



---

July 8, 2024

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**  
**Request for Proposals**  
**Amendment of Glendale's General Plan -**  
**Open Space and Conservation Element**  
**and Recreation Element (GPA-OSCR Elements)**

**NOTICE TO ALL PROPOSERS**

Notice is hereby given to all potential Proposers that this is an addendum to the Request for Proposal for the Amendment of Glendale's General Plan- Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element (GPA-OSCR Elements), issued on May 13, 2024, and in response to the questions and requests for clarifications received by June 5, 2024, as identified in the RFP. This Addendum is attached to and made part of the above-entitled RFP from the City of Glendale.

**Instructions:**

- Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum on **Form J (Addenda Acknowledgement)** in their submitted Proposal.

**CHANGES TO RFP SPECIFICATIONS**

The RFP deadline is extended from July 12th to September 20th, by 5:30 PM (PCT).

No substantive changes to the RFP specifications.

**General clarifications, amplifications and corrections to the RFP include the following:**

Section VI has been updated to correctly reflect the form titles and sequencing.

**Specific clarifications and corrections include:**

1. **RFP Title Page and Overview**  
Update of the Questions Due to the City from June 5, 2024 to **July 31, 2024**.  
Update of the Submission Deadline from July 12, 2024 to **September 20, 2024**.
2. **RFP, Pages 14-15, Section V. Task 2: Community Outreach and Engagement**
  - i. Updates to Community Outreach Plan strategy components from "Formation of issue based

- working/focus groups” to “Engagement with local stakeholder groups”.
- ii. Updates the Community Assessment Process, clarifying that results can be either statistically validated or able to demonstrate that engagement to a diversity of communities has been achieved through surveys and public outreach that would be sufficient and representational of the City.
3. RFP, Pages 20, Section V. Task 3: Existing Conditions Analysis
    - iii. Park Needs Assessment, d. Updated accessibility inventory to clarify:  
“The scope includes completion of ADA survey and compliance recommendations for all 48 park facilities, including 37 parks, the Civic Auditorium, 4 community centers, and 6 sports facilities; plus 4 historic buildings which CSP manages. That’s revisiting/updating the previous 30 surveys plus 22 new site surveys for all CSP facilities.”
  4. RFP, Page 33, Section IX Time Schedule  
Update of the dates:

| EVENT   | RESPONSIBILITY | DATE                                      |
|---|----------------|---|
| <b>RFP Distribution</b>   | City           | May 13, 2024                              |
| <b>Last Day to Submit Interim Questions (response within 4 weeks)</b> | Proposer       | June 5, 2024<br>July 31, 2024             |
| <b>Addendum 1 issued</b>  | City           | July 8, 2024                              |
| <b>RFP Proposals Due</b>  | Proposer       | July 12, 2024<br>September 20, 2024       |
| <b>Panel Reviews Proposals</b>  | City           | August 12, 2024<br>October 2024           |
| <b>Candidate Interviews</b>   | City           | September 6, 2024<br>Mid-November 2024    |
| <b>Final Candidate Announced</b>                                      | City           | September 16, 2024<br>Early December 2024 |
| <b>Last Day to Object to RFP or Evaluation Process</b>                | Proposer       | September 30, 2024<br>December 31, 2024   |
| <b>Contract Award (City Council approval)</b>                         | City           | January 2025                              |

5. RFP, Page 33-34, Section X. Submittal  
Update of the Submittal Deadline from July 12, 2024 to **September 20, 2024.**
6. RFP, Page 34, Section XI. Interim Inquiries and Responses; Interpretation or Correction of RFP  
Update of the Questions Due to the City from June 5, 2024 to **July 31, 2024.**
7. RFP, Page 35, Section XIII. Letters of Objection; Procedures  
Update of the Questions Due to the City from September 30, 2024 to **December 31, 2024.**

For Attachments, additional changes include:

- Update of document footer to “RFP for Amendment of Glendale’s Open Space and Conservation Element and the Recreation Element.”
- Update of titles/footers to Attachment/Form G – Proposer’s Noncollusion Declaration
- Update of titles on Attachment/Form B – Insurance Requirements Affidavit

## **EXCEPTIONS TO RFP**

Please note any exceptions you have to the RFP in **Form K**, Table of Exceptions. If any RFP changes are made as a result of additional review prior to the submission deadline, the City will issue additional Addenda. Noted exception(s) on Form K may be considered and negotiated prior to contract award.

