

October 2, 2018

ADDENDUM NUMBER #1:

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
for
OPEN SPACE PLAN
RFP #13-19

This Addendum forms part of the original document marked: “**RFP #13-19 Professional Services for Open Space Plan**”.

Answers to Questions submitted:

1) Is there any information regarding the budget for the open space plan?

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identified \$50,000 for the Open Space Plan.

2) Is there a page limit for the proposal?

No.

3) When will you anticipate signing the contract?

Within a month of final decision.

4) Has the Steering Committee been identified? If so, who will be represented?

The Steering Committee has not been identified yet. Planning Staff will determine who will be on this committee.

5) Do you have specific expectations that the ‘strategy for public involvement’ should meet, beyond the 2 public meetings and the summaries of public input?

We are looking for recommendations from the consultant to identify an appropriate process.

6) Could you clarify what you mean by ‘privately held open space’ for the purposes of updating the existing open space inventory?

Privately held open space are those lands not under ownership by a public entity.

7) When was the city’s open space inventory last updated? What format is it in?

A comprehensive inventory has never been conducted. The Public Undeveloped Land Assessment Report (PULA) conducted in 2010 is the closest and it is in GIS format.

8) This is part of the scope of the proposal in your opinion, is the use/overuse analysis of existing open space season-dependent? If yes, is the ideal season to conduct that analysis?

We are looking for a recommendation from the consultant.

9) Is there a not-to-exceed amount for the contract that the city has identified?

No.

10) Is there a fee set for the plan? The Capital Improvement Plan allocation of \$50,000 for the Open Space Plan, can you verify if the intended master plan is capped at this fee or if there are additional dollars available?

See answer to Question 1.

11) What are the major issues, as the City sees it, involved with increasing public access, upping the level of use, and enhancing stewardship in relationship to open space?

We are looking for recommendations from the consultant to identify any issues as part of this process.

12) Has an open space planning committee been set up for this, and if so, how often with the group expect to meet?

Planning staff will identify people to be on the committee. We are looking for a recommendation from the consultant on how often they expect to meet.

13) How up to-date is the recently developed inventory of existing open space and recreation resources and how much additional inventory work should we expect to have to conduct?

See above answer to Question 7. The Planning Department has existing GIS data and will provide support to the consultant. The existing PULA data should be a starting point and this process will add to and update that data.

14) What issues, if any, are expected with regards to community participation/public engagement in the planning process?

Developing an Open Space Plan was a recommendation of the Master Plan and this process is seen as a normal planning process. We are looking for the consultant to come up with innovative ways to engage the public.

15) Does the Open Space & Recreation Plan Steering Committee referenced in Task 1 currently exist, and if not, would the hired consultant be responsible for overseeing the formation of this committee?

Planning Staff will be responsible for forming the Steering Committee, not the consultant.

16) Could you provide more detail for the expectations for the sub-task “Evaluate the quality of existing open space & recreation parcels”. Is the consultant expected to provide a system for evaluating all existing open space & recreation? What role would the City and Committee play in carrying out this task?

We are looking for the consultant to recommend a process but staff will be available to advise the consultant.

17) What is the status of the existing GIS database of city-owned and private open space lands?

See answer to Question 7 above.

18) Is all existing data from the referenced previous reports available in a singular, succinct City database? Or are the supporting data stored across different programs and platforms?

All data is in ESRI format.

19) What is included in private open-spaced lands? Have these lands been identified or classified? Are they lands owned by the local land trust?

Private open space lands could be owned by local land trusts, but could also be private land owners with conservation easements. Some of these lands may be identified, but the consultant should be expected to identify additional private lands.

20) There are several tasks involving inventory, assessment, and recommendations for existing recreation facilities. What level of involvement will the Parks & Recreation Department have in the development of this plan?

The City does not have a Parks & Recreation Department. Appropriate staff will be included on the Steering Committee. See the Comprehensive Recreation Needs Study.

