

ADDENDUM #3: GIPEC Request for Statements of Qualification for Public Open Space Professional Design Services – Additional information, Questions and Answers

Posted: November 7, 2006

PLEASE CHECK THE GIPEC WEBSITE, www.govisland.com, FOR ANY ADDITIONAL ADDENDA POSTINGS.

- 1) **NOTICE: The deadline for submission of RFQ materials has been extended from November 15, 2006 to Friday, December 1 at 2:00 pm (Eastern Standard Time).**

- 2) **CORRECTION TO ADDENDUM #2, Question #2: Potential interview dates are no longer December 5-6, 2006 but will be arranged for early January 2007.**

- 3) **CLARIFICATION TO ADDENDUM #2, Question #4** (noted in italics):
Q: Must the lead firm be both a New York State Licensed Architect or Landscape Architect and have at least one completed (built) landscape design project of \$10 million or more, or can the team be led by a firm not licensed in New York State with at least one completed (built) landscape design project of \$10 million or more?
Please clarify the requirement on page 16 of the RFQ that the prime shall be a NYS registered landscape architect or an architect with previous built park or parks of \$10million or more (or the equivalent). First, many highly-qualified award-winning landscape architects would be excluded from being prime. They could not be "team leaders" but would have to be subordinate to a larger firm that may have the technical experience but lack the design reputation. Second, architects with 10 million dollars or more could include buildings with their associated "landscaping" which is not really the thrust of this RFQ. Third, is the \$10 million 2006 dollars, i.e. if a park was built for 6-8 million dollars, say, fifteen years ago, could the number be raised to 10 million dollars today because of inflation.

A: GIPEC would like to clarify the following statement on page 16 of the RFQ: "To qualify for submission the Consultant Team must perform under the direction of a New York State licensed Landscape Architect or Architect with at least one completed (built) landscape design project of \$10 million or more (as measured in U.S. Dollars or equivalent)." The following supercedes and clarifies the RFQ language and the verbal response to this question at the October 31 pre-proposal information session: A licensed Architect or Landscape Architect on the Consultant Team must have completed at least one landscape design project of \$10M or more (as measured in the equivalent of 2006 dollars), and they must be licensed in their

own country or in one of the states in the United States. They may be a prime consultant or a sub-consultant. For the team to be eligible, the person *or firm* meeting the \$10M requirement does not have to be a New York State licensed professional, but a member of the team must be either licensed in NYS or licensed elsewhere and capable of being licensed in NYS. If the NYS licensure is pending or in the future, this is acceptable but the NYS licensure must then be in place to do the design work later on because the Consultant Team must perform under the direction of a New York State licensed Landscape Architect or Architect for the public open space design services following the RFP /Design Competition. *In the RFQ submission in the organizational chart, please identify the NY State licensed professional or the professional to be licensed in New York State.*

4) **Q:** Is the submittal deadline for the RFQ November 15, 2006, no later than 3:00 p.m.?

A: No. Please see #1 above.

5) **Q:** Will you be posting the Sign-In Sheet from the Pre-Submission Information Session and Tour?

A: Yes, it has been posted as Addendum #1 as of November 1, 2006.

6) **Q:** As a foreign office we are planning to take part with an American partner office. Concerning the submission requirements, how do we have to submit with the two offices (one is responsible for the design and conceptual approach, the second one is responsible for the management part)? Does each firm (the American and ours) fill out separately the required documents (Experience and Personnel, List of principals, Work Samples etc.) or do we have to enter ONE submission document together, listing the required information of one office and then of the other?

A: If your firm has a partner firm or firms, then the firms together would be considered as one Consultant Team. Each Consultant Team (not each separate firm) should submit one proposal which includes a section on "Experience and Personnel". In this section you should explain the make-up of the team, which firm is the prime consultant and which firm(s) are sub-consultants, and the responsibilities of each firm (see page 17 of the RFQ for full description of submission requirements). See also Addendum #2, item # 3 for information on filling out the required forms – which ones must be completed by the prime or lead consultant and which ones must be completed by sub-consultants to the prime consultant.

