ADDENDUM NO. 1 Log of Questions and Responses for Combined RFQ “Design and Construction Document Services for Painter Park Phase 1 Improvements AND Design and Construction Document Services for Keewaydin Park Phase 1 Improvements”

Date: 4/30/21

I. Questions and MPRB Responses Specific to Painter Park Phase 1 Improvements:

Q1: Can you clarify that the boulder climbing area would be similar to the GFRC boulder and net systems provided by many playground manufacturer’s and this does not consist of a larger bouldering structure or wall at this park site?
R1: I agree that the boulder climbing area discussed would be of an available manufacturer product with minimal customization potentially incorporating some nature/natural play elements.

Q2: With the additional draw of a splash pad, was the community still in approval of the removal of the parking lot?
R2: The master plan estimated budget for the splash pad exceeds the available budget for this phase of improvements. The focus of community engagement (1 neighborhood meeting thus far, introducing the project) has not been on that element of the master plan. The focus for available budget is more of the elements north of the rec building. Initial feedback from internal MPRB staff is they’re concerned about losing the parking lot and a minimum want dedicated spaces on the street if it were to be removed.

Q3: Are there any State or Federal dollars being used to fund this project?
R3: No.

Q4: Are there any DBE / MBE requirements by the MPRB for the consultant contract and, if so, what are those goals and requirements?
R4: The estimated total consulting fee for this project is less than $175k and therefore no DBE/MBE requirements apply.

II. Questions and MPRB Responses Specific to Keewaydin Park Phase 1 Improvements:

Q1: Do you anticipate the bouldering activities to exceed 13 feet in height?
R1: Unknown at this time. Discussions about community interest and liability are planned. This will be the first climbing wall/structure in the MPRB system.

Q2: Have any determinations been made for the nature play elements in terms of whether these would be manufactured elements with a natural theme and characteristic, fully custom designs utilizing all-natural materials, or the potential for a mixture of both?
R2: No determinations have been made to date, however a mixture of both is possible.

Q3: Do you anticipate the nature play area would include an interactive water feature?
R3: A water feature is unlikely because the play area is adjacent to a school.
Q4: Is the removal of the wading pool part of this contract or being done separately?
R4: Pool decommissioning is part of the design scope and overall construction budget.

Q5: Are there any State or Federal dollars being used to fund this project?
R5: No. Project is funded through MPRB’s NPP20 and Hennepin Youth Sports Grant.

Q6: Are there any DBE / MBE requirements by the MPRB for the consultant contract and, if so, what are those goals and requirements?
R6: The estimated total consulting fee for this project is less than $175k and therefore no DBE/MBE requirements apply.

Q7: Do you anticipate relocating or replacing the current field lighting?
R7: No.

Q8: Is there a desire to replace or add pedestrian lighting or power sources in the park?
R8: Not at this time, though there may be some community interest when engagement is conducted.

Q9: Does MPRB have desired play equipment manufacturer(s) selected for this project?
R9: No.

Q10: What level of community engagement will be completed by MPRB prior to award of a contract to a consultant?
R10: Staff will have already introduced the project idea and a rough timeline to school staff, school site council, PTA, and the neighborhood organization as well as internal MPRB staff.

End of Addendum No. 1