

## Addendum #2 and Q&A Responses

From: Sean Burnett

To: Interested Parties

Date: 3/13/2026

Re: Addendum #2 and Q&A Responses for Request for Proposals (RFP) 1429

**This Addendum #2 is issued to provide responses to additional questions submitted by prospective proposers.**

Questions from Pre-Submittal Meeting (submitted via email)

### Bridges/Structures

1. There are four bridge structures within the subject corridor: one bridge over the CSX line; the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge; and spans that carry Hanover and Potee Streets over the Patapsco. In several points in the Request for Proposals, it notes “non-bridge structure.” Please clarify which bridges, if any, are included as part of this phase of work. **No bridges are included as part of this phase of work.**
2. Will all structural engineering and design be excluded from this contract, or only structural engineering related to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge? **No structural engineering is occurring as a part of this task.**
3. The scope of services states that engineering survey and subsurface utility survey should be conducted for all non-bridge structure facilities. Please confirm if the limits of the survey effort should exclude all structures in the Study Area (I-95 to Belle Grove Road) or only the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge. **Engineering survey and subsurface utility survey work should occur across the entire corridor and will exclude only the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge.**
4. The scope references 30% design for non-structural elements, but also includes a navigation study and potential movable span decommissioning. Please clarify whether any structural engineering analysis/design of the bridge is within this contract’s scope. **No structural engineering is occurring as part of this task.**
5. Please clarify the expected level of effort and deliverables for the navigation study and movable span decommissioning assessment (e.g., coordination requirements, agencies, assumptions, and anticipated format). **BCDOT expects that the navigation study and movable span decommissioning assessment will be sufficient to supplement and inform future structural design considerations for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge as part of a second phase of this Project, as well as future ingress and egress of maritime traffic. The selected consultant team will be expected to coordinate with the Baltimore City Harbormaster, U.S. Coast Guard, and other**

stakeholders as recommended by the Harbormaster. BCDOT does not have a predetermined format for these deliverables.

6. Given that bridge structures are excluded from this phase while the corridor limits extend continuously from I-95 to Belle Grove Road, how does BCDOT anticipate establishing logical termini and independent utility for NEPA purposes for the non-structural improvements only? As stated in the RFP, “the project limits will be from I-95 (northern boundary) to Belle Grove Road at the Baltimore City-Anne Arundel County line.” This will not include structures in the study area, which will have a separate NEPA process as part of a second planned phase of this Project. BCDOT will coordinate with the selected Project team to determine structural limits.
7. NEPA requires that project limits have logical termini and that improvements need to have independent utility. How will impacts associated with bridge improvements or bridge replacement within the corridor be addressed in the corridor NEPA study? As stated in the RFP, “the project limits will be from I-95 (northern boundary) to Belle Grove Road at the Baltimore City-Anne Arundel County line.” This will not include structures in the study area, which will have a separate NEPA process as part of a second planned phase of this Project. BCDOT will coordinate with the selected Project team to determine structural limits.
8. Should proposals assume bridge-related recommendations will be documented only as future considerations with no bridge/structural environmental approval included under this contract? Yes, that is correct. Bridge-related recommendations can be documented as future considerations.
9. For the navigation study and potential movable span decommissioning assessment, has BCDOT initiated coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard, and should teams assume federal permitting implications beyond NEPA? BCDOT has not initiated coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard. The navigation study and movable span decommissioning assessment are being removed from this RFP under this addendum.
10. Will a planning study for the structural elements happen concurrently? And how will these related and inter-dependent planning studies be coordinated? BCDOT expects there will be overlap between the preliminary engineering (30%) and NEPA phase for all civil/roadway facilities and the preliminary engineering (30%) and NEPA phase for bridge structures. BCDOT will coordinate with the selected Project teams for the separate studies to ensure alignment and consistency.
11. During the pre-bid meeting, it was mentioned that a study is underway to determine structural recommendations for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge. When will that study be complete and what firms are involved? The structural assessment is underway and will be completed in 2026. BCDOT is not disclosing which consultant is currently performing this task.
12. Does the City intend for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge to be rehabilitated and stay in place, or is there potential for that bridge to be replaced, which may require a new roadway alignment? The structural assessment currently underway for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge will determine whether rehabilitation is feasible or if replacement is necessary. Any potential changes to the roadway alignment will be addressed in a separate phase of this Project.

