NYC / EDC

Hunts Point Site D eTRU Hub Infrastructure
Delivery and Yard Management Services
Project #11669
Questions & Answers
June 17, 2026

In connection with the Request for Proposals relating to the Hunts Point Site D eTRU Hub Infrastructure Delivery Services released by NYCEDC on May 26, 2026, the questions from potential Respondents and answers provided by NYCEDC are below.

1. **Q:** Can NYCEDC clarify the anticipated project delivery and commercial structure for this procurement? Specifically: Is NYCEDC seeking a Design-Build, Design-Bid-Build, Design-Build-Operate, Design-Build-Operate-Maintain, concessionaire, or other delivery model?
   A: NYCEDC is seeking two contracted consulting services: one for delivery of the infrastructure on site and the other for yard management. Respondents may submit proposals for one or both of the services. Respondents are expected to propose commercial structures.

2. **Q:** What level of cost information is expected as part of the proposal (e.g., conceptual order-of-magnitude estimate, detailed capital cost estimate, phased implementation costs, lifecycle cost analysis, operating cost estimate, GMP, fixed-price proposal, or other)?
   A: Respondents should provide cost information at a level of detail appropriate to their proposed approach and scope. NYCEDC is not prescribing a single pricing methodology; however, proposals should include sufficient detail to evaluate the proposed cost structure, including applicable capital costs, operating costs, payment or reimbursement structure, and any assumptions, exclusions, contingencies, or conditions affecting pricing.

3. **Q:** Should respondents include costs associated with design, permitting, utility coordination, utility upgrades, construction, and commissioning?

A: Yes

4. **Q:** Does NYCEDC anticipate selecting a development partner based on qualifications and approach with pricing refined in a subsequent phase, or is pricing expected to be a significant component of the current evaluation?
   A: Pricing, reimbursement assumptions, projected revenues, operating costs, incentive assumptions, proposed fees, and potential ability to minimize or avoid upfront NYCEDC capital outlay should be considered when developing proposals. Commercial Structure(s) and Cost Optimization comprise of (20%) of the evaluation criteria.

5. **Q:** Has funding for project design and construction been secured, and if so, can NYCEDC provide an anticipated capital budget range for the project?
   A: NYCEDC expects respondents to propose funding and cost structures as part of their submissions.

6. **Q:** How will project cost be evaluated relative to technical approach, project delivery strategy, schedule, operational capability, and relevant experience during proposal evaluation?
   A: Project cost is evaluated as part of “Commercial Structure(s) and Cost Optimization (20%)” within the Selection Criteria. NYCEDC evaluates proposals holistically across all criteria, as set forth in Sections 5.1 through 5.6.

7. **Q:** Has Con Edison confirmed the available electrical capacity and preferred point(s) of interconnection for the proposed facility?
   A: Con Edison provided a preliminary site assessment, the results of which are listed in Exhibit A.3.

8. **Q:** Can NYCEDC provide the anticipated number of simultaneously connected TRUs required at full build-out and any projected future expansion requirements?
   A: It is anticipated that approximately 80–100 stationary TRUs can be accommodated.

9. **Q:** Can NYCEDC provide projected trailer counts, utilization assumptions, and seasonal demand forecasts used in developing the project requirements?

A: The Food Distribution Center has hundreds of stationary TRUs that operate 24/7. NYCEDC anticipates that there will be enough units to keep the Hub at full utilization year-round.

10. **Q:** Will survey, utility, geotechnical, environmental, and site remediation information be made available to respondents?
    A: We may provide the site boundary, topographic, and existing utility surveys, as they are in progress and can be shared as an addendum to the RFP. Currently, the site's only utility infrastructure is a stormwater system that conveys stormwater to a detention basin adjacent to the Bronx River shoreline. See below for more information regarding environmental/site remediation.

11. **Q:** Will there be any addenda issued post walk through?
    A: NYCEDC anticipates there will be an addendum posted to the RFP website.

12. **Q:** Please confirm whether NYCEDC has preferred ownership, reimbursement, and revenue-sharing structures for infrastructure delivery?
    A: NYCEDC will maintain ownership of the infrastructure. NYCEDC will favorably view structures that minimize upfront capital outlay by NYCEDC.

13. **Q:** Is the project tax exempt? Should the proposal include taxes?
    A: Respondents should include and clearly document any applicable tax assumptions (tax exemption or tax treatment) in their proposals.

14. **Q:** Will the Infrastructure Delivery team be responsible for environmental costs or will there be an allowance?
    A: Yes, the Infrastructure Delivery team will be responsible for environmental costs.

15. **Q:** Will EDC hire an environmental consultant, or will the Infrastructure Delivery team be responsible?
    A: The Infrastructure Delivery team will need to procure their own environmental consultant, and work with EDC and our consultant to get the project to the finish line.

