

Request for Proposals



Historic Preservation Architectural and Landscape Architectural Services for Peavey Plaza

RFP 2016-115, Issue Date: August 16, 2016

Q&A Addendum #1

September 1, 2016

Questions and Answers - Addendum #1 - Thursday, September 1, 2016

The following addendum summarizes answers to questions related to the above referenced RFP received via email through the end of day Tuesday, August 30, 2016, and including questions received at the Pre-Proposal meeting of Monday, August 29, 2016.

Q1: Peavey Plaza is a work of landscape architecture, designed by a landscape architect, not an architect. Is the RFP intentionally written to exclude a landscape architect from being lead for this project? Could you provide clarification on this point at the pre-proposal conference? If a landscape architecture firm is qualified, are they able to be team lead?

A1: Yes, a landscape architecture firm can lead a team and serve as the prime consultant. The RFP was not written to suggest that architecture firms are the only type of design firm qualified to lead the project or that Landscape Architecture firms are not equally qualified to lead a team.

Q2: What will be the role of Green Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District (DID) in the management and operation of Peavey Plaza?

A2: In the past, the City of Minneapolis Department of Public Works has been responsible for maintaining, repairing, and operating Peavey Plaza while the Downtown Council has taken responsibility for programming it (with the City issuing permits) and the adjacent Minnesota Orchestral Association playing a role as a major user for events. Two years ago, the Minneapolis Downtown Council and the local business community created a new non-profit conservancy called Green Minneapolis for the purpose of consolidating all of these functions within one organization. Green Minneapolis is intended to serve as the park operator responsible operations and maintenance and for programming and activating the two downtown parks that do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board: The recently completed Commons, and Peavey Plaza, once it has been refurbished. Green Minneapolis is still in start-up mode and the details of regular operations, maintenance and programming for Peavey Plaza will be worked out in the coming several years and once Peavey has been refurbished.

Q3: What criteria will the selection panel use to evaluate proposals, decide which teams to interview, and evaluate interviews?

A3: To amplify the criteria described in the RFP (Section V, EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS), The city will consider the firm and key individuals leading the team; the qualifications of the individuals, firms, and teams; relevant experience on and knowledge of historic landscape and/or building preservation projects; and the firm's and team's key individual's understanding of the Secretary of the Interior's standards for historic preservation design and construction.

Q4: Who will be on the selection panel?

A4: *We anticipate the selection panel will include: Lisa Cerney, Deputy Director of Public Works; Mike Kennedy, Director of Transportation Maintenance and Repair for Public Works; Jennifer Swanson, Interagency Coordinator for Public Works; and Peter Brown, Consultant and Project Manager; Ward 7 Council Member Lisa Goodman; Council Member Kevin Reich, Chair of the Transportation and Public Works Committee, to which Public Works reports; And Steve Cramer, representing the Minneapolis Downtown Council/Downtown Improvement District and the business community.*

Q5: Is there a preferred format for the Proposal?

A5: *RFP Item III, PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND LOCATION (Page 3) shall be replaced with the following language:*

PROPOSAL DUE DATE and LOCATION: The Consultant shall submit ten (10) bound copies of their proposal and one (1) unbound copy; one (1) copy of the Cost/Fee information (Item 6) in a separate sealed envelope; and a digital copy of the proposal on one (1) flash drive that includes three files: a PDF of the proposal; a PDF of the Cost/Fee proposal, and an unlocked excel file of the Cost/Fee proposal; to the City of Minneapolis Procurement Office, labeled:

City of Minneapolis - Procurement
Request for Proposals for:
Peavey Plaza Design
330 2nd Avenue South, Suite 552
Minneapolis, MN 55401

The submittal shall be made at or before **12:00 P.M. (Minneapolis Time), September 9, 2016. NOTE: Late Proposals may not be accepted.**

RFP Item IV, PROPOSAL FORMAT (page 3), is modified to include the following additional requirements:

Proposal text must be limited to 20 single-sided pages, no greater than 8.5 x 11 in size, formatted vertically or horizontally, with no less than 11-point font size. The page count applies to items **1** through **5**. Additional/supplemental supporting information such as staff resumes, company literature, and graphics may be submitted as an appendix at the end of the proposal. A cover letter, up to two pages in length, is also excluded from the page limit.

Submit Cost/Fee information (item **6**) separately in sealed envelope and as a separate PDF file on the flash drive per the instructions above.

Q6: Is there a page limit for the Proposal response?

A6: See Q/A5, above.

Q7: Will this be Design-Bid-Build Delivery?

A7: Yes, this will be a traditional design-bid-build project. Construction contracts will be procured through a competitive, public bidding process managed by the City of Minneapolis Purchasing department.