## **RESPONSES TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION**

- Q1. The Attachments do not follow the order indicated in the Proposal Requirements instructions. Would you like us to keep the order of the instructions, or follow the order of the Attachments?
- A1. Section VI has been updated to correctly reflect the form titles and sequencing, as shown in Addendum 1 and Attachments and highlighted below:
1. Insurance Requirements – Attachment A
  2. Insurance Requirements Affidavit – Attachment B
  3. Sample Professional Service Agreement/Contract – Attachment C
  4. Proposal Evaluation Criteria – Attachment D
  5. Proposer Experience Form – Attachment E
  6. Proposer’s Noncollusion Declaration – Attachment F
  7. Campaign Finance Disclosure Form – Attachment G
  8. Clarification Letter Form Template – Attachment H
  9. Table of Exceptions – Attachment I
  10. Addenda Acknowledgement – Attachment J
- Q2. We note that Attachment G is titled both “Proposer’s Noncollusion Declaration” and “Disclosure - Campaign Finance Ordinance”; we understand it to be the latter. Please confirm.
- A2. Attachment G has been updated to correctly reflect the Campaign Finance Disclosure Form.
- Q3. There are no instructions regarding the location of Attachment J – Addenda Acknowledgement. Would you like this to follow the rest of the specified contents?
- A3. Attachment J - Addenda Acknowledgement is included as the last page in Attachments. Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum on Attachment or Form J – Addenda Acknowledgement in their submitted Proposal.

- Q4. May we include a cover letter, preceding the specified contents?
- A4. An optional cover letter can be included but should be limited to 1-2 pages to keep proposal direct and concise.
- Q5. May we attach any S/M/WBE (etc) certifications, following all specified contents and inside the back cover?
- A5. Yes. This information is encouraged.
- Q6. Regarding part iii. Personnel, may we include an organizational chart to also describe our team structure (in addition to the specified organizational chart of our firm)?
- A6. Yes, organizational charts are helpful for explaining organizational structure and potentially for explaining proposed workflow.
- Q7. Is there a project fee budget for the work of the Consultant Team?
- A7. City Council has approved funding in the amount of \$500,000 for the GPA-OSCR Elements, under Quality of Life under Measure S. Note that approximately 10% of this funding may be allocated for contract contingency, administration, and support services outside the RFP-scoped consultant services.
- Additionally, city staff is seeking additional funding through Measure A and other competitive grant programs for supplemental funding. Certain tasks could be phased to accommodate budget and completion of primary tasks for the General Plan amendments.
- Q8. Is it necessary to use this Request for Clarification Form, or may we send the questions in the body of an email. If you require this format, will you provide a Word file? The PDF format is cumbersome. We appreciate your consideration.
- A8. Utilizing the Request for Clarifications Form ensures that clarification requests are clearly communicated to the city since details sent only in email can be lost or missed. Attachments/Forms can be exported from PDF to useable formats, such as a Word doc.
- Q9. Attachments A-E are not noted in the required submission outline; please confirm which, if any, are to be completed for inclusion in the submission, and if so, where? Are we to use Attachment E: Proposer Experience Form? If so, where should it be included in the proposal, in section iv. Experience, or section vii. References?
- A9. The Attachment submittal forms required with proposal submittals include:
- Attachment B: Insurance Requirements Affidavit
  - Attachment E: Proposer's Experience Form (or similarly formatted page)
  - Attachment F: Proposer's Declaration of Noncollusion
  - Attachment I: Table of Exceptions (if needed)
  - Attachment J: Addenda Acknowledgement
- \*Note, that Attachment G: Finance Disclosure Form, is only required by the Selected Proposer once a Notice of Intent to Award is issued.

Forms can be inserted into the proposal wherever they best fit.

Q10. Which forms A-I (if any) are required to be completed by the subconsultants and included in the submission? We understand that Attachment G – Proposers Noncollusion Declaration / Disclosure – Campaign Finance Ordinance includes a section with information we will collect from our subcontractors (subconsultants). Please further clarify/identify what information we must gather from subcontractors (subconsultants) to complete any other forms.?

A10. Subconsultants should also fill out Attachment E: Proposer's Experience Form. Attachment G, which subconsultants also fill out, is only required from the selected proposer.

Q11. We understand the title of the RFP to be, "Amendment of Glendale's Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element." Please confirm?

