

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 23-74



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Procurement and Contracting Services
KATJANA BALLANTYNE
MAYOR

To: All Parties on Record with the City of Somerville as Holding RFQ 23-74
Design Services for 217 Somerville Avenue Pocket Park

From: Felisa Garate, Procurement Analyst

Date: 6/20/2023

Re: RFQ 23-74 Design Services for 217 Somerville Avenue Pocket Park

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 23-74

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.

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 23-74

#	Question	Answer
1.	The "Qualifications & Experience" section (p. 5) discusses specific experience regarding parks with an emphasis on horticulture, and the Design Team portion of that section requests a Horticultural Expert, but the Project Vision (p. 10-11) discusses "maintainable... plantings" and the description of the work does not include significant mention of horticultural planting. Is a strong horticultural emphasis an anticipated part of the park program? Our understanding was that the park was anticipated as more of an urban plaza than a horticultural space.	At present, the specific programmed components of this pocket park are not yet known. However, there are certain relevant factors to consider, such as the existence of a native planting ordinance and the possibility of implementing a pilot program for a Miyawaki forest. Whether the park requires maintainable plantings or a more intricate planting scheme, possessing horticultural expertise will be essential for the successful execution of this project.
2.	The Design Team section on p. 5 includes a reference to a Licensed Site Professional. The listed site history (a church, followed by a VFW post) does not indicate significant past uses that would lead us to expect contaminated soils requiring an LSP. Does the City have additional information regarding the site history that would warrant an LSP's involvement?	The site's ownership goes back to the Nathan Tufts' Heirs, then subsequent use as a church, and later functioning as VFW Post #447. While we have no reason to suspect the presence of contaminated soils, it is important to note that the site is situated in a densely urbanized area. As a precautionary measure, it is crucial to have a Licensed Site Professional (LSP) readily available to supervise and address any potential contamination issues should they arise.
3.	In the event the City feels an LSP is required - in our experience it is more common for a municipality to contract directly with an LSP for any hazardous material remediation specifications (due to Professional Liability Insurance limitations). However, we have often worked with Environmental Engineers and LSP's as subconsultants to determine <i>if</i> such remediation is actually required. Would this be an acceptable approach to the City?	That would depend on the program of the pocket park, but the team should have a LSP available to address any potential contamination issues.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 23-74

4.	The Project Vision in the Scope of Services (p. 11) states "a minimum of five public meetings" but only lists three meetings, with an optional fourth meeting. Later, the Public Process portion requires a minimum of three meetings but budgeting for a maximum of five. Can the City clarify what the requested fifth meeting might be? Would you like bidders to propose an option?	You should budget for 3-5 meetings, min of 3 max of 5. Depending on the how much engagement we get at the community meetings outlined in the scope, it might be beneficial to collaborate with the consultant to explore additional methods of engaging with the community.
5.	Is the City open to considering alternative approaches to the proposed three-meeting public process that provide a comparable or higher level of public engagement?	Yes, we would like to explore different types of engagement to gather input from different groups/parties. Like stated in the previous questions response, it might be beneficial to collaborate with the consultant to explore additional methods of engaging with the community.
6.	The project budget states that the consultant's design fees are fixed at the negotiated contract price; however, there is very little clarity regarding the proposed program and level of design detailing, involvement of subconsultants, etc. (For example, should the public process indicate a desire for a pavilion structure that requires an architectural subconsultant, that is a significantly more complex design process, and would be a substantially different level of fees...) Is the City willing to accept a described scope of what is, and is not, included, vs. what can be added as an additional service if the public process indicates that it would be desirable, in order to keep the design fees within the target cap for this initial proposal?	The programmed concept for this space is to be a pocket park, beyond this, it will be the responsibility of the city and the consultant to engage the community to determine what programmed elements will be included in the park. If additional services are needed, that are not outlined in the scope then we would have to discuss at that time and issue an addendum to the scope.