

Project: Consulting Engineer Services for
Battery Park City Resiliency
Flood Resiliency Projects

Date: December 10 ,
2020

RE: Addendum #3
of Pages: 2

The following responses (the “Responses”) are provided to questions received by Battery Park City Authority (“BPCA”) in connection with its Request for Proposals for the Consulting Engineer Services for Battery Park City Flood Resiliency Projects (the “RFP”). The Responses are provided in bold, italicized print immediately following the questions. All capitalized terms shall have the same definition as provided in the RFP.

Please Note: This is part 2 of the Q&A. The first round of questions were answered in Addendum #2 to the RFP which was posted on December 8, 2020.

1. How many alternatives should be considered in the EIS?

Response: Per SEQRA and its enabling regulations, an EIS must contain a description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives. Proposers should account in their technical and cost proposals for the possible range of reasonable alternatives for a project the size and breadth of the Combined North and West PDB Project.

2. Tasks 6,7,8 pertain to the Construction Oversight scope of work noted in the RFP. We would like to know if the Authority intends to have a Construction Oversight team present and on- site full time through the Construction and Closeout phases? Based on the scope items listed for Task 6.A-F and Task 7.A-D, we are assuming a full time Construction Oversight team comprised of a Resident Engineer, Office Engineer, 2 Inspectors, a part time Scheduler, and a part time Safety Officer. This team would be supplemented as necessary to provide services that may sometimes be necessary. I.E. Estimating for change orders. Please advise if these assumptions are in line with the Authority’s vision of the Construction Oversight services required. If not, please clarify the degree of Construction Oversight desired.

Response: The Consulting Engineer will be expected to have the necessary construction oversight personnel present and on-site full time throughout the construction and closeout of the Combined North and West PDB Project. However, Task 8 of Attachment A (Anticipated Scope of Services) is not expected to involve construction oversight services in a similar manner. Proposers have flexibility in specifying the number and qualifications of the construction oversight personnel appropriate for the Combined North and West Project and should make their own assumptions concerning what will be required in order to provide the services specified in Tasks 6 and 7 of Attachment A (Anticipated Scope of Services). These assumptions should be consistent with the Proposer’s experience with similar projects and based on the information made available through the RFP. As required by RFP Section 5.2.10, these assumptions must be clearly spelled out in the Cost Proposal.

3. Task 2.B Development of Background Technical Information. The last sentence of the first paragraph states: However, the CE services may include, and the Consulting Engineering must be capable of:... and list 4 items – such as: topographic survey, utility survey server, geotechnical, hydrologic modeling and interior drainage etc. Are we to price such efforts (surveys and modeling) at this time in our fee proposal or as the sentence indicates do the firms just need to be capable of performing such efforts and if during the course of the project – such surveys are validated – the firm will negotiate a price for performing the work? The first paragraph also states the exact scope of the planning efforts and extent of technical background information necessary for the PDB procurement will be determined by BPCA in consultation with the Consulting Engineer and other BPCA advisors as part of the finalization of the conceptual Project Definition. If we need to develop a survey cost for the fee proposal at this time, and since the exact scope of the surveys is determined post award with the BPCA, can we provide an allowance for such surveys and modeling in the fee proposal?

Response: The Consulting Engineer must be capable of performing all tasks described in Attachment A (Anticipated Scope of Services), including the items identified in the question. Each Proposer should price the efforts of Task 2(B) in the Cost Proposal based on its determination of the extent to which work such as geotechnical, topographic, utility, and sewer surveys will be necessary and is not otherwise available. This determination should be made based on the information made available through the RFP and the Proposer’s experience with similar projects. All assumptions concerning the expected scope should be clearly spelled out in the Proposal. Ultimately, the BPCA expects to negotiate appropriate clarifications to the CE Services scope of work and the associated compensation prior to executing the Consulting Engineer Services Agreement based on the successful Proposal, including the assumptions and qualifications set forth in the Cost Proposal pursuant to RFP Section 5.2.10. While mechanisms such as an allowance may be included in the final Consulting Engineer Services Agreement, BPCA is seeking Proposals based on an assumed scope of work, consistent with the terms and conditions of the RFP.

By signing the line below, I am acknowledging that all pages of this Addendum #3 have been received, reviewed and understood, and will be incorporated into the Proposal submitted. This document must be attached to the Proposal for consideration.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Number of pages received: _____ <fill in>

Distributed to: All prospective Proposers