A11. RFP Title is: Amendment of Glendale's General Plan - Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element, which can abbreviated as GPA-OSCR Elements.

Q12. Since Attachment B – Insurance Requirements Affidavit requires our Insurance Company's Signature, will you please:  
a. correct the instructions to reflect this project by its accurate name (it currently references "the Verdugo Park North Renovation Project"); and  
b. include the full RFP title name on the line that currently reads, "Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Master Plan"?

A12. Attachment B has been updated with corrected titles.

Q13. Regarding Attachment A – Insurance Requirements, please define or clarify what is meant by "advertising injury" and "Personal and Advertising Injury (with Employer's Liability Exclusion deleted)". Our insurance brokers are not familiar with the phrase "Employer's Liability Exclusion Deleted", nor are the underwriters at our carrier. Our insurers hesitate executing the Insurance Affidavit without understanding what they are affirming.?

A13. Personal and advertising injuries are typically infringements on a person or business's personal or intellectual rights such as defamation and copyright infringement.

The employers' liability exclusions of the GL policy are intended to remove coverage in the GL policy for claims made against the named insured by the named insured's own employees.

Q14. Is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or other CEQA document(s) being prepared for the Land Use, Mobility, Safety, and Environmental Justice Elements that are currently underway?

A14. Yes, an EIR will be prepared for the Land Use, Mobility, and Environmental Justice Elements by De Novo Planning Group. The level of environmental review for the Safety Element Update has not yet been established.

Q15. Is the City expecting a standalone CEQA document for the Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element, or will one Environmental Impact Report (EIR) be prepared to cover all the updated elements (Land Use, Mobility, Safety, and Environmental Justice, Open Space and Conservation, and Recreation Elements)?

A15. The GPA - OSCR Elements will have their own environmental review. An EIR is anticipated.

Q16. Is the City looking to combine the Open Space & Conservation Element with the Recreation Element?

A16. No. City intends to adopt an Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element separately.

Q17. On page 5, they state “The City is soliciting Proposals...to update the City’s Open Space and Conservation Element, and the City’s Recreation Element to make these Elements consistent with the updated General Plan Guidelines.” OPR has yet to initiate their General Plan Guidelines that will include technical advisory on SB1245 that requires the open space update. Does the City plan to move forward with the Open Space & Conservation Element with their Recreation Element independent of the approaching General Plan Guidelines Update or will the City tailor the project schedule to accommodate the General Plan Guidelines Update guidance?

A17. City intends to move forward with General Plan Amendments to the Open Space and Conservation, and Recreation Elements based on the schedule described in the updated RFP. City’s proposed scope goes beyond the current GPA requirements for Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation, and, as emphasized in SB1425, also seeks to address equity and access, climate resilience and co-benefits, and rewilding opportunities in Element updates.

Q18. On page 15, RFP indicates that the consultant is responsible for producing all digital and printed project materials...which will be reviewed by CSP and City Manager’s office and be translated into the City’s identified languages including English, Armenian and Spanish. Can the City clarify the expectations for translation support? Will the consultant be responsible for translation and if so, will that only include Armenian, and Spanish?

A18. The default option will be to go through the city’s Graphics Department for most of the graphics, printing, and translation services but consultant may provide backup graphics, printing, and translation services by request. All public facing materials, including handouts, flyers, social media posts and webpages should be available or linked to information in City’s top three languages (English, Spanish, and Armenian). Consultant must provide raw text and graphic files so city can modify the language of their text, if necessary.

Q19. Has a decision-making framework between all the City organizations, Primary Team members, and the Steering Committee been established?

A19. No. Community Services and Parks (CSP) will be the lead department and Project Manager for these General Plan Amendments. A primary team has been established consisting of CSP, Community Development Department's Long Range Planning, and Office of City Attorney. A Steering Committee will be determined by City Manager's office and participation by Departments will be determined by their respective Directors, but anticipate representation from City Fire, Community Development, Public Works, and Office of Sustainability.

Q20. Can the City confirm the intent of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and confirm

that the intent is not to comply with Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or 2081 of California Fish and Game Code? Typically, an HCP would be developed to support issuance of an Incidental Take Permit under FESA or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). However, it seems that is not the intent for this HCP, therefore, can you confirm what the intent of this HCP is? In other words, is there an associated future action where one or more federal or state endangered species act listed species found during surveys could be impacted by projects, such as trail maintenance, fuel management, park facilities development, etc??

