ordinance.

Question #20: What is the minimum expected number of public meetings or workshops? Should the engagement plan include: one major workshop per jurisdiction (2 total) or multiple rounds in each jurisdiction (e.g., kickoff, draft review, adoption = 6+ meetings)?

Answer #20: I would anticipate a number of public meetings being around 2 total for each jurisdiction, with the opportunity for some of our regular public meetings to include discussions and hear comments.

Question #21: What is the formal adoption process and timeline for each jurisdiction? How many adoption meetings are anticipated with the Plan Commission and the County Commissioner and City Council?

Answer #21: The formal adoption procedure includes the Ordinances being introduced at a Plan Commission meeting (held monthly) and then being forwarded with a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to the deciding body (City Council or County Commissioners). Those bodies could have multiple meetings, the Commissioners (meets every 2 weeks) would have the capability to approve at their first meeting. City Council (meets monthly) requires 2 hearings before their board.

Question #22: Are there existing studies or analyses available beyond the Comprehensive Plan that would influence the UDOs, such as: housing studies, needs assessments, economic development strategic plans, market analyses, or buildable lands inventory?

Answer #22: There are several other plans that the jurisdictions may want other documents to influence, but there are no recent significant plans that I am aware of that would take lead. Communications with stakeholders, local agencies, and legal revisions would be the main influence.

Question #23: Have there been text amendments to the 1973 ordinances that need to be compiled, or are all amendments already incorporated into the current documents linked in the RFP?

Answer #23: A section adding a County Solar Ordinance was approved on October 7th, 2025. It is outlined in Article XXXI Section 13 and 14 on pages 153-173 in the current County Ordinance.