

Q & A Master Plan RFP

1. The RFP indicates a packet of information will be provided to all firms registered. We have received the floor plans. Will there be any other information made available to the registered firms?

The Asset Works database, which shows the current use of each room, will be made available to all bidders.

2. The RFP notes that the last Facilities Master Plan was completed in 2008. This was reviewed briefly as well in the pre-proposal walkthrough. Will the proposers be able to receive a copy of this before a team is selected, and if so when?

The Associate VP inherited one spiral bound hard copy of a draft of the previous master plan when he came into his position. It is too long and outdated to have someone spend the time making a copy. There is no electronic version available. Bidders are welcome to come to the campus and review this copy. We do not have any plans to distribute copies.

3. Is there a property and topo / utility survey available, and can this be provided for our use in our proposal preparation?

The B&G office has one full size topo map of the college property. An appointment can be made to view the map in the B&G office.

4. For the site utilities and infrastructure analysis outlined in the RFP, is the site/civil consultant to utilize readily available information for the campus OR is the vision and need such that the proposers shall plan to do detailed infrastructure assessments for items such as:
 - a. Hydrant flow testing and modeling of campus water system
 - b. Sanitary sewer system inspection, flow monitoring and modeling
 - c. Storm drainage system inspection and H&H analysis of the campus
 - d. Pavement cores or visual assessment based on record drawings

AND

Please advise with any specifics that may be known relative to what level of site/civil engineering may be anticipated in the study including but not limited to building and site drainage, re-location of utilities, new utilities etc.

We do not anticipate any need for site/civil engineering work in developing the campus master plan. A previous project had delineated drainage requirements for a proposed renovation of the courtyard, and a second project had examined the drainage around the field house. We are aware of issues related to underground electrical wiring maintained by NYSEG, but no engineering work is required to address that problem.

5. We understand from the pre-proposal walkthrough that an assessment of the dormitories is not to be included in the response. The RFP does not specifically mention an assessment of the Athletic facilities on the campus – will this be required?

The Paul Gerry Field House is the primary athletic facility and is included in the scope of work. To the degree that our athletic programs are a critical part of the college's future growth (and our move to Division II indicates they are), then than an assessment of the facilities needed to support these programs will be a part of the final master plan.

6. During the pre-proposal review it was suggested that it is not required to have MBE/WBE participation in the master plan study, but that this would be a “plus”. Please confirm this is not a requirement or elaborate as may be appropriate.

SUNY has set system-wide procurement goals for MBE/WBE businesses. SUNY Sullivan supports and makes every effort to achieve similar goals at the campus-level. However, we have not set specific requirements for any specific contracts or projects. That said, MBE/WBE proposals are given extra consideration.

7. Please advise how the various submittal and interview components will be weighted in your selection process.

The process for reviewing bids is as follows:

- Purchasing forms a bid committee to review the proposals. The members of the bid committee for this RFP will include management, staff, and members of the board of trustees.
- The initial review of the proposals looks at cost and the completeness of the bid package. Historically, the RFP process results in a range of prices. The committee pulls out the lower cost proposals for further review. The committee does not review incomplete proposals.
- The individual committee members rank each of the proposals chosen for review. The reviewers consider the following elements in ranking each proposal:
 - General qualifications based on the Proposer’s Profile.
 - Services based on the process proposed to complete this project, the recommended process for assuring maximum involvement and engagement in planning from the campus and community stakeholders, and the process for determining facility costs and proposed phasing.
 - Cost Proposal.
 - References. Purchasing will contact the references provided to obtain feedback on the working relationship established with the firm and the quality of the work. Purchasing will provide the reference checks to the review committee.
- The committee meets as a group to review and discuss their proposal rankings. If there is consensus on the top proposal, purchasing makes a recommendation to the president to award a contract to that vendor. If several vendors are close in the committee ranking, the bid committee will invite up to three vendors to campus to make a presentation on and answer questions about their proposal. The bid committee will use campus feedback on the presentations to make a recommendation to the presentation as to which bidder should receive a contract.

8. Does the College have a budget range for the Master Plan to help inform the scope of services?

The college does not have a budget range. Historically, the RFP process results in a range of prices. Purchasing regulations allow the college to select the best value, i.e., lowest cost is not the determining factor.

9. There is an objective of the Master Plan noted in the RFP that states, "Facilitate safer and more efficient mobility". Can you provide more information as to what type of mobility this refers to and what problems you are having with safety?

A consideration of mobility and flow is a typical element in the development of a master plan. Mobility-related concerns that have come up in the last few years include:

- The lack of a main or formal entrance to the college facilities.
- Traffic on the fire access road behind the main complex.
- Student service offices distributed throughout the facilities.
- Poor signage.
- Inadequate handicapped access.