

Addendum No. 1 to RFQF 18-15



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

To: All Parties on Record with the City of Somerville as Holding RFQF 18-15,
Allen Street Playground Landscape Design Services

From: Michael Richards, Assistant Purchasing Director

Date: October 31, 2017

Re: Answer Questions; Append Bid Holders List

Addendum No. 1 to RFQF 18-15

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.

The attached addendum answers all questions received during the Q/A period and appends the bid holder list as of 1:00pm 10/31/2017. The deadline for submissions remains unchanged – sealed proposals are to be delivered to the address below by **11:00am Tuesday November 7th**.

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 18-15

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Our understanding is that the existing portion of the site dedicated to the vegetable beds remains substantially the same, save for the integration of the work area and social gathering space. The portion of the site between the aluminum picket (at the sidewalk) and chainlink would become the tot lot. Is this correct?

ANSWER: That is substantially correct; however the existing chain link fence line separating the garden area from of the playground is not fixed and should be revised as necessary to expand the available area for the playground.

Q. Is a water feature/splash pad anticipated?

ANSWER: No, that will not be a part of the plan. As stated elsewhere however, a drinking fountain or bottle filler are reasonable considerations.

Q. Does this project require coordination with the Union Square (US2) development master plan?

ANSWER: No that is not required.

Q. At the end of Section 2.0, it states that the design budget is fixed with a maximum cost of \$20,000 including all costs and contingencies. However, on Page 7, there is a section on Fee Negotiations. Is the fixed \$20,000 negotiable? If not, how was this fee determined?

ANSWER: The budget is fixed at \$20,000 and is not negotiable. The price is a staff estimate based on other projects of similar size and scope.

Q. We have some questions about the formal aspects or the intended items to be in the RFQ, but there also seems to be a conflict between the design scope as presented in the RFQ and the CPA funding request's description of what was included, and between the scope in the RFQ and the funding available.)

ANSWER: When there is a discrepancy, please follow the guidelines included in the RFP, not the CPA funding request.

Q. Under 1.1 the instructions say to not use 3-ring binders, but under 1.3 the instructions call for a lay-flat binding with identification on the spine that "allow for easy removal and replacement of pages." Please clarify whether a GBC binding system is acceptable (since it is not clear whether that counts as easy removal as it requires a machine) or, if not, what alternative to 3-ring binders is preferred.

A. We typically request you not use a binder and do include some other formatting like spiral-bound (if using a spiral bound, don't worry about including your information on the spine of the submission). If you are only able to provide a 3-ring binder submission, that will be acceptable as well.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-15

Q. Under 1.3 Qualifications & Experience the text refers to historic sites and interpretive signage; we assume this is left over from a prior proposal, and that the section should describe work on small childrens' playgrounds within the context of existing sites instead? Will there be a new Qualifications and Experience paragraph issued in addendum?

ANSWER: Correct. Historic signage will not be required. Interpretative signage will be relative to safety recommendations for the playground's age use group, and should in both Spanish and English. Text for additional City standard signage; including a construction project sign, bronze dedication plaque, and park regulations will be provided by the City's representative; however the layout to be provided to the contractor will be the consultant's responsibility.

Q. Under 1.3's Design Team list, the list of consultants includes Civil/Structural Engineering and Lighting Consultants; however, the proposed scope of work and project budget (per Section 2) do not appear to include any new utility connections; large walls or built structures other than play equipment; street or crosswalk work; or lighting. Please clarify if the intent of 1.3 is to include individuals to address those items if the scope is increased, or if they are not required.

ANSWER: A Civil/Structural Engineer and Lighting Consultant are not required; however, the landscape construction plans must be stamped by a Licensed Landscape Architect, or a Civil Engineer. Additionally, while the need for new lighting has not been determined, it may be requested as a safety or design feature. If new lighting is included, the design team will need to provide all appropriate specifications including those for a new utility connection and electric utility box. It has not been determined if a new crosswalk will be included.

The consultant should assume that the new playground will include a drinking fountain or bottle filler, but that the existing water service in the community garden can be adapted for that purpose.

Q. 1.6 indicates that the City will request a fee proposal from the highest-ranked Offeror; however, Section 3.0's checklist and the included Section 4.0 contain a Fee Proposal Form. Please clarify whether a Fee Proposal should be included or if it is to be requested only after ranking firms (and, if it is included in the proposal, whether it will be considered in the Ranking).

