

*Addendum No 4*

Enquiries: Lisa Tierney 9326 2969

Request for Tender No. PTA250025

for

**Design and Construction of Transperth New Electric Passenger Vessels**

22 April 2025

Please ensure that you confirm receipt of this addendum by completing the Schedule of Addenda in Book 2(a) of your tender response.

Tenderers are to make note of the alterations, amendments, questions, answers or inclusions below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to Request for Tender documentation:**  Book 2b updated:  PTA250023 Supply of Goods (Book2b) RFT Schedule of Prices has been removed and replaced with PTA250023 Supply of Goods (Book2b) RFT Schedule of Prices **Version 2** |
| **Requests for Information:**  **RFI 14:**  Within the presentation, there was a page which had render image of the vessel and a table on the bottom RHS which indicated Hull and Superstructure as Aluminium construction. Is this a requirement for the new vessels to be of Aluminium construction?  **Response:**  The vessel design should be as per the Technical Specification. Any departure from this needs to be recorded in the departure log.  **RFI 15:**  We would like to clarify whether partnering with a local company in Western Australia is a requirement to participate in the tender.  **Response:**  No.  **RFI 16:**  Vessel wake in Melville is approx. double the size of the design significant wave height and risks washing over the deck at 600mm freeboard. Has the PTA considered the effect of wake from other vessels?  **Response:**  Yes.  **RFI 17:**  Tunnel wetness and slamming analysis at Hs = 0.45m would not include wake from other vessels and would likely show no problems. Would a NTFV that upon launch experiences tunnel wetness, slamming and possibly water over decks from other vessel wakes be accepted by PTA?  **Response:**  Tunnel slamming has been considered.  **RFI 18:**  We foresee that the NTFV will need to slow down during periods of high vessel traffic on Melville water, due to the insufficient deck freeboard. Will the NTFV be accepted if it falls behind the desired schedule, during times of heavy vessel traffic on Melville Water?  **Response:**  The vessels will be required to comply with all navigational safety requirements while operating in the Swan River.  **RFI 19:**  As the maximum design draft (before ballasting) is greater than the charted water depth near the Causeway, is it accepted by PTA that the NTFV may not be able to transit the Causeway at low tide and/or negative storm surge tidal residual?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 20:**  Has any recent hydrographic survey of the approaches to the Causeway been completed to confirm water depth?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 21:**  The specified NTFV can safely transit the Causeway from mid-tide with no ballast up to high tide with full ballast, not considering storm surge or wake from other vessels. Is this acceptable to PTA?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 22:**  Has storm surge residual been considered in the setting of the tender specification?  **Response:**  Yes.  **RFI 23:**  A system is required to give the vessel master advance notice of when it is safe for the NTFV to transit the Causeway and how much ballast water should be carried. Is this system the responsibility of the PTA or the shipyard?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 24:**  Can the PTA confirm that river water flushing is desired, not Fresh Water?  **Response:**  As per item A.217 of the Technical Specification, the toilet compartment shall be fitted with a seawater flush system.  **RFI 25:**  Will a proposal using two vessel designs, each more suited to the different upstream and downstream services, be considered?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 26:**  Would the PTA consider building a series of vessels truly suitable for Melville Water first, then build a dedicated series of vessels for upstream services later?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 27:**  Incat Crowther were commissioned to have significant influence on the vessel arrangement and tender specification, will they be permitted to submit their design services for the tender? If so, is that not a conflict of interest?  **Response:**  Incat Crowther were involved in the general arrangement however, not the development of Book 4, Technical Specification.  **RFI 28:**  There are several quality naval architecture firms in WA with local knowledge of the Swan River, who could have advised the PTA for the NTFV. What is the reason that this advisory/preliminary design requirement wasn’t tendered, or opportunity offered to WA designers?  **Response:**  The PTA won't comment on other procurement processes.  **RFI 29:**  Will a different design be required for Stage 2?  **Response:**  Not applicable for the route currently being considered.  **RFI 30:**  Design deadweight – saltwater flush system?  **Response:**  As per item A.217 of the Technical Specification, the toilet compartment shall be fitted with a seawater flush system.  **RFI 31:**  Why 25 knots?  **Response:**  Based on operational requirements for the timetabled service.  **RFI 32:**  Will you be seeking an exemption from 10 knots?  **Response:**  Yes.  **RFI 33:**  Where will charging stations be located?  **Response:**  The proposed Matilda Bay location (once determined).  **RFI 34:**  5-minute timeslots are proposed in the timetable. There is no allowance for charging.  **Response:**  Opportunity charging will be carried out at Matilda Bay before the vessel is swapped out.  **RFI 35:**  What are the delivery dates of the vessels?  **Response:**  As per the Schedule of Delivery included in Book 2b of the RFT documents.  **RFI 36:**  Design seems to be owned by Incat Crowther, who will bear the performance aspects of it, if it doesn’t have the battery capacity and range as per the design?  **Response:**  As this is a D&C contract, performance aspects will be the responsibility of the contractor.  **RFI 37:**  Does Transperth own the design?  **Response:**  The reference design is the PTA’s intellectual property.  **RFI 38:**  We respectfully request that an extension to the submission deadline be granted, in the order of 4-6 weeks?  **Response:**  An extension won’t be considered at this time. | | |
| **Attachments**  Nil | | |

*~~ End of Addendum No 4 ~~*