

Maritime Operators, Electric Barge Service Between Brooklyn Marine Terminal and Hunts Point Marine Terminal RFEI Project #11750
Questions & Answers
Updated on 9/25/26

In connection with the **Request for Expressions of Interest** relating to the **Maritime Operators, Electric Barge Service Between Brooklyn Marine Terminal and Hunts Point Marine Terminal RFEI** released by NYCEDC on **May 14, 2026**, the questions from potential Respondents and answers provided by NYCEDC are below.

1. Is an articulated tug-barge (ATB) required, preferred, or one acceptable option? Will conventional tug-and-barge and self-propelled vessels receive consideration?

A. All vessel types will be considered.

2. Which studies, operating assumptions, or terminal constraints informed the proposed configuration? Please share available comparisons of capital cost, operating cost, energy use, maneuverability, and cargo handling.

A. The 8-acre port size informed the proposed maximum barge capacity of 200 containers per sailing, assuming one barge operation per day and the site's ability to accommodate no more than 400 containers (200 inbound and 200 outbound) per day. No other comparisons are being made available. RFEI respondents may propose alternative barge capacities based on their own calculations, but assume a minimum of 100 inbound containers entering the port each day and 100 outbound containers exiting the port each day.

3. Which design constraints are fixed, including vessel dimensions, draft, loading method, reefer capability, and compatibility with existing or planned berths?

A. This RFEI is placing no constraints.

4. May respondents propose alternatives that meet the service objectives with a different vessel size, configuration, or sailing frequency? Please identify any non-negotiable requirements and how alternatives will be evaluated.

A. Yes. The only non-negotiable service objective is a minimum of 100 inbound containers entering the port each day and 100 outbound containers exiting the port each day. NYCEDC planned around a single daily round-trip barge and tug movement, but this RFEI seeks industry input on the feasibility of that original assumption. Please see Addendum #3 to this RFEI for additional information on the site.

5. Please provide the currently contemplated allocation of responsibilities among NYCEDC, site owners, terminal operators, the vessel operator, utilities, and cargo customers. A responsibility-and-cost matrix would be helpful. For each item below, identify who procures/contracts for it, who pays upfront and ultimately bears the cost, who owns it, and who operates or maintains it or if this is undecided and the respondent is expected to

provide a solution to the entire potential relationship. Mark unresolved allocations as pending rather than assuming operator responsibility.

- **Vessels and equipment:** tug and barge or alternative vessel acquisition, financing, onboard batteries and charging equipment, and containers or chassis that must be supplied.
- **Labor and support:** marine crew, assist-tug services, container-handling staff, terminal and dispatch staff, and shoreside or back-office support.
- **Lifecycle costs and risk:** routine maintenance, drydocking, battery replacement, insurance, cargo damage or refrigeration loss, and emergency or substitute transportation.
- **Terminal handling:** the loading lift and unloading lift for each shipment, stevedoring, yard movements, reefer storage, berth fees, and other terminal charges at both ends.
- **Cargo transportation:** marine carriage, first- and last-mile trucking, transloading, empty-container repositioning, and any booking or freight forwarding services.
- **Power:** utility upgrades, interconnection, shoreside charging infrastructure, electricity consumption, demand charges, and any standby or backup-power charges.

A. These allocations of responsibility have yet to be determined. Respondents may propose solutions.

6. Which entity will coordinate the overall service and resolve gaps between these responsibilities? Will customers receive a single bundled price or separate invoices from the participating providers?

A. These responsibilities and approaches to pricing have yet to be determined.

7. Is any exclusive operating right contemplated? Please distinguish exclusivity over the subsidized service, specified terminal access, or the corridor itself, and identify any exceptions.

A. Exclusivity rights have not been determined. Respondents may propose operating models.

8. What duration, renewal provisions, performance conditions, and suspension or termination rights would apply to that exclusivity?

A. Exclusivity rights have not been determined. Respondents may propose operating models.

9. What berth reservations or operating priority would the selected operator receive at each terminal, particularly when other users compete for access?

A. Priority and access rights have not been determined. Respondents may propose operating models.

10. Could the operator serve third-party customers, carry other cargo, or operate other routes with the same assets? What restrictions would apply to publicly funded assets or to maintaining availability for this service?

A. Proposals that include accommodating third-party customers would be considered. An operating model for ongoing public funding has not been developed.

11. What freight currently moves directly between BMT and Hunts Point, if any?

Please distinguish those observed movements from cargo moving between Hunts Point and other origins or destinations that might be redirected through BMT.

A. No freight currently moves directly via barge between BMT and Hunts Point. For indirect service (e.g., via some combination of truck and other barge route, with good ultimately ending at Hunts Point) respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research.

12. Who currently selects, books, dispatches, and pays for trucking for the relevant cargo: individual merchants, shippers, receivers, market operators, brokers, or a central coordinator? Please describe the existing transaction and delivery chain.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research.

13. Please share available demand studies and their source dates, distinguishing observed volumes, non-binding shipper interest, committed volumes, and forecasts. For each direction, provide daily or weekly volumes, seasonality, loaded/empty mix, and expected ramp-up.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research.

14. What are the current and projected origins and final destinations of that cargo, including goods arriving at and departing from BMT? Please provide geographic shares where available, identifying the period, denominator, measurement unit, and observed versus forecast basis.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research and make reasonable assumptions in their proposals.

