Question 1.
NYSDOT has provided the proposers with the Microstation DGN files for the directive and indicative plans. However, InRoads proposed alignment or proposed surface data have not been provided with these files. Could NYSDOT provide the proposers with the InRoads data files (.ALG, .DTM, etc.) used in the 40% plans?

Answer: The InRoads data files were distributed to Proposers on a CD as Reference Documents via FedEx on September 12, 2013.

Question 2.
It seems the Team(s) that submitted their Security information in a timely fashion are being penalized by the “other” team(s) lack of effort in providing the required documents as requested. The requirements of the Draft RFP do not indicate that the Security Representative must have a current SWAC clearance, and that they need to provide a SWAC Member Control Number with the Form. It does state that the Security Representative may be asked to provide in person certain requested information and documentation to verify individuals identify and immigration status. This indicates that the Department would be providing or obtaining the security threat assessments and in person interviews if required. Is the Department changing the requirements of the Draft RFP and Final RFP issued August 27, 2013? Can the Department provide an explanation of why the “Security Requirements” cannot be given to the Security Representatives that have been accepted at this time? Can the Department send an email to the Security Representatives that have been accepted and confirm their acceptance? Will the Department provided copies of the Draft Security requirements to the approved Security Representative if the Final version is still under review?

Answer: The Department has issued the Draft Security Requirements on the secure website.

Question 3.
Instructions to Proposers- General Instructions 4.4.1. (Page 27) refers to ITP-Appendix A, Section A2.3.5. Section A2.3.5 does not exist. Please clarify if this section will added or the reference is incorrect.

Answer: The Reference should be A2.2.5, this correction will be issued by Addendum.
Question 4.
Are there any as-built drawings of the bridge highway lighting system for K-Bridge available to the design-build teams from NYSDOT? An inquiry to NYCDOT about this issue indicated that these drawings would reside with NYSDOT.

**Answer:** The Department has made available all as-built plans for the bridge. The Department is not aware of any separate as-built lighting plans.

Question 5.
Are the CADD files prepared by the PB/ H&H Preliminary Design Team available? Several of these files, including the following, would help expedite the design effort of the Design-Builders:

- A. Microstation DRN_AREAS.DGN files
- B. Microstation InRoads Storm and Sanitary Sewer Pipe / Hydraulic Models (files to create the drainage in the preliminary design)
- C. Grades or Grading Plans and files, if any
- D. Database Files (providing coordinates and geometry design data)

**Answer:** The above requested files were distributed to Proposers on a CD as Reference Documents via FedEx on September 12, 2013.

Question 6.
Section 10.5 Part 3 – Geotechnics provides Table 10.5-1 showing the required deliverables for this section. The right hand column provides reference numbers for the various submittals. The first two requirements reference sections 10.4.1 and 10.4.2. Neither of these sections reference the required submittals noted. The remaining requirements reference Sections 10.4.6 thru 10.5.3.2. None of these sections are present in the document. Are these typos in the Table or are references correct and the narrative sections are missing?

**Answer:** The References have been updated as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
<th>Delivery Schedule</th>
<th>Reference Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>60 days after NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical work plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.5-1 –Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
<th>Delivery Schedule</th>
<th>Reference Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardcopy</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical investigation plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 days after NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical data report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120 days after NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Geotechnical Nominal Resistance Test Implementation Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 days prior to installing test piles or shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Geotechnical Nominal Resistance Test Results Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Within two weeks of completing each pile load test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Assessment Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 days after NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Instrumentation &amp; Construction Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 Days prior to the start of any construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Design Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 days prior to installing production piles or shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Foundation Installation Records</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Within two weeks of installing pile/shaft for a substructure unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ConSTRUCTION Condition Survey Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not less than 30 days prior to start of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-ConSTRUCTION Condition Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not less than 30 days before Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Monitoring Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7.

Reference and Engineering Documents on Department’s website – Section 1.5 of the ITP states, "Reference Documents are available on the Department’s website, but will not form a part of the Contract. The Department makes no representation or guarantee as to, and shall not be responsible for, their accuracy, completeness or pertinence, and, in addition, shall not be responsible for the conclusions to be drawn from the Reference Documents. The Reference Documents are made available to the Proposers and selected Design-Builder for the purpose of
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providing such information as is in the possession of the Department, whether or not such information may be accurate, complete or pertinent, or of any value."

We note this ITP provision is inconsistent with DB Section 104.5 (Differing Site Conditions) which provides that the Design-Builder has a limited right to rely upon the Department's Geotechnical Report.

We also note the Geotechnical Report is not included in the list of documents under Part 7, Engineering Data. Please include the Geotechnical Report as part of the Engineering Data documents and make consistent on the Project website, noting the Geotechnical Report is currently identified as a Reference Document on the Project website.

Answer: The Geotechnical Report is provided as a Reference Document only.