ANSWER: The City requests fee proposal to be included in a separate sealed envelope with the submission, but we will not review those proposed costs until after we have completed our initial review of the qualifications package. Please submit a fixed fee schedule with your submission, per Section 4.0

Q. Section 2.0's proposed project schedule (out to bid by March 2018) seems very tight for the City to procure a survey and process the design contract, to schedule the proposed three community meetings with the consultant, and still leave time for the consultant to produce complete construction documents for bidding. Can you clarify that this is the intended schedule, and whether there are CPA-related or other requirements dictating the schedule or if there is flexibility?

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-15

ANSWER: The City would like to bid the project as soon as possible in the spring of 2018 to get the best price for construction. Construction is expected to start in the late spring of 2018. However, the City is open to extending the completion date until April 1, 2018. As stated elsewhere, an electronic DWG file of a previous survey and layout plan will be provided by the City upon award of the contract.

Q. Is the size of the HeadStart groups that will use the space at one time available? (HeadStart has a square footage per child requirement.)

ANSWER: Anticipate that 20 Headstart children at a time may use the space; or one classroom's worth of kids.

(75 square feet /child x 20 = 1500 square feet)

Q. The Scope of Work 4.1 lists existing conditions and a base plan for design purposes as part of the Consultant's expected work product. Is the consultant expected to procure a survey and/or compile a base plan, or is the City procuring a separate survey which would be used as a base on which our observations would be documented? (5.1 indicates that the City will provide the survey.)

ANSWER: A new survey will not be necessary. Upon award of the contract, the City will provide electronic DWG files of the previous survey and layout plan which the consultant can adapt as a base plan.

Q. The Scope of Work 4.2 and 5.2 lists Utility, Lighting, and Irrigation plans - are these intended? There is no other mention of lighting; utility work described is limited; and irrigation would seem to be in conflict with the emphasis on green design elsewhere in the RFQ. Additionally, all of these elements of the scope would affect the ability to fit within the project budget.

ANSWER: At this time it has not been determined if utilities, lighting, or irrigation will be required elements of the renovation. However, if they are included, separate plans for those items are not required. The need for lighting will be determined during the community process. If irrigation is desired, it is assumed that water service; including a water utility cabinet with backflow preventer, can be provided with a connection to the existing water service in the community garden.

Q. When are the proposed three public meetings intended in the design process?

ANSWER: The consultant should anticipate three public meetings, unless it is determined that fewer are required. The meetings times would be agreed upon by the consultant and the City's representative. The first meeting would introduce the consultant and ask for community feedback, the second will present schematic design options, and the third will present the final design scheme.

Q. Please clarify that given the limited budget, no on-line surveys or other outreach are expected on the part of the designer other than participation in the three public meetings and three working group sessions.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 18-15

ANSWER: Correct, additional outreach is not required.

Q. 4.4 lists 2 hrs/day x 4 days/week for Construction Administration; 5.4 says 2 hrs/day x 3 days/week. Which is expected?

ANSWER: 5.4: 2 hrs./day x 3 days/week is correct. Fewer hours may be acceptable, depending upon the work; however the consultant should be anticipate these costs.

Q. The fixed design budget of \$20,000 seems insufficient for a project with an undefined construction scope and an intensive community meeting process. - Please clarify that the City already has or will separately be procuring a topographic survey of the site, outside the design budget.

ANSWER: The City will provide electronic DWG files of a survey and layout plan from the previous set of construction plans.

Q. Please clarify whether the Construction Administration phase is considered part of the "design budget".

ANSWER: Yes, Construction Administration costs should be included as part of the lump sum design proposal.

Q. Please clarify exactly which scope items (lighting, irrigation, utilities) the Designer should carry costs to include in the project scope, and which would constitute changes to the contract if added; none are currently indicated in the description of the work expected other than in lists of drawings.

ANSWER: These items may or may not be required, and will be determined during the community design process. There is water service on site but no existing electric service.

Q. It would also help if the City could specify a not-to-exceed project Construction Budget on which the design contract can be based to help define the Offerors' responsibilities.

ANSWER: The City will not specify a not-to-exceed project Construction Budget; however we anticipate that the maximum project construction budget will be under \$225,000.

Q. The CPA application described the \$20,000 design budget as for "Schematic Design" - presumably through either the end of 4.1 or the midpoint of 4.2 in the RFQ's scope - with the intent to submit for Construction funding in a future CPA cycle. This seems like a more reasonable expectation for the scale of the project budget.

- Please clarify the intent relative to the CPA application.

