



ADDENDUM #1

To: All Companies Interested in Submitting a Proposal
From: Rebecca Johnson, CPPB, Purchasing Agent
RFP: Master Plan for Hughes Park & Preserve (RFP #PUR0916-056); Dated: Sept. 29, 2016
Subject: Addendum #1 (4 pages)
Date: October 14, 2016

The following questions and/or clarifications were asked relative to the above-listed Request for Bid. This memo is sent for clarification to all companies to whom the bid was sent.

Question: On page 9 of the RFP in section 4.3.7 it says “final drawings”, which we typically interpret to include construction documents. Please clarify that for this RFP “final drawings” just means a final conceptual master plan and that construction documents will be a future phase of the design process under a separate contract. Is that correct?

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

Question: On page 9 of the RFP in section 4.8.9 it references “final plans and specifications” for the project. As above, please confirm that this project is for design development and a preliminary site plan and does not include construction documents and specifications.

Answer: Construction documents and specifications are for a future phase of this project and are not included in the Scope of Services for this RFP.

Question: Has the City performed any survey work (boundary, easement search, topographic, tree inventory/survey, etc.) as part of the land acquisition for the Hughes Park & Preserve Property?

Answer: No, the City has not performed any survey work for the property. The City has only what is available from the Assessor’s Office and site legal descriptions. A couple of specimen trees have been checked on site but a full inventory has not been done.

Question: The RFP identifies three (3) meetings with Parks and Recreation Department Staff and one (1) public meeting to be facilitated by the selected consultant. Is this correct? If not, what other meetings and/or presentations are required of the selected consultant by the City? For example – neighborhood associations/groups, Parks, Waterways and Recreation Commission, City Council, etc.?

Answer: Three (3) meetings with staff and one (1) public meeting is correct. No other meetings will be required.

Question: The RFP identifies the “final master plan shall be completed and submitted to the City’s Project Manager no later than January 31, 2017”. The City will receive submittals in response to the RFP on October 21, 2016. What is the date the selected consultant will receive an executed agreement and/or written notice to proceed from the City to begin work on the project? This timeframe information is critical to developing an approach, work plan, and schedule to achieve completion of the master plan by January 31, 2017.

Answer: At this time, the City hopes to have the contract awarded and executed by mid-November. If it takes longer than anticipated the completion date may need to be extended.

Question: Related to the question above, please confirm the City intends to complete the entire master plan process in three (3) months (or less) with anticipated late-October or early November agreement execution with the selected consultant and completion of the master plan no later than January 31, 2017?

Answer: This is our intention. If the schedule is too compressed the City will be open to discussion with the selected Consultant to adjust the timeline as needed.

Question: Will there be a technical advisory or steering committee appointed by the City? If yes, how many meetings will the selected consultant be required to facilitate with this group? Or will City Staff serve this committee/group function?

Answer: At this time City staff will serve as the technical advisory committee and the meetings will be as stated above. Additional meetings, if needed, will be negotiated separately.

Question: The RFP identifies potential program elements for the project to include, but not be limited to “naturalized walking trails or paths, natural play areas, arboretums, prairie, wetland, and woodlands. The possibility of interpretive signage, a medium sized pavilion and a small seating area for educational workshops are also being considered”. Are vehicular access(s), parking facilities or restrooms anticipated to be provided at the Park?

Answer: Yes, most likely a single vehicular access point and a single parking lot and possible restrooms may be provided. The extent and size of this will be determined in the design process.

Question: Are any of the existing structures on the property anticipated to remain and/or be repurposed as part of this project?

Answer: There are two (2) small to medium sized sheds on the property that will remain that may be used for cold storage by the parks and Recreation Department but if they cannot be utilized for on-site activities the option to repurpose may be explored. There is a very old hand-dug brick well that must be retained and incorporated as a design element on the SW corner of the park. There is also a foundation pillar of an old Hughes structure that the family has asked us to retain or tie into something if possible on the SE side of the park. There is a small ditch at the east border put in by the Hughes family in the last 10 years to redirect watershed runoff to the south away from the east neighbors that is important to retain.

