NOTE: The deadlines for the two Liberty State Park Mini-Bids will be extended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Original Due Date</th>
<th>Update Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals due</td>
<td>Tuesday, 6/13</td>
<td>Friday, 6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated award date</td>
<td>Tuesday, 6/27</td>
<td>Friday, 6/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work orders completed</td>
<td>Friday, 9/29</td>
<td>Friday, 11/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1B: Liberty State Park North (Audrey Zapp Drive to CRRNJ Terminal)

**Question:** Does NJDEP have expectations for the consultant to lead or support a community engagement process that builds on prior engagement within either mini-bid? What level Community Engagement, if any, related to Task 1 is expected to be performed by the selected Consultant Team? Shall we assume this means no public meetings or community engagement as part of this Mini-Bid? Is community engagement envisioned as a task as part of this Mini-Bid? Is community engagement part of a specific Task, or all Tasks?

**Answer:** Yes. The Department asks that the Consultant Team consider and propose appropriate additional community engagement that builds upon the work previously conducted by the Liberty State Park Task Force. The Department expects this additional outreach would likely include direct and targeted outreach to key stakeholder groups and potentially working with the statutorily convened Task Force. The Department does not anticipate the need for broad, general public meetings for this specific task order.

**Question:** There seems to have been a lot of public outreach for LSP – is there a summary of outcomes available? Has the state developed any specificity to the program elements listed in the 1B phase? Specifically: is there a specific number and type of sports fields, any desired seating capacity / event type for the amphitheater, and any specific program elements for the community center? If so, can these be shared?

**Answer:** No, there is not an explicit summary of outcomes available. Please see the “Summary of Advisory Group Considerations & Recommendations” report in the Teams site under “Reference Documents.”

**Question:** Since the Comprehensive LSP Revitalization Program is advancing in 3 parallel streams:
- Phase 1A – Environmental cleanup and restoration
- **Phase 1B** – Design of LSP North
- Phase 2 – Holistic Master Plan

the team would benefit from understanding who is designing Phase 1A and Phase 2 and what coordination is planned between the different projects developing in parallel?

Can the state clarify the goals around timing of the completed master plan recommendations? In our experience a master plan for a park phase/site of this size and complexity is typically at least a 6 month process. Are we able to propose an approach and timeline that extends beyond the 3 month window NJDEP has indicated in the work order? If so, are there any hard deadlines for the work that the project schedule should keep in mind?
Answer: Phase 1A is led by the DEP’s Office of Natural Resource Restoration, in partnership with the US Army Corps of Engineers, and Princeton Hydro. Work orders for Phase 2 have not yet been issued, and are expected later this year, consistent with this process for Phase 1B. DEP anticipates coordination among the Phases to be necessary and desired.

Question: What indoor programming (if any) is anticipated? (The RFP refers to “covered outdoor community space” and possibly concessions.)
Answer: The Department has heard from members of the community the desire for a year-round Community or Recreation Center near the Jersey Ave & Johnston Ave intersection, as well as adaptive reuse of the CRRNJ Train Sheds, which could be utilized for a range of covered outdoor community space. This could include things like space for vendor markets, event space, meeting space, etc. No single concept nor programming purpose is necessarily anticipated or required but would need to be for conservation and recreation purposes, which can include activities supportive of the restoration and maintenance of the historic structure.

Question: Could the NJDEP share the 60% design documents for the Phase 1A portion of the project?
Answer: The Department will work with the Office of Natural Resource Restoration to make those plans available. Additional information and renderings are available at: https://dep.nj.gov/revitalizelsp/

Question: Is information available about hazardous materials and remediation on site and in train shed building, both floor and structure and roof.
Answer: Yes, this information is contained in previous Train Sheds reports available on the Teams site under “Reference Documents.”

Question: Was an Regulated Building Materials assessment completed? If not, there may be a need to perform a full RBM assessment including Asbestos, Lead, PCB, Caulk, Universal Waste, Creosote, etc.
Answer: The Department is unaware of a Regulated Building Materials assessment. The Department would consider proposals to conduct such an assessment.

Question: Was a Phase 1 or ESA completed for the project site?
Answer: No.

Question: Would the shed space need to be wet- or dry-proofed?
Answer: This may depend upon the proposed uses, but is possible.

Question: Were any wetlands identified on site?
Answer: The area behind the Liberty Science Center, in the western most portion of the Phase 1B area, was previously identified as wetlands.

