Question 103.

*As-Built Drawings* – Detailed connections are shown for the existing main span. We note no such connection details are provided for the existing approach spans. Please make said as-built details available to Proposers if available.

**Answer:** All known available As-Built plans have been provided to Proposers.

---

Question 104.

*ITB Section B3.3 Service Life and Corrosion Protection Plan* – ITP Appendix B, Section B3.3.C make reference to supporting drawings to illustrate future maintenance and inspection access.

A. Can supporting drawings be 11x17?

**Answer:** Yes supporting drawings may be 11x17. This will be clarified by Addendum.

B. Please confirm referenced drawings are not included in the page count limits.

**Answer:** Reference drawings are not included in the page count limits. This will be clarified by Addendum.

---

Question 105:

It is understood that an exchange of information between NYSDOT and the FDNY was completed to ascertain requirements for the design of the fire standpipe systems on the bridge. In recent separate conversations with the FDNY they mentioned that the full design requirements had been discussed with the NYSDOT, at length. FDNY suggested we reach out to the NYSDOT for the information. We request to obtain copies of the meeting minutes and information between NYSDOT personnel and that of the FDNY where these requirements are fully described. As per NFPA 14, the D/B Teams are required to request information from the local jurisdiction on what is expected to be designed and provided. By reaching to the FDNY and to the NYSDOT, we are attempting to comply with the pertinent fire protection standards.

**Answer:** The standpipe requirements are included in the Final RFP – Part 3 – Section 17.

---

Question 106.

Part 3 Section 11.3.1.4 Paragraph F.2 on p. 79 of the Draft RFP requires the use stainless steel reinforcement in all pier caps and bridge seats below expansion joints. However 11.3.1.6 paragraph B on p. 82 states in second sentence to use solid stainless steel bar reinforcement in
concrete decks. For all other reinforced concrete elements, epoxy or uncoated reinforcement steel may be used provided they meet the 100 year design life. Please clarify, what type of reinforcement is permitted in the pier caps and bridge seats below expansion joint level?
Answer: As stated in Part 3 – Section 11.3.1.4 F.2 “Stainless Steel reinforcement shall be utilized in all pier caps and bridge seats below expansion joints. Reinforcing bars that extend into the pier cap below expansion joints shall be epoxy coated.”

Question 107.
In Table B of Appendix B of the ITP, it states that we have to provide color renderings from defined viewpoints. On similar design/build projects, the Owner provides the background photographs for the renderings in order to establish a common baseline in order to evaluate each team’s unique bridge solution. Will NYSDOT be providing the background images for the proposers to use for these color renderings?
Answer: The photographs will be posted to the Project website.

Question 108.
In the “Scope of Work” for the “Monitoring Program, Laurel Hill Site, Maspeth, New York; Groundwater Collection and Treatment System and Bulkhead” included in the Definitive Plans, it states that groundwater monitoring will continue on a quarterly basis for at least five years after all construction and construction related dewatering activities are completed in the vicinity of the Site. Is it NYSDOT’s intent to have the Design-Builder perform this monitoring for five years after all construction is completed?
Answer: The Design-Builder is responsible for maintaining the monitoring program from two months after award of the contract to Project Completion. The Department will take responsibility of the monitoring program after Project Completion.

Question 109.
In Draft RFP Part 3 paragraph 11.3.1.4.B on p. 78, it states that steel “stay-in-place” forms are not permitted. However, Note 1 on Indicative Drawing No. GN-02, under Superstructure Notes, allows for three options for forming the underside of deck slabs as permitted by the current NYSDOT Specifications. Paragraph B in Section 557-3.03 of the current NYSDOT Specifications on p. 357 states that permanent corrugated metal forms for superstructure slabs are allowed. Please clarify; will the NYSDOT permit the use of steel stay-in-place forms on this project in accordance with the NYSDOT Specifications?
Answer: As stated in Part 3 Section 11.3.1.4B “Stay in place forms are not permitted”. 
Question 110.
There are a number of Reference Documents that the NYSDOT has made available to the various Teams; e.g., the EIS, Record(s) of Decision from various Agencies, Reevaluation Statement(s), and etc. In many of these documents, work is described for both the Brooklyn and Queens’ side of the project that is not described in the Draft RFP Documents. Please clarify; will the successful Team be responsible to perform the work noted in the Reference Documents despite the fact that this work is not identified in the Indicative Plans, the Directive Plans, or in any of the RFP Documents?

Answer: As stated in the Final RFP – Part 3 – Section 1.2 “The Design-Builder shall be responsible for complying with all terms of the Contract Documents, the Record of Decision (ROD) and the Reevaluation Statement as they apply to this Project.” The Design-Builder is not responsible for work within the Part 7 – Contract Documents that does not pertain to the scope of work presented elsewhere in the RFP. For example the new parks in Brooklyn and Queens are not part of the Design-Build Contract.

