**NEW JERSEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**FOR**

**UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL REAL ESTATE FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR SELECT PARCELS**

**(Reference RFP #2023-RERFP-160)**

**ADDENDUM #1**

The following constitutes an Addendum, which can be a Clarification and/or Modification to the above-referenced solicitation. This Addendum is divided as follows:

* Part 1: Answers to Questions Submitted
* Part 2: Additions, Deletions, Clarifications and Modifications to the RFP

|  |
| --- |
| **Part 1: Answers to Questions Submitted** |
| No. | Question | Answer |
| 1. | Page 4, section 1.1:  What is the due date for the final version of all deliverables?  The RFP indicates different due dates on page 4 (120 days) and page 23 (60 days).   | Page 4 is correct. The due date for the final version of all deliverables in 120 days. Please see the modification to section 4.2.1 II. C.  |
| 2. | Page 18, section 3.5:  Should the Financial Analysis of the Massing/Development Plans consider the cost of demolition of the existing structures and any potential environmental remediation? | The financial analysis should include the costs to make the parcels available for development. An environmental allowance should be included, without knowing the exact cost of the contamination that may be present on the property. |
| 3. | Page 18, section 3.5:  If existing environmental contamination is to be considered, what current data is available pertaining to that contamination? | UH and RU do not have a formal environmental assessment/study about the property. An environmental assessment will eventually be required, but is not part of this SOW. That said, we understand that the debris from the demolished properties that were previously located on this campus in the 1960s remain under the surface and should be a consideration. |
| 4. | Page 18, section 3.5:  Is there a plan for relocating the current users of the existing buildings on the UH parcels?  Will the cost of relocating those tenants need to be estimated and included in the development budget? | An estimate to relocate the existing users should be included in the development budget. Note that the existing buildings include some spaces that are leased by the State to Rutgers, in addition to UH, and contain Rutgers’s occupants. They should also be considered when necessary for relocation. The awardee should obtain these details from UH and Rutgers following award. |
| 5. | Page 19, section 3.6:  IMPLAN is our preferred input-output model for economic impacts.  Is that an acceptable model for the Authority?  Or would you prefer RIMS II multipliers or another commercial model? | The IMPLAN model is acceptable. |
| 6. | Can Gensler’s Draft University Hospital Facility Master Plan be shared with prospective bidders? | Yes, UH will provide the presentation to the awardee. |
| 7. | The latest facility masterplan was presented to the Board of Directors in February of 2023 and it outlined a vision for the parcels mentioned in the RFP. How does that vision dovetail, if at all, with the proposed SOW? | The draft UH Master Plan presented in February 2023 focused on land required for use by the Hospital, which was presented following close collaboration with Rutgers University. Though the UH Master Plan and this SOW consider different parcels, it is anticipated that the SOW would include consideration of the goals and objectives for the UH Master Plan parcels, as well as the Rutgers University Master Plan for Newark to ensure mutually beneficial outcomes. |
| 8. | Are there other competing development plans / visions that the city has considered in the past that the consultant should know about? | Rutgers University issued a Master Plan for Newark, which can be found online [here](https://masterplan.rutgers.edu/reports/rutgers-2030-volume-2-newark). This should be considered in analyzing the highest and best use of the property, along with the UH Master Plan. |
| 9. | Are there existing site conditions analysis / drawings available for consultant team to work off from?  | University Hospital and Rutgers have campus maps that can be provided to the awardee to assist in this review.  |
| **Part 2: Additions, Deletions, Clarifications & Modifications to the RFP** |
| No. | Description | Clarification/Modification |
| 1. | Modification to Section 4.2.1 II. C. | The Proposer shall also set forth a detailed work plan that will accomplish the requirements of the Scope of Work, Section 3.0, including an outline of a proposed meeting schedule with Authority staff and timeline for key milestones and ability to complete the scope of work within the 120 day maximum timeline.  |