A20. No, the RFP does not intend for consultant to complete a Habitat Conservation Plan in compliance with Section 10 of FESA but instead is meant to be broader and used to develop policy. The vegetation and wildlife surveys and habitat assessments are meant to inform policies and recommendations for climate smart management strategies in order to protect/restore habitat and increase resiliency to wildfire broadly across Glendale's open spaces. Any listed species identified during surveys would inform future planning, projects and maintenance.

Q21. Does the City have a preferred CEQA documentation in mind? (e.g. Exemption, Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report?)

A21. An EIR is anticipated as a Planning-level document from which future environmental reviews may be tiered.

Q22. On page 15, it states that the Community Assessment Process needing to yield results that can be statistically validated. Statistically valid surveys require a high number of responses. What kind of existing partnerships or resources does that City have that will support this process to ensure a high survey response rate in order for the results to be statistically valid for the various demographic and underserved groups?

A22. The RFP scope regarding Community Assessments has been updated in Addendum 1 to read: The Community Assessment Process should yield results that **are either can be statistically validated or able to demonstrate that engagement to a diversity of communities has been achieved through surveys and public outreach that would be sufficient and representational of the City.**

RFP includes list of potential stakeholder groups on page 14, including: Glendale Chamber of Commerce, Glendale's Homeowner's Coordinating Counsel, Greater Downtown Glendale Association, Montrose Shopping Park Association, and various Homeowner's/Neighborhood Associations, The Glendale Historical Society, Tribal communities, and other community groups and associations.

Q23. Parks Needs Assessment (Task iii a). This is described as a detailed evaluation of every park in the City and every recreational facility within the City. This is typically a level of detail found in a Parks Master Plan. Can you please confirm that this is the expectation?

A23. Yes, it is expected for consultant to complete the Parks Needs Assessment as described. The Parks Needs Assessment Inventory and Analysis Task (Task 3 iii a.) builds on existing park assessments, including City's current City-wide Facilities Conditions Assessment (the scope's list of facilities is included in the linked references in Task 3 i f), the 2016 LA County Park Needs Assessment (the Park's Conditions Assessment is based on city's self- assessment via survey performed by park staff), and

city's own inventory of park amenities, including date of installation, inventory and dimensions of all courts and fields, playground inventory, trails inventory, etc.

Q24. Urban Forestry Master Plan (Task iii c). This task is essentially an Urban Forestry Master Plan that includes an evaluation of the health of every tree on public property in the City, locations where new trees are needed, overall tree coverage, and more. Can you please confirm that this is the expectation.

A24. Task iii c. does not request an Urban Forestry Master Plan (that phrase is not even used). No tree assessment is requested. Task 3 iii c. is meant to support the forestation and preservation of the community forest. The task includes, in summary, 1) obtaining existing urban tree forestry information from City's Public Works Urban Forestry staff; 2) Identifying priority reforestation projects in parks and trails (desktop analysis); 3) providing recommendations to expand and improve maintenance of city's urban forest. To reference some existing City Policy, see a draft Community Forest Management Plan included in reference links in Task 3 i f.

Q25. ADA Plan (Task iii d). The RFP describes the need for a detailed evaluation and list of improvements needed to meet ADA access to all parks and recreation facilities. Can you please describe the level of detail expected with this analysis?

A25. City's 2007 ADA Survey Findings for Parks included accessibility surveys of 30 facilities. CSP inventory includes 48 park facilities, including 37 parks, the Civic Auditorium, 4 community centers, and 6 sports facilities. Plus 4 historic buildings which CSP manages. The scope includes completion of ADA Survey findings for remaining facilities and revisiting/updating the previous 30 surveys. This task has been updated to better reflect the intended scope.

This task could be phased to accommodate budget and completion of primary tasks for General Plan Amendment.

Q26. Recreation Master Plan and Strategic Plan (Task iv). This is written as a very detailed evaluation of current programs, the effectiveness of the programs and new program needs. Can you please further describe your expected outcome?

A26. This task would analyze and assess city's recreation programs in order for the city to be able to make strategic decisions on future recreation programs and services. Assessment of recreation programs can be accomplished via multiple approaches, such as through staff surveys and interviews, community surveys, review of reservations of recreation facilities, and comparison of physical facilities to local and regional standards, to name a few examples.