- 7) **Q:** Will GIPEC provide the species and locations of the trees on Governors Island to the teams selected for the Stage 2 RFP / Design Competition?
A: Yes, GIPEC will provide a copy of the tree survey that was conducted in 2004 to each of the teams selected to compete in the Design Competition and respond to the RFP. The tree survey provides species, size, condition, and location information.
- 8) **Q:** What is the status of the development sites?
A: GIPEC's review process for the Request for Proposals for the Preservation and Redevelopment of Governors Island (the Development RFP) is still underway, and responses are still being evaluated. As GIPEC determines the preferred uses and configurations of the development sites, these will be incorporated into the overall master plan for the Island.
- 9) **Q:** What was your reasoning behind the location of the Southern Island development zones?
A: The locations are based on knowledge arising from our planning studies, market analyses, input from the Governors Island Alliance, and market feedback from the 2005 Request For Expressions of Interest and the 2006 Development RFP. The relative locations of the development zones and the parkland 1) provide for a significant portion of the Summer Park to relate directly to the water and the views of the harbor, but also to connect up through the center of the island to the Historic District and the Liggett Hall gateway arch, 2) provide reasonable access to transportation and utility infrastructure, 3) and allow for optimal access to summer cooling breezes within the Summer Park. The proposed location of the development zones optimizes access, views, and design flexibility for both park and development programming. It embodies a balance of considerations of the park needs with those of the potential development zone uses.
- 10) **Q:** Are the development zone boundaries final?
A: The precise boundaries of the development zones are still being determined. However, the boundaries shown in "Appendix B: Governors Island Illustrative Framework Diagram" are operative until further notice. During the Design Competition and the design process, firms will have the opportunity to provide comment and design feedback on those boundaries and edges.
- 11) **Q:** To what degree will the selected team be able to influence the development, transportation, and public art?

A: As stated in question #10, Consultant Teams selected for the Design Competition will have the opportunity to provide comment and design feedback on the boundaries and edges of the development zones. The design of the Summer Park must be coordinated with the designs for the development zones, and GIPEC would work with both Consultant Teams (master planning and public open space) on coordinating the work in an iterative fashion.

Consultant Teams may include artists on their team, and/or GIPEC may select other artists to execute public art projects. These would have to be integrated into the public open space design, and we would expect that the selected public open space design consultant would act as an advisor to GIPEC on public art issues (selection, siting, role in parkland, etc.)

Please see questions #20 and #21 for information regarding the design scope of work related to transportation.

12) **Q:** We have heard that you've requested a separate RFP for public art. Is this accurate?

A: No. There is no RFP for public art at this time, nor is GIPEC preparing such an RFP. See also Question #11 above.

13) **Q:** During the Stage 2 RFP will there be further information regarding the development of the parcels in the development zones?

A: GIPEC is currently working with our Development Advisory Services Consulting Team, HR&A, and with EDAW, our Master Planning Services Consulting Team to determine allowable and desired uses within the development zones. This program development and the master planning process will continue in parallel with the design of the parks and open spaces, and teams selected for the RFP will be provided with the relevant information at the time of the Design Competition.

14) **Q:** Are any massing studies for the development zones available?

A: Massing information for the development zones will be provided to the teams selected for the RFP / Design Competition.

15) **Q:** Please clarify the deed restrictions as they relate to public open space and the "Appendix B: Governors Island Illustrative Framework Diagram".

A: Please refer to "Additional Materials 2: Governors Island Deeds" for the exact text of the deed requirements. In summary, GIPEC is required to

develop at least forty (40) acres, located primarily south of Division Road, of public parkland. No less than twenty (20) of those acres are to be contiguous. Please refer to “Appendix C: Governors Island Illustrative Public Open Space Map” for an illustration of open space locations and approximate sizes. These same open spaces are also shown on “Appendix B: Governors Island Illustrative Framework Diagram”.

16) **Q:** Is there a budget for the construction of the parkland?

A: An estimated budget for the construction of the public open spaces on Governors Island will be made available to the teams selected to participate in the RFP/ Design Competition.

17) **Q:** Will the Utility Infrastructure Planning Report be made available online?

A: The Utility Infrastructure Planning Report will be made available to the teams selected to participate in the RFP/ Design Competition.

18) **Q:** Is economic feasibility a selection criterion? At what point would we have to prove that our project is economically feasible?

A: One of the RFQ selection criteria is “Demonstrated commitment to design excellence, innovation, and sustainability as demonstrated through submitted work samples of previous park designs,” where sustainability is financial as well as environmental sustainability. Firms selected for the RFP / Design Competition will be provided with an estimated budget for park construction. RFP submissions will be evaluated relative to estimated costs for construction (vis-à-vis the budget provided) and costs for on-going maintenance.

19) **Q:** Have winter uses for the parks been excluded?