Question 111.
Page 61 in Part 3 of the Draft RFP states that, in accordance with the NYSDOT LRFD Blue Page provisions for Downstate bridges, the return periods are 1,000 years and 2,500 years for the lower- and upper-level seismic events, respectively. In addition, site specific analysis is required. However, in Article A3.10.5.1 of the 2011 NYSDOT LRFD Blue Pages, it states for Critical Bridges in Downstate the return periods are 500 years and 2,500 years for the lower- and the upper-level seismic events, respectively. In addition, the Article A3.10.2.2 of the Blue Pages states, to perform site specific analysis, the input time acceleration histories shall be those in Report (3) - “Generation of Multi-Support Artificial Ground Motions” prepared by Risk Engineering in 2004. Report (3) has ground acceleration histories for 500, 1500 and 2500 year return periods. Could the return period of the lower level seismic event be changed from 1000 to 500 years? If not, will the 1,000-year return period ground motions be provided to us?

Answer: The 1000 year time histories have been posted to the Project website.

Question 112.
Several of the construction materials specified for this project are very expensive; e.g., stainless steel rebar. Will the NYSDOT consider the incorporation of a material escalation clause to address changes in the material costs for these high priced items?

Answer: The Department will not include material escalation clauses in the Contract.
Question 113.
The RFP contains an unsigned copy of an OCMC Street Permit indicating the work stipulations for this project.

   A. Is this the final version of the OCMC Street Permit which the various Proposers are to use to base their bid?
   
   Answer: The Department is coordinating with OCMC to finalize the permit stipulations. The final Permit will be provided to Proposers by Addendum.

   B. Does the NYSDOT anticipate changes to the work stipulations when the final version is executed?
   
   Answer: The Department has requested longer lane closure periods than provided in the Draft Permit Stipulations but it is not yet known if these longer lane closure periods will be granted by OCMC.

Question 114.
Please clarify; who is responsible for Railroad Flagging and Outage costs? If it is the successful Proposer, does the NYSDOT have an estimated range for these costs?

   Answer: The Design-Builder is responsible for Railroad flagging and outage costs. Daily rates for these costs will be provided to Proposers by Addendum.

Question 115.
Appendix C1 “Base Project”, Page C1-2 has no indication that a Proposal Bond is required where as Appendix C2 “Base Project plus the Option,” Page C2-2 Section C2.4 indicates that Form PB Proposal Bond should be submitted. Please confirm if a Proposal Bond (Form PB) is required for the Base Project submittal. A Proposal bond will cover both as it usually states 10% of amount bid.

   Answer: It is the intent of the Department to have only one Proposal Bond. The Bond is to be attached to the Base Bid and the Base Bid plus the Option

Question 116.
ITP Section 3.1 makes reference to ITP Section 2.2.2 for an email address for ATC submissions. No email address is listed under ITP Section 2.2.2. Please clarify.
Answer: The reference to Section 2.2.2 is incorrect. The correct reference is Section 2.2.1. This change will be issued by Addendum.

Question 117.
ITP Section 3.2.1 refers to contents of ATC submittals. The information requested is similar to the information requested in Form ATC. Please clarify if is necessary to submit this information twice.
Answer: No it is not necessary to submit this information twice. The information provided in Section 3.2.1 is meant to guide the Proposers on how to properly complete Form ATC.

Question 118.
ITP Section 3.2.2 refers to ITP section 3.3.1. There is no ITP Section 3.3.1. Please clarify.
Answer: The reference to Section 3.3.1 is incorrect. The correct reference is Section 3.2.1. This change will be issued by Addendum.

Question 119.
Final RFP Questions 80 and 81 have the same answer, which refer to question 81. Please respond to Question 80 - Part 3, Section 15, Article 15.5, page 120: If temporary fiber cable is required for the temporary ITS, is an aerial installation acceptable?
Answer: Yes a temporary aerial fiber installation is acceptable provided that it is secure.

Question 120.
Form ATC included in ITP Appendix D has Form PB in the footing of the form. Please clarify.
Answer: The footing of Form ATC states “Form ATC”.

Question 121.
Are mill certs required for mini-pile casings?
Answer: Yes - Per NYSDOT micropile inspector guidelines (GEM-25), record mill certifications are required for micropile casing reinforcement. Also per the micropile specification, Buy America provisions apply to all steel that is a permanent part of the pile.

Question 122.
Can rejected oil pipe be used for mini-pile casings?
Answer: Per NYSDOT specification item 551.9930xx17 – Micropiles, mill secondary (rejected API casing) is not allowed to be used for structural reinforcement. In addition, if it is proposed for use as a nonstructural member and is to be left in the ground as a permanent part of the pile, Buy America Provisions apply.