

November 6, 2020

ADDENDUM NO. 1

TO: ALL PROPOSERS

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY LAKES PROJECT

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR MASTER DESIGN SERVICES by
UNIVERSITY LAKES LLC, a single-member entity created and controlled by
LSU Real Estate and Facilities Foundation (“REFF”)**

BID DATE: Friday, November 20, 2020 at 12:00 P.M. CT

This addendum shall be part of the Contract Documents in accordance with the Instructions to Bidders. The following revisions shall be incorporated and take precedence over any conflicting part of the original contract documents. These items are issued to add to, modify and clarify the Contract Documents.

ADDENDUM:

This Addendum No. 1 consists of 11 pages including all attachments. **PLEASE INCLUDE THE SIGNED ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THIS ADDENDUM WITHIN PROPOSER’S RESPONSE. ELECTRONIC OR SCANNED SIGNATURES ARE ACCEPTABLE.** The signed Acknowledgement of Receipt will not count towards the proposal page limit.

PART I: Pre-Proposal Conference Call Participants List:

List of participants from Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference Call on October 28, 2020.

PART II: Proposers Questions:

Proposers Questions and Owners Responses.

PART III: Acknowledgement of Receipt:

Acknowledgement of Receipt of this Addendum to be signed and submitted with Proposer’s response. Electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable.

PART I: Pre-Proposal Conference Call Participant List:

UNIVERSITY LAKES PROJECT

MASTER DESIGN SERVICES

Wednesday, October 28, 2020 at 3:00 P.M. CT

PARTICIPANT LIST

The list below includes information submitted by participants when registering for the Pre-Proposal Conference Call.

Name	Company	Email
Mark Goodson	B&D/CSRS	mark.goodson@csrsinc.com
Michael Petty	Quality Engineering & Survey (QES)	MPetty@quesla.com
Jeff Robinson	G.E.C., Inc.	jrobins@gecinc.com
Andre Rodrigue	Stantec	president@thebatonrougecotillion.org
Cade E. (Eddy) Carter	Gulf South Research	Eddy@gsrcorp.com
Darren Sharkey	SWA	DSharkey@SWAGroup.com
Ryan Roppolo	B&D/CSRS	ryan.roppolo@csrsinc.com
Jack Morgan	Evans-Graves Engineers, Inc.	jmorgan@evans-graves.com
Kerri Da Silva	SWA	KdaSilva@SWAGroup.com
Marcy Beasley	Volkert, Inc.	marcy.beasley@volkert.com
Shannon Blakeman	CARBO Landscape Architecture	sblakeman@carbo-la.com
Bryan Jones	HNTB	bryanjones@hntb.com
Samuel Best	Anchor QEA	sbest@anchorqea.com
Georgie Cantu	OJB LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE	gcantu@ojb.com
Joe Smith	Anchor QEA	jsmith@anchorqea.com
Leu Anne Greco	LSU Foundation	lgreco@lsufoundation.org
Josef Hoffmann	Anchor QEA	jhoffmann@anchorqea.com
James Andermann	B&D/CSRS	james.andermann@csrsinc.com
Jackson Rollings	SCAPE LANDSCAPE	jackson@scapestudio.com
Kinder Baumgardner	SWA	kbaumgardner@SWAGroup.com
Chris Barnes	SCAPE LANDSCAPE	chris@scapestudio.com
Joshua Brooks	Sasaki	jbrooks@sasaki.com
DJuana Beason	Terracon	DJuana.Beason@terracon.com
Lance LaPlace	Quality Engineering & Survey (QES)	llaplace@quesla.com
Jennifer Dowdell	Bio Habitats	jdowdell@biohabitats.com
iPhone		
Miles Garriott	Evans-Graves Engineers, Inc.	miles.garriott@gmail.com
Kenita Hood	Design Workshop	khood@designworkshop.com
Andrew Wright	Asakura Robinson	awrig55@lsu.edu
Michael Griffith		
Claire Hempel	Design Workshop	chempel@designworkshop.com
Zhen Liu	Thompson Engineering	zliu@thompsonengineering.com

