



**THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ**

**THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY  
PURCHASING SERVICES DIVISION  
ONE MADISON AVENUE 7<sup>TH</sup> FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10010**

Date: March 9, 2010

**ADDENDUM #2**

**TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS ON RFP # 20264 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT,  
IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A CUSTOMIZED EVACUATION AND  
RECOVERY MODEL AND SIMULATION TOOL (CMST)**

**Due back on April 1, 2010, no later than 2:00 PM**

**The following information is made available in response to questions submitted by prospective bidders. It should not be deemed to answer all questions, which have been submitted by bidders to the Port Authority. It addresses only those questions, which the Port Authority has deemed to require additional information and/or clarification. The fact that information has not been supplied with respect to any questions asked by a bidder does not mean or imply, nor should it be deemed to mean or imply, any meaning, construction, or implication with respect to terms.**

Q1: Company XYZ requests an extension to the due date for submission of the response to the CMST RFP #20264 from 1 April 2010 to 4 May 2010.

A: No

Q2: Would the PA entertain the suggestion of a workshop to discuss the requirements of the RFP?

A: No

Q3: Is it acceptable to propose on only Module 1 of the RFP and not all 4 modules?

A: Yes

Q4: We would appreciate clarification of IP rights. On page 46 in the Rights in Software, under the definition of Custom Software, does the Contractor retain the rights to reuse custom software components developed during the course of this project for future work outside of the PANYNJ?

A: No

Q5: Do we need to simulate operations of the AirTrain to EWR?

A: No

Q6: Do we need to simulate train operations at EWR Airport Station?

A: No

Q7: Is plume dispersion necessary or would it be more accurate to define a blast radius/radius of dispersion?

A: Yes, it is necessary. Two separate types of incidents.

Q8: Should there be two different and distinct models, one each for the port and airport, or should there be one large model?

A: One large model.

Q9: Is the study to provide an off-line or on-line system? Specifically, an off-line system would produce a test bed model that ultimately owns a series of (pre-tested) "menu" responses to a given set of incidents. So the system, when altered, identifies a disaster scenario and pulls down a pre-tested plan from a library of disaster and recovery plans. An on-line system would allow a disaster description to be input and the models run on-line to produce an evacuation plan.

A: The PA is looking for contractor recommendations, but expects that the system will be flexible enough to model a wide variety of parameters and circumstances.

Q10: Does the PA have any preference in selecting software packages (for pedestrian modeling, traffic simulation, etc.) or are they looking for contractor's recommendations?

A: Contractor recommendation.

Q11: For large-scale evaluation planning, should we consider the City's evaluation plan?

A: No.

Q12: Are the programs that simulate different features, e.g. traffic, pedestrian flow, etc required to be interactive in that the solution derived from one package would affect the solution of another, or would the user draw the knowledge gained from discrete solutions and base decisions and outcomes from such?

A: The programs should be interactive.

Q13: The liquidated damages terms on pages 50-53 of the RFP seem quite onerous and excessive. We are willing to agree to some performance level damages as outlined in Section 11 for late deliverables. How willing is the PANYNJ will to adjust the wording of section 12 or remove parts of it entirely?

A: The Proposers may offer alternatives to the stated L.D. Though they may be rejected and or negotiated as part of the RFP proposal process.

Q14. The schedule outlined in the RFP for completion seems aggressive, especially given the liquidated damages terms of the contract. Is there flexibility to adjust this schedule?

A: There is some limited flexibility. The proposers may offer alternatives in their proposals. However they may be rejected and or negotiated as part of the RFP proposal process.

Q15: May we assume that a detailed work program response to this RFP that would require more time than has been allotted in the proposed schedule, but would ensure a better product, would be duly considered by the Port Authority?

A: There will be no extension of the RFP proposal due date of April 1, 2010.

Q16: Can you please confirm the end use/operation concept for the CMST. The RFP states that the tool will enable "... the opportunity to plan, evaluate, compare and outline strategies that support effective responses to a variety of emergency events in order to minimize the consequences." We understand that the end product be used to plan, evaluate and compare strategies in preparation of an emergency, but will it also be used during a real emergency necessitating 24x7 ongoing operation and support?

A: We will consider solutions that propose real-time capabilities as well as static.

Q17: The liquidated damages terms in Section 12 (Pages 50-53) seem to require round the clock staff to be dedicated on-call to the this project. Can you comment on the overall project budget and the available budget for system maintenance/upkeep? Also, can you please verify that this support is required on a 24x7 basis or simply normal business hours Monday through Friday?

A: We assume that support would be contingent upon the solution contained in the proposal, but would be interested in understanding what the estimated cost would be for a real-time vs. static solution.

Q18: Can you please confirm if there is a firm requirement for 12% MBE participation and 5% WBE participation, or is this simply a goal?

A: The MWBE participation is a Goal. Proposers are to make a Good Faith effort to include such participation.

Q19: Given the detailed nature of this response and the fact the Q&A response may change the proposal methodology and costs, can a two week time extension be granted?

A: No

Q20: Can you please confirm the payment schedule outlined on page 49? Does the 50% payment listed in the final row mean that 50% (the remainder of the system implementation payment) will be remitted after 250 days and then monthly system maintenance payments will be made thereafter?

A: The payment schedule assumes that the system will be operational and fully accepted by the Authority within 520 days of contract award, representing approximately 50% of the contract cost with the other 50% allocated to ongoing maintenance and system

administration. This payment schedule can be adjusted based upon the solution selected and contract negotiated.

