



THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Lower Manhattan Airport and Commuter Access Alternatives Analysis

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, a subsidiary of the New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transit Authority, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and the New York City Economic Development Corporation, seeks proposals to conduct a 6 to 9 month study identifying transportation alternatives to improve travel between Lower Manhattan and both Long Island Railroad's Jamaica Station and John F. Kennedy International Airport. The Study will result in a Recommended Alternative(s) that will proceed to implementation following appropriate environmental review.

June 30, 2003

Deadline for responses: Monday, July 21, 5:00 PM EST

Questions must be submitted in writing no later than Thursday, July 10 to Peter Madden by mail to LMDC or by facsimile to: (212) 962-2431. Addenda to this RFP, including responses to any questions, will be posted on the LMDC web site www.renewnyc.com by Monday, July 14.

LMDC will not accept, and cannot respond to, questions via any other methods.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Mission and Structure of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (“LMDC”) was established in late 2001 to develop and revitalize Lower Manhattan in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. As it relates to the work of LMDC, Lower Manhattan refers to all areas in Manhattan south of Houston Street. LMDC is a subsidiary of the New York State Urban Development Corporation, doing business as Empire State Development Corporation (“ESDC”), a political subdivision and public benefit corporation of the State of New York.

LMDC is funded by federal appropriations administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) through its Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) program. To date, approximately \$2 billion has been allocated to LMDC under such appropriations and another \$783 million is anticipated through a second grant.

B. Overview of Services Requested and the Submission Process

In fulfilling its responsibility of planning for the development and revitalization of Lower Manhattan, LMDC, in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Port Authority), and the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC) will need to obtain the services of one or more firms to provide a study of transportation options in connection with improved access to LIRR’s Jamaica Station and John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFK). A Management Committee consisting of one representative each from the Port Authority, MTA, EDC, and LMDC will manage the study. The Management Committee will serve as the RFP selection panel. The LMDC will coordinate activity between the Management Committee and the Consultant. The LMDC will also fund the study, in accordance with LMDC Board approvals and HUD requirements. The LMDC Partial Action Plan related to the expenditures of these funds can be found at the LMDC website: www.renewnyc.com.

The RFP panel may select one or more firms to provide some of the requested services, or it may select a single firm to provide all services requested. Firms interested in submitting proposals to provide such services are required to follow the recommended guidelines and instructions contained in this Request for Proposals (“RFP”). In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of this RFP, revisions will be provided by addenda posted on the LMDC web site: <http://www.renewnyc.com>.

Proposals should provide a straightforward, complete and concise description of the firm’s capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Please prepare ten (10) copies of your proposal and work samples. (Please see “Submission Requirements” on page 17 for more detail.)

Firms submitting a proposal in response to this RFP may be required to give an oral presentation of their proposal to the RFP panel. This oral presentation may provide an opportunity for the firms to clarify or elaborate on the proposal but will in no way change the original submission.

Engagement staff should be present at the oral presentation. The RFP panel's request for an oral presentation shall not constitute acceptance of a proposal.

Proposals must be received no later than 5:00 PM EST, **Monday, July 21, 2003**. Deliver all proposals to:

RFP Processor
Lower Manhattan Development Corporation
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10006
Attn: Commuter and Airport Access RFP

LMDC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals submitted if such election is deemed to be in the best interest of LMDC. LMDC assumes no obligation, no responsibility and no liability for costs incurred by the responding firms prior to the signing of a contract.

The current schedule for this effort is as follows:

- Monday, June 30 – RFP Issued
- Monday, July 21 – Responses Due
- Weeks of July 28th and August 4th – Oral Presentations Conducted
- Week of August 13th – RFP Panel Selection of Firms

Subject to annual review and approval by the LMDC Board of Directors, the selected firms will be retained for one year with an option for LMDC to renew.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Purpose and Project Area

A Consultant (or Consultant team) is required to identify and evaluate the construction and operational feasibility of one or more long-range opportunities to provide enhanced rail access to the Lower Manhattan Central Business District (south of Canal Street) from JFK Airport in Queens, and from the LIRR Station in Jamaica. The identified alternatives should provide a measurable improvement to existing and programmed services in categories such as travel time, frequency, reduction or elimination of transfer movements compared, and projected ridership. In the case of access to JFK, currently programmed service will consist of a two-seat ride trip provided by New York City Transit's A subway line in combination with the nearly completed JFK Airport "AirTrain" service. Long Island service currently entails a two- or three- seat ride provided by LIRR service to either Atlantic Terminal or Penn Station in combination with New York City Transit (NYCT) subway service to Lower Manhattan.

B. Background and Current Conditions

John F. Kennedy International Airport, located 18 miles southeast of Lower Manhattan, is an essential component of both the transportation network and economy of the region. It is the metropolitan area's primary international gateway, and is also host to a growing number of domestic flights.

At the present time, direct access to JFK Airport from Lower Manhattan is limited to private cars, taxis and for-hire vehicles, and shuttle vans (which generally make multiple pickups). All of these modes use the regional highway system, which is frequently congested, and can result in trip times of more than an hour at rush hour. The NYC subway system (A train) stops adjacent to the Airport long-term parking lot at Howard Beach, where a shuttle bus connection is available to airline terminals. Local bus services are also available from outlying subway stations in Brooklyn and Queens.

