

Addendum

RFP #2026-01

Design Services for Shingle Street Stream Crossing: Engineering Feasibility Study/Design Report

Q&A

1. On the Fee Proposal Form, we have a number of team members that would work on this assignment. Are you looking for the average hourly rate to be input under the “Billed Hourly Rate” column? If that is the case, how are subconsultant costs broken out on this form? **Proposals could be submitted as lump-sum not-to-exceed fee with supporting hourly breakdown. Subconsultants can be broken out in the same way.**

2.
 - a. Is it possible to schedule a site visit to the location? **Yes. It is a public road with public (State owned) property on both sides.**
 - b. Is there any format of engineering qualifications the district would like to see (staff resumes, example projects, etc.)? **No**

3. XXXX Engineers is interested in submitting a proposal for the above RFP and would appreciate any available information regarding the following:
 - a. Condition Evaluation **see NAACC record Id 101308 (https://naacc.org/naacc_display_crossing.cfm?qId=101308) for data and photos of current culvert.**
 - b. Record Plans **No plans currently exist**

4. We are reviewing the Shingle Street Stream Crossing Engineering Feasibility Study / Design Report RFP #2026-01 and have the following questions for clarification:
 - a. **Survey limits**
If a topographic survey is expected, does the District have preferred survey limits upstream, downstream, and along Shingle Street, or should the consultant propose

limits sufficient to support the feasibility report and conceptual design? **The consultant should propose limits sufficient to support the feasibility report and conceptual design**

b. Property ownership and access

The RFP notes that both sides of the road are owned by New York State and may require a Temporary Revocable Permit. Will the District or Town secure site access / NYS permission for field work, or should the consultant include this coordination in its scope? **If required for the purposes of this study, the consultant should include this coordination in its scope.**

c. Floodplain / floodway status

Based on preliminary FEMA mapping review, the crossing does not appear to be located within a FEMA regulatory floodway. Please confirm whether the District has any contrary information or whether a formal FEMA no-rise analysis is expected. **The District does not have any contrary information regarding the site's location in a FEMA floodway and the site location does not appear on the latest FEMA Flood map.**

d. Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling expectations

Does the District have a preferred modeling approach or software for the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis, such as HEC-RAS, HY-8, StreamStats, or other methods? **No, as long as the analysis done is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the NYS DEC guidelines listed on the Non Point Source Planning Grant's Culvert Repair and Replacement Engineering Feasibility Study/Design Report Outline factsheet.**

e. Existing information

Does the District have any existing information available for the crossing, such as prior inspection reports, Town highway records, culvert dimensions, photographs, flooding history, maintenance history, prior survey, or the NAACC assessment file? **See NAACC record Id 101308 (https://naacc.org/naacc_display_crossing.cfm?aqlid=101308) for data and photos of current culvert.**

f. Geotechnical work

Should the consultant assume that borings, test pits, subsurface investigation, pavement cores, or geotechnical design are excluded from this feasibility study? **Yes....we were not expecting any of the above activities.**

g. Wetlands and environmental resources

Should the consultant include wetland delineation, threatened/endangered species review, cultural resources review, or habitat assessments, or only identify anticipated environmental permitting needs based on desktop review and site reconnaissance? **Identification of wetlands and environmental resources should be sufficient to identify any anticipated regulatory approval and permits that would be required for culvert replacement.**

h. Opinion of probable construction cost

Does the District want the report to include an opinion of probable construction cost for the recommended alternative and/or for multiple alternatives? **Yes, that would be looked upon favorably.**

i. Meetings

Beyond the kickoff meeting identified in the RFP, should the consultant include additional meetings, such as a draft report review meeting or presentation to the District Board / Town? **Yes, at least one draft report review meeting.**

j. **Fee proposal format**

The fee form provides space for estimated hours, hourly rates, estimated charge, and maximum amount. Should the proposal be submitted as a lump-sum not-to-exceed fee with supporting hourly breakdown, or as a time-and-materials not-to-exceed proposal?

Proposals could be submitted as lump-sum not-to-exceed fee with supporting hourly breakdown.

k. **Schedule**

The RFP states that the District anticipates completing the study/design report within an 8-to-12-month period. Is there a preferred completion date or milestone schedule that the District would like proposers to follow?

Completion by March 2027 would be preferred.