Question 57.
Are the Utility Plates and Utility Agency Drawings available that were used to create the Base Maps? We desire to verify accuracy of the base mapping, as the responsibility of the Utilities is with the D/B Contractors.

Answer: The existing Utility Plate information has been provided to each DB team on a CD as reference documents.

Question 58.
Please verify if there is a Utility Facility Inventory Report initiated for this project in accordance with NYSDOT procedures. If available, can it be provided or located?

Answer: No - a Utility Facility Inventory Report was not initiated for this project.

Question 59.
Please clarify that the findings of the Quality Level A and Quality Level B Utility Surveys are or are not included in the 40% Plans per paragraph 6 of Section 4.1 SCOPE - PART 4 UTILITY REQUIREMENTS. If QLA and QLB survey data are not included in the 40% Plans, please identify where they may be located as not available in PART 7 – ENGINEERING DATA?

Answer: The Quality Level A and Level B Utility Surveys are not included in the 40% plans. The results of the Subsurface Utility Engineering, dated March 2013, are located on the Project website as a Reference Document.

Question 60.
Paragraph 11.3.1.6.B of Part 3 (Project Requirements) states that reinforced concrete decks shall utilize solid stainless steel bar reinforcement. Please clarify, are dowels, hooks or other reinforcing bars that extend into the deck from the superstructure below (e.g., from the precast concrete beams) also required to be solid stainless steel?

Answer: The reinforcing bars that extend into the deck shall be epoxy coated.
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Question 61.
Paragraph 11.3.1.4.F.2 of Part 3 (Project Requirements) states that stainless steel reinforcement shall be utilized in all pier caps and bridge seats below expansion joints. There is usually a significant amount of reinforcing steel that extends into the pier cap from the columns and/or pier walls below. Do the reinforcing bars that extend into the pier caps from the columns and pier walls below need to be stainless steel for piers located under expansion joints?

Answer: The reinforcing bars that extend into the pier caps below expansion joints shall be epoxy coated.

Question 62.
Bridge Security and Hardening Requirements – Any bridge security or bridge hardening requirements should be made available to all Proposers (even if in draft form) through the appropriate security processes as soon as possible to ensure design compatibility with said requirements.

Answer: The Department will provide the Security Requirements through the secure website. The Draft Requirements are anticipated to be available September 10, 2013.

Question 63.
Order of Precedence of the Contract – RFP, Part 2, Section 100, 102-2 provides order of precedence as follows:

a. Appendix A, Standard Clauses for New York State Contracts;
b. Appendix B Federal Requirements (including Attachment 1, FHWA Form 1273; Attachment 2, Federal Prevailing Wage Rate; Attachment 3, Goals for Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Participation; Attachment 4, Goals for Disadvantaged/Minority/Women’s Business Enterprise (D/M/WBE) Participation; and Attachment 5, Supplemental Title VI Provisions (Civil Rights Act));
c. Appendix C State Prevailing Wage Rates;
d. Iran Divestment Act;
e. DB Agreement (other than Appendix A, B, and C);
f. Parts 3 through 8 of RFP and Part 10 of RFP, as set forth in the above paragraph;
g. DB Section 100 General Provisions (Part 2 of RFP);
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h. The Standard Specifications of the New York State Department of Transportation, current on the Contract execution date, Sections 200 through 700;

i. The RFP Instructions to Proposers; any RFP Addenda; and any RFP Questions and Answers;

j. Design-Builder’s Proposal, including

Per section (f) above, Part 7 of the RFP, Engineering Data, is at the same order of precedence as the remainder of the RFP. Considering Part 7 contains items such as Permits and Applications, FEIS, ROD, Reevaluation Statement, which were not written for the same specific scope of this Phase 1 contract, we suggest the revised order of precedence after the Iran Divestment Act be as follows:

a) DB Agreement (other than Appendix A, B, C)

f) Parts 3 through 6, 8, 10 of the RFP

g) Part 2 Section 100

h) Part 7....

This will eliminate scope conflicts and associated confusion between the Part 7 documents and the remainder of the RFP.

Answer: The Final RFP - Part 7 - Engineering Data has been revised to remove the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) form the list of Contract Documents. The remaining documents in Part 7 – Engineering Data are of the same order of precedence as Parts 3 through 8 and Part 10 of the RFP.

In addition, RFP Questions and Answers will not be part of the Contract. Addendums will be issued to address any changes or additions to the RFP that arise from the Questions and Answers. This change will be issued by Addendum.

Question 64.