15. What cargo characteristics should respondents assume, including container size, weight distribution, refrigerated versus dry cargo, palletized or less-than container loads, and transloading requirements?

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research and make reasonable assumptions in their proposals.

16. What current trucking prices and transit-time data support the comparison? Please identify the routes, data period, price unit, included services, waiting or accessorial charges, and typical versus peak door-to-door travel times.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research and make reasonable assumptions in their proposals.

17. Which trucking and alternative marine-service scenarios have been compared? Please share the available results, methodology, and principal assumptions, including the sources used for emissions estimates.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research and make reasonable assumptions in their proposals.

18. Which shippers or receivers have expressed interest or made commitments? Please distinguish discussions, non-binding letters, and binding agreements, including volume, direction, duration, and conditions where available.

A. This information is not available.

19. Anonymized information is acceptable where identities cannot be disclosed. Who is expected to recruit customers and grow usage: NYCEDC, terminal operators, the vessel operator, or a combination? What existing customer relationships, introductions, or sales support would be made available?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

20. Who would contract with customers, set or approve prices, invoice them, and bear collection risk? Is the vessel operator expected to sell transportation directly or provide service to another contracting entity?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

21. Are minimum-volume commitments, minimum-revenue guarantees, availability payments, or operating subsidies contemplated? For each mechanism, please identify its current status, potential payer, duration, and conditions, or the assumptions respondents should propose.

A. NYCEDC encourages respondents to propose financial and operating arrangements.

22. Who would bear the financial risk of slower demand ramp-up, shipper withdrawal, or persistent underutilization? Could service frequency, capacity, or compensation be adjusted, and what triggers would apply?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

23. What funding for vessels, charging, and enabling terminal infrastructure is committed, applied for, or only under consideration? Please distinguish funding for common terminal works from funding available to the service operator.

A. NYCEDC has obtained a New York State grant, with the city providing matching funds. These funds will primarily be for utility construction. NYCEDC continues to explore additional funding opportunities, including potential federal funding.

24. What funding amounts, eligible costs, matching requirements, disbursement timing, and conditions should respondents assume? Are respondents expected to arrange private financing or bridge reimbursable costs?

A. Respondents may propose funding needs, costs, matching requirements, and other variables.

25. Which entity is expected to contract for the marine service? What initial term, renewal options, and payment-adjustment assumptions should respondents use?

A. There is no expectation of a specific entity. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

26. Who would own the assets during and after the contract? Please clarify contemplated end-of-term purchase, transfer, handback, or residual-value arrangements.

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

27. How would early termination or cancellation affect unrecovered investment, outstanding financing, and asset disposition? Please identify any proposed compensation principles or assumptions to be evaluated.

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

28. How would delays in terminal construction, permits, utility energization, or charging readiness affect vessel delivery, service commencement, payment, and performance obligations? Are interim deployment or standby arrangements contemplated?

A. This has not been determined.

29. For each terminal, which entities own or control the site, are contracted to develop the infrastructure, and will operate the facility? Please distinguish executed appointments from roles still to be procured.

A. NYCEDC, under the NYC Department of Small Business, is expected to maintain ownership of the site. Other factors have not been determined.

30. What berth dimensions, water depths, tidal or navigation constraints, loading interfaces, and shared-use limitations should respondents assume?

A. See Addendum #3 to this RFEI for bathymetry information. No other information is provided at this time and participants should conduct their own research using publicly available information.

31. Please provide available layouts, surveys, and relevant design documents. What cargo-handling equipment will be available at each end? Please identify lifting capacity and outreach, expected handling rates, simultaneous loading/unloading capability, operating hours, and equipment redundancy.

A. See Addendum #3 to this RFEI for additional site information. No other design documents are available at this time.

32. What yard, chassis, reefer-plug, storage, truck-staging, and gate capacity will be provided? Please share available tariffs, free-time rules, and other access conditions.

A. This information is not available. Respondents are welcome to propose needs for each of these components.

33. How is cargo expected to move between each terminal and the ultimate shipper or receiver? In particular, who will arrange onward distribution after cargo leaves BMT, and which transfer, staging, or last-mile services are already planned?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined. NYCEDC is open to proposals for a variety of operating models.

34. What construction and commissioning milestones are established at each terminal, including the dates by which berths, cargo handling, yard operations, and charging will be ready for vessel trials and commercial service?

A. This information is not available.

35. Who is responsible for terminal and landside permits, dredging where needed, access agreements, and interfaces with adjacent businesses? Which approvals or third-party agreements remain outstanding?

A. NYCEDC anticipates managing the permitting process or working in conjunction with a selected commercial partner to secure permitting.

36. Which utility or power provider will serve each terminal, and what electrical capacity and voltage are confirmed rather than preliminary? Please distinguish total site capacity from power available for vessel charging after other terminal loads.

A. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research and specify site needs as part of this RFEI process.

37. What interconnection studies, applications, agreements, and construction milestones are complete or outstanding? What energization assumptions should respondents use for each site?

A. This information is not available.

38. What charging-power, connection, and interoperability requirements are fixed? Can respondents propose the charging interface, onboard arrangement, or stationary energy storage?

A. No charging, connection, or interoperability requirements are fixed. Respondents should include their requirements as part of their proposal.

39. Where is the physical and contractual boundary between utility works, terminal electrical infrastructure, shoreside charging equipment, and vessel equipment? Who will deliver, own, operate, and maintain each part?