Q21: Page 51 – The liquidated damages clauses seem rather high; however, the description of High, Medium, Low severity issues is vague and open to subjective interpretation. Will the definition of “High, Medium and Low” be further refined. If not, how and who will define which problems fall into each category? How will disputes along these lines be resolved?

A: Definitions may be further refined based on the solution proposed and contract negotiations.

Q22: Page 53, Table item #6. Damages will be assessed if there is non-conformance to the control requirements (Attachment F). Will there be an opportunity for explanation and discussion for all the items discussed in Attachment F. Several Items are rather non-descript: therefore, we are unable to confirm their exact meaning. With damages being attached to conformance with these guidelines, it may be difficult for us to agree to the damage terms without a complete agreement on what all these terms/requirements mean.

A: These can be discussed in more detail during proposal submissions and if needed during contract negotiations.

Q23: Page 104, Paragraph A – What is considered a “... viable over a period of time” – 5 years? 7 years?

A: A minimum of 5 years.

Q24: Page 143, Item 2.6 – Can further description be provided to the required to operate with CAD Programs? How and in what manner?

A: The solution should employ an open architecture that may be integrated with other applications as necessary.

Q25: On Page 146, Interoperability – This is a very broadly-worded section which has great cost implications. The requirement that the system must: “support other software programs”, “operate with other GIS software”, “operate with other modeling tools”, “operate with CAD programs” would be difficult given that there is no list of the exact names of these tools and how many. There are literally dozens of other tools encompassed by these bullets. Pricing for “any other unknown tool” would be extremely costly and not realistic

A: The solution should employ an open architecture that may be integrated with other applications as necessary.

Q26: Page 159, cost estimate. Can you please clarify the purpose of the hourly rate table? Is there an intention to reimburse the vendor for tasks on a Time & Materials basis using this hourly rate schedule?

A: The purpose is for price evaluation only; contract payments will be based on tasks/deliverables completed.

Q27: In development of the CMST, do emergency routes need to vary based on time of day -- off peak and weekends, for example, major routes may be best; during rush hours, other routes may be needed?

A: Yes, of course.

Q28: In Paragraph G Acceptance of General Contract Provisions you state that the proposer is expected to agree with the General Contract Provisions but that specific exceptions should be set forth in a separate letter. Given the previous history of the RFP for this project, may we assume that PANYNJ is indeed willing to consider items of exception notwithstanding the statement that the "Authority is under no obligation to entertain or accept any such specific exceptions."

A: Yes

Q29: Can a vendor qualify and count towards both a MBE and WBE goals if they have dual certification?

A: Yes

Q30: Please confirm that 2<sup>nd</sup> tier subcontractors will count towards the M/WBE goals of the solicitation?

A: Yes

Q31: Module 1

- What is the expected area of interest to be modeled for highway network and connectors? Can you define the boundaries? What level of granularity is expected from the vehicular modeling requirement?
- ANSWER Approximately Route 80 to the North, Route 287 to the West, and the Outerbridge Crossing to the South, with as much detail as possible.
- Our assumption is that Module 1 does not require the modeling of cargo evacuation as it relates to cargo movement to and from PANYNJ marine terminals and the airport. Can you confirm if this assumption is accurate?
- ANSWER Yes
- Is module 1 attempting to accomplish the creation of a temporal model to test various impacts for various times of day or multiple events throughout the day that are continuous in nature?
- ANSWER Both

Q32 Module 2

- Please confirm if the CMST model – Module 2 requires modeling of PANYNJ cargo operations only and not the passenger ferry operations.
- ANSWER Yes
- Please clarify what level of detail for the movement of terminal equipment is required to be modeled in Module 2?

- ANSWER enough to determine the capacity to effect recovery and resources available to do so including labor and equipment.
- Please clarify if each and every marine terminal in the jurisdiction of PANYNJ is required to model explicitly using the existing equipments and work practices in use at these terminals.
- ANSWER Yes
- What is the upstream and downstream model boundary for Rail movement in the model? Is passenger rail movement required to be model in Module 3? If yes, which train stations are required to be modeled and what is the model boundary upstream and downstream from train stations?
- ANSWER same as above for freight rail only.

Q33 Module 3

- Please clarify if the CMST model – Module 3 will consist of cargo vessel movement only or does it also require modeling of passenger ferry boats?
- ANSWER Entire Port including Ferries if they are impacted by an incident.
- What level of details will be provided to the consultant on tank farm operations, capacity and available fuel sources?
- ANSWER Capacity levels and other general information.

Q34 Module 4

- What level of details is required to track passenger baggage in the CMST model – Module 4?
- ANSWER None
- What should be assumed regarding the passenger baggage storage during the one week shutdown period?
- ANSWER Not applicable.

**This communication should be initialed by you and annexed to your proposal upon submission.**

**In case any proposer fails to conform to these instructions, its proposal will nevertheless be construed as though this communication had been so physically annexed and initialed.**

**THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ**

**LARRY WAXMAN, MANAGER  
TECHNOLOGY AND OPERATIONAL PROCUREMENT SERVICES DIVISION**

**PROPOSER'S FIRM NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**INITIALED:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS ADDENDUM MAY BE ADDRESSED TO  
NADINE AZIZ, WHO CAN BE REACHED AT (212) 435-3934.**