

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**



**CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS**  
**Department of Purchasing**  
**JOSEPH A. CURTATONE**  
**MAYOR**

**To:** Proposers of RFQ # 22-26 Somerville Junction Park Design Services

**From:** Andrea Caruth, Deputy Chief Procurement Officer

**Date:** January 14, 2022

**Re:** Responses to request for information and changes to bid price form

---

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

---

This addendum documents responses to all requests for information (RFIs) submitted by prospective applicants to this IFB. This addendum specifies the Evaluative Criteria the City will use for proposals.

Please note: the bid package pricing form is updated. Please see attached.

**\*\*This addendum changes specifications and pricing form. Failure to acknowledge this addendum may result in bid disqualification.\*\***

**NAME OF COMPANY / INDIVIDUAL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDRESS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CITY/STATE/ZIP:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TELEPHONE/FAX/EMAIL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED INDIVIDUAL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDA:**

**Addendum #1** \_\_\_\_\_ **#2** \_\_\_\_\_ **#3** \_\_\_\_\_ **#4** \_\_\_\_\_

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

TO ALL BIDDERS:

Bidders are hereby informed that Contract Documents for the above-mentioned contract are modified, corrected, and/or supplemented as follows and the Addendum No. 1 becomes part of the Contract Documents

Section 1.3 Non-Technical Proposal-Qualifications and Experience

**DELETE** Lighting Consultants

**DELETE** Specialty natural turf grass consultants

Section 4.0 Proposer's Checklist and Forms

**REMOVE** Vulnerable Road Users Form

**REMOVE** Prevailing Wage Compliance and Weekly Report

#	Question	Answer
1	<p>From Addendum 1 question:</p> <p>The LSP cost for addressing any soil contamination encountered is unable to be estimated and therefore unknowable at this time. Since Section 2.0 suggests the City intends to engage an LSP separately from the design and the cost of LSP services is unknown, should applicants exclude LSP services from the qualification and price submission?</p>	<p>The following is an updated response to question 1 form Addendum 1.</p> <p>The City will contract with the LSP separately, and will provide the report to the chosen designer. Therefore, this RFP should not include fees associated with LSP work. Because this project may necessitate additional LSP work, if you have an LSP on your team, please include a fee proposal for LSP services. The City reserves the right to use an LSP other than the one listed in the selected bidder's proposal. All proposals will be considered, whether or not an LSP is included</p>
2	<p>The allowable design fee is listed in the Funding Section 4.0 of the RFP.</p> <p>It states the allowable design fee has been established at a fixed fee of \$80,000.</p>	<p>Responders should prepare a competitive bid that fully responds to the scope of work. \$80,00 is the City's current budget for design, including construction administration costs. The lowest price is not basis of award.</p>

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

	Does that 80k amount include the costs related to Construction Administration Tasks?	
3	Are there meeting notes available from the Community Listening Session (7/7/21)? The notes would be helpful in understanding the City's vision for the site in more detail.	The Community Listening Session can be viewed at this link: <a href="https://www.somervillema.gov/departments/psuf-public-space/somerville-junction-park">https://www.somervillema.gov/departments/psuf-public-space/somerville-junction-park</a>
4	Is the intent that the project's scope will leave the Community Path improvements in place, or does the City expect the possibility of modifying those elements in the course of the design?	The current intent is to keep the Community path along the northern edge of the site in order to maximize usable park space. However, this will ultimately be determined during the community design process.
5	Based on the RFQ, we assume a site survey either exists or will be obtained separately by the City. Is that correct, or is the site survey expected to be part of the \$80,000 fee?	Correct. The City will obtain site a survey separate from this design contract.
6	For a potentially highly technical project including coordination with the City's LSP regarding AUL and other issues, an 8.4% design fee is on the low end of the expected range, especially as the City has reserved the right to increase the project budget. Can the City provide any assurances regarding a maximum project budget above which the City would be open to renegotiating the fee?	This project is not a percent-based fee. It will not change based on the final budget. Applicants should propose a fee that enables them to complete everything in the scope.
7	The proposed schedule in 5.0 is both aggressive (1.5 months for Design Development through completed bid-ready CDs is a very tight timetable) and does not seem to align with the requested meetings listed in Public Process - the third meeting is listed as June 2022, at which point the Construction Drawings are	We understand that the schedule is aggressive. Because PARC Grant funding becomes available July 1, 2022, the City and selected design team will work together to stay as close to the outlined schedule as possible.

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

<p>expected to be fairly advanced according to the timetable, which does not allow for changes due to the third meeting, if appropriate. The schedule also does not appear to allow for City administrative review at each step of the process. Is there any flexibility in the proposed timetable?</p>	
---	--

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

**Comparative Evaluation Criteria**

The Comparative Evaluation Criteria set forth in this section of the RFP shall be used to evaluate responsible and responsive proposals. The Comparative Evaluation Criteria are:

All proposals will be reviewed by an evaluation committee composed of employees of the City. Final selection will be based upon the evaluators' analysis of the information and materials required under the RFP and provided by the proposing vendors in their submissions. The City reserves the right to involve an outside consultant in the selection process. Proposals that meet the minimum quality requirements will be reviewed for responses to the comparative evaluation criteria. The evaluation committee will assign a rating of Highly Advantageous, Advantageous, Not Advantageous, or Unacceptable to the comparative evaluation criteria.