16. **Q:** Can the RFP referenced "Site Management Plan (SMP)" be provided?
    A: The SMP is being finalized and timing of SMP completion is expected to fall after a respondent is chosen. The SMP will be provided to selected respondents for Infrastructure Delivery Services and select portions may be made available in the 'Additional Files' on the RFP website.

Substantial changes to the remedial cap/ in-situ stabilization area are prohibited, but the installation of piles to support a slab on grade is possible for clean energy installation, such as BESS or Solar and related infrastructure (however, this requires a work plan and NYSDEC approval first). Shallow conduits above the geomembrane liner would also work best for repairs.

Please note, since contamination (stabilized purifier waste and coal tar) remains on-site via in-situ stabilization, air monitoring during any disturbance of the solidified waste is required for TVOCs, H2S, HCN and particulate matter. Disposal of any access material will also need to be considered more expensive as it is considered contaminated.

For the workstream to get your project through NYSDEC, timelines will vary. Your team will need to work with our environmental consultant for proper documentation and reporting.

17. **Q:** In addition to providing Exhibit A, please provide anything as it relates to preliminary parking layout discussed at the walk through.
A: NYCEDC mentioned that there was an internal rough sketch developed to estimate the potential number of units that the yard could accommodate. This was not an engineering document with full consideration of optimal layout and circulation. NYCEDC expects respondents for Infrastructure Delivery Services to develop an optimized parking layout.

18. **Q:** Are there any perimeter fencing requirements? Or is the site fencing staying as is? Are security gates and CCTV required?
A: The site will require security considerations. Respondents for both services categories should propose security infrastructure and operation as it pertains to the respective services, which could include leaving, modifying, or replacing the existing fencing among other considerations. Proposals should also detail expectations of security responsibility delineations between service provider, NYCEDC, or otherwise, as they pertain to respective services.

19. **Q:** How many Level 2 chargers are required?
A: Inclusion of L2 capability and quantity should be defined by the respondent. NYCEDC will favorably view proposals for Infrastructure Delivery Services with more incentive eligible components.

NYC / EDC

20. **Q:** Is there any drainage modifications required and or additional drainage structures need to be added?
    A: The current stormwater drainage system is part of the remedy at the site. This system should be preserved, and we will not need to alter this system. We do not believe any additional NYCDEP or SWPPP requirements will be triggered for this project. However, the selected respondent will need to install protections to the system during construction to ensure excavated materials, etc. do not directly drain into the Bronx River.

21. **Q:** What on-going operations exist currently so logistics can be taken into consideration?
    A: The neighboring tenant is currently parking up to 30 trucks on-site. These vehicles will be designated to stay on the 1 acre unavailable to the project. There will be shared access.

22. **Q:** Are restroom facilities required?
    A: No.

23. **Q:** Please provide Exhibit A
    A: Refer to page 27 (of 28) of the RFP for Exhibit A.

24. **Q:** Please clarify the total quantity of trucking spaces. Paragraph 2 of 3.1 mentions temp parking of up to 30 trucks on a portion of the site. Is that in addition to the 80-100 eTRU spaces? And will those 30 spaces require shore power and after hour lighting?
    A: NYCEDC has entered into an access license permitting the temporary parking of up to 30 trucks on a portion of Site D that is not available for use as part of the Hub. This encumbered area should not be assumed to be part of the Hub program and should not be incorporated into utility assumptions, including shore power or lighting.

25. **Q:** Currently there is an existing railroad overhead crossing structure within the entrance/exit of the north side of the lot. Will that structure need to be relocated to allow for trucking to exit the parking lot? With regards to the two existing entrances there are no existing curb cuts. Has that process been started with the NYCDOB? Both the curb cuts at the property as well on the other side of the bike/pedestrian lane would be required.
    A: As mentioned in the RFP, proposals that improve safe site access (e.g. curb cuts) and reduce circulation conflicts will be viewed favorably. This process has not been started with DOB or any other potential agency having jurisdiction.

26. **Q:** Please provide all environmental reports and boring logs.

A: The Final Engineering Report (FER) is in the process of being finalized. The ISS QA/QC logs, which may be made available at a later date as an addendum to the RFP, are indicative of what the current subsurface materials currently exists on-site beneath the cover system.

All other previously submitted reports as part of the BCP can be accessed through the NYSDEC Environmental Remediation Database for Hunts Point Parcel D (Site No. C203100) - https://appfactory.dec.ny.gov/DERExternalSearch/ERDSearch.

27. **Q:** Is there a specific pricing format expected? Will a breakdown form be provided to be filled out? Is a P&P bond required? What are the insurance requirements? What services will the owner be providing such as 3rd party testing, permitting, etc.? What type of contract will this be?
A: Respondents should provide pricing in a clear format of their choosing, with sufficient detail for NYCEDC to evaluate the proposed cost structure, assumptions, and allocation of costs across the applicable scope(s), including clearly distinguishing between Infrastructure Delivery Services and Yard Management Services, as applicable. NYCEDC is not providing a separate pricing form at this time. Bonding, insurance, contract form, and other commercial requirements will be addressed in the applicable agreement(s) and may vary depending on the scope of services awarded. Respondents should identify any assumptions, exclusions, or requested deviations in their proposals and should assume responsibility for all services necessary to deliver their proposed scope, except where the RFP expressly states otherwise.

