

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Procurement and Contracting Services
JAKE WILSON
MAYOR

To: Applicants for **RFQ 27-13: Owner's Project Management Services for Building Master Plan**

From: Thupten Chukhatsang, Senior Procurement Manager

Date: 10/1/2026

Re: Questions and Responses

Attachment: Non-Mandatory Virtual Briefing Session Attendee List

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

**** Failure to acknowledge this addendum may result in bid 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 27-13

Questions and Responses

1) Project phasing and priorities: The RFQ identifies multiple primary and secondary buildings and notes that the Building Master Plan effort will advance alongside other City initiatives. Can the City clarify which buildings/projects are expected to advance first during the initial contract period and whether the selected OPM should anticipate managing multiple building projects concurrently?

The City does not have a list of priorities or a set order for which buildings/projects are expected to advance first. The City will advance each primary and secondary building based on funding priorities, project necessity, and the City's approval. Yes, the selected OPM will manage multiple tasks/projects concurrently.

2) Anticipated construction projects: Does the City currently anticipate that all buildings identified in the RFQ will progress through design and/or construction during the three-year OPM contract, or will individual projects be authorized based on funding, priorities, and City approval?

Refer to the answer to question 1.

3) Level of design currently completed: For each of the primary and secondary buildings, can the City identify the current level of planning/design completed and indicate which existing studies, drawings, surveys, assessments, cost estimates, hazardous-material reports, and other technical documents will be provided to the selected OPM?

The City will provide any available preliminary work that has been done for the primary and secondary buildings to the selected/awarded OPM.

4) Overall construction budget: Is there an established or preliminary total construction budget, capital improvement budget, or anticipated funding range for the Building Renovation & Department Relocation Master Plan? The OPM is required to establish and maintain a baseline project budget and provide cost estimating throughout design.

The City will provide any available preliminary work that has been done for the primary and secondary buildings to the selected/awarded OPM.

5) Cost-estimating requirements: The RFQ states that the OPM must engage a professional cost estimator for estimates at schematic design, design development, and construction document stages. Should respondents identify the proposed cost-estimating subconsultant in the qualifications package, including its qualifications and relevant experience?

Yes, the respondent should identify proposed subconsultants in the qualification package.

6) Full-time Project Representative: The RFQ requires an experienced, full-time on-site Project Representative during construction. Will one dedicated representative be sufficient if multiple construction projects occur concurrently, or should respondents anticipate separate on-site representatives for each active construction site?

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

Depending on the scope and complexity of the anticipated projects, and whether multiple construction projects occur concurrently, OPM should ensure sufficient on-site representative coverage for all active projects.

7) On-site coverage: The RFQ states that the Project Representative must be present whenever the contractor is conducting operations. If evening, weekend, second-shift, or simultaneous work occurs, should the OPM anticipate providing additional personnel to maintain continuous coverage?

Yes.

8) OPM staffing during preconstruction: Does the City have an anticipated minimum staffing level or expected on-site presence for the OPM during planning, schematic design, design development, and construction documents, prior to the full-time construction-phase requirement?

Depending on the scope of work and complexity of the anticipated projects, the OPM should ensure sufficient staffing coverage for all phases.

9) Architect/design team: Has the City already selected, or does it intend to separately procure, the architect/design team for any of the identified projects? If selections have already been made, can the City identify those firms and the projects to which they are assigned?

The City will procure separately.

10) Existing consultants: Please identify any existing City consultants whose work will need to be coordinated by the OPM, including commissioning, sustainability, environmental/hazardous materials, technology, communications, furniture, geotechnical, surveying, and other specialty consultants. The RFQ indicates that coordination of several City consultants will fall within the OPM's responsibilities.

The City will provide the selected/awarded OPM with the list of house doctor/consultants.

11) Commissioning responsibilities: Will commissioning agents be retained directly by the City, or is the selected OPM expected to procure commissioning services as a subconsultant? The RFQ refers both to OPM experience coordinating commissioning vendors and coordination of an independent commissioning agent hired by the Owner.

The City will retain commissioning agents directly; however, the OPM should have experience and excellent expertise working with commissioning vendors and coordinate the services of an independent peer reviewer/commissioning agent.

12) Community engagement: Can the City provide an estimated frequency and anticipated number of community meetings, public presentations, neighborhood meetings, and other

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

stakeholder-engagement events expected of the OPM? The RFQ requires the OPM to participate in and support community engagement, including development and coordination of meeting materials.

The frequency and anticipated number of community meetings are entirely dependent on the scope of work and the complexity of the anticipated projects.

13) Document-management platform: Does the City currently use a preferred project-management/document-control platform that the selected OPM will be required to use, or should respondents propose their own web-based collaboration and document-management system? The OPM is responsible for overseeing such a system during design and construction.

The respondents should propose their own web-based collaboration and document-management system.

14) Swing-space planning: To what extent will the selected OPM be responsible for identifying and evaluating swing-space alternatives versus implementing and coordinating swing-space plans developed by the City and design team?

The selected OPM is required, but not limited to, identifying and evaluating feasibility analysis and site selection, occupancy needs, functional requirements for the space, schedule and cost as well as any constraints, logistics and change management.

15) Geothermal feasibility study: Is the OPM expected to retain the technical consultant responsible for the shared mechanical/geothermal HVAC feasibility study for City Hall and the 1895 Building, or will that consultant be separately retained by the City? The RFQ specifically calls for feasibility, preliminary design review, and cost estimating for this system.

The City will procure separately.

