

September 12, 2016

ADDENDUM NO. 1

PROJECT: P-415PAS2, Preliminary and Final Design and Construction Support Services for Passerelle Pedestrian Bridge over NYC Transit Yard and Meridian Road, Borough of Queens

PIN: 8502017HW0003P

THE ADDENDUM IS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND IS HEREBY MADE A PART OF SAID REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO THE SAME EXTENT AS THOUGH IT WERE ORIGINALLY THEREIN.

Attached are the Questions and Answers received from the consultants for this solicitation.

Contact: Maritza Ortega, ortegama@ddc.nyc.gov
Phone No.: 718-391-1542

By signing in the space provided below, the Proposer acknowledges receipt of this Addendum.

THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE SIGNED BY THE PROPOSER FOR THE CONTRACT AND ATTACHED TO THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.

Andrew Cammock
Director of Professional Contracts

Name of Proposer

By _____

Title _____

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #1: On page 52 it states that the Pre Scoping Documents are considered 80% Draft Prelim Plans and that the Draft Prelim Plans should be based on the Pre Scoping Documents. Also, considering that the Schematic Design Phase is not required, we assume that alternative bridge types are not to be considered and that the bridge structural concept (generally replace in kind with a concrete deck) presented in the Pre Scoping Documents will be the basis for Final Design.

Answer: Yes, the Pre Scoping Documents will be the basis for Final Design.

Question #2: Will a project that has been fully designed and under construction be considered as a “Demonstration Project”?

Answer: Yes, a project fully designed and under construction will be considered as a Demonstration Project.

Question #3: How many copies of the Doing Business Data Form are required?

Answer: Submit one original completed Doing Business Data Form by the Prime Consultant.

Question #4: Are we to submit Attachment 3 in both the EXPERIENCE and PERSONNEL sections of the technical proposal?

Answer: No, in one section.

Question #5: Does the Workload (Attachment 5) need to be submitted for all firms, or just the prime?

Answer: The proposer and his/her Sub-consultant(s) providing services on this project must complete a separate Current and Anticipated Work Load Disclosure form.

Question #6: Are resumes to be submitted in both standard format and SF330 format for all individuals planning to work on the project?

Answer: Yes, resumes to be submitted in both standard format and SF330 format.

Question #7: Are you looking for a combined SF330 response with subconsultant information integrated, or do you prefer SF330s to be separated by consultant?

Answer: Prime and subconsultants must fill out separate SF330.

Question #8: The scope of the topographic survey in the RFP speaks to showing all major elements of the bridge. Does that include a survey of the entire underside of the bridge? If not, what is your interpretation in that regard?

Answer: The consultant to review the Topographic survey performed during Pre-scoping Phase and perform additional survey for required information.

Question #9: The bridge is located over and in the vicinity of railroads. Who will be the responsible party to secure property access and flagging services?

Answer: The consultant will coordinate the access under the Force Account agreement with respective railroads.

Question #10: For the Demonstration Projects and additional experience for SF330, it says “provide projects completed within the last ten years”; are we permitted to submit projects which are currently under construction?

Answer: Yes, you are permitted to submit projects which are currently under construction.

Question #11: For those sections that have been called out specifically, including additional experience (Section F) and expertise (Section H), are these to be provided separately, as well as in the complete SF330? (i.e. – do we need to repeat material in different sections of the submission?)

Answer: No, you do not need to repeat material in different sections of the submission.

Question 12: As regards staff resumes of ALL personnel to be provided for the Project, requested under 3. Personnel on RFP 21, we assume that these are the single page 330 resumes and would be included in the 330 form. For Attachment 3 we would annex the resumes of the 5 key staff shown....and these resumes could be up to 2 pages each. Is our assumption correct?

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

Question 13: The RFP states on page 20, “The proposer (including joint venture and/or all of its subconsultants) shall provide up to four (4) engineering Demonstration Projects, similar in scope, size and type to this project, completed within the last ten (10) years, which demonstrate the firm’s ability to provide services similar to those required for the Project described in this RFP.” Please clarify if by completed within the last 10 years, the NYCDDC means that the project was constructed within that timeframe or the firm’s contract for services was completed within that timeframe.

Answer: “ completed within the last 10 years” - It is the intent of NYCDDC that “ The proposer (including joint venture and/or all of its subconsultants) shall provide up to four (4) engineering Demonstration Projects, similar in scope, size and type to this project, construction of which is completed or are under construction (and not the service contract) within the last ten (10) years, which demonstrate the firm’s ability to provide services similar to those required for the Project described in this RFP.”

Question 14: On page 1 of Schedule B, the NYCDDC indicates the total M/WBE participation goal for this project is 9%. Please confirm that this is the correct participation goal.

Answer: The M/WBE Participation Goal is 9%.

Question 15: Please clarify the scope of work related to the rooftop of the Passerelle Building and ADA ramp at the south end of the bridge.

Answer: The scope of work related to the rooftop of the Passerelle Building and ADA ramp at the south end of the bridge is outlined in the Pre-scoping documents.

