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PART 1  GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
This Request for Qualifications is intended to solicit responses from qualified consultants or consultant teams for:

- Design and engineering work and preparation of construction documents, including cost estimates, for park improvements at Bryn Mawr Meadows Park;
- Assisting Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board staff in reviews and submittals to permitting authorities and other agencies with jurisdiction; and
- Performing construction contract administration services oriented to compliance with documents and implementation schedules.

This Request for Qualifications is offered through the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), which will act as the contracting authority for work resulting from this request.

This Request for Qualifications is organized around the following core elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>General Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Project Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>Request for Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>Contract Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All information related to this Request for Qualifications shall be obtained as described in Section 1.2. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is the sole authority to speak to issues related to this Request for Qualifications.

This Request for Qualifications is open to any entities. Lead consultants shall choose subconsultants as prescribed in the City of Minneapolis Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) portion of the contract requirements. SUBP information and goals are stated in Attachment 1.

A Scope of Work and a fee for services will be negotiated with the successful responder.

1.2 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:

Tyler Pederson
TPederson@minneapolisparks.org
No other staff is 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 Section 1.3 Responses and will be provided to all known proposers via email by the date indicated in Section 1.3.

Responses to questions or requests for clarifications will be posted to the MPRB’s website under MPRB Business Opportunities

1.3 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS SCHEDULE
The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will pursue the following schedule related to this Request for Qualifications and the engagement of a consultant or consultant team:

- Release of Request for Qualifications 5 April 2021
- Questions or requests for clarifications due 15 April 2021
- Last addenda, including MPRB responses posted 19 April 2021
- Proposals due 3:00 pm, 28 April 2021
- Interview notifications, if required 3 May 2021
- Interviews, if required 5-day minimum notification

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

PART 2 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 BACKGROUND
The park sits within the Bryn Mawr Neighborhood in the North Service Area of the Minneapolis park system. Bryn Mawr means “Great Hill” in Welsh and refers to the western portion of the neighborhood. The park, commonly referred to as “The Meadows” by the neighborhood today, lies in the lowest area of the neighborhood. It is bounded by active rail lines on the north and southeast, TH394 to the south, and Morgan Avenue and residences to the west. It is one of the MPRB’s primary athletic complexes, along with Northeast Park, Bossen Field, Lake Nokomis, and Nieman Fields. As such, it is currently home to 13 ball diamonds of varying quality, lighting, and sizes. Most are arranged so their outfields overlap, so not all can be utilized at once. Several soccer fields can also be found here, and cricket is avidly played—though the pitches overlap ball diamonds, paths, and trees. Batting cages used by cricket players are in the northeastern portion of the park. In winter, the lighted ball diamonds near the warming room are flooded for broomball rinks. A large parking lot off the end of Laurel Avenue serves the entire site, but parking spills out onto surrounding neighborhood streets.

Near the center of the park is a grouping of more neighborhood-oriented facilities: a wading pool, playground, and basketball and tennis courts. A restroom and storage building in this area also serves as a warming house for the significant broomball program at this park.
Trails wind throughout the park, however many are in disrepair making interconnected walking loops inaccessible. The Luce Line Regional Trail passes through the northern portion of the park and connects to an overpass of the railroad, which then connects to the Cedar Lake Regional Trail. Another connection to the Cedar Lake Regional Trail (albeit rather convoluted) passes under I-394, up a helix ramp and along the freeway, then down to the trail.

A variety of trees are scattered throughout the park, some large, though overall the park is an open field. A more forested area is found in the eastern end of the park, where it comes to a point between railroads. This area of woods sits upon large quantities of random fill placed over the years.

In general, the park tends to be wet, and some fields are hard to keep from getting regularly soggy. For this reason and to improve Bassett’s Creek water quality, the Bassett’s Creek Watershed Management Commission is collaborating with MPRB and the City of Minneapolis to install water quality ponds within the park. Some portions of the park improvements work (work under this RFQ) will connect to these storm ponds, such as the parking lots and possibly field drain tile.

