

**NEWELL Street RTF Demolition/ Conveyance Modifications Project and
CSO 029 Reduction/Conveyance Modifications Project
RFP No. 17-3330-004**

Posted May 16, 2017

Addendum No. 1- Questions and Answers

Addendum No. 1 addresses questions from the pre-proposal meeting held on April 18, 2017 and submitted questions for referenced Request for Proposal (RFP) distributed April 4, 2017.

1. Paragraph 5.5 A&B both state “The Engineer should add anticipated soil borings in their cost proposal, “ but then paragraph 7.5.2 states the engineer should assume up to five sonic bores and up to 10 soil borings may be necessary. Should we base our cost on the 5 sonic bores and 10 soil borings since the actual work and site conditions are still unknown?

- Due to the unknown extent of necessary work, an allowance item will be added for this work. Please refer to the revised Cost Proposal Sheets. An allowance item of fifty thousand dollars will be added for borings and/or geotechnical services. All work will need prior approval (with cost details) from the OCDWEP.

2. Paragraph 7.5.2 in the RFP asks for the Engineer to provide a cost per boring on the cost proposal sheet, but there is no place for this cost. Does the County also want a cost per sonic bore? Please advise.

- An allowance item has been added. Please refer to revised Cost Proposal Sheets. RFP shall have the following additional language:

7.5.5 A. Allowance for soil borings/sonic borings/and or geotechnical services-not to exceed allowance (CSO 067):

At this time, the County recognizes that the extent of the work required for soil/sonic/and or geotechnical work is unknown. The Engineer should assume an allowance amount of fifty thousand dollars, (\$50,000). The allowance will not be utilized without the County’s prior approval. A detailed cost estimate should be provided to the County for approval prior to any work performed.

7.5.5 B. Allowance for soil borings/sonic borings/ and or geotechnical services-not to exceed allowance (CSO 029):

Same as above for CSO 029 project above.

3. Paragraph 7.5.1. B states Design Deliverables and Meeting and this does not reflect the same language in the Project B cost proposal summary sheet which just states 25% Design. Should this be the same as Project A paragraph 7.5.1 A which states 25% Design and Basis of Design?

- For clarification, Section 7.5.1 B should be the same services and tasks as Section 7.5.1 A. Please note that Section 7.5.1 B. has an additional task or meeting. Section 7.5.1 B. shall be renamed 25% Design, Basis of Design, and Meeting.

4. Due to the Memorial Day holiday weekend, we request an extension to June 2.

- The County will extend the submittal date to June 1, 3:00 P.M.

5. Can you clarify the schedule regarding both the 50% and 95% design being shown as 2 months kick off rather than 2 months from the previous deliverable? In addition, there is no scheduled date or timeframe for the Evaluation of Conveyance and Recommended Modifications or 25% design.

- The schedule was inaccurate and should have also included the 25% Design/Basis of Design. Please refer to the revised Schedule attached. If the Engineer takes exception to the schedule, it shall be so noted in the Proposal and an alternate schedule offered.

6. Can the successful proposal obtain the hydraulic SWMM model for use in design?

- The County will supply the successful proposer with the hydraulic SWMM model based upon 2016 conditions and any existing report for use in design.

7. Paragraph 7.7.4 A & B- The sentence “The Engineer shall incorporate the erosion and sediment control plan detail” does not have a period and appears to be truncated. Please advise if additional text should have been included.

- The RFP shall include the following additional language under Task 7.7.4:
The Engineer shall incorporate the plan into the contract documents. The Engineer shall prepare an inspection and maintenance plan for the erosion and sediment control practices and stormwater management controls. The Engineer shall be responsible for all inspections needed for the SWPPP, per NYSDEC regulations. The SWPPP shall be developed/certified by a licensed professional engineer (PE) or a certified professional in erosion and sediment control (CPESC)/certified professional in stormwater quality (CPSWQ). The Engineer shall prepare and submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the

NYSDEC Bureau of Water Permits prior to commencement of construction. It should be noted the NOI is not to be submitted to the NYSDEC until the SWPPP has been reviewed and approved by OCDWEP. The Engineer shall prepare and submit a Notice of Termination (NOT) to the NYSDEC Bureau of Water Permits following the conclusion of all construction activities and project site stabilization.

8. Paragraph 7.8.1 A&B-Does the County require the engineer to be present at or facilitate the Pre-Bid meeting?

- The County will require the successful Engineer to facilitate the Pre-Bid meeting as part of the Construction Phase Services. The RFP shall include the following additional language:

Pre-Bid Meeting (A & B)

Schedule and conduct a pre-bid meeting to be held at a County-determined location. Prepare and issue addenda as required following the meeting. The meeting shall serve as a question-answer session for Contractors. The Engineer shall prepare written responses to all questions and distribute to all parties within five (5) business days of said meeting.

9. Paragraphs 7.8.2 A&B - Should we base the number of bi-weekly progress meetings upon the 40- week construction period stated in section 7.9? If not, please advise.

- In order to evaluate each proposal equally, each proposal should assume bi-weekly progress meetings for each project for a 40-week construction period. It should be understood that the construction period may be less.

10. Paragraphs 7.9 A&B - Please confirm that we should budget one full time representative for each project, for a total of two full time inspectors for 40 weeks each.

- It is at the County's discretion to award the contract to one firm or split the projects and award to two separate consultants. Therefore, each proposal should budget based on the projects being independent of one another. As a supplement to the proposal, proposers may provide a narrative summary of cost savings and efficiencies potentially obtained by awarding the project parts A & B to one firm. As described in the RFP, summarize any value-added concepts to benefit the County, suggested by the proposer, which may not have been specified in the RFP.

