

# Answers to Questions received on the TRyy1130 M-55 Illinois-Gulf Marine Highway Initiative RFP

---

## Clarification for RFP Sections:

- ▶ Under Section 2, Scope of Services – mention is made to the study being six parts (line #2) and five study parts (line #7).

**This was a typo; there are 6 parts to the study.**

- ▶ Would letters of support from active transportation interests be appropriate for inclusion with proposal submission?

**We hope that previous work (who and what subject matter) would be included in your proposals. Submitting letters of support will certainly be appropriate.**

## Clarification on Management Committee:

- ▶ How many individuals are contemplated to participate in the Management Committee?
- ▶ Are specific organizations or entities identified as stakeholder representatives on the Management Committee? If so, which organizations or entities comprise the committee? The goal here is to understand if the consultant will be working with a knowledgeable committee or working with a group who will need to be educated by the consultant.

**The three members of the Management Committee are knowledgeable about the industry. The Committee consists of one member from the USDOT Maritime Administration, one member for the Heart of Illinois Port District/TransPORT and one member from the Missouri Department of Transportation, Multimodal Operations Division, Waterways Section.**

## Clarification on Freight Flow Data Requirement

- ▶ Will MoDOT provide these data, such as railroad freight waybill sample data, or will the contractor be responsible for obtaining all freight flow data?

- ▶ If freight flow data are the responsibility of the contractor, should these charges be included in our proposal, or will they be allocated for by the Management Committee, per Section (3), D (Pricing) (2), Covered Costs of the MoDOT Request for Proposal?

**We expect the selected Offeror will obtain these in the course of conducting the study at their cost. Proposals should reflect data costs.**

#### **Clarifications on Schedule and Project Briefings:**

- ▶ The RFP states that the contract period will be 12 months, yet the Project Schedule calls for a start date of April 1, 2011 and a termination date of February 29, 2012—11 months. Will this be an 11-month or 12-month project?

**The deadline is January 31, 2012 for the product on this project; therefore dictating the length at 10 months if you count from April through January. The February 29, 2012 date is for final invoicing to occur.**

- ▶ On page 9 of the RFP, 6 in-person briefings are called for. Will it be possible to substitute webinars for in-person briefings for some of these “events”? For instance, could the first and last briefing be in-person, but the others be webinars?
- ▶ Where will the briefings take place (what city)?

**The Management Committee is open to the possibility of the first and last meetings being in-person with others being via webinar, provided the project is on target and we are satisfied with progress. The in-person meetings will be in St. Louis, Missouri.**

#### **Background Information Requests**

- ▶ Could MoDOT provide a copy of the cooperative agreement between MoDOT, TransPORT, and MARAD?
- ▶ On Page 10, Paragraph (A), we note the following language: “It must include the concepts and information contained in the relevant Marine Highway Corridor recommendations and the applications by sponsors of the Marine highway Initiative named in this Agreement.” Could MoDOT provide a copy of these recommendations and the application?

**Yes, we will post the cooperative agreement between MoDOT, TransPORT and MARAD here: <http://www.modot.mo.gov/services/OR/orRFP.htm>. The appendix of this document will address both questions received.**

#### **Clarifications for NEPA requirements**

An approved NEPA document for the defined corridor could be an extensive effort based on the issues identified during scoping and the number of local, regional, state and federal agencies involved.

- ▶ The following slide addresses all NEPA questions received during the Q&A period.

### **NEPA Questions**

- ▶ The RFP indicates that the “Recipient(s) shall make the necessary funds available to conduct the NEPA analyses...” Does this simply mean that the consultant selected for TRyy1130 is responsible for delivery of the programmatic NEPA document, or does this refer to other funding from MoDOT for a separate effort? Please clarify if possible.
- ▶ Is it anticipated that the NEPA process would be conducted concurrently or delayed until initial tasks (Part I through Part III) are reviewed by the Management Committee to better define the scope of NEPA Analysis needed?
- ▶ Will a full and complete NEPA Analysis be required within the fee and schedule outlined in this RFP?
- ▶ How much time is allotted for the NEPA analysis? Will the time for the NEPA analysis be part of the project time?
- ▶ Historical data reveal that a NEPA-compliant analysis of this type will cost more than the entire project budget and require at least one year to complete. Has MoDOT defined the scope in such a way as to make it fit within the project?

**The Management Committee expects the consultant to do *due diligence* in considering all environmental impacts for the Illinois-Gulf Marine Highway Initiative described on the Maritime Administration’s website. Impacts could include air quality, surface transportation, and marine habitats for the complete intermodal shipping corridor including all modes.**

**The Committee expects the impacts to take into account viable marine highway service alternatives reviewed in the project. The alternatives could entail regularly scheduled services and therefore considerable impacts such as those noted above. Since the Maritime Administration plans to conduct a programmatic review, the Committee expects the consultant to substantially cover the expected environmental impacts based on substantial research and preliminary analysis. The impacts include the effects and the way forward such as coordination with regional, state and local agencies for viable service alternatives considered in the Illinois-Gulf Marine Highway Initiative.**

**The expected budget for the environmental portion of the study is about 20%, including potentially working with the MARAD Office of the Environment to ensure the provision of enough information. Each consultant should provide a scope and budget of what it believes is the required level of effort to provide the Committee with the necessary information for the Maritime Administration.**

**ADDITIONAL Questions received:**

- ▶ What level of NEPA is necessary?

**At least at this stage, MARAD does not believe that a new container or trailer barge service would be granted a Categorical Exclusion. It is possible that a Finding of No Significant Impact may be determined. Yet it is critical to first point out that a programmatic review is expected to be conducted by MARAD based on the environmental review in the Illinois-Gulf, East Coast and West Marine Highway Initiatives and three Marine Highway Funded Project (Grant). The involvement of Federal monies mandates an environmental review.**

- ▶ Page 18 refers to section 3 paragraph I, but there is no paragraph I in Section 3:

**This is a typo, it should be Section 4, paragraph I.**

- ▶ Could you provide a copy of the short sea coast document referenced in the RFP on page 10 in the top paragraph and footnote?

**This report is 189 pages and can be located using the following link:**

**[http://www.ccdott.org/transfer/projresults/2005/task%203.21/task%203.21\\_8a.pdf](http://www.ccdott.org/transfer/projresults/2005/task%203.21/task%203.21_8a.pdf)**