The scope requests further evaluation of these recreational programs against future population growth and other trends. We understand that residents will want and need more park amenities than the City can accommodate, but we are seeking to prioritize our facility and capital improvements to best meet community needs and interests. This assessment will be a key resource for the Recreation Element

Q27. Habitat Conservation Plan (Task v b). This is typically an implementation action from an Open Space and Conservation Element. Can you please



confirm that the City desires an complete HCP for the City? This is typically a stand-alone project that is very detailed and comprehensive.

A27. See A20.

Q28. Financial Feasibility Analysis (Task 4 iii). Can you please provide the level of detail expected for this task? Is the expectation that the consultant will develop a detailed funding and financing plan to identify the total costs of improvements from the list above and then develop the mechanisms for paying for the improvement? As with other tasks, this is not typically found in General Plans.

A28. Because the General Plan is a policy document and has a broad time horizon, cost estimates may have imprecise relevance within the General Plan but will be critical to understanding limitations and opportunities presented in the GPA-OSCR Elements and support ultimate adoption, as well as future implementation and grant application. Since we anticipate projects within the GPA will be at a pre-concept to concept level, the cost estimate is based on precedent research of comparable projects to determine cost opinion information. An order of magnitude of construction and/or maintenance costs, including contingency, is the level of detail we're expecting with some likely assumptions, such as acquisition, design, and other implementation costs not being included at this stage.

Q29. Completing the above scope of work (plus engagement, management, etc.) will require a very significant budget. Can you please provide the consultants with an estimated budget for the project?

A29. See A7.

Q30. Can the proposer revise the scope of work provided in the RFP?

A30. Proposers are asked to respond to the RFP scope of work. Proposers are free to propose additional services they think are appropriate, and to indicate where and why they have done so.

Q31. How often should the consultant meet with the Steering Committee?

A31. To be determined. Should be assumed at least quarterly

Q32. Is virtual Consultant attendance at some or all Steering Committee meetings ok?

A32. Some of the Steering Committee meetings can be virtual. Should assume at least two in-person.

Q33. How often should the Consultant plan to meet with the Primary Team throughout the project timeframe?

A33. Consultant should plan to meet with the Primary Team bi-weekly. Most of these meetings could be virtual meetings.

Q34. Does the City expect the Consultant to lead the issue-based working/focus group meetings? How many meetings are expected?

A34. Yes, the consultant would lead the community meetings. The RFP states, "Conduct and

facilitate a minimum of six (6) community meetings and/or focus groups". The Community Outreach Plan strategy has been updated to only require "engagement with local stakeholder groups" rather than having to form working or focus groups. These are minimum requirements.

Q35. Should the consultant budget for translation/interpretation?

A35. See A18.

Q36. Does the City have document and/or branding templates the consultant should use in this project?

A36. Yes; these will be provided.

Q37. Can you please provide more detail on the City's expectations for Task 2 iii (Public Information)?

A37. Task 2 iii is proposer's public relations strategy. City has suggested support services and relationships that can be leveraged as part of the project outreach campaigns and at minimum should engage the community using city's website, social media (providing content to post), and even Glendale's TV6, among other media relations and partnership opportunities.

Q38. Will City staff assist with the engagement activities? If so, what specifically will City staff be responsible for?

A38. The assigned project manager for the City will be responsible for coordinating engagement procedures and processes to support the project. This will include but not limited to: support, review, and approval of outreach plan by project team. Review and approval of graphics and translation services and printing, and if necessary, posting of announcements on the city's website, newsletter, and social media. Coordinate announcements to other departments and city council. Coordinating responses between departments in making connections to stakeholder groups, attend and participate in all public meetings--will review and support development and approval of all outreach material, presentation material, reservation of the community space and preparation of space for community meeting--, as well as support with documentation of events, coordinating outreach support and bothing at community events, support dissemination of information utilizing city resources, among other support services.

Q39. Is the consultant expected to prepare detailed financial cost estimates, or would ballpark figures (such as a price range) be acceptable?

A39. See A28.

Q40. What is the desired level of detail of the evaluation of the "viability, cost-effectiveness, and return on investment of suggested strategies and recommendations"?

A40. projections, summary of expected outcomes, case study examples, to name a few expected deliverables.

Q41. The RFP states that the consultant should “create a framework for communicating and prioritizing the financial resources required to sustain current and desired assets at the appropriate levels of service.” Can the City provide more detail as to what is requested?