Corrosion Protection Plan – ITP Appendix B, Section B.3.3, part b requires Proposers, “…Provide a life-cycle cost analysis, consistent with the methodology and process steps described in FHWA 02 047, Life-Cycle Cost Analysis Primer…”

It would seem requiring any cost information in the Technical Proposal would be a conflict of interest to the overall process. Furthermore, the reference FHWA 02 047 Analysis Primer
includes user cost delays which are not available to Proposers. We suggest this requirement be revised to omit any capital, maintenance, and/or user cost delays i.e. costing from the Technical Proposal to avoid aforementioned conflict of interest.

**Answer:** The requirements of the Life Cycle Cost Analysis will be clarified so as to only include the initial cost of the selected items that are being evaluated and not to include the overall Initial Project Cost in the Analysis. Also, the Department will provide the user delay cost to be utilized in the analysis. These changes will be issued by Addendum.

**Question 65.**

Traffic Source Files – we suggest the Vissim, HCS, and Syncro source files referenced in the Traffic Study be made available to all Proposers as Reference Documents.

**Answer:** The Vissim, HCS, and Syncro files will be provided to Proposers on a CD the week of September 9, 2013.

**Question 66.**

Detour Plans – Part 3, Section 16.3.2, we note reference is made to Detour Plans throughout section 16. Please make Detour Plans available to all Proposers.

**Answer:** Draft Detour Plans based on the 40% plans have been posted to the Project website.

**Question 67.**

Lead Paint on the Existing Bridge – To help Proper’s best understand and quantify the amount lead paint on the existing bridge, please make available information such as former repainting contracts to all Proposers.

**Answer:** The latest painting contract has been posted to the Project website as a reference document.

**Question 68.**

*Department Network Use Security with P6 – ITP, Appendix B, Part B.5.2.1 requires, “All work to prepare the Initial Project Schedule be performed using Primavera P6 software provided by the*
Department on network servers, and accessed through the Internet with Department provided user accounts.”

After completing our application and obtaining access to the site through the Office of Construction, we find there is no security on the public drives where Proposers are to build their P6 Schedules. Furthermore, the network drives of which Proposers are to develop their P6 schedule also contains P6 files for active construction projects, making Kosciuszko Project Proposer’s schedules visible and accessible to not only competing Proposers, but any Contractor developing a P6 schedule on the Department’s network.

Considering the absence of security on the shared P6 drives sacrifices Proposer confidentiality, we suggest omitting the requirement Proposers build their P6 schedule in the pre-ward phase on the Department’s network. The confidentiality of Proposer’s methods including schedule is imperative to the Design-Build and best-value selection process in the pre-award phase.

Answer: The Department has addressed your concern regarding security and confidentiality. The Department has now limited the DOT access to the K-Bridge secured location of P6 to two high level and essential Department administrators. With the exception to these two Department administrators, only the DB Proposers will have access to their P6 work environments. Your schedule that resides within P6 is in a secured location of the network database. It is not an accessible public network drive.

Regarding the concern of security related to public drive access the following actions have been taken. To ensure security and confidentiality of the “T” drive, the following secured electronic folder directories have been established:

T:Drive:

*Design-Build Proposal Teams*

**D900011**

1) CCA Civil-Halmar-Arup  
2) K-Bridge Constructors JV  
3) Kosciuszko Bridge Partners  
4) Skanska-Kiewit-ECCO III

Only the DB team approved system users with Active Directory Accounts will be allowed to access their respective contract team folder. Please be informed that should you wish to save files to the T drive, to maintain security you MUST save it ONLY to your team folder. All other folders contained in the T drive are shared folders. Additionally note, that all contents within these folders are system cleared (deleted) at approximately 11:30pm each evening. To preserve your T drive files, you must save it off of DOT’s system onto your corporate system daily.
Please verify that the above security measures have been adequately addressed and feel free to bring any addition concerns or needs for assistance to our attention.

Question 69.

The contract states that the schedule will be on a server maintained by a third party provider, which the design builder will provide. At this moment we have a sample project on the DOT server. Do we have to build the schedule on the DOT server? Get a third party provider now and build the schedule on that server? Or will we have a onetime import of the baseline after Award?

Answer: You must build your Proposal Schedule (Initial Baseline Schedule) on DOT’s server. Importing your Proposal schedule is not acceptable. Only the winning Proposer will be required to provide the 3rd Party Hosting Service. The Department will then assist in moving the winning Proposer’s schedule onto the 3rd Party Hosting Service subsequent to execution of the contract.