As part of a joint Port Authority-MTA effort to enhance access to the region's airports, the Port Authority is completing work on an "AirTrain" light rail transit system, which will link the airport's nine terminals with regional subway and commuter rail lines that will provide ongoing transit service to Lower and Midtown Manhattan. New station facilities are being built at Jamaica and Howard Beach to make transfers as seamless and convenient as possible. The AirTrain system is expected to open beginning in the fourth quarter of 2003, and will allow for a two-seat trip from Lower Manhattan to JFK Airport in approximately 48 minutes, with a service frequency of 4-8 trips per hour. The AirTrain system is also being built in a manner to support a future potential direct train service from JFK Airport to Manhattan via either the LIRR or existing subway lines.

As a result of the attack on the World Trade Center complex on September 11, 2001, the LMDC was established by Governor George Pataki and then Mayor Rudolph Guiliani to guide the recovery and redevelopment of Lower Manhattan. Working with the Governor and the Mayor and holding a dialogue with a broad range of constituents, the LMDC, the MTA, the PA, and EDC have identified improvements in access between Lower Manhattan and JFK as a key

element in the area's economic recovery, and in its ability to compete with other global economic centers such as London, Berlin and Tokyo.

LIRR's Jamaica Station is a central hub for LIRR service. All but one of the branches of the LIRR system make a stop at Jamaica Station. To reach Lower Manhattan, Long Island commuters are faced with two equally inconvenient options. The first is through Atlantic Terminal in Brooklyn to a Lower Manhattan bound subway. Some commuters have direct service from Long Island to Atlantic Terminal, though a significant number do not. Those riders must switch at Jamaica for Atlantic Terminal-bound LIRR trains, and switch again for the subway to downtown.

The second alternative is to take LIRR directly to Penn Station in Midtown and switch for a downtown subway line. This is sometimes a longer and less direct route, but enables customers to stay seated for a longer portion of their trip, and does not require a second transfer. On the other hand, it contributes to crowding at Penn Station, which is already the most heavily used train station in the country. Improving the commute from Jamaica to Lower Manhattan is viewed as crucial to support Lower Manhattan's redevelopment.

The convergence of the LIRR and the AirTrain systems at Jamaica provides the opportunity for one new service to improve travel for both commuters and airport passengers. The proximity of AirTrain and the MTA/NYC Transit A Line at the Howard Beach station provides a point at which a physical link between the two systems is possible.

III. ANTICIPATED SCOPE OF SERVICES

A. Goals

The goals of this study are:

1. To identify feasible rail-based transportation alternatives that, simultaneously and as much as possible sharing the same infrastructure, will:
 - a) Provide for improved travel between the Lower Manhattan Central Business District and JFK International Airport in comparison to the planned combination of NYCT subway service with AirTrain from Howard Beach or LIRR service with AirTrain service from Jamaica.
 - b) Provide for improved travel between the Lower Manhattan Central Business District and Long Island in comparison to the current LIRR service and connecting NYCT subway service.

The existing service characteristics for travel between the Lower Manhattan Central Business District and JFK with which the new alternatives should be compared include:

- A one-transfer trip between the Broadway-Nassau Fulton Station (Fulton Street Transit Center) and the JFK Airport terminal area;
- Current travel time;
- A service frequency of 7-15 minutes, except for nights and weekend periods; and

- A conventional subway train environment (e.g. no “premium service”).

The existing service characteristics for travel between the Lower Manhattan Central Business District and Long Island with which the new alternatives should be compared include:

- A one-transfer trip between Lower Manhattan and LIRR’s Jamaica Station;
- Current travel time;
- A service frequency based on current LIRR schedules and NYCT service; and
- A conventional commuter rail and subway train environment.

[Note: The above comparatives will be discussed with the consultant before they are finalized.]

2. To evaluate the construction feasibility, schedule and costs; operational impacts; and ridership forecasts of those alternatives that survive the fatal flaw analysis. (See Section C. Task 7.)
3. To arrive at a preferred alternative or alternatives (i.e. short & long term). In the case of the long term alternative, the project timeline should demonstrate completion by 2013.

The key work tasks to be undertaken are described in section III.C. and the deliverables are summarized in section IV.

The Consultant shall work under the supervision of a Management Committee comprised of representatives from MTA, Port Authority, EDC and LMDC to review, clarify, refine, and finalize all work leading to the recommended alternative. The LMDC shall coordinate activity between the Management Committee members and the Consultant. The Consultant's work efforts shall also be guided by a Technical Advisory Committee and selective consultation with relevant agencies and interested parties.

Optional task for proposal: The Consultant should suggest any project goals which they would change or modify. For each proposed change, please provide your reasoning.

B. Products

The product of this study shall be a planning and concept feasibility study report that establishes the physical and operating feasibility of one or, if necessary, more alternatives, as well as a comparison of each alternative to other strategies. The study report shall consist of a series of technical memoranda -- the deliverables which are described in this scope of services. (See summary in section IV.) The completed report shall include all required written elements and study drawings, and shall thoroughly document and discuss all work performed in the evaluation of the alternatives. The planning and conceptual engineering to be performed on the final alternatives shall be developed to a level that provides a sound basis for appropriate environmental review consistent with applicable law and further engineering in anticipation of implementation.