In the spring/summer of 2021, the three entities will enter into a cooperative agreement for the installation of water quality ponds and associated infrastructure within Bryn Mawr Meadows Park at the expense of the BCWMC. All design, engineering, construction administration, and construction expenses will be the responsibility of the BCWMC. Upon construction completion, the City will take ownership of water quality infrastructure improvements within the right of way and the MPRB will take ownership of the water quality improvements within the park. See Attachment 2.

The City of Minneapolis will also be working on a sanitary sewer replacement project that runs through the park’s northern end, and between the proposed water quality pond locations. All aspects of sanitary sewer work will be the responsibility of the City. Sewer construction will likely take place prior to park and stormwater improvement construction begins. Coordination with their engineers will be required to ensure park improvements that may be placed over the sewer pipe do not place additional stress on the new pipe. See Attachment 2.

Much of the area has changed dramatically over the last century. Prior to becoming a park, the area was farmland, homes, and open fields. Since the MPRB purchased the land, the homes east of Morgan Avenue were removed and park development began, first with a baseball field then with play areas.

The site is situated on varying soil types, and as noted earlier, can be a soggy place. An Environmental Investigation has been completed in 2020 and is detailed in Attachment 3.
The Bryn Mawr Meadows Park improvements have been conceptually approved in February 2019 as part of the North Service Area Master Plan. That master plan can be found on its project page under key documents, specifically under Chapter 4.

Park improvements for consideration are replacement of the play equipment and splash pad, athletic field reconstruction, parking lot reconstruction, open lawn areas, natural areas, bike park, and walking path replacements. This project will begin by prioritizing each park element with the help of the neighborhood and other stakeholders to meet the $3.75 million project budget.

2.2 GENERAL SCOPE OF WORK

The MPRB is soliciting qualifications with the intention of entering into a contract for the preparation of design and construction documents and the performance of construction contract administration services for the park improvements.

The budget for the constructed project (inclusive of design and engineering fees, administrative costs, municipal fees) has been established at $3.75 million.

The scope of work, at a minimum, is expected to:

- Coordinate with City of Minneapolis and Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission;
- Review of project needs related to the North Service Area Master Plan recommendations for the park;
- Support, but not necessarily facilitate, engagement of the public and project stakeholders in conformance with the MPRB’s Community Engagement Policy;
- Prepare design documents, in stages as described in Section 2.3, allowing for incremental reviews and alignment with the project budget;
- Identify and provide supporting materials for any permits and approvals, but not necessarily participating in meetings associated with those permits and approvals;
- Provide incremental estimates of construction costs and prepare recommendations for aligning estimated costs with project budget;
- Perform contract administration services; and
- Perform other services necessary or intended to deliver a superior design and compelling project.

The MPRB follows a policy that requires engagement of interested parties and the community for every project. MPRB staff will coordinate the engagement process and facilitate required community engagement meetings. The consultant team will support the engagement process by providing documents (drawings, illustrations, and other graphics) that are in-process. It is not anticipated that the consultant team will prepare documents beyond those necessary to directly prepare and advance the design.
2.3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STAGES
In order to guide the work, the MPRB anticipates deliverables according to logical stages of plan development. To align the work with expectations of staff review and any associated public engagement, the following general thresholds shall be considered by the consultant in defining a Scope of Work as part of a Professional Services Agreement:

At the completion of Preliminary Design/Schematic Design, the work shall be approximately 30 percent complete and:

- The project basis (need, scope, and intent) has been fully articulated;
- Investigations informing project directions and feasibility have been completed or scheduled in concert with other project activities and tasks;
- Key project criteria are defined and documented;
- Major project elements and systems have been defined according to criteria established by the MPRB and the consultant;
- Major project decisions have been made and are demonstrated in initial design drawings;
- Initial estimates of cost can be reasonably achieved;
- Regulatory compliance has been reviewed such that the project can be reasonably achieved;
- Engagement of the public has occurred such that knowledge of the project, its scope, and impacts on the park and neighborhood are understood by members of the public who have chosen to participate in meetings;
- The project has received “concept” approval from the Board of Commissioners, establishing the Preliminary Design as the proper path to implement; and
- A robust initial project development review has been completed with a log of issues and comments recorded.

