

**New Jersey Turnpike Authority
Engineering Department**

**Order for Professional Services No. T3920
Independent Design Review, Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension
Improvements Program, Section 2, Milepost N1.3 To N2.9**

**Addendum No. 1 and Response to Inquiries
Request for Expressions of Interest
June 14, 2024**

Addendum No. 1:

1. Page 17 of 47, Subsection B.2., Detailed Scope of Work, Item No. A.1, is replaced with the following:

“Westbound and Eastbound Newark Bay Bridge structurally continuous, cable-stayed bridges inclusive of one (1) main span, two (2) back spans and two (2) flanking spans for each bridge, including primary superstructure and substructure members and critical connections.

Inquiries:

1. Considering the very limited number of cable-stayed bridges in North America in design/construction over the last few years, will the Authority allow the successful qualified firm to present relevant experience within the last ten (10) years in either a primary design or similar IDR role?

Response:

No. The Consultant can present prior relevant experience under other submission requirements.

2. Please clarify if “flanking spans” imply the full length of the “east and west approach spans” to the proposed 3-span twin cable-stayed bridges from MP1.3 to 2.9. Please note that Detailed Scope of Work Item A.1 (see page 17 of 47) as written is limited to Cable-stayed bridge only.

Response:

Design is currently underway. For this RFEOI, the scope is limited to the structurally continuous main span, two (2) back spans and two (2) flanking spans for both the westbound and eastbound bridges. Refer to Addendum No. 1, Item No. 1.

3. Would the Authority be willing to provide the EOR's current baseline schedule for design as the IDR consultant's schedule will be influenced by the EOR's schedule? If not, what schedule should we assume?

Response:

The Consultant's Design Schedule will be provided to the Successful Qualified Firm after the Notice to Proceed. A short-term schedule, though May 2025, will be made available to firms requested to submit Technical and Fee Proposals.

4. Will the firm that provides the demolition engineer for the IDR consultant be precluded from participating at a later time as a subconsultant to a contractor that will bid on the demolition contract?

Response:

Not at this time. Review the requirements under any future procurement and be guided accordingly.

5. Referring to Rating Factor 2 (see page 19 of 47), is the reference to "project manager" meant to be instead the "IDR Lead Engineer" when considering the responsibilities outlined in Section D. Role of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer"?

Response:

Rating Factor 2, Page 19 of 47, shall remain as presented. Other Key Staff and supporting staff will be assessed under other identified Rating Factors.

6. Section F – Post Design Services on Page 21 does not indicate a scope for shop drawings for the IDR Consultant; however, a column is provided in the Staffing Estimate table on Page 25. Please clarify intent of the shop drawing scope of work for the IDR Consultant.

Response:

The Consultant shall propose the level of effort based on prior experience and their review and understanding of the scope of work as presented Section B.2, Detailed Scope of Work in the RFEOI.

7. Staffing estimate for Post-Design Services will vary greatly depending upon the number of Addenda, Contractor RFIs and Change of Plans, so would it be possible for NJTA to consider providing an allowance for this effort or a set number of hours to be used by all to estimate this effort?

Response:

The Consultant shall propose the level of effort based on prior experience and their review and understanding of the scope of work as presented Section B.2, Detailed Scope of Work in the RFEOI.

8. Are subconsultants that are part of the design team working only on the trestles for OPS T3922 precluded from being a subconsultant for OPS T3920, which does not involve trestles?

Response:

Not at this time. Review the requirements under any future procurement and be guided accordingly.

9. Would it be acceptable to propose key personnel who are in the process of gaining their New Jersey PE license and will be appropriately licensed by the time of the contract award? This will allow teams to propose staff who are most qualified to deliver the scope of services for a project of this magnitude.

Response:

Refer to the OPS requirements and be guided accordingly.

10. Please verify that a check on "the design of the demolition of the existing bridge" is not included in the IDR scope.

Response:

An Independent Design Review of the demolition of the existing bridge is not proposed within the IDR Scope.

11. As stated in General NB-HCE Limits of this Scope of Services (Page 15 of 47), The IDR firm shall carry post-design IDR services for Construction Contract No. 3 – Existing Newark Bay Bridge demolition. Is it the Authority's intent that the IDR Firm perform an independent design review of the existing bridge demolition procedure developed by the EOR of Contract 3? The IDR of the existing bridge demolition is not listed in the Detailed Scope of Work.

Response:

The IDR firm will not carry post-design IDR services for Construction Contract No. 3 – Existing Newark Bay Bridge demolition nor independent design review of the existing bridge demolition procedure developed by the EOR.

12. Will the Design (and IDR) of Construction Contract 2 & 5 be performed concurrently or will the contracts be delivered at different time periods?

Response:

For the purpose of this EOI, the Consultant shall presume that Contract Nos. 2 and 5 will be performed sequentially. The Authority will address more directly at the time of RFP development.

13. Does the Authority intend to include any Security Analysis (blast threats, fire, etc.) as part of the IDR process?

Response:

Refer to the RFEOI's SOW and be guided accordingly.

14. Does the Authority intend that the IDR Firm independently verify the system redundancy approach for the cable stayed bridge design? The system redundancy approach can be directly related to the Security Analysis requirements.

Response:

Yes.

15. Does the Authority intend to have the IDR Firm also perform an IDR of the Construction Cost Estimate and / or Construction Schedule?

Response:

The IDR Firm will not perform an IDR of the Construction Cost Estimate or Construction Schedule.

16. Section E.3(a) - Is it the Authority's intent for the IDR firm to perform independent verification of the aerodynamic performance of the bridge (e.g. independent analytical evaluation or independent wind tunnel testing)? Or is the intent that IDR firm certifies that the Wind Tunnel Testing / Aeroelastic Stability Report is based on the appropriate design and performance criteria and that the results have been incorporated into the design correctly?

Response:

The IDR firm shall certify that the Wind Tunnel Testing / Aeroelastic Stability Report is based on the appropriate design and performance criteria and that the results have been incorporated into the design correctly.

17. Section E.3(e) – Is it the Authority's intent for the IDR firm to perform an IDR of the Erection Manual? Typically, the Erection Manual is developed by the Contractor's Erection Engineer and is Approved by the EOR of the Cable Stayed Bridge.

Response:

Yes. The EOR's Erection Analysis Report and Erection Manual defining the Contractor's permissible Construction constraints shall be reviewed by the Successful Qualified Firm. Refer to Page 18 of 47, Item No. B.11. and Page 20 of 47, Item No. E.3.d).