Question: Will the proposed activities be consistent with the requirement of historical and cultural resources?
Answer: Yes. The Department is always mindful of the historical and cultural resources of its sites, in particular the CRRNJ railroad terminal, and is looking for ways to enhance those connections. Generally, all proposed activities must be consistent with use for conservation and recreation purposes, which can include activities supportive of the restoration and maintenance of historic structures.

Question: Will a meeting be held with the NJDEP Division of Land Resource Protection to review scope of natural and cultural resource permitting? What level of permitting process is expected to be performed by the Consultant Team?
- Freshwater wetlands
- Waterfront Development
- Flood Hazard
- Historical & Cultural Resources
- Threatened & Endangered Species
**Answer:** The LSP Team will coordinate a meeting with the Office of Permitting and Project Navigation to determine what permits would be necessary for this project, and to what level the Consultant would be responsible.

**Question:** What is expected for the Task 1 “final detailed design and engineering plans necessary for implementation of the selected alternative” within this 13-weeklong scope of work? It is not listed as one of the deliverables for Task 1. However, it is included in Task 2.

**Answer:** For Task 1, the Department is seeking more designs with recommendations for placement and amenities in the project area consistent with the Task Force recommendations. Once a recommendation is selected, the Department has requested final detailed design and engineering plans necessary for implementation of the selected alternative. The Department recognizes that it sets aggressive timelines for task completion and encourages Consultant Teams to indicate what can be completed within those time frames with regard to design and engineering plans and, as appropriate, where additional time may be necessary.

**Question:** Draft Recommendation Report, Final Rec Report + “Design & Engineering Plans for Selected Alternative”. Please confirm that all of these are expected within the June 27 – Sep 29 working period? Is the chosen team for this Mini-Bid assumed to continue into detailed design and engineering plans after the completion of this scope by 9/29? Are these detailed design and engineering plans following the scope of this Mini-Bid, and not part of the deliverables for this scope due 9/29? Or are a deliverable due 9/29? What level would the “Design & Engineering Plans for Selected Alternative” be? Are these detailed design and engineering plans following the scope of this Mini-Bid, and not part of the deliverables for this scope due 9/29? Since this task is following the completion of Task 1 and Task 2, is it to be assumed that this is the final scope to be delivered by 9/29, so previous draft and final reports for Task 1 and Task 2 must be submitted in advance of 9/29 to initiate Task 3 after Tasks 1 and 2, and deliver Task 3 by 9/29?

**Answer:** Please see answer above, especially the last sentence. (See updated dates for timing.)

**Question:** For Task 2, is the chosen team for this Mini-Bid assumed to continue into detailed design and engineering plans after the completion of this scope by 9/29?

**Answer:** Yes. (See updated dates for timing.)

**Question:** What level of Amphitheater design is required for Task 1? Is Architectural design of a Bandshell required in Task 1 and to what level? What is the expected crowd sizes for Amphitheater performances? Will specialized Acoustic Design related Amphitheater performance spaces be required? Will the Consultant Team need to engage consultants that specialize in performance lighting design and sound systems?

**Answer:** The Department requests that the Consultant Team consider, consistent with its expertise, the most appropriate answers to these questions in its assessment of proposed alternatives that best fit Liberty State Park. Final design will be requested based on the selected alternative.

**Question:** Are we able to pick up new team members as part of this Mini-Bid, specifically as related to Task 3 (Branding and Communications)?

**Answer:** Yes, so long as all additional organizations are entered into NJSTART before work is awarded.

**Question:** Can additional clarification and information be provided about the goals and requirements for the “Branding Guidelines” and “Communications Plan”? Is developing new logos and brand identity for the entirety of LSP, or just the scope of this Mini-Bid area for Audrey Zapp Drive and CRRNJ Terminal?

**Answer:** The branding and communications would be exclusively for the Phase 1B area, focused on creating an identity for this active recreation use area and developing a way to communicate updates on the project. DEP requires a way to keep the public informed of the work being done during Phase 1B development (community engagement, recommendation reports, etc.) and after the reports are developed (communicating the “final” recommendations, etc.).