11. Paragraph 7.14.5 states there shall be no salary adjustments due to salary increases and bonuses, however section 7.15.2 asks the engineer to provide details on any increases in wage rates (actual dollar amount, not percentages) on an annual basis for the term of the contract. These statements appear to be in contradiction to each other. Please advise if increases will be acceptable or if the rate at the beginning of the project should be carried through to the end of the contract.

- The contract rates provided shall be held for the duration of the contract.

12. From RFP instructions for Parts A & B, should we assume these projects will be conducted completely separate, i.e., separate Kick-Off Meetings, separate Design Review Meetings, preparation of separate Contract Documents, two separate inspectors, etc.?

At this time, each proposer should assume each project is separate and provide costs based on each project independent of the other. As a supplement to the proposal, proposers may provide a narrative summary of cost savings and efficiencies potential obtained by awarding the project parts A & B to one firm. As described in the RFP, summarize any value-added concepts to benefit the County, suggested by the proposer which may not have been specified in the RFP.

13. Will the County's existing calibrated hydraulic model be provided to the selected consultant?

- The County will provide the most current calibrated hydraulic model report to the selected consultant.

14. Will the County provide the projected peak design flows and volumes for the 1-year, 2-hour storm event (including reduction in flows in green infrastructure improvements underway) for the CSOs so they can be used for the basis of the CSO alternative evaluations?

- Yes, the County will provide projected flows and volumes to the successful bidder.

15. Can the County expand on Part 7.2.B, bullet that reads “Conditions of existing sewers and manholes”? Should the consultant plan to perform any CCTV work here?

- The consultant should plan to perform any necessary CCTV work. The County reserves the right to reduce costs by supplying personnel and equipment for this task.

16. It appears that the Schedule Date information in Section 8. Of the RFP is incorrect-should these durations be based upon the previous task and not “Kick-off meeting + 2 Months”?

- Yes, Schedule date information in Section 8 is incorrect. Please refer to the revised schedule attached. If the Engineer takes exception to the schedule, it shall be so noted in the Proposal and an alternate schedule offered.

17. It appears that “Submission of 25% Design and Bod Report” and “25% Design Review Meeting” is missing from the schedule in Section 8?

- Yes, please see revised Schedule for clarification below.

18. Since the evaluation phase is included in the project scope and the actual “project” has not been determined until that phase is completed, would the County consider establishing an allowance item for “Surveying” and “Borings” since the extent of the work is unknown at this time?

- Since the extent of the work is unknown an allowance item will be added to the contract. All work will need prior approval from the County. Please see revised Cost Proposal Sheets for each project. Please see responses above to questions 1 and 2.

19. Please clarify the scope differences between Task 7.6 Permitting and Easements and Task 7.12 NYSEFC Financing, Energy Incentive Procurement, SHPO, and SEQR.

For clarification, Task 7.6 should anticipate all costs associated with all permits, easements, and inter-municipal agreements. Task 7.12 is primarily for meeting NYSEFC financial requirements. There is an overlap. EFC will require supplying similar documents as required in Task 7.6 as well as completing other financial related documents or requirements. Since it is unknown whether the County will seek NYSEFC financing, utilize Task 7.12 for all NYSEFC financing requirements.

20. Under Section 7.2.B, seventh bullet. Are you asking the consultant to televise/inspect the sewers and manholes?

- The Consultant should assume sewers and manholes will need to be evaluated and televised. All costs associated with the task should be added. The County reserves the right to reduce costs by utilizing their personnel and equipment. At this time, the County cannot commit the resources and therefore, the associated costs should be included in the contract price.

21. Is this work regulatory-driven?

- As part of the Amended Consent Judgment, the County continues to work toward increased CSO volume capture and reduction of CSO activity. Both CSOs are part of the County's submitted CSO Facilities Plan to NYSDEC.

22. How often does CSO 067 activate?

- CSO 067 activity is dependent on rainfall intensity. The current SWMM model rainfall trigger for CSO 067 is 0.3 inches/hour.

23. What is the criteria to be considered successful? 4-6 events?

- The criteria is based upon the 1-year, two-hour storm (1991). The rainfall data from 1991 is considered the representative hydrological year; the design storm is 1/2" inches of rain per hour for two hours that is, 1" of rain total. At this design storm value, the CSO would be active 4 to 6 times in the representative year.

Revised Schedule shall be added to Section 8 of the RFP:

REVISED SCHEDULE

TASK	SCHEDULE DATE
Conduct Pre-proposal Meeting	4/18/17
Submit Proposal to County	6/1/17
Select Consultant/Issue Notice to Proceed	7/7/17
Kick-Off Meeting	TBD
Evaluation Memorandum and Meeting	TBD
25% Submittal/ Basis of Design	Evaluation Meeting + 1 month
50% Submittal	25% Submittal + 2 months
50% Design Meeting	50% Submittal + 2 weeks
95% Submittal	50% Design meeting + 2 months
95% Design Meeting	95% Submittal + 2 weeks
Final Design Complete with NYSDEC Approval	TBD
Commencement of Construction (Project A)	April 2018
Commencement of Construction (Project B)	January 2019
Anticipated Construction Completion (Project A&B)	November 2019 **
One Year Warranty Walkthrough	November 2020

** In the event construction completion is delayed, contract will be extended**

Proposal Due Date (Revised): June 1, 2017, 3:00, P.M.

Additional Information provided on the website:

- Newell RTF Control Building Photos
- Memorandum CSO 029 Approach Analysis (CH2M/December, 2016)