REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
ADDENDUM NO. 1 – SEPTEMBER 14, 2020
ADDENUM NO. 2 – SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Services for
Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild

Release Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020

Optional Pre-Qualifications Meeting: September 17, 2020 at 9am
JOIN ZOOM MEETING – call-in info below

Last Day for Questions: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 at 3pm

Due Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 at 3pm

REQUEST

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) seeks professional consulting services for the Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild project.

ABOUT MPRB

The MRPB is an independent, semi-autonomous body responsible for maintaining and developing the Minneapolis Park system to meet the needs of citizens of Minneapolis. This unique structure allows independent decision-making so the MPRB can efficiently oversee a diverse system of land and water. Nine Park Board Commissioners are elected every four years: one from each of the six park districts within the city and three that serve at-large. The Board of Commissioners appoints the Superintendent to provide high-level oversight and leadership to the nationally renowned park system. Three Assistant Superintendents, all appointed by the Superintendent, oversee operations, planning and recreation with a staff of 400+ full-time and 1200+ part-time employees. The MPRB is one of five Minnesota park agencies and one of only 108 agencies in the United States that is accredited by the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA).

The Minneapolis Park System consists of 182 park properties, including local and regional parks, playgrounds, triangles, golf courses, gardens, picnic areas, biking and walking paths, nature sanctuaries, and the 55-mile Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway. Together, these properties total 6,732 acres of land and water. The backbone of the park system is its full-service neighborhood recreation centers. It serves as host to approximately sixteen million visitors annually. The Park Board adopted a Comprehensive Plan (2007), after substantial public input, which will provide guidance through 2020. Staff are currently working on the next comprehensive plan, Parks for All.
GENERAL INFORMATION

This Request for Qualifications is intended to solicit responses from qualified consultants or teams (Consultant Team) for services related to the Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild.

The MPRB is the sole authority to speak to issues related to this Request for Qualifications.

This Request for Qualifications is open to all qualified firms and individuals. As described in Contractual Obligations, there are requirements for participation from small and underutilized businesses that will be released through an Addendum to all known proposers and posted on the MPRB’s website under MPRB Business Opportunities.

A Scope of Work and a Fee for Services is not requested through this RFQ and will be negotiated with the successful responder.

CONTACT INFORMATION

The MPRB has assigned staff to manage the Request for Qualifications process, including any needs related to clarifications or questions. Any communications related to this request shall be directed VIA EMAIL ONLY to:

Daniel Elias, Design Project Manager
DElias@minneapolisparks.org

No other staff are authorized to respond to questions or requests for clarification of this Request for Qualifications. Failure to follow this instruction may be cause for disqualification.

Questions or requests for clarification must be received by the date indicated in the Qualifications Schedule. Responses will be provided to all known proposers via email by the date indicated in the Preliminary Project Schedule and will be posted to the MPRB’s website under MPRB Business Opportunities.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The MPRB seeks professional consulting services from a Minnesota-licensed architect, landscape architect and other affiliated professionals (collectively, the Consultant Team) to provide conceptual design, schematic design, design development, construction document, bidding and construction administration services for the Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild project.

The building, lost to fire in 2019, was originally constructed in the 1930s, with a renovation completed in 1988. The building was a single story and the primary structure was timber framing with metal roofing tiles and walls of plaster stucco finish. A little over half of the building footprint (1,945 sf) was enclosed space containing the building functions, including food preparation and service, freezer and cold storage, keg storage, dishwashing
area, mechanical space and public and employee restrooms. The remaining square footage (2,055 sf) was covered open area currently used for seating and queueing for ordering.

With the recently passed Bde Maka Ska-Harriet Master Plan as guidance, the rebuilding of the Refectory will include amenities lost during the 2019 fire, ADA compliant restroom facilities, an ADA site arrival point and an additional auxiliary space to be determined through the design process and reviewed and approved by the Board of Commissioners through a Concept Design approval process.

PROJECT CONTEXT & OPPORTUNITY

The master plan created for Bde Maka Ska suggests several goals for the north and northeast portions of the lake. While conditions specific to these parts of the lake may have changed or may be changing, the goals of the master plan are still pertinent and will be used as a guide toward any change. Specifically, the master plan offers the following guidance for the north and northeast portions of Bde Maka Ska that are most directly related to the subject of the RFQ:

North Focus Area
- Construct a Chain of Lakes Visitor Center with overlook and patio spaces.

Northeast Focus Area
- Construct an all-gender restroom and storage building.
- Replace the turnaround at the existing boat launch with a curbside drop-off area that includes designated spaces for deliveries and accessible parking.
- Improve waterfront access for pedestrians.

The loss of the refectory could not have been anticipated. The opportunity to rebuild anew allows for the inclusion of multiple master plan recommendations to be addressed with this singular project.

PROJECT SCHEDULE (Subject to change and contract negotiations)

- Concept Design January-March 2021
- Concept Design Board Approval April 2021
- Schematic Design April-May 2021
- Design Development June-Aug 2021
- Construction Documents Sept-Dec 2021
- Bidding Jan-Feb 2022
- Construction Contract Award March 2022
- Construction April 2022-March 2023
- Fit Out Vendor Space April 2023
- Initiate Full Vendor Operations May 2023
SCOPE OF SERVICES

While the MPRB is not relying on a preconceived scope of work to determine a qualified consultant, there is an expectation that the following services will be provided as part of the negotiated Scope of Work:

- Concept Design Services
  - Existing Conditions Assessment
  - Permitting Coordination
  - Community Engagement Assistance
- Schematic Design Services
- Design Development Services
- Construction Document Services
- Bidding Services
- Construction Administration Services

PRELIMINARY PROJECT BUDGET AND FEE PROPOSAL

A fee proposal is not requested as part of the as part of this RFQ.
QUALIFICATIONS SCHEDULE

The MPRB will pursue the following schedule related to this Request for Qualifications and the engagement of a Consultant Team:

2020

- RFQ Release - September 8, 2020
- Pre-Qualifications Information Session - September 17, 2020 at 9am
  
  https://zoom.us/j/97564596239?pwd=bDdrakFyb0llb1owLzVabjFNT0dNZz09
  
  Meeting ID: 975 6459 6239
  Passcode: 720291
  
  Dial by your location
  +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
  
  Meeting ID: 975 6459 6239
  Find your local number: https://zoom.us/u/adOJvyvh31
  
- Last Day for Questions - September 22, 2020 at 3pm
- Qualifications Due - September 29, 2020 at 3pm
- Consultant Team Interviews (if necessary) - October 13-16, 2020
- Scope of Services and Fee Negotiations - October 27-30, 2020
- Consultant Contract Award - December 2, 2020

*Updates to the schedule will occur only via an addendum to this Request for Qualifications.
PROJECT GUIDANCE

In addition to guidance and direction through the Project Manager, this project is anticipated to include engagement and review by each of several committees or bodies. The frequency and timing for meetings with each group will be determined in concert with the selected Consultant Team.