Q8: The Request for Proposal indicates a “Pre-Design” for this project. Is there a particular format for the Pre-Design? Or is this in reference to a design phase only?

A8: The purpose of the predesign phase will be for the design team and the City to work together to formalize the program, scope of work, and work plan for the project. The pre-design work will be formalized in a concise document that will likely include plan diagrams, narrative, schedule, and cost sections. See also Q/A14.

Q9: Who will be the reviewer for the Accessibility of the plaza?

A9: Accessibility will be reviewed by City Planning staff as a part of the Preliminary Development Review (PDR) process and by the Access Committee of the Minneapolis Advisory Committee on Disabilities.

Q10: Who will the reviewing agencies be for this project?

A10: The project will be like any private project in the City of Minneapolis. It will be submitted to the City for review by the City of Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) planning staff and will be subject to the PDR process (above, Q/A9). The Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Committee (HPC), the Minneapolis City Planning Commission (CPC), and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will likely also review the design.

Q11: How much of the Services are funded and can begin upon award?

A11: The design services described in this RFP that will form the basis of the contract can begin upon award.

Q12: Are you able to clarify Section IV Proposal Format, Number 7 “Grant-funded Services”? Is the audit report and management letter only required if you have received over \$50,000 in City contracts in 2015? If more than that, how many previous years? Does this only apply to City of Minneapolis contracts or any City contracts?

What would the definition of “received” be? Having a contract that is signed, billing from a contract, money received in payment for a contract?

A12: The informational reference to the audit and management letters required in RFP Item IV.7, Grant funded Services, are not required to be submitted at this time but may be required as a part of the contracting process.

Q13: I understand that the list of those who attended today will be provided with the posted answers to questions on Thursday. Is it possible for you to confirm today who was at the pre-proposal meeting?

A13: See the scan of the sign-in sheets at the end of this document.

Q14: How will THE City make decisions regarding potential Peavey Plaza improvements during the Program, Evaluation and Scope confirmation phase to ensure the project proceeds according to schedule?

A14: The City expects the design team to review the HSR and all related documents and re-present/re-propose the scope of work for the project based on their own understanding of the project. The Design Team and City staff will review and discuss this draft, make revisions as required, and City will approve the final scope. This document will serve as the basis for the start of the Schematic Design Phase. At each phase, the scope, design, and cost estimate will be reviewed and revised as required to reflect new information prior to proceeding to the next phase. See also Q/A8.

Q15: What are the goals and desired outcomes of the public engagement process (specifically the 6 public meetings identified)?

A15: The Public Stakeholder Group that attended meetings throughout the completion of the HSR was comprised of members of the preservation community, the disabled community, nearby business owners, nearby residential neighbors, City staff, representatives of the Minnesota Orchestra, representatives of Westminster Presbyterian Church, representatives of the Downtown Council and Green Minneapolis, and others generally interested in the project. The group typically numbered between 15 and 30. The purpose of the meetings was to meet monthly to review work that had been completed, findings, and upcoming work and next steps. The HSR team made a brief PowerPoint presentation at each meeting and the group participated in discussions related to the types of choices that would need to be made related to historic significance, function, accessibility, design, costs, schedule, and other issues. We expect that many of the same stakeholders will continue to attend these meetings, that we will have similar discussions throughout the design process, and that the project team (city and design team) will solicit input from these stakeholders throughout the process so that the final design is influenced by this ongoing discussion.

Q16: Verify that the identified (6) meetings with stakeholders and users happen every one to two months and not all occur within the Program, Evaluation and Scope confirmation phase (this is the way it reads on page 20 of the RFP)

A16: Correct. Assume that the meetings will be every one to two months throughout design phases, including one during pre-design and probably one summary meeting at the end design development or part way into the construction documents phase. The purpose of the meetings is to discuss progress and seek feedback on a regular basis, but only when enough work has been done to justify the next meeting (if there is no new info we won't meet).

Q17: Please describe the makeup of public stakeholder group identified on page 19 of the RFP.

A17: See Q/A 15, above.

Q18: Should the proposal response include scope related to community and stakeholder engagement during the pre-design phase, particularly with respect to accessibility?

A18: We expect that the review of accessibility will occur throughout the pre-design and detailed design phase as part of the overall stakeholder meetings. Accessibility location as well as details such as dimensions, clearances, and materials will need to be identified with the input of the community.

Q19: Appendix F identifies a series of drawing sets and additional information that would be needed to provide an accurate design for the fountains. The required drawings/surveys identified include: plumbing schematic, fountain pool plan and sections, survey of equipment space, piping system testing, survey of electrical, survey of sump pump float switch locations, survey of lighting and locations, determination of total fountain water volume. Are these all drawings/information that the City will provide or are these drawings/surveys expected to be created by the consultants as needed to make design decisions and to create SD, DD and CD's?

