

The following questions were submitted in regards to the City of Lathrop CIP PK 19-13 Development of Inaugural Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Please see complete list of questions and answers below:

1. Would it be possible to get a plan holder list or a list of firms that submitted questions, along with contact information?

1	110 Percent	21	Matrix CG
2	Abey Arnold Associates	22	Melton Design Group
3	Architerra Design Group	23	MIG
4	BFS	24	O'DELL Engineering
5	Blair, Church, & Flynn Consulting	25	Pros Consulting llc
6	Richard Fisher Associates	26	RHA Landscape Architects Planners, INC.
7	Blue Point Planning	27	RHAA Royston, Hanamoto, Alley, & Abey
8	CALA	28	RJM Design Group
9	Community Design+Architecture	29	Shellito Consulting
10	Crane Architectural Group	30	SSA
11	Dahlin Group Architecture Planning	31	Studio-MLA
12	David Evans and Associates	32	The HLA Group
13	Gai Consultants	33	Verde Design
14	Gates Associates	34	Willdan Group
15	GreenPlay llc	35	Wood+Partners Inc.
16	Harris Design		
17	Heller and Heller Consulting, Inc.		
18	HRC		
19	KTU + A Planning & Landscape Architecture		
20	LPA		

2. The payment schedule in the proposal does not align well with the actual work schedule to prepare the master plan. Will the City consider an alternate payment schedule that better reflects the timing of the work performed?

While we do feel our payment schedule aligns well the work schedule the City would be open to discussing once a consultant is identified.

3. What is the City's anticipated budget for this project?

While the City has identified up to \$150,000 of project related expenses for CIP PK19-13, we would anticipate associated costs to be reflective of recent projects of cities with comparable acreage and population.

4. The City's proposed schedule is tight; what is driving the April 13, 2020 deadline?

The City of Lathrop currently works on a two-year budget cycle. This timeline would allow us to begin to implement aspects of this plan as within the following budget cycle.

5. Does the City anticipate needing public outreach services in languages other than English?

While we did not specifically request this within the scope of the RFP if this is something that is available through your firm please include that within your proposal.

6. The “Final Master Plan” description specifies drawings to be provided in AutoCAD format. Are there specific plans you expect in AutoCAD? Will GIS format be acceptable?

The City would accept drawings in either format.

7. Is the intention of Task 10 to complete technical-level studies or to provide a more general overview of resources?

The intention of Task 10 is to ensure the proposal considers the items identified within the bullets of this task as we look to develop a plan for our community moving forward.

8. Will the City be handling CEQA review of the Master Plan or would you like that included in this scope of work?

The City will be handling the CEQA review of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

9. The Proposal Evaluation Criteria identify cost as one of the criteria, but the Basis for Compensation says to submit the fee in a separate, sealed envelope. Should the Project Costs section in the proposal (6.7) include a total of costs, or just the breakdown of hours for each task.

Response to Section 6.7 should include the total number of hours and cost associated to each task within the scope of work.

10. The RFQ states that “proposals should not exceed 20 pages in length excluding a cover letter of no more than two pages, plus resumes and appendices”. Does 20 pages refer to 20 pages of paper single sided (20 sheets of information) or 20 pages double sided (40 sheets of information)?

20 sheets of paper double sided would be acceptable.

11. What type of information is acceptable to include in the appendices?

Appendices would include documents to support your firm’s experience or ability to complete the scope of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

12. Is the requested table of contents exempt from the page limit?

No the table of contents is not exempt.

13. Where would the City like resumes to be located? Should they be included in an appendix at the end of the proposal or somewhere else?

You may decide where you would like to locate resumes to support your proposal.

14. In Section 5, Basis for Compensation, a separate, sealed envelope for the fee proposal is requested. Section 6.6 Project Team states to “describe the consultant team...including hourly rates.” Should these hourly rates be included in the separate, sealed envelope?

No they should not be included in the separate sealed envelope.

15. Information in the proposal is requested to be submitted in the order shown in Section 6. As item 6.7 is Project Costs (fee proposal) is requested as a separate, sealed envelope, how should we address this section in the proposal?

Response to Section 6.7 should include the total number of hours and cost associated to each task within the scope of work.

16. Section 6.7 states to “identify the indirect component of each hourly rate...”. Please define the term “indirect component” as you intended its meaning to be.

Any variable cost which are not directly related to the hourly rate indicated within your proposal.

17. Section 6.11 references the City’s Professional Services Agreement and Page 9 references “Appendix A: Standard Professional Services Agreement & Terms.” Will the City please provide a copy of this Agreement?

Ask Sal can we post a blank copy of an agreement

18. Is one copy of the sealed fee proposal acceptable?

Yes, one copy of the sealed fee proposal is acceptable

19. Is there a specific R-Value and margin of error that the City would like to use/achieve for the statistically valid survey?

The City’s interest is in ensuring firms receive enough responses to surveys to make them statistically valid.

20. For the inventory scope item, does the City expect their GIS shapefiles to be updated by the Consultant?

No

21. How much outreach/involvement related to joint use programming/facilities would the City like from the two school districts (Manteca Unified and Tracy)?

This would be part of the City Engagement included within Task 3

22. Does the City wish to utilize this master plan effort as a community building mechanism and not just a planning document?

The City would anticipate the Parks and Recreation Master Plan do both provide a planning document while building community throughout the process.