1. **Has DEP or Parks conducted any preliminary analyses or site assessments? The RFP mentions data available from NYC Parks and other entities. Are there topographic surveys of each site? Does survey or as-builts of the drainage network for each site exist?**

NYC Parks has identified potential sites for GI interventions, as discussed in the Harlem River Watershed Management Plan.

NYC Parks has the following data available for each of the sites:

- Site visit notes on observed flooding issues along pathway flooding in Moshulu Parkway
- MS4 spatial data at Ft. Independence Park; data available is outside of the project area, however (western section of park)

As part of this project the consultant will review all available records. Parks will facilitate record requests to Parks mapfile unit during the site assessment phase.

The USDA and NYC DEP prepared reports on subsurface conditions nearby that might be of use:

- https://bceq.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/TripReport_geophysical_Grove_Bronx_CHS.pdf
- bceq.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Advanced-Schematic-Design_Sedgwick-Dickinson_Karen-9.16.2020-1.pdf

2. Are there planned projects by NYC Parks, NYCDEP, NYCDOT, or other agencies at either site? Can these plans be made available to bidders?

Parks Capital is currently in the design phase for two projects, a Playground Reconstruction and a Public Restroom Building Construction at Fort Independence park.Both are outside the project area but within the park. Projected completion of both projects is June 2026.

NYC Parks is not aware of any other projects planned for the project areas at either site at this time.

3. Have nature-based stormwater management features been implemented previously at either site?

Trees have been recently planted at Mosholu.

4. Who is expected to maintain the proposed features once constructed?

NYC Parks would maintain the proposed features. As part of this effort, HRF is supporting local community stewardship organizations who might be able to assist.

5. Are either of these sites included in ongoing NYCDEP or NYC Parks stormwater management/CSO reduction planning or design work?

No.

6. Is the intent that the deliverables produced under this project will be used by NYC Parks or DEP to progress through future phases of design? If not, who will need future phases?

Yes, if sustainable solutions are feasible, the intent is to secure funding for additional phases of design.

7. Does HRF or City agencies have funding identified for future design or implementation?

HRF and NYC Parks have identified potential sources of funds for future design and implementation but that funding is not yet secured.

8. The project limits for the Mosholu Parkway site are extensive and encompass a range of typologies. Is the intent to develop concept designs for the entire project area (i.e. all drainage areas within the limits included in the RFP) or are select concept designs for 1-3 locations within the limits acceptable?

Ideally, the concepts would address all drainage areas but preparation of select concept designs for the most important 1-3 locations is acceptable.

9. Does HRF intend to publish the deliverables from this project? Would this require a QAPP? Should we assume that a QAPP is required?

If you plan to publish, post, distribute, analyze, or otherwise use data collected through monitoring or other means (including data collected previously by you or others), proposals will be required to develop a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) that must be approved by HEP and EPA before any monitoring or data analysis can begin. HEP staff will provide technical assistance for the development of the QAPP, if needed, but be sure to allocate time and effort for QAPP preparation as part of the proposal.

10. Is it expected that consultants are to provide pro-bono or in-kind support and does this factor into proposal evaluation?

Pro bono and/or in-kind support is not required but should be indicated and will be considered in evaluation of proposals.

11. Should the work samples in the appendices be within the last 5 years?

Ideally, the work samples should be within the last 5 years but you can include others if they are more relevant. Please date such samples.

12. On the "Key Personnel" Page in the portal, do we need to create an account for anyone that would be working on the project even if they are not working on the proposal?

It's not necessary to add all personnel working on the project, this should include primary team personnel or anyone who will need to review the proposal within the portal. Personnel can also be added to the program in the portal post-award.

13. For key personnel who will work on the project, do we submit their qualifications through the Key Personnel page on the portal or can we post PDF resumes in addition to the 8-pages we are allotted in the PDF submittal?

You should submit key personnel qualifications as part of the 'Professional Merits and Experience' section in the Project Description attachment (see page 9 of the RFP). This can include links to key personnel resumes, LinkedIns, or other relevant resources to demonstrate past work.

14. Can we see an example contract for applicants?

Yes. Please request an example contract from Christina Carrero (christina@hudsonriver.org).

15. Will digital AutoCAD or Civil 3d file formats be available from NYC Parks Mapfile Unit or just PDFs of topographical surveys?

AutoCAD files may be available for recent projects, but likely only PDFs will be available. Availability of AutoCAD files varies based on site. As part of this project the consultant will review all available records.

16. Is digital subsurface utility information available as part of the above surveys or otherwise available for the two project areas?