At the completion of Design Development, the work shall be approximately 60 percent complete and:

- Design of major project elements and systems have been completed and the type, size and location of those elements and systems are fixed relative to the project site and building configuration;
- The relationship of elements and systems of the project can be fully assessed for agreement or conflict;
- The constructability of the project can be fully demonstrated;
- The project’s conformance with standards, regulations, and best practices can be determined;
- Updates to project costs can be reasonably determined;
- Methods of perpetuating the completed project can be reasonably assessed by the MPRB relative to cost, operational parameters, access, and other factors determined through the design process;
- Changes to the Preliminary Design in terms of scope, magnitude, cost, and program impacts have been communicated to MPRB staff and, if necessary,
from the perspective of MPRB staff, to the public and the Board of Commissioners;

• Issues and comments identified in the initial project development review are resolved; and

• A project development review commensurate with this stage of design has been completed with a log of issues and comments recorded.

At the completion of Final Design and Construction Documents, the work shall be approximately 95 percent complete and:

• Project deliverables necessary to construct the proposed improvements have been substantially demonstrated in a set of drawings and associated specifications;

• Details associated with the construction of elements and systems of the project have been considered for compliance with standards, regulations, and best practices;

• Permits have been obtained or all documentation necessary to obtain permits is in place;

• Issues and comments identified in the project development review are resolved;

• Reviews by functional units within the MPRB have been accomplished with written comments provided to the design and engineering consultant;

• A final estimate of project construction costs can be reasonably delivered; and

• The application of signatures or stamps of responsible professionals can be reasonably assumed to be occurring within two weeks of the review.

2.4 PROJECT OUTCOMES

The MPRB has defined the following as necessary outcomes of the design process:

Facility-related outcomes

• A set of athletic fields that are safe, multi-functional, and utilize best practices in field design;

• Sport courts that are safe and long lasting;

• A parking lot that is safe, appropriate in size, and utilizes sustainable stormwater best practices to remove pollutants and sediment;

• A natural area that is restored as quality habitat for animals as well as the enjoyment of park users;

• A playground space that is safe, fun, and engaging for children and their caretakers;

• Trails and sidewalks that allow for easy access throughout the park;

• A design and construction process that seamlessly integrates with other projects noted in this RFQ;
• A design aligning with the sources and magnitude of funding available for the work and that demonstrates a path to implementation aligned with available funding;
• A design that can be implemented incrementally, if necessary, with respect for future needs and opportunities;
• A design that can be perpetuated with the latest and evolving technologies;
• Reliable opinions of probable cost at various stages previously mentioned, established in year-of-implementation dollars, along with estimates of the costs of ongoing maintenance and operation;
• A design that is efficient and demonstrates ease of operations, even to such a degree that it sustains itself; and
• A design that is compelling for the setting but does not overwhelm the intrinsic character of the park.

Process-related outcomes
• A process that respects the MPRB’s Community Engagement Policy;
• A process that encourages innovation and invention, particularly relative to field design and layout, court design, parking lot efficiency and sustainability, natural area restoration, playground design, and trail and sidewalk design;
• Documents communicating a rich understanding of the design by staff and a community that may not be familiar with design processes;
• A vision for the project that can be realized in a relatively short timeframe, demonstrates consistency with input from the public and especially where that input can be elevated to new degrees of potential for the project;
• A design that can be approved by the MPRB and any jurisdictions with authority over the project; and
• A process that keeps MPRB staff assigned to this project at the forefront of interactions with the community.