13. Can you share copies of the latest structural assessment of all bridge structures in the corridor? **BCDOT is not sharing structural assessments of bridge structures in the corridor, as they are not included in the scope of services for this Project.**
14. The Request for Proposals mentions decommissioning the bridge span opening. Will there be a need for future large vessel passage requiring the span to open? **Structural considerations are not included in the scope of services for this Project, including details related to the moveable span that currently exists. The movable span decommissioning assessment is being removed from this RFP under this addendum.**
15. Please clarify the requirements for the maritime navigation studies (page 10 and 11) and how they pertain to this non-structural phase of the project. **The navigation study is being removed from this RFP under this addendum.**

### **Traffic**

16. The scope of services states that one of the subtasks is to “develop and evaluate appropriate planning-level traffic model/simulations to evaluate the impacts of each of the three alternatives recommended by the 2022 Feasibility Study.” Please specify the source of the recommended alternatives and provide a link to the 2022 Feasibility Study being referenced. **The source of the recommended alternatives is the “Hanover Street Corridor Study Final Project Report,” which is being sent directly to interested parties as an attachment under this addendum. The correct year for this report is 2019, rather than 2022. This has been corrected in the RFP under this addendum.**
17. Will traffic data collection be required by the consultant team or provided by BCDOT (e.g., volumes, turning movements, crash history)? **The consultant team will be required to collect all relevant traffic data to support design.**
18. Please confirm what existing data will be provided to the consultant team (e.g., prior feasibility study files, traffic counts, signal timing, crash data, GIS/CADD base mapping, right-of-way mapping). **BCDOT will provide all readily available data, including traffic counts, crash data, GIS files, and other types of data not already mentioned. The project team should be prepared to work with BCDOT to supplement readily available data through collection efforts.**

### **NEPA**

19. Should the environmental scope assume screening-level technical memoranda only, or preparation of discipline-specific technical studies (e.g., hazardous materials, noise, air quality) sufficient to support FHWA approval? **The environmental scope is determined by the significance of the impacts of the proposed activity which then determines the level of preliminary design and technical studies to support the NEPA class of action.**
20. The Request for Proposals references both an anticipated draft Categorical Exclusion and preparation of a Draft/Final Environmental Assessment and FONSI. Which should we expect? Does BCDOT anticipate a specific NEPA Class of Action at this time, or should teams assume the Class of Action will be determined during scoping? **The RFP states on page 9 that “the Project Team will enter into NEPA with the following anticipated analysis (resulting in an expected draft Categorical Exclusion,” but also considers also notes the potential for another class of action: “The project team will prepare the Draft and Final Environmental Assessment and associated technical reports and memoranda; the Draft and Final Findings of No**

Significant Impact (FONSI), if applicable.” Proposal submitters should assume that any class of action has not been predetermined at this point, and be prepared to conduct all environmental, social, cultural, and recreational resources analysis as needed.

21. Section 4(f) was not mentioned, but the corridor passes through parks. Are there any impacts expected to park properties? BCDOT expects the consultant team will assess impacts to adjacent park properties as part of NEPA. Section 4(f) is part of NEPA and as part of the NEPA process, the Official with Jurisdiction of the park property that may have impacts will be identified and coordinated with appropriately. The type of use, if any, of any Section 4(f) property will be determined by project impacts and coordination/approval with the Official with Jurisdiction.
22. Will staff from SHA serve as the environmental manager to oversee NEPA compliance? FHWA will oversee NEPA review and approval. BCDOT is the direct recipient of the grant funding for this Project; SHA will not act as a pass-through entity for NEPA approvals
23. Please confirm whether FHWA will be the NEPA decision authority and whether SHA will act as NEPA lead/manager for reviews and approvals. FHWA will oversee NEPA review and approval. BCDOT is the direct recipient of the grant funding for this Project; SHA will not act as a pass-through entity for NEPA approvals.

