

## Addendum 1 to RFP # 2026-039VF

### Emergency Services Facility Utilization & Master Plan

#### Questions and Answers

1. Does the County have any geotechnical information regarding the existing site? If not, should the consultant include this scope in our fee proposal?

**A: The County does not have any geotechnical information available for the site. Geotech is not part of this phase of the project.**

2. Does the County have either paper drawings or CAD drawings of all 7 separate buildings? If not, should the consultant include building scans of all 7 buildings in our fee proposal?

**A: The County has a limited set of drawings that will be made available to the selected consultant, however, the consultant is expected to create any drawings deemed necessary to complete the study.**

3. Have there been any previous studies regarding the need to add an additional radio communication tower to the current site? If not, as part of this evaluation, should the consultant include what would be required to provide connectivity to the County radio system in the fee proposal?

**A: No, this is not in the scope of the project.**

4. Off-site relocation/new construction - if the consultant is to look at potential off-site locations, how many different sites should be included in the fee proposal?

**A: The identification of potential offsite locations is not included with this scope of work. Please review the note regarding Section 4.D.3.c) of the RFP at the bottom of this Addendum.**

5. For possible new sites, are there specific site(s) that the County is thinking about that can be shared with the consultants? If not, is the County expecting the consultant to assist them in a search for possible new site(s)?

**A: Please review the note regarding Section 4.D.3.c) of the RFP at the bottom of this Addendum.**

6. Does the County have a specific schedule or timeline for completing this Facility Utilization and Master Plan study?

**A: The study is anticipated to be completed in approximately six months from contract execution. Contract execution is anticipated in September 2026.**

7. Other than the steering committee, will the consultant be expected to present the findings at public meeting(s)? If so, how many meetings should be budgeted for?

**A: No expectation of presentations at public meetings.**

8. For any building improvements, modifications, additions, or new construction, are there specific sustainability goals that need to be accounted for and factored into the construction cost estimates?

**A: Major additions or new buildings are required to be constructed to LEED Silver standards.**

9. Are there any recent reports in which each of the 7 buildings has been tested for regulated building materials? If not, should that scope of work be included in the consultant's fee proposal?

**A: The County is not aware of any reports regarding regulated materials. Regulated building materials testing is not included in the scope.**

10. For the possible acquisition of a new site, the consultant is to perform a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Should a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment also be completed on the current site?

**A: No.**

11. Will the County provide the current report that has been conducted on the Fire Tower rehabilitation that was mentioned at the walkthrough?

**A: The County will provide the report to the selected consultant.**

12. Should the consultant include any site contamination testing in the training areas that are grandfathered in and are anticipated to remain for potential clean-up?

**A: Site contamination testing is not part of this scope of work.**

13. Item 4.E.8 of the RFP references a "Project Schedule" and Item 7B includes "Schedule" as an evaluation criterion; however, no anticipated project duration, milestone schedule, or completion deadline is included. Please provide the County's anticipated project schedule and desired completion date for the study.

**A: The study is anticipated to be completed in approximately six months from contract execution. Contract execution is anticipated in September 2026.**

14. Will Erie County provide existing site surveys, as-built drawings, floor plans, utility plans, previous studies, environmental reports, facility assessments, or capital improvement plans for the ECTOC campus?

**A: The County has a limited set of drawings that will be made available to the selected consultant, however, the consultant is expected to create any drawings deemed necessary to complete the study.**

15. Has Erie County completed any previous studies, feasibility analyses, technology assessments, or planning efforts related to primary, backup, or NG911 facilities that will be made available to the selected consultant?

**A: No.**

16. Does Erie County have a minimum or desired number of alternatives to be evaluated and presented within the final report?

**A: At least 3 different alternatives should be evaluated and presented in the final report.**

17. Are conceptual order-of-magnitude cost estimates acceptable, or does Erie County require estimates formatted in accordance with a specific methodology or cost database?

**A: Conceptual order of magnitude cost estimates are acceptable.**

18. Given that the scope may vary significantly depending upon the number of alternatives evaluated and the level of systems investigation required, does Erie County have a budget estimate or anticipated funding amount available for this study?

**A: At least 3 different alternatives should be evaluated and presented in the final report. (see Section 4.D.3 of the RFP and the note below). The County is not disclosing the project budget.**

19. Section D.6. of the RFP mentions a Phase I site assessment. Is this being requested for the current site?

**A: This is not for the current site. If the report determines the best alternative is locating some functions on an adjacent or alternative site, then a Phase I ESA would be requested. This scope item is for a price of a Phase I ESA, if necessary, on an adjacent site.**

20. It was mentioned that a feasibility study was done on the 9-story tower, will this be made available?

**A: The County will provide the report to the selected consultant.**

21. Is the existing 911 center included in the study scope, or is the scope limited to evaluating future E911/NG911 needs?

**A: The scope includes the addition of the back-up 911 at the existing site, no study of the existing 911 center or system at 45 Elm Street in Buffalo is required.**

22. Will the County provide the identified alternate and/or adjacent site(s) to be evaluated, or is the consultant expected to help identify potential alternate sites?

**A: The identification of potential offsite locations is not included with this scope of work. Please review the note regarding Section 4.D.3.c) of the RFP at the bottom of this Addendum.**

23. Is environmental review, SEQR support, or a site environmental assessment required as part of this scope?

**A: SEQR is a requirement of this scope of work. See Section 4.D. of the RFP. See question 19 regarding the environmental assessment.**

24. Is the prior feasibility study for the nine-story training tower available for review? If so, could it please be provided to proposers?

**A: The County will provide the report to the selected consultant.**

25. Can the County confirm expectations for the cost proposal? Specifically, should the fee be broken down by scope/task, hours, and cost?

**A: See Section 6 of the RFP. A separately sealed Lump Sum Cost Proposal is required along with a completed Exhibit "B" Cost Per Scope Item Grid.**

---

Please note that Section 4.D.3.c) of the RFP should be amended as follows:

Off-site relocation/new construction. This *alternative will include an evaluation of whether the proposed public safety training academy facility functions can be accommodated at the existing site or if something offsite is needed.*

*If the public safety training academy facility can fit on the existing site, then this alternative should include recommendations for building renovation/expansion and site*

reconfiguration at the existing site required to accommodate space needs for classrooms, storage space, and other functions.

*If the public safety training academy facility cannot fit on the existing site, then a future study, outside of this scope of work, would evaluate offsite options.*

| NAME                       | Firm / email.com                  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>DAVID WELIER</b>        | <b>LABELLA</b>                    |
| Joe Holman                 | Buffalo Engineering               |
| <b>DESEE</b>               | CAVIERE ENGINEERING & DESIGN      |
| <b>RAY MURPHY</b>          | <b>FFAE ARCHITECTS</b>            |
| Gwentward                  | Azar Design Co                    |
| <b>MARY MURKIN</b>         | <b>HUNT - EAS</b>                 |
| Michael Trapanowski        | Hunt - EAS                        |
| <b>BEN CLEMENTS</b>        | SCHROEDER GROUP / HCM             |
| <b>DANIEL SCHNEIDER</b>    | <del>FRASER</del> <b>DIPONATO</b> |
| <b>JOHN DALY</b>           | <b>TRATMAN</b>                    |
| <b>CHRISTINE VAPERS</b>    | <b>VAPERS ASSOC.</b>              |
| <b>TIMOTHY RIDER</b>       | <b>TRATMAN ASSOC.</b>             |
| Roxanne Patton             | Ashley McCraw & ch.               |
| Kaitlin Chmura             | Wendel                            |
| <b>ERIKA ABBONDANZIERI</b> | <b>SWBR</b>                       |