16) Renovation-versus-replacement evaluations: For properties identified as possible renovation, demolition, or replacement projects, what level of alternatives analysis is expected from the OPM, and will the architectural/design consultant be responsible for developing the technical alternatives and associated conceptual designs?

The OPM is responsible for collaborating with architectural/design consultants and facilitating a robust, structured alternatives analysis, including overseeing feasibility studies that evaluate options, cost analysis, construction schedules, timelines, professional assessments, and environmental reviews.

17) Contract authorization structure: Does the City anticipate authorizing the entire OPM scope at contract award, or will services for individual buildings/phases be authorized through separate Notices to Proceed, amendments, or task authorizations?

Depending on the scope and complexity of the anticipated projects, additional notice to proceed, amendments, and authorizations will be needed.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

18) Contract term versus project completion: The RFQ identifies an estimated contract completion date of November 26, 2029, while the scope includes construction completion and a one-year warranty phase. How will OPM services extending beyond November 26, 2029, including warranty-phase services for projects not completed before that date, be handled?

If there is a need to extend the contract beyond the 3 year maximum term for the contract, the City will consider amending the contract for the required scope of work and will need City Council approval to do so.

19) Reference requirements: The RFQ requires at least three relevant references. May respondents submit more than three references, and does the City have a preference for references involving Massachusetts public construction, multi-building municipal programs, occupied renovations, historic facilities, or projects performed under M.G.L. c.149?

Per the RFQ, the reference information should include a description of the work performed under each contract, the dollar amount, and the volume of work performed. The inclination for reference should be a similar project nature to the projects listed in the RFQ.

20) Page limitation: Please confirm whether there is a maximum page count for the qualifications submission, and whether resumes, required forms, certifications, references, and subconsultant qualifications are included in or excluded from any applicable page limit. The application-format instructions specify organization, 12-point font, 8.5 × 11-inch pages, and consecutive page numbering, but the portion reviewed does not state a page limit.

There is no maximum page count or limit.

21) Selection methodology for the OPM?

Refer to Section 1.6 Evaluation Methodology for an explanation of the selection process and fee negotiation process.

22) Will the interview process happen?

Yes. We will narrow down the finalists for interviews.

23) Which buildings are expected to proceed through schematic design, full design, bidding, and construction during the initial three-year term?

Refer to the answer to question 1.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

24) What is the current estimated construction cost and total project budget for each building?

The City will provide any available preliminary cost estimate that has been done for the primary and secondary buildings to the selected/awarded OPM.

25) Is the OPM expected to manage the portfolio under one consolidated program or through individual project authorizations?

Depending on the scope and complexity of the anticipated projects, the OPM will manage the portfolio as a single consolidated program or through individual project authorizations.

26) Will there be separate designers and contractors for each building?

Yes, depending on the scope and complexity of the anticipated projects, and based on funding priorities, project necessity, and the City's approval.

27) Does the full-time, 40-hour-per-week Project Representative requirement apply to every active construction site?

Depending on the project's scope and complexity, the on-site requirement for the site representative will be coordinated with the owner.

28) If multiple buildings are under construction simultaneously, will separate full-time representatives be required?

Refer to the answer to question 27.

29) Will full-time site representation and extended-shift coverage be negotiated separately for each construction project?

Will not be negotiated separately for each construction project, and the city does not anticipate significant coverage for each construction project.

30) Which delivery methods are anticipated—Chapter 149 design-bid-build, Chapter 149A CM-at-Risk, or both?

Both

31) What work remains from the Kleinfelder and BBB master plans, and what portions does the City expect the new OPM to validate or redo?

No additional work remains from these vendors.

Addendum No. 1 to RFQ 27-13

32) Has a designer already been selected for any of the listed buildings?

No

34) How will services extending beyond November 2029, including construction closeout and the one-year warranty period, be authorized and compensated?

If there is a need to extend the contract beyond the 3 year maximum term for the contract, the City will consider amending the contract for the required scope of work and will require City Council approval to do so.

35) Is the Standard Designer Application Form intentionally required for this OPM procurement?

Yes, the "Standard Designer Application Form for Municipalities and Public Agencies not with DSB Jurisdiction" is required for this OPM Procurement.

36) If available, the Building Renovation and Department Relocation Master Plan referenced in the RFQ?

Please refer to the RFQ page 13 for the web links to the Building Renovation & Department Relocation Master Plans developed by Kleinfelder and Beyer Blinder & Bell (BBB).

Attachment on next page:

Non-Mandatory Virtual Briefing Session Attendee List

Attendees of Non-Mandatory Briefing Session for RFQ 27-13 - OPM Services for Building Master Plan [on 2:30pm, 9/23/2026]

Name	Company	Phone	E-mail
Sean Burke	PMA Consultants		sburke@pmaconsultants.com
Jessica Fosbrook	PMA Consultants		jfosbrook@pmaconsultants.com
Suresh Bhatia	Atlantic Construction & Management, Inc.	978-505-5434	sbhatia@aconstructioninc.com
Margaret Fulenwider	Socotec		
Dana M. Sanders	Socotec		
Silvia Zurita	Socotec		
James M. Jones	Skanska USA Building Inc.	617 593 3901	Jim.Jones@skanska.com
Tom Doolittle	Skanska USA Building Inc.		tom.doolittle@skanska.com
Mark Stafford	Turner & Townsend Heery		
Jenn Weiss Donovan	Accenture I&CP		
Jennifer McGrory	CHA Consulting Inc.		
Molly Canfield	CHA Consulting Inc.		
Jennifer Villegas	AECOM		
Julie Leduc	AECOM		julie.leduc@aecom.com