#### **Selection Process**

24. The Request for Proposals states, “Only the highest-ranking firms will be interviewed. The Firm that submits the highest rated Technical Proposal will be requested to submit a Price Proposal to BCDOT.” If the highest rated technical proposal will be requested to submit a price proposal, how does the scoring of interviewed firms factor into the criteria for selection? Firms are scored based on the criteria included in their proposals relating to the scope of work in this RFP; BCDOT is not seeking a cost proposal unless a firm is selected based on the proposal submitted.
25. If an offeror is successful in winning this solicitation, will the Prime or any subconsultant be precluded from submitting for the future structural phase component of this project? No, consultants selected to work on this Project will not be precluded from submitting for the structural design and NEPA RFP.

#### **DBE**

26. Should proposal submitters submit the MDOT DBE forms and respond with a “DBE compliance” written section if there is no DBE goal? No, MDOT DBE forms are not required for submission given the 0% DBE goal. Please do include an introduction letter if any MDOT-certified DBE firms are included. This requirement is being removed under this addendum.
27. The Request for Proposals states about DBE compliance, “this section must include an introduction letter listing all the proposed MDOT Certified DBE firms, associated MDOT Certification Numbers, proposed work and percentages, NAICS codes applicable to the work to be performed, and the name and contact information of the DBE Consultant Liaison Officer for Minority Affairs.” Given that there is a 0% DBE goal for the contract, please confirm that associated MDOT Certification Numbers, NAICS codes applicable to the work to be performed, and the name and contact information of the DBE Consultant Liaison Officer for Minority Affairs are not required in the introduction letter, or please otherwise clarify. No, these elements are not required given the 0% DBE goal. This information is being removed under this addendum.

28. The Request for Proposals states that “firms providing a SF [330] submission in response to this RFP who do not follow guidelines within this RFP including being prequalified, meeting SMBA&D goals at the time of the submittal due date will be deemed nonresponsive. Failure to follow the guidelines of this advertisement will cause disqualification of a firm(s) submission for this project and will disqualify the entire team for further participation in the project.” Please confirm there are no SMBA&D goals for the contract or please otherwise clarify. **This Project includes no SMBA&D goals. This information is being removed under this addendum.**
29. The Request for Proposals states, “An overall goal has been established for DBE participation for this Project located in Section 10 G of this RFP.” There is no Section 10G in the RFP. The RFP goes on to say that MDOT Forms A and B must be submitted with technical proposal. During the pre-proposal meeting, it was stated that information pertaining to any MDOT DBE subconsultants on an offeror’s team should be included on MDOT DBE Forms A and B, as the information is desired despite there being no DBE goal for the contract. Our question contains two parts:
- a. If an offeror does not include MDOT DBE certified firms on its team, are the MDOT DBE Forms A and B required to be included in the proposal? **No, DBE Forms A and B are not required for submission given the 0% DBE goal. This information is being removed under this addendum.**
  - b. If an offeror does not include MDOT DBE certified firms on its team but MDOT Forms A and B are required to be included, should the forms be completed with “N/A” in the data fields? **DBE Forms A and B are not required for submission given the 0% DBE goal. This information is being removed under this addendum.**
30. The grant application included a strong equity and environmental justice element, but is no longer a priority or requirement for federally-funded projects. How do you intend to address equity and environmental justice needs under the new directives from USDOT? **BCDOT intends to uphold the terms of its grant agreement with FHWA and complete all elements of the project as stated in the grant application. Examples including preparing a plan that addresses the systemic integration of green infrastructure and environmental site design into the streetscape; analyzing resource impacts as part of NEPA; assessing reasonably foreseeable effects as part of NEPA; identifying opportunities for economic development in underserved (among other) areas in a written report; completing an implementable workforce development plan that prioritizes education; and job training for unemployed or underemployed residents along the project corridor.**

