Question 7.
Draft RFP issued 7/17/13, ITP section 1.6 – The Proposal Schedule in referenced section defines Proposal Due Date as October 23, 2013. This allows approximately 3 months for Proposer’s to design, cost, and develop their Proposal. We note this is consistent with what was conveyed in the RFQ stage. Given the accelerated pace of the procurement process, it will be critical Proposers have an expeditious process whereby they can vet out ATC’s within the first few weeks of the procurement period with NYSDOT. The current ATC schedule outlined in referenced section occurs too late in the procurement process for Proposer’s to know whether or not an ATC is acceptable for inclusion in their Proposal. A solution would be early ATC meetings the week of August 5th or August 12th in which Proposers could present draft ATC solutions to the NYSDOT, in a confidential manner, and get verbal feedback on their potential for inclusion in their Proposal.

Answer: Proposers can submit ATCs per the requirements provided in the Draft RFP at any time before the “Final Date for Proposers to submit ATCs” provided in the ITP. The first set of One-on-One meetings will be held August 20th and 21st.

Question 8.
Draft RFP issued 7/17/13, ITP section 1.6 – The Proposal Schedule in referenced section defines “Final date for receipt of Proposer’s questions” as September 30, 2013. Is it the NYSDOT’s intent to impose a deadline on Draft RFP questions? If so, please provide a due date for such questions on the Draft RFP?

Answer: NYSDOT does not intend to set a deadline for Draft RFP questions.

Question 9.
Draft RFP issued 7/17/13, ITP section 2.3.3 – The referenced section outlines the question and answer process for the Project. We note there is no means in the ITP which allows Proposers to ask confidential questions to NYSDOT. Given the accelerated procurement period, a method which allows Proposers to mark questions as “CONFIDENTIAL” would expedite the ATC process while encouraging innovation and ultimately the best value solutions for the Project. Will NYSDOT consider a confidential question process for questions pertaining to proprietary Proposer information? It would be expected NYSDOT could make such confidential questions public if they did not believe it contained proprietary Proposer information, but only after Proposer had the opportunity to first retract the question. Please consider.

Answer: Proposers may submit questions marked “Confidential”. Before providing a response, the Department will determine whether or not the question contains proprietary
information. If the Department determines that the question does not contain proprietary
information, the Proposer who submitted the question will be notified that the question is
not considered confidential. The Proposer will then have the opportunity to withdraw the
question or request that the Department provide a response to the question in which case
the question and response will be provided to all Proposers.

Question 10.
As-Built drawings of existing structures - Drawings of the existing main span, approach and
connectors will be critical for the development of Proposer’s Design. Please define the process
Proposers are to follow for obtaining these critical documents through their Security
Representative (as identified in form C(S) of the ITP). Please make such as-built documents
available immediately to Proposer’s approved Security Representative.

Answer: As-Built drawings were made available to the shortlisted Design-Build Teams at the
RFP Informational Meeting on a USB Drive. See Question and Answer #6.

Question 11.
Deep Foundations in Spills and Plumes - Section 3.2.5 L of Part 3 of the Contract Documents
(Project Requirements) discusses contaminated soil conditions and the preference for driven
piles particularly in the vicinity of the Greenpoint Oil Spill and Meeker Avenue Solvent Plume in
Brooklyn. This section further states that driven piles “may not extend more than 10 feet above
the Raritan Clay confining layer”. In Section 10.3.10.2 B of the same document the areal limits
applying to the 10-foot buffer above the clay layer are stated as “in the vicinity of the Meeker
Avenue Solvent Plume between Varick Avenue and Vandervoort Avenue”. Also, in other
instances in Section 10 the environmental restrictive areas relative to installing drilled shafts
(10.3.10.2 A) or micropiles (10.3.10.2 C) are defined in the same manner as 10.3.10.2 B. Please
clarify by providing the exact limits and environmental restrictions for the installation of driven
piles, drilled shafts and micropiles.

Answer: As stated in the Draft RFP – Part 3 – Section 3.2.5 “Driven piles are preferred by
NYSDEC to eliminate the generation of contaminated spoils brought to the surface,
particularly in Brooklyn in the vicinity of the Greenpoint Oil Spill and Meeker Avenue Solvent
Plume. Should the Design-Builder choose an alternative pile method, the Design-Builder must
develop methods to contain and dispose of the contaminated spoils, and provide written
proof to the Department that such methods are acceptable to NYSDEC. Regardless of the type
of piles that are selected, the depths of the piles may not extend more than 10 feet above the
Raritan Clay confining layer in order to avoid cross contamination of the deeper aquifer”.

The Final RFP will be modified to remove the limits referred to in the Draft RFP – Part 3 –
Section 10 “… between Varick Avenue and Vandervoort Avenue”.
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If the Design-Builder proposes an alternative to a driven pile or a pile that penetrates the Raritan Clay, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for obtaining the approval of NYSDEC for the method of installation as further stated in the Draft RFP – Part 3 – Section 10.3.10.2.