CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
purchasing@newtonma.gov
Fax (617) 796-1227

January 26, 2015

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #15-54

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING CONSULTANT FOR REHABILITATION OF NEWTON HIGHLANDS PLAYGROUND

THIS ADDENDUM IS TO: CHANGE PROPOSAL DUE DATE TO:

Tuesday February 3, 2015 at 10:30 am

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA ON YOUR BID FORM. FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA COULD RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR BID AS NONRESPONSIVE.

Thank you.

Nicholas Read
Chief Procurement Officer
CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
purchasing@newtonma.gov
Fax (617) 796-1227

January 26, 2015

ADDENDUM #2

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #15-54

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING CONSULTANT FOR
REHABILITATION OF NEWTON HIGHLANDS PLAYGROUND

THIS ADDENDUM IS TO: ANSWER QUESTIONS:

Q1. Would the building commissioner consider a pre-fabricated fieldhouse if it meets the City’s specifications?
   A1. Yes.

Q2. Can we receive a copy of the specifications prior to the proposal?

Q3. What is the level of detail in existing survey (scale, contour intervals, underground utilities, Stearns Brook box culvert location, property lines, etc.)? What is the date of the survey?
   A3. 40-scale topographic survey in Autocad; 1-foot contours; underground utilities, box culvert and property lines are all shown; dated April 6, 2007 by Chappell Engineering Associates.

Q4. Can more information be given on the requirements for the 1,000 SF proposed field house/support building (number of rooms/uses, expectations of materials and design, etc)? Can you provide the specifications/design plans from the Newton South HS field facility? Clarify if only one such building is needed as the Master Plan indicates two new “support buildings” each budgeted at $200,000. Any thoughts to having the architectural design of this proposed facility contracted as a separate project?
   A4. The design for the ONE field house is conceptual. It is to include restrooms, a concession and storage to be shared by the leagues. The specs and design for the NSHS field facility can be found on Purchasing’s website under closed bids. The intent is to keep the architectural design included in the overall project.

Q5. Please clarify the current, anticipated construction budget. Will the project be funded by both CPA funds and private donations - at both design and construction level?
   A5. The design phase has been funded by the Community Preservation Committee. There are no private donations to be used for the design phase. The project’s history and budget information is listed on the City’s website under the Planning Department’s Community Preservation Committee.

Q6. Confirm that synthetic turf will NOT be part of the design
   A6. NOT

Q7. How much of the site/which fields will need to be lighted?
   A7. The football/soccer field and the Little League field are both to be lighted.
Q8. We understand from the RFP that the design services contract is to be financed utilizing CPA funding. Based upon the CPA funding request spreadsheet the City noted a CPA funding contribution of $240,000 for design services, and listed an additional $122,000 available for design services raised via private donations. Is it therefore accurate to assume that the City’s budget for design services associated with this contract is approximately $362,000?

A8. No. The design fee funded is as shown on the CPA website.

Q9. We understand from the briefing held earlier today that the project is to include one building (not two). Firstly, is design of this structure to be included within the design services scope and fee proposal prepared in response to this RFP? If so, the RFP notes a desire by the City to build the new field house/support building…”meeting the specifications used for the recently constructed Newton South High School field facility”. Should we therefore assume that the contract drawings and specifications provided by RDA Associates for the Newton South High School project will be utilized in their exact design (other than re-stamping for permitting and construction)? Or is the intention to “tweak” and revise elements of that design to produce similar, but entirely new sets of contract drawings and specifications? Also- will a filed sub-bid be required for this building’s construction, and will RDA or another architect be involved in construction observation?

A9. Yes, the design of the building is to be included in the response to this RFP. The intention is for the design to be similar. Yes, a filed sub-bid will be required for construction and no RDA-involvement.

Q10. It appears that the process associated with creation of the 2008 Master Plan for the Park led by the consultant team of Weston and Sampson involved a lengthy public process with thorough public outreach made. This proposal includes another public process involving 2 more public meetings and many additional meetings with stakeholders and City staff and design review committees which would seem to imply that there is desire to revisit the results of the 2008 Master Plan and perhaps re-design layout and/or programming elements included in that plan. Is that the case or can the consultant team for this proposal assume that the general layout and programming desired for the Park is established, based upon the framework generated by the 2008 Master Plan?

A10. Assume the general layout and programing as established by the 2008 Master Plan.

Q11. There are a number of items discussed in the Master Plan and included in the cost estimates associated that do not appear on the cost estimates included for CPA funding request, such as: woodland and wetland path, utility hook ups for concession/restrooms, planting (other than seeding), other landscape improvements such as entry walls/ piers, signage, etc.? Are these items to be included in the design scope for this project?