Question: What GIS layers and aerial imagery does the City have with respect to the park and its natural resources? Will these be made available to the consultant?

Answer: The City has aerial imagery and contours available as well as some GIS mapped utilities such as water, sanitary and storm sewers. The City also has assessors mapping information. GIS data may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Orthoimagery:
 - Spring 2012, 4" resolution
 - Spring 2008, 6" resolution
- b. Pictometry Ortho Mosaic Tiles:
 - Fall 2014, 4" resolution
 - Fall 2012, 4" resolution
 - Spring 2011, 4" resolution
 - Spring 2009, 4" resolution
- c. LiDar data:
 - Spring 2012, 0.7 meter resolution
- d. Parcel polygons, address points, street centerlines, right of way polygons and additional feature classes as available.

Question: What natural resource reports and mapping are available for the park?

Answer: None at this time.

Question: The RFP identifies "arboretums" as a desired park feature. In the context of a "naturalized park setting" and "naturalized oasis", this implies the creation of formal tree plantings using native species, with identification and story-telling signage. Is this what is desired? Are non-native horticultural varieties also desired?

Answer: There will be an emphasis on native species to be installed but some of the existing non-natives may remain as well. It is desired to maintain most of the healthy trees due to the history of this property and the family's request. Many of the planted trees, some close to 100 years old, are non-native. The City would like to explore options for how to include these trees in a viable overall plan during the process and look at possible additions, but the City will not be removing large numbers of existing healthy trees.

Question: The RFP identifies "prairie, wetland, woodland" and "naturalized walking trails" as desired park features, suggesting the creation of places that reflect "original Iowa" through which people would stroll or jog, experiencing through recreation the beauty and variety of the natural world. Is this the aesthetic direction you envision for the landscape you describe here?

Answer: This may be a design option to consider for the site and could be explored to see if it fits.

Question: Is interpretive signage the preferred way to communicate with park users? Would digital media accessed through mobile devices complement interpretive signage? Would limited interpretive signage directing the user to more information via digital access be preferred?

Answer: At this point interpretive signage is anticipated to be the most likely way of conveying information but exploring the digital option may be a viable alternative. The City has no experience with this at this time.

Question: The “inventory of trees and any significant vegetation” identified in the RFP can be accomplished in different ways. One way is to conduct a standard tree inventory of all trees larger than a fixed diameter (usually 4-6 inches dbh), with other significant vegetation areas mapped from aerial photographs. Another way, using a natural resources inventory approach, is to complete a land cover map of the entire site, with descriptions of each land cover type providing details on the species, sizes, and densities of trees. For example, lowland hardwood forest may be mapped along streams, with the predominant species being green ash, box-elder, American elm, and hackberry – with sizes and abundances of these species described. Invasive species infestations would be linked to the land cover types also. Significant other trees, such as old bur oaks, outside forested areas could be mapped individually. Of the two approaches, which do you prefer?

Answer: A standard tree inventory will be fine.

Question: Has a master plan fee budget been established for this project, including the requested existing conditions survey of the Park boundary, topography, infrastructure and utilities, buildings and inventory of trees and any significant vegetation?

Answer: The budget for the scope of services requested in this RFP is anticipated to be approximately \$20,000.

Question: Has a total project budget been established to complete all improvements at the Park? If no, has an initial Phase 1 total project budget been established or appropriated by the City?

Answer: No budget for development of this park has been established at this time. The purpose of this RFP is to identify the future direction the City wishes to take in regards to this property to drive future budget requests.

Question: Please clarify the requested work samples pertaining to relevant experience. Is a 1-2 page project description sufficient within our submission or does the City wish to see the full master plan booklet for relevant projects? If the booklet – will one copy suffice?

Answer: Full master plan booklets are not necessary. A few pages with narrative or drawings within your proposal submission for three to four similar projects will suffice.

The deadline for questions has passed. This addendum shall become a part of the contract documents and shall be acknowledged and dated on the bottom of the Signature Page (Attachment C). The deadline for proposal submittal is Friday, October 21, 2016 before 3:00 p.m. CDT.