Community-related outcomes
• A design capable of serving park visitor needs and safe access well into the future without unreasonable interruption for construction activities; and
• A design that is unique and wholly appropriate for Bryn Mawr Meadows Park and represents the recommendations of the North Service Area Master Plan.

2.5 CONTRACTED SERVICES
While the MPRB assumes the above listed tasks as core to the delivery of the project, it also believes that through this solicitation a fully qualified expert will be engaged. As a Scope of Work will be negotiated between the MPRB and the responder determined as most qualified through this solicitation process, it will rely significantly on the qualified expert to deliver the project. In that process, outcomes as indicated in Section 2.4 will need to be fully considered by the selected consultant.
2.6 PROJECT SCHEDULE
The MPRB anticipates a process related to the preparation of design and construction documents allowing for construction to begin in late 2021 or early 2022. Attachment 4 contains a generalized schedule that is provided as a guide for anticipated work and deliverables.

2.7 PROJECT BUDGET
The MPRB has established a budget for the improvements of $3.75 million, which shall include all project costs. On a preliminary basis, the budget might generally be directed to the park improvements project as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of Const.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction, including contingency</td>
<td>$3,103,000.00</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in RFQ scope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape architectural design and</td>
<td>$372,360.00</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering (this RFQ's consulting fees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey, geotechnical services</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in RFQ scope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Investigation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(completed, attached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management, community</td>
<td>$186,180.00</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement, and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in RFQ scope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>$12,651.00</td>
<td>.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not in RFQ scope)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,749,191.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contracting for services related to preparation of design and construction and the conduct of construction administration services, the MPRB must recognize the value paid for consulting services relative to the funds available to implement the project.

2.8 PROJECT GUIDANCE
In addition to coordination of project activities provided by a consultant through MPRB staff, the design process is anticipated to include engagement and review by staff groups and partnering agencies, and Bryn Mawr Neighborhood stakeholders as noted in the Community Engagement Plan, Attachment 5. Such engagement and review will be led by MPRB staff with support, as appropriate and necessary, by the consultant. The frequency and timing for engagement sessions and project reviews will be determined in concert with the selected consultant or consultant team, but MPRB staff will be primarily responsible for this work.

PART 3 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

3.1 RESPONSES, IN GENERAL
A response to this Request for Qualifications shall contain information in the order indicated in the chart in Section 3.2. Where responses to questions are required the responder shall prepare a narrative response that may include graphic information, diagrams, or other means of communicating key messages. The MPRB anticipates a creative, unique response specific to this request such that all aspects demonstrate a clear relationship to the effort of designing the improvements at Bryn Mawr Meadows Park. Standardized or “boilerplate” information, including firm descriptions, personnel resumes, and project narratives shall not be provided as a part of a response.

Failure to follow the requirements for content and format may result in disqualification of the response.

### 3.2 FORMAT AND CONTENT OF RESPONSES

A response to this request shall be provide in PDF format, delivered digitally as noted in Section 3.6. Responders shall direct particular attention to the order and requirements of information to be included in a response as indicated in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cover letter</td>
<td>• There is no limitation on the content presented as part of this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This section shall be limited to one page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team identification</td>
<td>• The respondent shall provide the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) <em>The name, address, and telephone number of the lead consultant, and/or the office location from which the work would be conducted for a lead consultant not located in the Twin Cities area;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) <em>The name, address, and telephone number of other members of the consultant team, and/or the office location from which the work would be conducted if the consultant team member is not located in the Twin Cities area; and</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) <em>The name, title, email address, and telephone number of the person who is primarily responsible for preparation of the response.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This section shall contain no descriptive information about the consultant or consultant team other than the information requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This section shall be limited to two pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project understanding</td>
<td>• The respondent shall respond to the following information:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beyond information contained in this Request for Qualifications, describe the consultant’s or consultant team’s understanding of the need and intent of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How will the lead consultant ensure the work of this request is fully responsive to the outcomes identified in this request?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No other information shall be included in this section.  
- This section shall be limited to two pages.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 | Skills and experience of the lead consultant  
   - The respondent shall respond to the following information: |
|   | 6) What single project performed by the lead consultant is most similar to the focus of this request and what role did the lead consultant play in the project? Provide narrative, graphic, and pictorial support for that project. |
|   | 7) What role did the Key Personnel play in the referenced project and how did their performance contribute to the project’s success? |
|   | 8) Who may be contacted as a reference for detailed questions about the project identified as relevant similar experience? |
|   | 9) What other projects demonstrate the lead consultant’s capacity to perform the work? Provide abbreviated narrative, graphic, and pictorial support for those projects. |

