

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
YARDLEY, PA 19067

ADDENDUM NO. 2

This **Addendum No. 2** gives additional information in connection with **Contract No. C-697A** and is hereby made a part of the RFP. This Addendum is to be signed by the Consultant and this **Page AD2-1** is to be attached to the Technical Proposal.

This Addendum including pages **AD2-1** through **AD2-4** is hereby accepted and agreed that it shall become part of the **RFP** for **Contract No. C-697A**.

DATE: _____

(CONSULTANT'S NAME)

(SIGNATURE)

ADDENDUM NO. 2

A. Modifications to Request for Proposals

1. Submission Requirements, Technical Proposal, Item 3, Page 28

Revise the first sentence to read as follows:

“One (1) single sided, tabloid-sized (11” x 17”) page organizational chart showing key personnel names, position, title and reporting relationships (not included in the sixteen (16) page Proposal limitation cited above).”

B. Response to Inquiries

1. **Inquiry**: Are any state or federal funds planned to be used for any phase of the project (Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, or construction)?

Response: No state or federal funds are planned for this Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Documentation for the Washington Crossing Bridge Replacement phase of the project. As for the future phases of the project, no decisions have been made regarding funding.

2. **Inquiry**: What approvals are needed from PennDOT and/or NJDOT for the project?

Response: Considering the project area extends beyond the jurisdictional limits of the Commission, all approvals deemed applicable to obtaining a FONSI will be needed from PennDOT and/or NJDOT.

3. **Inquiry**: The RFP specifies a minimum font size of 11; may we use a smaller, but still legible font size on graphics, tables, captions, etc.?

Response: Smaller but still legible font sizes may be used on graphics, tables, captions, etc.

4. **Inquiry**: With the amount of disciplines involved in this project, may we use an 11” x 17” size page for our organization chart?

Response: Yes, the organization chart may use tabloid-sized (11” x 17”) paper as modified herein this Addendum No. 2.

5. **Inquiry**: Does the consultant need to register and take online training with the Commission's Payment Verification System before contract award?

Response: No, the Consultant is not required to register and take online training with the Commission’s Payment Verification System before contract award. This task is traditionally performed after contract award.

6. **Inquiry:** What electronic CADD and 3D survey mapping files will be made available to the awarded firm?

Response: The Commission has editable source drawing and survey type files from various past improvements some of which are as recent as 2009 (i.e. TS-442A) and will make said files available to the awarded firm. It shall be noted that this information was collected for a specific project and is approximately fifteen (15) years old. It is further noted that the awarded firm will be responsible for field verification of dimensions and existing conditions.

7. **Inquiry:** Please clarify what the scope of work is for the bridge over the D&R Canal related to the alternatives analysis since the limit of the project goes to the NJ Route 29 intersection.

Response: The range of alternatives to be developed for the Project are to comprise the project area which includes the bridge over the D&R Canal. Accordingly, the scope of the work for the bridge is anticipated to be guided by the needs of the Project.

8. **Inquiry:** Along with the traditional safety analysis conducted for this study, will DRJTBC be requiring a HSM predictive safety analysis utilizing IHSDM for each of the alternatives?

Response: The tools/methodology used by the Consultant to perform all elements of the Scope of Services including, but not limited to, a safety analysis shall meet the requirements necessary to obtain a FONSI.

9. **Inquiry:** Please confirm that in responding to the “Experience and Credentials of the Project Team” that the PM’s for subconsultants should include both the brief biographical narrative and 3 references, or just 3 references.

Response: In the event that a subconsultant’s Project Manager is also a Key Team Member, a ‘brief’ biological narrative and client references should be included; otherwise, including just client references is sufficient.

10. **Inquiry:** Can the org chart be on 11x17?

Response: Yes, the organization chart may use tabloid-sized (11” x 17”) paper as modified herein this Addendum No. 2.

11. **Inquiry:** Is existing geotechnical information (e.g. boring logs) available from any previous studies or investigations performed by DRJTBC at or near the bridge? Will this information be made available to the selected consultant?

Response: The Commission has boring logs for two (2) borings taken in November 2008 from within the area of the abutment located on the Pennsylvania approach. Information about the borings is included as part of an in-depth inspection and evaluation report which is available for inspection/review and will be made available to the selected consultant.

Additionally, the Commission has core type information taken in October 1992 from each of the five (5) rubble stone faced masonry piers. Information about the cores is included as part of a report which is available for inspection/review and will be made available to the selected consultant.

12. **Inquiry**: Does DRJTBC have any land survey data from prior studies, which may be provided to the selected firm for reference?

Response: The Commission has land survey data from 2009 (i.e. TS-442A) and will provide the data to the selected firm. It shall be noted that this information was collected for a specific project and is approximately fifteen (15) years old. It is further noted that the selected firm will be responsible for field verification of dimensions and existing conditions.

13. **Inquiry**: The RFP Addendum added Underwater Inspections performed in 2021 to the list of available documentation for review. It is also understood that DRJTBC has recently awarded an Underwater Substructure Improvement Design contract. Can DRJTBC clarify if underwater inspection and improvements to the existing structure are required under this contract, or, if this will be implemented as part of the Underwater Substructure Improvement Design contract?

Response: Addendum No. 1 addressed the question regarding the performance of an underwater inspection and whether or not the Underwater Substructure Improvement Design project includes improvements to the existing WCTSB does not affect the Scope of Work for this Project.