Project Advisory Committee
Throughout the design process, the selected Consultant Team will convene with a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) composed of staff internal to MPRB at key milestones. The Consultant Team may be asked to participate in meetings of the Project Advisory Committee.

Technical Advisory Committee
The project may require technical input from entities beyond MPRB or other bodies described in this section. For this project, technical insights may be sought from various departments of the City of Minneapolis, MnHPO, MnDNR, or others. While a formal Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) may not be convened for this project, it is requested that the Consultant Team advise MPRB around entities with jurisdiction or with plan review authority and coordinate with each entity accordingly.

QUALIFICATION CONTENT, SUBMISSION & EVALUATION

Due Date: Tuesday, September 29th, 2020 – 3:00 PM CST

Submit to: Daniel Elias
Design Project Manager, Planning Division
Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
delias@minneapolisparks.org

The email submittal must clearly state in the subject line that the communication contains:

“Statement of Qualifications for Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild”

Submit one electronic copy in pdf format. The Qualifications should be no larger than 8½” x 11 with a maximum page count of 30 broken down as indicated below. Each page of content is considered 1 page. The Qualifications will become public data upon selection. No text shall be smaller than 11-point font.

Any communications and/or inquiries by a bidder during this RFQ process must be submitted by 3pm on Tuesday, September 22nd.
It is not the MPRB’s responsibility to acknowledge receipt of any qualifications as a result of the Request for Qualifications process. It is the Proposer’s responsibility to assure that the qualifications are received in a timely manner and is responsive to any RFQ Addendums provided.

The Qualifications must contain the following information and be submitted in the following order:

1. Cover page (=1 page)
2. List/Org chart of all firms/areas of expertise involved identifying lead firm and lead project manager (≤9 pages)
   a) Identify the **day-to-day** project manager for the lead architecture firm/area of expertise.
   b) Identify the **day-to-day** project manager for each other expertise identified.
   c) Resumes of each individual identified in 2a and 2b.
   d) Identify sub-consultants that are certified to meet the City of Minneapolis Small & Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) goals.
3. Built project examples similar in scope including references and year built (≤9 pages)
   a) Up to three (3) relevant project examples for the lead firm/project manager/area of expertise
      ▪ Day-to-day project manager must have worked on identified projects
      ▪ Describe how each project will inform this work at Bde Maka Ska
   b) Up to Two (2) relevant project example for each project manager not serving as the lead project manager
      ▪ Day-to-day project manager must have worked on identified projects
      ▪ Describe how each project will inform this work at Bde Maka Ska
4. Responses to Questions (see below) (≤3 pages)
5. Statement of acceptance of standard contract form and insurance requirements (≤1 pages)
6. Hourly Billing Rates for each firm on project team (≤7 pages)

The Qualifications **should not** contain the following:

1. Cover letter
2. Statement of project understanding
3. Firm profile (other than as requested above)
4. Work plan and deliverables
5. Project Schedule
6. Resumes or project examples for individuals that will not be day-to-day project managers for their expertise
7. Project examples that were not built
8. SUBP Commitment Form – this will be due prior to Contract Award
Respond to the following questions:

Question #1: With the extremely active northeast corner of Bde Maka Ska (Lake Street/parkway intersection, trail use, boat launch, boat rentals, etc), construction access and staging will prove difficult. Describe a project designed and constructed by key members of the Consultant Team in a busy, urban, and pedestrian/bicycle friendly environment and the strategies employed to manage the constructing phase.

Question #2: What do you anticipate will be the key challenges (other than as noted above) in the successful execution of this project? How does your Consultant Team propose to address these challenges?

Question #3: How will your Consultant Team approach communication and discourse with the general public around this project’s architectural aesthetic/design theory? What strategies have you used in the past and how will that be leveraged in this project?

EVALUATION OF RESPONSES

Responses to this Request for Qualifications will be reviewed by a combination of the following representatives from the MPRB:

- Daniel Elias, Project Manager, Planning Division, MPRB
- Adam Arvidson, Director of Strategic Planning, Planning Division, MPRB
- Shane Stenzel, Permits Manager, Asset Management Division, MPRB
- Jeff Evenson, Director of Asset Management, Asset Management Division, MPRB
- Matt Diaz, Park Operations Manager, Asset Management Division, MPRB

Responses shall be reviewed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the required format of the response:</td>
<td>No consideration will be given to Qualifications failing to follow the format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications and experience of the day-to-day project manager of the lead firm:</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications and experience of the day-to-day project manager of the supporting firms/areas of expertise:</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Questions:</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any determination relative to the selection of a Consultant Team made by the MPRB shall be considered final.
SELECTION OF CONSULTANT TEAM

Should it be determined after a detailed review of responses that interviews are necessary to determine the best qualified Consultant Team, the MPRB will organize interviews as follows:

- The Consultant Teams selected for an interview will be notified not less than six calendar days prior to the date scheduled for the interview;
- Participation in the interview will be limited to four members of the Consultant Team, and must include the following:
  - Project Lead;
  - No more than three Key Personnel of the Consultant Team;
- The interview format will be provided to those selected for interviews at the time of notification.