A. Respondents are welcome to propose the physical and contractual relationship that makes this barge operation feasible.

40. Which electricity tariffs, time-of-use rates, demand charges, connection charges, and expected escalation assumptions should respondents use? Who will hold the utility account, and how would electricity costs be passed through to the operator?

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research.

41. What firm-capacity, availability, and outage-response commitments are contemplated? How should respondents address curtailment, simultaneous charging and reefer loads, or extended utility outages?

A. Respondents may propose commitments and constraints.

42. The published service description refers to capacity for at least 100 refrigerated 40-foot containers per sailing. Is this a fixed vessel-capacity requirement, a target service capability, or an expected loaded volume? Does it apply equally in each direction, including during ramp-up?

A. This is a target service capability. See response to Question 2. NYCEDC understands that volumes may be lower during a ramp-up period when this operation is first established.

43. The published terminal description refers to 150 40-foot containers moving in each direction simultaneously. What does that figure measure: yard capacity, cargo exchange per vessel call, or another operating assumption? Please specify its time basis and implications for service sizing.

A. See response to Question 2.

44. Which operating days, service hours, sailing frequencies, cargo cutoff times, and delivery windows are fixed? What demand or logistics requirements establish those service levels?

A. None of these variables are fixed.

45. What cargo weights, reefer electrical loads, transit times, berth turnaround times, and charging windows should respondents use for the reference operating case?

A. Respondents are encouraged to propose their own assumptions in their responses.

46. What reliability targets, weather or tidal allowances, maintenance downtime, and recovery requirements should be assumed? Is a dedicated spare vessel or other backup capacity required, and what performance remedies are contemplated?

A. A high level of reliability is desired but perfect reliability is not. Respondents should propose what they view is reasonable.

47. May respondents propose a phased start, smaller vessels with more frequent sailings, or capacity that grows with demonstrated demand? Which capacity and performance requirements would still need to be met at launch?

A. Yes, this is acceptable. Capacity and performance requirements at launch have not been determined.

48. How does NYCEDC define the stated all-electric and/or zero-emission requirement? Which non-battery-electric technologies, if any, would be eligible, and does assessment cover vessel operations only or lifecycle emissions?

A. NYCEDC is open to a variety of technologies and vessel types. Assessment covers vessel operations only.

49. Which activities fall within that standard: the principal vessel, routine assist tugs, emergency or substitute vessels, onboard and shoreside reefer power, terminal handling, and first- or last-mile trucking?

A. The principal vessel, onboard and shoreside reefer power, and terminal handling fall within this standard.

50. What exceptions, approvals, or reporting requirements would apply during emergencies, maintenance, charging failures, or utility outages? Would any non-zero-emission backup operation be permissible, and under what limits?

A. Respondents are encouraged to propose their own approach to emergencies and other out of the ordinary operations. Respondents should weigh financial and operational feasibility against perfect adherence to the zero-emission goal.

51. What emissions methodology and reporting boundary should respondents use? Please specify the truck counterfactual, grid-electricity treatment, empty repositioning, backup operations, and first/last-mile movements, along with the required metrics and verification approach. Which existing labor agreements or jurisdictional arrangements would apply separately to marine crew, assist-tug services, terminal handling, and landside operations? Please distinguish binding arrangements from preferences or matters still under discussion.

A. NYCEDC has used the metrics of one-way truck trips avoided per vessel operation per time period (e.g., “one barge replaces 150 one-way truck trips per day, or 54,750 trips per year”) and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reductions compared to a trucking-based counterfactual. Respondents are welcome to use and propose additional metrics and methodologies.

52. What wage, benefit, staffing, training, local-hiring, or job-quality standards are mandatory? Which are evaluation preferences or respondent-proposed commitments?

A. Respondents are encouraged to propose staffing models. NYCEDC will seek to connect this project with its maritime career development programs, which emphasize community hiring, where feasible.

53. What Minority- and Women-owned Business Enterprise (M/WBE) participation requirements or targets apply? Please clarify whether they would be measured at the overall consortium level or separately for vessel, operating, and terminal contracts.

A. NYCEDC expects to set MWBE targets for this project as it does other projects in its portfolio.

54. Which vessel-eligibility, domestic-build, domestic-content, and Build America, Buy America conditions should respondents address? Please distinguish generally applicable requirements from conditions tied to particular funding sources, and identify the relevant guidance.

A. NYCEDC will adhere to applicable state and federal laws. NYCEDC anticipates that federal regulations will be most applicable should this project receive federal funding.

55. What regulatory or class-approval evidence is expected at the RFEI stage for the proposed vessel and battery/charging systems? Which approvals must respondents obtain, and which enabling approvals would NYCEDC or terminal partners lead?

A. No regulatory approvals are needed to respond to this RFEI.

56. What are the anticipated next procurement steps and decision milestones, including any subsequent RFP? Please distinguish target dates from approved schedules and identify the entities responsible for procurement and award decisions.

A. Next steps have not been decided. Responding to this RFEI is not a prerequisite for responding to a future RFP. However, respondents’ submissions will help NYCEDC design the scope of any future RFP. NYCEDC has publicly committed to construction of the Hunts Point Marine Terminal by 2030. More information here: https://edc.nyc/sites/default/files/2025-10/NYCEDC-Blue-Highways-Action-Plan_10-31-2025.pdf

57. Are vessel supply, marine operations, terminal operations, and charging expected to be procured together or separately? What role would an RFEI response play in later eligibility, shortlisting, or procurement design?