A: No. As stated in the RFQ, the use of the term “Summer Park” is not to be taken literally as the calendar season, but is a metaphor. We expect the usage of the Island’s parks and open spaces to vary with the seasons, with lower visitation expected in the winter. There are challenges to activating parklands on an Island during the winter months so the main focus of programming will be for spring, summer, and autumn use, but winter uses are not excluded.

20) **Q:** Where does the master planning team’s work regarding transportation and access end and the selected public open space design team’s scope begin?

A: As part of the master planning scope of work, GIPEC’s consultants, EDAW and DMJM Harris are analyzing transportation to and from the Island, the

general location of transportation infrastructure, such as ferry landings, and the locations of on-island circulation routes for service, delivery and emergency vehicles, non-motorized modes and pedestrians. In addition, GIPEC is analyzing the potential for aerial gondola access to and from the Island. Within the master plan, GIPEC will identify specific access / open space-related design projects which would be included in the scope of work for the selected public open space design team. These may include the design of arrival/departure plazas, ferry waiting rooms or waiting areas, roadways, sidewalks, bikepaths, bicycle and vehicle parking areas, unloading and drop off areas, transit stops and shelters, pedestrian paths, etc.

21) **Q:** Is there a separate RFQ for transportation? If so, what is the scope of that work and what is the relationship between these RFQs?

A: No. There is no separate RFQ for transportation. Please refer to Question #20 above.

22) **Q:** Will there be another opportunity to visit the Island before the November 15th deadline?

A: No. We conducted a full-Island tour on October 31, but cannot accommodate individual visitors between November 1 and December 1 (the extended deadline). "Photographs of and from Governors Island" are available on the GIPEC website in Appendix D.

23) **Q:** What is the relationship of the local Community Boards to this process?

A: We meet regularly with CB 1 in Manhattan and CB 2 and CB 6 in Brooklyn to update them on our planning process and to hear their comments. Because GIPEC is a New York State entity, the GIPEC planning and development process is governed by the 1968 Urban Development Corporation Act. GIPEC is not required to go through the NYC Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) process.

24) **Q:** Is the project funded? If so how?

A: A significant portion of the design of the public open spaces is funded. GIPEC will be seeking additional funds for design and construction. As is typical with many similar projects, funding for construction will be secured in phases as the project approaches construction. All of GIPEC's costs, capital and operating, are funded equally by the City and State of New York.

25) **Q:** Has the Master Planning Consulting Team set priority projects or phasing? Will we be able to influence their selection of such projects and phasing?

A: GIPEC establishes the priority of various projects and their phasing with technical assistance from its consultant teams. We have not created a public open space phasing plan, but will be in a better position to do so once we have a better defined set of design concepts after the Design Competition. We expect to work closely with both the master planning consultants and the public open space design consultants to set those priorities.

26) **Q:** Does GIPEC have a preferred architectural style for park structures?

A: No. While the character of the Historic District is governed by the Preservation and Design Manual, GIPEC has much greater flexibility in terms of the design expression of buildings and landscape on the South Island. GIPEC has no stylistic preference at this time. Please refer to the “Park and Open Space Vision” on page 8 of the RFQ for further guidance.

27) **Q:** Will GIPEC be releasing the names of the members of the selection committee for the RFQ?

A: No. GIPEC will convene a selection committee comprised of representatives of GIPEC and City and State agencies, but will not release individual names.

28) **Q:** Please describe the operation goals for the island. Will the island be accessible year round? What will the hours be? Do you envision this being an evening destination or primarily daytime? Are dining/café facilities being considered? If so, what are the anticipated operational hours?

A: GIPEC expects that in the future, the Island will be accessible year-round with a range of mixed uses that are active at different times of the day. The public open spaces would be a daytime destination for most of their visitors, but they would also be an important evening destination for special events, dining, programs, etc. Dining and café facilities are a welcome part of the mix of Island uses currently being considered in the master planning process. The Island may eventually be accessible 24 hours a day, but the Island’s hours of operation will depend on the mix of uses that are determined for the Island.

29) **Q:** Who will maintain the new open spaces and facilities? How do you expect to fund ongoing maintenance – from developer contributions, performances, events?

A: Currently, GIPEC is responsible for operating and maintaining Governors Island, using funding provided equally by New York City and New York State. Management and financial responsibility for the operations and

maintenance of the new public open spaces is under consideration, and has not yet been determined. We anticipate funding for on-going operations and maintenance will come from a mix of public and private sources.

30) **Q:** Can the existing seawalls be altered as part of the public open space design scope?

