

Riverfront District
Park Trail and Open Space Planning
Request for Proposals – Questions and Answers Through 6.5.18
Professional Planning and Design Services

ADDENDUM #2
6/8/18

COMMUNITY QUESTIONS

1. **What community and nonprofit stakeholders are on the Advisory Group?**
Representatives of the municipalities, Allegheny County and several nonprofits, including Aspinwall Riverfront Park, the Pennsylvania Environmental Council, and Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy.
2. **Can you share the members of the Advisory Group who will be reviewing the submissions?** Please see question 1
3. **The park is to “strengthen connections into each of the communities, yet there isn’t a task associated with public engagement. Is public engagement not to be included in the scope of work?**
Public engagement is included in the scope of work, and creating something the public has ownership of and pride in is important to us. We did not put specific direction around the types and plans for public engagement because we wanted to solicit your creativity and thinking in how to best address it. That said, we expect at least one component of this engagement to include some sort of data that is easily quantifiable, like a survey and at least one community meeting.
4. **Can you provide information on what will be expected of the design team for civic participation/community engagement for the project?** Please see the answer to the previous question.
5. **The RFP also says that the park is to “establish economic development opportunities beyond the District borders.” Are you expecting a market analysis of the adjacent communities be included in the scope of work?**
No. This is a dynamic situation and we do not expect it to be captured by a static analysis. Proposers are not expected to provide this service.

6. **We did not anticipate that this scope of work would involve a community engagement component, but wanted to confirm this with you.** As stakeholders in the development of their community, we expect the community to have a voice in this project. Please see the response to question 3.

7. **Has there been any market, visitor or audience analysis completed for this public riverfront park or trail segment?**
There has not been a market, visitor or audience analysis completed for this trail segment.

PROPERTY QUESTIONS

8. **The project boundaries provided don't break out the acreages. What composes the 80+ acre Riverfront District?** The Riverfront District is comprised of a number of property owners between Aspinwall Riverfront Park and James Sharp Landing. These include Riverfront 47, Rye Development, Sharpsburg Borough, O'Hara Township, Graciano, and Linda Jean DePasquale.

9. **Rye Development is proposing a hydro-electric plant to be integrated into the master plan and future park. Should we anticipate allocating resources to coordinate with Rye to integrate the power plant operations within the Riverfront District? Similar question for coordination with ALCOSAN.** Yes. Rye Development is a property owner within the District and should be integrated into the planning. Similarly, ALCOSAN's lines run through the middle of the site. We are looking for creative and practical thinking to address the issues and opportunities that that situation creates.

10. **It is unclear how the Scope of Work will include Aspinwall Riverfront Park and Aspinwall's Public Works facility. Are we to anticipate site improvements and upgrades to these two elements? The project limit diagram does not appear to include these, but on page 6 the first paragraph of the Base Scope narrative mentions those particular facilities.** At this time, this scope of work does not anticipate changes to Aspinwall Riverfront Park or Aspinwall's Public Works facility.

11. **Does a topographic and boundary survey exist for the property? If not, does the consultant need to provide a cost for a survey?** Yes, both are available and able to be shared. The Consultant does not need to provide funding for these.
12. **Can the Riverfront District master plan be provided for context?** A master plan is not available at this time. Thinking around the master plan is evolving and it is our hope that this process will inform its creation.
13. **Please confirm the attached map represents the correct project area.**
Please see the exhibits in the provided drop box.
14. **Please confirm that a full ground topographic, boundary, and utility survey is needed for Base Scope Item No. 1.** These studies have already been completed and are available for the chosen consultants review.
15. **Please confirm that a consolidation and associated permitting of all the parcels involved is not necessary at this stage in the development.** The Riverfront District is composed of a number of property owners, the largest of which is R47. Riverfront 47 is in the process of subdividing its property along the municipal borders.
16. **Please advise if an ALTA survey should be incorporated as part of the base mapping scope of services.** We have an ALTA survey which can be shared with the chosen firm or team. Creating this survey is not necessary.
17. **Do you envision constructing the entire trail and park at once, or will construction be broken-down into phases?** We expect to consider phased construction for the project. This will be determined during the design phase.
18. **Page 2 states the Riverfront District consists of 80+ acres....how much of the 80 acres do you estimate will be park/trail and how much will be development?** Our aspiration is that at least 30% of the land will be devoted to park and trail space. Please refer to Exhibit 4 in the reference materials provided in the RFP.

FUNDING QUESTIONS

19. **What are the anticipated funding sources for the for construction of the park? Do you anticipate PennDOT involvement for the actual implementation? If PennDOT funding is part of this phase we need to know how the funding is allocated based on the division of work. Are there certain funds set aside for master planning and a certain amount for implementation?** This RFP is to respond to the planning of the Park and Trail only, to include the design development phase. At this time, funding sources for the construction of the Park have not been explored, but we would anticipate that the sources would be some of the same sources that have been instrumental in building Parks and Trails throughout the area. This may or may not include PennDOT.
20. **If funding sources for future phases are not secured presently, will the chosen consultant be responsible for assisting R47 in securing those funds?** It is our experience that compelling plans are powerful fundraising tools. We welcome the chosen firm's experience with fundraising and recommendations about agencies or private funders that may be approached to help build out the plans, but time spent creating additional documents which would be geared specifically for individual potential funders is not part of this scope.
21. **Has all funding been secured/obtained for construction?** No.
22. **Is there a need for the consultant to provide drawings/sketches/narratives for fundraising purposes?** We would expect that the final deliverables would be easily translated into a wide variety of fundraising materials.
23. **Is the GTRP Grant and R47 match subject to any specific requirements (such as a % set aside for implementation or other uses) that would break down the total?** No. This RFP is entirely for planning.

