Question 1: Because of the page limit on submissions, am I correct that only the team lead submits the SF330 forms?
Answer 1: The SF330 forms should reflect all team members. Under H., it should read, “All proposals must be limited to thirty (30) pages total, double-sided or sixty (60) pages total single-sided” to accommodate the inclusion of the GSA form 330 format. The addition of resumes will not be counted towards the maximum number of pages allowed. The resumes submitted should be limited to staff assigned to the project.

Question 2: If a team is chosen for the Engineering Assessment will they be allowed to submit should the project move forward into design?
Answer 2: The team selected for the engineering assessment will not be precluded from proposing on the design phase.

Question 3: Will the team producing the Assessment be precluded from proposing on the New or Expanded Convention Center in the future?
Answer 3: The team producing the Assessment will not be precluded from proposing on the New or Expanded Convention Center in the future.

Question 4: How often are Steering Committee meetings held?
Answer 4: It is anticipated that Steering Committee meetings will be held each month throughout the duration of the project.

Question 5: Is hazardous material assessment on a research level only (no onsite actual inspection)?
Answer 5: The hazardous material assessment is on a research level only. Onsite inspection and review of drawings may be required to verify existing conditions.

Question 6: Is this a GSA project?
Answer 6: This is not a GSA project.

We see that there are 3 sites/options listed for analysis: 1. HVS “Expanded BNCC Site” (which was an expansion laterally from the existing BNCC), 2. HVS “HSBC Lot Site”, and 3. Alternative “outside the HVS study” site which includes an expansion through the addition of the 3rd floor to the existing BNCC. These 3 sites/options weave in and out of the various phases noted on pages 3-4 of the RFP to varying degrees. In some cases, all 3 options are noted, in others it is referred to “Both Sites”. Can you please clarify:

Question 8: Is it the County’s intention that all 3 options noted above will be studied equally?
See Answers 8, 9, 10 below.

Question 9: In all instances where the term “Expanded BNCC Site” is used, it refers to the HVS option only? (This would mean that Phase II assesses the existing building only in terms of the applicability/suitability/requirements of lateral expansion using the HVS scheme. It would not assess the existing building for suitability of expansion upwards) See Answers 8, 9, 10 below.

Question 10: When the term “Both Site Options” is being referenced, the scope will refer to only the site options noted above as 1 & 2 (sometimes noted as “both HVS site options”)? In Phase V, it is the only place where the heading says both site options, but the scope (a) refers to all 3 options. See Answers 8, 9, 10 below.

We are trying to clarify if all 3 options are receiving the same level of analysis.
Answers 8, 9, 10: The terms “both site options” and “both HVS site options” refer to the “Expanded
BNCC Site” and “HSBC Lot Site” options only. The “Expanded BNCC Site” option involves an expansion *laterally* from the existing convention center.

The proposed concept (outside the scope of the HVS study) is noted in three sections of the Scope of Work: 1.b., 3.a.iv., and 5.a. In regards to the proposed concept, it will not be researched to the degree of the HVS concepts at this time. Erie County is trying to assess the general concept feasibility, and in assessing this, the County is seeking to understand: (i) how construction of an expansion *upwards* would impact business operations at the existing convention center, including an estimate of downtime (as referenced in 3.a.iv.) and (ii) the overall suitability/constructability/feasibility of expansion *upwards* at the existing convention center (as referenced in 5.a.). If accomplishing these tasks would involve additional work in any of the phases beyond what is noted, please provide details within your proposal.

Based on the above, Section A.5. should read:

“5. Phase V – Overall Assessment of Both Site Options and Proposed Concept Plan
   a. For both HVS site options and the proposed concept plan, the Consultant shall assess the general feasibility, constructability, and implications of pursuing each based on information collected and assessed throughout this project. A summary of pros and cons for each HVS site option and the proposed concept plan shall be developed with the understanding that the review of the proposed concept plan will be less extensive.
   b. The Consultant shall provide recommendations on additional studies that may provide useful information to aid in the County decision-making process in relation to the site options.
   c. Deliverable
      i. Phase V interim report for review by Steering Committee (electronic copy)”