

RFP QUESTION AND ANSWERS
November 4, 2021

1Q. Section V.B indicates that proposals should be no more than fifteen pages in length. Does this page count include the following:

- a. Cover Letter and Table of Contents**
- b. RFP Submission Form**
- c. CVs and Resumes**

1A. NVRC will exclude the Cover Letter, Table of Contents, and RFP Submission Form (Attachment C) from the fifteen-page limit. CVs/Resumes can be appended and excluded from the 15-page count.

2Q. Attachment B: Reference Material – the links for the following documents do not appear to work:

- a. 2019 Final Infrastructure Gap Analysis Report** – See NVRC Website
- b. 2009 Prince William County Potomac River Commuter Ferry Service Study & Route Proving Exercise - Potomac River Commuter Ferry Feasibility Study & RPE Results - PDF Free Download (travelsdocbox.com) (Executive Summary)**
- c. 2000 VDOT Ferry Boat Feasibility Study** – See NVRC Website

2A. See attachments on the NVRC website for the following:

- a. 2019 Final Infrastructure Gap Analysis Report
- b. 2009 Prince William County Potomac River Commuter Ferry Service Study & Route Proving Exercise
- c. 2000 VDOT Ferry Boat Feasibility Study

3Q. Section II – Statement of Work – a reference is made to ‘three 249-passenger vessels. This is a very specific capacity and will have a significant impact on all aspects of the business case; from capital and operating expenses to wake energy to regulatory issues. Can references be provided to previous studies that drive this specific vessel capacity?’

3A. From our previous market analysis, it was determined about 600 passengers could come from Woodbridge to JBAB. We recognize the USCG regulations on construction and relative costs are the same from 249 to 300 passengers. The study should survey vessels of varying size as the viability of the ferry system may require a variety of vessels and sizes. The vessel size can only be determined after the routes are determined, which include locations, water depth and availability of docking, then the number of vessels and capacity can be determined. Cross river runs may be less attractive (in passenger numbers) than north/south runs and require smaller capacity vessels such as JBAB to Crystal City or Pentagon. Until routes are specified, then the size of vessels will be determined.

4Q. Attachment A: Scope of Work – Task 1: Service Model. ‘Consultant needs to take into consideration wake disturbance, the depth of the three rivers and be able to discuss with the limitations of speed and propeller versus jet propelled versus hydrogen.’ Please confirm that the intent of this requirement is to analyze all potential forms of propulsor (propellers, waterjets, etc.) and their effectiveness on the specific route given speed requirements and all environmental factors (water depth, debris, etc.) as well as all potential forms of propulsion (powering the propulsors) such as hydrogen fuel cells, diesel engines, etc. If there is an alternate intent, please clarify.

4A. Yes, the intent of this study is to analyze all potential forms of propulsion and their effectiveness on the specific routes.

5Q. Attachment A: Scope of Work – Task 1: Ridership Forecasts. ‘Finally, the consultant should fully describe all possible service routes (origin, destination, vessel types, passenger estimates, operating and capital costs, environmental considerations, etc.) and determine which routes are recommended for inclusion in the financial analysis to be completed in task two.’ Are passenger estimates to be based on forecasting from previous studies or is the consultant expected to develop new ridership forecasting?

5A. Yes, ridership forecasting should be based on previous studies.

6Q. RFP pg. 10 states that “Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance by the firm of the conditions contained in this request for proposal unless clearly and specifically noted in the proposal submitted and confirmed in the contract between NVRC and the entity selected.” If proposers wish to note any exceptions to the conditions, can these exceptions be appended and excluded from the 15-page count?

6A. No, they will not be excluded from the 15-page count but rather discussed in the context of the proposal.

7Q. In the Evaluation Criteria and Weighting table on p. 8 of the RFP, 5% of the scoring weight is allocated to Small, Women-owned, and Minority-owned (SWaM) Businesses. Can the NVRC please clarify how this criterion is scored? For example, does the Prime Consultant have to be a SWaM business to fulfill this criterion, or would participation from a SWaM subconsultant count towards this criterion? Is there a specific goal associated with this project?

7A. Participation from a SWaM subconsultant counts towards the criterion.