If not available in Parks mapfile records, then subsurface utility information is not available.

17. In terms of project reviews and incorporation of feedback, what is the assumed role of City agencies?

NYC Parks is the property owner and main stakeholder. NYC Parks is part of the project team and will review and comment on project deliverables.

18. Do the concept designs need to follow any particular format (i.e. Public Design Commission components for typical conceptual design submission?)

Parks can provide a preliminary design template.

19. Are there any specific green infrastructure design standards that are required to be utilized within the park property when considering proposed practices?

Parks preference is to utilize vegetated stormwater management practices and re-grading to manage stormwater at these sites. Please reference the NYC Stormwater Manual for guidance and follow DEP green infrastructure design standards when applicable.

20. Are practices within the ROW under DOT and/or DEP jurisdiction under consideration and if so, are there specific standards and/or practices that are required to be used in making stormwater calculations for design of GI?

No, the ROW is not part of the project area for either site. Project areas and interventions should be proposed on Parks property for ease of coordination and implementation.

21. If soil borings are decided to be part of the approach, what is the permitting pathway and associated timeline for borings on Parks and/or DOT properties?

Conservative estimate of 3-4 weeks for permitting from application to issuance. Permits can be applied for on the Parks website. Applicable permits include Construction Permit (there is a box to check for exploratory work), and Tree work permit (required for work within 50' of a street tree or Parks property tree – may or may not be needed depending on boring location). Parks point of contact would help facilitate the permits after they are applied for.

22. The 30% plans are to include non-structural /stewardship interventions. Can this definition be clarified?

Interventions include planting events, vegetation management events, or other maintenance work identified that humans can do, etc

23. The 30% plans are to include site drainage. May we assume that this would be improvements to overland grading that would facilitate better drainage towards existing drainage infrastructure? Or is the project seeking new below-ground pipes and detention as well?

- In Moshulu parkway there is no known infrastructure in the project area - though when we pull historic records for the site, the consultant will review and confirm. Thus, we anticipate interventions to include re-grading to facilitate better drainage and encourage ponding away from pedestrian pathways.
- In Fort Independence park, there is some drainage infrastructure in the project area - again, we will see what we can learn from historic records. Interventions may include re-grading and a management of stormwater via a rain garden, but it's possible the stormwater overflow may connect to existing Parks drainage infrastructure for the rain garden, for example.

24. Are site borings required?

No, site borings are not a required task, they are an optional task and additional funding up to $10,000 is available to accommodate this work.

25. Is it possible to submit a proposal with a higher budget?

You may submit a proposal that outlines the tasks from the RFP that are feasible to complete with the given budget ($60,000 with an optional additional $10,000 for soil borings). Please also include a note with cost estimates for all remaining tasks.

26. Would you accept proposals for alternative/partial tasks from those outlined in the RFP?

You may submit an LOI and/or full proposal under any of the following alternatives:

- Conceptual design - You may submit a proposal for only the conceptual designs as opposed to full schematic designs (completing Tasks I and II and completing a summary report and community board presentation under Task III) but please note cost estimates to complete schematic designs.
- One site - You may submit a proposal for work on one of the two sites (with or without soil borings) but please note cost estimates to complete the additional site.

27. The grant portal, ProposalCentral, appears to be more suited for academic institutions or non-profits and there are several fields in the application that are not applicable to a consultant/subcontractor. How should those fields be addressed?

The Hudson River Foundation uses the same portal for both our grants and professional services contracts. Please ignore or include N/A (not applicable) for any questions that are not relevant to you while filling out the proposal. If you have any questions about specific fields, please contact Christina Carrero at christina@hudsonriver.org.

28. The RFP requests "Work Samples: Add a PDF attachment of printed materials describing comparable projects your firm has undertaken." Can you please clarify if you are seeking sample drawings and diagrams, or narrative explanations of past projects are acceptable?

Either narratives and/or sample drawings are acceptable.

29. On the submission portal, under budget detail, we see a statement that "Applicants should plan to expend about 30% of the budget by August 31, 2025." Since this date has passed, can you please clarify if there is a different target date by which 30% of the budget should be spent?

Please ignore that statement, it applied to a separate RFP and should have been removed. There is no set target date for 30% of the budget for this project.

30. The budget submission includes a separate line item for “Fringe” costs, which we interpret to mean overhead costs that we typically account for in our rates. Can you please clarify what you are looking for under this entry?

Fringe here refers to employee benefits including vacation, holiday, and sick time . If that is accounted for in your overall rates, then you can note that in the budget summary and put “0” for Fringe.