A11. Yes.

Q12. Regarding permitting and survey: were the wetlands noted on the 2008 Master Plan flagged as part of the survey completed in 2007 and if so should we assume that they will need to be re-flagged due to the passage of time? We are assuming the remainder of the survey completed in 2007 is still considered up to date and will not need to be revisited, is that the City’s assumption as well? (We are assuming it is the wetlands noted in the Master Plan that are triggering the need for the NOI filing included in this RFP, and not the potential day lighting of Stearns Brook, as we understand the City is no longer interested in pursuing that idea. Is that assumption correct?)

A12. Yes, we are assuming the 2007 survey is up-to-date. While the area labeled wetlands is wet no wetland resource areas have been identified in the park. A NOI would be required for best practices related to stormwater management.

Q13. We noted based upon the CPA funding request that the City may have raised private funding for approximately $160,000 of playground construction. Should we assume that the playground will be designed as part of this design contract and if so, that its construction should meet that budget? (Understanding the construction budget will help us to understand the scale of the playground improvements that the City is anticipating.)

A13. Assume a budget of $220,000 for the total playground area.
Q14. What is the Construction Budget for this project?
   A14. Budget details can be found on the City’s Community Preservation Program website.

Q15. What is the Budget for the Field house?
   A15. The Feasibility Study done for the leagues, has budgeted $350,000.

Q16. Can someone meet us at the Newton South High School to see the inside of the Field house?
   A16. No, not prior to the proposal due date.

Q17. What are the design requirements for the field house?
   A17. The field house design is to be similar to the Newton South High School’s Field Facility.

Q18. Will the construction of the field house be a separate procurement?
   A18. It’s to be bid as an alternate.

Q19. Does the designer provide oversight for construction of the field house?
   A19. Yes.

Q20. Is an electronic base plan survey showing existing grades, details and property lines being provided to the design teams? If so, in what format and level of detail? Would there be any chance that additional survey be required?
   A20. Yes. A complete topographic survey was completed in AutoCAD June 2007 by Chappell Engineering Associates. Additional information may be needed.

Q21. Will the Feasibility Study (2011) prepared by the youth sport leagues be provided?
   A21. Yes, the 2011 Feasibility Study prepared by the leagues’ consultant will be provided.

Q22. The RFP does not mention the future condition of the Stearns Brook box culvert. Has the culvert been rehabilitated? If not, is that part of this work? Is there a desire to explore daylighting the Brook as described in the Master Plan?
   A22. Any leaks identified with the culvert have been rectified by the City’s Utilities Department. No, daylighting as shown in the Master Plan is not to be explored.

Q23. It is expected that water, sewer and electric will serve the support building. What if any additional utility services (telecom, gas) are desired to service the support building?
   A23. Additional utilities will be coordinated and provided by others. However, conduit runs should be specified to allow for expansion of services.

Q24. Is the "PROPOSER'S QUALIFICATIONS AND REFERENCES FORM" required for all design consultants or just the Prime?
   A24. The Qualifications and References form is required only for the person or entity submitting the proposal.

Q25. Is the intent to duplicate that recent Newton South HS recreation building entirely, to use the same plan layout, materials and fixtures, or to use the same construction materials? There could be issues of architectural copyright along with wondering why one would need a new architect if you're matching another architect's building.
   A25. The intent is not to copy the NSHS Field House, but rather point to a building whose program is similar, and thus has a design that meets our needs. We are open to different building materials, fixtures, features, layouts, etc.
Q26. We understand from the Newton CP website that approx. $320,000 has been allocated for design but this seems to have been partially based on the approx. $1 million construction budget allocated for synthetic turf. Now that the donation for synthetic turf seems to be out of the picture, is there an expectation for a lower design fee/construction budget?

A26. Yes. All information related to the CPA-funded design fee and the proposed construction budget-to-date is on the City’s website for the Community Preservation Program.

Q27. Why has the 2007 Master Plan $336k for design fee been lowered $320k in the 2014 appropriation?

A27. Refer to the Community Preservation Program website for the budget and history of the project.

Q28. The RFP indicates Feb - Aug, 2015 to submit DDs and CDs along with multiple meetings, Con/Com (NOI), Design Review Committee and utility permitting for the support building. This is a very tight schedule and possibly unrealistic. While the selection committee be open to seeing a more realistic schedule presented in the submitted proposal?

A28. Yes.

All other terms and conditions of this bid remain unchanged.

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA ON YOUR BID FORM. FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA COULD RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR BID AS NONRESPONSIVE.

Thank you.

Nicholas Read
Chief Procurement Officer