28. **Q:** Is it more economical to provide power connects overhead on a structure or surface mounted stubbed up?
A: NYCEDC is looking for respondents to suggest answers to this question in their proposals.

29. **Q:** While there are manufacturers listed within the RFP of the TRU's. Are there a specific KW and Voltage we should be designing to?
A: Respondents are encouraged to consider and address the “summary of proposed electrical capacity (kW/kVA) and the number of simultaneous eTRU connections supported, including key load assumptions” as part of their proposal.

30. **Q:** Given that this RFP entails both a design build process along with actual pricing would a time extension be granted? This would allow the time and effort it would take to accurately obtain subcontractor price input.

A: NYCEDC might grant a short extension, which could be around one week, if any extension will be granted it will be done so via an addendum to the RFP.

31. **Q:** Can you please provide the cutsheets for the TRU units?
    A: The following URLs are cutsheets of example units within the Food Distribution Center:
    a. https://www.thermoking.com/content/dam/strategic-brands/thermo-king/americas-asset-library/document/spec-sheet/precedent-s-700-specification-sheet-55871.pdf
    b. https://www.shareddocs.com/hvac/docs/2000/Public/0A/62-11664.pdf
    c. https://www.utilitytrailer.com/wp-content/uploads/CBNA-Spec-Sheet-625-Hybrid.pdf

32. **Q:** Can NYCEDC/Con Edison confirm the Krasdale bank (~1,600 kW) as the intended point of interconnection, and whether the ~1,600 kW is firm available load-serving capacity, net of existing customer load, or subject to a formal capacity study?
    A: Per the RFP, this was an identified available load by Con Edison's eMobility Advisory Team's preliminary site assessment. This is not from Con Edison's Energy Services Team, which will provide an engineering assessment once a case is opened with them, which is the responsibility of the Infrastructure Delivery Services.

33. **Q:** Where will the Con Edison point of delivery / demarcation sit, and what service voltage(s) are available — specifically, can 480 V 3-phase be delivered (for the Carrier eTRUs), or should we assume customer-side transformation from secondary network voltage?
    A: The local network is 480V 3-phase per Con Edison's capacity maps and eMobility Advisory Team.

34. **Q:** What is the process and timeline to obtain a cost estimate?
    A: A formal case needs to be opened with Con Edison's Energy Services Team through Project Center, which is the responsibility of the Infrastructure Delivery Services. This process will lead to the timeline and cost allocations.

35. **Q:** Is the bank a secondary (area/spot) network or radial, and are there export/network-protector constraints affecting any on-site storage?
    A: This information would be provided by Con Edison through a formal process.

36. **Q:** For the new ~800 kW secondary-service alternative, does the 9–12 month timeline run from a Con Edison service application, and would NYCEDC support or expedite it?

A: The estimated timeline is from acceptance of a Con Edison Service Determination. NYCEDC cannot expedite Con Edison timelines.

37. **Q:** What subsurface work is permissible under the SMP (shallow conduit, pile-free anchoring, surface-mounted protection), and what is the NYS DEC approval pathway/timeline if any trenching is proposed?
A: The majority of the surface cover system is approximately 3 feet. It is a 6-inch cushion layer of imported quarry screenings (gravel), a 60-mil impermeable geomembrane, geotextile fabric, approximately 2 to 2.5-feet of additional quarry screenings, followed by a 6-inch-thick layer of asphalt pavement (this is thinner in the center of the site. The outer perimeter contains concrete curb and gutter backed by 1.5-inch stone and riprap adjacent to the access ramps. The depths of the ISS Monolith, which is below the cap, vary from approximately 15-27 ft below ground surface.

    Piles cannot be driven into the monolith, and work cannot be done without a work plan and NYSDEC approval.

38. **Q:** Can NYCEDC confirm the locations/dimensions of the two ingress/egress points and constraints on adding curb cuts (authority, coordination, duration)? Which point does NYCEDC anticipate for the Hub vs. the encumbered-area licensee?
A: The locations are identified in Exhibit A of the RFP. Per the RFP, it is up to the respondent to propose which point would be for the Hub and which for the encumbered area licensee. NYCEDC anticipates the curb cutting process to follow the standard DOB and DOT process and timeline.

39. **Q:** Can NYCEDC provide a dimensioned site plan or CAD/GIS file for the ~2.6-acre available area and the ~1-acre encumbered area?
A: A CAD or GIS file for this specific ask is not available.

40. **Q:** Are there maximum point-load or surface-loading limits on the SMP cap that constrain placement of pad-mounted or gravity-anchored equipment (BESS, transformers, solar)?
A: NYCEDC does not have specific information pertaining to maximum point-load or surface-loading limits, however, the site remedy was based upon a need for vehicle parking at the time.

