

The following questions were submitted regarding the Design and Engineering of the Historic Park City/Main Street Improvements: Answers follow in bold print.

- 1) Does Park City have any CAD based planning topography, GIS data, or other information that we can use to compile concept plans and 30% design? Or does the City wish for the consultant to conduct a design level survey of the project, which can be used for future design purposes?

Pretty limited CAD info/as-builts. We have GIS data for utilities. The consultant should not be doing design level survey info – more simply I seek the best we can do to generate more informed cost estimates without breaking the bank. Typical costs/sf and unit prices will likely go a long way. I see cost being negotiable on this point, and don't anticipate penalization if proposals allow for too much or too little detail – I am certain the successful firm/Park City can agree on a \$/hr to get to whatever level of detail that we agree to.

- 2) Can you identify what specific roles there may be for an architect, structural engineer, and mechanical engineer. We didn't see any specific reference in the "design elements" suggesting a building or structures in the scope of work. Perhaps there are some ideas floating in the community that involves some small structures that are not explicitly stated in the scope of design elements. The question has to do with how we develop a fee proposal for all disciplines listed when we are uncertain exactly how some of these disciplines may be involved. Any further illumination you have on how the list of disciplines was developed in relation to the scope of design elements will be appreciated.

Good question. This is mostly an exercise in concept planning and creating place through projects → then infusing those projects into our annual budget process for prioritization. This is not an exercise in blowing out DD drawings. The reason to have the engineers is to help inform placeholders we put in our capital budget for the scope of the prioritized projects. To the end that I anticipate the concepts and projects to include utilities, structures and lighting, etc. the Team should have the engineering or construction estimating support to provide high level cost estimates.

- 3) We are anticipating including other disciplines that are not specifically included in the scope of services to address some elements of the design elements. Is this problematic?

No, this is awesome!

- 4) Given the page limit, how much information are you looking for from regarding the qualifications of the entire team, versus the team lead/contracting firm?

I am personally interested in the lead firm the most, mostly due to the limited level of detail we are seeking on the technical/engineering side. I represent only

myself though. The City Engineer and Public works will have 3-4 spots on the selection committee so the entire team will need to be able to stand alone also.

- 5) Section III indicates a budget of \$275,000 - \$375,000. We understand this to be the project budget, rather than the design services budget, but we wanted to clarify. The term "project" is also used in the title of Section II - Scope of Project, to mean the specific scope outlined.

Absolutely, the RFP incorrectly states the budget includes construction. The budget/scope include design, engineering, cost estimates, public presentations, etc., construction or design services budget.

Further clarification: No construction. Preliminary design development dwgs. Approx 30%'s.

- 6) We're also uncertain if the stated funding is the maximum budget, since the scope of the project also discusses preparing a possible budget request for the next fiscal cycle, which begins in March 2012. We're uncertain whether this means that the existing appropriation will be allocated to specific projects, or whether there may be a request anticipated for additional funding beyond the maximum of \$375,000 that is currently funded.

It is not the maximum budget. The funding is our Main Street RDA which has a little more flexibility above and beyond the stated budget. To that end if there are some good "bang for the buck" projects that rapidly surface, I may try to implement with other existing RDA funding, perhaps to the tune of \$50k or so.

- 7) The web link to the RFP web site noted in the RFP did not seem to work, but we found the information following the links through the main Park City home page. There are no posted addenda (as of the date/time of this email). We just wanted to confirm if any have been posted yet? Also, do you have a timeline to post responses to questions following today's deadline? We assume that responses will be posted and not just answered individually to those who have asked questions. What is the deadline that any final addendum will be posted?

Thanks for letting me know about the RFP link. I will look into it. I intend to post all questions by Friday at noon. Otherwise, no addendums.

- 8) In Section III your RFP states, "The funding for the total project including construction will be provided from the Main Street RDA has been approved for the Fiscal year 2011/2012. It includes a range of \$275,000-\$375,000 in the budget for this project. The final design budget for this RFP will be negotiated with the preferred Team based on the final scope." I am looking for clarification here about the "total project including construction" portion in this language. I'd like to understand the intent Park City's RDA has for the \$275,000-\$375,000 with regard to the construction components of the project. It will help us craft a suitable response with regard to what we can offer and stay within your budget.

The RFP definitely had a mistake by saying the budget included “construction” of projects. There is no intent that any “projects” will be implemented with the \$275 - \$375k. The intent is for the budget/scope is to prepare an informed project list that can be contemplated by our City Council for funding as a placeholder for future construction during their annual budget process that culminates in June 2011.

- 9) The Historic Park City Improvement Plan Prepared by IBI identified several projects with a total estimated construction of about \$8.5M. In Section III of the RFP the funding is identifies that the funding including construction is \$275K to \$375K for the FY2011/2012. Are we to understand that additional funding will be made available in the next few years or is the \$275k to \$375k an expected range for the design team services?

The final deliverable of this project we will use as the basis of budget discussion for FY 13 (July 1, 2012), during which we will secure funding for prioritized projects. Once funded, those projects will go out with separate design RFP and then construction bid.

- 10) On section 8, the insurance requirements are set at \$2M. Can this be an excess liability insurance and/or umbrella insurance that combined with the existing insurance brings the total up to \$2M that is required.

Usually we accept the umbrella, especially when we are not going into full CD's.

- 11) Would you please clarify section III – Funding, of the RFP - is the \$275,000 - \$375,000 the design fee budget for the referenced 30% Preliminary Design Development drawings and other scope represented in section II, or is the \$275,000 - \$375,000 the 2012 capital budget and professional fees are a portion of the capital budget?

The funding is for the preliminary DD's and other scope in section II. It is Main Street RDA increment not allocated to debt service for the parking garage. The anticipated budget for the projects i am guessing will be north of \$10 million. The effort is intended to id capital budget (and ultimately a revenue source) for projects in the 2013 FY budget.

- 12) Could you please clarify item III. Funding in the RFP? The wording is somewhat confusing and just want to be clear. Am I right in assuming that the approved funds of \$275,000-\$375,000 is the design/engineering budget for the requested scope in the RFP?

Yes it is for design, engineering, cost estimates, public presentations... not construction budget.