

March 16, 2018

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF EXPERT PROFESSIONAL PLANNING AND FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE WHARF REPLACEMENT PROGRAM DURING 2018 THROUGH 2020 (RFP #52133) ADDENDUM #5

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey hereby amends the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), dated February 20, 2018 as follows:

Attachment A

On page 20, Paragraph B, Reference Documents, after k. 8) Climate Resilience, skip a line and insert l. [Soil Log \(SL\) Drawings](#).

The following questions were received from RFP recipients. The questions and the corresponding Authority answers are provided for your information and use, as appropriate.

Question#1: In Attachment A, Task H, item 3a, it states that “available subsurface information [will be] provided in the form of Soil Log (SL) drawings by the Authority for the facilities within the scope. Two sample SL drawings per facility are included with this RFP. At the Notice to Proceed, the Authority will provide electronic PDF files for 900 SL drawings, as well as master boring location plans for all facilities indicating SL drawing number associated with each of the borings.”

Where are these two drawings per facility located within the RFP?

Answer #1: Please see above under amendment to the subject RFP.

Question #2: Will soil lab results or other soil characteristics and design parameters be provided by the Authority?

Answer #2: The provided SL drawings will include soil classification. Some of the SL drawings will include results of laboratory testing performed on selected samples. The selected Consultant will be responsible for developing design parameters based on subsurface information provided by the Authority.

Question #3: In Attachment A, Task D, Field Assessment, Verification and Surveys, item 3c, point 1 states that field assessment/verification of overall conditions is required for buildings “which may have a significant cost or design impact in the replacement of the existing wharfs and the development of this Study.” Similar language is provided concerning utilities. We take that to mean that only those building structures and utilities in the immediate vicinity of the wharf that would be

impacted by wharf construction or would influence the staging/sequence of construction require field verification, and then only when insufficient information is available in the available documentation to be provided by the Authority. Please confirm that it is not the Authority's intent that all buildings/utilities on the respective sites will require field investigation.

Answer #3: Confirmed. Only the buildings/utilities being impacted by wharf construction or staging/sequence of construction, and when insufficient information is available in the available documentation are to be considered for field assessment/verification.

Question #4: Please provide clarification for Task H relative to the Base Case comparison to the resiliency design alternatives. We are asked to develop alternatives for each type of operation at a berth (e.g., roll-on/roll-off, auto, container, bulk and liquid bulk, etc.) at each facility, with Cost Benefit Analyses for each. Will the Port Master Plan study narrow down the type(s)of operation that we should consider at each facility?

Answer #4 The Port Master Plan (PMP) will identify current and recommend future types of operations at each facility.

Question #5: It is possible that the best solution at one facility may be different from the best solution at a different facility. Is it the Authority's intention that there will be a Base Case for each facility?

Answer #5: Yes, the optimal solution may vary by facility as identified in the PMP.

Question #6: If the answer to sub-part 2 above is yes, is it necessary to provide the Authority with a base case for every design alternative for each facility or just the best alternative?

Answer #6: The Base Case for each facility should reflect those identified within the PMP.

Question #7: Should we expect that the Authority's Climate Resilience Guidelines will require that we consider raising the elevation of the seawalls or simply the major infrastructure that would be damaged by a flooding?

Answer #7: The Engineering Discipline Guidelines: Climate Resilience Guidelines shall be followed to establish the proper project Design Flood Elevation for incorporation into the Basis of Design, but the Guidelines do not impose or recommend a specific design solution. The identification, development, and design of cost-effective measures to mitigate associated coastal flood hazards are the responsibility of the design team, in consultation with the Authority (including other Authority Engineering Guidelines) and in reference to local codes, national standards, and/or criteria imposed by external regulatory or funding agencies.

Question #8: In the Attachment A, Section I: Introduction, Objectives of this Study, the sixth paragraph states "Once the design criteria are established, several conceptual design alternatives shall be developed for each type of operation (e.g., roll-on, roll-off, auto, container, bulk and liquid bulk, etc.) at the five port facilities encompassing all pier, bulkhead, and wharf structures". Please advise whether the Port Master Plan will indicate at which locations/berths at each of the five port facilities the different types of operations are to be considered?

Answer #8: The PMP will indicate types of operations to be considered within each of the Port Department facilities. The berths design criteria will need to be compatible with the recommended marine operation.

Question #9: In the Attachment A, Section II: Coordination with Master Plan Recommendations, item 2c, it is noted that this makes reference to “Implementation schedule for the new wharfs being proposed under the PMP, including any required dredging”. Should Proposers assume that the conceptual design alternatives referenced above may include dredging beyond the 50 feet depth in the navigation channels? Does the Port Master Plan address any further channel deepening?

Answer #9: The PMP will indicate options that may require dredging beyond 50 feet of depth in the navigation channels. The PMP will recommend working with the United States Army Corps of Engineers to establish the extent of future dredging requirements.

Question #10: Will the Authority provide a list of the Priority Repairs that have been implemented on the berths and the schedule and location of planned construction of future Priority Repairs?

Answer #10: Recent Priority Repairs implemented in construction contracts will be available to the selected Consultant. Construction contracts in the planned workload, which include general repair locations and construction schedule, will also be available to the selected Consultant.

Question #11: Can the recommendations of the Port Master Plan be changed during this project if there are defensible reasons and the overall plan is improved by these changes?

Answer #11: The recommendations of the PMP will not change.

Question #12: In Section I: Proposer Requirements, item A states that “the firm must have completed at least one (1) feasibility study evaluating alternatives for planning, engineering and construction phasing options for replacement of wharves at a major seaport facility handling diverse cargo business in the past ten (10) years. Item B similarly refers to the “past ten (10) years”. However, in Section III: Submission Requirements, item G states “for all projects referenced, the services must have been performed, or are currently being performed, by the Proposer within the last five (5) years.” There appears to be a discrepancy between the two above requirements. Can the Port Authority please clarify?

Answer #12: In Section I, items A through D list the proposer requirements that firms must meet in order to be considered for an Agreement. Firms are to provide a letter requested in Section III, item C, demonstrating their compliance with the aforementioned proposer requirements. Section III, item H requests information pertaining to a firm’s experience, which is one of the evaluation criteria for this RFP. Some of the projects referenced in this section may be the same as those projects a firm lists in their letter of compliance with the proposer requirements. It is a business decision which projects to reference for each section.

Question #13: Should firms submit separate flash drives for the Price Proposal?

Answer #13 Yes, the submission of one flash drive for the Price Proposal is sufficient. It must be submitted in a separate, sealed envelope per the instructions listed in the RFP Letter, Section III, Item J: Pricing and Compensation Proposal.

The date for receipt of proposals for the subject RFP remains 2:00 P.M. on March 26, 2018.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Courtney R. Eddington, Senior Contract Specialist, at ceddington@panynj.gov.

Sincerely,

David Gutiérrez, CPPO
Assistant Director
Procurement Department