A41. The deliverable should support the city in making planning, budgeting and financial decisions based on accurate forecasts of necessary maintenance, services, and improvements to sustain current and desired assets at the appropriate levels of service. Also see A28.

Q42. What is the anticipated deliverable for the final GPAs (e.g., Word document? Elements formatted in Indesign? Etc.)?

A42. The final deliverable will be a fully accessible, easily readable PDF format document. City is requesting editable copies of the documents, including word and Indesign formats. City will also provide templates for the elements as City’s Long Range Planning is working toward a consistent format for all of the new and updated GP elements with different colors for each element.

Q43. Do you envision a comprehensive rewrite of the existing Elements or just updates?

A43. Given the level of detail, the Scope of Work is a comprehensive re-write of the existing Elements and will include a lot of new information (not an update with strike-outs and underlines).

Q44. Do you expect that the Parks Needs Assessment, Urban Forestry Master Plan, ADA Plan, Recreation Master Plan and Strategic Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan, and Financial Feasibility Analysis will be included in the General Plan or will they be separate reports/documents?

A44. The technical assessments will be appendices to the GPAs, as they will be summarized and referenced in the GPAs, and will be standalone documents. See A23-28 for additional guidance/parameters.

Q45. Does this proposal have a page limit?

A45. No.

Q46. Can consultants revise and rewrite the scope of work?

A46. See A30.

Q47. “Attachment E – Proposer’s Experience Form” seems duplicative of the content requested under letter a. Should the proposer repeat information included in Attachment E under section a, or can the proposer simply refer to Attachment E for this information?

A47. Repeat the information. The Attachment E - Proposer's Experience Summary Form provides the city and reviewers a summary of relevant experience and references to those project contacts to meet the requirements of the RFP. Proposals should still present the full project details with drawings and images in the proposal sections (i.e. letter a) describing the firms qualifications and experience.

Q48. The RFP states, "As part of that experience, proposers should demonstrate knowledge of the impact construction, maintenance, and operation of public facilities or similar projects have on implementation of the GPAs as described in Section IV "Project Objectives" and VI "Scope of Work". Can you describe what specifically the City is looking for?

A48. Because the scope of work includes park planning and program evaluation, and development of financial strategies, and other technical services, city is seeking a proposer that demonstrates broad experience/understanding not only in developing General Plan and GPA, but also specifically in parks and open space maintenance, operations, and capital projects.

Q49. Should the proposer include the same level of detailed information on subconsultants (including resumes, firm descriptions, quals, references, etc.)??

A49. Yes, same level of detail of relevant information, including resumes of relevant staff, firm descriptions, quals, references. Subconsultants should also fill out an Attachment E form.

Q50. The RFP states, "Based on similar past experience, provide a work plan that summarizes, in narrative form and project management schedule format, how each Scope of Work task will be completed." How much detail should the proposer provide as to how each scope item will be completed? This section could get very long, and we're sensitive to the fact that later in the RFP the City requests proposals that are "as direct and concise as possible without sacrificing the clarity and completeness." Is more general approach language ok??

A50. Provide as much detail as necessary, noting that more specific information the better. Broad or general language is acceptable.

Q51. Can the proposer refer to Attachment E, or does the City wish for the proposer to repeat this information in this section?

A51. Repeat the information. Attachment E is meant as a summary form.

A52. The RFP states, "A proposer must also complete submission via a secure weblink share file that the City will provide to Proposers upon request." How and when should the proposer request the link?

A52. Requesting the weblink through the Request for Clarification form or an email is acceptable. You will receive a weblink to share proposal documents before the proposal deadline.

Q53. The RFP states, "The City will issue Addenda in writing only. The City will email the Addenda to all individuals who submitted an email and will make reasonable efforts to deliver Addenda to all Proposers whom the City knows have received the RFP and have provided a street address for receipt of an Addenda. The City cannot guarantee that all Proposers will receive all Addenda." How and when should the proposer request the Addenda?

Q53. Any Addenda to the RFP will be posted to the RFP website. Anyone signed up for eNotifications for RFPs on [City's RFP/RFQ/BID webpage](#) will be alerted an addenda to this RFP. Additionally, anyone who has contacted the project manager during the RFP application process will be informed by email of any updates.

Regards,



Onnig Bulanikian  
Director of Community Services and Parks



Joseph Gonzalez  
Park Planner