The City will only award a contract to a responsive and responsible Proposer. Before awarding the contract(s), the City may request additional information from the Proposer to ensure that the Proposer has the resources necessary to perform the required services. The City reserves the right to reject any and all proposals if it determines that the criteria set forth have not been met.

<b>Factor 1: Technical and Management Approach</b>	
<b>Highly Advantageous</b>	The Offeror's Qualifications demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the Scope of Work outlined in Section 2.0 and a thorough attention to detail. The Offeror's Qualifications demonstrate that they have exhibited past projects that are both cost effective and relevant to Somerville's specific needs.
<b>Advantageous</b>	The Offeror's Qualifications demonstrate a moderate understanding of the Scope of Work outlined in Section 2.0 and modest attention to detail. The Offeror's Qualifications demonstrate that their past projects have not been optimally cost effective and lack certain aspects of relevance to Somerville's needs.
<b>Not Advantageous</b>	The Offeror's Qualifications lacks a comprehensive understanding of the Scope of Work outlined in Section 2.0 and a thorough attention to detail. The Offeror's Qualifications demonstrate that their past projects have not been cost effective or relevant to Somerville.

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

<b>Factor 2: Key Personnel</b>	
<b>Highly Advantageous</b>	<p><u>All</u> of the personnel identified by the Offeror are proven to possess a <u>very high level</u> of landscape design and construction administration experience and performance. Resumes are included in the RFQ for all proposed personnel. All proposed personnel are currently performing functions similar to those proposed clearly show an adequate level of relevant experience to successfully perform the scope outlined herein.</p>
<b>Advantageous</b>	<p><u>All</u> of the personnel identified by the Offeror are proven to possess a <u>high level</u> of landscape design and construction administration experience and performance. Resumes are included in the RFQ for most of the proposed personnel. Some of these proposed personnel show an adequate level of relevant experience to successfully perform the scope outlined herein.</p>
<b>Not Advantageous</b>	<p><u>Most</u> but not all of the personnel identified by the Offeror are proven to possess an <u>adequate level</u> of landscape design and construction administration experience. Resumes are not included not any of the proposed staff.</p>

<b>Factor 3: Past Performance</b>	
<b>Highly Advantageous</b>	<p>The RFQ demonstrates the Offeror's efficient and effective design and management of eight or more projects of similar size and scope in settings similar to Somerville and to the types of projects listed in Section 2.0.</p>
<b>Advantageous</b>	<p>The RFQ demonstrates the Offeror's efficient and effective design and management of six to eight park projects of similar size and scope in settings similar to Somerville and to the types of projects listed in Section 2.0.</p>

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

<p><b>Not Advantageous</b></p>	<p>The RFQ demonstrates the Offeror's efficient and effective design and management of less than four park projects of similar size and scope in settings similar to Somerville and to the types of projects listed in Section 2.0.</p>
--------------------------------	---

**RFQ 22-26**  
**SECTION 3.0**  
**PRICING**

By signing this Price Form, the Proposer certifies the following bulleted statements and offers to supply and deliver the materials and services specified below in full accordance with the Contract Documents supplied by the City of Somerville entitled: **Somerville Junction Park Design Services**

- The proposals will be received at the office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Somerville City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville, MA 02143 no later than **1/19/2022 1PM ET**
- If the **awarded** vendor is a Corporation a “Certificate of Good Standing” (produced by the Mass. Sec. of State) must be furnished with the resulting contract (see Section 4.0.)
- **Awarded Vendor** must comply with Living Wage requirements (see Section 4.0; only for services)
- **Awarded Vendor** must comply with insurance requirements as stated in Section 4.0.
- The Chief Procurement Officer reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals and/or to waive any informalities if in her/his sole judgment it is deemed to be in the best interest of the City of Somerville.
- The following prices shall include delivery, the cost of fuel, the cost of labor, and all other charges.
- This form to be enclosed in sealed proposal package.

**Please provide Unit Price for the following and include any additional fees not listed:**

<b>Total Project Fixed Fee (in figures)</b>	\$
<b>Total Project Fixed Fee (in words)</b>	
<b>Itemized Design Fee for Base Services by Task (for reference and billing)</b>	
Site Analysis and Schematic Design	\$
Design and Construction Documentation	\$
Bid and Negotiation	\$
Construction Administration	\$
<b><u>Additional Fees</u></b>	



**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**

Additional Community Meetings - Cost per meeting:	\$
<b><u>Hourly Fee Schedule (for reference and billing)</u></b>	
Principal / Project Manager	\$
Associate	\$
Designer	\$
LSP	\$
Other:	\$
Other:	\$
Other:	\$
<b>Name of Company/Individual:</b>	
<b>Address, City, State, Zip:</b>	
<b>Tel #</b>	<b>Email:</b>
<b>Signature of Authorized Individual</b>	
<p>Please acknowledge receipt of any and all Addenda (if applicable) by signing below and including this form in your proposal package. Failure to do so may subject the proposer to disqualification.</p> <p><b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDA:</b></p> <p>Addendum #1 ____ #2 ____ #3 ____ #4 ____ #5 ____ #6 ____ #7 ____ #8 ____ #9 ____ #10 ____</p>	

**Addendum No. 2 to RFQ 22-26**