A. The procurement approach has yet to be decided. Respondents to this RFEI may propose ideas.

58. May a consortium demonstrate the required experience collectively, including a technology or vessel-development firm teamed with an established maritime operator? Which qualifications must be held by the prime respondent itself?

A. Yes. No specific qualifications must be held by the prime respondent in a consortium or collective submission.

59. Are any additional evaluation priorities, scoring weights, affordability thresholds, or subsidy limits available beyond the published criteria? How will cost, reliability, emissions, labor outcomes, and delivery readiness be compared?

A. Responses will be evaluated holistically.

60. What level of commercial, technical, and financial detail is expected now, and which assumptions may remain indicative?

A. Respondents are encouraged to submit as comprehensive a response as is possible given respondents' capacity and expertise.

61. For unresolved City or terminal inputs, should respondents use a common reference case or propose and justify their own assumptions?

A. Respondents are encouraged to submit as comprehensive a response as is possible given respondents' capacity and expertise.

62. Three container capacity figures appear across the RFEI and the June 2026 information session materials: a minimum of 100 40-foot containers per sailing, an HPMT terminal design of 150 40-foot containers each way simultaneously, and a described vessel of 100 to 200 containers. Which figure is the binding requirement for vessel sizing, and are the other two planning parameters?

A. See response to Question 2.

63. The information session materials describe RORO ramp capability at HPMT as dependent on demand. Is RORO capability part of the base-case requirement for this service, or an optional future capability that respondents need not design for?

A. RORO capability is anticipated as part of HPMT. Respondents may propose specific RORO ramp and operational parameters.

64. Battery capacity, Does NYCEDC expect to power vessel propulsion and all 100, 40-foot refrigerated containers via battery only (this will be a very large load)?'

A. Respondents are encouraged to make proposals for vessel propulsion.

65. Is NYCEDC expecting vessels to operate with full propulsion redundancy following a single battery-system failure?

A. Respondents are encouraged to propose their own approach.

66. Are vessel battery spaces expected to be segregated into multiple fire zones? Does NYCEDC anticipate requiring onboard firefighting systems beyond currently applicable USCG requirements?

A. NYCEDC anticipates working with any future partners and the US Coast Guard to determine an approach to these questions.

67. Would battery-systems be allowed onboard the barge?

A. Yes.

68. Does NYEDC anticipate having fixed or semi-portable fire suppression stations (ie. fire hoses, reels, foam, dry chemical) at each landside terminal?

A. This information is not available. Respondents are encouraged to propose their own solutions.

69. Is NYCEDC actively interested in battery swapping or merely requesting evaluation of feasibility?

A. NYCEDC is interested in battery swapping as it relates to the addressing the challenges of electrification.

70. What maximum vessel turnaround time is NYCEDC targeting?

A. NYCEDC anticipates a daily round-trip barge operation. Respondents may also propose alternatives.

71. Would NYCEDC consider shore-side battery storage facilities at both terminals?

A. Yes.

72. Should battery swapping be evaluated as the primary charging strategy or as a contingency option?

A. Respondents are encouraged to choose a charging strategy that they deem best, guided by the terms of this RFEI.

73. What berth dimensions should respondents assume at both terminals?

A. Refer to Addendum #3 to this RFEI, which provides additional information on the geography of the site. No other information is available at this time.

74. What maximum air draft constraints should be considered?

A. NYCEDC does not specify a maximum air draft. However, vessels should have sufficient vertical clearance to safely pass beneath the East River bridges throughout the full tidal cycle.

75. Are there maximum vessel length restrictions at either terminal?

A. Vessel should be able to berth alongside the Hunts Point Marine Terminal bulkhead. For dimensions of the existing bulkhead, see Addendum #3 to this RFEI.

76. Does NYCEDC prefer a single large barge or multiple smaller barges?

A. NYCEDC has envisioned a single large barge. Respondents may propose alternatives that meet the minimum container volume as described in the response to Question 2.

77. What minimum controlling depth should respondents assume at BMT and HPMT?

A. Respondents are encouraged to seek publicly-available information on channel and berthing depths. See Addendum #3 to this RFEI for available bathymetry information for the Hunts Point peninsula.

78. Should respondents assume all-weather operation regardless of tide? Are there anticipated navigation restrictions in the East River or connecting waterways?

A. Respondents should assume all-weather operation. For navigation restrictions, respondents should conduct their own research.

79. What under-keel clearance criteria should respondents use?

A. NYCEDC is not laying out specific criteria. Respondents are encouraged to conduct their own research of publicly-available information.

**80. Are terminal sites expected to accommodate RORO ramps?
Is RORO capability viewed as desirable or required?**

A. RORO capability is anticipated to be built at Hunts Point.

81. Should respondents evaluate dual-purpose LOLO/RORO operations? Does NYCEDC anticipate wheeled cargo in addition to containerized freight?

A. Respondents may propose dual-purpose operations. NYCEDC anticipates some demand for RORO cargo.

**82. What percentage of anticipated cargo is expected to require refrigeration?
Are respondents expected to provide onboard generator backup for refrigerated containers?
Should reefer operations be assumed year-round? Will any cargo require heat in the winter months?**

A. NYCEDC is currently assuming that every reefer unit will require refrigeration. NYCEDC encourages respondents to submit proposals that ensure high reliability of the refrigeration system.

