



**Combined Addendum #1
April 30, 2025**

**Town + Gown Request for Proposals
Citywide Fossil Fuel Phase Out Study
NYC Embodied Carbon Baseline Study**

Section I, Paragraph C of the two RFPs above (Citywide Fossil Fuel Phase Out Study, “RFP 1”, and NYC Embodied Carbon Baseline Study, “RFP 2”; collectively, the “RFPs”) permits Consultants to make an inquiry or request for a clarification or explanation with respect to the RFPs in writing no later than April 18, 2025. In the event DEP and OLTPS determined that it is necessary to respond to such inquiry or request in writing, such response would be furnished as an addendum to the RFPs to all Consultants as described in Paragraph D.

This Combined Addendum #1 is such an addendum. Section I, Paragraph D requires that this Combined Addendum #1 become part of the requirements for RFP 1 and RFP 2 and sent to all Consultants to which RFP 1 and RFP 2 were issued. In addition, Section 1, Paragraph D requires each Consultant submitting a Proposal in Response to acknowledge receipt of this Combined Addendum #1 to the RFPs, by attaching an original signed copy of this Combined Addendum #1 to its Proposal in Response.

We are making this a Combined Addendum #1 because the answers to questions posed about RFP 1 may be of interest to researchers for RFP 2, and vice versa.

Part I. Modification to Section III Format and Contents of the Proposal in Response In RFP 1 and RFP 2 from 12-Page Limit to 15-Page Limit

The Proposal in Response must be in a form that conforms to Appendix B-2 to the Consortium Contract, which template form is attached to this document as Attachment B for the purpose of

convenience. That template form is also downloadable from the Town+Gown:NYC website at (<http://www1.nyc.gov/site/ddc/about/town-gown-advisory-council.page>). The Consultants shall not make organizational changes to the Proposal in Response template form and shall limit their Proposal in Response to **15** pages, 1.15 spaced, in size 11 font, exclusive of resumes or curricula vitae.

Part II. Questions and Responses for RFP 1 (Citywide Fossil Fuel Phase Out Study)

1. The scope for this RFP is very large compared to the available budget. In addition, as the RFP acknowledges, there are significant gaps in the data about the energy systems in buildings not covered by Article 320 of Local Law 97 that are the focus of the study. Will OLTPS be able to provide non-public data from NYSERDA, utilities or other sources, in particular for the purpose of developing the equipment inventory in task 3 for NYC building typologies under 25,000 sf (where existing data is sparse)? Specifically, will OLTPS be able to provide utility meter data from Con Edison, National Grid or NYSERDA?

Consultants in their Proposal in Response should focus on aligning their approach to ensure the Consultant can remain within the available budget and scope of the study outlined in RFP 1. If the Consultant feels some aspects of the scope need to be slightly simplified to fit within the budget, it can propose alterations to the scope outlined in RFP.1, which will be considered as part of the evaluation process.

OLTPS will work with the Consultant to enable data access, but acknowledges that there is still limited access to granular data for smaller buildings.

2. With respect to the requested equipment inventory (task 3), the RFP indicates that OLTPS is seeking “a typology-based representative inventory and assessment of fossil fuel fired building equipment” (p. 3). What does OLTPS mean by a “typology-based representative inventory” (p. 3)? Given existing data limitations, is OLTPS expecting that for tasks 2 and 3, the Academic Partner will identify NYC building typologies, and based on publicly available information, and other information that OLTPS provides, generate assumptions about the fossil fuel equipment in these buildings?

Consultants can reference the [“One City Built to Last: Technical Working Group”](#) report or the [“Pathways to Carbon Neutral NYC”](#) for similar typology-based analyses.

OLTPS will work with the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner, to define typologies for the priority areas as defined in RFP 1. In working together to define the typologies, OLTPS may recommend that typologies be consistent with those used in other past or current reports.

Yes, OLTPS is expecting that for Tasks 2 and 3, the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner, will identify NYC building typologies, and using available data, generate assumptions about the fossil fuel equipment in these buildings.

3. Does OLTPS have a number of building typologies (or sub-typologies) in mind for the analyses in the study? (e.g. for the inventory requested in task 3 of typical fossil fuel equipment used in NYC building typologies)

OLTPS does not have a number of typologies defined within the priority areas. We will determine the number of typologies with the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner.

4. The references to “priority areas” in relation to tasks 2 and 3 (pp. 6, 8) suggest that OLTPS anticipates that the study will prioritize certain building sectors or sub-sectors over others. Is it correct to assume that OLTPS anticipates a study that prioritizes certain building sectors over others? For example, Art. 321 buildings can be very large and include building systems that are very different from virtually all buildings under 25,000 sf. Given budget limitations, it may be difficult to fully deliver in great detail on the RFP scope for all relevant building sectors.

The priority areas include buildings that are not covered under Article 320 in Local Law 97. OLTPS does anticipate particular focus on several building equipment types, as noted in RFP 1, including district steam and process loads excluded from LL154.