C. Description of Tasks

Task 1: Identification of Alternative Alignments and Terminals

Based on discussion with the Management Committee, the Consultant shall identify mode/alignment alternatives that address the project's primary goal of enhancing rail transit service between the JFK terminal area and Lower Manhattan and Jamaica Station and Lower Manhattan (See Task 1a.). The Consultant shall also identify alternatives that would provide short-term interim measures and partial options to improve service to the airport and Jamaica even though they may not fully achieve the goals of the study (See Tasks 1b. and 1c.).

Task 1a. Direct Service Alternatives (Note: Consultant should propose additional alternatives for consideration).

Examples include:

- Construction of a physical link between AirTrain and LIRR Atlantic Branch from either Jamaica or Howard Beach, with extension to Lower Manhattan via new East River tunnel
- Construction of a physical link between AirTrain and LIRR Atlantic Branch at Jamaica or Howard Beach, with extension to Lower Manhattan via NYCT Cranberry tunnel (A line)
- Construction of a physical link between AirTrain and LIRR Atlantic Branch at Jamaica or Howard Beach, with extension to Lower Manhattan via NYCT Montague tunnel (M line)

NOTE: In the case of alternatives utilizing a link to the AirTrain system, identify a recommended alignment for either an extension of the AirTrain system or a combination of the AirTrain system and either LIRR or NYCT subway service.

Task 1b. Interim options requiring one to two years to implement

Interim options are defined as those that would provide improvements over current service and could be implemented within one to two years of the completion of this study. Interim options need not improve access to both JFK and Jamaica Station in order to be considered. These options cannot preclude or delay the implementation of the permanent solution (the recommended option) that is chosen as a result of this study.

Examples of interim options include:

- Enhanced NYCT subway service.
- Other modes such as ferry.

Task 1c. Partial options requiring longer than two years to implement

Consultant shall identify options that fulfill either the goal of improved access to JFK or improved access to Jamaica Station, yet do not achieve both goals.

Note on 1c.: It is unlikely that the consultant shall be asked to perform in-depth analysis of these partial options, except in the unlikely situation that all options identified in Task 1a. are deemed infeasible.

Examples of partial options include:

- Construction of a physical link between AirTrain and the NYCT A subway line at Howard Beach
- Construction of a physical link between AirTrain and the NYCT A subway line at Euclid Avenue

As a starting point of this alternatives identification task, the Consultant will review and re-evaluate, as necessary, the alternatives identified in MTA's JFK Airport One-Seat Ride Study, the Lower Manhattan Access Alternatives Study, materials provided by EDC, and any other relevant past and ongoing studies from the MTA, Port Authority or other sources.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum identifying all potential alternatives for providing enhanced rail service between JFK Airport and Lower Manhattan and between Jamaica Station and Lower Manhattan. The information provided for each alternative should consist of the following: route alignments, transfer points where necessary, Lower Manhattan terminal locations or intermediate stations, and need for new vehicle technologies. Consultant may propose additional criteria for this initial stage of evaluation. Consultant shall create summary charts comparing all the options based on one set of criteria.

Task 2: Identification of Lower Manhattan Terminal and Intermediate Stations

For each alternative the Consultant shall identify a terminal location in the Lower Manhattan CBD and key stations in Brooklyn and Lower Manhattan where the airport and commuter rail service would possibly stop en-route to a terminal. Terminal and station locations evaluated should include locations in the vicinity of and potentially accessible to the planned "Fulton Transit Center" complex at Fulton Street and Broadway, (comprised of the Fulton St 4,5 station, the Fulton St J,M,Z station, the Fulton St 2,3 station, the A,C Broadway-Nassau St station, and the N,R Cortlandt St station), the World Trade Center PATH Terminal, as well as potential new dedicated station locations in Downtown Brooklyn and in the vicinity of the World Trade Center.

Task 2.a. Flight Check-in, Baggage Handling, and Security

As part of the terminal identification process, the Consultant shall determine the feasibility of providing "airport-specific" amenities such as dedicated ticket vending facilities, passenger waiting areas and platforms; advanced flight check-in and baggage handling; and flight status information. Consultant shall obtain input from the Port Authority and federal agencies involved

with baggage security to determine the requirements to be able to offer baggage handling. Consultant shall also research the security implications of a rail service that would function both on and off airport property.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum identifying potential Lower Manhattan Terminals and Intermediate Stations, logistical requirements for providing flight check-in and baggage handling, and an overview of security requirements for a rail service traveling to an airport.

Task 3: Public Involvement

The Consultant shall provide technical assistance for targeted outreach to key stakeholders as defined by the Management Committee. The outreach will be conducted by the Management Committee. The objective of such an outreach process will be to inform stakeholders about the Alternatives Analysis, including the project goals, purpose and need for the study, alternatives to be considered, nature of the decisions to be made, alternatives evaluation process and other pertinent study information.

At the conclusion of the Study, the results will be presented to key stakeholders.