83. Does NYEDC anticipate restrictions for empty container stacking height at each landside terminal? Please provide anticipated loaded-versus-empty container volumes in each direction, and available/planned terminal storage capacity for empty and full containers at BMT and HPMT (with stacking and without stacking).

A. NYCEDC anticipates learning more about load restrictions during the engineering design phase of designing HPMT, which has yet to commence.

84. The RFEI document states “In planning HPMT, NYCEDC designed the terminal to accommodate 150 40-foot containers moving in each direction simultaneously.” Can you clarify if this means a total of 300, 40 foot, nonstacked containers.

A. This study assumed a port capacity of 300 containers in the port. Additional information on how the containers would be stacked is not available. Respondents may propose a port layout.

85. Will the barge service have dedicated berth access at BMT and HPMT or share berths with other marine users?

A. Shared berthing space is assumed. However, should the respondents' proposed operation be unable to share space, respondents should describe their reasoning behind this constraint.

86. Please provide NYCEDC's projected cargo demand by year and direction, including average and peak daily/weekly volumes?

A. This information is not available.

87. Should respondents assume megawatt charging capability will be available? What vessel turnaround time should charging systems be designed to support? Should respondents assume simultaneous charging of multiple vessels or assets?

A. Respondents should state charging needs in their responses. NYCEDC will work with utility companies and any future selected partners to provide adequate charging capability at the port.

88. Does NYCEDC have a preferred tug configuration or operating profile? Should respondents consider commercially available vessels only, or developmental designs as well?

A. No.

89. Are alternative zero-emission propulsion technologies acceptable? Is a diesel tug with battery assist acceptable or vice versa? Should respondents assume one tug or multiple tugs in service?

A. Other zero-emission propulsion technologies are acceptable. NYCEDC is open to electric tugs with diesel assist, though encourages respondents to explain this decision in its proposal.

90. Is there a target operating speed for barge movements?

A. No.

91. What environmental conditions should bollard pull calculations assume?

A. This information is not available. Respondents should make reasonable assumptions.

92. Should emergency towing scenarios be included?

A. This information is not required. However, respondents may include this information as part of a comprehensive response.

93. Are intermediate charging locations being considered? What charging window duration should respondents assume? Is opportunity charging preferred over overnight charging? Should charging infrastructure be sized for future fleet expansion?

A. Charging parameters have not been determined. Respondents should state preferences in their proposals.

94. Is backup propulsion capability required by NYCEDC? Does NYCEDC have a preference regarding battery-only versus hybrid solutions? Should backup systems be capable of

completing a full operating shift? Is backup power intended for propulsion only or hotel loads as well?

A. NYCEDC prefers battery-only solutions but will accept solutions that include hybrid technologies. Should respondents submit hybrid solutions, respondents should provide clear reasoning.

95. What evaluation criteria will be used to compare alternative ZE technologies? Are hydrogen fuel-cell systems acceptable for evaluation? Should respondents evaluate multiple ZE technologies? Does NYCEDC prefer commercially proven technology over innovative concepts?

A. ZE technologies will be evaluated holistically including financial and operational challenges and tradeoffs. Respondents are not required to but may submit proposals for multiple ZE technologies. Additional evaluation criteria is not available.

96. Does NYCEDC have a preferred public-private partnership structure? Would NYCEDC consider a design-build-operate-maintain arrangement? What level of capital investment is expected from private partners? Will infrastructure and vessel ownership be separated? Are there existing contractual models NYCEDC would like respondents to consider?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

97. Has NYCEDC established a preferred operating term? Should respondents assume contract extensions are available? How should respondents account for battery replacement cycles? Are minimum revenue guarantees being considered? Does NYCEDC expect respondents to propose financing structures tied to contract duration?

A. NYCEDC does not have a preferred operating term. Additional information on battery replacement cycles, minimum revenue guarantees, and financing structures is not available. Respondents may propose an approach to each of these aspects of the barge operation in their responses.

98. How does NYCEDC envision allocation of utility power availability risk? Who would bear vessel technology performance risk? Who would bear cargo volume risk? What risk-sharing principles does NYCEDC generally prefer for long-term operations contracts?

A. This information is not available.

99. Please clarify the anticipated division of responsibilities among NYCEDC, terminal operator, marine operator, stevedores and landside logistics providers. Should the employee count include only personnel directly employed by the marine-service provider, or also stevedores, terminal personnel, maintenance personnel, charging/infrastructure staff and subcontracted employees supporting the overall operation?

A. NYCEDC has not made responsibility determinations. Employee count should include those involved in vessel and portside operations.

100. What planning horizon should respondents use for financial analysis? Does NYCEDC have cargo volume forecasts available for respondents? What inflation and escalation assumptions should be used? Are operating subsidy assumptions acceptable for evaluation purposes?

A. NYCEDC does not have a preferred planning horizon. Other information is not available. Respondents should make reasonable assumptions.

101. Is domestic U.S. construction required or merely preferred?

Will construction location be an evaluation factor?

Is there a maximum distance from NYC a shipyard can be located?

Does NYCEDC have local workforce participation objectives?

A. Domestic construction is not required except where state or federal funding may require it.

102. Does NYCEDC have a target service commencement date?

Should respondents include permitting durations in project schedules?

Are terminal improvements expected to occur concurrently with vessel construction?

Are phased vessel deliveries acceptable?

