



8081 – Request for Proposal for Consultant Services Woodhaven Park – Phase 2 Design Plan

DATE: October 9, 2014

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Addition/Change to the Contract Documents

The work provided for in this addendum shall become a part of the RFP submittal.

The following include responses to submitted questions on the RFP:

Question 1: *Who provided the Phase 1 design and construction documentation? And, did that phase of development go smoothly?*

Response: The improvements constructed under the Phase 1 concept plan were performed by several contractors under work orders. No records apparently exist for a single design/construction contract.

Question 2: *Is there an existing topographic/site survey and/or as-built base mapping available in ACAD format or will we need to provide survey?*

Response: The City does not have any topographic information for the site. The consultant will need to include survey services for a topographic survey of the site's current conditions.

Question 3: *Do you anticipate the need for environmental permitting, no-rise studies or other floodplain related studies being required for this phase of development?*

Response: Refer to Question 4 below. If expansion of the existing stormwater quality treatment facility is needed, CWS and possibly DSL permits may possibly be required. The final alignment of the trail if located within the wetland or vegetated corridor, may also require environmental permitting. The final alignment of the trail will dictate the need.

Question 4: *Does the existing stormwater facility have the capacity to accommodate the proposed Phase 2 improvements or do you anticipate that it will need to be expanded to accommodate increased impervious surface?*

Response: The existing stormwater treatment system located on-site treats stormwater runoff from Sunset Boulevard. The water quality facility system will need to be reviewed to determine if excess capacity is available to treat on-site runoff. If necessary, the system will need to be expanded to handle the additional flows.

Question 5: *Are you envisioning the Shelter/Restroom building being a pre-engineered structure such as Romtec or will it be a custom design requiring an Architectural sub-consultant?*

Response: The expectation is that a pre-engineered building structure will be installed.

Question 6: *Will the parking lot or any other feature require lighting? If so, is there already electrical service on site from the Phase 1 development?*

Response: It is anticipated that the parking lot and building exterior will have area/security lighting. Access to and capability of existing public power systems will need to be verified with PGE.

Question 7: *Do you anticipate any significant right-of-way permits being required associated with the parking lot design?*

Response: The proposed project will fall under a general site development permit, which will cover on-site connections to public right-of-ways.

Question 8: *Just to clarify the rate schedule requirements, it appears that you are looking for an actual detailed fee estimate with total hours and associated costs to be used for contract negotiations after the preferred consultant is chosen. Is that a correct assumption?*

Response: The separately submitted hourly rate schedule is to be utilized after a consultant is selected and a project scope of work is negotiated. The submitted rate schedule will then be opened and then applied to the negotiated scope of work to ascertain the proposed project cost. At that point negotiations will then occur on either reducing scope of work items or proposed rates. The submitted rate schedule will not be used to determine the selection of the consultant(s).

Question 9: *Also just to confirm, it is my understanding that this scope of work is to provide the permit ready drawings to the City and that the City will be responsible for filling out permit applications and routing the information through the process. Is that a correct assumption?*

Response: The expectation is that the consultant will provide appropriate support services through the design review and permitting process. The City will be taking responsibility for filling out permit applications and routing the information through the design review and permitting process.

Question 10: *Can you share any information as to who will be making up the selection committee for this RFQ?*

Response: It is anticipated that the selection committee will be made up of the following four individuals; the Community Services Director, the Community Development Director, the City Engineer, and a representative of the City Parks Board.

Question 11: *What kind of base drawings (current survey as-builts of Phase 1 development construction) are available for the park site, and are they available in an electronic format (i.e. AutoCAD)?*

Response: The City does not have any topographic information for the site. The consultant will need to include survey services for a topographic survey of the site's current conditions. (see response to Question 2).

Question 12: *Is there an existing irrigation system? Are there as-built drawings for the irrigation system?*

Response: There is access to an existing irrigation system along the street right-of-way. It is anticipated that modification of this system to provide irrigation service into the site will be required.

Question 13: *Are there specific City standards or specific formats that the City would like the consultant to use for project specifications?*

Response: The City utilizes APWA/ODOT Oregon Standard Specification for Construction 2015 for all public infrastructure improvements. This standard may not cover all design elements that are incorporated into this project. AIA standards are suitable for design elements not covered by the APWA/ODOT specifications. All construction contract front end document language must comply with public contracting requirements. The City will provide examples of City contract documents showing this language.

Question 14: *What is the designated budget for design work outlined in the RFP?*

Response: \$80k to \$100k.

Question 15: *Does the City want a custom designed restroom facility/picnic shelter, or is a pre-manufactured structure desirable?*

Response: The expectation is that a pre-engineered building structure will be installed (see response to Question 5).

Question 16: *The Parks Master Plan Recommendations and Actions Plans mentions a "sprayground" at Woodhaven Park with an estimated budget of \$50,000. This is not shown on the Master Plan. What is the status of this addition?*

Response: The "sprayground" item has been removed from the park plan and proposed project improvement list.

