



## FINANCE

333 Broadalbin Street SW, PO Box 490, Albany, Oregon 97321-0144 | PHONE 541-917-7500

---

### ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: May 20, 2019

To: Interested Proposers

From: Diane M. Murzynski, CPPO, CPPB, Purchasing Coordinator

Re: Waterfront Redevelopment Design Request for Proposals (RFP)

The purpose of this Addendum is to modify the RFP documents only to the extent indicated herein. All other areas not changed or otherwise modified by other addenda shall remain in full force and effect. This Addendum is hereby made an integral part of the original Project Documents. The Proposer shall sign below acknowledging they read and understand that this Addendum includes and incorporates the following changes.

**The Purpose of this addendum is to modify the following and answer questions submitted by potential Proposers. All answers and modifications are reflected in bold and italics.**

1. “Has there been a planning or design firm assisting the City with the planning of the project leading up to the RFP?”

***Answer: Attachment B of the RFP (Page 33) shows the firms and groups that have worked on components of this project in the past. The SCYP group put together a lot of conceptual design work and the Water Avenue Streetscape Design Guide was completed with WHPacific, Inc. But there has not been a firm working from the beginning to the present on the planning of this project, and we are not working with an outside firm on any component of the project currently.***

2. “The RFP mentions seeking one or more well-qualified design firms for the project. Is it the intent to have one lead firm with possible subconsultants under one contract or is the City thinking there could be multiple consultants with multiple contracts to complete the work?”

***Answer: The intent is to have one lead firm with possible subconsultants under one contract.***

3. “Will there be a preproposal meeting? If there will be, is there a date and time set for this?”

***Answer: There is no preproposal meeting scheduled.***

[finance.cityofalbany.net](http://finance.cityofalbany.net)



4. “Is there an opportunity to meet with you and others from the City prior to the proposal completion date to discuss the project?”

***Answer: The City will let potential proposers know if there will be a preproposal meeting scheduled for interested parties to meet with the City.***

5. “What type of firm do you envision leading this project, civil engineer or landscape architect?”

***Answer: No preference between types of firms (civil engineer/landscape architect) so long as they have the capacity to take it on as a team or pull in another firm.***

6. “Clarify the scope for the existing waterfront park areas identified in the recently-posted diagram. These areas contain existing public park/open space amenities. Is it imagined that these park spaces are redeveloped or replaced?”

***Answer: The RFP did not differentiate between re-development and replacement. As a general comment, our intent was to focus on “re-development” as both improvement to park space as both new or improved facilities. If you look at the SCYP document for example, it shows conceptual ideas for both new and improved facilities.***

7. “Is the intent to follow the 2008 Streetscape Design Guide exactly? Is there anything you’ve learned since then that you’d would like to add?”

***Answer: There is no need to duplicate work that’s been done, but design and aesthetic changes may reasonably come up during this process. The railroad crossings have been negotiated and some in this area have been updated using this guide.***

8. “Who are the local stakeholders to consider?”

***Answer: Albany Visitors Association, Albany Downtown Association, Carousel, CARA Advisory Board, key staff in other departments, business and building owners, and others as identified throughout this process.***

9. “Are there any comprehensive code or development code barriers to this project?”

***Answer: No.***

---

Proposer’s Signature

---

Date

---

Company Name *(Please print)*