Deliverable: Presentation materials for public meetings, potentially including computer modeling and visualizations.

Task for Proposal: Consultant shall provide description and examples of presentation materials produced for past projects, including computer modeling and visualizations.

Task 4: Development of Purpose & Need and Evaluation Criteria for “Fatal Flaw” Analysis

Concurrent with the identification of alternatives, the Consultant shall develop criteria by which the alternatives shall be evaluated. The consultant shall develop a formal “purpose and need”, consistent with NEPA, that can be used as a basis for the evaluation of alternatives and in a subsequent environmental document.

Criteria shall be developed to:

- Identify initial “fatal flaws” which would eliminate alternatives early in the evaluation process;
- Confirm that the alternative meets the purpose and need defined for the project;
- Confirm that the alternative be constructed using proven engineering and construction methods; and
- Confirm that the alternative can be operated to adequately meet forecast demand and be operationally compatible with the existing and programmed MTA commuter rail, rapid transit systems, and AirTrain system.

Deliverable: Technical memorandum developing the “purpose and need” of the study and

defining criteria upon which the alternatives shall be evaluated

Task 5: Conduct “Fatal Flaw” Analysis: Constructability, Physical and Operational Feasibility

Based on the evaluation criteria, the Consultant shall conduct an initial fatal flaw analysis of all alternatives identified. This analysis shall be used to screen out proposals that have characteristics that are likely to prevent their implementation.

Deliverable: Technical memorandum identifying fatally flawed alternatives to be dropped from further study.

Task 6: Vehicle Technology Analysis

Any alternatives utilizing a combination of the AirTrain system and either LIRR or NYCT subway alignments will require the development and design of an advanced-design rail vehicle that is functionally compatible with both systems used. Subject to revision, the AirTrain compatibility requirements include:

- Ability to operate on grades of up to 5.35%
- Ability to operate on turning radii of 225 feet
- Ability to operate in fully automated mode utilizing AirTrain’s ATC technology while on AirTrain right-of-way
- Compatibility with the AirTrain system's basic fixed plant facilities, including station facilities which have a maximum platform length of 240 feet and specific platform door locations
- Ability to operate within the parameters of the AirTrain service plan, which include operational headways of 2-4 minutes.

MTA and PA will provide the consultant with appropriate compatibility requirements for LIRR, NYCT subway, or AirTrain operation, as necessary.

The Consultant will review the vehicle technology specifications prepared for MTA’s JFK Airport One-Seat Ride Study, and update them as required to meet current federal and state regulations and AirTrain, NYCT and LIRR operating practices.

Deliverable: Technical memorandum identifying compatible vehicle technologies or vehicle technology specifications required for each alternative.

Task 7: Analysis of Remaining Alternatives

Once a preliminary analysis has been conducted to eliminate “fatal flaw” alternatives the Consultant shall then evaluate all remaining alternatives, as well as the general attractiveness of the new service to prospective customers, including commuters, air travelers and airport

employees. These analyses shall be based on evaluation criteria to be identified by the Consultant and approved by the Management Committee. The evaluation shall encompass:

Task 7a. Determination of Engineering Feasibility And Constructability

The Consultant shall analyze the engineering and constructability aspects of the remaining alternatives. The analysis shall include the Consultant's development of sufficient engineering detail to determine whether the alignment can be built and operated, based upon general planning guidelines and engineering design standards provided by the PA, NYCT and LIRR. The Consultant shall also prepare an estimate of design and construction time required, assuming continued operation of subway and commuter rail service along all shared rights-of-way. The Consultant shall propose a strategy for minimizing the project schedule under different scenarios, with the goal being project completion by 2013.

For each alternative, the Consultant shall provide base maps and profiles for vertical alignments, showing interfaces with all existing and proposed transportation systems and facilities. The level of detail of these maps and profiles shall be subject to negotiation between the Management Committee and the Consultant prior to the start of this work project.

Task 7b. Operability Analysis

The Consultant shall develop sketch service and operating plans for each of the remaining alternatives to determine that an adequate level of service can be provided to meet the projected demand, while not exceeding the available vehicle and train capacity of any AirTrain, LIRR and NYCT subway alignments used by the alternative.

The consultant shall then use the service and operating plans to determine whether the new service can be operated consistent with current and projected operating requirements of the other AirTrain, commuter rail or subway services, and to identify significant operating issues which may affect each alternative's travel time, service frequency and reliability.

Task 7c. Preliminary Environmental Impact Analysis and pre-EIS Work

While this study will not have an EIS component, an environmental overview shall be undertaken by the Consultant in which an analysis of transportation, social, economic, and environmental impacts will be conducted for the set of reasonable alternatives (those alternatives which are analyzed under Task 7). The intent of this task is to determine environmental impacts associated with each set of surviving alternatives without providing the level of detail associated with an EIS. Any severe environmental impacts which could preclude the advance of a particular alternative, including significant negative impacts on existing services and passengers, should be identified.

Task for Proposal: The proposal should describe the different environmental categories to be studied as well as the associated methodology to be employed. The consultant should propose areas of work (i.e., development of a baseline alternative, the no-build alternative analysis, general data gathering, etc.) that could be conducted concurrent with this study and be part of the future EIS.