5. If OLTPS is open to a study that prioritizes certain building sectors or sub-sectors, does OLTPS anticipate that OLTPS will work with the Academic Partner’s project team to identify the priority sectors or sub-sectors early in the study process, based on various factors, including data availability etc?

Please see answer to Question 1 above. Yes, OLTPS anticipates working with the project team of the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner, to identify the sub-sectors or priority areas that should be focused on early in the study process, however OLTPS anticipates all priority areas will be included in the RFP 1 study scope.

6. For the “priority areas” for Tasks 2 and 3 (pp. 6, 8), is the intent that for buildings under 25,000 sf (a) process loads excluded from LL154 and (b) district steam buildings should be given greater priority focus than other buildings/equipment in the inventory (e.g. more granular detail, survey data, etc.)? Or simply to call out those loads/buildings as something to be addressed i.e. not left out?

These loads/buildings are called out as something to be addressed specifically i.e. not left out or lumped into another typology.

7. For Task 2(5), what kind and depth of modeling does OLTPS envision is necessary to fill data gaps?

The Consultant should provide in its Proposal in Response what it believes is feasible to fulfill this need within the available budget.

8. The RFP mentions that “the Academic Partner, in coordination with the OLTPS Project Team, shall coordinate with DCAS and their consultants as they conduct the Municipal Study and Plan in parallel with this Study and development of the Phase Out Plan. Much of the existing data analysis, data frame working, and data gap closure needs will overlap between the two studies.” Is there information that the city can share about the ongoing Municipal Study with DCAS? For example, are there building typologies or equipment inventories that have been developed for the Municipal Study that might be useful in responding to this RFP? Who is the outside consultant working with DCAS?

The Municipal Study is under procurement at this time. Typologies and equipment inventories will be specific to city owned and operated buildings. Typologies are likely to have less overlap, however equipment inventory and associated properties are likely to have significant overlap.

OLTPS will share details of the study with the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner after evaluation and selection.

9. From tasks 5 and 6, is OLTPS seeking a single plan for phasing out fossil fuel equipment based on the assumption that the city will legally require building owners to replace this equipment at the end of its useful lives with electric equipment?

OLTPS is seeking, for each technology, a date by which there will be market ready solutions that would allow the City to prohibit in kind replacement of a technology with a fossil system, and require by law replacement with an electric system. This would be at the time of existing equipment replacement. This is specific to the priority areas noted (i.e., buildings that are not covered under Local Law 97 Article 320).

10. Alternatively, through tasks 5 and 6, is OLTPS seeking (a) a base case analysis of whether the city’s objectives for carbon neutrality by 2050 will be met if building owners are allowed to decide whether to replace fossil fuel equipment at the end of its useful life with fossil fuel or electric equipment (i.e. a no-regulation baseline), and (b) analyses of one or more policy options for phasing out fossil fuel equipment to ensure that the city’s 2050 goals are achieved? For example, requiring that fossil fuel equipment be replaced with electric equipment at the end of its useful life could be one policy option that the study analyses.

OLTPS is seeking an appropriate schedule for when fossil fuel equipment can be replaced with an electric alternative. We are not seeking an analysis of if the base case could meet carbon neutrality by 2050, but rather evaluating the requirement that fossil fuel equipment be replaced with electric equipment at the end of its useful life.

11. Will OLTPS accept proposals that significantly prioritize certain tasks over others, e.g. proposing a limited scope for some tasks, due to data and budget limitations?

Please see answer to Questions 1 and 5 above.

12. To the extent that the Notice to Proceed is not issued by July 1, 2025, would the winning team still be able to plan to complete the work over a calendar year (i.e., after June 30, 2026), since the allocated funds are from a US DOE grant? The instructions for Article 2.3 of the form Proposal in Response states that “City agencies must use expense funds in the City fiscal year they are appropriated; they are not permitted to roll unexpended expense funds into the following City fiscal year and must appropriate expense funds anew in each succeeding City fiscal year. Thus, for Research Project funded with City tax levy funds, it is important to demonstrate an alignment between the proposed schedule in the Project Plan and the Requestor’s expressed expectation for the Project duration”

These funds are from a US DOE grant and are not tied to the City fiscal year.

13. Is NYC confident that the US DOE grant funding the study will be available to the city to pay the Academic Partner?

The City received the award documentation in September, and since then we have not received any communication stating that the grant is cancelled or won’t be reimbursed

14. Since the study is funded by a US DOE grant, will DOE have a role in the study or overseeing it?

DOE will not have a specific role in overseeing the study. OLTPS will update DOE with ongoing status reports, and the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner may be asked to help with providing updates.

Part III. Questions and Responses for RFP 2 (NYC Embodied Carbon Baseline Study)

1. What is the expected start date after the proposal selection?

While the City intends to proceed as expeditiously as possible through the procurement process under the PPB Rules, it cannot commit to any particular start date at this time.

