
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: FY 2027 SUBREGIONAL ENGINEERING ASSISTANCE
PROGRAM (SEAP)
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Responses to Questions, issued on July 22, 2026

Question 1: Can you confirm whether any DBE/ESBE (or similar) requirements apply to this project?

Response 1: There are no DBE/ESBE requirements for this project.

Responses to Questions raised at the July 9, 2026 Pre-proposal Meeting, issued on July 22, 2026

A pre-proposal meeting was held by virtual meeting on July 9, 2026 at 2:00 PM (ET) to provide a general overview of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the FY2027 Subregional Engineering Assistance Program (SEAP). The following are questions asked by meeting attendees and the NJTPA's official responses.

Question 2: Plans have been provided in the RFP, should they be used as a baseline for the traffic and geometric analysis or are we expected to reevaluate all alternatives?

Response 2: The concept plans in Appendix J are the preliminary preferred alternatives for each project that will be advanced in preliminary engineering.

Question 3: Is each team required to submit on all 4 projects or could a team submit on fewer than 4?

Response 3: A team can submit a proposal for one or more contracts. Four individual firms will be selected for the four individual contracts. Please note that a single firm will not be awarded multiple contracts. A prime consultant will only be awarded one contract.

Question 4: A few of the concept plans seem to have a few sheets missing:

- Project A-2: Sheets 3, 6 & 7
- Project B-1: Sheet 4
- Project C-1: Sheets 1 & 2
- Project C-2: Sheets 3 – 5

Response 4: Appendix I Project Details includes the original applications submitted by the project sponsors. During the technical review committee process for selecting projects for the program, there were reductions in scope including the removal of some intersections. The project sponsors were not required to revise their applications to reflect these adjustments. Appendix J Concept Plans include the final revised preliminary preferred alternatives for each project that will be advanced. We are providing further clarification for each project in Appendix I and J .

Question 5: The RFP states Jackson Mills Road from County Line to Georgia Road. Appendix materials appear to define the corridor around Winding Woods Way/Tree Top Circle to Georgia Road. Which limits govern?

Response 5: See Appendix J for concept plan for the limits of the project.

Question 6: There seems to be a large time gap between when questions must be submitted and when the RFP is due. Is there a possibility that the question deadline can be extended?

- Response 6:** Deadline for inquiries has been extended to August 12, 2026, and the deadline for posting responses to the website will be August 19, 2026.
- Question 7:** Are there any ESBE or DBE requirements?
- Response 7:** See the response to Question 1.
- Question 8:** The RFP identifies Cedar Bridge Avenue as S. Clifton Avenue to Airport Road, but Appendix I/J materials reference Clifton Avenue to Airport Road and also show mileposts extending around MP 30.39 to 33.17. Should the team include the Garden State Parkway ramp area or any work beyond Airport Road?
- Response 8:** The project limit ends at Airport Road and does not extend to Garden State Parkway.
- Question 9:** Can you clarify on C-3 the intent of the “Morris County 2025 Local Aid Resurfacing” incorporation? How is it anticipated to upgrade a signal without touching the pavement/sidewalks?
- Response 9:** There are 5 intersections with traffic signal upgrades which will require repaving within the intersection limits.
- Question 10:** Will NJTPA provide existing traffic/count data or should all counts be collected under this contract?
- Response 10:** NJTPA and/or Project sponsors will provide traffic data collected as part of the application. During preliminary engineering project sponsors and the consultant will determine if additional traffic counts are needed for traffic signal design.
- Question 11:** Can NJTPA confirm that the safety need, crash screening, and selection of safety countermeasures were established during the Appendix J conceptual development process, and that Task 4 is intended to focus on operational traffic analysis of the approved conceptual improvements rather than a new safety analysis?
- Response 11:** Additional traffic counts may be collected during preliminary engineering.
- Question 12:** Should consultants assume that standard intersection and corridor operational analyses will be sufficient, or are there locations where more advanced modeling may be anticipated?
- Response 12:** More advanced modeling may be needed and will be determined by the project sponsors and consultant during preliminary engineering.
- Question 13:** Under what circumstances does NJTPA anticipate traffic simulation modeling will be necessary for public presentations, and should consultants include simulation development as a standard assumption. (refer Task 4 (last bullet) the phrase "when beneficial" is subjective and could significantly increase effort.)
- Response 13:** Traffic simulation modeling is not anticipated for public presentation on these projects.
- Question 14:** Is the lighting analysis localized (at the intersection only), or does it apply to the entire corridor.
- Response 14:** Lighting analysis applies to the whole corridor.

Question 15: Could more information be provided on how the signal pole design for back plate load is anticipated to be handled? Will this be sole source then and will Federal funding cover?

Response 15: Consultants will perform a feasibility analysis to determine if that is an aluminum pole design that could accommodate backplates. The analysis will be summarized in a memo including preliminary construction details and further discussed by NJDOT. It would not be sole source.

Question 16: LSP application front-end Sections 1-8 included in Appendix I (Project Details) for B1, B2, C1, C2, C3, D1, D2, and D3 appear to be duplicates of A1 (aside from some instances of updated information in the “brief description of project area” field). Kindly provide missing LSP application front-end Sections (if available) as applicable to the respective projects

Response 16: We are providing further clarification for each project in Appendix I and J.

Question 17: Could the Authority please clarify the anticipated schedule for Phase 2, specifically regarding the cost proposal submission process? The proposal webpage indicates that Phase 2 is anticipated to run from October 19 9:00 am through October 23 5:00 PM. However, the RFP schedule appears to list October 19 as the deadline for cost proposal submission. We may be misinterpreting the schedule, but would appreciate clarification regarding when cost proposals will be requested from the firms that are determined the most qualified and when they will be due.

Response 17: As stated on page 16 of the RFP, following the review of the technical proposals, the NJTPA will request cost proposals from the firms determined to be the most qualified. Shortlisted firms will be notified in writing accordingly. Phase 2 opens on October 19, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., at which time shortlisted firms may begin submitting their cost proposal documents. The Phase 2 deadline is October 23, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.