41. **Q:** Will NYCEDC facilitate coordination with NYC DOB and FDNY, and are there known filing or review constraints for an above-ground, modular installation on a capped site?

A: NYCEDC expects coordination with agencies having jurisdiction to be contemplated by respondents. NYCEDC does not know of any filing or review constrains for above-ground, modular installations.

42. **Q:** For any stationary BESS, are there NYC-specific FDNY/NFPA 855 requirements or siting constraints NYCEDC expects respondents to design to?
A: NYCEDC is not expecting respondents to propose BESS as part of the Hub. If BESS is part of the design, NYCEDC expects respondents to be familiar with the requirements of the applicable agencies with jurisdiction.

43. **Q:** The RFP (Part 6) contemplates infrastructure costs being reimbursed over time and Yard Management compensated via fees or reimbursement. Can NYCEDC clarify the anticipated contract structure and compensation basis for Infrastructure Delivery — e.g., fee-for-services with construction costs reimbursed or passed through, versus a fixed-price / guaranteed-maximum-price delivery in which the provider carries construction cost risk — and whether construction is performed under this engagement or separately procured?
A: NYCEDC is looking for respondents to propose the most cost-effective and time efficient structures for both service categories. Construction is to be performed as part of Infrastructure Delivery Services.

44. **Q:** Would NYCEDC consider lease or as-a-service models in which a finance partner owns the portable/demountable infrastructure and NYCEDC pays to use it, to minimize upfront City capital and proposer balance-sheet exposure?
A: NYCEDC is open to any model that delivers the appropriate infrastructure without any real estate interests or concession considerations for the respondent.

45. **Q:** Part 6 notes Hub revenues may both reimburse infrastructure costs and compensate Yard Management. If a single Hub revenue pool serves both, how will NYCEDC prioritize the two reimbursement streams if revenue is insufficient in a given period, and is the infrastructure reimbursement obligation independent of actual Hub revenue (e.g. availability-based) or contingent on it?
A: If Hub revenues are not sufficient to cover NYCEDC's financial obligations for Infrastructure Delivery Services and/or Yard Management Services, NYCEDC will still cover its financial obligations.

46. **Q:** In a decommissioning scenario, to what condition must the Site be restored, and would removable/portable infrastructure satisfy the standard with minimal additional work?
A: In such a scenario, the RFP asks respondents for Infrastructure Delivery Services only to provide proposed plans for decommissioning and site restoration.

NYC / EDC

47. **Q:** Is the ~3–6 year operating period expected to track the new Produce Market completion, and is there a transition trigger that should inform which components we design as temporary vs. modular vs. permanent?
A: The estimated operating period is not related to the Produce Market as the site will be available to tenants across the Food Distribution Center. Potential conversion of the site would be contingent on the utility of shore power infrastructure versus other uses, such as charging infrastructure, as the landscape of technology shifts (i.e. increased prevalence of battery powered eTRUs vs shore power capable eTRUs).

48. **Q:** Part 9 permits an M/WBE respondent to count its own participation toward the 30% goal. Two clarifications: (a) will NYCEDC credit a DSBS-certified MBE/WBE whose certification is in process at submission (e.g. via Port Authority NY/NJ Expedited Certification per Condition 12), provided it completes before award/performance; and (b) where a firm is prime on one service category and subcontractor on the other, will its certified participation count toward the goal on each agreement, computed against that agreement's value?
A:
    a. Credit will only be counted if a firm is certified by SBS at the time of award
    b. Credit is given for each service provided. The prime will not get extra credit for the sub, one credit per service.

49. **Q:** If a team offers cost savings when the same team is awarded both categories (shared PM, integrated design, single mobilization), how would NYCEDC like those combined-award savings presented and treated in evaluation, given separate awards are reserved? **A:** The cost savings will be evaluated for each service category against other proposals for that service category as it pertains to relevant evaluation criteria (cost, feasibility, etc)

50. **Q:** Can NYCEDC share data on the relocating eTRU population — count, manufacturer/model mix, diesel/hybrid/electric, and typical setpoints (frozen vs. refrigerated) — to inform monitoring, onboarding, and load assumptions?
A: There are a substantial amount of TRUs in the Food Distribution Center, primarily refrigerated, that may find utility in having an eTRU yard. TRUs parked in the Hub would be required to plug in, so no purely diesel-powered units would use the Hub. There is not a specific population of units for which the Hub is being built out.

51. **Q:** What is the expected concurrency profile — all 80–100 units connected simultaneously, or phased in over the deployment period?

A: The Hub should be able to support a fully populated yard plugged in simultaneously. Note that this does not mean that all compressors will be operating with peak draw simultaneously.

52. **Q:** Will trailers arrive already electric/hybrid-capable, or will some require conversion before operating on shore power? (Affects the onboarding workflow and ramp.)
A: There are a substantial amount of units within the Food Distribution Center that are already electric or hybrid. As noted in the RFP, neither service category needs to consider or deliver TRU delivery or conversion.