Question 16: Page RFP-21, paragraph 2, can you please send me the SF 330, page 3, which (I'm hoping) has the format for the Section F that you are requesting? I am referring to the RFP language highlighted below: In addition, the proposer and each of its subconsultants shall provide up to five (5) projects, similar in scope, size and type to this project, completed within the last ten (10) years, which demonstrate the firm's ability to provide services similar to those required for the project described in this RFP. The proposer shall present each project on one 8 ½" X 11" inch page (one sided). The proposer shall provide contact information for each client/owner for each of the project submitted. The proposer and each of its subconsultants shall provide information regarding prior projects in response to Section F of Standard Form 330. Responses by the proposer and each subconsultant to Section F of Standard Form 330 shall be indicated in the five (5) rows which are provided on Page 3 of the form [one (1) page]. Any information regarding Experience that is not listed in Section F of Standard Form 330 will not be considered.

Answer: Please refer to the RFP, page 20 Section IV A-1 for the Standard Form 330.

Question 17: Several published sources have indicated an alignment for the proposed LaGuardia AirTrain which would put the AirTrain terminal in very close proximity to the Passerelle. Has NYCDDC obtained any additional information regarding the alignment of the proposed AirTrain?

Answer: No additional information regarding the alignment of the proposed Air Train is obtained by DDC.

Question 18: Will the designer be required to incorporate any connections with the Air Train terminal into the design of the Passerelle?

Answer: No, the designer will not be required.

Question 19: What level of coordination with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey will be required on the part of the designer?

Answer: Designer will be required to coordinate with ALL stake holders, including PANYNJ.

Question 20: Pre-scoping phase drawings show proposed ramps with slopes greater than 1:20 and no landings, which does not meet ADA requirements. Please confirm that the final design will need to be fully ADA compliant.

Answer: Yes, final design will need to be fully ADA compliant.

Question 21: Will designer be responsible for preparing maps and assisting DDC in obtaining required easements (temporary and permanent) over non-Parks property, such as the Casey Stengel Depot?

Answer: No temporary and permanent easement is anticipated at this time.

Question 22: What role will the designer have in coordinating with the LIRR vis a vis reconstruction of the Passerelle over the LIRR's right-of-way, and LIRR's planned reconstruction of their Mets-Willets Point station, including existing / proposed Passerelle column locations and the disposition of the station canopy?

Answer: Designer will be required to coordinate with ALL stake holders, including LIRR. Detailed scope is outlined in the RFP/Contract.

Question 23: The Passerelle includes areas currently used by the LIRR for station operations, including passenger ticket collection and queuing. Will it be necessary for the designer to identify space for and design temporary facilities to maintain LIRR operations during Stage 2 construction?

Answer: Designer will be required to coordinate with ALL stake holders, including LIRR. Detailed scope is outlined in the RFP/Contract.

Question 24: Section 4.2 of the Design Report addresses vertical clearance over highways. However, no mention is made of required vertical clearance over the NYCT or LIRR facilities. NYS Railroad law requires a vertical clearance between top of rail and any overhead bridge of 22', and additionally states that "...where the overhead or side clearances between a track and any building, structure or facility are less than the minimum prescribed herein, but were created prior to the effective date hereof, minimum clearances prescribed herein shall be provided whenever a building, structure or facility is relocated or reconstructed." (NY Railroad Law §51-a). The pre-scoping phase drawings appear to indicate that the Passerelle falls well short of this requirement in several instances, particularly for the NYCT tracks and LIRR Tracks 5 and 6. Will the elevation of the Passerelle need to be modified to satisfy the minimum clearance required by NYS Railroad law?

Answer: The Pre-scoping Documents shall be the basis for Final design.

Question 25: The RFP states, "If there is Federal Funding allocated for the project, the Consultant shall prepare the Design Report in the format required for "Design Approval Document (DAD)" for NYSDOT and FHWA and submit to NYSDOT and FHWA for approval." Has a determination been made regarding whether the project will include federal funding, as this will affect the level of effort required for the Design Report Preparation task?

Answer: There is no Federal Funding associated with this project at this time.

Question 26: The Design Report for Pre-Scoping Services includes "NYCDPR Program Recommendations" which include "Keep(ing the) historic look of the southern shade structures." Will the designer be required to follow this recommendation?

Answer: Yes, however, the Designer may propose alternate design which may be in keeping with the historic perspective.

Question 27: Will the designer be required to coordinate with any other agencies regarding the historic nature of the Passerelle, such as the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission or the State Historic Preservation Office? If so, has DDC initiated any discussions with these agencies regarding their expectations for this project?

Answer: The bridge is not within the jurisdiction of Land Mark Commission or State Preservation Office.

Question 28: Please confirm whether Task 5 Design Report Preparation is in the Scope of Work. Given that Task 4 Schematic Design is excluded and several tasks under Task 6 Preliminary Design have already been performed by another consultant (including pre-scoping documents that are considered about 80% of draft preliminary plans), we question the need for preparation of another design report.

Answer: Yes.

Question 29: . One of our subconsultants does not have a SF330 Form, only a SF244 and SF255. For them, can we substitute their SF244 & 255 for the SF330?

Answer: SF254 & SF 255 are not acceptable for this project. Standard Form SF 330 is available at <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/ddc/contracts/work-with-ddc.page>. Please have subconsultants fill out the SF330 form.