

December 22, 2022

Addendum No. 1 to Town of Caroline Highway Facilities Project RFP posted November 28, 2022

Given the additional information of Addendum No. 1, we are revising the tentative schedule for the RFP as follows to allow further questions and time for proposal development.

- **Second Round Questions due: 1/6**
- **Answers provided: 1/11**
- **Proposal deadline: 1/25**
- **Interviews: 2/6 - 2/17**
- **Award: by 2/28**

1. Question: Can you make available the recently completed site evaluation report? Has the town already generated a Programming Plan?

Answer: The Feasibility Study is available on the Town website, [HERE](#). It contains Existing Conditions, Space Programming, current vehicle inventory, cost estimates, and other information developed for the purposes of comparative feasibility study of potential building sites. That information should be taken as provisional, but provides a picture of the Town's assets and needs. In developing the Programming Plans, we will seek at least three options that provide a range of approaches to maximizing efficiency and economy of the highway facility. The 16-bay, 23,000 sq. ft. facility has an estimated construction cost of 5.4 M and should be considered the high end of options (see pages 19 and 27 of Feasibility Study). From initial discussions between the A/E Firm and the Town in honing in on a Schematic Design Plan, the firm should provide at least two alternative options for design and/or layout that maximize economy (for instance, cold storage of appropriate equipment).

2. Question: Could this RFP be broken into two separate requests, one for design and the other for construction?

Answer: No, we seek a firm to provide this full package of services including construction administration services. The language in I. General Information, Paragraphs I.A. I.B. and I.C. also make this clear, as well as the full text of the RFP Paragraphs IV.6-8. Also see response to question 25 below.

3. Question: Under IV. Requirements, #2 Building and Site Programming Services, second bullet under "Deliverables" states: Alternative site of facilities on property and building layouts. Is the Town seeking design proposals for sites in addition to 852/866 Valley Road?

Answer: No. After completing the Feasibility Study, The Town is now committed to reutilizing the current site. The 852 and 866 Valley Road properties are contiguous and should be considered together as a single site. The wording under Section IV is clarified as follows: Alternative siting and building layouts (at 852/866 Valley Road).

4. Question: Do you have a budget for this project? Is the Town planning to bond or does it have funds set aside?

Answer: The Town has not set a project budget. We are looking for the most economical solution that satisfies our needs for highway department functionality, facility longevity, and operational efficiency of the building(s). We have a project reserve fund, but we will also need to bond for the project in addition to any grants that may be obtained.

5. Question: Can you define the size of the facility?

Answer: See Answer #1.

6. Question: What time are bids due on the January 6, 2023, deadline for proposals?

Answer: Proposals are to be submitted electronically as pdf documents and will be accepted on or before midnight on the proposal due date, **now amended to January 25, 2023.**

7. Question: For Section V. Proposer Information. C. Project Approach (60 points). Items 1-4 only sum to 35 points.

Answer: The RFP is hereby amended as follows to show correct point allocations for Project Approach:

C. Project Approach (60 points)

1. Describe your experience in providing architectural/engineering services to a municipality for the design and construction of a large-scale municipal highway facility on an existing highway facilities site. (10 points)
2. Detail your firm's understanding of the challenges for this project and your proposed approaches to overcoming these challenges. (25 points)
3. Identify risks and methods for mitigating these risks. (20 points)
4. Program delivery - estimated work plan and timetable. Outline the tasks your firm proposes to accomplish in your proposal. Provide an estimated schedule and timeline for each task. (5 points)

8. Question: APPENDIX A: SIGNATURE AND AUTHORITY AFFIDAVIT FORM - is the language in this affidavit pertinent to the proposer and what would be "agreements to prevent the completion of this project?"

Answer: Yes, this form is to be completed by Proposers. It is to affirm non-collusion and that your firm has no contracts or interests at this property that would conflict with performing the work.

9. Question: There is reference to a standard AIA B101 Owner-Architect contract. Please confirm if the Town will hire a CM during construction?

Answer: The A&E firm will act as the owner representative for Construction Administration services.