The Consultant Teams selected for an interview shall consider information contained in a response to this Request for Qualifications to be read and understood, with no need to repeat or review that information during an interview. Additional information regarding interviews may be provided to the prospective Consultant Teams at any time up to the start of the interview.

It is intended that the same individuals identified as reviewers in the Evaluation of Responses will conduct the interviews. The interview panel may be modified based on review of the responses received.

ATTACHMENTS TO THIS RFQ (Included in original RFQ only)

- Attachment A: Bde Maka Ska (Lake Calhoun) Refectory Facilities Assessment – 2016 – included in original RFQ only
- Attachment B: Bde Maka Ska-Harriet Master Plan – link only
- Attachment C: Draft AIA B101 Contract – included in original RFQ only
- Attachment D: SUBP Commitment Form – included with RFQ Addendum No. 1 only – not due with Qualifications
- Attachment E: Notes, Questions & Answers from September 17, 2020 Virtual RFQ Information Session (including presentation)

NOT ATTACHMENTED TO THIS RFQ (Will be provided to the selected Consultant Team)

- Draft Community Engagement Assessment
- ALTA and Topographical Survey
- Geotechnical Evaluations
- Reports related to Fire Loss of Refectory – 2019
- Environmental Site Assessment – Phase 1
CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION

CONTRACT

The MPRB uses the AIA B101 contract. The selected consultant will be expected to complete the requirements of the agreement and submit signed copies prior to beginning work. The agreement MAY NOT be changed in any way without MPRB Board approval. This contract, if over $100,000, will require MPRB Board approval.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS SMALL AND UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESS PROGRAM (SUBP)

I. Overview

The City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) policy is to provide equal opportunities to all businesses, with an effort to redress discrimination in the City’s marketplace and in public contracting against Minority-owned business enterprises (MBEs) and Women-owned business enterprises (WBEs). This is accomplished through the Small and Underutilized Business Program (“SUBP”) as detailed in the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances Chapter 423. The SUBP applies to any construction, service, or purchase contract over $175,000. SUBP goals are set on projects based on the project scope, subcontracting opportunities, and availability of eligible MBEs/WBEs.

This contract will include the following SUBP goal to facilitate participation of eligible MBEs and WBEs (MBEs/WBEs):

The goal on this contract will be 8% MBE/WBE (combined).*

* This project has a combined MBE/WBE goal. This SUBP goal may be met by utilizing either an MBE firm or a WBE firm, or by a combination of MBE and WBE firms.

In order for the participation of an MBE/WBE firm to be counted toward the SUBP goal, the MBE/WBE firm must be:

1. Certified as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE). This is the only MBE/WBE certification accepted by the SUBP.
2. DBE-certified within the scope of work that they will perform.
3. Performing a commercially useful function. An MBE/WBE performs a commercially useful function when it executes a distinct element of work and carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.
4. Located within the City’s marketplace, which includes the Minnesota Counties of Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Le Sueur, Mille Lacs, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Sibley, Washington, and Wright; and the Wisconsin Counties of Pierce and St. Croix.
Consultants should search for DBE-certified MBE and WBE firms using the Minnesota Unified Certification Program (MnUCP) directory, here: (http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/).¹

Consultants must make a Good Faith Effort to meet the SUBP goal. This means that Consultants must make every necessary and reasonable effort to subcontract with MBEs/WBEs. Commitment to use MBEs/WBEs, Good Faith Efforts to include MBE/WBE participation, and compliance with SUBP will be a factor in the selection of the consultant.

II. GOOD FAITH EFFORTS EVALUATION

If a Consultant does not meet the SUBP goal, the Consultant shall demonstrate its good faith efforts to do so. To determine if the Consultant demonstrated good faith efforts to meet the SUBP goal, the following list of factors may be considered:

1. Soliciting through all reasonable and available means (attendance at pre-proposal meetings, advertising and/or written notices) the interest of all eligible MBEs/WBEs certified in the scopes of work of the contract. The proposer must solicit MBEs/WBEs in sufficient time prior to proposal due date to allow MBEs/WBEs time to respond to solicitations. The proposer must determine with reasonable certainty if the MBEs/WBEs are interested by taking appropriate steps to follow up on initial solicitations.

2. Selecting portions of the work to be performed by eligible MBEs/WBEs in order to increase the likelihood that the SUBP goal will be achieved. This includes, where appropriate, breaking out contract work into smaller units to facilitate MBE/WBE participation, even when a proposer might otherwise prefer to perform these work items with its own forces.

3. Providing interested eligible MBEs/WBEs with adequate information about the plans, specifications, and requirements of the contract in a timely manner to assist them in responding to a solicitation.

4. The proposer must negotiate in good faith with interested eligible MBEs/WBEs and provide written documentation of such negotiation with each such business.

5. A proposer should consider a number of factors in negotiating with potential MBE/WBE sub-consultants, and should take into consideration an eligible MBE or WBE’s price and capabilities and scheduling as well as the established contract goal. However, the fact that there may be some additional costs involved in finding and using eligible MBE’s/WBE’s is not in itself sufficient reason for a proposer's failure to meet the established MBE/WBE goal, as long as such costs are reasonable. The ability or desire to perform the work of a contract with its own organization does not relieve the proposer of the responsibility to make good faith efforts. Proposers are not, however, required to accept higher quotes from eligible MBE’s/WBE’s if the price difference is excessive or unreasonable.

6. The proposer must offer information regarding, and make reasonable efforts to assist, solicited eligible MBEs/WBEs in obtaining bonding, lines of credit or insurance as required by the city or by the proposer; provided that the proposer need not provide financial assistance toward this effort.

¹ If a Consultant identifies a business that is not yet certified, but may qualify for certification as MBE/WBE, the Consultant should encourage the business to immediately begin the application process for certification with the MnUCP. The Consultant should include this in their Good Faith Efforts documentation.
7. Effectively using the services of minority/woman community organizations; minority/woman contractors’ groups; local, state and federal business assistance offices; and other organizations as allowed on a case-by-case basis to provide assistance in the solicitation and placement of MBEs/WBEs.
8. Whether the apparent successful proposer met or exceeded the average eligible MBE/WBE participation obtained by other proposers responding to the same City publication.