A: Yes - Changes to the seawall, including but not limited to breaches or embayments, will be considered provided that the designs are feasible from technical and regulatory standpoints and when taken together with the rest of the design, conform to the construction budget (budget to be provided in Stage 2).

31) **Q:** Is the existing topographical information available?

A: Topographic and bathymetric information will be made available to Consultant Teams selected to participate in the RFP / Design Competition.

32) **Q:** Have soil borings been taken in the Summer Park area and submitted for laboratory analysis to characterize the subsurface conditions (e.g., composition and cleanliness)?

A: GIPEC has conducted soil borings throughout the Island. A resulting report, "Geotechnical Structural Borings Report (February 2006)" is available on the GIPEC website as Addendum 3 to the Request for Proposals for the Preservation and Redevelopment of Governors Island. Also refer to Appendix N of the same RFP for "Geotechnical Historic Data Report, Governors Island (December 2005)". Go to this address to download both: http://www.govisland.com/About_GIPEC/preservation_rfp.asp

33) **Q:** Has an environmental site assessment been conducted for the grounds and buildings on the south end of the island to confirm presence or absence of site contamination, underground drums, asbestos and/or lead-based paint?

A: The federal government conducted an environmental investigation and performed all necessary remediation of hazardous substances prior to the transfer of the Island property to GIPEC, in accordance with the requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"). In addition, the federal government included a CERCLA covenant in the deed to GIPEC, which provides that if additional hazardous substance contamination is discovered on the Island property, the federal government will remediate such contamination, at its cost, in accordance with the requirements of CERCLA. To safeguard the excavation process in regard to unexploded ordnances (UXOs), it is necessary to use a magnetometer

during excavation. There is very limited information available about the non-historic South Island buildings. Some information regarding asbestos and asbestos abatement history is available as part of a set of building conditions assessment reports, which will be made available at the request of the selected Stage 2 participants. However, these reports may be an incomplete accounting of the use of asbestos in the buildings.

34) **Q:** Are there any septic tank systems on the island or is the island fully connected to the City sanitary system?

A: There are no known septic tank systems on the Island. The Island's buildings are connected to the City's sanitary sewer system.

35) **Q:** Where is the sanitary sewer tie-in location? What information can the GIPEC provide concerning the presence of any CSO's (location, size, quality), either on the Island or outfalls located in Brooklyn or NYC immediately opposite Governor's Island?

A: As noted in question #17, GIPEC will provide the selected teams with the Utility Master Plan Report (2006), which details existing locations and preliminary conditions assessments of the Island's utility infrastructure.

36) **Q:** Can we restructure the team during Stage 2 or bring in additional consultants?

A: As stated in Addendum #2, Question #5, in their RFQ responses, responding firms should list the major sub-consultants necessary to perform the scope of work for the public open space design services. GIPEC understands certain sub-consultants may be brought onto the team at a later date, subject to approval by GIPEC, during or after the design competition. The resulting Consultant Team must still meet the requirements laid out in the RFQ.

37) **Q:** Is this RFQ geared primarily towards architects or landscape architects?

A: The eligibility requirements are outlined in Section VI of the RFQ "RFQ Process and Submission Requirements" and clarified in the Addenda. Responding firms should assemble the team they deem best suited to and necessary for performing the scope of work for the public open space design services described in the RFQ.

38) **Q:** Can technical consultants be on multiple teams during Stage 1, the RFQ?

A: Yes.

39) **Q:** What is your budget for the design fee?

A: Consultant Teams selected for Stage 2 will be required to submit a fee proposal as part of their response to the RFP. One of GIPEC's selection criteria for the RFP will be reasonableness and level of fees proposed. GIPEC will not be providing a budget for the design fee at this time.

40) **Q:** Does the scope of your master planning consultant, EDAW, Inc., include a physical master plan at the level of schematic design or is it just an urban design framework plan?

A: The schematic design for the public open space is not in the scope of the master planning consultant. It is part of the scope of this RFQ for Public Open Space Professional Design Services. Please refer to Appendix B for the "Governors Island Illustrative Framework Diagram" prepared by EDAW.

41) **Q:** Do we need a programming consultant or is EDAW finalizing the program as part of their master planning scope?

A: It is up to each respondent team to determine which types of consultants are required based on the RFQ. The programming for the public open spaces has started with work by GIPEC and EDAW but must be developed and finalized by the Public Open Space Design services Consultant Team (working with GIPEC and in consultation with EDAW). GIPEC and EDAW will be responsible for the programming of other non-public open space areas of the Island (such as the Historic District buildings and the new buildings of the development zones).