24. **We also wanted to confirm that the entire fee for the project is \$300,000 (assuming that there were no other matching funds).** There is currently \$300,000 in funding for the services described in this RFP.
25. **What is the budget for planning and design? What is the budget for final construction?** See response to question 24. The budget for final construction depends on the design. Although park and trail building is often thought of in terms of decades, one of the priorities of the project is to create a park and trail that is connected to the communities and can be enjoyed by the public within a few years. We encourage you to be thoughtful about budget. As a reference point, Aspinwall Riverfront Park was built for \$8 per square foot, and a portion of the park opened in under two years of the property's purchase.
26. **Can the PA Commonwealth Financing Authority use the GTRP Grant for planning and design or is it restricted for implementation/construction?** The entire grant is for planning.
27. **Page 2 states you have received a \$250k grant and \$50k match. Is that money for design or do you anticipate some being utilized for construction?** We anticipate that all of the funding will be utilized for design.

DELIVERABLES QUESTIONS

28. **What are the expectations for the Phase I Design Development deliverable? It is unclear if these are meant to be at a preliminary construction document level package (i.e. a set with grading, layout, details, etc.).** We expect that the park and trail design base scope described in Scope of Work items 1-11 will produce a Design Development level set of deliverables for both park and trail elements. Two criteria inform our expectations: first, we would like the funding we've received from the State to stretch as far as possible; second, it is critical that this project be actionable. At the end of this process, we hope to be able to begin construction on the trail and at least one feature of the future park. In other words, deliverables should include both a broad sense of the design, with a construction document level package of the trail and a park

node which can be built in the near term for the community to begin to enjoy within the next two years.

29. **The top of page 6 states that part of the scope is construction documents. However, the last two scope items on page 7 (#10 and #11) are Design Development tasks. No specific task is identified for construction drawings. Are construction drawings for the park and trail a required part of the scope?** Deliverables for construction documents cannot be confirmed at this time, but it is our expectation that at least a portion of the project will get to this stage of planning. It is the goal of the Project to advance the design of the Project elements to as great an extent as possible utilizing the current funding for the project. To obtain this goal, individual proposers are encouraged to identify a process and fee budget to develop the documents further.
30. **When you talk about page numbers under Submission Format and organization (pg 11 of RFP), do you count 1 page as 8.5x11 single sided, or double sided.** We consider one page to be a single side.
31. **Base scope items 1-9 appear to be planning and schematic design-level tasks and items 10 and 11 discuss design development-level tasks, however the Project Scope of Work specifically mentions "construction document to advance said elements to implementation." Is final design including construction documents and specifications, bid phase services, and/or construction phase services expected as part of the base scope?** Please see the response to question 29.
32. **Should we bid on a CatEx or EA/FONSI level of effort?** Please bid on an EA/FONSI level of effort.
33. **Do you prefer tabs/dividers for the sections and appendices? Are they included in the page count?** We would appreciate tabs or dividers and they are not included in the page count.

CONTRACTUAL QUESTIONS

- 34. It is a little unclear who the client is, in terms of responsibility. Who or what is the contracting entity? Who will be paying consultant invoices?** Allegheny Development Partners is responsible for the project, but we consider the client a wider group of stakeholders that are property owners and community members. Invoices will be paid by Riverfront 47, LP, who is also the contracting entity. Riverfront 47 is a partnership formed by both The Mosites Company and Allegheny Development Partners. The Mosites Company, not Mosites Construction, is the general partner of Riverfront 47, LP, but by the terms of the partnership, issues related to the development of the park and trail are led by Susan Crookston of Allegheny Development Partners.
- 35. Related to the question about engagement, and interaction with the developer, Mosites, can you elaborate on the extent/expectations of engagement with agencies such as ALCOSAN, PWSA, and Rye Development (hydro-elec plant)?** The developer is Riverfront 47, LP (see question #?). As a property owners and stakeholders, we expect the chosen consultant to engage with ALCOSAN and Rye Development to the extent that it is needed. PWSA's property is not within Riverfront District Boundaries.
- 36. Can you describe the role and expected participation of the developer in the process?** See question 30.
- 37. Our company is certified through the Women's Business Enterprise National Council (WBENC) through the PA, DE, NJ Chapter as a WBE. Do you recognize this certification?** For this project, to satisfy WBE goals the women owned firm must be certified through Pennsylvania Unified Certification Program.
- 38. If so, as a prime proposer, does our certification count towards the 15% goal?** Please see response to question 33.
- 39. Can you provide a bit more information on how the integrated engineering for district infrastructure through Rye Development's hydro-electric power plant and new sub-station will affect this project? For**

example, should our team include an energy planning consultant? Rye Development is a property owner, stakeholder and collaborator for the Riverfront's development and at the appropriate times, will be involved in this Project. Like the development of R47, their project and process is evolving. We defer to each individual team to determine whether they feel an energy consultant would bring an important added perspective to the planning process.

40. Do the subconsultants need to submit the standard forms, or just the prime consultant? In the RFP proposer's certifications and assurances section, any contractor or subcontractor receiving funds from this grant must complete the forms.