1. **Q:** Do you expect the SOQ to include the full team that will propose for the RFP?

   **A:** The proposed Project Team should be as fully developed as possible. Respondents must recognize that its key assigned employees, along with its subcontractors and their key employees included in the SOQ, will be a factor in determining Short-listed Respondents for eligibility to receive the RFP. Therefore, changes to the Respondent’s proposed team, including subcontractors and key employees, will not be allowed in the Proposal stage except for extenuating circumstances, such as corporate takeovers, buyouts, and other unforeseen changes, to enhance Proposal teams, or as otherwise approved by the Trust if determined to be in the Trust’s best interest. Proposers may strengthen their teams prior to submittal of Proposals by adding additional personnel and subcontractor members. The Evaluation Committee shall have the right to determine, in its sole discretion, the acceptability of any changes in the Proposer’s proposed team as prescribed in its SOQ. Any changes to the Proposer’s proposed team found to be unacceptable by the Evaluation Committee may result in disqualification of the Proposer.

2. **Q:** Is there a design-build component to the project? The table in Part 1, section 2.2 (Procurement Schedule) indicates that the RFP will be issued with a “Design-Build Contract”?

   **A:** No, this is not a Design-Build project. The reference in 2.2 is a typo and is meant to state “Design Contract”.

3. **Q:** Is funding in place for the Project?

   **A:** Yes, funding is available. The construction budget is being finalized and a range will be available to Short-Listed Respondents during the RFP phase.

4. **Q:** Will the Trust release the Power Point that was presented at the information meeting on September 25, 2018?
A: A PDF version of the presentation will be emailed to all Planholders (i.e. individuals who contacted GansevoortRFQ@hrpt.ny.gov to obtain RFQ materials.)

5. Q: What are the MWBE goals?
   A: We expect that the MWBE goals for the RFP to be 30% for M/WBE and 6% for SDVOB.

6. Q: How will selection committee work? Will the same committee evaluate RFP responses?
   A: Please refer to Part 3 of the RFQ regarding “Evaluation Committee and Approvals”.

7. Q: Will you only accept SOQ’s from prime Landscape Architects?
   A: Please refer to the RFQ, Part 1, section 1.1 (Project Overview) and Part 6, section 6.2.2 (Project Team). The Trust expects the prime to be a landscape architectural firm.

8. Q: Can sub-consultants propose as part of multiple teams?
   A: Yes.

9. Q: Are joint ventures allowed?
    A: Yes. Please note that if Respondent is a joint venture (“JV”), each firm in the joint venture must sign and submit an SOQ Transmittal Letter (Exhibit A). In addition, please note that SOQ requires submittal of information for each firm of the JV (See Part 6, section 6.2.2). If the JV is selected as a Short-List Respondent, the Trust may request a copy of the draft JV agreement as part of the proposal submission.

10. Q: Are stakeholders on the RFQ panel?
    A: No. Please refer to Part 3 of the RFQ regarding “Evaluation Committee and Approvals”.

11. Q: Will MWBE requirements be City or State Requirements?
    A: The M/WBE requirements will be New York State requirements.

12. Q: Will the attendance list be available?
13. Q: Can you provide a list of MWBE subcontractors?

A: We have made a vendor list available to Plan Holders. You may also find a directory of NYS certified M/WBE on the New York State Contract System website at https://ny.newnycontracts.com/.

14. Q: Are we compelled to provide all the information on the last form in the RFQ - the Financial Information Summary? Will this information become public, or be accessible by others besides the HRPT? Is there other information we can provide in lieu of this?

A: All respondents must submit a financial information summary. The Trust does not intend to share this information with anyone outside of Trust staff. However, the Trust is a New York State Public Authority and, as such, is subject to the Freedom of Information Law, Article 6 of the Public Officers Law of the State of New York (“FOIL”). Please refer to Part 5, section 5.8 of the RFQ regarding Information Disclosure to Third Parties.

15. Q: Our company provides a service of LED light conversions and while reading your projects summary I saw that there is room for opportunity for new light fixtures. I was wondering if there were any other documents relating to the contract that shows a table of pre-existing fixtures?

