

Purchase College Project RFQ-05-08-15 Addendum
Green Infrastructure Project
Addendum #01- Consultant's Questions & Answers

Q1. Is the Feasibility Study performed in June 2014 available for review?

A1. **This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>

Q2. Has a construction budget been determined for the project?

A2. **This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>

Q3. Is a copy of the Grant Application for this project available for review?

A3. **This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>

Q4. Provide Complete RFP

A4. **To date, RFP has not been completed.**

Q5. Availability of topo Survey, and Storm Drainage Collection system maps

A5. **This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>

Q6. Copy of EFC approval of bioswales and their denial of Porous pavement

A6. **See below response from EFC's Carrie VanDerhoof.**

The EFC team has prepared the technical comments below following our review of the document entitled "Feasibility Study for SUNY Purchase College", dated June 16, 2014 stamped by Susannah C. Drake, RLA.

Overall the team finds the feasibility study acceptable, but would like to call out some items for Purchase College to acknowledge and be prepared to address them in the next deliverable which is a Design Report. The desired content of a Design Report is outlined in the attached document and is an more robust representation of the project details.

- 1. Two green practices are identified in Feasibility Study, bioretention and porous pavement installation. The team here at EFC has concerns about the effectiveness of the porous**

- pavement as proposed. Installing porous pavement adjacent to existing pedestrian paths would replace pervious cover and provides minimal stormwater runoff capture and infiltration. The water quality benefit of installing porous pavement could be maximized by locating porous pavement in a location that is replacing impervious cover and has a larger and more defined stormwater catchment area. The team recommends looking at the existing parking lots for areas where the installation of porous pavement would provide the greatest benefit for the cost. We would be glad to review this in more detail in a conference call with your Facilities Management team and/or your design consultant.
2. Please note that to be grant-eligible, the bioretention practices proposed must meet performance measures in the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual. While variations on the design may be acceptable, NYSDEC approval of the final design will be required.
 3. Page 10 of the feasibility study provides stormwater calculations for the bioretention practices for parking lots W-1 and W-2. For Drainage Basin A – the Water Quality Volume (WQv) of 7,786 cubic feet is greater than the Actual Storage Volume (Vs) of the practice of 7,070 cubic feet. The WQv cannot exceed the Vs. As you progress the design, please note the Vs should meet or exceed the WQv.
 4. Page 10 stormwater calculation for Bioretention B also shows the WQv exceeding the Vs. Please note the units on Vs is in square feet not cubic feet. Please check the units and ensure the through design that Vs equals or exceeds WQv.
 5. The runoff from W1 and W2 will travel significant distances before reaching the bioretention areas. Is this expected to be sheet-flow by the time it reaches the practices? Please indicate whether energy dissipation measures will be needed and whether the pea gravel and/or plantings are at risk for erosion. (Note: pea gravel may not be the appropriate media for this application as flow may wash it out. Recommend using more substantial stone material).
 6. The diagram for the bioretention practice (Page 5) shows a compacted subgrade. Please note that proper infiltration, the subgrade must not be compacted during construction. This note will need to be modified to indicate non-compacted subgrade.
 7. Please note the USGS Soil Classification where bioretention practices are proposed is classified as “urban land” and may need soil amendment to ensure appropriate infiltration and overall performance of the practice.
 8. Please note that the depth to bedrock is noted as 6-ft in the areas bioretention is to be installed. As design progresses, more investigations may be warranted to ensure the practice can be designed to work effectively.
 9. Please note the depth to water table was not cited in the feasibility study. This should be investigated in each area green practices are proposed and summarized in the design report.
 10. Please verify the location of the green practices relative to 100-year floodplain. It is important that all green practices be located outside of 100-yr. floodplain (or floodway).
 11. Please provide a project schedule. It would be helpful to know the timeline from RFQ/RPF for a design consultant, design report finalization, plan and specification development, bidding and awarding, and lastly construction commencement and completion.

Purchase College Project RFQ-05-08-15 Addendum
Green Infrastructure Project

Addendum #01- Consultant's Questions & Answers

Carrie D. VanDerhoof, P.E., CPESC
Environmental Project Engineer II
Phone: 518-402-7461
Email: Carrie.VanDerhoof@efc.ny.gov

- Q7. Any subsurface information, geotechnical assessment, test borings
- A7. The feasibility study did not address Q7. However, see link for previous work done on campus that partly answers the question: <http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>**
- Q8. Location of buried underground utilities
- A8. This information can be found on the link: <http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>**
- Q9. Is it going to be a SUCF form of contract, another one you use or can it be the consultants form of agreement?
- A9. This contract conforms to Purchase College contracts**
- Q10. Will the costs of the topographic survey and geotechnical investigation be taken from the Design & Engineering budget?
- A10. Yes**
- Q11. Are there specific requirements for a geotechnical investigation?
- A11. See EFC design guidelines, <http://www.efc.ny.gov/Default.aspx?tabid=445>**
- Q12. Will Construction Administration services fall under the Engineering budget or the Construction budget?
- A12. See EFC design guidelines, <http://www.efc.ny.gov/Default.aspx?tabid=445>**
- Q13. Which entities (Purchase College, EFC, etc.?) will be reviewing the Designs?

