



ESSEX COUNTY OFFICE OF THE MANAGER

7551 Court Street · P.O. Box 217 · Elizabethtown, New York 12932
Telephone (518) 873-3332 · Fax (518) 873-3339

Daniel L. Palmer
County Manager

Linda M. Wolf
Purchasing Agent

TO: All Bidders

FROM: Linda Wolf, CPA, Purchasing Agent

DATE: October 8, 2015

SUBJECT: Addendum #3 RFP ROME DAM ENGINEERING SERVICES

This Addendum, issued to bid document holders of record, indicates changes to the bid documents for the RFP for *ROME DAM ENGINEERING SERVICES* Opening October 14, 2015.

Please note that the RFP OPENING DATE has been extended to October 21, 2015 at 2:00 P.M.

Please see attached Questions & Answers.

END OF ADDENDUM # 3

#	Questions	Answers
1	Task 4.6 and 4.7 are more in line with evaluations that are conducted if the dam remains. Is the town including these tasks in case dam removal is not a feasible alternative?	Task 4.6 and 4.7 have to be completed in the report. Those items will assist the community in selecting a desired alternatives Dam safety - 4.6 may be better written - Perform hydrogic and hydraulic analysis required for alternitive(s) presented. - ie - review of ability to pass spillway design flood, stability assessment, etc. If the dam is to remain then an EA will be required to demonstrate the dam meets safety criteria. - 4.7 - Inundation mapping for sunny day and flood scenerio - is this to verify hazard class, or for Emergency Action Plan (EAP) needs if required for the selected alternative - This is unnecessary (4.7) for the existing dam configuration, if dam is to be removed.
2	Relative to the Existing Conditions Plan, what is the geographic extent of the planimetrics. More specifically, penstocks are located below the dam. If dam removal occurs, are the penstocks and other features besides the dam being removed?	The report is to develop dam removal alternatives and all components connected to the structure
3	When was last dam inspection?	Addendum #1 included the Dam inspection.
4	Will all files at DEC and Town on the dam be sent out?	Addendum #1 was released which included documents from the DEC. No other documents will be released. - There are additional documents in our file that can be made available to the engineer awarded the project, if requested, however these documents are historical in nature and were judged marginally or not relevant to the project.
5	Please clarify exactly what you would like scope and fee proposal on. Include alternates? Task 6 design?	Provide a fee proposal for tasks 1-6
6	Is there any sediment data available for the impounded material?	There is no existing sediment data
7	What information exists regarding river flow, elevations, inundation, etc. in the Ausable West Branch during Hurricane Irene?	Irene was deemed a 500 year flood event. It will be the consultants resonsibility to retain information created by outside agencies
8	Has an inspection of the dam been performed to assess pre-Irene and post-Irene conditions? What damage exists as a result of Hurricane Irene? Do any engineers inspections currently exist?	No
9	What existing information/documentation is available for the dam?	The County does not have any inspection data
10	Are there Drawings, DEC inspection reports, flood/inundation mapping, etc.?	DEC provided a DEC inspection in Addendum 1
11	It appears that an FIS was completed in 2002. What type of mapping was used to collect information and complete this hydraulic analysis? (was LIDAR used?) Are there any updates to mapping (i.e. has recent LIDAR been flown?) or to the 2002 FIS?	The County has no updated mapping. Lidar was not used
12	Who is HGA consultants and how are they involved? What is their role/responsibility?	HGA is assisting the state in administering the funding

13	Does Essex County anticipate the need for the Consultant to support grant reporting/assistance? Is there a time limitation for completing this work to receive funding?	We expect the chosen consultant to be capable of grant compliance but the county will administer the project
14	Does information exist on the river profile before the dam was constructed?	The County does not have this information
15	What are the timeline/schedule constraints associated with this project? Contract Development is targeted for November 30: survey, sediment studies, biological studies may not be feasible during winter months.	Technical proposal content is required to have an appropriate timeline detailing major project milestones
16	How is water controlled upstream of dam?	There are no known upstream water control measures in the immediate upstream area
17	When collecting data in and around the dam, and working in the river; is there a requirement to maintain a minimum flow rate in the river?	This will be determined in the design and permitting phase
18	Is it correct to assume that the forms and certificates noted/included in the RFP Appendices I.e., county vendor responsibility form, non-collusive bidding certification, insurance certificates, etc. are not required to be submitted with the proposal?	All forms are required. No exceptions. Proposals that do not include all required forms will be deemed incomplete
19	For bridge crossings upstream and downstream within 3-5 miles of the project site: does survey information exist for these bridges, assessment for scour, etc.? What as-built information exists for these bridges? Have any bridges been removed since the 2002 FIS?	The County does not have any of this information
20	We anticipate that concerns regarding fish, wildlife, and river ecology should be considered during this phase of work with some of the options, but this work is not directly stipulated by the Owner. Please confirm that bidders shall follow all state and federal laws regarding environmental impacts of all options.	Environmental Impacts should be addressed when providing alternatives
21	Has a SEQR been conducted or started? Has it been determined that it's needed?	No. SEQRA cannot be conducted without a project scope
22	Is a sediment transport analysis required as part of the hydraulic study, based on the findings determined on the sediment testing?	Yes
23	Part 3 of the RFP appears to be boiler plate verbiage included with wide range of RFP types. Should we expect to identify labor hours and costs for all tasks/work identified in this section relating to 'Engineer/Consultant'? If not, please identify the parameters of this section that are specifically applicable to this RFP.	All items listed are applicable