III. Required Documentation
1. The proposer must thoroughly document its efforts to solicit and incorporate eligible MBE/WBE participation to meet the SUBP goal. The following must be submitted with the fee for services documentation, prior to contract award. This form is not due with the qualifications submittal.
   a. SUBP Commitment Form, listing all sub-consultants, contractors, suppliers, and service providers that will be used on the project. This completed form will be used to determine whether the proposer is committing to meeting the SUBP goal. The commitments listed by the proposer on this form are a material condition of contract award, and constitute minimum commitments on this contract.

2. If the SUBP Commitment Form does not demonstrate verifiable MBE/WBE participation sufficient to meet the SUBP goal, then the proposer must submit documentation demonstrating that the proposer made sufficient good faith efforts (GFE) to meet the SUBP goal. This GFE documentation will be due upon request by the City. This GFE documentation includes:
   a. Good Faith Efforts Checklist: A checklist based on the factors that may be considered in determining whether a proposer made good faith efforts to meet the SUBP goal.
   b. Supporting Documentation to Demonstrate Good Faith Efforts: The proposer must submit documentation evidencing the efforts taken to achieve the SUBP goal. The documentation may include, but is not limited to, copies of solicitation emails, quotes received, faxes, and phone call logs. Any such documentation of solicitations to MBE/WBE firms must clearly include the identification of the recipient firm(s).

3. The contract may be monitored through the Contract Compliance Information Management System (CCIMS)/B2Gnow software, or other method specified by the Minneapolis Department of Civil Rights (MDCR). If specified by MDCR, the prime contractor and its subcontractors and suppliers will be responsible for entering information into the specified software. Such information will include, but may not be limited to, payment amounts made to the prime contractor and payment amounts made to MBE and WBE subcontractors and suppliers. The prime contractor and its subcontractors and suppliers will also be responsible for maintaining the appropriate records to document their compliance and for producing such records if audited.

IV. Post-Award Substitutions
A Consultant shall not substitute, reduce participation of, or eliminate MBE/WBE sub-consultants listed in the SUBP Commitment Form without prior written approval of the Minneapolis Department of Civil Rights. A Consultant who substitutes, reduces participation of, or removes an MBE/WBE sub-consultant listed in the SUBP Commitment Form without prior written approval shall be subject to a fine of up to $10,000 per violation, or any of the penalties listed below. The Consultant must make good faith efforts to replace an MBE/WBE sub-consultant that is unable to perform with another MBE/WBE to perform the same scope of work.
V. Penalties for Non-Compliance
Compliance with SUBP is a material condition of the contract. The City may take the following actions wholly, partly, or in any combination:
   a) Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency.
   b) Permanently withhold payment for all or part of the activity not in compliance with this chapter if the deficiency cannot be corrected, or the entity refuses to correct the deficiency.
   c) Suspend or debar the noncompliant consultant, sub-consultant, supplier or vendor as ineligible for all current or potential contracts with the City or supported by City funds.
   d) Designate the noncompliant consultant, sub-consultant, supplier or vendor as high-risk for future contracts and require of the consultant, sub-consultant, supplier or vendor increased reporting requirements, mandatory audits and similar measures.

The City will monitor compliance with the SUBP throughout the contract. Compliance with the MBE/WBE goal and other SUBP requirements will be a material condition of the contract and failure to comply may be deemed a breach of contract.

Please review Minneapolis Code of Ordinances Chapter 423 for more information or the contact the City of Minneapolis Civil Rights Department (612.673.2086) or contractcompliance@minneapolismn.gov.

MPRB RIGHTS
The MPRB may reject any or all Qualifications, parts of Qualifications, accept part or all of Qualifications and to create a project of lesser or greater scope than described in this Request for Qualifications, or the respondent's reply based on the financial components submitted. The MPRB also reserves the right to cancel the contract without penalty, if circumstances arise which prevent the Board from completing the project.

RESTRICTED DISCUSSIONS/SUBMISSIONS
From the date of issuance of the RFP until the Project Manager takes final action, the Proposer must not discuss the Qualifications or any part thereof with any employee, agent, or representative of the Board except as expressly requested by the Project Manager in writing and as stipulated in this RFP. Violation of this restriction will result in REJECTION of the Proposer’s Qualifications.

INDEPENDENT PARTIES
Except as expressly provided otherwise in the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, the Board and the Proposer shall remain independent parties and neither shall be an officer, employee, agent, representative or co-partner of, or a joint venture with, the other.

PERFORMANCE INVESTIGATIONS
As part of its evaluation process, the Board may make investigations to determine the ability of the Proposer to perform under this RFP. The Board reserves the right to REJECT any proposal if the Proposer fails to satisfy the Board that it is properly qualified to carry out the obligations under this RFP.
SEVERABILITY
If any provision of the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, is contrary to, prohibited by, or deemed invalid by applicable laws or regulations of any jurisdiction in which it is sought to be enforced, then said provision shall be deemed inapplicable and omitted and shall not invalidate the remaining provisions of such contract.

NOTICES
All notices and other matters pertaining to the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, to a party shall be in writing, shall be hand delivered, or sent by registered or certified U.S. Mail, return receipt requested, and shall be deemed to have been duly given when actually received by the addressee at the address set forth on this RFP.

INTEREST OF MEMBERS OF BOARD
The Proposer agrees that no member of the governing body, officer, employee or agent of the Board shall have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect, in the contract.

EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT/ COVENANT AGAINST CONTINGENT FEES
Employee Involvement: Proposer hereby certifies that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, no individual employed by the Proposer or subcontracted by the Proposer has an immediate relationship to any employee of the Board who was directly or indirectly involved in any way in the procurement of the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP or goods or services thereunder. For purposes of this provision, immediate relationship means: a current spouse, a person who currently has any interest including but limited to an equity interest in the Proposer’s business, and a person who is currently a party to a contract materially related to the work outlined in the RFP, or has any interest including but limited to an equity interest in an entity who is currently a party to a contract with the Proposer materially related to the work outlined in the RFP. Contractual party interest, as outlined above, does not include an agreement with a former owner and/or employee of the Proposer that is incident to the completed buyout of ownership interest and/or the final separation of employment with Proposer.