Purchase College Project RFQ-05-08-15 Addendum
Green Infrastructure Project

Addendum #01- Consultant's Questions & Answers

- A13. Purchase College will be reviewing the Design but ultimately the NYS Environmental Facilities Corporation (ECF) will approve the design.**
- Q14. Will exceptions to the Terms and Conditions of this contract be considered prior to issuance of the contract?
- A14. Terms and Conditions of the RFQ cannot be altered however the winning bidder will have an opportunity to negotiate Terms and Conditions.**
- Q15. Does SUNY have a standard up-front and technical set of specifications that will apply to this project or is the consultant to provide these?
- A15. The technical specifications that apply to this project are per EFC's guidelines.**
- Q16. Is the need for a SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) anticipated for this project?
- A16. See EFC design guidelines, <http://www.efc.ny.gov/Default.aspx?tabid=445>**
- Q17. Would the College be opposed to losing any parking spaces? If not, what would be the max amount?
- A17. Other than temporarily losing parking spaces due to construction, the College is opposed to permanently losing any parking spaces.**
- Q18. What is the name of the consultant who prepared the feasibility study?
- A18. Dland Studios LLC**
- Q19. Will that consultant be allowed to participate in this project?
- A19. No**
- Q20. When will you provide access to the cost proposal prepared as part of the feasibility study that was used for the basis of the \$850,000 grant?
- A20. The cost proposal should not be construed as the actual cost of the project thus is not provided.**
- Q21. Is part of the construction cost to include resurfacing of the 165, 527 square feet parking lot?

Purchase College Project RFQ-05-08-15 Addendum
Green Infrastructure Project
Addendum #01- Consultant's Questions & Answers

- A21. No**
- Q22. Will we be able to review the site survey to be used for construction prior to the RFQ due date?
- A22. This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>
- Q23. When will we be able to review the drainage as-builts for the existing storm drainage system prior to the RFQ due date?
- A23. This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>
- Q24. In the pre-proposal site visit/meeting the 165, 527 square feet was a portion of the W2 Parking Lot. In the RFQ the scope of work includes survey and analysis of W1 and W2 parking lots. Please clarify what areas we will be investigating.
- A24. See Feasibility Report. This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>
- Q25. Are there GIS or topographical maps available for the entire watershed?
- A25. This information can be found on the link:**
<http://www.purchase.edu/purchasemeansbusiness>
- Q26. As a WBE prime do we qualify to satisfy the WBE requirements outlined in the RFQ?
- A26. Yes, your company would satisfy the WBE requirements however your company would still have to show how it would satisfy the MBE portion of the project.**
- Q27. Regarding the insurance requirements listed in item 18. These requirements appear to be excessive for a project of this size and complexity and are a problem for a small WBE/MBE. We have never been required to meet these requirements on any of our existing SUNY Construction Fund projects, to whom can we appeal these limits to be changed to \$1million/\$3million?
- A27. The insurance requirements were set by SUNY thus the College does not plan to amend this requirement.**

Purchase College Project RFQ-05-08-15 Addendum
Green Infrastructure Project
Addendum #01- Consultant's Questions & Answers

- Q28. The RFQ does not require a cost proposal. How will M & WBE participation be determined and confirmed?
- A28. The minimum of 30 percent of MWBE participation will be confirmed during negotiations with the winning bidder on the project.**
- Q29. The project will require certain supplemental professional services, such as topographic surveying. Are these considered part of the consultant fee or can they be listed as reimbursable expenses?
- A29. Supplemental professional services are considered part of the consultant fee.**
- Q30. The feasibility study's budget breakdown included costs for monitoring [design] and monitoring expenses. Are these considered part of the consultant fee or are they to be listed as reimbursable expenses?
- A30. Costs incurred for monitoring expenses will be handled by Purchase College's Environmental Sciences Department.**
- Q31. Is the consultant responsible for permitting, or will the consultant prepare documentation for the College's facilities department to file?
- A31. The College is self-permitting; however, all work performed on campus must conform to all local, state, and federal laws.**
- Q32. Part I: Section 4, Submit six (6) complete bound Qualifications, one of which must have original signatures.
- A32. Rather than submitting six (6) complete bound Qualifications, submit five (5) complete bound Qualifications, one of which must have original signatures.**