Boston Redevelopment Authority ("BRA") d/b/a Boston Planning & Development Agency ("BPDA")

"Flood Resilience Mitigation Planning, Feasibility & Design Study for Charlestown Navy Yard"
RFP

Boston Planning & Development Agency
One City Hall Square, Room 910
Boston, MA 02201-1007

ADDENDUM NO. 1 dated March 7, 2024

This addendum modifies, revises, amends, and supplements designated parts of the **"Flood Resilience Mitigation Planning, Feasibility & Design Study for Charlestown Navy Yard"** RFP issued on **February 19, 2024** and is hereby made a part thereof by reference and shall be as binding as though inserted in its entirety in the locations designated hereunder.

Wherever portions of any addendum are in conflict with a previous addendum, the addendum bearing the latest date shall govern. It shall be the responsibility of each consultant to notify all sub-consultants of any changes or modifications contained in this addendum. No claim for additional compensation due to the lack of knowledge of the contents of this addendum will be considered. Consultant(s) are hereby notified they must acknowledge this addendum as part of the IFB submission requirements.

General

Item 1: The **RFP deadline** has been extended to **Tuesday, April 2nd at 12:00pm**. A Virtual meeting for the RFP opening will be held on April 2nd, 2024 at 12:00 noon using the following link *(note this is the same link as written in the RFP on page 23, only the date has changed):*
https://www.zoomgov.com/meeting/register/vJltdumuqD0vG7TSyVqjdxcuTZ_Bfos_d Dc

Interviews will now occur the **week of April 8th - 12th, 2024.**

Item 2: Please also note, in addition to the noted Quality Requirements on page 27 and 28 of the RFP, respondents will also be required to have knowledge and experience in "building level adaptation."

Item 3: Plan Holders of Record please note the following Questions were received by the 5:00pm deadline on March 1, 2024 and the following Answers are provided:

Administrative Questions

Q1: During the pre-submission conference, the project was identified as "Flood Resilience Mitigation Planning, Feasibility & Design Study for Charlestown Navy Yard *& Little Mystic Channel* [emphasis added]" in the PowerPoint presentation. Is this the project name that should be used in proposals, or should the project name included on the RFP be used (which excludes reference to Little Mystic Channel)?

A1: *Resilience Mitigation Planning, Feasibility & Design Study for Charlestown Navy Yard & Little Mystic Channel* is the full project name that should be included in the proposals, though given the discrepancy between the RFP documents and the PowerPoint presentation we will not be faulting any respondents if they use the RFP language.

Q2: Under Supplemental Services, is the miscellaneous work allowance of $150,000 included in the $1,000,000 project budget or in addition?

A2: The $150,000 should be included within the $1,000,000 project budget.

Q3: Text appears to be missing in the first sentence on page 16 of the RFP. Please confirm/clarify.

A3: The following text referenced in Q3 above can be omitted from this section of Task 2, "Provide feasibility analysis of proposed; include cost effectiveness, site logistics, and time constraints."

Q4: Please confirm if the Fee Proposal should be submitted as a hard copy or electronic copy, or both.

A4: Hard copy in a separate sealed envelope.

Q5: Will BPDA consider modifying clause VIII.H of the Draft Contract to match the language used by BPDA's Draft Contract for the recent Long Wharf and Raymond L. Flynn Marine Park projects (copied below for reference)? *"Limited Liability. Except as provided in Section I.B of this Contract, in no event shall the total liability of the BPDA or the Consultant in connection with this Contract exceed the Maximum Amount provided for under Section II hereof. In no event shall the BPDA or the Consultant be liable under this Contract for damages for loss resulting from causes beyond the reasonable control of the Parties. In no event shall the Parties be liable for incidental, special or consequential damages, including loss of anticipated revenues or profits, whatever the cause."*

A5: If the selected vendor wishes to revisit this question upon award, we can bring this request to our attorneys for review when drafting the contract.

Q6: Do all forms that require signatures for the original technical proposal need to be signed with an ink signature?

A6: Yes, ink signatures or electronic would work as well.

Q7: Could we add an appendix to show additional project experience?

A7: Yes.

Q8: Are all subconsultants, including those who may not have major roles, required to be present for the interview?

A8: The review committee will be evaluating the full team that is applying for the project, therefore questions may be posed about all aspects of the project. It is up to the consultants to determine who is present for the interview, but it should be understood that all questions must be able to be answered during the interview.

Q9: Can we add sub-consultant projects to form A? Or do these need to be only Prime Consultant projects?

A9: Form A is intended for prime consultant projects. However, you choose to add supplemental information regarding sub consultant experience, that is acceptable.

Q10: Can we add more rows and show more than five projects for current active projects (page 38 of the RFP)?

A10: Yes.

Scope of Work Questions

Q1: Will project meetings with BPDA and other project partners be virtual or in person?

A1: Project meetings will be virtual for the majority of the project. However, some in-person meetings will occur throughout the process that will be determined as a team. For example, a kickoff meeting may be conducted in-person in order to facilitate relationship building amongst project team members early on. Additionally, stakeholder meetings with property owners could occur on-site.

Q2: Is the 3D Site Model intended to be dynamic or used for static visualizations?

A2: The 3D Site Model will be used for dynamic and static visualizations to be determined during the project.

Q3: Locations of Coastal Resilience Strategies indicated in CRS Report are located along the southern and western sides of the Little Mystic Channel only. Can BPDA elaborate on the location and extent of anticipated improvements on the north side of the Little Mystic Channel that are expected to be explored as part of this project?

A3: The BPDA owns the parking lot / boat ramp parcel on the north side of the channel where work is ongoing. This area has been included in the project site area in order to study any near term improvements that may be needed that will not preclude future resilience improvements.

