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

Responses to Questions, issued on July 21, 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 21, 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.

Responses to Questions, issued on August 19, 2026

Question 18: Is Traffic count data and traffic signal analysis available for the intersections for the contracts C1 and C2? For C3, are timing directives available? If available, can this information be provided during the proposal phase or after award of the contract?

Response 18: Traffic count data and traffic signal timings will be available after the contract is awarded.

Question 19: Do the City and County have roadway and traffic signal as built available for all three contracts C1, C2, and C3? If available, can this information be provided during the proposal phase or after award of the contract?

Response 19: Roadway and traffic signal as-builts (if available) will be shared after the contract is awarded.

- Question 20:** Are Road Safety Audit and Road Safety documents available?
- Response 20:** Where Road Safety Audits were conducted, the corresponding documents are included in the application materials.
- Question 21:** The Disclosure of Investment Activities in Iran form shown in the RFP is different from the form downloaded in the website, can you clarify what specific format should we accomplish?
- Response 21:** The Disclosure of Investment Activities in Iran form has been updated. The same version is now available through either link.
- Question 22:** For the resumes, is there also a requirement that all projects included must have been completed within the last five years or at least within 50% completion?
- Response 22:** No, there is no requirement. We are looking for more recent and relevant experiences.
- Question 23:** For Projects C1 and C2, are corridor wide curb replacements required?
- Response 23:** The consultant will need to work with the subregion during design to decide if replacements are necessary.
- Question 24:** Please confirm the scope of work shown on the Project D3, Ocean County LSP Application #1 plans. For Plan Sheets 1 and 2, we understand that no work under this contract is to be performed within the area identified as the “Cedar Bridge Avenue Safety Improvements (Completed) – NJTPA FY 2017–2018 LSP” project limits. Please confirm. For Plan Sheets 3 and 4, please clarify the division of responsibility between the “Cedar Bridge Avenue Road Improvements – Menlo Engineering Associates (In Design)” project and the work included under this contract. It appears that this contract includes the design of the shoulder widening, shared-use path, and sidewalks. Please confirm who is responsible for the following improvements, new raised median; overall roadway paving; pavement markings and striping; traffic signal modifications at Avenue of the States. Lastly, please confirm the scope of work shown on Plan Sheet 6 adjacent to “The Hub” at the Lakewood Airport project. We understand that this contract will not include any work within the limits of the yellow-shaded area or any work associated with the proposed traffic signal at the airport’s main entrance. Please confirm.
- Response 24:** Please refer to the call outs in the concept plan. The proposed improvements are also reiterated in list form in the application. See page 12 of the project details appendix for this project.
- Question 25:** In regard to Contract D3, the RFP concept calls out for the replacement of 2 culverts, but it isn't repeated in the narrative. Can you please confirm whether or not culvert replacement is part of this project?
- Response 25:** Yes, the replacement of these culverts is part of this project.

Question 26: Our understanding is that NJDOT currently does not permit traffic signals with retroreflective backplates to be mounted on aluminum poles. Task 3 requests consulting services to develop and coordinate, in collaboration with a manufacturer, an aluminum traffic signal pole detail capable of accommodating retroreflective backplates. Please clarify how the use of aluminum traffic signal poles with retroreflective backplates should be addressed in the design and project approach, including any anticipated coordination with or acceptance required from NJDOT.

Response 26: Please see response 15.

Question 27: In reviewing Appendix I, we noticed that the Hudson County LSP Application is included with all Contracts/ projects. Can you please make available the Sponsor LSP Application intended for each project? Or inform us whether an updated version of Appendix I is forthcoming?

Response 27: This has been updated. Please see the project website for the updated version of Appendix I.

Question 28: (Appendix I) Contract A shows an intersection labelled as Vauxhall Road and Pine Avenue in Union but there is no other mention or reference data provided. Is this location part of the project and if so, can the rest of the data be provided?

Response 28: No, the only intersections part of this project are listed on the bookmark cover for Project A2. A total of seven intersections with three of them having alternates that will be refined in preliminary engineering.

Question 29: (Appendix J) Can a concept drawings be provided for:

- a. Broad Street and Ashwood Avenue, Summit
- b. North Avenue and Tuttle Parkway, Westfield
- c. Plainfield Avenue and West Eighth Street, Plainfield

Response 29: These intersections are not included in this project.

Question 30: The concept drawing provided for South Michigan Avenue and Fairfield Avenue depicts very minor work—adding a crosswalk, installing handicap ramps and revise parking. Please confirm this.

Response 30: Yes, this is correct. The awarded consultant will need to work with the subregion to determine if additional improvements are necessary.

Question 31: Two separate concepts were provided for the Plainfield Avenue and Randolph Road/Sheridan Avenue, Plainfield and Vauxhall Road and Burnet Avenue, Union locations. Can clarification be provided which one of these will be advanced?

Response 31: Please see response 28.

Question 32: Pages 13 & 14 of the RFP note Insurance and Liability requirements. Can you please clarify that the additional insured, primary and non-contributory and waiver of subrogation

requirements are only applicable to policies in line with market norms (being the CGL, Auto and Property Insurance)?

Response 32: The additional insured, primary and non-contributory, and waiver of subrogation requirements shall apply to each applicable policy of required insurance, including Excess/Umbrella Liability, as specified in the RFP, except for Professional Liability and Workers' Compensation.