## **Personnel**

31. Do Key Staff 1 and 3 need to be a registered Traffic Engineer, or can one be a Roadway/Highway Civil Engineer? **BCDOT will allow for the interchanging of one Traffic Engineer and one Roadway/Highway Civil Engineer.**
32. Does Key Staff 4 require any licensure? **This position does not require licensure.**
33. Can the timeframe for the key staff resumes be extended to eight years instead of five years? **The experience for each individual Key Staff shall be recent experience performed within the last five (5) years.**
34. There is no Time Distribution required for an environmental manager or environmental

specialists, but this project will include an extensive NEPA process. How should time for environmental staff be incorporated in the Time Distribution? **The RFP has been updated to include environmental manager/environmental specialist in the time distribution table under this addendum.**

35. Key Staff 5 is a Professional Land Surveyor. However, there is no Job Classification listed for a Surveyor in the Time Distribution. Where should this individual's time be categorized in the Time Distribution? **The RFP has been updated to include Professional Land Surveyor in the time distribution table under this addendum.**

## **Miscellaneous**

36. Where in the proposal should the City of Baltimore Prequalification Certificates be included? **Prequalification certificates can be attached to the proposal, and don't need to be in any particular location or order.**
37. Please confirm whether the contracting agency and negotiator for this procurement will be Baltimore City DOT (BCDOT) or MDOT SHA. **The contracting agency and negotiator for this procurement is BCDOT; MDOT SHA is serving in an advisory capacity.**
38. The RFP requests a financial responsibility/insurance letter addressed to SHA. Please confirm whether this letter should be addressed to SHA or BCDOT. **This letter should be addressed to BCDOT. This information is being updated in the RFP under this addendum.**
39. Can the timeframe for the three requested sample projects be extended to eight years instead of five years? **Please submit sample projects from within the last five years preceding submittal.**
40. Please confirm that the page limit for SF 330 Section F is 5 pages for the 3 example projects as stated in the RFP. **Correct, the page limit for sample projects is five pages.**
41. The Request for Proposals states, "Out-of-State Corporations must identify their corporate resident agent within the application." Where in the proposal should this information be included? **This information is included in a firm's prequalification application, which enables a company to do business in Maryland, and not in the proposal itself.**
42. Are dividers/tabs between the section of the technical proposal allowed? **Yes, dividers/tabs are permitted in printed proposals.**
43. Should the design alternatives include proposed trail improvements along the waterfront or separated from the roadway corridor, such as the new trails proposed as part of the Reimagine Middle Branch Master Plan? **Design alternatives prepared under the scope of the Project should include all implemented or currently planned trail improvements undertaken by the City of Baltimore; BCDOT will advise on the inclusion of specific trail and other multimodal improvement projects during the 30% design phase.**
44. Please clarify if the support personnel matrix is one 11x17 page or two 11x17 pages. **The support personnel matrix can be two 8.5 x 11-inch pages or one 11 x 17-inch page. This has been clarified in the RFP under this addendum.**

notification. Please clarify what type of emergency services are anticipated for this project and whether this requirement applies to all disciplines or only certain services. In instances where BCDOT requires faster-than-average responses to reasonable requests for information, BCDOT expects consultants to be available within six (6) hours to provide information. This requirement largely pertains to the prime consultant on the Project team.

46. If we have follow-up questions after answers to these questions are posted, will there be a way to submit new questions? Please email additional questions to Ethan McLeod, Planner II, Baltimore City Department of Transportation, [ethan.mcleod@baltimorecity.gov](mailto:ethan.mcleod@baltimorecity.gov). The Q&A period for this procurement effort has finished, but may be extended if needed. Questions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
47. Would BCDOT please provide the attendee list and any meeting minutes from the March 3, 2026 pre-submittal meeting? Please see the attached attendance list from the meeting, being distributed with this addendum.



Veronica P. McBeth  
Director  
Baltimore City Department of Transportation



Brett Thorne  
Interim Asst. Deputy Director of Planning & Sustainable Transportation  
Baltimore City Department of Transportation