A19: The Design team should assume that it will be required to produce any additional surveys and drawings that were not provided or referenced in the HSR but that will be required to complete the design.

Q20: For the fountain repair scope of work should we assume all of the recommendations in Appendix F should be included (page 13 – 21)?

A20: Generally speaking, the intent of the fountain scope of work is to revitalize the fountains and their systems and put them back into good working order for the next several decades. The recommendations in Appendix F of the HSR are the recommendations of the fountain consultant that was a part of the HSR team and should be considered a starting

point for the design. Final decisions about the fountain scope of work will be based upon cost, functionality, etc., and should be a product of the detailed design process.

Q21: Are the interviews still scheduled to occur Thursday September 15, 8 a.m. – 1 p.m.?

A21: No. The interviews described in Section V of the RFP (page 56) have been postponed due to scheduling conflicts. Proposers should check the RFP webpage for a future addendum with an updated date and time frame.

Q22: Does the request in the proposal for “the most recent audit report and management letter if vendor receives over \$50,000 in City contracts” apply to only the prime consultant or to all proposed subconsultants (RFP, Proposal Format, 7, p.4)?

A22: This information is not required at this time per Q/A12

Q23: Should additional survey and exploratory studies be planned to identify connections between underground infrastructure and utilities that are unverified on the existing conditions surveys?

A23: Proposers should plan to provide all information required (in addition to the work completed and/or referenced in the HSR) to complete the design work outlined in this RFP or to specifically identify and exclude such work or provide it as an additional service any survey.

Q24: The pre-proposal meeting indicated the desirability of including public restrooms. Has a program been determined for this amenity? Is there a preferred option from the HSR? Are there other services or amenities that anticipated for inclusion but that are not identified in the RFP SOW but that should be considered as part of the RFP response?

A24: There was no discussion of restrooms at the pre-proposal meeting. The scope of work described in the RFP does not include restrooms or other services or amenities. Proposers should base their proposals on the scope described in the RFP.

Q25: Should consultants assume “using Route Option C plus an accessible ramp into the basin” for site accessibility (as stated in the HSR, V. Recommendations, Refurbish Existing 1 [Scope 1], p.117), or should the consultant consider other options?

A25: There was not a single preferred route described in the HSR but several options. The role of the consultant is to make design recommendations to the city based upon the concepts and recommendations outlined in the HSR. The City and consultant will work together to determine the best route option(s) throughout the development of the design.

Q26: Is a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan required as part of permitting process for the project? If onsite capture and retention of storm water is anticipated, is a system for stormwater reuse within the water features expected?

A26: The City and consultant together will answer these two questions during the design process. Generally, the City of Minneapolis values the sustainable use of resources including storm water management systems, water usage, and power.

Q27: Is public use of the plaza during the construction period anticipated? Should project phases be devised to coordinate public access to specific areas?

A27: No. The City's priority is the public's safety followed by the completion of the project as quickly as possible. The plaza will be partially or completely closed as required to allow for a safe, efficient, and cost effective construction project.

Q28: Is construction laydown and staging to be contained on site or is off-site space provided?

A28: Assume that construction laydown and staging must be accommodated on site.

Sign in Sheets from August 29 Pre-Proposal Conference

Peavey Plaza Historic Preservation Architectural & Landscape Architectural Services
Pre-Proposal Conference · August 29, 2016 · City Hall, Room 132

Please Print

Name	Company	Phone	e-mail
MICHAEL BJORNBERG	HGA	612-758-4385	Mbjornberg@hga.com
Theodore Lee	HGA	612-758-4306	tlee@hga.com
John Slack	PTW	612-291-3264	John.slack@perkinswill.com
KEITH TASHINA	BUILDINGS CONSULTING GROUP	612-799-1776	KTASHINA@BCGMILWAUKEE.COM
Morgan Anderson	EVS		mmanderer@evs-eng.com
Brian Adams	CONFLICT MILLER	612-257-5916	baldred@thinkconflict.com
Denita Lemmon	Dunwiddie	412-278-7130	dlemmon@ millerdunwiddie.com
Jean Garbano	TOFA	612-332-7622	Jgarbano@ davenport.com
Julie McGarvey	Coent Partners	612-644-9650	julie@coentpartners.com
Cindy McCreary	LEO A DALY	612-242-4424	cammccreary@ leoadaly.com
ELIZABETH HARRIMAN	Michael Cooley Erickson	612-339-4941	eharriman@ michaelscooley.com