53. **Q:** The RFP notes relocated units may be hybrid diesel-electric but prohibits diesel operation on Site. Can NYCEDC confirm that hybrid units operating in all-electric standby (engine off, refrigeration on shore power) are eligible, and clarify any onboard-engine lockout or verification expected to evidence no-diesel operation?
A: Yard Management Services is expected to ensure that hybrid units are connected and not using diesel.

54. **Q:** What metering and sub-metering granularity does NYCEDC expect — site-level, per-pedestal, or per-unit — for billing/reimbursement and for incentive/program reporting?
A: Proposals for Yard Management Services should contemplate optimal billing/reimbursement models to inform Infrastructure Delivery Services.

55. **Q:** Are there specific City, utility, or carbon-market reporting standards or formats NYCEDC will require for the avoided-diesel / emissions-reduction reporting under Hub Goal E?
A: No.

56. **Q:** Does NYCEDC have preferred data-export or integration standards (e.g. OCPP, open API) for City/utility reporting from the management platform?
A: No.

57. **Q:** Will NYCEDC select Infrastructure Delivery and Yard Management providers concurrently or sequentially, and how will the two awardees be expected to coordinate (interface responsibilities, shared data, commissioning hand-off)?
A: NYCEDC will help facilitate coordination and optimization of services between awardees of respective service categories.

58. **Q:** For a Yard Management respondent, what interface and data access will NYCEDC require from the Infrastructure provider's equipment (OCPP, open API,

metering) so the platform can monitor and optimize regardless of who delivers the infrastructure?

A: This is dependent on responses, but NYCEDC will facilitate coordination and optimization of services between awardees of respective service categories.

59. **Q:** Does NYCEDC prefer a fixed management fee, an operational cost-reimbursement model, or a hybrid for Yard Management — and are tenant-paid usage fees expected to be a primary funding source?

    A: NYCEDC is open to preferred fee structures by respondents for Yard Management Services, so long as the structure does not contemplate real estate interests or concessions. NYCEDC will favor proposals that maximize reimbursement of capital outlay and fees through Hub-driven revenues.

60. **Q:** Should billing and settlement be operated by the Yard provider on NYCEDC's behalf (fees flowing to NYCEDC), and how does NYCEDC want Charging-as-a-Service structured given Hub revenues belong to NYCEDC?

    A: Yes. Respondents for Yard Management Services are expected to propose optimal structures.

61. **Q:** Is there a target or expected contract term for budgeting within the 3–6 year window, and how would NYCEDC treat proposals demonstrating value beyond it?

    A: The 3-6 year window mentioned in the RFP is explicitly stated as an *estimated* time of valuable utility. NYCEDC is open to proposals demonstrating value of the Hub beyond this window and will evaluate accordingly.

62. **Q:** Does NYCEDC have any constraint on enrolling Hub load or on-site storage in utility/ISO demand-response or grid-services programs during the term, and how would resulting payments be treated relative to Hub revenues?

    A: There is no constraint so long as there is no disruption to the operation of Food Distribution Center tenants utilizing the Hub. All revenues of the Hub would belong to NYCEDC.

63. **Q:** Has NYCEDC engaged Con Edison or NYSERDA on demand-response, flexible-interconnection, or grid-flexibility programs applicable to this Site, and are there timelines respondents should align to?

A: NYCEDC has not engaged Con Edison or NYSERDA about these programs as it pertains to Site D. NYCEDC will look favorably on the most expeditious timelines for infrastructure delivery.

64. **Q:** Are there page, formatting, or appendix conventions NYCEDC prefers beyond the PDF/ZIP naming and Cover Page + Parts 1–11 (Part 9 M/WBE, Part 10 Doing Business, Part 11 Statement of Agreement) structure already specified?
A: No.

65. **Q:** What are the dimensions, surface conditions, and any height or weight restrictions for each of the two ingress/egress points?
A: Dimensions and surface conditions are available in an as-built survey. This survey is in progress and might be shared as an addendum to the RFP. The site is currently used by larger, tractor trailer trucks.

66. **Q:** What are the anticipated operating hours and truck traffic volumes for the 1-acre encumbered area?
A: The licensee of the encumbered area has access to said area 24 hours a day and has the right to locate up to 30 trailers in said area. While trailers have been regularly parked in the encumbered area, the area has not seen regular activity.

67. **Q:** Is CEQR review anticipated for this project? If so, what level of review does NYCEDC expect, and has any review been initiated?
A: No, CEQR is not anticipated to be required in connection with this project.

68. **Q:** Is backup power permitted on-site during outages? If yes, which sources are allowed — battery storage, grid-tied storage, temporary generator, or zero-emission alternatives only?
A: Yes. NYCEDC will view non-emitting backup generation favorably.