- No other information shall be included in this section.  
- This section shall be limited to three pages.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 | Skills and experience of other consultant team members  
   - The respondent shall respond to the following information: |
|   | 10) What single project performed by each member of the consultant team is most similar to the focus of this request and what role did the consultant member play in the project? Provide narrative, graphic, and pictorial support for that project. |
|   | 11) What role did the Key Personnel play in the referenced projects? |
|   | 12) Who may be contacted as a reference for detailed questions about each project identified as relevant similar experience in the response? |

- No other information shall be included in this section.  
- This section shall be limited to three pages.
6 Key Personnel

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

13) **What roles or areas of expertise are needed to fully satisfy the requirements of the requested work?**
14) **Which members of the consultant or consultant team will be assigned to those roles or areas of expertise? Why are those individuals best positioned to perform those roles or address the areas of expertise?**
15) **Provide a summary of projects or other experience demonstrating capacity for performing this work for each Key Personnel.**
16) **What roles necessary to perform this work has the consultant or consultant team not included as part of its team?**

- Key Personnel shall be those individuals responsible for assuming significant tasks and assuring the quality of key deliverables.
- In submitting a response and identifying Key Personnel, the MPRB assumes the individuals have sufficient time to fully serve in their respective roles. Substitutions after the project has commenced shall require review and confirmation by the MPRB. In the event of a departure of any Key Personnel, the consultant or consultant team assumes all responsibilities related to “onboarding,” gaps of information, delays of the project, or other similar issues resulting from a transition in high level project personnel.

7 Approach

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

17) **In general terms, describe the general approach that will be pursued in the consultant’s or consultant team’s design process. Describe approaches that encourage a high degree of interaction between the MPRB, the consultant or consultant team, and the public. Highlight**
milestones and primary checkpoints in the consultant’s or consultant team’s design process. Frame the description in ways that the outcomes shared in this Request for Qualifications might be realized. Outline the general deliverables that will be important in demonstrating directions of the design at various stages of this process.

18) What tasks will be directed to the MPRB as a part of anticipated deliverables?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
- This section shall be limited to three pages.

8 Schedule

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

19) What are the key points for the consultant’s or consultant team’s deliverable and any incremental reviews by the MPRB?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
- This section shall be limited to two pages.

9 Quality management

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

20) What methods will be used to ensure the quality, completeness, and timeliness of interim and final deliverables?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
- This section shall be limited to one page.

10 Review of standard agreement for professional services

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

21) What components of the MPRB’s standard agreement for professional services are not acceptable to the consultant or consultant team (AIA B101 Attached)?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
- This section shall be limited to one page.

13 Certification

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:
In additional to the requirements indicated in the chart above, responders shall note the following:

- In the requirements outlined above, the term “page” shall refer to the face of each page, such that one page is equal to one face (side) of a sheet of paper;
- No page shall be larger than 8-1/2 inches by 11 inches;
- No text shall be smaller than 11 point for any portion of the primary narrative or smaller than 9 point for any other text; and
- No other material or information shall be appended to a response.