Julian Sagastume	B&D/CSRS	
Kim Martin	B&D/CSRS	kmartin@bdconnect.com
Lynne Roussel	Terracon	Lynne.Roussel@terracon.com
Kevin Nunnery	Bio Habitats	knunnery@biohabitats.com
Jessica Darling		
Anastasia Lyons	Sasaki	alyons@sasaki.com
Patrick Martin	LSU	pmartin@lsu.edu
Matt Salmon	Volkert, inc.	matt.salmon@volkert.com

End of Section

PART II: Proposer Questions:

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS: As points of clarification

1. **QUESTION:** Is a separate public engagement consultant needed within our response?
RESPONSE: The existing Project Advisor team will provide lead public engagement tasks. The Master Designer is expected to participate and provide necessary support, as needed, for public engagement activities.
2. **QUESTION:** Can you clarify what lakes are being considered for improvements?
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.
3. **QUESTION:** The RFP states an eight-week design period is that accurate?
RESPONSE: This is not an accurate design period. The design period will be finalized during the contract stage based on the final Scope of Work.
4. **QUESTION:** Please explain the percentage complete within task 3 and task 4?
RESPONSE: The percentage complete is based on payment schedule milestones.
5. **QUESTION:** What is the total cost of construction?
RESPONSE: The construction cost based on the 2016 master plan totals an estimated \$100 million. The total budget for Phase I, including construction, is \$15 million.
6. **QUESTION:** Can you explain the cost component of the proposal?
RESPONSE: The RFP requires Proposers to provide one all-inclusive rate per position identified in the RFP. The RFP does not require a total fee for services and Proposers should not submit a total fee as part of their proposals.
7. **QUESTION:** Can you explain more details regarding the funding sources?
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.
8. **QUESTION:** Proposal scoring speaks to the total cost and hourly rates?
RESPONSE: The total cost referred to in the RFP is the “Total Weighted Hourly Rate” shown in Schedule B, which will be computed by UL.
9. **QUESTION:** Will the master design consulting team be responsible for permitting?
RESPONSE: The existing Project Advisor will be responsible for permitting. The Master Designer is expected to provide necessary support, as requested.
10. **QUESTION:** How does the funding source align with the master design scope?
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.
11. **QUESTION:** Has environmental work been conducted?
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Master Plan Info” link.
12. **QUESTION:** Are architectural structures to be included within the master designer scope?
RESPONSE: Phase I is not anticipated to include the construction of architectural structures. General spatial relationship recommendations may be required as part of schematic design. The Scope of Work will not include architectural construction documents.
13. **QUESTION:** Were permitting agencies involved during the 2016 the master plan process?
RESPONSE: Yes.
14. **QUESTION:** Has the placement of material been determined?

RESPONSE: The 2016 master plan provides recommendations on the placement of fill. The Flood Risk Reduction Designer (to be procured in the future) will make the final determination on the placement of fill, in coordination with the Master Designer.

15. QUESTION: Has the excavation method been determined?

RESPONSE: No

16. QUESTION: Is branding a priority?

RESPONSE: Yes.

17. QUESTION: What is the relationship between the University and master design team?

RESPONSE: The University (LSU) is providing funding for the project and has representation on the Project Management Committee. LSU is also a long-term landowner of four of the six lakes. It is anticipated that the Master Designer will work with LSU to engage faculty, staff and students in the design process. This engagement will be coordinated by the Project Advisor.

18. QUESTION: Tasks 2, 3 and 4 list percentages of completion for drawings and details. For example, Task 4: Design Development lists fifteen percent (15%) completion and Task 5: Construction Documentation lists thirty percent (30%). Please further define the percent completion requirement. Is this for the percent per project area?

RESPONSE: Please see question 4 of this addendum.

19. QUESTION: Which areas of the project outlined in “Exhibit 1 – University Lakes Project Map” will be brought to a Schematic Design level of completion?

RESPONSE: The entire project areas, including all six lakes, will be brought to schematic design level of completion.

20. QUESTION: Which areas of the project outlined in “Exhibit 1 – University Lakes Project Map” will be brought to a Design Development level of completion?

