REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS ADDENDUM #1
Downtown Public Place Design Concepts

RESPONSES TO INQUIRIES SUBMITTED BEFORE NOVEMBER 25, 2019 AT 4PM

Release Date: November 11, 2019
Proposal Submittal Deadline: December 18, 2019 before 4pm

https://smwi.org/economic-development/
Regarding Budgets

“Do you have a target consultant budget for this work?”

“What is the City’s anticipated budget for this scope of work?”

“Fees: Is there an anticipated fee range for the design work?”

“Does the City have an anticipated fee they have budgeted for this planning work?”

“Does the City have a budget in mind for the professional design services for this first phase of work?”

This concept design and public engagement process is unique from the processes previously undertaken by the City. As such, the City has elected not to set a budget for this phase of work that would ultimately limit the deliverables and outcomes of the scope as written in the RFP. The scope is a guide for respondents to craft a lump sum fee that can be reviewed as part of a holistic assessment of each response.

“Do you have a sense of the construction budget for the project (when applicable)?”

Regarding the potential construction investment, the City does not have a budget in mind. While the hope is to expeditiously proceed with this project as the months progress, the City is not in a position to project construction costs under an unknown construction timeline.

“Could you please send us the current links for the documentation and discussion materials referenced in the RFP document?”

The RFP PDF file links were activated and posted on November 20, 2019.

Regarding the Project Proposal Guidelines

“In review of the RFP it notes that consultants will be evaluated based on their description of their proposed approach, however an approach section isn’t included in the outline of expected content in the proposal guidelines. Is the City expecting the proposed approach will be described as part of the Cover Letter or is the City looking for an Approach section in the submission?”

The City expects the proposed approach to be included in the Cover Letter as listed on Page 7 of the RFP.

Regarding the Project Scope of Work

“Scope: Are you open to any proposed alternates to the scope and approach?”

The City intends to discuss any modifications to the scope during the Contract Negotiations period. At this time, the City requests that respondents assemble a response and lump sum fee that align with the scope as listed.

“Regarding m): The RFP describes the final deliverable as “final concepts” and specifically mentions two perspectives. Can the City elaborate on the expected level of development of the plan (i.e., “concept” plan, “schematic” site plan)?”

The City can elaborate on the expected level of development of the plan. The City is requesting concepts to scale, i.e. with approximate dimensions, in keeping with what is traditionally labeled “schematic design”.

“Is this project grant or otherwise funded? If so, will there be funding reporting or deliverable requirements included in the project?”
The project is not grant funded at this time; as such, no funding reporting or funding deliverables are requested for this project.

“The RFP outlines 10 different sites within the project limits. Is the City looking for up to three design concepts for each site or up to three concepts total across all 10 sites?”

The City requests up to three concepts total across all 10 sites. The City views the project area as a single area. See the attached map for a clearer view of the project area boundary and parcels within.

Regarding Public Engagement

“I see the desire to have project information areas at 4 to 5 locations with an interactive feedback collection system. Does this include surveys and other data collection methods for feedback? Is it desired to have the interaction based on viewing plan options created and prepared by the planning consultants or prior to the planners creating various plan options to solicit the public’s ideas first?”

“I also see the desire for 1 public input session, I imagine perhaps a couple hours in length. Is this the only suggested opportunity the public may have to generate ideas prior to the planners beginning their work, presuming this occurs on the forefront of the project?”

“I also see the desire for 1 last public input session for feedback to the planner’s concept options. Is this second session the only suggested opportunity for the community to comment on the planner’s work?”

“Are the above RFP desires the preferred amount of community involvement or are you open to a more engaging public process that allows for the community to develop and define a vision for the site? I’m envisioning a short yet purposeful engagement process involving the community’s own efforts first (prior to planner designed concepts) as a means to generate widespread participation, public buy-in, sense of ownership, and potential local funding opportunities? Their vision would then be developed and refined by the planners.”

“Is this other option for community involvement something staff would be interested in seeing conducted for this project?”

The project information areas are intended to allow for informal, non-scientific survey and/or data collection methods. At this time, the City requests that interaction occur as listed in the RFP scope.

As referenced in a prior answer, the City intends to discuss any modifications to the scope during the Contract Negotiations period. At this time, the City requests that respondents assemble a response and lump sum fee that align with the scope as listed.

“Will Caterpillar play a role in this project?”

Employees of Caterpillar and other local corporations may elect to participate in public engagement, but the City is unaware of Caterpillar’s intent to play a role in this project.

“Regarding e) and f): Could you expand on what the City is looking for informational signage and public input stations, or provide an example? Would these need to be located on public property?”

“Is there a materials budget for the informational signage and interactive input stations outside of this project? Does the City have a precedent for this process?”

The City is looking for concepts for temporary or semi-permanent informational signage and public input stations, on public property or right-of-way, in areas of the community with higher pedestrian traffic. The City intends to a) purchase the materials and related printing services, and b) install and uninstall the displays recommended by the selected team. The City requests that the selected team provide the concepts, dimensions, layouts, digital files for plotting or printing, and the engagement method for these stations.
City staff are familiar with the work of Candy Chang and many others who have established physical reflections of public engagement; however, the City is not looking to a specific precedent for the informational signage and public input stations.

“What role will the City’s communications liaison play in the communications plan and public engagement sessions?”

The City’s communications liaison(s) will be responsible for distribution of the communications plan and public engagement sessions on the City’s website, the City’s Facebook page, and the City’s LinkedIn page. The City’s communication liaison(s) will not participate in the creation of the communications plan or public engagement session formats.

Regarding Existing Relationships

“Considering that GRAEF is likely qualified to fulfil this scope of work, is the City looking for a new perspective/team on this design project?”

The City has prior and current relationships with multiple providers of planning, design, or engineering services. For example: The City's current relationships include: GRAEF for economic development and downtown streetscape services, Foth for zoning code update services, and Collins for survey and design services for water mains and roads. The City elected to release an open Request for Proposals so that all consultants, regardless of prior or current relationship, could communicate interest in providing the requested services.

Regarding Site Conditions and Information

“Regarding b) on page 5 of the RFP: Could you please describe in more detail what information on the site’s existing conditions (i.e., easements, utilities, historic building foundations, contaminated soils, etc.) is currently available from the City and what further “technical analysis” will be expected of the consultant?”

“I see the need for a topo survey on page 5, but a reference to other data the City has, can you summarize the existing data the City has for the project area? Specifically, does the City have utility and roadway information for the project area?”

“Does the city have environmental assessment information on the site regarding soil contamination, etc. Are there any documented environmental issues with any of the parcels?”

“Survey: Would you provide any existing survey information? Or should we anticipate creating all? We assume survey would need to extend beyond the boundary area.”

“Is there existing survey of the project area?”

“Please clarify under Project Scope of Work, page 5, paragraph b: should we assume that we need to provide an ALTA survey for the project area?”

“Regarding b): Are we correct in assuming an existing topographic survey does not exist and that one is an expected deliverable for this project?”

The City has Phase I environmental site assessment information for the project area. The City also has survey information as recent as 2018 for a portion of the project area. The City has utility and roadway information for the project area.

The City is requesting site planning only. No surveys, environmental assessments, or other site conditions assessments are requested for this project. The City will provide topographic information.

Through this addendum, the City is formally modifying the Project Scope of Work, item b), to read “Inventory the site, and review pertinent surveys, easements, agreements, and topographic information.”