**Question:** The Branding and Communications Task states “following completion of Task 1 and Task 2. Does this mean that Draft and Final Reports for Task 1 and Task 2 do not need to follow this branding guidelines?
**Answer:** This means that the communications plan will be executed by DEP following completion of Task 1 and Task 2. Branding and communications may be used during community engagement and development of the deliverables in Tasks 1 and 2, however there will need to be a plan for continued communications following the deliverable due date, to communicate the recommendations, designs, etc. of the deliverables to the public.

**Question:** Will the Draft Brand Guidelines also receive a 1-week turnaround by DEP as stated in Tasks 1 and 2?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question:** Can you provide clarity on the 3rd bullet point of Task 4 – “Recommendation Presentation – Consultant shall their final recommendations under Task 3 to the Department at least one week prior to submitting...” Does this mean “present” or “submit” – and can you clarify “under Task 3” – as Task 3 is the Branding and Communications?

**Answer:** Bullet should read: “Recommendation Presentation – Consultant shall present their final recommendations under Task 4 to the Department at least one week prior to submitting final Zapp Drive Amenity Development Recommendation Report and Terminal Recommendation Report.”

**Question:** For Task 3, Branding and Communications, has the client defined the extent of the brand guidelines required?

**Answer:** The extent is not firmly defined. The Department is looking for guidance on how to make communication surrounding this project look and feel uniform. Examples of guidelines could be font use, colors, logo use, etc. The Department anticipates these guidelines to be detailed enough for ease of use, and not so comprehensive as to consider every scenario.

**Question:** Should we understand the [branding and communications] guidelines required to include the following:
1. Positioning and strategic messaging for the Phase 1B area
2. Naming (has the name for the Phase 1B area been confirmed as Zapp Terminal?)
3. Logo, logo usage, and logo application rules
4. Typography and color palette rules
5. Photography art direction guidelines that define the look, feel, and style of any photography the park commissions
6. Film art direction guidelines that define the look, feel, and style of any films the park commissions
7. Communication templates (what communication templates would need to be designed by us for use during your community outreach?)
8. Signage guidelines (would any signage guidance be required? ie, logo usage on construction fencing.)

**Answer:** Yes for #1-5. Yes for #7: PowerPoint master slides, example poster/flyer, example social media posts (Facebook and Instagram). #6 and #8 are likely “no” as they will conform to DEP’s current film and sign guidelines. #3 logo use could include which to use in video and on signs, though.

**Transportation Connectivity Planning**

**Question:** Does NJDEP have expectations for the consultant to lead or support a community engagement process that builds on prior engagement within either mini-bid?

**Answer:** Yes. The Department asks that the Consultant Team consider and propose appropriate additional community engagement that builds upon the work previously conducted by the Liberty State Park Task Force. The Department expects this additional outreach would likely include direct and targeted outreach to key stakeholder groups and potentially working with the statutorily convened Task Force. The Department does not anticipate the need for broad, general public meetings for this specific task order.

**Question:** Which organizations in Jersey City will the team be expected to consult with regarding additional parking requirements, incorporating them on developments to serve the public, and aligning with Jersey City’s Vision Zero plan and Complete Streets efforts? Will the NJDEP facilitate this communication and access to information needed?
**Answer:** At a minimum, it may be advisable to connect with the Jersey City Department of Infrastructure and the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency. DEP can facilitate these connections.

**Question:** Will any engagement with external agencies (e.g. NJDOT, NJ TRANSIT) and/or the LSP Design Task Force be required? Or is NJDEP looking for the Consultant to propose a plan for external coordination? Will the team be expected to work with the NJDOT?

**Answer:** Yes, engagement with NJDOT and Transit is necessary.

**Question:** Will information about the “large, planned developments taking place on the periphery of park property” be available to the team for review?

**Answer:** The DEP does not host this information, but the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency or Planning Board should have materials available to review.

**Question:** Were there any vehicular parking need studies done and would they be available to the team for review?

**Answer:** Not to DEP’s knowledge.

**Question:** How flexible is the Marina’s current layout?

**Answer:** The Department will be engaging with the current marina operator on a number of issues, so we could consider layout changes in this context if warranted.

**Question:** Does NJ DEP envision revenue generating facilities as part of the concessions or any other aspect of the Zapp Terminal program?

**Answer:** The Department expects all designed amenities to be for public recreation use and not for private profit.

**Question:** Will the evaluation of the existing building be based upon record documentation or will site inspection of structure and equipment be required?

**Answer:** The Consultant Team should consider which approach is most appropriate.