



**Date:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020

**To:** Recipients

**Re:** Regional Trail Network - Feasibility Survey  
Questions and Answers

**Q1. Can/will responses to RFP questions be posted on a rolling basis, particularly as they may affect the decision to submit?**

A1. Questions will be answered as quickly as possible and answers will be posted on a rolling basis.

**Q2a. The Scope of Work in the RFP is significantly different from what is described in the 2021 UPWP. Based on this new scope of work, the proposed level of effort appears to significantly exceed the amount budgeted in the 2021 UPWP. Is there additional funding available to reflect the increased scope? If so, can SJTPO provide a ballpark estimate or range on the amount?**

**Q2b. The \$55,555 (FHWA-PL) published in the Unified Planning Work Program – Is this the full extent of funding available for this planning exercise?**

**Q2c. How much total budget has been allocated for this effort?**

A2. The language in the UPWP was written broadly and intended to allow for either a limited assessment of numerous ROWs across the region or to dig in and look deeper at a more narrowly focused location. It was determined that looking more deeply at a single location was most useful at this time. Additional funding may be considered for this effort, if needed. However, SJTPO is not looking for firms to target a specific budget and back into the scope of work, but rather to propose based on the scope of work described in the RFP. At the time that a consultant is selected, SJTPO will look at the proposed budget and may opt to add budget to the project, negotiate elements out of the scope, or both. Firms are encouraged to submit proposals that optimize efficiency in addressing tasks but address all tasks in the scope of work.

**[Update 9/8/2020]** While the above answer remains accurate and SJTPO continues to ask firms to submit proposals based on the scope of work described in the RFP, it is clear that it would be helpful to proposing firms to have greater clarity regarding the potential budget available for this study. Today, as part of the publicly available TAC packet, an amendment to the UPWP is proposed that would increase the maximum budget available for this study from \$55,555 to \$87,506.98. Consideration for Policy Board approval will be made at the September 28, 2020 meeting. At the time a preferred firm is selected, SJTPO will determine what portion of this maximum budget it intends to expend based on the value of the tasks relative to the proposed budget.

**Q3. Is there a designated % set aside for DBE/ESBE participation for this solicitation?**



---

**Date:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020

**Re:** Regional Trail Network - Feasibility Survey

---

- A3. Information regarding DBE/ESBE utilization is described on pages 13 and 14-16 of the Request for Proposal. Firms are encouraged to review this material in detail. As is noted in these sections, the DBE/ESBE goal for this project is 13.23 percent.
- Q4. Under Task 2 on Page 9, the consultant is asked to map the “length, dimensions, and boundaries of the ROW.” Is it expected the ROW mapping would be based solely on existing GIS parcel data? Or is survey and/or deed research expected?**
- A4. Surveying is not expected as a part of this effort. Identifying parcel boundaries via GIS seems adequate. However, it would be expected to identify ownership, which may require going beyond publicly available GIS data and could include deed research. The purpose of this task is to identify ownership of the properties that would be impacted by the construction of the off-road trail, to allow for coordination early in the process to avoid any potential issues as the trail moves towards construction.
- Q5. Task 4 on Page 9 asks for a general assessment of structures, culverts, buildings, etc. Can you expand on what type of assessment is needed? In-person visual, desktop, etc.?**
- A5. Work associated with this technical study is a planning-level effort, and the intention is not to conduct a Preliminary Engineering (PE) level of analysis for this task or any other task described within this RFP. Any assessment should generally identify items that would be broadly beneficial to the discussion of advancing the Atlantic County Bikeway West. For example: if there was an abandoned rail bridge in the corridor, identifying that structure and that it would need to be studied further as a possible crossing would be appropriate for this technical study. Following with that example, we would not expect a formal engineering assessment of the safety or capacity of that bridge, but essentially offering a more qualitative planning-level assessment would be beneficial. The consultant should determine how that assessment is conducted.
- Q6. Under Task 5 on Page 9, the consultant is asked to “identify and map the location of utilities (water, sanitary sewers, electrical and gas lines, telephone, etc.) in relationship to the proposed trail ROW.” This is typically a Preliminary Engineering (PE) task that requires significant utility coordination and CADD mapping. Is existing utility information available as a GIS layer? Or is PE-level analysis expected?**
- A6. As noted in A5, the intention is not to conduct a PE-level of analysis for any of the tasks described within this RFP. Task 5.a indicates that utilities should be mapped, but 5.b notes that the purpose is to identify if the utilities serve in the development of the trail or could be an impediment. Mapping the utilities is to assist in identifying if they will either be a barrier or perhaps their ROW could be a potential opportunity for routing. Local knowledge will likely be of importance in this identification. Knowing if certain utility companies have been amenable to trails within their ROW will be helpful.



---

**Date:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020

**Re:** Regional Trail Network - Feasibility Survey

---

**Q7. For Task 7 on Page 11, is this for “order of magnitude” or engineering cost estimates? Note that developing cost estimates for land acquisition/easements is generally a PE task.**

A7. An order of magnitude estimate is requested. As previously noted, the level of effort for this technical study is exploratory and planning level. The anticipation is that any proposed trail will proceed to Preliminary Engineering in the next phase of the project delivery process.

**Q8. Plan Review Committee Format: Per your instructions, the public meetings should be budgeted in-person. Would SJTPO want consultants to budget for plan review committee meetings to also be in-person, or are you open to those meetings being scoped as virtual?**

A8. At the present time, SJTPO staff are working remotely from home. Given COVID-19, all efforts should be made to attend meetings virtually, to limit exposure and need to enter the workplace. However, other members of the review committee may opt for in-person meetings, and depending on the status of conditions related to COVID-19, SJTPO would want to be as accommodating as possible.,

**Q9. Printing of the Final Report: The number of required final report copies will depend on the number of municipalities that will be determined to host the trail. Given the possible alternative alignments, could you advise of the number of municipalities to use at this point in time?**

A9. The proposing firm should familiarize themselves with a map of the area and make an estimate they are comfortable with in creating their proposal. Ultimately, the number of reports printed will be based on the route selected regardless of the proposed estimate, so firms should make estimates they feel comfortable with.

**Q10. Potential Trail Linkages: Under Task 3.3, shall we include planning for linkages to public transit in the trail corridor, and adjustments/facilities that should be provided to facilitate both access from population centers to the trail and multimodal travel?**

A10. Regarding the public transit portion of the question, while it is important to note that transit is minimal in this area, in areas where the potential trail alignment does intersect or is proximate to transit, bus, rail, or otherwise, planning for linkages would be appropriate.

The focus of this technical effort is on the Atlantic County Bikeway West, and not a network of trails. Firms are not expected to address every possible point of interest in the area, however, reasonable consideration of how people would access the trail is appropriate particularly from significant nearby points of interests/origins/destinations. It would not be inappropriate to consider access points, especially those that may link up with sidewalk networks, possible locations for parking, or the aforementioned transit connectivity. Additional recommendations that came from this effort, such as improvements to local networks to improve access to the Bikeway, would be a positive value-added deliverable, but are not required.



**Date:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020

**Re:** Regional Trail Network - Feasibility Survey

---

**Q11. Other Trail Uses: Should the study of uses for the proposed trail include activities and facilities such as equestrian uses? Should we consider linkages to the potential equestrian network in the study area?**

A11. The existing section of the Atlantic County Bikeway does not permit horse access, as such it would likely not be appropriate to incorporate equestrian uses in the Atlantic County Bikeway West corridor.