ADDENDUM # 1

From: Lena Butler, Purchasing Supervisor
To: All Firms
Project: RFQ 19-0001-Echo Farms Park
Date: July 24, 2018

This addendum is issued regarding questions received in response to the County’s Request for Qualifications “RFQ 19-0001-ECHO FARMS PARK” and is hereby made a part of said Request for Bids to the same extent as though it were originally therein.

1. Can you please tell me if this project has already gone through advanced planning? Is there a master plan? Budget? How much is the budget? If so, who are the consultants involved in advanced planning and was the County happy with the consultant and deliverables?

   There is a conceptual plan. Estimated total budget: $3,457,000. Sage Design & Sawyer Sherwood & Associates provided conceptual design and cost estimates. We were pleased with their services.

2. We have a question concerning #3 under Selection Criteria on Page 3 of 6 in the RFQ.

   a. How will the scoring % be affected, if a local firm shows multiple successful similar projects as well as Parks & Rec. projects yet is very lean with New Hanover County recent projects?

   It would count for 1/3 of the weight applied to section 3 which is 35% of the total value of points.

3. In reference to the submittal requirements, the General Information section calls for submittal of qualifications on standard form SF330. In the Submittal Requirements section, “Standard Form 330 and complete statement of qualifications…” is requested.

   Can you please clarify if a separate document/proposal is needed in addition to the SF330? If so what information is required.

   This is a request for qualifications only. The SF330 allows you to submit your projects for consideration. We are not asking for proposals.

4. Just to confirm you only want the SF330 and no additional attached information such as Certificates of Insurance or other written statements addressing the “Specific Evaluation factors” listed in the RFQ

   You will need to submit a separate document to complete the specific evaluation factors. No specific proposal for the Echo Farms project.
5. We have a question concerning #3 under Selection Criteria on Page 3 of 6 in the RFQ: A lead Architect has contacted us concerning the specification, “Recent experience with New Hanover County; preference given to local firms.” How will the scoring % be affected, if a local firm shows multiple successful similar projects as well as Parks & Rec. projects yet is very lean with New Hanover County recent projects?

It would count for 1/3 of the weight applied to section 3 which is 35% of the total value of points.

6. I have a quick question in regards to the Echo Farms RFQ. Under the General Information schedule, we did not see that there would be an interview process for a narrowed down pool of candidates and just wanted to confirm.

Anticipate interviews to be held the week of Aug. 20th or Aug. 27th.

7. Pool renovations – Can you provide clarity as to the scope of the renovations? Will the pool and pool deck be expanded from its current footprint and will new pool amenities be programmed?

No, anticipate improvements to be more along the lines of code updates and efficiencies to aged pool facility.

8. Public engagement/outreach – Will there be any formal public involvement in the design process such as open house events or neighborhood meetings?

Will host a couple focus groups.

9. Is there a minimum or maximum number of relevant projects firms should list on the RFQ?

No, whatever you feel is necessary to define experience.

10. Is there a design budget established for this project?

Estimate for total design and construction is $3,457,000.

11. Request clarification on the following:

1. Please clarify the extent of anticipated renovations to the existing swimming pool.
   a. Is this work mostly items above grade and around the swimming pool or is the pool itself being modified?
   Improvements to be more along the lines of code updates and efficiencies to aged pool facility

2. Contract Language
   a. 1.8.3 & 1.8.3.2 Request that the word “inspections” be changed to “observations”. Design teams do not perform “inspections”, but rather observe work to ensure it is compliant with the intent of the drawings and at a stage consistent with contractor’s application for payment. Accepted
b. 3.5 Basis of Compensation. Request that the word “Contractor” be changed to “Architect” …as per the proposal provided by the Contractor Architect in Exhibit A……. Accepted

c. 6.6 Subcontractors. Request that only Architects Major Subcontractors be required to meet the insurance requirements. Example: cost estimators, interior designers, and landscape architects do not typically carry the level of insurance required by architects, structural engineers and civil engineers.

Rejected per J. Stancil, “I think my question would be what constitutes major? Unfortunately, we are working with a pool on this one and would want any sub, large or small to carry the same insurance limits. Regardless of the size of the job, the liability could still be just as great.”