Task 7d. Travel Demand Forecasts

Task for Proposal: The Consultant shall propose a travel demand forecasting process using one or more models. This process will be used to forecast the likely ridership for each of the remaining alternatives for the base year of implementation and at various intervals from the base year, in order to determine each alternative's general attractiveness to airport customers and commuters. All significant factors that influence route choice and mode choice shall be accounted for in the proposed process. Separate models may be needed for commuter and airport travel. Among the tools made available will be: data collected by agencies involved in Lower Manhattan recovery projects, MTA's regional transit network and Regional Transit Forecasting Model, ridership forecasts prepared by the Port Authority as part of the AirTrain Planning process, and the 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package and any other appropriate data sources.

Travel demand forecasts should reflect the impacts of planning envisioned for Lower Manhattan (i.e., continued growth in the residential population and proposed commercial development) and improved economic conditions that will most likely result.

The Consultant shall document current and future ridership forecasts and methodology. The Consultant shall provide the necessary forecast data for each alternative to allow for estimating the revenue, operating cost, and facility needs requirements of each alternative in other tasks. Specifically the consultant should study:

- Rail and subway ridership within the corridor inclusive of intermediate points including linkage with LIRR service at Jamaica station serving Lower Manhattan commuters originating in eastern Long Island counties as well as New York City Transit ridership. Diversion from other transit and non-transit modes shall be studied as well.
- Airport passenger ridership to/from JFK via a premium service. (A premium service would potentially offer baggage handling and a higher level of passenger amenity than a traditional transit vehicle.) All major modes of travel to/from JFK should be included in the analysis.
- Airport passenger ridership to/from JFK via a non-premium service.

Any ridership changes (both increases and decreases) in other affected rail or transit modes which serve Jamaica Station, JFK, or intermediate points within the study corridor (which may result from implementing a particular alternative) should be identified and documented.

Demand projections should consider existing and projected commuter travel demand between Lower Manhattan and Long Island points of origin, air travel demand at JFK and between JFK and Lower Manhattan, and rail and subway demand within New York City, including travel to and from points other than Lower Manhattan. In addition, the analysis should provide information on the sensitivity of ridership to various factors including ticket pricing, service frequency, travel times, special service amenities, etc. Ridership shall be provided for the base year (2003), build year, and at various intervals from the build year.

Task 7e. Cost Estimates

The Consultant shall prepare cost estimates of the remaining alternatives to evaluate the economic feasibility of constructing, operating and maintaining the service. This estimate shall include:

- Capital, operating and maintenance cost estimates (including right-of-way and vehicles); and
- Estimation of offsetting operating revenue based on the ridership forecasts developed in the Travel Demand Forecasts task and fare levels to be developed in coordination with the Management Committee.

Construction cost estimates should assume maintenance of existing commuter rail and/or subway service during the construction period.

The capital, operating and maintenance cost exclusively attributable to commuter service between Lower Manhattan and Jamaica shall be calculated and stated separately from costs attributable to airport service.

Consultant shall develop a revenue forecast for both the premium and non-premium services. In addition, consultant shall develop different scenarios for financing construction and operation of the Recommended Alternative.

Task 7f. Construction Timeline and Phasing

Consultant shall propose time frame for project implementation including the potential for constructing a portion of an alternative and beginning partial service before the entire project is completed. The goal is completion of implementation by 2013.

Task 7g. Comparison of Alternatives

The Consultant shall prepare a summary of all the alternatives evaluated, and shall provide a series of comparison charts ranking all alternatives by:

- Construction and operating costs
- Construction Timeline and Phasing
- Significant Environmental Impacts
- Ridership Demand
- Travel Time and Frequency
- Other criteria requested by Management Committee

Deliverables: Technical memorandum summarizing the evaluation results of each remaining alternative, including: engineering feasibility and constructability (accompanied by base maps, plans and profiles); preliminary environmental impact analysis; travel demand forecasts; service and operating plans and operational issues; order-of-magnitude construction, operation and maintenance costs; construction timeline; and qualitative analysis. Comparative ranking charts of alternatives should be provided.

D. Optional Supplementary Tasks

In addition to the tasks described in this scope of work, the Management Committee may request the Consultant undertake additional analysis of one or more alternatives identified in Task 7 or any additional analysis or task deemed to be warranted.

E. Resource/Reference Material

LMDC, the Port Authority, MTA, the City of New York, New York State Department of Transportation, *Lower Manhattan Transportation Strategies*; April 24, 2003
http://www.renewnyc.com/plan_des_dev/transportation/default.asp#download

The Port Authority, *Airport Access Alternatives Retrospective*, May, 1993

The Port Authority, *Phase II Ridership Estimates of an Automated Guideway Transit (AGT) System Linking John F. Kennedy International and LaGuardia Airports to the New York Regional Transportation Network*, May, 1993

The Port Authority, *Phase III Ridership Estimates of Individual Segments of an Automated Guideway Transit (AGT) System Linking John F. Kennedy International and LaGuardia Airports to the New York Regional Transportation Network*, June, 1996.

The Port Authority, *Phase IV Ridership Estimates for the JFK Light Rail System*, July, 1996.