Question 8.
Questions and Answers to the RFP Contractual – Part 2, section 102-2 states, "The Department’s answers to any questions posed during the procurement process for the Contract shall in no event be deemed part of the Contract Documents and shall not be relevant in interpreting the Contract Documents except as they may clarify provisions otherwise considered ambiguous."

Article 5 of Part 1 - DB Agreement provides that "RFP Questions and Answers" are part of the Contract Documents.

Please provide clarifications regarding this apparent discrepancy.

Answer: 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 to Part 1, Article 5 and Part, Section 102-2 will be issued in an Addendum.

Question 9.
Coordination with other contracts in the Work area – Part 2, section 102-4 states, "The Department reserves the right to let other contracts in the Work area that may require coordination with the Work under this Contract..."

What is the Department's current expectation of letting other contracts in the Work area?

Please compile a comprehensive list of the other areas of Work requiring coordination with the Design-Builder.
Answer: A list of currently anticipated projects within the work area is included in Part 3 of the RFP – Section 1.4.

Question 10.

*Reference Information* – Part 2, section 102-5.3 states, “Document Language -- "The Department will make available to the Design-Builder upon request all information obtained from utilities, pipeline owners, and other parties that the Department has notified concerning the proposed construction."

What information has the Department received from Utilities that has not already been provided to the Proposers? Please provide any such additional information.

Answer: Any information the Department has obtained from the Utilities has been provided to the Proposers.

Question 11.

*Design Scope* - In the General Notes, Drawing No. GN-01 of the Directive Plans in Part 6 of the RFP, Note 1 specifies, “... The Base Contract also includes the advanced design of the westbound Brooklyn Approach, westbound Queens Approach and westbound Main Span including all related highway, drainage, lighting, ITS, geotechnical, mechanical and electrical work.” This note does not refer to the Bikeway/Walkway.

Section 1.3, page 2 of Part 3 of the RFP, the Project is noted to include the preliminary design of the “New Bikeway/Walkway.”

Please clarify whether the pedestrian bikeway/walkway is included in the scope of the Project.

Answer: The bikeway/walkway is part of the westbound structure. Therefore, where design and construction of the westbound structure is included in the contract this includes the design and construction of the bikeway/walkway. Similarly, where the preliminary design of the westbound structure is included in the contract this includes the preliminary design of the bikeway/walkway. It is also noted, that per Part 3 – Project Requirements – Section 1.3. The Laurel Hill Boulevard pedestrian ramp in Queens is included in the Base Contract.

Question 12.

*BQE/LIE As-Built Plan for Ramps* – As-Built Plans released to date do not include the mid-1960’s record plans of the BQE / LIE Interchange, particularly the vicinity of the LIE WB ramp, 43rd
Street ramp and the LIE EB ramp connections to the WB BQE, the BQE mainline in this area (from 54th Avenue eastward) and the divide between the aforementioned ramps and Laurel Hill Boulevard. Please make these available.

Answer: Additional As-Built Plans were distributed to Proposers on a CD as Reference Documents via FedEx on September 12, 2013.

Question 13.
As-Built Plans for Structures - Please provide the as-built drawings for the following structures:

E. Existing Queens Connector Spans 101, 102 & 103 (starts east side of 54th Ave and heads west)
F. Existing Retaining walls for the LIE Interchange in Queens.
G. From the site tour, it is apparent that there were additional contracts for the Brooklyn Connector after the FIBQE 71-1 contract, such as the reconstruction of the connector in the 1980's. Please provide all drawings for those contracts.
H. Existing Meeker Ave viaduct drawings for Pier 75 - existing abutment (Pier 0 of Brooklyn Connector).

Answer: Additional As-Built Plans were distributed to Proposers on a CD as Reference Documents via FedEx on September 12, 2013.

Question 14.
As-Built Plan Details - In the provided as-built drawings for contract FIBQE 67-1, sheet 6 of 22, Note 1 states, "The contractor may substitute HS bolts in lieu of welding and no increase of costs" regarding the connection between the crossbeams and the stringers.

If possible, please provide the limits of where the crossbeam to stringer connection was bolted and where it was welded.

Answer: Bolted connections to retrofit failed and broken weld connections between stringer top flanges and crossbeam bottom flanges can be found throughout the length of the bridge at numerous locations.

Question 15.
Limits of Bikeway/Walkway - In Part 3 Section 11.3.1.5, "Bikeway/Walkway", the limits of the bikeway/walkway to be constructed in Phase 1 are not clearly defined. Item 1) in this section states that the bikeway/walkway shall have a clear width of 20 feet along its full length on the
bridge and approaches. It does not provide the limits of the bikeway / walkway on the Brooklyn & Queens Connectors, nor whether there is a tie-in to the new Pedestrian Bridge at Laurel Hill Blvd.

Please provide the limits of the bikeway / walkway on the Brooklyn Connector, the Queens Connector and the tie-in to the New Pedestrian Bridge (at Laurel Hill Boulevard) to be constructed in the Phase 1 Contract.

