

“PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES

FOR

VARIOUS PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENTS”

7/30/2018

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS

SPLOST 04

The following are responses (in red) to questions received from prospective bidders:

Question #1: Are we expected to provide the complete right-of-way acquisition services namely, appraisal, negotiation, and the closing?

Response: No. Only plats and legal descriptions will be required in support of the city’s acquisition/negotiations/closings.

Question #2: Are there any City resources we can use in negotiating and closing? The City attorney for example?

Response: NA

Question #3: Are we to exclude the cost of the property in our proposal?

Response: NA

As a side note; this is not standard practice in the State of Georgia

Question #4: RFP makes no mention of any environmental services. Has this already been done or are we expected to include this service?

Response: Not required

Question #5: RFP makes no mention of any geotechnical services. Has already been completed? or are we expected to provide this service?

Response: Not required as part of this proposal. Any work associated with the bioretention swale will be performed by the city's on-call material testing firm

Question #6: RFP makes no mention of any site lighting are we expected to provide this service?

Response: Not required

Question #7: The RFP makes no reference of GDOT prequalification. Are all consultants and sub-consultants expected to be GDOT prequalified in the necessary area class?

Response: Not required although appropriate experience in the areas described in the RFP must be satisfied.

Please take note that the city would prefer proposals from companies whose offices are located in the State of Georgia and with experience in the State of Georgia

Question #8: Is the landscape architect expected to be GDOT prequalified?

Response: NA

Question #9: At this stage of the process can the City excludes all review fees (City, State and CSX)? We cannot estimate these costs at this stage.

Response: This is a City project. No state funding as identified in the RFP

The Consultant shall estimate the design fees for preparing plans, applications, etc for submittal to CSX and include those design fees in their proposal.

The City will fund fund the cost of the CSX permit fees.

Question #10: The schedule provided is very aggressive particularly where right of way acquisition is involved. In our experience, negotiation takes a minimum of 6 months. Is the schedule flexible?

Response: NA (see previous responses regarding acquisition)

Question #12: The RFP states the contract is hourly with a not to exceed amount. Will the scores be based on the hourly rates or the not to exceed amount?

Response: No

Question #13: Can the city please clarify or provide some specificity as to the level of detail and extents of existing survey that will be provided to the selected consultant team?

Response:

Trailhead: The city provided plans in the Exhibit that identified topographic survey for the trailhead. The City will provide the appropriate CAD drawings to the selected firm.

Rowland from Lovejoy to NIC: No survey required – only resurfacing.

North Indian Creek @ Rowland: Database sufficient to provide easements and/or ROW and the intersection layout to support construction of the medians, RT IN/RT OUT islands and the striping

Rowland Street from NIC to Market: Survey of infrastructure within existing ROW footprint to support the design components included in the RFP

Church and East Ponce Sidewalks: Survey of infrastructure within existing ROW footprint to support the design components included in the RFP

Question #14: Exhibit D, Table 1, Project B – it is stated that PATH Foundation to restripe and sign for Bike Lanes – please clarify is the striping and signage in this scope of work or, not in Contract and the responsibility of PATH?

Response: Signage and restriping plan for the entire length of Rowland (Market to Lovejoy) to be included in the proposal. The installation of all the signage and striping to be accomplished by the City. This clarifies the discussion at the pre-bid and RFP document. The City does not anticipate that PATH Foundation will perform this work.

Question #15: Exhibit D, Table 1, Project B – Is the city prepared to replace curb when resetting curb is not viable due to damage of existing curb material?

Response: New header curb will be utilized if the city's decision is to modify the existing footprint of the roadway as discussed at the pre-bid meeting. As discussed, the city may choose to use traffic calming, modifications to the alignment of the roadway or any combination thereof in order to achieve the desired "Pedestrian Friendly" environment. To that end; some, all or selected areas of header curb on Rowland Street (NIC to Market) may be replaced.

Question #16: Exhibit D, Table 1, Project C – please provide detail as the quantity/quality of the warehoused trolley rail that is to be incorporated into the trailhead design?

Response: One section of rail approximately 5 ft. in length. Good condition – minimal corrosion.

Question #17: Exhibit D, Table 1, Project D – the project appears to indicate 2 new mid-block crosswalks, with no mention of RRFBs or HAWK signals. Please advise – has the city previously determined that neither are appropriate, or does the city anticipate one or the other will be included at these crosswalks?

Response: Refer to Figure #11 in the Wolverton Report – RRFB in addition to this crossing layout. This is the city's preferred design