

ADDENDUM #2

To: All Proposal Holders

Date: September 25, 2025

From: Michelle Koslap, Program Analyst
SEDA-Council of Governments
201 Furnace Road
Lewisburg, PA 17837
570-524-4491

Project: Newport Borough Curbs and Sidewalks SR0849

This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Quotes (RFQ) and modifies the original RFP, dated August 26, 2025, as noted below. All proposers must sign and return the attached Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum. Acknowledgement of Receipt is required to ensure consideration of the proposal. Failure to do so may subject the proposer to disqualification.

This Addendum consists of the following items:

1. Question: What funding is available for this project?

Answer: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) in the amount of \$100,686.00 (\$108,586.00-\$7,900.00 in delivery), Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) funding in the amount of \$520,000.00 and approximately \$21,414.00 in local funds.

2. Question: What is the name or source of the PennDOT funding for this project?

Answer: The project has RTP funding for construction, which is currently showing on the TIP as STP. This funding is 100% Federal and may not be used for any design services or consultant services during design, and is restricted to construction items and activities, including construction inspection.

RTP – Regional Transportation Plan

- A long-range (typically 20+ years) planning document developed by a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).
- It outlines transportation goals, strategies, and projects for a region.
- Projects listed in the RTP are often eligible for federal funding.

TIP – Transportation Improvement Program

- A short-term (usually 4-year) plan that lists specific transportation projects scheduled for funding and implementation.
- It must be consistent with the RTP and is required for projects to receive federal funding.

STP – Surface Transportation Program

- A flexible federal funding source that can be used for a wide range of transportation projects, including highways, bridges, transit, and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure.
- In your context, it's being used for construction only, not for design or consultant services.

So, in summary:

- The project is listed in the TIP with STP funding.
- The funding originates from RTP and is 100% federal.
- It's restricted to construction-related activities, including construction inspection, and cannot be used for design or consultant services.

3. **Question:** Will the CDBG funding be used to pay for the engineering fees? Are there any additional monies above the CDBG funding available or is that the maximum?

Answer: The CDBG funding will be used towards the engineering costs of the project since the PennDOT funding is restricted. The borough may be putting in some funding depending on where bids come in.

4. **Question:** Regarding *"Survey work required for easements/rights-of-way is not a part of this quotation. Federal Environmental Reviews, State Historic Preservation Office Review, and Archaeological Reviews are not a part of this quotation."* Is the engineer expected to do a topographic survey of this corridor, but not identify the existing legal right of way of the roadways? Is that correct? How will we be able to identify the outer limits of right of way (ROW) that we are able to design and work within, will the District be providing the ROW information for the consultant to add into the basemap developed from topographic survey?

Answer: PennDOT and the Borough will provide any existing rights-of-way mapping available. The engineer should anticipate the potential need to pull deed information from the County Courthouse for rights-of-way identification, even though a field survey is not anticipated for that need.

5. **Question:** Regarding the *"Federal Environmental Reviews, State Historic Preservation Office Review, and Archaeological Review"*, are we to assume that the District is completing all of the necessary reviews, then? Since the RTP funds from PennDOT are being used for construction funds, this project will be required to complete the environmental NEPA review clearance. Who is responsible to complete that effort for this project, the consultant or PennDOT?

Answer: The submission of the environmental review will be coordinated by PennDOT and SEDA-COG. No ER specific documents are anticipated to be required from the engineer. There may be supporting documents requested from the engineer, but they would be within the scope of work of the project.

6. **Question:** Is the Borough and SEDA-COG aware that a right-of-way plan is likely needed to facilitate this project? I didn't see any mention of a ROW Plan being required in the RFP, or language about how acquisitions/negotiations would be handled. We requested ROW information from PennDOT District 8 for this section of road and determined that the existing RW is 60' from Fickes Lane to Caroline Street, but only 32' from Caroline Street to Market Street. The 60' RW width should likely be an adequate width to complete all work within the RW. However, the 32' RW width from Caroline to Market is not wide enough to complete any sidewalk work, since the existing roadway curb-to-curb width is about 32' wide. It would likely even be tight for curb replacement work. The sidewalks from Caroline to Market all seem to be in private property, unless there are existing sidewalk easements that we are not aware about on SR 849.

Resulting from this upfront research, I have some more questions.

- a. Can SEDA COG/PennDOT/Newport please provide the ROW information to us now, if different than the attached information that District 8 provided us, so that we can adequately scope this project?
- b. Is the Borough's intent to not obtain any ROW and/or Temporary Construction Easements from property owners as part of the project? If so, then only curb replacements may be possible from Caroline Street to Market Street, and possibly select ADA ramp replacements where the SR 849 right-of-way meets up with the intersecting Borough street rights-of-way.
- c. If the Borough was aware of this RW width restriction from Caroline to Market and additional easements do not exist, then we will assume that our scope of work and fee will include the development of a RW Plan for acquiring RW/TCE to complete the work.
- d. Who would perform the acquisition/negotiations? If the engineering consultant, then we need to know so that we can bring on a subconsultant now to assist in this effort of acquisition/negotiations and need adequate lead time to prepare that information prior to the RFP deadline.
- e. If we are to expect work to be completed outside of the existing RW, then that opens up the need for additional environmental clearance review effort.
- f. We are unable to survey outside of public RW unless we send out public notice of intent to enter letters to each property owner, so this is also something we would need to consider in our effort and fee, as well, if needed.

Answer: At this time, it is assumed that all sidewalk work is within existing rights-of-way even if not illustrated on PennDOT rights-of-way plans. Rights-of-way will be confirmed after an engineer is selected. At this time, work for rights-of-way is not included in the RFQ scope. If rights-of-way scope of work do become necessary, a contract amendment will be negotiated at a later date. The engineer will not be responsible for notifying property owners or for the easement acquisition process.

Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum

We hereby acknowledge and confirm receipt of **ADDENDUM NO #2** regarding the **Newport Borough Curbs and Sidewalks SR0849** and have attached this Addendum to our copy of the RFQ.

Company Name:

By:

Title:

Date:
