

ADDENDA 2

Question 1: Anticipated Structures / Buildings

What types and how many structures should the design team assume may be included in the scope (e.g., pavilions, pergolas, restrooms, monument elements, gateway features)?

Response:

The final number, type, and scale of structures will be informed through the master planning and community engagement process. Proposers should assume typical passive park elements such as small pavilions or shade structures, gateway or monument features, pedestrian bridge elements, seating areas, and related amenities appropriate for a destination gateway passive park. The selected firm will work with the City to refine these elements during master planning.

Question 2: Consultant Requirements

The RFQ includes staffing categories typical of vertical building projects. Are Mechanical, Plumbing, and Life/Safety Engineering consultants truly required for this park project, or is this language included as standard boilerplate?

Response:

Proposers should include only those consultants necessary to support the anticipated park amenities and any applicable structures.

Question 3: Pedestrian Bridge Scope

Is the signature pedestrian bridge expected to be fully engineered and permitted as part of the final construction document package, or developed to a conceptual level with final engineering deferred?

Response:

The pedestrian bridge is expected to be fully engineered and included in the final construction ready document package, including permitting coordination as required.

Question 4: Creek and Environmental Permitting

Has the City completed any environmental or regulatory determinations for the creek corridor (buffers, floodplain, Corps jurisdiction, etc.) that would inform the permitting approach?

Response:

The City has not completed formal environmental or regulatory determinations at this time. The selected design team should anticipate coordinating with applicable agencies and incorporating permitting considerations into the design process as required.

Question 5: Utilities and Pipeline Constraints

Are there known utility or pipeline crossings within the creek/pond area that must remain in place and be screened rather than relocated?

Response:

There are known utilities and pipeline features within the project area that are anticipated to remain in place. The design team should evaluate opportunities to accommodate or visually screen these elements where feasible rather than assume relocation.

Question 6: Survey and Base Data Availability

What existing survey information, CAD base files, or utility mapping will be provided to the selected team, and should proposers assume additional field verification or new survey work will be required?

Response:

Available reference materials such as existing surveys, base mapping, CAD files, and utility information will be provided to the selected firm as available. Proposers should assume that additional field verification and/or supplemental survey work may be required as part of the design scope.

Question 7: Geotechnical Investigation Responsibility

Will geotechnical services be provided by the City, or should geotechnical investigation and reporting be included in the design team scope to support grading and bridge design?

When will geotechnical work be completed?

Response:

Geotechnical services have not yet been completed. The selected design team should include geotechnical investigation and reporting in their scope as necessary to support site grading, trail design, and the pedestrian bridge. The timing of the geotechnical work will be coordinated early in the design process following consultant selection.

Question 8: Final Construction Document Expectations

What level of detail is expected for the “Final Design and Construction Documents” deliverable—full bid-ready documents for all park amenities, or primarily for core elements such as trails, bridge, planting, and lighting?

Response:

Final Design and Construction Documents are expected to be complete, bid-ready documents for the park improvements approved through the master planning process, including trails, bridge, grading, drainage, landscaping, lighting, and associated amenities.

Question 9: Project Budget Alignment

Is there an established construction budget target under SPLOST VI funding that the design team should use as a framework for master planning and cost estimating?

Response:

The project will be funded under SPLOST VI. A final construction budget will be refined as part of the master planning and cost estimating process in coordination with the City.

Question 10: Schedule and Procurement Timeline

Does the City have any desired durations for master plan process, construction document delivery, bidding, and construction start? Are there any constraints associated with the funding sources?

Response:

Specific durations have not yet been established. The selected firm will work with the City to develop a realistic schedule aligned with SPLOST VI funding requirements and City approval processes.

Question 11: Fee Structuring / Scope Definition

Given that the final park program and amenity scope will be refined through the master planning process, would the City be willing to accept a fee range or phased fee approach for the Construction Document phase, with the final CD scope and fee to be confirmed upon master plan approval?

Response:

Proposers should submit a fee that includes completion of construction-ready documents. The master planning and community engagement process is expected to provide sufficient information to define the full project scope for construction documents.

All other terms and conditions of the RFP unchanged.