3.3 EVALUATION OF RESPONSES

Responses to this Request for Qualifications will be reviewed by, at a minimum, the following representatives of the MPRB and any project partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Pederson</td>
<td>Design Project Manager, MPRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Duesman</td>
<td>Construction Project Manager, MPRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrystal Passi</td>
<td>Design Project Manager, MPRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Arvidson</td>
<td>Director, Strategic Planning, MPRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Swenson</td>
<td>Director, Design and Project Management, MPRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Starr</td>
<td>Park Operations Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Jester</td>
<td>Administrator, Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses shall be reviewed using the following criteria:
• Clarity and directness of the response: 10 percent
• Experience of the consultant or consultant team, particularly with regard to Key Personnel: 30 percent
• Demonstrated understanding of the project: 20 percent
• Coherency of approach to the work, especially directed to design process, interactions with project staff, and appropriateness of anticipated deliverables: 30 percent
• Acknowledgement and understanding of project risks, the need for managing quality of the work, and the timeliness of milestones leading to full delivery: 10 percent

No consideration will be given to proposals failing to follow the response format.

Any determination relative to the selection of a consultant or consultant team made by the MPRB shall be considered final.

3.4 SELECTION OF CONSULTANT OR CONSULTANT TEAM
Should it be determined after a detailed review of responses that interviews are necessary to determine the best qualified consultant or consultant team, the MPRB will organize interviews as follows:

• The consultant or consultant teams selected for an interview will be notified not less than five calendar days prior to the date scheduled for the interview;
• Participation in the interview will be limited to four members of the consultant or consultant team;
• The interview format will be provided to those selected for interviews at the time of notification. The MPRB requests that responders selected for an interview allow up to 45 minutes for an interview.
• The interview may require the consultant or consultant team to develop and present an initial scope of work and associated fees. Such presentation may be used in selecting a consultant or consultant team, but the scope and fee shall remain subject to negotiation.

The MPRB reserves the right to negotiate a scope and fee with more than one responder in order to determine the best value for the services requested.

The consultant or 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 consultant or consultant team at any time up to the start of the interview.

It is intended that the same individuals identified as reviewers in Section 3.3 will conduct the interviews. The interview panel may be expanded based on reviews of the responses received.
3.5 QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

Questions regarding this Request for Qualifications shall be directed VIA EMAIL ONLY to:

Tyler Pederson, Tpederson@minneapolisparks.org

Questions or requests for clarification must be received by the date indicated in Section 1.3. Responses will be provided to all known proposers via email by the date indicated in Section 1.3.

3.6 SUBMITTAL OF RESPONSES

Responses will be accepted only up to the time indicated in this Request for Qualifications. Responses shall be submitted in PDF format. Proposals shall be submitted VIA EMAIL ONLY to:

Tyler Pederson, Tpederson@minneapolisparks.org

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


PART 4 CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

A copy of the MPRB standard AIA B101 Professional Service Agreement is included as Attachment 6. The selected Design Team 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.

PART 5 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

5.1 LINKS

North Service Area Master Plan project page:
https://www.minneapolisparks.org/park_care__improvements/park_projects/current_projects/north_service_area_master_plan/

PDF of Chapter 4:

City of Minneapolis Public Works – Irving Ave N Sanitary Sewer Replacement Project Page:
http://www2.minneapolismn.gov/cip/currentprojects/irvingavesanitarysewer

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission – Bryn Mawr Meadows Water Quality Improvement Project Page:
5.2 ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – SUPB Language and Participation Form
Attachment 2 – Conceptual layout of stormwater ponds and sewer pipe alignment
Attachment 3 – Environmental Investigation
Attachment 4 – General Project Schedule
Attachment 5 – Community Engagement Plan
Attachment 6 – MPRB standard AIA B101 Professional Service Agreement

https://www.bassettcreekwmo.org/projects/all-projects/bryn-mawr-meadows-water-quality-improvement-project