69. **Q:** Geotechnical Data (Reference 3.1, Part 2): No geotechnical report, boring logs, or allowable bearing pressure data are provided. Request that NYCEDC provide available geotechnical information, or confirm that no subsurface data exists and that respondents should state bearing assumptions accordingly.

A: The remedy was not performed for any specific use or design and therefore there is no geotechnical information. Basic Parking was envisioned for the use of the parcel at the time.

70. **Q:** Boundary, Topographic, and Existing Utility Survey (Reference Exhibit A.1): The available area is shown only as a color overlay on an aerial image, without dimensions, coordinates, course & bearing, or topographic information. Request that NYCEDC provide a dimensioned survey delineating the 2.6-acre available area, the 1-acre encumbrance, ingress/egress points, topography, and any existing utilities, drainage structures, or easements on or crossing Site D.
A: Survey maps are being prepared that include the pavement contours, ISS surface and liner. This includes ingress and egress. These maps are in progress and may be shared as an addendum to the RFP.

71. **Q:** Stormwater & Drainage (Reference 3.1 and Exhibit A): Capped remediation sites typically incorporate engineered drainage that cannot be altered. Request that NYCEDC identify any existing stormwater management features that must be preserved, and confirm whether new impervious area or grading will trigger a NYCDEP review or SWPPP requirement.
A: There is sufficient drainage for the entire surface of the remediated parcel. Any new storm drainage can be diverted into the perimeter catch basins where it will be captured by the storm system. All storm drainage runs east of the site and empties into a detention basin for infiltration into the subsurface. We do not believe this will trigger a NYCDEP review or SWPPP requirement.

72. **Q:** Flood Zone Equipment Elevation (Exhibit A): Confirm that the work for this project will not be in the 100-year flood zone, or if any city flood-resiliency or equipment elevation requirements applicable to electrical equipment pads (transformers/switchgear) apply at Site D.
A: The site is out of the AE flood zone on the top of the remediated area. Land outside and at original grade may be in the AE and possibly VE flood zone. Please consult flood insurance maps.

73. **Q:** Existing Pavement Conditions and Final Surface Treatment (Part 2 and Part 8): The RFP encourages a slab that runs utilities aboveground but does not state the

existing surface type or condition, the load-bearing capacity of the existing cap/pavement section, or the final surface treatment required for the Hub working area. It likewise does not define the surface condition to which the Site must be restored upon decommissioning (Part 8 references restoration "to a condition acceptable to NYCEDC"). Request that NYCEDC: (a) describe the existing surface and its condition; (b) state any required final surface treatment/specification for the operating yard; and (c) define the acceptable restoration standard so that restoration scope can be priced consistently across respondents.

A:

a. Utilities may be installed in shallow concrete conduit channels that are placed anywhere above the geomembrane liner (generally within 3 feet of the top of asphalt). A utility survey is in progress and might be shared as an addendum to the RFP.
b. NYCEDC is not prescribing a specific pavement or slab specification at this time, but the proposed surface treatment must be adequate to safely and reliably support Hub operations for the term of the agreement.
c. Upon decommissioning, unless otherwise directed by NYCEDC, the Site shall be restored to a condition substantially similar to its condition prior to installation of the Hub improvements, ordinary wear and tear excepted, and otherwise acceptable to NYCEDC.

74. Q: DEC Approval Timeline (Section 3.1): The RFP states that trenching and subsurface work "may be constrained and subject to approval by NYSDEC and/or other agencies." Because schedule and deployment speed is weighted at 25% (Section 5.5), the DEC review/approval timeline for SMP-governed subsurface work is critical path. Request that NYCEDC provide the anticipated DEC review/approval timeline and confirm whether any blanket or pre-approved penetration details already exist for the cap.

A: No estimated timeline for NYSDEC review and approval can be provided at this time. Respondents may use individuals experienced in working with NYSDEC and the Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) to assist in the process to potentially shorten the approval time.

75. Q: Off-Site Routing Across the Rail Corridor (Section 3.1, Exhibit A.2): The RFP states that the adjacent rail corridor (west) and 400 FCD (south) "may be subject to

remediation" for any required trenching, and that NYCEDC "is working to get the adjacent rail corridor site investigated and remediated," and that respondents "should not assume that all adjacent subsurface areas are available for unrestricted excavation." Routing to the identified Con Edison connection points likely requires crossing these areas. Request that NYCEDC clarify the current investigation/remediation status and expected availability date of the rail corridor, and confirm whether respondents may assume off-site routing access for pricing and schedule purposes.
A: For routing across the rail corridor, rail is currently being removed from the rail corridor, and we plan to complete the remedial investigation of the rail corridor by the end of the summer. We currently plan to phase any remediation so that this area is remediated first to accommodate installation of the conduits for this site. If development of the project does not align with our remediation schedule (which is still in flux and subject to NYSDEC approval), this area can be remediated via an Interim Remedial Measure. We would need to confirm the timeframe with NYSDEC for this path, but it is a possible pathway to get this work completed prior to the larger remediation effort.