A. NYCEDC is targeting Q2 2030, in line with the completion of construction of the port facility. Respondents are encouraged to provide as much detail as is feasible in project schedules.

103. What minimum domestic content percentage should respondents assume?

Are specialty imported steel products permissible where domestic sources are unavailable?

A. This information is not currently available.

104. Should respondents assume future federal funding will require BABA compliance?

What level of BABA compliance should be assumed for planning purposes?

Are BABA waivers anticipated for specialized marine technologies?

A. BABA compliance as a result of possible federal funding is a reasonable assumption. No additional information is available.

105. Does NYCEDC have preferred escalation assumptions for cost-risk evaluations?

How should respondents address utility equipment procurement risks?

Is supplier diversification viewed favorably?

Will respondents be required to develop formal procurement risk mitigation plans?

A. Respondents should make reasonable assumptions. Procurement risk mitigation plans are not required as part of this RFEI.

106. Does NYCEDC anticipate ABS classification of vessels?

What USCG regulatory regime should respondents assume?

Are specific performance demonstration requirements anticipated?

Is a reliability demonstration period required prior to revenue service?

A. This information is not available at this time.

107. Will Union employees be a requirement for vessel crew?

**Will Union employees be a requirement for landside terminal workers?
Are there NYCEDC requirements or objectives for prevailing/living wage, local hiring, benefits, training or other job-quality measures that should be incorporated into respondents' staffing models?**

A. RFP responses should focus narrowly on considerations of the barge itself.

**108. Does NYDEC anticipate having full-time employees at each terminal?
Besides loading/unloading cargo from the vessel(s), what other work does NYDEC anticipate could occur at each terminal?**

A. Respondents may include staffing models as part of their response. NYCEDC envisions the Hunts Point Marine Terminal as a multipurpose port that may accommodate other vessels, including RORO operations, in addition to this electric barge operation.

109. Section I requires continuous refrigeration of all containers during transit. What connected-load assumption should respondents use per 40-foot reefer - average kW and peak kW - and at what ambient design temperature? What is the anticipated mix of frozen versus chilled cargo, and will any portion be non-refrigerated dry containers? Will containers be pre-cooled and energized prior to loading, and will shore power be available to reefers while staged in the yard and while the vessel is alongside? Is the requirement to provide powered reefer plugs for at least 100 containers per sailing, or to power every container carried up to the vessel's full capacity?

A. Respondents should make reasonable assumptions and include preferred approaches in their proposals. NYCEDC anticipates making shore power available in the yard.

110. Is the 150 40-foot containers each-way HPMT design figure a firm vessel capacity requirement, or a terminal planning parameter, with 100 per sailing being the binding minimum?

A. See response to Question 2. 100 per sailing is the binding minimum, based on terminal planning.

111. What sailing frequency and daily throughput does NYCEDC assume at service opening, and what growth profile through 2045?

A. NYCEDC has assumed a daily sailing frequency. No other information is available.

112. What operating hours are contemplated at each terminal, including whether night and weekend sailings are anticipated?

A. Respondents may develop preferred operating hours as part of their RFEI.

113. What directional imbalance is expected between BMT and HPMT, and what volume of empty container repositioning on the return leg?

A. This information is not available.

114. For each of BMT and HPMT, what are the planned berth length, water depth alongside at MLLW, and design dredge depth? What maneuvering area or turning basin is planned at HPMT, and are there maximum length-overall and beam limits at either berth?

What fendering, mooring, and bollard arrangements are planned at HPMT, and what mooring loads should be assumed? Is automated mooring - vacuum or magnetic berth-side systems - contemplated in the terminal design as a means of reducing port-call time? If so, which party is expected to fund and own the berth-side equipment? Has NYCEDC identified, with USCG Sector New York or otherwise, any transit-window, speed, or security-zone restrictions on the East River route, and has any route, current, or metocean study been performed that will be made available to respondents?

A. See Addendum #3 for bathymetry information. Mooring information and financial information for mooring is not available.

115. What electrical service capacity is planned at HPMT and at BMT, in MW at the point of common coupling, and how is that capacity allocated among vessel charging, yard reefer load, cranes, and yard tractors?

Has Con Edison been engaged on service sizing and interconnection timing for either terminal, and what is the current status and expected energization date?

A. Electrical service capacity needs will be determined via responses to this RFEI and additional planning studies, with close engagement of the utility provider to ensure adequate electrical service by time of port opening in 2030.

116. Is stationary battery energy storage planned at either terminal as part of the electrification design - for peak shaving, demand-charge management, or resiliency?

If so, what capacity, and would it be available to buffer vessel charging demand?

Under what tariff and demand-charge structure would charging energy be billed, and would the operator contract directly with the utility or purchase through NYCEDC or the terminal operator?

A. This has yet to be determined. Respondents are encouraged to include this information as part of their proposals.

117. Which party is expected to fund and own vessel-charging equipment and any required substation or feeder upgrades?

A. The precise nature of the commercial arrangements have yet to be determined.

118. What laydown footprint, deck loading capacity, and crane coverage would be available at each terminal for shoreside energy equipment, and where would it sit relative to crane staging lanes and reefer rows? What yard handling equipment is planned at each terminal in addition to the mobile harbor cranes – reach stackers, top handlers, terminal tractors – and what is the maximum lift capacity and reach of each?

A. This has yet to be determined. Respondents are encouraged to include this information as part of their proposals.

119. What is the maximum single-lift capacity of the planned mobile harbor cranes, and can they handle an ISO-footprint unit at the upper end of gross container weight?