- Please clarify whether the construction phase would be applying for future CPA funding, as described in the CPA application, or if the City does not plan to pause to apply for CPA funds for construction and would follow the schedule as described in the RFQ.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQF 18-15

ANSWER: The \$20,000 budget is inclusive of all phases of the project design and construction administration services, and is not limited to "Schematic Design." It is expected that the funding source for construction will be CDBG funding, and that construction will start in the late spring of 2018, and that no additional CPA funds will be requested.

Q. The Allen Street CPA Application also discusses having the design "maintain or expand the 16 existing community garden plots and benches for neighbors" - please clarify that there is no work expected within the community garden area and that the redesign only addresses the approx. 1900 square feet indicated in the RFQ. The application also discussed traffic calming measures; please confirm that none are expected in the project scope.

ANSWER: The boundary and fencing around the community garden area are likely to change in order to maximize the available space for the playground; however the 16 existing community garden spaces will be preserved. In addition, traffic calming measures including a new crosswalk and a new street tree are strong possibilities.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQF 18-15

Appendix A

Bid Holders List

RFQ 18-15 Allen Street Playground Designer Services - List of Vendors Interested

Name	Company	Address	Phone	E-mail Address
DJ Chagnon	CBA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS	24 Thorndike Street Cambridge, MA 02141	617-945-9760	dj@cbaland.com; clara@cbaland.com
Kathryn Desmarais	Meridian Associates, Inc.	69 Milk Street, Suite 302, Westborough, MA 01581	(508) 871-7030	kdesmarais@meridianassoc.com; jtrainer@meridianassoc.com
Christine King	BETA Group, Inc.		401.333.2382	CKing@BETA-Inc.com ; tlionetta@BETA-inc.com ; asloan@BETA-inc.com ; ssmith@BETA-inc.com
Kenneth McClure	HALVORSON DESIGN PARTNERSHIP, INC.	25 Kingston Street 5th Floor Boston, Massachusetts 02111	617.536.0380	ken@halvorsondesign.com
David Walsh	Hammer + Walsh Design, Inc.		617-670-0257	dw@hammerwalsh.com
Danna Day	Copley Wolff Design Group	160 Boylston Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02116	617 654 9000	dday@copley-wolff.com
Stalker, Thomas R.	BSC Group	803 Summer Street Boston MA 02127	617-896-4349	tstalker@bscgroup.com; LMartin@BSCGroup.com
Debbie Dempsey,	The Blue Book Network			bbbid@bbid.thebluebook.com
Leonard Ruszczyk, P.E.	Surveying and Mapping Consultants, Inc.	325 Wood Road, Suite 109 Braintree, MA 02184	(781) 519-5074	lruszczyk@smcsurvey.com
Eden Dutcher / Will Martin	GroundView LLC	5 Dell Street, Somerville, 02145	617 - 548.9688	edendutcher@groundviewdesign.com
DJ Chagnon	CBA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS	Cambridge, MA 02141	617-945-9760	dj@cbaland.com ; clara@cbaland.com
David J. Warner, R.L.A.	Warner Larson, Inc.	130 West Broadway, Boston, MA 02127	(617) 464-1440 x12	DWarner@warnerlarson.com
	Terraink	Arlington, MA 02476	(781) 316-1595	info@terraink.com; mmariscal@terraink.com
Jennie Abbott	STEPHEN STIMSON ASOCIATES	Cambridge MA 02139	617 876 8960	jabbott@stephenstimson.com
Joanne J Hiromura / Karen Sh	STUDIO MLA Architects	Brookline MA 02445	617- 608-1551	
Andrew Leonard	LDA LEONARD DESIGN ASSOCIATES	Arlington, MA 02474	781-641-0750	leonarddesign@rcn.com
David Walsh	THE COLLABORATIVE	Boston, MA 02210	617- 338-0018	dwalsh@thecollaborative.com
Karen Fitzgerald	ProjectDog	Newburyport, MA	978-499-9014	addenda@projectdog.com
Justin Felisco	ConstructConnect	Norcross, GA	323-602-5079	Justin.Felisco@ConstructConnect.com
Aminah McNulty	Brown, Richardson, & Rowe Inc	Boston, MA 02210	617-542-8552	Amcnulty@brownrowe.com
Elizabeth Hollander	Shadley Associates	Lexington, MA	781-652-8809	ehollender@shadleyassociates.com
Art Eddy	Birchwood Design Group	Boston, MA 02210	617-207-5440	aeddy@birchwooddesigngroup.com
Robert Angelo	CivilView	Methuen, MA 01844	978-416-0203	rangelo@civilviewinc.com