

Boston & Albany Rail Trail Feasibility Study
Request for Proposal Questions Received as of August 1, 2018

1. Item 4.9.9 on page 11 of the RFP references completion of a cost summary form. Will CEDC provide this cost summary form or does the CEDC just wish to receive a general summary of our proposed costs?
 - a. **Only a general summary of your proposed costs will be required.**

2. Item 6.3.1 on page 12 of the RFP references as “enclosed agreement” although we were not able to locate this agreement/draft contract for review. Can you direct us to where this item is located so that we may review it in advance of our submittal?
 - a. **The proposed contract will be a standard professional services contract. Please note that if you have a standard contract that you regularly use, you may attach it to your proposal.**

3. Will there be an opportunity to supplement funding by way of other grant funds?
 - a. **No**

4. What is the level of municipal support, public support for the project?
 - a. **It is difficult to determine the levels of support until such time as the various recommended routes are identified.**

5. Given the need for late season field investigations, will the county or other entities be able to mow or reduce vegetation in areas to be investigated?
 - a. **No**

6. This RFP asks the consultant to provide a list of subconsultants. Since this is a feasibility study, will you please clarify what types of subconsultants is referred to in this RFP?
 - a. **Engagement of any possible sub consultants are not required or anticipated but up to the individual firms responding.**

7. This RFP asks that the consultant have experience in developing and recommending policies. Please clarify policies that may be part of this feasibility study.
 - a. **Demonstrated familiarity and experience with other Rail Trail Development will be sufficient.**

8. The consultant is asked to provide content for implementing community outreach. Will the consultant be asked to attend outreach sessions (in addition to the four (4) meetings with CEDC and CLC)?
 - a. **The Consultants will not be asked to attend any outreach sessions as part of the Feasibility Study.**

9. The proposal is to be in 8.5 x 11" format. Shall this be in portrait or landscape format? If the proposal is in landscape format, it may be more easily adapted to projection (maps and diagrams) during community outreach.
 - a. **As long as the proposal can be sent electronically, it will be fine.**

10. Both the 1999 Feasibility Study and the RFP identify portions of the land are in private ownership. Have any of these landowners been approached previously regarding use of the land, and if so, are there any who have strong opinions against the use of their land under any circumstances?
 - a. **None of the landowners have been contacted concerning the use of their land. Please remember that this is a feasibility study only and if the study indicates that such a project could possibly work, then the actual implementation of the plan would occur.**

11. Please explain why a two month turnaround time was chosen and is there any flexibility to this schedule?
 - a. **The two month turn around time frame was chosen by the staff of CEDC and the CLC after several meetings as an adequate time frame for the completion of the study. As for flexibility, there may be some room to alter this time frame, if substantial evidence of a need to extend the time line is provided.**

12. Will the project time frame allow for a full featured public engagement process, including allowing the public to review and react to mapping and other data gathered during the project?
 - a. **At this time there is no planned public engagement process planned as part of the feasibility study.**

13. Do you intend to initiate a deed search of potentially-affected properties within the corridor?
 - a. **No deed searches will be required.**

14. Is property disposition data currently online for the potentially-affected properties within the corridor?
- a. The County Real Property Tax Service has online the tax roll information for all parcels within the corridor.**
15. How many privately owned properties are there within the corridor?
- a. A preliminary review of the corridor indicated 12 privately owned parcels and three municipally owned parcels.**
16. Will CEDC arrange access to privately-owned property within the corridor for inventory purposes?
- a. No, if required, a letter of introduction will be provided to the contractor.**
17. What, if any, inventorying needs to be done for alternative routings/alignments/corridors proposed by the consultant?
- a. The consultant should keep in mind that the purpose of this study is to determine the feasibility of connecting the Empire Trail in the City of Hudson to the Harlem Valley Trail in Philmont. If the consultant believes other, more feasible routes are available, he/she would be required to complete all of the inventorying for that alternative route.**
18. For utility mapping and identification of potential conflicts with utilities, can we rely on existing mapping of the utilities or do you expect that utilities would be field identified by the consultant team?
- a. The consultant should use existing mapping for the corridor review. However it may be necessary for a more detail identification of the utility infra-structure if a conflict is discovered during the inventory. The consultant should identify any conflicts and provide any alternatives that he/she deems feasible.**
19. What level of detail will CEDC require for the “general assessment of existing bridges, canals, culverts and/or tunnels?
- a. Structural engineering reports will not be required for these items. The consultant should make a general assessment and include in the study a description of what constitutes “excellent , good, fair or poor” assessment for each of the items located during the inventory.**

20. What level of detail will CEDC require for the Natural Features inventory?

- a. **The Natural Features inventory would include general physical features such as wetlands, cliffs, ponds, streams, etc. No wetland delineation would be required for the feasibility study.**

UPDATED 8.08.18/cwilber