A. This has yet to be determined. Respondents are encouraged to include this information as part of their proposals.

120. Has NYCEDC established with FDNY the permitting basis for containerized lithium-ion energy storage sited on either terminal, and are there siting, separation, or aggregate quantity limits respondents should design to?

A. Engagement with FDNY will commence as part of the design process following this RFEI.

121. What loading and discharge time does NYCEDC assume for a 100-container exchange at each terminal, and how many cranes are planned per berth? What crane cycle rate underlies that assumption? Will the cranes be provided and operated by NYCEDC or a terminal operator, or is the barge operator expected to furnish them?

Which party is responsible for training terminal personnel on the vessel interface - power connection, cargo securing, and berth procedures - and is a training program contemplated in the terminal operating plan?

Is BMT's berth availability and lift-on/lift-off capability confirmed on the same Q2 2030

timeline as HPMT, given BMT's ongoing environmental review and Vision Plan process?

What are the HPMT construction milestones, and when would the berth and shore power first be available for vessel commissioning and trials ahead of service start?

What operator office, dispatch, and maintenance space would be available at each terminal, and on what square footage basis?

A. In initial planning, NYCEDC has assumed 1 day to unload 150 containers and load 150 containers. BMT is assumed to have berth availability on the same timeline as HPMT. Respondents may propose their own operational cadence.

122. What cargo documentation flow is contemplated for the service, and is it expected to be fully digital? Which terminal operating system, gate system, or EDI standard would the barge operator be required to interface with? What FDA, USDA, and NYC Department of Health documentation requirements attach to food cargo moving through this corridor, and which party holds responsibility for chain-of-custody and cold-chain temperature records during the marine leg?

A. This has yet to be determined.

123. Does NYCEDC anticipate federal funding participation in the vessel, the terminals, or the service that would trigger Build America/Buy America, Cargo Preference, or Davis-Bacon requirements? Are prevailing wage, project labor agreement, or M/WBE participation requirements expected to apply to vessel construction, shoreside operations, or both?

A. See response to Questions 53 and 104.

124. Who is anticipated to be the contracting counterparty for the service - NYCEDC, a terminal operator, or another City entity? Does NYCEDC contemplate an availability-payment or subsidy structure, a minimum volume or revenue guarantee, or a fully commercial tariff-based service? What contract term is NYCEDC prepared to consider to support vessel and battery capital, and does NYCEDC anticipate providing or supporting any portion of that capital?

Has NYCEDC identified committed cargo interests at the Hunts Point Food

Distribution Center, and would any volume commitment form part of a future RFP?

A. This has yet to be determined.

125. Section VI sets a 25 to 30 page limit. Are appendices, drawings, renderings, and financial models counted against it?

A. Yes – renderings, site plans, drawings, and financial models are part of the 30 page limit.

126. May a respondent submit more than one service commercial concept, and may parties respond jointly as a team with a single submission? Please confirm whether a separate RFEI and/or RFP will be issued for the procurement of the two Mobile Harbor Cranes referenced in the current RFEI and depicted in the proposed Hunts Point Marine Terminal layout.

A. Respondents may submit more than one service commercial concept. Parties may respond jointly as a team with a single submission. Information on future RFEIs and RFPs is not available.

127. Please confirm in response to this RFEI, whether respondents are expected to provide information and proposals related to Mobile Harbor Cranes, as well as any other anticipated yard equipment requirements for container handling. Please confirm whether technical specifications and/or performance requirements are available for the proposed Mobile Harbor Cranes referenced in the current RFEI. Please confirm whether any preliminary terminal design layouts, berth drawings, or plans are available for review in connection with the proposed terminal.

A. Respondents are not expected to provide information and proposals related to mobile harbor cranes except what basic unloading operation is envisioned to meet the throughput minimums as described in the response to Question 2.

128. Given the approximately 8-acre footprint of the proposed Hunts Point Marine Terminal, are there target container dwell times, stack densities, or land-use efficiency metrics that should be considered when evaluating yard crane solutions and container storage concepts? Has NYCEDC evaluated the relative benefits of a mobile berth-side crane solution combined with rubber-tyred (RTG) container yard operations, compared with more fixed cargo handling arrangements, particularly with respect to flexibility, scalability, and future Blue Highways expansion?

A. NYCEDC does not have these targets and has not made specific evaluations regarding crane and stacking technologies. Respondents should propose solutions that enable continuous throughput of a minimum of 100 daily inbound containers into the terminal and 100 daily outbound containers.

129. What vessel turnaround times and daily container throughput targets have been assumed for the proposed 100-200 container operation, and are respondents encouraged to consider independent optimization of quayside and yard operations through separate crane systems?

A. See Questions 2 and 128.

130. As future expansion to additional New York Harbor and regional terminals is

contemplated, how important is equipment mobility and the ability to redeploy cargo handling assets between locations as volumes and service patterns evolve?

Does NYCEDC have specific requirements regarding operational redundancy, such as maintaining vessel and yard operations during equipment maintenance or outages, and should respondents evaluate cargo handling concepts that separate ship-to-shore and yard handling functions to maximize system availability?

A. NYCEDC has not made a determination about the ability to redeploy cargo handling assets between locations. NYCEDC does not have specific cargo handling requirements at this time.

