

Project:**Sixmo Project No. 5140 03 22**

Avon Lake Play Space (ALPS) RFQ/SOQ
City of Avon Lake
150 Avon Belden Road
Avon Lake, Ohio 44012

Addendum Letter:A: RFQ/SOQ Clarifications**Issue Date:**June 28, 2023**Owner:**City of Avon Lake**To Contractor:**All interested persons

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS CLARIFY, ADD TO, DELETE FROM, AND/OR OTHERWISE CHANGE AND/OR SUPERSEDE INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY ISSUED IN THE BID DOCUMENTS FOR THE ABOVE REFERENCED PROJECT. PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AND ADJUST YOUR PROPOSAL ACCORDINGLY.

Requests for Clarifications for the above referenced project were due on June 23, 2023, at the offices of Sixmo Architects and Engineers. The following summarizes the responses to those communications.

Questions Received/ Responses Given:

1. **Questions:** What is your budget and scope of work? Completion time? Etc.? Site Size — Surface — age range!
 - 1.1. **Response:** You can download the complete RFQ from the City's website (scroll down on the page to find the link): <https://www.avonlake.org/public-works/bid-docs>. The RFQ should answer your question about the budget. There is no completion time set at this point. I've attached the Concept Plan with approximate dimensions. You can also attend the project information meeting this Friday if you are available.
2. **Questions:** Is this second go round? What was issue round 1?
 - 2.1. **Response:** The previous bid was pulled, this is a completely new round. The concept plan hasn't changed, only the structure of the bidding process.
3. **Questions:** I just wanted to verify that the SOQ we are turning in on June 30th will be in electronic format only correct? The rfq states that the SOQ is to be formatted in a searchable pdf format and states nothing about physical copies to submit.

**Architects
Engineers
Code Compliance
City Services**

Cleveland Office

1101 Auburn Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
216-767-5400

Zanesville Office

534 Market Street
Zanesville, Ohio 43701
740-452-7434

Marietta Office

204 Front Street
Marietta, OH 45750
740-809-2400

- 3.1. **Response:** Yes, you can absolutely submit the SOQ in electronic format, no need to submit anything on paper.
4. **Questions:** If you could please describe in more detail:
- 4.1. **Questions:** Should we send the email submissions cc'd to anyone other than Erin Fach?,
- 4.1.1. **Response:** Please send it to Erin Fach (efach@avonlake.org) and CC me (Katalin) on the email.
- 4.2. **Questions:** Erin's email is not listed under the owner contact person, could you send that out to everyone?
- 4.2.1. **Response:** Erin's email is in the advertisement and on the Renew ALPS page as well: <https://www.avonlake.org/public-works/bid-docs>.
- 4.3. **Questions:** Will there be any type of submission confirmation once we send it
- 4.3.1. **Response:** I will ask Erin to send confirmation to everyone who submitted. If you don't receive one by 4pm on the 30th, please let us know.
- 4.4. **Questions:** Any other misc. information as to submission we may need.
- 4.4.1. **Response:** All information should be in the RFQ regarding submission. It describes the size limit, what should be included, etc.
5. **Questions:** Why the previous bid was pulled?
- 5.1. **Response:** The document needed council approval; it was acquired later after the process was reconstructed.
6. **Questions:** Is the budget fixed?
- 6.1. **Response:** The RFQ states "The target budget may be exceeded if proposed solutions enhance overall value." Not all elements of the concept plan will fit into the budget set in the RFQ.
7. **Questions:** Is there a structure on the site currently?
- 7.1. **Response:** The previous playground was demolished a couple years ago. The two towers are there and are to be preserved and included in the design.
8. **Questions:** Is the city looking for a custom playground or off-the-shelf products?
- 8.1. **Response:** The budget probably doesn't allow for everything to be custom, the price will be an important factor. However, the city is not against custom structures, in fact they are looking to create a destination playground for the area. There was no material or color specified in the concept, the city is open to any solution.
9. **Comment:** The following are some points requiring more information. Though we are in the qualifying stage of the process, these unanswered questions may dilute the process of a fair assessment of respective packages:
- 9.1. **Questions:** The RFQ is specifically states this is a "design build" package. However, the city does not clarify or define how the city defines Design build.

- 9.1.1. **Responses:** The term "Design Build" and all other necessary terms are defined in the RFQ in Section 2.6 as well as the provided sample agreement. The term "firm", while not defined, repeatedly refers to the entity that submits a proposal as a Design-Build Team.
- 9.2. **Questions:** Usually, the chosen firm is required to come up with plans that allow for three equal products lines to allow for competitive bidding that matches the basis of design. Will Avon Lake be following the rules that state a DB firm must provide and accept three options that reasonably match the DB firms plans? Can you provide more specific definition of DB firm?
- 9.2.1. **Responses:** Page 2 Section 2, items 1 General, 2 Project Objectives, and 3 Scope of Work outlines our understanding of the Design-Build services requested. Additionally, the intended Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Design-Builder – Lump was attached to the RFQ to outline the definition, scope of services, and mutual understanding of both parties. Offerors who are ranked as the top three following evaluation of the SOQs will be required to submit only 1 proposal for the project – not 3 separate proposals each.
- 9.3. **Questions:** The package also has specific requirements for portions of the project (i.e. site work; paving; lighting, etc.) The budget set forth in the RFQ essentially will possibly require the full budget to be used for this scope of work, neglecting to provide any play or site furnishing equipment without expanding the budget. There is no mention to what degree of flexibility and budget increases will be available to the approved firm. It is highly unusual for a project like this to have a "wide open" back end on the budget. This has a direct effect on the required bonds that will be required. Bond company requires the entire bid be bonded. Yet the package neglects to provide any specifics. This ambiguity creates a very restrictive and potentially bias application of the review process and will likely result in a wide array of proposals regarding budget. The RFQ lists a scoring system for applicants that places heavy emphasis on price. How can the city assure a fair and balanced approach to scoring without more specific guidelines and budget restrictions?
- 9.3.1. **Response:** This question is premature. Once the highest 3 or 4 ranking Offerors are selected following review of the SOQ's, further information will be provided.
- 9.4. **Questions:** Another concern we have is the communication with the criteria architect. We have learned that some of the bidders have had direct contact with Sixmo, outside the pre bid meeting. While this communication in and of itself is not improper, Sixmo must handle these inquiries via a formal RFI (request for information) that is shared with all participants. Sixmo to date has not shared these communiques with anyone formally. We have only learned of these communications via fellow bidders. Will the city take corrective action on this matter to assure all parties are receiving information? The package specifically states anyone

with "inside information" will be removed from the process. These communications with individual bidders outside the rules for RFI processing raise some concerns. What corrective action will be taken deal with this concern?

9.4.1.**Response:** All responses to questions from potential and interested Offerors have been compiled and set forth in this document.

Anticipated Specification Revisions:

1. None.

Anticipated Drawing Revisions:

1. None.

Attachments:

1. None.

End of Document

Z:\2022 Projects\5000 - Public Sector\5140 - Avon Lake\51400322 - ALPS\01_Issued\2023-06-28 Addendum A\2023-06-28 Addendum A 51400322.docx