

September 3, 2019

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF EXPERT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONCEPTUAL DESIGN WITH OPTION FOR “AS-NEEDED” TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICES FOR THE LINCOLN TUNNEL HELIX REPLACEMENT PROJECT– RFP NO. 58219- ADDENDUM # 1

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (the Authority) hereby amends the subject Request for Proposal (RFP), dated August 21, 2019, as follows:

- 1) **The date for receipt of proposals for the subject RFP has been changed to 2:00P.M. on October 3, 2019.**
- 2) In the RFP Letter, page 2, Section II., Paragraph A, third line, **Delete:** “The page limit pertains only to Letters E, F and G in Section III, below.” and **Replace with:** “The page limit pertains only to Letters E, F and H in Section III, below.”
- 3) In the RFP Attachment A Scope of Work, page 21, Task I: Traffic Analysis and Study, paragraph 2 after the sentence *Assume that eight (8) stages per scheme shall be analyzed*, **Insert:** “The analyses performed shall include all MPT stages throughout the construction duration (i.e. 2024 – 2029) for each scheme.”
- 4) In the RFP Attachment A Scope of Work, page 21, Task I: Traffic Analysis and Study In subsection 2.a, fourth line, **Delete:** “Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010)” and **Replace with:** “Highway Capacity Manual Sixth Edition.”

In the RFP Attachment A Scope of Work, page 22, Task J: Traffic Simulation Models, paragraph 1. Model Development Strategy Session, after the last sentence, **Insert:** “Identify the build year per build MPT only condition”
- 5) In the RFP Attachment A Scope of Work, page 48, Section VI Conditions and Precautions, paragraph C. Work Hours, after subparagraph 3, **Insert:** the following sub-paragraph:

4. Traffic Data Collection (Traffic Analysis and Modeling) must be conducted Monday-Friday, morning rush hours “AM” (6:00AM to 10:00AM), afternoon rush hours “PM” (4:00PM to 7:00PM) and “Early Evening” (7:00PM to 10:00PM) periods.

The following questions were received from a Request for Proposals (RFP) recipients(s). The questions and the corresponding Authority answers are provided for your information and use, as appropriate.

Question 1: Attachment A, Page 21, Task I: HCM 2010. Will HCM 2010 or HCM 6 be required for the analyses?

Answer 1: HCM 6 (HCM 2016) should be used for the analysis instead of HCM 2010.

Question 2: Attachment A, Page 23: what would be the year for MPT analysis? The future build is 2040 but MPT year is not mentioned. We need to know this to develop the traffic demand maps.

Answer 2: The analysis shall include all MPT stages throughout the construction duration/timeline (i.e, 2024 thru 2029).

Question 3: Attachment A, page 3 and page 16 identifies 3 schemes to evaluate, then states that the consultant shall assume that a total of three variations of the previously identified schemes be developed and evaluated. Are we to assume that three variations of each of the three schemes equates to a total of 9 schemes/variations to be evaluated? Please clarify.

Answer 3: As per Attachment A, page 3, Section II, "the Consultant will evaluate and refine up to three schemes based on previous work".

Question 4: Attachment A, page 4 and page 16. With regard to the NJDOT Bridges, the document states that the consultant should assume six alternatives for the three NJDOT Bridges. Are we to assume that six alternatives for each bridge equates to a total of 18 alternative NJ Bridge schemes are required? Please clarify.

Answer 4: Yes

Question 5: Attachment A, page 5, Item 3. It is not clear whether subtasks a through k apply to the Scheme Evaluation Phase 1.A.1, or to the Conceptual Design of the selected scheme Phase 1.A.2, or both. Please clarify.

Answer 5: For scope of work related to Scheme Evaluation Package refer to Task F and for Conceptual Design Package refer to Task K. All Items listed in Attachment A, Section II.A.3 (with the exception of items f, g, and k) apply to both Scheme Evaluation and Conceptual Design Package Tasks. Items f, g and k apply only to Conceptual Design Package Task.

Question 6: Attachment A, page 28, Item 8. The consultant is requested to evaluate the feasibility of using the same structural system for the entire Helix. Is the intent of this item to achieve aesthetic similarity? If so would SHPO and other conservancy considerations outweigh this requirement?

Answer 6: The intent is to achieve, if possible, aesthetic similarity, ease of fabrication, construction and maintenance.

Question 7: Attachment A, page 19, Task G. The first sentence of Task G refers to performing a CBA of the preferred Helix scheme and comparing it with; 1-No Build and 2-Any alternative schemes advanced under the project's conceptual design scope. How many CBA comparisons should be assumed in the proposal? Please clarify.

Answer 7: Cost Benefit Analysis will include one comparison, i.e., comparing Preferred Scheme and No-Build Scheme. If needed, cost Benefit Analysis will be updated if the preferred scheme is refined during conceptual design.

Question 8: What is the design life expectation for the rehabilitation option?

Answer 8: Design Life for No-Build option defined in Task G shall be assumed as 25 years.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Allison Agliardo, Operations Manager at aagliardo@panynj.gov

Sincerely,

David Gutiérrez
Assistant Director
Procurement Department