131. Please confirm whether a separate RFEI and/or RFP will be issued for the procurement of the two Mobile Harbor Cranes referenced in the current RFEI and depicted in the proposed Hunts Point Marine Terminal layout.

A. See question 126.

132. Good morning I would like to receive information regarding load data and other energy issues regarding the two Port facilities - current and planned - along with any feasibility studies on this subject that may have been carried out. The information is needed to determine a "whole of system" approach to the project - Port infrastructure, marine craft, warehousing, mobile equipment, communications and other systems. The data is also necessary to ascertain the ideal energy system - all electric, hydrogen, dual fuel, other for both onshore and marine propulsion.

A. This information is not available. Respondents may propose solutions.

133. Would EDC consider providing interested parties an opportunity to see Hunts Point Marine Terminal site? This would be useful in preparing a response to the RFEI. It would be helpful is see the site.

A. NYCEDC provided a tour on September 17, 2026.

134. I would like to respectfully request that a site plan of the current Hunts Point Marine Terminal be shared with respondents as an addendum. It would be useful for respondents to have that sooner than the Sept 18th date. And are there any current conditions report for the berth? Thank you!

A. See Addendum #3 to this RFEI.

135. Does EDC plan on modeling this system like the NYC ferry system where they would own these assets or would this be a variety of private companies providing service.

A. NYCEDC is soliciting interest in a broad variety of operating models via this RFEI.

136. If EDC buys the electric tug, will EDC also develop the shoreside charging system?

A. NYCEDC is committed to port electrification to decarbonize logistics operation but the financial model and specific transportation technology and system are yet to be determined.

137. Following up on the previous question regarding the RFI T&C. Please consider that a tremendous amount of effort goes into this RFI, and if it will be an OPEN RFQ then there is no incentive for the participants of the RFI to provide a proposal.

A. Respondents to the RFEI may help direct the course of a future RFP, e.g. type of zero-emissions technologies considered and operating models. Respondents may opt to identify any information as business confidential. Within the confines of Freedom of Information Law NYCEDC will disclose only what is required.

138. Would the EDC consider a self propelled vessel, or is it important to have the feasibility to connect/disconnect the barges and use the electric boat for other operations?

A. NYCEDC is open to a variety of methods for vessel and barge movement.

139. What information will be provided to respondents to answer question 21 regarding any needed site utility upgrades?

A. Refer to the RFEI document for all information being made available at this time.

140. Will the RFQ call out a "winning" concept emerging from the RFEI, or specific technical requirements for the vessels?

A. Respondents to the RFEI may help direct the course of a future RFP, e.g. type of zero-emissions technologies considered and operating models.

141. Must the tug be 100% electric/zero emission or can it be hybrid so the tug can be used for other operations?

A. See response to Question 89.

142. What is the EDC expected percentage of funding for the design and construction of the tugs and barges?

A. This RFEI seeks to better understand the financials of such a barge operation.

143. Preference between LOLO and RORO?

A. This RFEI seeks information on a LOLO operation. Additional information on the feasibility of a RORO option may be provided.

144. What is envisioned for the RORO option, using mobile container forklifts or containers on flat beds?

A. NYCEDC does not have a perspective on operations.

145. At both ends of the operations is the primary means of LOLO via mobile container cranes or is the EDC looking at other options of loading/unloading cranes?

A. NYCEDC is open to a variety of operational options.

146. Are you aware of any stack height limitations for the barge?

A. Respondents should perform their own due diligence regarding maritime safety regulations.

147. To evaluate RORO question 9, an understanding of how terminal would function as critical node in broader network would require compatibility with the of basis of design for Marine Highways and HPMT (inc small vessels with cargo bikes out of HPMT). Will that be made available to respondents?

A. Refer to the RFEI document for all information being made available at this time.

148. Could the container service be temporarily suspended for environmental factors like extreme temperatures or currents or is 24/7 service critical?

A. This RFEI seeks to learn about potential operating models and challenges to standing up a BMT to HPMT barge service.

149. Will RFEI responses be subject to FOIL and released to the public?

A. NYCEDC will follow applicable local, state, and federal laws regarding disclosure. For further information reference response to Question 137.

150. Are you imagining one NB and one SB transit per day (i.e. one round trip)?

A. Respondents are encouraged to respond holistically. Including what would be the implications of different service frequencies.

151. NYEDC RFEI mentioned considering the use of charging containers or containerized battery energy storage systems. Has discussion with FDNY or others (i.e. AHJ's) regarding fire safety, emergency response, permitting, and operational requirements for these installations?

A. Currently NYCEDC has not engaged regulatory entities on specific questions of technology and application. Should technology advance via future procurements these discussions would happen during a later planning phase.

152. Is there flexibility with transit times based on Hell Gate currents?

A. Yes. This RFEI seeks to learn about potential operation models via information provided by respondents.

153. Will diesel tug and barge or diesel vessels be excluded from use at the new facility?

A. No vessels are presumed to be precluded from using the terminal at this time.

154. Do you have an anticipated % of frozen vs. chilled containers?

A. No.

155. Vessel speed limits along the route?

A. RFEI respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding laws and regulations governing this barge service.

156. For electrical sizing of the battery it is dependent on the vessel design and operation, how does NYCEDC want battery information shared without this information available?

A. Respondents should make their best effort to answer the questions. However, respondents are not required to answer every question.

157. It looks like it is highly desirable to carry both ro-ro and lo-lo containers, do you have a % of each?

A. No.