The Port Authority & LMDC, *Design for the World Trade Center PATH Terminal and relevant materials from Studio Daniel Libeskind on WTC site Master Plan*
Federal Aviation Administration and New York State Department of Transportation, *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's Airport Access Program*, May 1997

Contributions from work conducted by EDC.

Office of the Mayor of the City of New York & Office of the President of the Borough of Queens, *The Manhattan/Airport Express Project: A Comprehensive Airport Access Plan*, June 1996.

The Port Authority, *Request For Proposals, Airport Access Program-Design, Build, Operate & Maintain Contract for the Jamaica-JFK with Howard Beach Light Rail Transit (LRT) System*, January 21, 1997

New York City Transit Authority, Engineering Design Guidelines

New York City Transit Authority, Scope of Work for an Engineering Study of Extension of Existing Rail Rapid Transit Lines to LaGuardia Airport. April, 1998

New York City Transit Authority, Capital Cost Methodology For Major Investment Studies, June 4, 1996

Long Island Rail Road, Network Strategy Study, May, 1994

Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Scoping Document for the Fulton Street Transit Center

Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Forecast of Usage of Proposed Kennedy Airport Rail Service, October, 1969

Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Preliminary Planning Study – Long Island Rail Road Service to John F. Kennedy International Airport, January, 1969

Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Report on LIRR Kennedy Airport Service, December, 1970

Metropolitan Transportation Authority, JFK Airport One Seat Ride Study, February, 2001

IV. SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLES

This section is a list of the technical memoranda that make up the final study report. The completed report shall include all required written elements and study drawings, and shall thoroughly document and discuss all work performed in the evaluation of the alternatives. The planning and conceptual engineering to be performed on the final alternatives shall be developed to a level that provides a sound basis for appropriate environmental review consistent with applicable law and further engineering in anticipation of implementation.

Task 1. Identification of Alternative Alignments and Terminals: Technical Memorandum identifying all potential alternatives for providing enhanced rail service between JFK Airport and Lower Manhattan and between Jamaica Station and Lower Manhattan. The information provided for each alternative should consist of the following: route alignments, transfer points where necessary, Lower Manhattan terminal locations or intermediate stations, and need for new vehicle technologies. Consultant may propose additional criteria for this initial stage of evaluation. Consultant shall create summary charts comparing all the options based on one set of criteria.

Task 2. Identification of Lower Manhattan Terminal and Intermediate Stations: Technical Memorandum identifying potential Lower Manhattan Terminals and Intermediate Stations, logistical requirements for providing flight check-in and baggage handling, and an overview of security requirements for a rail service traveling to an airport.

Task 3. Public Involvement: Presentation materials for public meetings, potentially including computer modeling and visualizations.

Task 4. Development of Purpose & Need and Evaluation Criteria for “Fatal Flaw”
Analysis: Technical memorandum developing the “purpose and need” of the study and defining criteria upon which the alternatives shall be evaluated

Task 5. Conduct “Fatal Flaw” Analysis: Technical memorandum identifying fatally flawed alternatives to be dropped from further study

Task 6. Vehicle Technology Analysis: Technical memorandum identifying compatible vehicle technologies or vehicle technology specifications required for each alternative.

Task 7. Analysis of Remaining Alternatives: Technical memorandum summarizing the evaluation results of each remaining alternative, including: engineering feasibility and constructability (accompanied by base maps, plans and profiles); preliminary environmental impact analysis; travel demand forecasts; service and operating plans and operational issues; order-of-magnitude construction, operation and maintenance costs; construction timeline; and qualitative analysis. Comparative ranking charts of alternatives should be provided.

V. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Please letter your responses exactly as the questions are presented herein. Please limit your submission to **seventy five (75)** one-sided pages, not including work samples, which must be included in a separate, bound appendix. Conciseness is encouraged. Please include a brief executive summary. Interested firms are invited to submit proposals that contain the following information:

A. Work Program and Schedule

The Consultant shall prepare and submit a detailed and comprehensive work program that identifies and describes the approach, task sequencing, scheduled duration by task, task work items, and deliverables (both interim and final) in accordance with the specifications of the Tasks (section III.C.) described in this RFP. Please note the specific "Task(s) for Proposal" which are highlighted in the scope.

The work program shall assume completion of all work tasks within 6 to 9 months from project start with final completion no later than April 2004. The Consultant shall propose alternative timelines, suggesting different potential completion points within the 6 to 9 month range.

B. Experience, Structure, and Personnel

1. A history of the firm's experience providing transportation related work to economic development organizations, municipalities, other governmental entities, private developers, not-for-profits and civic organizations.
2. A description and diagram of the proposed Project Team's organizational structure, including resumes and technical job titles of the principals, project manager(s) and professional staff who would work directly with the Management Committee. Resumes must describe the candidate's skills and experience within the context of the assignments. (Note: resumes do not count towards 75 page limit.) In addition, please provide your standard education and experience requirements related to each technical job title. When a contractor submits a proposal with prospective contractors' resumes, the Management Committee will assume that those contractors identified whether direct employees or subcontractors have agreed, prior to the Proposal submission, to perform the services for which their names and resumes have been submitted. (See Fee Proposal below for further required information related to staff.)
3. Samples of up to five (5) major projects that the firm has completed in the area of transportation. Include the client, the name of a contact person who is able to provide a reference, a description of the nature of the work, the size and complexity of the project, and the amount and the agreed fee arrangements. References must be from within the last 24 months and must have first hand knowledge of the contractor's ability to perform the type of personal services requested in the RFP.
4. Any other information that you believe would make the firm's work on behalf of LMDC superior to that of other firms or information about your firm's specialty or particular skill to perform a specific requested service.