Covenant Against Contingency Fees: The Proposer also warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed, engaged or retained to solicit or secure any contract resulting from this RFP or any advantage hereunder upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, or in exchange for any substantial consideration bargained for, excepting that which is provided to the Proposer's bona fide employees or to bona fide professional commercial or selling agencies or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been known by the Board to be maintained by the Proposer for the purpose of securing business for Proposer. In the event of the Proposer's breach or violation of this warranty, the Board shall, subject to Proposer's rights, have the right, at its option, to annul any contract resulting from this RFP without liability, to deduct from the charges otherwise payable by the Board under such contract the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, and to pursue any other remedy available to the Board under such contract, at law or in equity.
Violation of either of the above sections by Proposer shall be grounds for cancellation of the contract. Such cancellation shall not limit other contractual remedies against the Proposer provided in the contract, or in law, or in equity.

**HOLD HARMLESS**

The Proposer agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Board, its officers and employees, from any liabilities, claims, damages, costs, judgments, and expenses, including attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from an act of omission of the Proposer, its employees, agents or employees of subcontractors, in the performance of this contract or by reason of the failure of the Proposer to fully perform, in any respect, all of its obligations under this contract.

The Board agrees to defend and hold harmless insofar as the law allows the Proposer, its officers and employees, from any liabilities, claims, damages, costs, judgments, and expenses, including attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from an act or omission of the Board or its employees in the performance under this contract or by reason of the failure of the Board to fully perform its obligations under this contract.

**DATA PRACTICES**

The Proposer agrees to comply with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and all other applicable state and federal laws relating to data privacy or confidentiality. The Proposer shall immediately report to the contract monitor any requests from third parties for information relating to this agreement. The Board agrees to promptly respond to inquiries from the Proposer concerning data requests. The Proposer agrees to hold the Board, its officers, department heads and employees harmless from any claims resulting from the Proposer's unlawful disclosure or use of data protected under state and federal laws.

**CHANGES**

The MPRB may, from time to time, request changes in the Scope of Services to be performed by the consultant. Such changes, including any increase or decrease in the amount of consultant’s compensation, which are mutually agreed upon shall be incorporated in written amendments to the Professional Services Agreement and may require Board approval, which takes several weeks. Consultants shall monitor their budgets and plan and budget time accordingly.

**QUALIFICATIONS CONTENTS**

The contents of the Qualifications and any clarifications to the contents submitted by the consultant shall become part of the contractual obligation and be incorporated by reference into the ensuing Professional Services Agreement.

**DRAWING AND SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

- Electronic drawing standard documents, front end specifications, AIA documents and templates shall be obtained from the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board FTP site. Contact Tom Johnson for password and login information: tjohnson@minneapolisparks.org.
- Compatibility with AutoCAD 2014.
- Half size drawing sets (pdf and printed copy) shall be provided for reviews.
• Use MPRB title block as provided.
• Pen Table line weights and fonts shall be included as e-transmittal package.
• AutoCAD site drawing files must be projected using the Hennepin County coordinate system.
• The Consultant will furnish the MPRB with as-built drawings for all issued sheets as follows: one half-sized paper set, electronic AutoCAD files, and a full-size PDF set. The Consultant will also supply to the MPRB one indexed electronic and one bound paper copy of the specifications.
• Effective April 28, 2017, All .pdf and word documents posted electronically for public review must comply with ADA digital standards, WCAG 2.0 requirements and Federal Guidelines. Any submitted .pdf that is not ADA compliant will be rejected and revised at the consultant’s expense.

ENTIRE AGREEMENT
The Proposer’s written submission in response to this RFP shall be considered the Proposer’s formal offer. The content of the RFP, the Proposer’s submission in response to the RFP and the resulting contract, if any, shall be the entire agreement between the successful Proposer and the Board. It is understood and agreed that nothing herein or in the resulting contract is intended or should be construed as in any way creating or establishing the relationship of co-partners between the parties hereto, or in any manner whatsoever. The Proposer, if any, is, and shall remain, an independent Proposer operating in accord with the terms and conditions of the rights granted as a result of this RFP.
Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild

September 17, 2020 from 9:00 – 10:00 am
Held Virtually through Zoom

Attendees: Approximately 50 individuals were present for the information session

Staff and speakers present: Daniel Elias, Emma Pachuta (MPRB); Aidan Dunn (Mpls – Civil Rights)

1. Welcome

Daniel Elias welcomed everyone to the Virtual RFQ Information Session and provided an agenda for the session.

[A copy of the Presentation follows this Q&A]

2. Questions/Comments and Answers from September 17th Information Session

Q: Will RFQ Addendum No. 2 include a list of attendees at this RFQ Information Session?

A: Addendum No. 2 to the RFQ will not include a list of attendees for the September 17th RFQ Information Session. Due to the virtual nature of the meeting, there was no meeting sign-in requested by MPRB.

Q: Please clarify the role of changes to the Northeast part of Bde Maka Ska identified in the Bde Maka Ska-Harriet Master Plan.

A: While the Bde Maka Ska-Harriet Master Plan includes significant changes to the northeast corner of Bde Maka Ska, this project is generally a Refectory Rebuild project. There are certain improvements included in the master plan that will naturally become a part of this project scope and those improvements have been identified in the RFQ under “Project Context & Opportunity”. For example, the master plan identifies a Visitor Center on the north side of Bde Maka Ska. For this project, we will consider the inclusion of an undefined auxiliary space that could meet some of the needs and provide program space like that of a traditional visitor center. The master plan also identifies the removal of the roundabout/boat launch and notes the need for drop-off, accessible parking and delivery access. For this project, we will not be removing the boat launch or roundabout but will be required to provide an accessible site arrival point. We will also consider drop-off and deliveries for the future condition of a relocated boat launch and removed roundabout.
Q: Food service consultant is not listed. Is this anticipated as a subconsultant?

