
BPCA’S RESPONSE TO SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS:

The following responses are provided to substantive questions received by Battery Park City Authority (“BPCA”) by 5:00 p.m. E.S.T. on July 21, 2023, in connection with this RFP. The Responses are provided in bold, italicized print immediately following the Questions. Please note that all capitalized terms shall have the same definitions as provided in the RFP. Also, note that, via a forthcoming addendum, BPCA will provide responses to any additional substantive questions received between July 21, 2023 and the new/extended questions submission due date (referenced in Addendum #2).

1. Is it possible to get an extension?
Please refer to Addendum #2 for the extended Proposals due date.
2. If a firm is a subconsultant to the CM team or any other BPCA Prime contracts, will be precluded from responding to this RFP as a Prime?
Please refer to Addendum #1 for the RFP clarification statement that addresses this question.
3. How many firms will be selected for this procurement?
There is no pre-determined number of firms to be selected for the Pre-Qualified Panel. The number of firms ultimately chosen will depend on the quality and content of Proposals, and how the Committee determines that the Services would be best addressed.
4. Is the fee cap per contract or for each of the specific areas?
The “fee cap” within the RFP refers to the cap for the Services in total, and will likely vary from year to year based upon projected BPCA needs as recommended by the Real Property Department.

Is it acceptable to identify M/WBE subconsultants at a later date if/when we receive a task order with specific scope requirements? Will this approach affect Technical Evaluation scoring for part D) Approach to the Services, including overall quality and clarity of Proposal, proposed sub-consultants, and approach to staffing assignments, communication, and responsiveness/scheduling protocols?

Yes – that is acceptable. Please note that, given that no M/WBE or SDVOB goals have been established at this time – due to the pre-qualified nature of this procurement, and as stated in the RFP’s Exhibit B – Proposers’ proposed M/WBE / SDVOB utilization plans will not have an impact on the Committee’s scoring of Technical Proposals. However, once a Proposer is selected for inclusion in the Pre-Qualified Panel, BPCA’s contract with such firm will be assessed for M/WBE / SDVOB utilization goals.

5. In reference to the sub-areas listed on page 1 of the RFP, Section II Overview, does risk management refer to contract risk management or flood risk management?
For the purposes of this procurement – “risk management” refers to contract and project risk management, not flood risk management.
6. Could you please provide clarity on what we could expect the MBE/WBE/SDVOB goals for future task orders so that we can appropriately structure our team?
The MWBE/SDVOB goals will remain the same, and be based on the total final Contract value.

7. During the pre-proposal conference on Monday, July 17th, BPCA stated that a list of precluded consultants would be posted. Could you please confirm that this list will be made available?
Please see the response to Question #2, above.
8. Will consultants be eligible for escalation of rates on an annual basis?
Yes, contracts for the selected Proposer(s) will include provision for periodic (no more frequently than annually), industry-standard rates escalations subject to BPCA's review and approval.
9. Could you provide clarification on whether the anticipated annual spend for the agreement is in total or is per successful proposer?
As stated in Section IV. B., the anticipated total value of all Services will likely range from seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000) to three-hundred and fifty-thousand dollars (\$350,000) per year – subject to a fee cap that will require annual approval by the BPCA Board.
10. In the Technical Evaluation criteria on page 11 of the RFP, it is stated that the proposal will be evaluated on "...projects in New York City." However, Question 9 on page 6 of the RFP asks that we detail our team's experience with similar work "...with an emphasis on New York State public entities". Could you please clarify if you would like us to present New York City entity experience or New York state entity experience?
Section VII. A., 9) asks the Proposer to describe its proposed team's experience with New York State public entities, whereas Section X C. 1) A. relates to the Proposers' experience providing technical/general advisory services on large urban infrastructure projects – especially such projects in New York City. Proposers should include descriptions of its experience with similar work performed for both New York State public entities and New York City public entities.
11. Question 6 subsection E on page 6 of the RFP asks that we provide proof of NYS licensure for Key Personnel. As this is an advisory on-call, with no design required, could you please confirm if the following certifications and other related certifications would suffice to fulfill this requirement: PMI, DBIA, AACE, AAA, etc.
As stated in Section V. 1), all Key Personnel must be lawfully authorized to do business in New York State. The New York State licensure requirement mentioned in Section VII. A., 6) only dapplies to Key Personnel that are already required by New York State to have a professional license in order to practice in the State. That being said, Proposers are welcome to list relevant certifications in their Proposals.

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