

## **ADDENDUM NO. 1**

---

### **Project:**

Request for Qualifications – Multi-Use Parking Complex Architect (the “RFQ”)

### **For:**

Public Parking Authority of Pittsburgh  
232 Boulevard of the Allies  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1616

### **Date:**

July 27, 2012

**Item No. 1:** Copy of respondents’ questions and requests for clarification / interpretation / modification (the “Requests”) and the Authority's responses thereto.

Any Requests submitted beyond the applicable deadline set forth in the RFQ will not be addressed.

This Addendum No. 1 and Item No. 1 are hereby incorporated into the RFQ. The information contained in this Addendum No. 1 shall supersede any information provided to date by the Authority.

## **ITEM NO. 1**

---

1. We are a little confused by the inclusion of “request for proposal (RFP)” aspects within this RFQ. The RFQ seems to be primarily for the Due Diligence and Program Development services defined in section 1, with the future *possibility* of actual design and construction yet to be determined. There lacks enough detail to develop a scope and fee for the Due Diligence and Program Development services. Isn’t the point of an RFQ to review qualifications and leave fee determination and negotiation to a later stage?

*Authority Response: Each respondent is expected to provide pricing information responsive to Sections 7(c)(i) through 7(c)(iii) of the RFQ for each of its Team Members for each Phase of the Scope of the Work. At this time, respondents need not submit information responsive to the remainder of Section 7(c) of the RFQ; however, the Authority reserves the right to require that this information be provided in the future.*

2. Please provide recommendations on ways to demonstrate a firm “has the financial soundness and resources to complete a project of this type,” keeping in mind most respondents are privately held companies that are reluctant to release sensitive financial information?

*Authority Response: At this time, respondents need not submit information responsive to Section 7(b)(i)(6) of the RFQ; however, the Authority reserves the right to require that this information be provided in the future in a form that is acceptable to the Authority.*

3. Please confirm if the limited pricing information that is being requested is only for Phase 1 Services outlined within Exhibit B of the RFQ?

*Authority Response: See Authority’s Response to Question 1 herein.*

4. Please confirm if Respondent’s limited pricing should include fees in Phase 1 related to collaboration with others hired by the Authority who will perform survey and environmental engineering along with demolition consultation?

*Authority Response: See Authority’s Response to Question 1 herein. The successful respondent will be expected to collaborate with all other professionals retained in connection with this project.*

5. Please indicate whether or not Phase 2 and 3 services estimated pricing fees for all other Professional disciplines noted within Exhibit B is required to be submitted as part of this RFQ solicitation?

*Authority Response: See Authority’s Response to Question 1 herein.*

6. Is the intent of the RFQ that respondents identify all required professional team that would be engaged to provide Phase 2 and 3 comprehensive services?

*Authority Response: Yes, it is the Authority's intent that each respondent identify each firm that constitutes one of its Team Members for purposes of each Phase of the Scope of Work.*

**7.** Can a structural engineering/parking consultancy firm be the prime consultant leading the design team that may include an architect?

*Authority Response: Yes. In furtherance of the foregoing, see the last paragraph on page 2 of the RFQ.*

**8.** Can you clarify the relationship of the garage to the future air rights development? Will the garage be a separate free standing garage with retail space with the air rights transferred to an adjacent parcel to allow for a bigger building there? Or will the future development be on top of the garage with its structural support coming down through the garage?

*Authority Response: The Authority envisions that the air rights parcel will be above the parking garage; however, the Authority is open to suggestions for an alternative configuration.*

**9.** Do project teams need to include any history of lawsuits, arbitrations and professional liability loss claims? It is not uncommon requested information in government work.

*Authority Response: No.*

**10.** Should the Architect include Geotechnical testing and engineering services as part of the site Due Diligence?

*Authority Response: Yes. See the description of Phase 1 of the Scope of Work.*

**11.** Page 2, fourth paragraph, Is it your intent for the proposers to submit a fee for A and B only, and not X, Y or Z at this time?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 1 herein.*

**12.** If we are to submit a fee for X, Y or Z at this time, can you provide some quantification of the project size either SF, # of parking spaces, number of retail floors, project budget or other information so that we can determine the magnitude of the project and the services we will need to provide so we can provide a competitive fee?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 1 herein.*

**13.** Page 2, fifth paragraph, The RFQ indicates we are to provide "limited pricing information", what is meant by that statement and how does it affect the requested information for page 8, item c. Fee Proposal?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 1 herein.*

**14.** Page 8, c. Fee Proposal requests detailed fee and hourly projections for each "Team Member" but at item iv. it asks us to include sub-consultants under reimbursable expenses. Do we list each individual for each sub-consultant who may work on the project or only the architects staff members?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 1 herein.*

**15.** Page 4, #4.a – Re: the 5pm deadline for delivery of submissions, does that same 5pm deadline apply to both the delivery to Christopher Holt and to Martin Kaminski?

*Authority Response: Yes.*

**16.** Page 4, #4 – Re: material to submit, please confirm the following:

- 3 hard copies of the submission and 3 copies on CD are to be sent to Chris Holt
- 1 hard copy and 1 CD are to be sent to Martin Kaminski

*Authority Response: Confirmed*

**17.** Page 6, #6.b. – Re: "...levels and types of insurance that are acceptable to the Authority..."

*Authority Response: The Authority will provide the required levels of insurance in a separate addendum that will be issued prior to the Deadline for Submission of Statements.*

**18.** What are anticipated "acceptable" levels and types of insurance?

*Authority Response: See the Authority's Response to the foregoing question.*

**19.** Page 7, # 7.b.i.4 -- Does the Authority want references from each team member or just from the prime? Also, does this overlap w/ references for specific categories of work asked for on Page 7, #7.b.ii.1 and 2?

*Authority Response: The Authority desires references for each firm that constitutes a Team Member.*

**20.** Page 7, #7.b.i.6 -- What kinds of documents will the Authority accept to demonstrate our firm's financial soundness and adequate financial resources? e.g. bank statements, tax returns? How detailed must this be?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 2 herein.*

**21.** Page 7, #7.b.ii.1 -- Re: projects to include. Are a particular number of projects wanted for this section? Does the Authority want references, too, w/ names, phone numbers, e-mail, etc. to address this item?

*Authority Response: Each respondent should provide at least three (3) pertinent examples of high-visibility, public, or mixed use projects in a downtown or urban area, with references (including contact information) for each project. The Authority would prefer examples of projects that could be classified as urban redevelopment projects.*

**22.** Page 7, #7.b.ii.2 -- Re: "...3 pertinent examples...": Does the Authority want references, too, w/ names, phone numbers, e-mail, etc.?

*Authority Response: Yes.*

**23.** Since the final scope of work for phases beyond the due diligence study is not yet determined, is it acceptable to submit a fee only for the first phase of work as outlined in the RFP?

*Authority Response: See Authority's Response to Question 1 herein.*

**24.** I am looking through your RFQ for project and was curious if civil engineering (and surveying) are a part of another RFQ? Can you clarify?

*Authority Response: The surveyor is being retained by the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, which is the Authority's partner in this project. The Authority expects that a civil engineer or civil engineering firm will be included as a Team Member.*

**END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1**