RESPONSE: During Phase I of the project, the areas including City Park, Erie, and Campus Lakes will be brought to a design development level of completion by the Master Designer. Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.

21. QUESTION: Which areas of the project outlined in “Exhibit 1 – University Lakes Project Map” will be brought to a Construction Document level of completion?

RESPONSE: During Phase I of the project, the areas including City Park, Erie, and Campus Lakes will be brought to a construction document level of completion by the Master Designer. Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.

22. QUESTION: What is the held Construction Budget, if defined, for implementation of the LSU Lakes Project outlined in “Exhibit 1 – University Lakes Project Map”?

RESPONSE: Please refer to the response to Question #5 above.

23. QUESTION: With regard to “Schedule A – 2. Proposal Content – 6. Project Understanding and Work Plan,” (p. 19) the requirement states: “the work plan shall include at a minimum the equipment to be used, methods to be employed to perform the work and schedule.” Does this primarily refer to the methods intended to execute Task 1: Pre-Design Habitat Inventory and Topographical Survey? Are these criteria (specifically, the “equipment to be used”) also expected to be listed out for other Tasks as part of the proposed Work Plan?

RESPONSE: That language refers to methods intended to execute all tasks. Relative to “equipment to be used”, Proposers are encouraged to use their best judgement, based on whether the equipment to be used will add value or benefit to the project (e.g. cost or time savings), versus what is commonly used in the industry.

-
24. **QUESTION:** Will the permitting applications be handled by the Owner, or are these part of the outlined services?
RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #9 above.
25. **QUESTION:** What is the intended timeline for the Project Advisor to develop and coordinate with the selected Consultant on an Outreach and Engagement Plan? The RFP states to “expect four activities per year” (p. 7). How should the Consultant account for the number of community and stakeholder meetings per Task?
RESPONSE: The total number meetings will be negotiated during the contracting phase. Proposers are invited to provide recommendations in their proposed work plans as to the number and type of meetings per Task.
26. **QUESTION:** The proposal states that the Consultant shall “solicit input from LSU Student, faculty and/or staff experts” (p. 7). Will the Consultant be directly involved in coordinating or facilitating engagement beyond providing comments to the Outreach and Engagement Plan and developing materials for engagement activities as requested – or will this be handled by the Project Advisor?
RESPONSE: This will be handled by the Project Advisor.
27. **QUESTION:** With regard to the proposal’s limit of 30 pages, “not including Proposed Fee and Other Required Documents” (p. 19):
- Is it intended that the 30 page limit allows for front and back content on each allowed page? (e.g. 60 pages of total content vs. 15-double-sided sheets)
 - Can the client clarify which specific proposal components count towards the 30 pages? At minimum, would exclusions to the 30 page limit include any of the following: Proposal Cover Sheet, Letter of Transmittal, Table of Contents, internal divider pages, or References?
 - May team member resumes (requested as part of the “Firm and Key Staff Experience” section) be included in an Appendix and not be counted towards the page limit?
- RESPONSE:** The 30-page limit does not include the Cost Proposal Form, the Certification Statement, or any Acknowledgements of Receipt of Addenda. All other content must be limited to 30 pages, front and back.
28. **QUESTION:** The proposal states in Section 2 - Project Scope, Task 2, Requirement 1 that the Master Designer “will provide input into FRR Designer selection process and, potentially, the selection of other consultants.” Will this preclude team members of the Master Designer from participating in the FRR Designer team?
RESPONSE: Yes
29. **QUESTION:** Please confirm what the estimated \$15 million budget for Phase 1 includes.
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.
30. **QUESTION:** Does the estimated \$15 Million budget for Phase 1 include the design fees for all (4) scopes – Bathymetric and Stump ID, Geotech Data Collection, Flood Risk Reduction Design, and Master Design Services?
RESPONSE: Yes
31. **QUESTION:** The proposal requests Hourly Rate Labor Costs (p. 23). Should respondents include Direct or Loaded Hourly Labor rates?
RESPONSE: Loaded Hourly Rates
32. **QUESTION:** If a firm is a sub on a team for the Master Designer contract, does that conflict that firm out from priming the Flood Risk Reduction Design (FRRD) solicitation??