C. Methodological Approach

1. A description of how the firm intends to address the anticipated scope of services set forth in Section III of this RFP.
2. A statement explaining the firm's approach to the multiple demands of this scope, including methods, analytical techniques, or models, etc. that would be employed.

D. Fee Proposal

1. Total estimated firm fee for completion of the project, and whether the firm would be willing to agree to a cap.
2. The normal hourly billing rate and technical job title of each principal and staff member whose resume is provided or whose job category may be required, and the rate used in the fee proposal. The fee proposal may not include overhead charges or multipliers on top of the billing rates. In addition, please provide your standard education and experience requirements related to each technical job title.
3. Detailed information regarding any proposed subconsultants and the components of the fee proposal attributable to any and all such subconsultants.
4. Using the attached Staff Rate Chart, please include the hourly rate and a breakdown of hours per task for each member of the Project Team (including any subconsultants).
5. A list of anticipated reimbursable expenses and the rate charged for each.
6. Any reduced fees offered to other municipalities, governmental entities, economic development or nonprofit organizations, and civic organizations. LMDC will require that the proposed billing rates and fees are equivalent or less than those charged to any other client for equivalent services.

NOTE: The fee proposal must be submitted in a separate, clearly marked, sealed envelope. The fee proposals will not be opened until all proposals have been initially evaluated. Although proposed fees will be taken into account, LMDC reserves the right to negotiate a lower or different fee structure with any firm that is selected.

E. Contact Information (Note: does not count towards 75 page limit.)

On a single cover sheet in your proposal, please provide:

1. The lead firm or individual name;
2. The lead firm's contact person;
3. License or certification information of lead firm principal or individuals working on the project;
4. Telephone, fax, and wireless numbers for firm principals or individuals working on the project;
5. E-mail address for firm principals or individuals working on the project;
6. The street address of lead firm or individual;
7. The year the firm or individual practice established;
8. The MBE/WBE status of the firms (Minority-owned Business Enterprise or Women-owned Business Enterprise, as certified by New York State);
9. The type of work or specialty and size of firm; and
10. The signature of the lead individual, and the date of the signature.

- F. Conflicts of Interest (Note: does not count towards 75 page limit.)
1. Submit a statement describing any potential conflict of interest or appearance of impropriety, relating to other clients of the firm, or officers, directors, and employees of LMDC, MTA, Port Authority, or EDC that could be created by providing services to LMDC, MTA, Port Authority, or EDC.
 2. Indicate what procedures will be followed to detect and notify LMDC and to resolve any conflicts of interest.
 3. Indicate any pending litigation and/or regulatory action by any oversight body or entity that could have an adverse material impact on the firm's ability to serve LMDC.
 4. Indicate if the firm has ever had a prior contract with any governmental entity terminated for any reason, and provide an explanation.
 5. Submit a completed Standard Background Questionnaire (Attachment 3).
- G. Non-discrimination Policy (Note: does not count towards 75 page limit.)
1. Firms with 50 or more employees shall submit a copy of their nondiscrimination or affirmative action policy or plan.
 2. Firms with less than 50 employees shall submit a statement of their commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action from their chief executive officer.
 3. Each responding firm must also complete and submit both:
 - (a) Attachment 1 relating to the anticipated workforce to be utilized on the contract, and
 - (b) Attachment 2 relating to the anticipated participation of minority and women-owned business enterprises as subcontractors, if any.

All information and documents described in subsections A through G above must be included or addressed in the submission.

VI. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

In evaluating proposals submitted pursuant to this request, the Management Committee places high value on the following factors. The percentages next to the headings reflect the weight these factors will be given in evaluating proposals.

Transportation Experience

- A minimum of five (5) years' experience in transportation planning with special emphasis on transportation infrastructure issues.
- Demonstrated experience as the prime consultant transportation projects of major complexity and scale, with a construction value over \$100 million **or** demonstrated experience with large, complex transportation projects.
- Experience of the firm with comparable projects. Experience of the firm with projects in New York City and the New York City Metropolitan region.
- Number, complexity, and nature of transportation studies handled by the firm.

Quality of Proposal

- Approaches in methodology with respect to the anticipated scope of services that demonstrate maximum comprehension of and ability to provide such services.

Outstanding Work Product

- Innovative or outstanding work or skill that demonstrates the firm's qualifications or capacity to perform this study.
- Quality of work product as demonstrated in submitted work samples.
- Demonstrated knowledge of transportation planning and engineering.

Staff Qualifications and Availability

- Experience of firm and employees to be assigned to the project in general, and in particular, providing transportation related services to municipalities, economic development organizations, or other governmental entities.
- Selected firm's staff ability, availability and facility for working with LMDC directors, officers, staff and consultants.

