October 20, 2023

Request for Qualifications
Trail Design, Construction Documentation, and Construction Administration Services Grand Rounds Missing Link, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Addendum #1

Updated Information

1. Grand Rounds Missing Link Regional Trail Plan – A high resolution plan is posted with the RFQ on the MPRB Business Opportunities site.
2. Consultants will be working with MPRB to determine priority segments based on cost estimating, timing with partner agency projects, trail design, and feasibility. There are unknowns around priorities that the selected consultant will need to help MPRB resolve.
3. The consultant may be asked to support the development of additional funding requests and administration of grant packages, such as regional solicitation applications. This has been added to the General Scope of Work in 2.2.

Questions and Answers

Below are the questions from interested firms. Answers by the MPRB are below each question.

1. Does the project budget of 6.5 million reflect the CIP and state bonding funding in the year 2024-2025 or the full funding for the three years of the contract period? Is it anticipated that more funding will come in the three-year contract period?

$6.5 million is the amount of funding that will be unlocked or allocated to the Grand Rounds Missing Link in 2024. MPRB has determined this will be the budget for the first phase of implementation for the regional trail that will take an estimated three years to complete.

2. Please confirm the initial segment focus correlates back to the 2019 master plan as Section J: Hennepin Avenue, Section K: Industrial Boulevard, and Section C and D: Towerside District. (page 289 of the 2019 master plan). Along with three trailside amenities by site: Broadway and Industrial, Hennepin and Industrial, and Towerside District. (page 287 and Page 311 of the 2019 master plan).

The initial segments are between Stinson Boulevard and Hennepin Avenue, the Towerside District, and 27th Avenue from University Avenue to River Rd. Segments of these areas will be the focus of implementation efforts over the next three years. The exact segments within those areas will be determined through interagency collaboration, design coordination, and additional funding opportunities as they arise. It is undetermined at this time if the trailside amenities at Hennepin Avenue and Industrial Boulevard will be included in the project scope. Additional minor trailside amenity opportunities may be identified over the course of the design process. The trailside amenities in the Towerside District will not be included in the project scope.
3. Please clarify if the new Towerside park, and two flexible green spaces as identified in the 2019 master plan are expected to be in the initial segment focus of Section C and D: Towerside District (page 293 of the 2019 master plan). This will help define the project approach and related key personal experiences.

   *No this will be a separate design process outside of this RFQ scope, with services to be solicited at a later date.*

4. Please clarify if an architectural component of a toilet and maintenance building in the Towerside district is expected to be in the contract scope. This will help to determine if architectural specialty will be included in the consultant team.

   *No this will be a separate design process outside of this RFQ scope, with services to be solicited at a later date.*

5. Because the project is taking an incremental approach with available funding, please clarify whether the contract scope and fulfillment will be defined by time (three years), by the negotiated scope of trial segments (initial segment focus), or by the total project budget (6.5 million), or whichever comes first. After the fulfillment of the contract scope, is it expected that MPRB will initiate a new RFP/RFQ for future work or amend the existing contract with consultants when additional funding becomes available?

   *The fulfillment of the project will be determined by the expenditure of the total project budget. The timing, amount of funding, and design approach for the next phase of implementation has not yet been determined.*

6. The RFQ identifies a parking lot as one of the project outcomes (page 9, section 2.4), please clarify if that indicates a parking lot reconfiguration and update near the Malcom yard area.

   *The list of Facility-related outcomes are generalized/standardized guidelines for all projects at MPRB and may include details that are not involved in the trail plan implementation work. There are no parking lots planned to be included at this time in the design services scope for this RFQ.*

7. Because of the project’s proximity to historical industrial areas and the known brownfields, has an environmental impact study and groundwater impact research been done for the GRML? Is it expected that the project needs to work closely with EPA for environmental permitting?
There is no known need for an EIS for the project at this time, and on a case by case basis, there may need to be an EIS and permitting work performed. If an EIS is required, MPRB may hire additional services, but permitting should be supported by the design team as part of the scope of services under this RFQ.

8. What is the expectation regarding consultant team expertise in terms of survey, geotechnical testing, and environmental assessment and remediation? Should that expertise be on the team, or is the expectation those services will be contracted separately?