24	Please confirm that construction phase services: i.e., bidding, contractor support services, construction oversight, answering RFI's is excluded from this phase of work.	Construction phase services are required as listed in Part 3, Item #6
25	Pertaining to the Engineer/Consultant; please quantify a number of meetings that bidders should propose costs for.	Meetings will be once a month until the project is complete
26	Has the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) been notified of this project? Is the APA aware of the potential options?	There are no plans to be put in front of the APA at this time. Permitting is a task requirement within the RFP
27	Regarding task 6.1 - alternatives, design criteria, and suggested options won't be established until after the feasibility report is presented and discussed. Are consultants expected to price a final design package during this phase of the proposal?	Provide a fee proposal for tasks 1-6
28	Is the consultant preparing all documentation and application information related to permits during the initial phases of this project? Or is this scope expected to occur during the final engineering (task 6.1) phase of the project?	Yes, the consultant is expected to acquire all permits
29	The proposal lists a contract development date of November 30, 2015. For scheduling purposes, what date is the notice to proceed anticipated?	Notice to Proceed is expected to be November 30th 2015
30	Under Technical Proposal Content, Section 4, Management and Staffing, the section requests a staffing plan that includes "...a staff loading-by-task chart showing individual time allocated by task, hourly wage rates and total labor charges". Below that section is a statement "NO DOLLARS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL". These statements are conflicting. Please clarify.	Yes, the staff loading bypass chart showing time allocated by task. Hourly wage rates and total labor charges should be included in cost proposal only.
31	In the allocation of responsibilities section, the first item listed for the engineer/consultant includes participation in public meetings and public hearings. Please clarify what public presentations and hearings anticipated for this project (number of meetings, timing, duration, etc.).	Meetings will be once a month until the project is complete
32	As a public project for which construction is anticipated, we understand that payment of prevailing wages for all work performed by surveyors are required. Please confirm.	Yes
33	Task 2.1 Do you anticipate land acquisitions? This will determine if a full blown ROW/Property Line survey is needed to establish property lines.	Desired alternative will determine if acquisition or easements are necessary

34	Task 2.4 of the Scope of Services restricts the deed and title search to “the dam sites and impoundment-abutting properties. However, on the field visit, it was mentioned that the ownership of lands downstream of the dam (this was specifically mentioned at the downstream pedestrian bridge crossing) is unclear. Please clarify the extent of the lands included in this task as well as how far back in time is this title search required to go?	40 year abstract and title
35	Task 2.5 of the Scope of Services states that the generalized guidelines on conducting historic resource reviews for dam removal projects are attached to the RFP. It was not attached.	We have attached it to this addendum
36	Task 2.5 of the Scope of Services states that the Request for Project Review (RPR) will be completed by the New York State Storm Recovery Office.	The consultant will not be required to complete the RPR. The NYS Office of Storm Recovery will assume that task
37	Task. 4.3 of the scope of services requires a scour analysis of infrastructure. Please clarify if this is for the existing conditions due to a dam breach and its downstream effects, or for the partial and complete removals to evaluate potential scour upstream of the existing dam, or both.	The scour analysis is to determine the potential impact that removing the dam will cause on the surrounding infrastructure.
38	Task 4.5 Scope of Services please clarify if this task is necessary and if so, why.	Yes, Task 4.5 has to be completed. This project is a hazard mitigation project which needs to ensure that dam removal will not impact personal property, public infrastructure and risk to life.
39	Task 4.7 of the Scope of Services requires inundation mapping for dam failure scenarios (sunny day and flood dam failure scenarios). Confirm that this is for the existing dam and any options that do not entirely remove the dam, or only the present condition and final selected alternative?	Yes it is for the existing dam. Alternatives will be developed utilizing mapping to make make a decision on removal. See above - what is purpose of 4.7?
40	Task 5.1 of the Scope of Services requires "Alternatives analysis for the removal of the dam structure." Please confirm that this is one alternative for the complete removal of the dam.	Complete removal is the desired alternative for the Town. Other alternatives are sought to determine cost effectiveness.

41	<p>Task 5.3 of the Scope of Services, the cost estimate developed for the recommended alternatives are to include the cost for engineering services and permitting costs to take the project to bid. Based on this, it would appear that the final engineering costs to bring the preferred alternative to final design should not be included in this RFP, Yet task 6 of the RFP, is the engineering and permitting of the preferred alternative. Because the preferred alternative is not known at this time, we would much prefer not to attempt to price the engineer (if we do, it will require extension assumptions which limit what is included in the final design). Please clarify if the permitting and engineering tasks are to be included in our cost proposal.</p>	<p>Task 6 states if removal is deemed feasible the consultant will retained to develop final plans and specifications. Task 6 is engineering for complete removal.</p>
42	<p>It states that the technical proposal content section should not include dollars. Part 4 of that section states that we must provide hourly wage rates and total labor charges. How do you want this information presented? Or would you prefer that information be provided in the Cost Proposal?</p>	<p>Yes, the staff loading bypass chart showing time allocated by task. Hourly wage rates and total labor charges should be included in cost proposal only.</p>
43	<p>Are W-9 Forms required to be submitted?</p>	<p>Yes, it is required as part of this RFP.</p>
44	<p>Task 6 requires the successful consultant to develop plans and acquire permits for the final design. Not knowing the final design and in an effort to be consistent with other consultants, what assumptions should be made to develop the scope and fee for this task?</p>	<p>All consultants should be consistent with that Task 6, by understanding that dam removal is the most desirable alternate for the Town.</p>
45	<p>Manner of payment for the engineering: Would you prefer to make the payments based on Man-hours or % complete based on the fixed price provided?</p>	<p>Payment would be issued to the consultant via a lump price per task complete.</p>