10. Question: How many vehicle storage bays are required?

Answer: See #1.

11. Question: How many vehicle maintenance bays are required?

Answer: See #1.

12. Question: Are all vehicles to be stored fueled by gasoline and/or diesel fuel? Are there any alternative fuel design considerations?

Answer: Almost all vehicles currently use diesel fuel. We wish to discuss alternative fuel design considerations.

13. Question: Is a vehicle wash station required? If so, what type?

Answer: Yes; type to be determined in initial phase of work with the A/E Firm.

14. Question: Will the facility be used as an emergency shelter?

Answer: Not currently planned. To be discussed.

15. Question: Is the facility located in a flood plain?

Answer: Part of the property is in a flood plain. See Feasibility Study and FEMA maps.

16. Question: Does the facility need an emergency power or backup generator? If so, should it be for the entire facility?

Answer: To be discussed.

17. Question: It appears there is no public water or sanitary sewer available at the site. Please confirm what utilities are available at the site and that well water and septic design is part of the project scope?

Answer: There is no public water or sewer. Well and septic design is part of project scope.

18. Question: Should commissioning services be provided as part of the A/E contract or will the Town hire an independent third part to complete commissioning?

Answer: Commissioning services are part of the scope of work with the A/E Firm.

19. Question: Does the Town have any regulated building material (RBM) studies for the existing building(S)? If so, can you please share them? If not, should we include environmental assessment of RBM in our scope of work?

Answer: No. We are not aware of RBMs. Environmental assessment of RBMs should be included in the scope of work. Abatement, if needed, would be separate from this RFP.

20. Question: Are there any contaminated soils on site? If so, can you please share any reports with us? If not, should we include a Phase 1 ESA, soils testing, and creation of a Site Management Plan in our scope of work?

Answer: The Town has no such reports. Phase I ESA should be included in the scope of work. We would also expect the consultant to lead the SEQR process, in association with town staff and attorney.

21. Question: NYS Contract Reporter indicates there is a 20% MWBE utilization goal, however, the RFP does not mention MWBE utilization in it. Please confirm if MWBE participation goals are part of the RFP.

Answer: MWBE is a goal but not a requirement. We are not including MWBE in the scoring of proposals.

22. Question: What is meant by “reuse or refurbishing of existing infrastructure where feasible”. Are you referring to the current buildings/facilities and have certain buildings already been identified for reuse?

Answer: We wish to consider reusing or refurbishing any existing infrastructure where feasible. We have made no decisions and would want to discuss this with the A/E firm. See Answers #1 and #2.

23. Question: Do you anticipate an increase in the Salt Storage capacity at the new facility or are you intending to keep the same size salt shed? It has been noted that the salt shed is undersized for today's use, and that it is refilled often during the snow winter maintenance season.

Answer: Possibly - to be discussed.

24. Question: How many bays for the new Highway Garage facility? It was mentioned that the Town was looking for 18, but during the feasibility study 16 bays was discussed. Has this changed?

Answer: See #1. Program Plan is to be defined in the initial phase. We have not proposed an increase from the Feasibility Study.

25. Construction Phase services: Are daily construction observations required or will Town Codes/Inspector or Highway Superintendent to assist in such activities? We understand that the Town wished to have a lump sum proposal, but as the scope of construction inspections/observations is dependent on the final scope of work, in order to compare "apples to apples" we suggested either deleting these services and negotiating later or getting a fixed quote for 300hrs with extra to be change ordered.

Answer: Oversight of construction will be the responsibility of the A/E Firm. The Code Officer will make inspections in his role in enforcing the NYS building code. The point about scope of work is well taken. In developing cost proposals, please propose a fixed quote for 300 hrs within the lump sum proposal (Paragraph V.E.B.), with additional hours to be change ordered, as suggested.

26. Question: Will construction be a single phase operation, i.e. will it be phased out over a few years to implement to assure minimal impact on daily operations?

Answer: To be discussed. The Town would expect the main garage to be constructed in one phase/season. We wish to consider construction strategies that ensure continuation of highway operations with limited interruptions.