On an as needed basis, geotechnical testing, survey, and environmental assessment and remediation may be included. If the consultant team chooses to subcontract with a geotechnical engineer, the design budget would need to meet the requirements listed in Section 2.7.

9. Does MPRB expect the contract will operate similarly to an ongoing service contract as there will be temporary on-hold periods between different segments of the trail?

There will likely be on-hold periods between the segments.

10. Does MPRB expect a landscape architecture firm or civil engineering firm as the project lead? Because it has a large amount of both trail design and site design.

MPRB is open to either a landscape architecture firm or civil engineering firm leading the work. The majority of the work will be focused on trail design services.

11. Since the trail will likely be placed within ROW controlled by other agencies, is there clarity regarding how much will be designed as “stand-alone” MPRB facilities, versus what may be an add-on to a County- or City- led roadway project?

There is not a clear ratio of what will be stand along vs a city or county-led project. MPRB estimates that the majority of the work will be led by MPRB on other agencies’ right of way.

12. Pages 9 and 10 of the RFQ reference the design of fields, a parking lot, and playground. Is it anticipated that this contract will include design and implementation of these features, or are they included as possible outcomes?
These are included as possible outcomes for all MPRB planning and design projects and are not currently in the scope of this project.

13. Can MPRB provide additional information about plans to bridge the large railyard and what assumptions and variables the consultant team should understand for this project? While the RFQ states this long bridge is not included in this project phase, can we assume a bridge will be required to cross the northwest/southeast BNSF railroad mainline and it will be included in this project?

The bridge crossing design and construction will not be included in this phase of implementation, but a bridge crossing will be required in the future. A partner agency is currently leading a feasibility study for the crossing of which MPRB is a participant. MPRB may request that the bridge landings are integrated into trail design efforts.

14. Should we assume that any necessary cultural resource reviews and clearances are part of this project, or will the MPRB engage cultural resource review services separately?

There are no cultural resource reviews identified at this time. If this service is required, MPRB may contract separately if needed.

15. With a potential impact to schedule, does MPRB anticipate all trail segments will be separately submitted for concept approval by the MPRB Board?

The final concept has been approved for the trail by the MPRB Board of Commissioners as part of the regional trail plan review and adoption in 2019. There may be the need for final concept approval if there is land acquisition and trail side amenity design at Hennepin and Industrial. There may need to be approvals for interagency agreements on a segment by segment basis or for permitting/entitlements with the MPRB Board. The design team may need to support the development of interagency agreements and exhibits.

16. Does MPRB anticipate that all trail segments identified as part of this first phase of construction will be bid in separate packages? The RFQ says “built incrementally” – can you provide clarification on what this means?

Each segment could be bid in different packages depending on timing and partner agency project coordination.
17. Is the Consultant responsible for coordination of separate submittals to each of the reviewing agencies?

*The consultant will coordinate, along with MPRB staff, separate submittals to each of the reviewing agencies with jurisdiction as needed.*

18. Since the MPRB has used professional estimation firms on previous large projects, is that a preference here for the Engineer’s Cost Estimate?

*The engineer should be providing the most accurate cost estimating services to the Park Board.*

19. Is it possible to get a link to a higher resolution file for the 2019 Regional Trail Plan for the GRML? (The images and tables are not legible in the link provided).

*A higher resolution plan is posted with the RFQ on the MPRB Business Opportunities site.*

20. How does MPRB envision the decision-making process to determine which segment or area will move forward through the phases of design and construction as part of the current $6.5M funding allocation?

*Segments will be prioritized through alignment with partner agency projects and additional funding opportunities. The consultant will be asked to provide MPRB with segment specific analyses, designs, and cost estimates to aid in partner agency coordination and funding requests to determine which segments are to be prioritized.*

21. Development of cost estimates and feasibility analysis is listed in 2.3 4) as part of the Project Scope. It also looks like this is listed in 2.7 Project Budget as completed. Can you confirm if this step has been completed, or if it will be revisited as part of the project scope?

*High level cost estimates were developed as part of the regional trail plan, but as the project progresses, MPRB will need updated cost estimates at each development stage aligned with the stated project construction budget, on a segment by segment basis.*