A: Consultant Teams should include all expertise necessary to successfully complete the project.

Q: Has an environmental site assessment (Phase 1) been completed or is it anticipated?

A: A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment is in-process and will be provided to the selected Consultant Team once complete.

Q: When the Refectory reopens in 2023, will there be a new food vendor or will the lease for the current vendor be extended?

A: The current Lola’s on the Lake lease extends through the summer of 2022. Based on 18 years of precedent, existing tenants are provided the opportunity to renew their lease with MPRB. If the vendor elects to discontinue their services at this location, MPRB would engage in a public call for a new tenant. The selected Consultant Team will be tasked with engaging the current tenant; however, the space will be designed for any food and beverage vendor that will occupy the space in the future of the facility.

Q: This is a sensitive Native American site. Will MPRB provide this voice or will this be needed as part of the Consultant Team?

A: Consultant Teams are encouraged to include all expertise necessary to successfully complete the project. The MPRB Community Engagement Assessment and Plan have not yet been fully developed and it is unclear what engagement strategies will be employed for this project due to COVID-19. MPRB, through our work, continue to make efforts to elevate underserved community voices typically left out of these processes.

Q: Please elaborate on required information: “Statement of acceptance of standard contract form and insurance requirements”. What document should be reference and what is required in the statement?

A: MPRB uses the AIA B101 agreement in a modified form. A sample agreement is attached to the original release of the RFQ. Insurance requirement for the Architect are stipulated in Article 2. Submitter qualifications need to acknowledge the MPRB AIA B101 agreement and insurance requirements. Any requested modification to this agreement will require MPRB legal review and approval.

“(Submitter) understands and accepts the use of the MPRB AIA B101 agreement and the included insurance requirements,” is sufficient to meet this qualifications requirement.

Q: Has a project budget and building budget been established?

A: An overall project budget and building budget have not been established. Revenue from the fire loss insurance claim are sufficient to begin the design phase but insufficient to complete the project. MPRB will work to identify funding sources as the project progresses.
Q: Has the floor area for the new building been established?

A: The project is generally scoped to replace the old Refectory building (1,945 SF of interior space, 2,055 SF of covered exterior space) and include a new auxiliary space to be determined through the Concept Design Phase and Board of Commissioner review and approval processes. Due to site constraints, it is expected the new facility will not exceed 5,000 SF (combined interior and covered exterior space).

Q: Has the building program been developed?

A: The building program has not been further developed beyond what is available in the RFQ and Addendums.

Q: Will the Park Board own the kitchen equipment, or will it be provided by the tenant?

A: Kitchen equipment will be provided by the current lease holder/tenant at the time of building reopening. The Consultant Team will be responsible for designing all fixed mechanical, electrical, structural and fire suppression systems.

Q: In the RFQ, there are two questions to respond to, today’s presentation mentions three questions to respond to, please explain.

A: Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ added Question No. 3. There are now three questions to answer in the Qualifications submittal.

Q: After the Request for Qualifications process, with there be a Request for Proposals process?

A: At the conclusion of the RFQ process, MPRB will hold Consultant Team interviews (if necessary). After interviews, the MPRB selection committee will select a single Consultant Team to begin fee and scope of services negotiations. There will be no RFP process.

3. Questions/Comments and Answers from General Inquiries

Q: Does the lead firm need to be part of a “Certified Vendor” list to qualify for this project?

A: Consultants do not need to be pre-certified as vendors prior to Qualifications submittal. All firms will be considered if Qualifications are received. However the selected lead firm would need to become a vendor with the City of Minneapolis (if not already registered) which includes having an Affirmative Action Plan on file with the City’s Department of Civil Rights.

Q: Do you know if there will be Heritage Preservation Commission involvement for this project?

A: MPRB does not have a definitive answer to this question. Through Scope of Services negotiations with the selected Consultant Team, MPRB will be identifying tasks associated with the historic preservation implications of the project. As experts in your field, please provide team members you believe necessary for the successful completion of the project.
Q: At the Information Session, staff stated that no budget has been established for the project construction. Has this answer changed since the Information Session? Has MPRB defined a range or a maximum limit?

A: MPRB does not have new information regarding the construction budget. Through the Concept Design phase and associated cost estimating, a construction budget will be established. Through the Concept Design Board approval process, the Board of Commissioners will review and approve a construction budget.

Q: Has funding been established for the Consultant Team design fee?

A: A design fee has not been established for this project. Funds from the fire loss insurance claim are sufficient for the anticipated design fee.

Q: For the requested relevant project examples, do they all have to be completed by the individual at their current firm or can we also submit experience of the specific project manager from their previous employer?

A: Relevant project examples can be from a previous employer as long as the individual listed played a direct role in the delivery of the project in the same role they are currently identified in this qualifications submittal.

Q: How is traffic evaluation to be completed, by MPRB, City of Minneapolis, or consultant?

A: There is no planned traffic evaluation associated with this project. If the selected Consultant Team believes this is a critical evaluation, this service can be included in the qualifications or negotiated during Scope of Service negotiations.

Q: Do you have the requirements needed for the food vendor LOLA or others?

A: MPRB does not have the requirements needed for the current food vendor, Lola’s on the Lake. These will be established through the design process. The starting point for discussion with Lola’s will be their food service operation at the time of the fire.

Q: How is MPRB incorporating Dakota voices into informing the project?

A: The MPRB Community Engagement Assessment and Plan have not yet been fully developed and it is unclear what engagement strategies will be employed for this project due to COVID-19. MPRB, through our work, continue to make efforts to elevate underserved community voices typically left out of these processes.

Q: What is the MPRB community engagement approach going to be?

A: The MPRB Community Engagement Assessment and Plan have not yet been fully developed and it is unclear what engagement strategies will be employed for this project due to COVID-19. In all scenarios, MPRB will lead the community engagement approach to the project with the assistance of the selected Consultant Team.
Q: What is the public’s role, from inform to collaborate/empower, in the project process?

A: It is anticipated that MPRB will utilize a level of engagement aligned with “Consult” as defined by the IAP2 International Federation 2014 Public Participation Spectrum. MPRB anticipated engaging the public in a discourse around the design and programming of the new building. The means of engagement are not yet defined.