8Q. Are subconsultants required to fill out the RFP Submission Form, or only the Prime consultant?

8A. We are requesting the prime consultant to complete the RFP Submission Form, but we are asking the prime to disclose who their subs would be. That could be a matter of negotiation and approval.

9Q. Section GG. of the RFP requires an umbrella policy with \$5,000,000 per occurrence and aggregate limit. Umbrella policies typically provide excess coverage of Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability insurance. For a planning project, the exposures for General Liability and Automobile Liability policies are relatively small. A \$5,000,000 umbrella requirement is more typical of Contractor requirement for a construction project with significant risks in these areas. This limit may also prevent us from including smaller subconsultants on our team who would not carry these limits as they do not have these levels of exposures. Would NVRC remove the umbrella requirement given the nature of the requested services. If not, would NVRC consider removing the requirement to flow down the insurance requirements to subconsultants?

9A. NVRC will consider modifying the insurance requirements for the Consultant and subconsultants, based on guidance from NVRC's underwriter and conditions of the funding agency.

10Q. Would NVRC consider setting up payment for this project on a lump sum (fixed price) basis payable monthly for percentage of services completed?

10A. Yes, NVRC will consider setting up a payment plan based on monthly percentages; however, monthly progress reports would be required as well.

11Q. In Appendix A in task 1, the RFP states “Finally, the consultant should fully describe all possible service routes (origin, destination, vessel types, passenger estimates, operating and capital costs, environmental considerations, etc.) and determine which routes are recommended for inclusion in the financial analysis to be completed in task two.” But in the description of Task 1 Deliverable 2 the RFP states, “Report describing three possible service routes and any/all opportunities needed to launch the service.” Can you please clarify if the intent of Task 1 is to look at all possible service routes and then somehow settle on three possibilities, or if the task is to identify up to three possible service routes?

11A. The intent of the study is to identify all possible routes but no less than three service routes.

12Q. In Task 3, there is a list of potential revenue sources to be included in the financial model that lists “small freight package delivery.” From other portions of the RFP freight feasibility seems to be excluded from Phase 1 of the business case. Can you please clarify if this is intended to be only a placeholder for any possible freight revenue?

12A. Yes, we want to identify a placeholder for possible freight revenue.

13Q. Realizing that freight feasibility has been moved into Phase 2 of the business case, to what extent should considerations around the potential for freight handling be included in the Phase 1 report? In Task 1 these may be influences on the operating plan, conceptual vessel design, and most definitely terminal assumptions and requirements, please clarify.

13A. Freight revenue should be considered as it pertains to the operating plan, conceptual vessel design, and terminal assumptions.

14Q. The capital financial model in Task 2 includes consideration of a maintenance facility, yet there is no description or requirement to establish what that might be in Task 1. Can you clarify if this is intended to be a placeholder in the capital financial model, or is there an expectation that the service/operational portion of the business plan (Task 1) also includes an assumed plan for a maintenance facility?

14A. Yes, a maintenance facility is a placeholder for the business plan.

15Q. Task 2 Deliverable 2 – Please clarify if the intent is to create fixed documents displaying the model inputs and outputs for inclusion on the website, or if the intent is to make the entire financial model available on the website?

15A. The intent is to make the entire financial model available on the website.

16Q. Task 3 analysis requires the consultant to address a description of considerations for a governance model including, “The description should address the extent of whether the District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Virginia, and State of Maryland are willing to consider participation in a regional model.” Can you please clarify the responsibility of the consultant in this case, is this intended to be a politically speculative description, or is the consultant expected to get legislation introduced and passed within each jurisdiction that reflects acceptance of a regional model?

16A. The intent is to have draft legislation drafted for each political jurisdiction. Introduction of the legislation will be part of phase 2.

17Q. The scope of work makes multiple references to making presentations to and working with NVRC and an advisory committee. While we can assume the implied necessary meetings and process to achieve that, can you please generally describe how NVRC envisions the business case development process rolling out with NVRC staff and advisory committee. For example, is it anticipated there would be one culminating presentation of all three tasks, or is the process envisioned to be more iterative with meetings focusing on issues and discussion around each task as business case development moves through the process?

17A. The process should be iterative. Meetings should focus on issues and discussion of each task as the business case moves through the process.