

**Addendum #2**  
**Issued April 21, 2017**  
**RFP #46-17**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, NH**  
**DESIGN ENGINEERING SERVICES**

This Addendum forms part of the original document marked “**RFP #46-17 Design Engineering Services for Maplewood Avenue Downtown Portion – Complete Street Project.**”

**1. Page 7, under Submittal Requirements, the first sentence should read as follows:**

Proposals shall include ~~the following and~~ shall be organized using each of the ~~above~~ *following* required elements as section headings:

**2. Page 7, under Submittal Requirements, item D should read as follows:**

Scope of Services- Describe in narrative form the consultant’s approach and technical plan for accomplishing the work listed herein. The Consultant is encouraged to elaborate and improve on the tasks listed in the RFP; however, the consultant shall not delete any requested scope tasks unless explicitly noted. The Consultant shall submit a schedule for completing the scope of work for the *Conceptual Design and Preliminary Design Phases only. Future amendments for Final Design Plans and Specifications Phase may be negotiated at a later date.*

**3. Page 7, under Submittal Requirements, item E should read follows:**

Cost Proposal -- In a separate envelop labeled “Price Proposal RFP #46-17” budget itemized by task and a total project cost stated as a firm fixed fee. Include assumed hours per task and hourly rates for project staff. *Firms are asked to only price the Conceptual Design and Preliminary Design portion of the work for this proposal. Future amendments for Final Design Plans and Specifications Phase may be negotiated at a later date.*

## **Answers to Bidders Questions**

**1) Did the Maplewood Ave feasibility study identify a preferred alternative?**

Alternatives 2 and 3 were called out as viable alternatives, but neither was identified as the preferred alternative. The Bike Ped Plan recommended Alternative 3 (bike lanes on both sides), as well as wider sidewalks, which is what the City has been leaning to in more recent discussions about the corridor.

**2) Are there any other City-led planning or visioning projects for the downtown that would inform or influence this project?**

The City Council recently formed a SubCommittee to lead a planning effort for the reuse or revitalization of the City's public spaces near Maplewood including Bridge St Lot, Worth Lot, and Vaughan Mall. While this process is just beginning and no formal scope or time frame has yet been identified, there will be opportunities for sharing ideas between the two planning efforts, which the City staff can help facilitate. A preliminary presentation on this effort is available here --

<http://www.cityofportsmouth.com/agendas/2017/citycouncil/cc032717ppt2.pdf>

The City is currently working on design and engineering to widen the sidewalk and add landscaping on the east side of Maplewood Ave between Hanover and Deer St. This project is expected to be constructed summer of 2017 in order to make use of available funding. This will also entail striping of bike lanes and elimination of a travel lane on one side of the street between Congress St and Deer St. A rough concept of the planned improvements is provided below. Detailed plans will be available in early May.



**4) Does the City have existing standards for sidewalks, street lighting, etc?**

We have general standards for sidewalk width (typically not less than 10' in the downtown), sidewalk materials (brick and concrete depending on context) and curbing (6" reveal, granite). We also have a pedestrian-style light that is our typical standard for the downtown. The City is currently working on creating street design guidelines for different street types, which should be available in final format prior to the start of this project. This will provide general guidance depending on context for street and travel lane widths, bike facilities, width of sidewalk and sidewalk materials, but will not specify standards.

**5) Do you need final design cost in the proposal or will just preliminary suffice?**

Please see Addendum #2.

**6) From an urban design perspective are you imagining the scope of work will extend beyond the back of sidewalk (since streetscape/ sidewalk generally about 8' wide) in select areas to improve or suggest**

**potential urban design improvements beyond sidewalk - in areas such as Worth/ Bridge lots, future development areas west of RR tracks and north of Maplewood?**

The scope of work should focus primarily on the City public right-of-way along Maplewood, Vaughan and Raynes, but should be done so in the context of the existing and future land use and design treatments of the private and public properties that align the corridor.

**7) Should we include within the scope involvement in the interface with the Worth and Bridge Street lots as potential for improved urban design at back of sidewalk and study of ped connections between new garage and Vaughn mall?**

The scope can acknowledge this as a potential opportunity, but this is a separate project. The City will coordinate on possible opportunities for coordination if the timelines for the two design initiatives are in sync.

**8) Does it make sense to include a lighting designer to assess lighting levels and to assess if both a ped lantern light and larger traffic light pole will be necessary?**

The City does not require that a lighting designer be a part of the team.

**9) Addendum # 1 notes that "Proposers should include additional scope and cost estimate for the inclusion of Vaughan Street and Raynes Avenue in the project area". Should additional costs be broken out separately, such that the individual costs associated with Maplewood Avenue, Vaughan Street and Raynes Avenue are provided and can be assessed independently?**

The additional scope for Raynes and Vaughan should be called out separately in the cost proposal.

**10) Does Portsmouth have complete streets guidelines?**

The City has a Complete Street Policy and is currently working on creating street design guidelines for different street types, which should be available in final format prior to the start of this project. This will provide general guidance depending on context for street and travel lane widths, bike facilities, width of sidewalk and sidewalk materials, but will not specify standards.

**11) On page 7, the RFP states that "proposals shall include the following and shall be organized using each of the above required elements as section headings". Please confirm whether the word "above" should have been "below".**

Correct, the proposals should be organized by the section headings listed below and the proposed scope should address the tasks identified above. See Addendum #2 for clarification.

**12) Did the 2014 Feasibility Study included any public or direct stakeholder input?**

No, but the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan did.

**13) Has the City undertaken any parking turnover counts or studies in the general project area to quantify parking demand?**

The City conducts turnover counts as well as parking occupancy counts each year in and around the downtown area. Last year, parking occupancy counts were done on all downtown streets for two days in June, August and October, but turnover counts were only done for one day in July in the Bridge Street lot, Worth Lot and Memorial Bridge lot. The summary reports are available for review. Contact Eric Eby [ebeby@cityofportsmouth.com](mailto:ebeby@cityofportsmouth.com) or 603-766-1415 for more information.

**14) Is bridge #231/103 over the North Mill Pond intended to be included in the study?**

No, the project study area ends on the downtown side of the bridge.

**15) As noted in the RFP under Phase 1, the traffic study should start with the recent studies prepared for proposed private development projects in the downtown. There has been a great amount of data collection that would seem to indicate that additional traffic counts will not be required. However, both pedestrian and bicycle counts do not appear to be available. Should a data collection effort be assumed as part of the scope/fee to ensure all modes will be captured?**

Some additional data collection may be appropriate to supplement the recent traffic counts, particularly for bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel.

**16) It is our understanding that the intersection of Middle Street at State Street is included in the closed loop system of Deer, Hanover and Islington/Congress. Is it safe to assume that only timing/phasing changes will be necessary at the State Street location?**

This should be confirmed as part of this project's scope of work.

**17) Is a project goal to provide on-street parking along Maplewood Avenue between its intersection with Congress/Islington and its intersection with Deer Street?**

This should be an option that's considered in the planning portion of this project to determine if it is feasible/desirable.

**18) Under Phase 1, Public Meeting, please confirm the number of meetings that are anticipated.**

One meeting under Phase 1.

**19) Will this project need to go before the Historic District Commission?**

No.

**20) Is a meeting with the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee needed during Phase 1 – Conceptual Design?**

No.

**21) What is your understanding of the sewer scope and the stormwater scope?**

This will be determined based on the Utility Study in Phase 2.

All else remains unchanged.

Please acknowledge this addendum within your proposal. Failure to do so may subject a proposer to disqualification.

End of Addendum #2