A: Technical specifications are being developed at this time and will be made available to the Short-listed Respondents during the RFP phase of the procurement.

16. Q: Please describe the anticipated hydrodynamic and sediment modeling so that we can provide the most appropriate personnel for the task.

A: Hydrodynamic and sediment modeling is anticipated to be a requirement during the design process to ensure that any proposed work at the river edge is feasible and maintainable as it relates to the river’s scouring action, tides and currents.

17. Q: Please identify which portions of Exhibit A must be completed by subconsultants.

A: Respondents must submit copies of licenses and certifications for team members who are leading the design efforts.
18. Q: Please confirm that Exhibit C is only to be provided for the prime consultant.

A: Exhibit C (Financial Information Summary) must only be submitted by the prime consultant.

19. Q: Since financial information is listed in neither Volume 1 nor Volume 2 of the SOQ, can we submit financial info in a separate, sealed envelope?

A: Please see Addendum No. 1, which can be found on the Website at https://hudsonriverpark.org/about-us/bids-business-opportunities. Exhibit C (Financial Information Summary) shall be submitted in Volume 3.

20. Q: Do you need 5 hard copies of the financial information, as well as a flash drive with the financial information on it?

A: Yes. Volumes 1, 2 and 3 must be submitted as five (5) hard copies and one (1) electronic version.

21. Q: Are sub-consultants also required to provide the Financial Information Summary?

A: No; however, the Trust may request such information during the evaluation process prior to selecting Short-Listed Respondents.

22. Q: If previous design plans have been commissioned for this site, could you share them?

A: Access to existing condition documents will be given to the Short-Listed Respondents as part of the RFP process. Previous design concepts will be shared with the eventual selected firm.

23. Q: In 6.2, the outline of the SOQ states that the SF330 form should be included with Volume 2 of the submission. However, the SF330 is discussed in 6.2.2 as a requirement that should be submitted in relation to the Project Team, which would fall under Volume 1. Can you clarify which volume the SF330 should be included with?

A: Volume 1 shall include SF330 completed by subconsultants. Volume 2 shall contain SF 330 completed by prime respondent and its staff.
24. Q: In addition to the 2 volumes that are to be submitted with the SOQ, outlined in 6.2, we are also asked to include Financial Qualification (6.2.6) and Commitment to M/WBE Participation (6.2.7). Should these be bound separately from the 2 volumes, and if so, should the same number of copies be provided for those documents?

A: Please see Addendum #1, which can be found on the Website at https://hudsonriverpark.org/about-us/bids-business-opportunities. Exhibit C (Financial Information Summary) shall be submitted in Volume 3. Commitment to M/WBE Participation may be submitted as part of Volume 1.

25. Q: Should subconsultants also submit project for the requirements outlined in sections 6.2.4.1 and 6.2.5, or only the prime?

A: Subconsultants must also provide the information required by Exhibit B of the RFQ, including relevant projects.

26. Q: M/WBE & SDVOB Participation (Page 8-9): If the prime is MBE/WBE, is there a requirement for additional MBE/WBE participation on the team?

A: A prime M/WBE may only receive credit for MBE or WBE but not both. While a prime M/WBE may self-perform, there may be additional M/WBE goal requirements as well as SDVOB requirements.

27. Q: General Instructions (Page 13): Submittal section notes to send the package by registered or certified mail or by hand. Is FedEx or UPS also acceptable?

A: Yes, any form of tracked mail is acceptable.

28. Q: Project Team (Page 16): Listing of consultants on the team does not include a graphics/signage designer or interpretive designer, but scope of services for Upland Park Finishes/Improvements, (p. 6) includes providing ‘interpretives’. May we include a signage/interpretive/graphic designer on the team?

A: A signage/interpretive/graphic designer should not be included. HRPT has an approved wayfinding/signage system and would work with the design team to site and implement such signage.

29. Q: There is no indication of anticipated construction budget or construction target budget for the project. Is this currently available,
or will it be determined during the concept phase of the project using the estimates prepared by the consultant team’s cost estimator?

