



Jersey City, New Jersey
Department of Housing, Economic Development and Commerce

SOLICITATION FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

Route 440/Routes 1&9 Truck Multi-Use Urban Boulevard
Concept Development Study

Clarification #2

January 5, 2009

New Date for ORAL PRESENTATIONS: Thursday, February 5, 2009.

- 1. The date for Oral Presentations has been changed From Wednesday, February 3, 2009 to Thursday, February 5, 2009. All bidders are advised that they should be prepared to be available in-person in Jersey City on Thursday, February 5, 2009 in the event that they are selected for oral presentations.**
- 2. The RFP states that certain background documents are available upon request. Please note that we are having technical difficulties in duplicating the November 4, 2008 aerial photography of the Route 440 / Route 1&9T corridor; therefore, this item will not be available.**
3. My firm is currently providing services for the 22-acre West Side Campus project for New Jersey City University. We do not think that this is a conflict of interest carrying out the subject study since it is a State owned facility and not a private developer.

This would be considered a conflict of interest under the terms of the solicitation because the CONTRACTUAL PROHIBITION AGAINST CONFLICTS OF INTEREST section in the solicitation does not distinguish between private developer and public developer. Page 9 of the solicitation states, "Firms and their sub-contractors are also advised that for the duration of the Route 440/Routes 1&9 Truck Multi-Use Urban Boulevard Concept Development Study they and their sub-contractors may not enter into contract with, or otherwise work for, any contractor doing business in Jersey City, or any developer doing business in Jersey City.

“Contractor” and “Developer” shall be liberally construed to include any entity who may represent the interests of the contractor or developer.”

4. Regarding Task 2C: Clarification #1 states “the survey should include road and property boundaries, topography, easements, utilities and services, location and depth of storm water and sewer drains, power lines, optical fiber, significant trees and canopy width, fences, driveways, poles”. Further, the within Summary of Issues and Concerns the RFP requires “determining the extent, width, and **precise right-of-alignment** for adjacent neighborhood development”. Is specific right-of-way [lot by lot] determination necessary throughout the nearly 3.5 miles of Project Area or will the City accept tax map and filed map information superimposed onto base mapping supplemented with lot determination in critical areas such as the Bayfront Redevelopment area. Please clarify the Project Purpose which states that the final product is the identification of a preferred alternative to be **advanced** into the next phase of Feasibility Assessment.

The Scope of Work section 1 states, “The purpose of this project is to prepare a Concept Development study for the creation of a multi-use urban boulevard along Route 440/Routes 1&9 Truck in Jersey City and to determine if it is possible to remove through truck traffic from Route 440/Routes 1&9T in Jersey City. The product of this project shall be the identification of a preferred alternative (and associated projects) to advance to the next phase of project development, Feasibility Assessment.”

The Scope of Work section 5b states: “Determine extent (length), width, and precise right-of-way alignment to create multi-use urban boulevard. Precise delineation of the right-of-way alignment is needed to establish build-to lines for adjacent neighborhood development in the short term. It may be the case that the right-of-way needs to be designed to accommodate more than one possible scenario or the potential for changes to occur in the boulevard over time as conditions may warrant. Consideration must be given to all existing and anticipated future cross streets, including attention to the intersection of Lincoln Highway/Communipaw Avenue and Route 440.”

The Scope of Work section 7 Scope of Services and Deliverables states: “...Task 5 Deliverables: Sub-task A: Report on methodology for identification of alternatives. Description of alternatives with text, maps, and drawings. Survey-level delineation of new rights-of-way for boulevard alternatives and a survey level delineation of a new right-of-way that accommodates all boulevard alternatives .”

Clarification #1 states: “The survey should include road and property boundaries, topography, easements, utilities and services, location and depth of storm water and sewer drains, power lines, optical fiber, significant trees and canopy width, fences, driveways, poles, service boxes, hydrants, intersecting streets and rights of way, tops and toes of adjoining walls, embankments, hills, and existing curbs, and any other elements that may be necessary to design alternatives for a multi-use urban boulevard and to delineate precise build-to lines and infrastructure connections for adjoining development parcels along the length of the Route 440/Routes 1-9T corridor in Jersey City.”

The purpose of the survey is to facilitate preparation of boulevard alternatives and delineation of boulevard alignment, without regard to the location or legal descriptions of current tax lot boundaries. The delineation of boulevard alignment is needed so that build-to lines parallel to Route 440/1-9T may be delineated throughout the entire Route 440/1-9T corridor for zoning purposes. SECTION 7, TASK 5A SHALL INCLUDE THE DELINEATION OF BUILD-TO LINES FOR ZONING

PURPOSES. The level of precision that should be provided is that which is necessary to address these purposes.

5. There is a contradictory statement with regards to the number of narrative to describe the Scope of Work; Section 12 calls for “no more than 30 pages” and Section 13 calls for no more than 25 pages”. Please clarify.

The scope of work may be up to 30 pages.

6. Scope of Work Tasks 7& 8 require an estimate of “operating costs”; please clarify what costs should be considered.

The operating costs that should be considered are dependent on the alternatives chosen. In the RFP response it is sufficient to provide examples of operating costs that could be considered when alternatives are identified in Tasks 5.A. What specific operating costs should be considered are unknown at this point since the alternatives have not been identified.