

Addendum No. 1 to RFP 16-53



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

To: All Parties on Record with the City of Somerville as Holding RFP 16-53
Hoyt Sullivan Playground Design

From: Alex Nosnik, Assistant Director, Purchasing

Date: December 29, 2015

Re: Answers to Questions

Addendum No. 1 to RFP 16-53

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.

X

Name of Authorized Signatory
Title of Authorized Signatory

- 1. The purpose of this Addendum is to provide answers to questions.**
- 2. And, to extend the deadline of the RFP to 1/13/16. Please note that proposals are now due on 1/13/16 at 11AM EST.**

Q: Under Comparative Evaluation Criteria, Factor 2, Key Personnel, the RFP reads "The degree to which the Offeror's proposed key personnel resumes which must include either a letter of intent or a signed resume by the key personnel and the contractor demonstrates the individual's ability..." - we are having difficulty interpreting that sentence. It appears to be asking for signatures on the resumes themselves, and/or a "letter of intent," but we're not clear on what the "letter of intent" means?

A: The point of the above requirement is to confirm that the proposed staff will work on the project and will not be moved off of the project once the award has been issued. Proposed staff

Addendum No. 1 to RFP 16-53

can sign letters of intent (which indicate that they intend to work on the project), but other forms of confirmation will also be acceptable.

Q: Our understanding of Factor 3, Past Performance, is that it is requesting documentation (ie, samples/information) on a number of similar past park projects (ideally, 10+) which can be from any time period, as well as detailed references for a minimum of three past projects from within the last three years. We interpret this as indicating that the three or more recent projects for which references are given can be included in the larger 10+ projects demonstrating past performance, not that 13+ projects are requested. Is this correct?

A: Correct.

Q: Under Section 3, Rule for Award, the first sentence implies that the overall most advantageous proposal (including but not solely based on price) will be awarded the contract. However, the third sentence about extension of the time for award refers to agreement with the "apparent lowest responsive and responsible bidder." Please clarify?

A: Section 3, Rule for Award will be struck (in its entirety) and replaced with the following:
"SECTION 3.0 RULE FOR AWARD

The contract shall be awarded to the responsible and responsive proposer submitting the most advantageous proposal response, taking into consideration all evaluation criteria as well as price. The contract will be awarded within ninety (90) days after the bid opening. The time for award may be extended for up to 45 additional days by mutual agreement between the City and the apparent, most advantageous proposer."

Q: The Pricing form includes a line "Please provide Unit Price for the following and include any additional fees not listed." Is that line in error, as no Unit Prices are requested?

A: Correct. All references to Unit Prices can be ignored.

Q: Additionally, the Hourly Fee Schedule includes a line for LSP, but none is called for in the RFP body; is an LSP required?

A: No. An LSP is not required.

Q: Lastly, should the Hourly Fee Schedule also include sub-consultant's hourly fees? If so, is a separate sheet acceptable for listing those, as there is not much space on the form?

A: No. Only the prime consultant's rates are needed.

Q: A W-9 is included in the forms but not listed in the checklist. Should we be including the completed W-9 in the proposal response, or will it only be requested of the selected Consultant?

A: If the proposer is already a registered vendor with the City of Somerville, you do not need to include a W9. Otherwise, please include one in your sealed technical proposal.

Q: The proposal requires that we include a lighting designer on the team, but it does not mention the requirement for an electrical engineer. Can we assume that if we are installing lights that an electrical engineer is required for the Construction Documents or will the City provide an electrical engineer?

Addendum No. 1 to RFP 16-53

A: The park will require a new lighting plan and that plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Department of Inspectional Services. However, the decision to hire an electrical engineer shall remain with the consultant. It is the City's assumption that the lighting designer will have the expertise to provide whatever plans are needed. The City will not provide an electrical engineer.

Q: Can you clarify whether the City would be able to conduct percolation testing if permeable surfacing is desired?

A: No, the City will not conduct percolation testing. However, the City agrees that testing is a reasonable consideration. If the consultant and the City agree to pursue a percolation test, the City will provide a backhoe and operator to dig a test pit; however, the percolation test itself would have to be performed by the consultant.

Q: The proposed overlook adjacent to the rail corridor, per the RFP, is to be located on the park's parcel. However, there are numerous trees and significant brush further down the slope in MBTA property as well. Is clearing of that vegetation expected to be part of the contract?

A: It is likely that some clearing of vegetation and debris will be required on MBTA land, and it will be the consultant's responsibility to outline the scope of work and specify the MBTA access requirements for the contractor. Presumably, the overlook's configuration, size and surrounding views will influence the amount of removal needed.

Q: Does the City have standard light fixtures that they want used consistently across their parks?

A: The City does have standard light fixtures that can be incorporated into the design. However, we are open to the use of other fixtures if they will improve the quality of the lighting and the design.

Q: Does the site currently drain well? Is it anticipated that the drainage infrastructure can be re-used?

A: Yes, the City assumes the existing drainage infrastructure will be reused or adapted to the new design. While it is unknown how well the subsoils drain, no drainage issues have been reported. With the exception of the paved asphalt basketball court, the existing park does not have many impervious surfaces.

Q: Can you clarify whether the level of construction administration expected is as described in Section 5.4 and in the first paragraph of Section 4.4, as compared to the schedule listed in the first bullet point of Section 4.4?

A: While it is unknown how many hours the landscape architect will actually need to be on site during the construction period, the consultant should anticipate the above hours as a minimal (estimated) requirement during the periods of active construction. It is expected that the construction will take approximately one year; however, there will be several weeks when little Construction Administration is required.

Q: Also, under Section 5.2, there's a reference to a seasonal ice rink and playfields. Please confirm that these features are not intended to be included in the Hoyt Sullivan playground.

Addendum No. 1 to RFP 16-53

A: Any reference to a seasonal ice rink and playfields in the RFP form are a typographic error and do not apply to this park.

Q: Please confirm whether the landscape architect will be required to be present on site 2 hrs/day, 4 days/week throughout construction period; and whether construction period is intended to be approximately one year, per schedule provided.

A: While it is unknown how many hours the landscape architect will actually need to be on site during the construction period, the consultant should anticipate the above hours as a minimal (estimated) requirement during the periods of active construction. It is expected that the construction will take approximately one year; however, there will be several weeks when little Construction Administration is required.

Q: Please confirm the requirement of submitting as-built plans during the Site analysis/Schematic Design phase of work. Are these drawings to represent existing site conditions, and if so, to what extent?

A: As-built drawings will not be required until the park construction is complete, and will not be required as part of the Site analysis/Schematic Design phase of work.