76. **Q:** Has NYCEDC submitted a formal service request to Con Edison for any of the three preliminary capacity pathways identified in Exhibit A (1,600 kW at Krasdale, 1,400 kW at Baldor, or 800 kW new secondary service)?
A: No. A formal service request requires a site plan, load letter, and one-line drawing, which will be the responsibility of the Infrastructure Delivery Services.

77. **Q:** Does NYCEDC have a preference among the three Con Edison pathways, or should respondents propose the pathway they believe best balances speed, cost, and reliability?
A: Respondents should propose the pathway they believe best balances speed, cost, and reliability.

78. **Q:** Is dual-use L2 charging capability required or optional? Does NYCEDC expect all connections to be L2-capable, or only a subset?
A: Dual use chargers are optional, but will potentially enable some of the build-out cost to be eligible for Con Edison incentives, which will be viewed favorably by NYCEDC.

NYC / EDC

79. **Q:** What connector standards are acceptable for eTRU shore power and L2 charging? Are there specific standards NYCEDC or Con Edison requires for incentive program eligibility?
    A: NYCEDC will favorably view non-proprietary shore power and L2 connectors for maximum compatibility. Con Edison's incentive program will require L2 chargers to be compatible with Medium-Heavy Duty Electric Vehicles.

80. **Q:** What TRU OEMs and models will be relocated to Site D? Please provide electrical specs (voltage, amperage, phase), connector types, load profiles, duty cycles, and temperature setpoints for the anticipated fleet.
    A: There is not a specific population of eTRUs that the site is being built for. Please see cutsheets in the answer to Question 31 for examples of units present in the Food Distribution Center.

81. **Q:** Are the units being relocated currently hybrid diesel-electric or fully electric? Will any require retrofits to operate on grid shore power?
    A: Respondents should anticipate use of the Hub by both hybrid and electric units. Neither service category will be responsible for TRU retrofit or delivery.

82. **Q:** Who is responsible for TRU equipment maintenance — the infrastructure provider, yard manager, OEM service contracts, or NYCEDC?
    A: Proposals for Yard Management Services should contemplate maintenance for the Hub. Maintenance of TRUs themselves is not part of the scope of either service category.

83. **Q:** Who physically connects and disconnects trailers to shore power — tenant drivers, dedicated yard staff, the infrastructure operator, or the yard manager?
    A: Yard Management Services will be responsible for ensuring proper connections. Responses for this service category should contemplate the best means for the physical connections to be established.

84. **Q:** What tenant-facing systems (YMS, WMS, TMS, or other logistics platforms) currently exist at the Hunts Point Food Distribution Center that the yard management solution should integrate with or avoid conflicting with?

A: None.

85. **Q:** What are NYCEDC's expected coverage hours for Yard Management Services — 24/7, standard business hours, on-call, or a hybrid model?
A: eTRUs are expected to be connected at the Hub 24/7. Responses for Yard Management Services should contemplate the best means for ensuring reliability for 24/7 operation.

86. **Q:** Does the Yard Management scope require dedicated on-site personnel, or will NYCEDC provide its own site staff for physical operations?
A: NYCEDC will not be providing staff for physical operations.

87. **Q:** Does NYCEDC expect mandatory demand response program participation, or is grid-interactive load management an optional enhancement to the proposal?
A: Grid-interactive load management is an optional enhancement.

88. **Q:** What uptime guarantee level does NYCEDC expect for shore power availability? Is there a minimum threshold below which performance penalties would apply?
A: NYCEDC will require continuous uptime to prevent the spoilage of its tenants inventories.

89. **Q:** How will interface risk and responsibility be managed if Infrastructure Delivery and Yard Management are awarded to separate respondents — e.g., for outages caused by equipment failures at the boundary of the two scopes?
A: NYCEDC will help facilitate coordination between awardees.

90. **Q:** Who is responsible for electricity costs — NYCEDC, market tenants, the infrastructure provider, the yard manager, or a pass-through model? What metering and billing structure does NYCEDC anticipate?
A: NYCEDC anticipates that electric costs would be passed through to users of the Hub, but these are considerations respondents for Yard Management Services should include in proposals.

NYC / EDC

91. **Q:** Can infrastructure delivery costs be reimbursed through fixed availability payments (not contingent on Hub revenue), or does NYCEDC require revenue-based reimbursement only?
    A: NYCEDC will favor proposals that leverage revenues from the Hub to reimburse fronted capital costs. However, this structure is not a requirement.

92. **Q:** Does NYCEDC have a target payback period, cost ceiling, or preferred return on any upfront capital investment, or is the infrastructure provider expected to self-finance 100% of delivery costs?
    A: NYCEDC will favor proposals that minimize upfront capital outlay by NYCEDC for Infrastructure Delivery Services. Proposals that require NYCEDC to provide some amount of upfront capital should clearly detail this. NYCEDC does not have a preconceived payback period, cost ceiling, or preferred return.