OLTPS encourages Proposals in Response to include a draft schedule that can be accomplished within a 12-month period, likely beginning in July or August 2025.

2. What are the interim deadlines for major deliverables (e.g., draft reports, stakeholder engagement phases)?

Interim deadlines for major deliverables are to be determined by the project team from the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner, in coordination with OLTPS. As noted in the answer to Question 1 above, draft interim deadlines are encouraged in Proposals in Response, but please keep in mind that the length of the study should not exceed one calendar year from contracting.

3. Is there any flexibility for adjustments based on data availability or methodological refinements?

The City intentionally baked flexibility into RFP 2 language, so this approach allows for Consultants, in their Proposals in Response, to come forward with alternative methodologies if a survey approach is not defensible or feasible, or if such approach should be only a component of the analysis. OLTPS anticipates working with the project team from the awarded Consultant, as Academic Partner, to identify sub-sectors or priority areas that should be focused on early in the study process, however OLTPS is flexible to adjust priority areas included in the RFP 2 study throughout the duration of the RFP 2 study.

4. We understand that each University can only contribute one proposal in response. Can a proposal by University A have a co-PI from University B (both part of the consortium)? If that happens, does it count towards University B's limit to one proposal in response, or does it only count towards University A (and University B could still submit a proposal in response led by another faculty member)?

Consultants can submit more than one Proposal in Response to the RFP.

Additionally, the definition of Subcontractor in Article 1 of the Master Contract is below:

"Subcontractor" shall mean any person, as an individual, a firm or corporation, providing professional or other skills, who is not an officer or employee of the Consultant or related to such officer or employee, with whom/which the Consultant intends to and/or actually contracts with to furnish academic services or services, labor, or labor and materials, or labor and equipment directly related to a Research Project as provided in Section 3.3 (e) (8) hereunder.

Section IV, B, 2 of RFP 2 provides:

2. Subcontracting. The Consortium Contract, under which this T+G RFP has been issued, permits Consultants to join with one or more other Consultants to prepare a Proposal in Response (see Section 3.3 (b)) as well as to utilize Subcontractors (as defined in the Consortium Contract) as part of a Proposal in Response (see Sections 3.3(b) and 3.3(e)(8)). Consultants should refer to the Consortium Contract if they wish to consider joint proposals with researchers at other Academic Consortium institutions or include Subcontractors as part of their Proposal in Response. Individual researchers developing

Proposals in Response should contact the Gown Advisory Council representative for the respective Academic Consortium institution to obtain a copy of the Consortium Contract, the form of which is also downloadable from the Town+Gown website (<http://www1.nyc.gov/site/ddc/about/town-gown-advisory-council.page>). Please note that Consultants wishing to subcontract with a Subcontractor as part of its Proposal in Response must disclose its intention to use the services of a Subcontractor in its Proposal in Response as provided in Section 3.3 (e) (8) of the Consortium Contract and Appendix C to the Consortium Contract.


Section IV, B, 1 of RFP 2 provides:

1. *Insurance.* If awarded the Task Order resulting from this T+G RFP, the Consultant and all of its subconsultants must not commence performing any services under the resulting Task Order until all insurance required by this T+G RFP, and the resulting Task Order, is in effect and provided satisfactorily to the Requestor. The Consultant must ensure uninterrupted and continuous insurance coverage in the manner, form, and limits required by this T+G RFP, and the resulting Task Order, throughout the entire duration of the Task Order.

In the form of the Task Order, the following sections contain relevant provisions with respect to Subcontractors that the Consultant should be aware of

- *Article 3, Academic Partner’s Billing and Invoicing, Section 3.1, Compensation for Services*
- *Article 4, Insurance*
- *Article 5, Representations and Warranties, Section 5.3. Academic Team Members*

5. I am contacting you regarding the page limit outlined in the **NYC Embodied Carbon Baseline Study** RFP. The RFP specifies a 12-page limit for the proposals in response. Since we have to keep the boilerplate language in the template, I assume the 12-page limit includes the boilerplate language and is counted from the first to the last page (with signatures), excluding only CVs and resumes, which gives us about **4-5 pages of added text to the template**. Am I correct in this assumption?

The form of the Proposal in Response is Attachment B to the RFPs, which contains the icon  followed by italicized text that is intended to be informational/instructional. Proposers should delete all italicized text that is obviously informational/instructional in their Proposal in Response to help comply with the stated limit in the RFPs: 12 pages, 1.15 spaced, in size 11 font, exclusive of resumes or curricula vitae.

Do not, however, delete the boilerplate text in Sections 4-6, as that is part of the Proposal in Response.

NOTE: Please see Part I above for amendment to both RFPs to change in total length of Proposals in Response from 12 pages to 15 pages.

All other terms and conditions in RFP 1 and RFP 2 remain unchanged.

Institution Name: _____

Acknowledged by: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

[NOTE: to be attached to Proposal in Response]