Q: Are there options for the functionality of interior space to be changed – particularly in relation to strong Dakota connections to this place?

A: As defined in the RFQ, there is a programmatic opportunity to include an auxiliary space to be defined through the Concept Design Board approval process. It is in this auxiliary space that an opportunity exists to incorporate historically and culturally relevant programming into the new building.

Q: If we utilize a general contractor as part of our cost estimating / logistics expertise, will they be prohibited from participating in future construction bidding?

A: A general contractor can bid on the construction project if their role on the design team is finished by the conclusion of the Construction Documentation phase/initiation of the bidding phase.

Q: Will interviews be virtual?

A: Yes, interviews will be virtual through zoom.

Q: Is it possible to deviate from the RFQ submittal requirements to show work that includes two projects for an architect lead and two projects for the LA lead? This relates to a leadership integration approach that we would typically put in a cover letter or approach section.

A: Through Addendum No. 2, we are allowing up to two project examples for project managers that are not serving in the lead project manager role. The total number of pages for project examples now totals nine. However, the scoring system remains the same and submitters need to identify the individual and project examples to be considered as the lead firm/project manager/area of expertise.

Q: Would the Park Board consider projects under or nearing completion to be “Built”? 

A: A project that is nearing completion (photo documentation of construction entering final stages) will be considered “built” for this qualification’s submittal.

Q: Can you confirm extents of site improvements for the project? Is there a map outlining the anticipated project area?

A: No map has been provided relating the extent of site improvements. It should be generally assumed that site improvements will be limited to an area bound by the roundabout/boat launch, Bde Maka Ska, the colored concrete central promenade, and East Bde Maka Ska Parkway.
Q: **Will the new building need to adhere to the current DNR required setbacks or has the DNR confirmed the existing foundation location would be grandfathered?**

A: MPRB has not engaged with MnDNR staff regarding this question. The foundation was left in place because of the setback requirements mentioned in this question. The Consultant Team will be tasked with answering this question during the Concept Design phase.

Q: **Is it anticipated the project would go under review per SHPO requirements?**

A: MPRB does not have a definitive answer to this question. Through Scope of Services negotiations with the selected Consultant Team, MPRB will be identifying tasks associated with the SHPO requirements for the project. As experts in your field, please provide team members you believe necessary for the successful completion of the project.

Q: **Has the Park Board developed a community engagement plan for the project?**

A: The MPRB Community Engagement Assessment and Plan have not yet been fully developed and it is unclear what engagement strategies will be employed for this project due to COVID-19. In all scenarios, MPRB will lead the community engagement approach to the project with the assistance of the selected Consultant Team.

Q: **In the RFQ’s Qualification Content, Submission and Evaluation section, Item #3: Build project examples, bullet a) – the requirement of the day-to-day project manager must have worked on the 3 identified project examples – if we have more than one discipline in house (ex: Architecture and Landscape) can the day-to-day contact vary based on the project type we’re submitting as long as they are the day-to-day contact for each of the disciplines?**

A: If a single firm is providing both lead and support project managers, each individual needs to be identified in the role they will serve. It is acceptable for a single firm to provide staff to serve on the team for multiple areas of expertise, keeping in mind the Mpls Civil Rights goals for SUBP sub-consultant participation in the contract.

Q: **Is the project anticipated to include site lighting infrastructure or any other specific site amenities, or will the scope of work be primarily limited to the building footprint and a handful of feet beyond that?**

A: It should be generally assumed that site improvements will be limited to an area bound by the roundabout/boat launch, Bde Maka Ska, the colored concrete central promenade, and East Bde Maka Ska Parkway. Work within this zone may include site lighting, seating, and other general site improvements as determined through the Concept Design phase. All necessary utility connections should be considered part of the scope of this project.
Q: Is there a “site perimeter” or will that be determined later in the initial design phases?

A: It should be generally assumed that site improvements will be limited to an area bound by the roundabout/boat launch, Bde Maka Ska, the colored concrete central promenade, and East Bde Maka Ska Parkway.

Q: Are there meeting minutes from the 9-17 Pre-RFQ call?

A: This document represents the meeting minutes from the September 17th pre-qualification information session. The presentation follows this document.

Q: The masterplan called for the Sailing Club building/program to be relocated to the NW side of the lake prior to any work at the Refectory and surround area. Will that work actually be implemented and completed by the time the Refectory project starts?

A: The Sailing Club will remain in its current location until a separate project and funding are identified. At this time, it is anticipated that the Sailing Club and boat launch will remain in place through the duration of this project.

Q: Will the bridge/WPA scope be entirely outside the refectory scope? If not, are their independent dollars that are being sought for this work?

A: The bridge/WPA scope is entirely outside of this project scope.

Q: Have there been discussions or plans to shift the bus stop location along West Lake further east from the NE corner of the congested intersection?

A: MPRB has not engaged in any formal discussion with Metro Transit around the relocation of the bus stop on West Lake Street.

Q: If our office has previously submitted our application to be certified SUBP and is awaiting acceptance, does the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board consider this a good faith effort? If so, how would the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board like this documented?

A: Applying to be SUBP certified does not constitute a Good Faith Effort. A firm would have to be successful in achieving SUBP certification in advance of contract award in order to meet the defined 8% SUBP goal. If the lead consultant is not SUBP certified and does not meet the 8% SUBP goal, a Good Faith Effort Evaluation would be initiated by the Mpls Civil Rights Department as defined in the Contract Obligations section of the RFQ.
Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild
Optional Pre-Qualifications Meeting

September 17, 2020 – held via Zoom
1. Small and Underutilized Business Program – City of Minneapolis Department of Civil Rights – 8% Combined Goal
2. RFQ Schedule
3. Recent Site Activities
4. RFQ Contents
5. Preliminary Project Schedule
This contract will include the following SUBP goal to facilitate participation of eligible MBEs and WBEs (MBEs/WBEs):

**The goal on this contract will be 8% MBE/WBE (combined).**

This project has a combined MBE/WBE goal. This SUBP goal may be met by utilizing either an MBE firm or a WBE firm, or by a combination of MBE and WBE firms.