Effective Management and Ability to Meet Schedule

- Demonstrated effectiveness of management structure and control systems.
- Demonstrated ability to produce within required timeframes.

Conformity with LMDC Policies

- Conformity with or exceeding of applicable LMDC's policies as noted herein, including specific policies relating to nondiscrimination and affirmative subcontracting goals, and M/WBE subcontracting goals. LMDC has established a 20% M/WBE participation goal for its entire redevelopment project. (See sections VII and VIII)

VII. CONTRACT TERMS AND REQUIREMENTS

The contents of the proposal prepared by the successful firms, with any amendments approved by LMDC, will become a part of the contract entered into as a result of this RFP Process.

The selected firms will be required to:

- Work with LMDC staff and its consultants to provide transportation consulting services to LMDC on matters that may arise in connection with the planning, development, and revitalization of Lower Manhattan, including but not limited to the scope of services provided within this RFP.
- Maintain accurate accounting records and other evidence pertaining to costs incurred in providing services, and on LMDC request, to make such records available to LMDC at all reasonable times during the contract period and for six (6) years after the date of the final payment to the firms under the contract.
- Assume sole responsibility for the complete effort as required by this RFP, and be the sole point of contact with regard to contractual matters.
- Refrain from assigning, transferring, conveying, subletting or otherwise disposing of the contract or its rights, titles or interest therein or its power to execute such agreement to any other person, firm, partnership, company, or corporation without the prior consent and approval in writing of LMDC.
- Comply with applicable law governing projects initiated or supported by LMDC, including all applicable HUD requirements and regulations.

The RFP panel may select one or more firms to provide some of the requested services, or it may select a single firm to provide all services requested. Firms may choose to submit qualifications to provide less than all of the anticipated scope of services. Responding firms must specify which services they are proposing to provide.

LMDC reserves the right to terminate any contract entered into as a result of this RFP at any time, provided that written notice has been given to the firm at least thirty (30) days prior to such proposed termination date.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS CONDITIONS

A. Obligation Only on Formal Contract

The issuance of this RFP, the submission of a response by any firm, and the acceptance of such response by LMDC do not obligate LMDC in any manner. Legal obligations will only arise on the execution of a formal contract by LMDC and the firm(s) selected by LMDC. LMDC's formal contract may include schedules, including terms and conditions in the form of the accompanying Schedule A (Attachment 4). LMDC provides these forms for informational purposes only and may amend them from time to time.

Responses to this RFP will be prepared at the sole cost and expense of the proposing firms. No materials submitted in response to this RFP will be returned.

B. LMDC Reservation of Rights

LMDC may (i) amend, modify, or withdraw this RFP, (ii) revise requirements of this RFP, (iii) require supplemental statements or information from any firm, (iv) accept or reject any or all responses hereto, (v) extend the deadline for submission of responses thereto, (vi) negotiate or hold discussions with any respondent to waive defects and allow corrections of deficient responses which do not completely conform to the instructions contained herein, and (vii) cancel this RFP, in whole or in part, if LMDC deems it in its best interest to do so. LMDC may exercise the foregoing rights at any time without notice and without liability to any proposing firm or any other party for their expenses incurred in the preparation of the responses hereto or otherwise.

C. Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policies

It is the policy of the State of New York and LMDC to comply with all federal, state and local laws, policies, orders, rules and regulations which prohibit unlawful discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability or marital status, and to take affirmative action in working with contracting parties to ensure that Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprises ("M/WBEs"), Minority Group Members and women share in the economic opportunities generated by LMDC's participation in projects or initiatives, and/or the use of LMDC funds. As a subsidiary of ESDC, LMDC follows ESDC's non-discrimination and affirmative action policy will apply to any contract entered into as a result of this RFP. LMDC has established a 20% M/WBE participation goal for its entire redevelopment project. The selected firm(s) shall be required to use best efforts to provide for the meaningful participation of United States M/WBE's, Minority Group Members and women in the execution of this contract. A copy of each responding firm's equal employment opportunity policy statement, Attachment 1 relating to the anticipated workforce to be utilized on the contract and Attachment 2 relating to the anticipated participation by M/WBEs as subcontractors, shall be included as part of the response to the RFP. The ESDC Affirmative Action Unit ("AAU") is available to assist you in identifying M/WBEs certified by the State of New York that can provide goods and services in connection with the contract anticipated by this RFP. If you require M/WBE listings, please call the AAU at (212) 803-3224.

	Task 1		Task 2		Task 3		Task 4	
Position (Hourly Rate)	Estimated Hours	Cost	Estimated Hours	Cost	Estimated Hours	Cost	Estimated Hours	Cost
<i>Example</i> Technical Staff (\$75.00)	10	\$750.00	5	\$375.00	0	0	5	\$375.00

	Task 5		Task 6		Task 7		TOTAL
Position (Hourly Rate)	Estimated Hours	Cost	Estimated Hours	Cost	Estimated Hours	Cost	
<i>Example</i> Technical Staff (\$75.00)	15	\$1125.00	10	\$750.00	30	\$2250	\$5625.00