A: Please refer to response to Question 3

30. Q: In addition, will an anticipated project schedule for after the competition phase be provided?

A: Project schedule will be provided Short-Listed Respondents in the RFP.

31. Q: Shall the proposal keep the new bulkhead on the western shore of the site as is or can it be modified?

A: For cost reasons, the Trust proposes to keep the existing newly constructed bulkhead in place.

32. Q: Which methods are currently envisioned to stabilize the north and south peninsula edges?

A: Methods are expected to be part of the consultant design services. It is anticipated that public in-water access will be provided at the south peninsula edge.

33. Q: “Resiliency measures to protect the peninsula” is mentioned. Does this refer to flood risks mitigation or other type or resiliency?

A: These measures refer to storm surge and flood risks to the peninsula itself. It is not anticipated that this project will protect inland areas from flooding/storm surge.

34. Q: Is the location of the Whitney art piece fixed, or are there opportunities to move its location on the site? If possible, could you please share drawings?

A: The location is fixed. Drawings will be available to Short-Listed Respondents during RFP phase.

35. Q: Is there any known contaminated plume or other type of contamination of the peninsula’s subsurface? If surveyed, please share.

A: There is no known site contamination requiring remediation. Five (feet) of fill was removed and replaced with gravel as a precautionary measure.
36. Q: Are there plans made for the future DSNY Marine Transfer Station to be built on site? If so, please share.

A: More information will be provided as part of the RFP materials, but since this is a potential future project to be constructed by a New York City agency, the Trust does not have plans available to share. As noted, this is a potential future facility with no advanced plans in place.

37. Q: Is it possible to share a detailed CAD of the site with the site boundary?

A: The City of New York Department of Design & Construction will be providing as-built plans, including CAD documentation that will be provided to the selected designer; the Trust does not currently have this available.

38. Q: On RFQ page 16 the Project Team lists “Ecological Designers” as one of the necessary disciplines. Can you provide more details on what is included in the ecological design scope?

A: The scope of services anticipates public in-water access at the south end of the peninsula. The ecological designer will help design this land/water interface.

39. Q: Can you confirm that items a) and b) on the bottom of page 16 are required for both the Prime Firm and all subconsultants?

A: The information referred to (Part 6, section 6.2.2, paragraph 4 a) and b) is only required of the Prime firm.

40. Q: May the similar projects requested in Section 6.2.5 be the same as, or include some of the same projects as the ones in Section 6.2.4.1?

A: Yes.

41. Q: Is the Standard Form 330 to be included in Volume 1 in its entirety under 6.2.2 Project Team Qualifications? Or only resumes and organization chart in Volume 1 and Reference Projects in Volume 2?

A: See response to Question 23.

42. Q: Please confirm whether or not front and back covers will be counted toward the 100-page limit.
A: Front and back covers are not included in the 100-page limit.

43. Q: In Section 6.2.2. Project Team, is the name and business address of each partner, officer, and stockholder who own five percent or more of the shares required of all team members or just the Respondent?

A: Only the prime respondent.

44. Q: Can Section 6.2.2. Project Team Resumes be formatted as desired, provided that required information within Standard 330 Form Section E is included?

A: Yes, Project Team Resumes be formatted as desired, provided that required information within Standard 330 Form Section E is included.

45. Q: Are full resumes, in addition to Standard 330 Form Section E Resumes, required?

A: Yes.

46. Q: Please confirm that Section 6.2.5. Reference Projects can be formatted as desired, provided that required information within Standard 330 Form Section F is included.

A: Reference Projects can be formatted as desired, provided that required information within Standard 330 Form Section F is included.

47. Q: Please confirm that Section 6.2.5. Reference Projects do not count towards the 100-page limit.

A: Reference Projects do count toward the 100-page limit.

48. Q: Please confirm the Reference Projects in Section 6.2.5. may also include proposed sub-consultant experience.

A: Yes, Reference Projects in Section 6.2.5. may also include proposed sub-consultant experience; however, the respondent must provide a separate SF330 for each proposed subconsultant.