RESPONSE: Yes

33. QUESTION: Can a firm that is the prime on one submittal be a sub on another submittal for the same contract??

RESPONSE: No

34. QUESTION: Will Proposer rates be confidential?

RESPONSE: No

35. QUESTION: Will characterization of sediment quality be limited to the sampling proposed in the Geotechnical and Sediment Sampling RFP or will there be the opportunity or necessity to further characterize sediment quality as part of the FRRD work?

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that the sampling proposed in the Geotechnical and Sediment Sampling RFP will be sufficient to characterize sediment quality. However, if it is determined that further sampling or characterization is needed, UL will consider contracting for that additional work based on allowable and available contracting vehicles at the time.

36. QUESTION: Has guidance criteria already been developed for placement of the dredged material or will development of such criteria be part of the scope of the FRRD contract??

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #14 above.

37. QUESTION: Is there a “Plan B” for using clean material to reconfigure the lake edges if the sediments do not meet the guidance criteria??

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #14 above.

38. QUESTION: What is the intent of the stumps? To be removed or left in-place for habitat, or will determination of their fate be part of the scope of the FRRD team?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #14 above.

39. QUESTION: What is the plan for the excavation? Mechanical? Hydraulic? Or dewatering of the lake?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #15 above.

40. QUESTION: Is there a specified schedule for the Master Designer Services through completion of Construction Documents? Is 8 weeks the expected schedule for pre-design through construction documentation?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #3 above.

41. QUESTION: Are we submitting a total fee for the project, or just hourly rates for key staff?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #6 above.

42. QUESTION: How will the hourly rates be used during the administration of the project?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #6 above.

43. QUESTION: If we are only submitting hourly rates, will the fee be a lump sum?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #6 above.

44. QUESTION: How do you anticipate public engagement to be performed for this project?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #25 above.

45. QUESTION: There are percentages noted for each design phase Z (e.g. Schematic Design 5%, Design Development 15%) what are these in reference to?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #4 above.

46. QUESTION: What is the tree inventory scope?

RESPONSE: The tree inventory scope includes capturing the GPS location of all trees over 6” DBH within the project areas, and noting any significant characteristics (e.g. “large live oak” or “appears unhealthy”).

47. **QUESTION:** The deliverables mention Permit Plans – who is leading and coordinating the permitting process?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #4 above.

48. **QUESTION:** Who will be responsible for any regulatory fees for permitting?

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #9 above.

49. **QUESTION:** Regarding Schedule B Cost Proposal Template: how should we handle differing rates for the same “title”. (For example, different principals charge different hourly rates)?

RESPONSE: Provide one rate per position.

50. **QUESTION:** Are there any allowances for travel reimbursables? If so are they to be included in the fee or as a separate cost?

RESPONSE: There are no allowances for travel reimbursables.

51. **QUESTION:** Please clarify and explain the following sentence found on page 15 of the RFQ under “6. Notice of Intent to Award”: UL reserves the right to make multiple awards and assign different portions of the scope of work to the Contractors through the terms of their contracts?

RESPONSE: UL reserves the right to award more than one contract as a result of this procurement, and any such contracts may contain any or all portions of the Scope of Work.

52. **QUESTION:** What does this mean?

“Present work to Project Advisor at 10% and 30% complete. UL reserves the right to employ various methods of project delivery, which may require production of up to 100% construction documents.”
(Task 5, p. 9?)

RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #4 above.

53. **QUESTION:** Per the RFP, proposed personnel must be licensed in the State of Louisiana. Is this the case for all proposed team members or would the lead designer suffice?

RESPONSE: Requirement applies to any designer who may be stamping construction documents.

54. **QUESTION:** The RFP describes a diverse scope of work. Is University Lakes searching for a Landscape Architect or an Engineer as the lead for this project?

RESPONSE: As stated on page 4 of the RFP, UL prefers that Proposers be led by designers who have substantial experience working on high-profile projects that include designing recreational facilities, habitats, and quality of life improvements.