**Answer:** The bikeway/walkway is part of the westbound structure. Therefore, where design and construction of the westbound structure is included in the contract this includes the design and construction of the bikeway/walkway. Similarly, where the preliminary design of the westbound structure is included in the contract this includes the preliminary design of the bikeway/walkway. It is also noted, that per Part 3 – Project Requirements – Section 1.3. The Laurel Hill Boulevard pedestrian ramp in Queens is included in the Base Contract.

**Question 16.**
*Public Involvement Manual* – Book 3, Section 8.2, we note reference is made to the NYSDOT Project Development Manual: Appendix 2 Public Involvement Manual. Please confirm that all Proposers are to refer to the Appendix 2 Public Involvement Manual issued in January of 2004.

**Answer:** Yes Proposers are to refer to the Appendix 2 Public Involvement Manual issued in January 2004.

**Question 17.**

Please make referenced Report available to all Proposers.

**Answer:** The 2006 Seismic Analysis Report has been posted to the Project website as a Reference Document.

**Question 18.**
*Environmental Compliance Plan* – Please refer to Instructions to Proposers, Appendix B, 3.6 – Environmental Compliance Plan (page B-7), and Part 3 – Project Requirements, 3.2.6.1 Environmental Compliance Plan (page 37).
The ITP states, ‘the Technical Proposal should provide an Initial Environmental Compliance Plan that describes how the Proposer will comply with applicable environmental and permitting commitments and requirements during the performance of the design and construction Work.’

Should Proposers format the Initial Environmental Compliance Plan within the Technical Proposal to mimic the format of the Environmental Compliance Plan given in Part 3 – Project Requirements, 3.2.6.1 Environmental Compliance Plan?

Answer: Yes.

Question 19.
Will the NYC be responsible for snow plowing on both the existing and new Kosciuszko Bridges during the term of our contract?

Answer: Part 3 of the RFP – Section 16.3.1 states the following:

“The Department will retain responsibility of maintenance of the existing bridge (including snow removal) for as long as it remains in service for general public use. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for maintenance of all new Construction in accordance with DB §105-12 until Final Acceptance. Where the existing bridge and the new bridge are both in operation, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for the new Crossing structure, until Final Acceptance, and shall be responsible for liaising with the Department in relation to operational arrangements.”

The Design-Builder will be responsible for snow removal on the new structure until Final Acceptance.

Question 20.
Who will be responsible for maintaining the existing Kosciuszko Bridge roadway/structure until traffic is on the new bridge?

Answer: Part 3 of the RFP – Section 16.3.1 states the following:

“The Department will retain responsibility of maintenance of the existing bridge (including snow removal) for as long as it remains in service for general public use. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for maintenance of all new Construction in accordance with DB §105-12 until Final Acceptance. Where the existing bridge and the new bridge are both in operation, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for the new Crossing structure,
Kosciuszko Bridge Replacement project – Phase 1
Contract D900011
Final RFP Questions and Answers 1 thru 25

until Final Acceptance, and shall be responsible for liaising with the Department in relation to operational arrangements.”

Question 21.
Are there environmental inspection reports to guide the D/B teams with regard to the remediation requirements of the existing buildings to be demolished? If not we ask that an Allowance be setup to perform any remediation work in these buildings.

Answer: The Draft Asbestos Assessment and Design Report for buildings is located on the Project website as a Reference Document.

Question 22.
Under the scope of work for base bid who will be responsible to vacate the NYPD parking under the bridge and is it to be reinstated below the Queen’s approach after completion of the project?

Answer: The Department is responsible for having the NYPD impound lot vacated under the bridge. The anticipated vacancy date is September 20, 2013. The Department has not yet determined if the lot will be reinstated at Project completion but if it is to be reinstated after completion of the project, the Design-Builder will not be responsible for this work.

Question 23.
If the Department chooses the Option, please clarify if the D/B Contractor retains sole use of the area that is presently occupied by the existing west bound structure which is to be demolished under the base bid for the entire time allotted to reconstruct the westbound main span.

Answer: Yes – the Design-Builder will have full use of the Right-of-Way during the Contract period.

Question 24.
When determining the design clearance envelop required over the main channel of Newtown Creek must the height above the water take into consideration the traveler in motion or just the lowest fixed element of the Main Span over the navigation channel.
Answer: The required clearance is measured to the lowest fixed element of the structure over the navigational channel.

Question 25.
Two files that are referenced as CAD source files were not provided on the CD originally distributed by NYSDOT. These files appear to have been in a folder labeled “ny_photogrammetry” which was not provided. The two files are named:

- x72977_img_ort_photodop_2006_001
- x72977_img_ort_photodop_2006_002

Can these source files be provided?

Answer: The requested files were distributed to Proposers on a CD as Reference Documents via FedEx on September 12, 2013.