21) Task 3 suggest that the consultant will be part of planning and facilitating the public meetings in coordination with the Planning Staff. However, under “City Responsibilities”, planning and facilitation is listed as Portsmouth Planning Staff responsibilities. Could you please clarify your vision for this collaboration?

Planning & facilitation is primarily the consultant’s responsibility but City Staff will also play a role.

22) Do you have demographic information available to assist the consultant in identifying disadvantaged or underserved populations?

No, other than available Census data.

23) What is expected for the level of service analysis and level of use/overuse analysis of existing open space?

The consultant should recommend an approach.

24) What is the anticipated budget or budget range for this project?

See answer to Question 1.

25) Shall we assume Task 8 for this project will be a draft and final report?

Project timeline should include a draft and final report.

26) 1. For costing purposes, it would be helpful to understand the frequency of various City meetings:

a. How often does City staff contemplate meetings to update on the progress of work?

Consultant should provide a proposed number of meetings as they deem necessary.

b. Assuming attendance at each meeting is desired, how often does the Open Space and Recreation Plan Steering Committee meet, and is the work requested in the

RFP anticipated to be on the agenda at every meeting? *See above.*

c. How often does the Planning Board meet, and is the work requested in the RFP anticipated to be on the agenda at every meeting?

See meeting calendar for frequency of meetings. No, it will not be on every agenda at every meeting.

http://files.cityofportsmouth.com/files/planning/Meeting_Schedule_2018_Revised.pdf

d. How often does Conservation Commission meet, and is the work requested in the RFP anticipated to be on the agenda at every meeting? *See above.*

e. How often does Recreation Board meet, and is the work requested in the RFP anticipated to be on the agenda at every meeting? *See above.*

f. How often does City Council meet, and is the work requested in the RFP anticipated to be on the agenda at every meeting? *See above.*

27) The WEST Environmental Report dated November 2010 provides a baseline inventory of 91 undeveloped City-owned properties. The nearly 10-year old survey report describes the natural resources and human use attributes useful to spatial mapping and management planning associated with the different parcels. Because nearly 10-years have passed since this information was collected, does the City contemplate that “Task 2: Existing Conditions” should include, at least in part, a new baseline survey of the properties included in the 2010 report?

This should be used as a starting point and be updated as part of this planning process.

28) Typically, surveys of the existing conditions of urban open space includes an inventory of vegetation and wildlife conditions at different times of the year. This is advisable because natural conditions may vary depending on the season, which in turn can prompt restricted human uses at different times of year. Does the City contemplate that “Task 2: Existing Conditions” should include, at least in part, consideration of changed natural conditions at different times of year? If so, might the 9-month work schedule be extended to include observations and surveys conducted over a full 1-year time frame?

No, we do not expect this level of detail.

29) The Coastal Resilience Initiative Report dated April 2013 contains a wealth of information on current and anticipated future sea level and flooding conditions. This information is presented spatially in figures found in the report. The RFP indicates the City will provide to the successful bidder the spatial layers used to visualize this information. This and any other spatial information will be provided in ArcMap 10.0, correct?

Yes.

30) In the RFP, the City’s role is stated as including “planning and facilitating public meetings and other community outreach related to this planning process”. Task 3 indicates the bidder should plan and facilitate 2 public meetings. What planning and facilitating activities specifically does the City require the successful bidder to be responsible?

See answer to Question 21.

31) Has the City set aside funding for the work contemplated in the RFP? If so, can the amount of the funding – or the limit of available of finding – be disclosed to bidders?

See answer to Question 1.

32) What is the minimum “level” of a “service analysis” required by the City?

See answer to Question 21.

33) What is the minimum “level” of a “use/overuse analysis of existing open space” required by the City?

See answer to Question 21.

Proposers are to acknowledge Addendum#1 within their proposals. Failure to do so may subject a Proposer to disqualification.

End of Addendum #1