49. Q: Can Reference Projects listed in Section 6.2.5. be in progress?

A: Yes
50. Q: Please clarify which parts of Section 6.2.6 Respondent’s Financial Qualifications count towards the 100-page limit and which do not count.

A: See Addendum No. 1 on the Website. Volume 3 shall have no page limitation.

51. Q: The 6.2.6.2 Direct Financial Questions begins with 2. Material Adverse Changes in Financial Position. Please confirm that this is the first question of the Questionnaire.

A: Yes, this is the first questions of the Questionnaire. Please see Addendum No. 1 for correction.

52. Q: What is the expected frequency of DSNY sanitation trucks to and from the site? Has this been identified?

A: The only known non-Trust related vehicle usage is FDNY vehicles accessing the existing Marine One facility. Part of the scope of services, to be further defined in the RFP, will be close coordination with the FDNY through design. There is no current planned DSNY use of the site. A DSNY Marine Transfer Station MAY be built in the future and a conceptual design task, to be further defined in the RFP, will be to demonstrate how a design/program could accommodate future construction of such a facility.

53. Q: Is this project currently under any other pre-existing permits, beyond the NYS DEC permit? Have other agencies been identified as needing permits?

A: In-water work within Hudson River Park is subject to regulatory approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“USACE”) and NYS DEC. The Trust has existing umbrella permits from both the USACE and NYSDEC, though both agencies will have to issue permits for specifically proposed construction once detailed designs are available. The design team will be required to provide plans and support during the permitting process. The Trust has also previously secured a Coastal Zone Consistency Determination from the New York State Department of State (“NYSDOS”) and NYC Department of City Planning. NYS Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”) will have to review the project given the bulkhead is a historic resource. More information will be provided as part of the RFP materials.

54. Q: Paragraph 2.6 states that “there are no environmental reviews applicable to the development of the project site.” Are there any planned future environmental reviews for site?
A:  The entirety of Hudson River Park was previously subject of a comprehensive environmental impact statement under SEQRA and CEQR, and the Trust has continued to review build-out of the park for consistency with such reviews. If needed based on a specific design program, HRPT may require design support for additional environmental for Gansevoort, though the designers would not take the lead in this process. More information will be available in the RFP.

55. Q:   6.2.2 - Project team: We believe that wayfinding/signage designers will be required in addition to the list.

A:  Please see response to Question 28. HRPT has an approved wayfinding/signage system and would work with the design team to site and implement such signage.

56. Q:  Environmental engineer may be need to assess the site given its previous use by the Department of Sanitation. (Previous uses included a salt shed, transfer station, garbage destruction plant and a garage)

A:  Please see response to Question 54.

57. Q:  Can the Trust confirm that a complete asbestos abatement was performed along with demolition of exiting sanitation buildings?

A:  A complete asbestos abatement was performed as part of the NYC DDC demolition work. The report will be included in as-built materials and will be provided to the consultant selected through the subsequent RFP process.

58. Q:  What is the program development process and schedule expectation? Monthly community meetings for 9 months? Or focused on 3 specific community groups, etc?

A:  Program development process and schedule expectations will be more detailed in the RFP materials.

59. Q:  Regarding the potential future waste transfer station, how big might it be and can you describe its nature.

A:  Please see response to Question 36.

60. Q:  Is a Marine Engineer required to be listed as a subconsultant on our team? The PPT presentation excluded this discipline.
A: A marine engineer should be included due to the proposed reconstruction of the north and south peninsula edges.

61.Q: Our firm has submitted a proposal for the Owner’s Representative RFP A4989. If we are selected for that RFP, I understand we will be precluded from Gansevoort Peninsula, or other design RFQ’s. If we have subs on the owner’s rep contract, are they also precluded from future design RFP’s? When will the decision be made on the short list or selection for the Owner’s Rep RFP?

A: Whether a firm is precluded from proposing on future solicitations will depend on several project specific factors will be determined on a case by case basis. The Trust expects to have a selection for Owner’s Representative by the end of November 2018.