

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP-26-03 DESIGN BUILD - INCLUSIVE & ACCESSIBLE PLAYGROUND

ADDENDUM #2



TOWN OF AMHERST



ADDENDUM #2

This Addendum forms part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Design Build – Inclusive & Accessible Playground project and shall be incorporated into and become part of the Contract Documents. Proponents must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their submission.

This Addendum is issued to provide responses to questions asked during the mandatory site visit.

Q1. Where does the Town want the power supply run from for the site?

A1. The existing site building is equipped with a 100-amp service entrance. Power for the proposed new lighting installation shall be supplied from this existing electrical service.
Electrical servicing for the proposed lighting installation shall be provided via underground power conduit. The installation shall be completed in accordance with all applicable electrical codes, standards, and regulations, and shall meet all requirements for depth, protection, and installation.

Q2. What is the expected lighting standard for the finished project?

A2. The lighting design for the Beacon Street accessible playground should provide safe, consistent illumination while minimizing impact on the surrounding neighborhood. General, the play areas should be lit to approximately 75–100 lux, with slightly higher levels (up to 150–200 lux) focused on key features, and 50–75 lux along pathways and accessible routes.
The lighting should be uniform, downward-directed, vandal-resistant LED fixtures (IP65+) to eliminate up light and reduce glare. A dusk-to-dawn photocell system is recommended as the base operation, with zoned controls to allow sections of the park to be turned off while maintaining minimal safety lighting where required. The overall approach should prioritize visibility and passive surveillance to help deter vandalism, while limiting light spill and preserve compatibility with the surrounding residential area.



Q3. Can the Town confirm that they want the play structure to be inclusive of all ages 0-12.

A3. Yes.

Q4. Will the Town provide a 2-week extension to the closing.

A4. Yes, the RFP closing will be extended to May 12, 2026 @2:00pm local time.

Q5. Can the Town confirm whether the landscape architect responsible for the concept design will have any involvement in the evaluation of submissions?

A5. The landscape architect responsible for the concept design will not be involved with the evaluation of submissions. The evaluation will be completed by an evaluation committee made up of Town staff.

Q6. Can the Town confirm whether the concept design consultant is permitted to participate as part of a design-build team for this project? If so, are there measures in place to ensure a fair and equitable process for all proponents?

A6. The Concept design consultant is permitted to participate as part of a design-build team for the project. All proposals will be evaluated consistently in accordance with the published evaluation criteria, and no proponent will receive preferential treatment during the procurement process.

Q7. If we are to adhere to a \$1M budget, is there an alternative to the embankment as this appears to be a costly element to provide within this budget.

A7. The conceptual design is intended to serve as a guiding framework rather than a prescriptive requirement. While the Town expects proponents to incorporate key elements and overall intent from the conceptual design into their submissions, proponents are encouraged to propose alternative designs and features that achieve similar functional and aesthetic outcomes within the \$1M budget. This includes the flexibility to replace or modify higher-cost elements, such as the embankment, where a more cost-effective solution can be demonstrated.



Q8. In the RFP document, the budget is indicated at \$1,000,000 while in the attachment that you provided, there is costing (page 19 and 20) for phase 1- \$679,258.69 and phase 2 - \$717,232.82 which totals \$1,396,490.5 which exceeds your RFP budget.

Can you please clarify the scope of work in phase 1 and 2 for the \$1M budget and what this is to include so we have a clear understanding of what's required and included in this budget?

A8. The cost estimates provided in the attached report are Class D estimates only, intended for high-level planning and conceptual purposes. As noted in the report, these figures include broad assumptions, contingencies, and allowances, and should not be interpreted as detailed or final construction costs.

The Town's expectation for this project is that the accessible playground be designed and delivered within the \$1,000,000 budget identified in the RFP. In this context:

Phase 1 generally reflects the core accessible playground elements, including site preparation, accessible surfacing, primary play equipment, pathways, lighting, and essential site features.

Phase 2 includes additional enhancements such as the embankment, expanded play features, and supplementary site elements, which are considered non-essential or "optional" components.

Proponents are expected to use the conceptual phasing and associated costing as a guide only and to prioritize the core accessible playground features within the available budget. Elements identified in Phase 2 may be included at the proponent's discretion, provided the overall submission remains within the \$1M budget.

The Town is open to alternative approaches that achieve the intended functionality and accessibility outcomes while aligning with the established budget.

Any recommended features or proposed playground elements beyond the core items that cannot be accommodated within the \$1,000,000 budget may be identified separately as optional items, to be considered at the sole discretion of the Town for inclusion based on available funding.