93. **Q:** Will NYCEDC provide a minimum guaranteed contract term or minimum revenue commitment to support project financing?
    A: This can be negotiated with short-listed respondents.

94. **Q:** Who bears spoilage or product-loss liability during outages or connection failures — the infrastructure provider, yard manager, tenant, or is this excluded from the contracted scope?
    A: Proposals for Yard Management Services should contemplate this.

95. **Q:** What insurance, bonding, indemnity, cybersecurity, and data protection requirements will appear in the final contract? Are there minimum coverage thresholds?
    A: Insurance, bonding, indemnity, cybersecurity, and data protection requirements will be set forth in the applicable agreement(s) and may vary depending on the scope of services awarded, including whether the Respondent is providing Infrastructure Delivery Services, Yard Management Services, digital systems, payment administration, or other data-related services. Respondents should assume that NYCEDC's standard contractual requirements will apply, including minimum insurance coverage thresholds appropriate to the awarded scope.

NYC / EDC

96. **Q:** What M/WBE documentation is required at the time of proposal submission? Does NYCEDC consider good-faith efforts when a respondent cannot fully achieve the 30% participation goal at the time of submission?
A: At the time of submission, the firm should submit the MWBE certificate/s from SBS, the narrative, and the subcontractor participation plan. Good faith efforts are assessed after award if MWBE utilization cannot be met. It is not assessed at the time of submission.

97. **Q:** Proposal Submission Packaging (Section 4.3): Section 4.3 requires "one complete electronic version… in PDF format" but also specifies a ZIP file naming convention for appendices. Please confirm whether a single consolidated PDF is required, or a primary PDF accompanied by a ZIP of supporting files.
A: A primary PDF accompanied by a ZIP file is acceptable.

98. **Q:** Proposal Formatting (Section 4.4): The RFP table of contents lists Section 4.4 ending at Part 10; however, the actual section contains 11 parts. Please confirm the controlling part structure so that proposals are organized to the intended outline.
A: The omission in the table of contents was in error. This will be amended.

99. **Q:** Missing Exhibit F (Section 4.4, Part 11): The required notarized statement must be submitted "in the format of Exhibit F," but the RFP package contains only Exhibit A. Please provide Exhibit F or remove the requirement and reference. Please confirm whether Exhibits B through E were intentionally omitted, or provide those exhibits.
A: The reference to “Exhibit F” was in error. This will be amended to “Exhibit B” with an inclusion of this exhibit

100. **Q:** Who owns the data generated by the Hub — energy consumption, trailer tracking, utilization records, and emissions data?
A: The data will be owned by NYCEDC.

101. **Q:** What data retention, audit rights, and third-party verification requirements will apply? Are there specific reporting standards (utility, city, or carbon market) that the system must support?

A: EDC will view full retention of data favorably. There are no third-party verifications or reporting standards required at this time.

102. **Q:** For proposals covering both service categories, will NYCEDC evaluate Infrastructure Delivery and Yard Management independently (each weighted at 10% for feasibility) and then combine scores, or will integrated proposals be assessed holistically?

A: Proposals for each service category will be compared to other proposals for that service category independently.

103. **Q:** Could you please confirm whether the PDF issued on May 26, 2026 (see attached), represents the complete formal RFP package? If additional documents are available, please provide the full RFP package, including all exhibits, required forms, contract templates, insurance requirements, bonding requirements, tax instructions, submission forms, Site Management Plan, environmental/cap documents, and any addenda issued to date.

A: Additional materials and an amendment have been uploaded to the RFP website.

104. **Q:** Is there a list of attendees and/or respondents you can share?

A: A list of site visit attendees was posted to the RFP website.

105. **Q:** In both NYSDEC filings and EDC's earlier Site D RFP (2023), the subject property has been variously referred to as "6.7 acres" (2023 NYCEDC Clean Energy Infrastructure & Technology RFP) and "7.1 acres" (2018 NYSDEC BCA). Can you help us reconcile these earlier quotes with the significantly smaller parcel referenced in the current eTRU hub RFP (2.6 acres for hub + 1 acre encumbered for truck parking)?

A: 6.7-7.1 acres represents the area of the entire “Site D” premises, including the Hub area, encumbered area, ingress and egress ramps, and area surround the elevated lot. The 2.6 acres represents the approximate potential area of Hub’s yard, minus the encumbered area, ingress and egress points, and area surrounding the elevated lot.

106. **Q:** Given that the scope includes a significant services component, I wanted to ask: is it permissible to submit a proposal scoped specifically to equipment supply and a portion of yard management services, or is a full-service response required to be considered?

A: Full responses are required to be considered. NYCEDC allows for responses from consortiums of equipment and/or service providers to account for a full response.

107. **Q:** Is there any information on the GC's or Principles that will be bidding for the RFP, of course, if it is public information.

A: NYCEDC does not have pre-knowledge of who will submit proposals to the RFP.