In order for the participation of an MBE/WBE firm to be counted toward the SUBP goal, the MBE/WBE firm must be:

1. Certified as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE). This is the only MBE/WBE certification accepted by the SUBP.
2. DBE-certified within the scope of work that they will perform.
3. Performing a commercially useful function. An MBE/WBE performs a commercially useful function when it executes a distinct element of work and carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.
4. Located within the City’s marketplace, which includes the Minnesota Counties of Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Le Sueur, Mille Lacs, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Sibley, Washington, and Wright; and the Wisconsin Counties of Pierce and St. Croix.

Consultants should search for DBE-certified MBE and WBE firms using the Minnesota Unified Certification Program (MnUCP) directory, here: [http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us](http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFQ Release</td>
<td>September 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ Addendum No. 1 Release</td>
<td>September 14, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Qualifications Information Session</td>
<td>TODAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day for Questions</td>
<td>September 22, 2020 at 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications Due</td>
<td>September 29, 2020 at 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Team Interviews (if necessary)</td>
<td>October 13-16, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Services and Fee Negotiations</td>
<td>October 27-30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Contract Award</td>
<td>December 2, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 16, 2019 – Bde Maka Ska Refectory fire causes irreparable damage
May 28, 2019 – Bde Maka Ska Refectory demolished
September 11, 2019 – Bde Maka Ska Refectory foundation paved over
Recent Site Activities

**Summer 2020 – Bde Maka Ska Drinking Fountain and Utility Disconnection**

Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild – Request for Qualifications
Scope of Services:

- Concept Design Services (Board approval prior to commencing SD)
  - Existing Conditions Assessment
  - Permitting Coordination
  - Community Engagement Assistance
- Schematic Design Services
- Design Development Services
- Construction Document Services
- Bidding Services
- Construction Administration Services
Preliminary Program:

- General replacements of program spaces lost to fire
  - Food prep, service area, freezer/cold storage, keg storage, dishwashing area, mechanical space, employee restrooms and covered seating and queueing space
- ADA compliant public restrooms
- Auxiliary Space to be determined through the design process and approved by the Board of Commissioners through a Concept Design approval process
Qualification Submission:

1. Cover page (=1 page)
2. List/Org chart of all firms/areas of expertise involved identifying lead firm and lead project manager (≤8 pages)
   a) Identify the **day-to-day** project manager for the lead architecture firm.
   b) Identify the **day-to-day** project manager for each expertise identified.
   c) Resumes of each individual identified in 2a and 2b.
   d) Identify sub-consultants that are certified to meet the City of Minneapolis Small & Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) goals.
3. Built project examples similar in scope including references and year built (≤8 pages)
   a) Up to three (3) relevant project examples for the lead firm
      i. Day-to-day project manager must have worked on identified projects
      ii. Describe how each project will inform this work at Bde Maka Ska
   b) One (1) relevant project example for each sub-consultant
      i. Day-to-day project manager must have worked on identified projects
      ii. Describe how each project will inform this work at Bde Maka Ska
4. Responses to Questions (see below) (≤3 pages)
5. Statement of acceptance of standard contract form and insurance requirements (≤1 pages)
6. Hourly Billing Rates for each firm on project team (≤6 pages)
**Response to Questions:**

Question #1: With the extremely active northeast corner of Bde Maka Ska (Lake Street/parkway intersection, trail use, boat launch, boat rentals, etc), construction access and staging will prove difficult. Describe a project designed and constructed by key members of the Consultant Team in a busy, urban, and pedestrian/bicycle friendly environment and the strategies employed to manage the constructing phase.

Question #2: What do you anticipate will be the key challenges (other than as noted above) in the successful execution of this project? How does your Consultant Team propose to address these challenges?

Question #3: How will your Consultant Team approach communication and discourse with the general public around this project’s architectural aesthetic/design theory? What strategies have you used in the past and how will that be leveraged in this project?
Qualification Submission (DO NOT INCLUDE):
1. Cover letter
2. Statement of project understanding
3. Firm profile (other than as requested above)
4. Work plan and deliverables
5. Project Schedule
6. Resumes or project examples for individuals that will not be day-to-day project managers for their expertise
7. Project examples that were not built
8. SUBP Commitment Form (due with negotiated fee proposal prior to contract award)
Evaluators of Qualifications:
Daniel Elias, Project Manager, Planning Division, MPRB
Adam Arvidson, Director of Strategic Planning, Planning Division, MPRB
Shane Stenzel, Permits Manager, Asset Management Division, MPRB
Jeff Evenson, Director of Asset Management, Asset Management Division, MPRB
Matt Diaz, Park Operations Manager, Asset Management Division, MPRB
## Qualification Evaluation Criteria:

| Adherence to the required format of the response: | No consideration will be given to Qualifications failing to follow the format |
| Qualifications and experience of the day-to-day project manager of the lead firm: | 1/3 |
| Qualifications and experience of the day-to-day project manager of the supporting firms/areas of expertise: | 1/3 |
| Responses to Questions: | 1/3 |
Qualifications Submission:
Due Date: Tuesday, September 29th, 2020 – 3:00 PM CST
Submit to: Daniel Elias (delias@minneapolisparks.org)

The email submittal must clearly state in the subject line that the communication contains: “Statement of Qualifications for Bde Maka Ska Refectory Rebuild”

Submit one electronic copy in pdf format. The Qualifications should be no larger than 8 ½” x 11 with a maximum page count of 27 broken down as indicated below. Each page of content is considered 1 page.

Any communications and/or inquiries during this RFQ process must be submitted by 3pm on Tuesday, September 22nd.
## Preliminary Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept Design</td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Design Board Approval</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>April-May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td>June-Aug 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>Sept-Dec 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding</td>
<td>Jan-Feb 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Award</td>
<td>March 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>April 2022-March 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Out Vendor Space</td>
<td>April 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Full Vendor Operations</td>
<td>May 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

www.minneapolisparks.org