Q4: Are any Massport properties on the north side of the Little Mystic Channel included in the study area?

A4: No, but they will be engaged as an abutter to the study.

Q5: Can BPDA elaborate on any anticipated modifications to the bridge from Chelsea St to Terminal Street that may be included as part of this project?

A5: Modifications to the bridge itself are not anticipated, but the area under the bridge on the south side will be studied as a part of this project.

Q6: The CRS report notes that the preferred coastal resilience strategy *"includes extending the southern and eastern edges of the Channel outward into the water as part of a new elevated park with integrated coastal flood protection"* which would *"provide opportunities to introduce ecological restoration projects, such as constructed wetlands"* but also noted this strategy *"is challenging to permit under today's regulations and could require updates to existing regulations."* Can BPDA elaborate on any anticipated extension of the edges of the Channel outward into the water as part of the current project?

A6: The project will deliver an implementation plan for the near and long term future of the Navy Yard and Little Mystic Channel. The alternatives analysis will include a variety of solutions for the various time horizons, but schematic design will only be advanced for currently permittable solutions in this phase of the project. The CRS report will be used as a basis for alternative solutions but it will not be the only set of solutions studied.

Q7: Does the inspection of the current waterfront structures fall within the scope? If it does, will BPDA provide the existing inspection reports before the proposals are due to be submitted so that we can assess the extent of the necessary inspections?

A7: We will not be including any existing conditions reports before proposals are due. Inspecting current waterfront structures does fall within the scope of the project. Any information we have on this throughout the study area will be shared with the winning bid.

Q8: Should the Boston Autoport/Wind Technology Testing Center be included in the Phase 2 study area or will this be part of a separate study? The flood pathways into these areas from the Little Mystic River to the south may also be impacted by flooding from the Mystic River on the north side.

A8: No, this is not being included within this study area.

Q9: Is it expected that the design team should be conducting topographic surveys and geotechnical/environmental studies of the entire study area? Given the study areas are quite large and extend along a large length of shoreline, we expect this could require a significant portion of the project budget. If required, can BPDA confirm that these services are a Supplemental requirement?

A9: Some level of topographic surveys and geotech/env studies of the area may be needed. Priority areas for this information within the project area will be on the near-term flood paths and areas where this data does not already exist.

Q10: Is there a minimum number of study alternatives that should be considered in Task 3 before identifying a district-wide strategy to proceed with schematic design?

A10: No minimum has been set.

Q11: For this large of a study area and the budget provided, it will likely be challenging to reach 30% design level and the design development products listed, particularly if Task 3 does not quickly come to consensus around a singular preferred schematic design (across all areas). If multiple iterations and alternatives need to be explored further in Task 3, would BPDA's preference be to forego Task 4 and expand the scope of Task 3, modify Task 4 (e.g., focus solely on BPDA-owned properties, achieve a lower target level of design detail (i.e. 10-15% design)), or other --- such as issue a continuation phase of the project?

A11: We will not be providing guidance on a change of scope at this point. The outlined tasks should be considered set and as the project progresses the project manager and project director will be able to field questions like this with the selected consultant.

Q12: Can BPDA estimate specific quantities with respect to: "Deliver schematic design drawings for all BPDA owned properties / public rights of way/ public access easements in the CNY and schematic drawings for tie ins to private property owner interventions as studied in this process" (pg. 19)?

A12: Specific quantities cannot be estimated at this time as it is an iterative process.

Q13: Given the references to the Massachusetts Coastal Flood Risk Model training, what is the extent of additional (new) flood modeling scope expected if any (per pg. 19)?

A13: The *Coastal Resilience Solutions for East Boston and Charlestown Phase II* report which includes this study area utilized BH-FRM data and MC-FRM data that was available. This study is looking to ensure we are using the most up to date information for the flood pathways in the area given that the report was published prior to MC-FRM being published by the State.

Engagement Questions

Q1: Will the public workshops identified in Task 5 be virtual or in person?

A1: This will be determined by the project team at a later point. We will be following the guidance of our Community Engagement team on best practices.

Q2: Are the community meetings referenced in the Task 5 Deliverables the same as the three community workshops identified in the Task 5 description, or in addition to the workshops?

A2: Yes, though as noted this is the additional community engagement (site walks and 3 public workshops). There will be engagement with individual groups and entities throughout the rest of the tasks.

Q3: Should the consultant's team include interpreters for engagement initiatives and/or translation services, or will these services be provided by BPDA if necessary in accordance with the City's Language Access and Communications Policy?

A3: Translation and interpretation services will be provided by the BPDA, noting that the consultant will likely have to input translated copy back into original presentations and other files.

Q4: Should the consultant include translation services to meet the requirements of the City's Language Access and Communications Policy or will this be conducted by the BPDA?

A4: As noted in question 3 above, the BPDA will be providing language services for the project.

Q5: As it spans across RFP Tasks 2.4, 4.1, and 5, will BPDA clarify expectations with respect to the level of desired stakeholder engagement? (I.e., anticipated number of stakeholder and/or workshops or focus group meetings, number of site walks)

A5: At this time we do not have an exact number of meetings that will be needed for the engagement beyond the site walk and 3 public workshops. Stakeholder engagement may be done during (or in place of) regularly scheduled biweekly check-ins as well in order to maximize efficiency.

Q6: Are there specific expectations for the workshops --- are these to be conducted in person, or virtually?

A6: As noted in question 1, the venue for the public workshops is yet to be determined.

Tim Mathis
Interim Director of Finance/Chief Procurement Officer
END OF ADDENDUM