55. **QUESTION:** Would you be able to provide a budget breakdown regarding the stated \$15 million for Phase 1?

RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrsinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link.

56. **QUESTION:** Under Task 1.a., Pre-design Services, Desktop Environmental Analysis, third bullet, “Submittal of environmental questionnaire to stakeholders and LSU, City-Parish of East Baton Rouge” – what is the intent of this questionnaire? To determine potential Phase I need? If not, then what information is sought and what is the expectation for collection, review and conclusions sought?

RESPONSE: The purpose of the environmental questionnaire is to determine potential Phase I needs and support the permitting process.

-
57. **QUESTION:** In regard to Task 1.b., third bullet, “Provide guidance to UL regarding potential permitting strategy for present potentially present species listed as Threatened or Endangered...” Have RTE species been documented on the site?
RESPONSE: No
58. **QUESTION:** In regard to the top of page 5, last bullet under 1.a.: This implies that the ESA isn’t included in this scope of work but could be determined to be an added service. Is this correct or should the team be prepared to provide the services associated with an ESA amongst our team members?
RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #4 above.
59. **QUESTION:** Can you please clarify the phasing and scope related to this particular RFP. In the master plan there are three phases system wide. There is currently \$15 million ear-marked for certain elements. Is the purpose of this RFP to develop conceptual design and schematic design for the full build out of the lakes system and then to do design development and construction documents for a portion of phase 1-2A focused on multi-modal improvements and a certain number of lakes water quality features. You mentioned a Slide Show that explained some of this, perhaps that will clarify. If not, could you please elaborate further the geographic scope of the project?
RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link. In addition, please see responses to Questions 19, 20 and 21 above.
60. **QUESTION:** For page restrictions outlined on page 19 of RFP, can you clarify if the following content counts towards the allotted pages: front and back cover, cover letter, divider pages, project cut sheets, and individual team resumes.
RESPONSE: Please see response to Question #27 above.
61. **QUESTION:** In regards to the use of Section 3 businesses outlined in proposal content items 9 and 10, is there a specific form to address this information, or should submitting firms provide their own affidavit? Additionally do you have a specific M/WBE requirement and/or goal in mind for this project?
RESPONSE: There is no specific M/W/DBE requirement or scoring element in the evaluation. Proposers are reminded that ULLLLC, the University, and other project stakeholders all have a goal of increasing M/W/DBE participation at all levels of all of the projects they undertake and fund.
62. **QUESTION:** Outlined in proposal content item 12, can you please clarify if references in this section can or should be those included earlier from project samples in item 3?
RESPONSE: The references can be those included from projects or may be additional references.
63. **QUESTION:** Where can submitting firms access the following required forms: Certification Statement (Schedule C), and Schedule B – Cost Proposal Form?
RESPONSE: Forms are not provided. Submitting firms are to include both Schedule B and Schedule C as reference in the RFP on firm branded layouts.
64. **QUESTION:** The Proposal Content guidelines as for references in item #2, and item # 12. Should these references be listed separately, and can there be some overlap?
RESPONSE: Separately.
65. **QUESTION:** Please clarify what is needed for the cost proposal section. Is a complete cost proposal required, or are you looking for Schedule B/hourly rates only?
RESPONSE: Hourly rates only.

66. QUESTION: Can we assume that Phase 1 in the Master Plan is the Phase 1 for this scope of work? If not, please clarify how it differs”

RESPONSE: Please refer to www.csrinc.com/lakes for the “Phase One Improvements” link. In addition, please see response to Questions 19, 20 and 21 above.

End of Section

PART III: Acknowledgement of Receipt

This Acknowledgement of Receipt must be signed by an Authorized Representative of the Proposer and included in Proposer’s response to this Request for Proposals.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM 1 TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR MASTER DESIGN SERVICES AND HAVE INCLUDED A COPY OF THIS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT WITH PROPOSAL AS EVIDENCE OF RECEIPT.

COMPANY NAME: _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: _____

PRINTED NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

DATE: _____

End of Addendum