Question 17: *Environmental – I see mitigation plantings on site and I assume there is a resource assessment of the stream corridor. Can you tell me when it was completed?*

Response: The City files have a jurisdictional wetland delineation report from April 1990. Given the age of the report it is anticipated that if a resource assessment is needed for project permitting purposes, that it will be included in the scope of work.

Question 18: *Topographical – the master plan shows contours of the pre-construction conditions. Has there been an as-built survey completed? If not, I assume the City will want the consultant to provide this service?*

Response: The City does not have any topographic information for the site. The consultant will need to include survey services for a topographic survey of the site's current conditions (see response to Question 2).

Question 19: *Geotechnical – was a geotechnical investigation performed as part of Phase 1 work?*

Response: No geotechnical report exists for the site.

Question 20: *Stormwater – is there an existing stormwater management report for the previous work that was conducted? Specifically, one that includes the design assumptions/intent for the existing swale.*

Response: A technical design report exists for the stormwater facility. The existing stormwater treatment system located on-site treats stormwater runoff from Sunset Boulevard. The water quality facility system will need to be reviewed to determine if excess capacity is available to treat on-site runoff. If necessary, the system will need to be expanded to handle the additional flows.

Question 21: *The RFP indicates only one consultant will be chosen. Does that mean one team? That is, are we able to submit our qualifications with another firm (them acting as Prime, us as Sub)?*

Response: The intent is to select a design team comprised of a prime consultant along with sub-consultants. A sub-consultant may propose with as many consultant teams as they wish.

Question 22: *Was irrigation constructed with Phase 1 and will irrigation be a component of Phase 2?*

Response: There is access to an existing irrigation system along the street right-of-way. It is anticipated that modification of this system to provide irrigation service into the site will be required (see response to Question 12).

Question 23: *Are CAD as-built electronic files for the Phase 1 project available to the selected firm?*

Response: The City does not have any topographic information for the site. The consultant will need to include survey services for a topographic survey of the site's current conditions (see response Question 2).

Question 24: *It appears from the Master Plan that this site may have been surveyed – will an electronic version of topographic survey of the site be provided to the selected firm or is a topographic survey intended to be part of the services provided?*

Response: The City does not have any topographic information for the site. The consultant will need to include survey services for a topographic survey of the site's current conditions (see response Question 2).

Question 25: *What is the overall construction budget?*

Response: The construction budget has not been established for the project at this time.

Question 26: *Is the City open to doing an architecturally designed shelter/restroom?*

Response: The expectation is that a pre-engineered building structure will be installed (see response to Question 5).

Question 27: *What type of analysis was undertaken that determined the overall parking count listed in the master plan?*

Response: The City Municipal Code is silent regarding vehicle parking requirements for public parks. Based on the current and expected future use of the park, it is not foreseen that a larger parking stall count would be needed.

Question 28: *Generally, what is the review time for land-use approval.*

Response: Code mandates a maximum 120-day approval timeline. Depending on City planning staff workload, the actual time to receive approval may be less than the maximum.

Question 29: *In addition to 60% and 90% CD packages, will there also be 60% and 90% land-use packages?*

Response: It is expected that land-use review packages be submitted at the similar 60% and 90% development level.

Question 30: *Generally, what is the review time for Building Permit approval?*

Response: Building Permit review times vary depending on the size and complexity of the structure in review. For a project of this size and complexity it is anticipated that the Building Permit review time may be between 3 to 6 weeks.

Question 31: *What is the intended format/structure of the public meeting? Is the purpose of this meeting to re-visit the master plan or to provide the community with alternatives?*

Response: The public meeting format is a standard item for projects which require land-use approval from the Planning Commission. Generally, these meetings allow the developer to present their plan and record the comments presented by citizens. This meeting is not intended to re-visit the master plan or significantly change the current project concept plan.

Question 32: *Has a wetland/sensitive lands delineation been done for the project site?*

Response: The City files have a jurisdictional wetland delineation report from April 1990. Given the age of the report it is anticipated that if a resource assessment is needed for project permitting purposes, that it will be included in the scope of work (see response to Question 17).

Question 33: *Would the CA phase be included in the project scope? If not, would that be negotiated after the completion of the documentation phase? If so, will the City be working with a construction management consultant?*

Response: The administration of the construction process has not been determined at this time. Construction Administration (CA) is not intended to be included as part of the RFP response or scope of work for the Design Phase of the project.

Question 34: *Can you describe what type of information the City is looking for under the "Supporting Information" evaluation criteria and if there is a page limit? As this is worth 15 point of the total score, we would like to provide you with meaningful materials that are responsive to the RFP.*

Response: The intent is that the consultant teams present supporting information which shows they have performed similar projects successfully. The expectation is the quality of and not simply quantity of projects designed which will represent the team's capabilities. The number of pages is not dictated as we are leaving that up to the judgment of the consultant teams.

This ADDENDUM shall be signed and attached to the Bidder's Proposal and shall subsequently become part of the Contract Documents.

Company Name	
Contractor Name	
Contractor Signature	
Date	