

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-07



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

To: All Parties on Record with the City of Somerville as Holding RFQ 18-07,
Landscape Design Services for Prospect Hill Park

From: Michael Richards, Assistant Purchasing Director

Date: August 16th, 2017

Re: Answer Questions, Clarification of Comparative Evaluation Criteria

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-07

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by signing below and including this form in your proposal package. Failure to do so may subject the proposer to disqualification.

This addendum clarifies questions received during the Q/A period and clarifies a factor in the Comparative Evaluation Criteria. Please see that attached answers for all questions received.

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. 1 to RFQ 18-07

Comparative Evaluation Criteria Clarification

To clarify, Factor 3: Past Performance, it requests 5 or more projects that are comparable to those listed in Section 2: Scope of Services. At least THREE of these must be HISTORIC landscape projects with comparable examples to the goals and objectives described in the SOW. The remaining two can be non-historic, but must demonstrate the (non-historic) goals and objectives of the Prospect Hill project. Respondents' qualifications packages must include reference to the comparable projects to meet this criterion.

Questions and Answers

- Q. Lighting plans and consultants are mentioned in the RFQ. Is the intent to replace/upgrade existing site lighting only with modern and site appropriate technology, or is it the City's intent to also light the tower and/or flag?
- A. While we may want to light the tower, any lighting will be from the park. We are not anticipating running conduit into the tower as part of this project
- Q. Section 1.3 under Design Team, the RFQ mentions potential sub-consultants as a Licensed Site Professional, Lighting Consultants, Civil and/or structural engineer, and specialty natural turf grass consultant. Is it the City's recommendation that all of these sub-consultants be required, or are they listed as examples? For example, based on the RFQ and a visit to the site, we are not aware that an LSP would be necessary for this project and we believe that turf grass discussions can be handled with our staff expertise.
- A. This is correct. We do not foresee needing an LSP, but the proposer should be prepared to have a team of subs appropriate to this project and should list them. If any are missing, we will discuss.
- Q. Can you describe the scope for the LSP?
- A. LSP is an example of a consultant that may be needed. We do not anticipate we will need one for this project.
- Q. What do you anticipate the scope for the organic lawn consultant?
- A. The lawn may need to be rehabilitated. This consultant will help the landscape architect design the lawn (and subsurface) in a way that best allows the grass to grow, accounts for urban usage, and provides a maintenance plan assuming a non-chemical based regime.
- Q. The RFQ also includes mention of an Irrigation consultant and irrigation plans. Is it the City's intent to irrigate some, or part, of the site
- A. Yes
- Q. The RFQ mentions the City's traffic calming lead. Can the City share who that firm is and who the main contact at that firm is for the City's projects?
- A. This is an internal City team. If there is an outside firm required, it will be procured by the Transportation planner.
- Q. A 3-ring binder is not allowed, however the spine of the proposal requires that information

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-07

- be written on it. What type of binding is recommended?
- A. Proposals will not be rejected based on the presentation or packaging of the submission. The City requests respondents clearly label their proposals (if only on the cover if available) and avoid elaborate or cumbersome formats for ease of evaluation and storage. A spiral- or GBC-bound proposal is acceptable.
- Q. Does the \$75,000 design budget include Bid/Negotiation and Construction Administration services?
- A. Yes, the project fee will include site analysis and schematic design; design development and construction documents; bid and negotiation; and construction administration services, as described in the scope of services.
- Q. There is a reference under the Letter of Introduction section in your RFQ to certification. Are you stating that the letter be notarized or certified in any way?
- A. The letter of introduction must be signed by an individual that can certify that they are authorized to enter into a contract with the City on behalf of their organization. This letter does not need to be notarized or formally certified – simply a signature in the letter. The signatory is formally certified by completing and submitting a Certificate of Signature Authority (either for a corporation or LLC) included in Section 3.0 Forms.