Question 123.

**ITP Definition of Subcontractor** – ITP Appendix F, Definitions – Based on the definition of Subcontractor in the referenced appendix we would interpret that we fill out forms such as Form FP and EEO for 1st Tier dedicated subs only. Please confirm this interpretation and clarify the extent to which these forms are to be completed for Subcontractors.

**Answer:** Form FP should be filled out by the Proposer only, or all Principal Participants if the Proposer does not have a Federal ID Number and a New York State Vendor ID Number; other forms that are to be filled out by subcontractors should only be filled out by first tier subcontractors.

Question 124.

**ITP Form FP Clarification** - In Appendix D, Form FP requires the Federal ID Number for the Proposer. It is common practice for that Principle Participates (Joint Venture equity partners) only apply for a Federal ID Number after being selected as Best Value Proposer. Is it the intent of the Department that the Proposers use a Federal ID Number for the Joint Venture (where applicable) or each individual Principal Participant to execute Form FP separately with their individual firm Federal ID Numbers?

**Answer:** If a Federal ID Number and a New York State Vendor ID Number are not available for a Joint Venture, then each Principal Participant shall provide Form FP. This will be clarified by Addendum.

Question 125.

In the draft asbestos assessment survey performed by EPM all but three of the buildings scheduled for demolition were examined. Will NYSDOT and/or EPM survey the remaining buildings prior to the proposal due date and if so will this information be provided to the bidders?

**Answer:** Since the issuance of the Draft Asbestos Assessment, the Department has completed the asbestos assessment survey of Lee Stone (M29R1), Premier Poultry (M30), Wing Sing (M76), and Lu Transports (M80R1). The updated Asbestos Assessment Report will be provided to Proposers on the Project website.

No further asbestos surveys will be completed by the Department. The buildings located on Map 28 and Map 31 will not be able to be sampled and tested in advance of the proposal due date. Proposers should make necessary provisions in their cost proposal to account for the costs associated with such asbestos removal and abatement at these sites. It is noted that a
preliminary asbestos survey was completed for Map 28 and the results and assumptions are provided in the Asbestos Assessment Report.

**Question 126.**

*Ambiguity in Scope of WB Mainspan* - The scope to be included in the Bid Option for the Westbound Mainspan is not clear. Please provide a comprehensive list of the items to be included in the scope. (e.g. bridge drainage, fire standpipe, aviation & navigation hazard beacons, inspection traveler)

**Answer:** If the Department chooses to exercise the Option, the Project will include the Base Project scope of work as well as the Design-Build services for a new westbound Cable-Stayed Main Span. This includes bridge drainage, fire standpipe, aviation and navigation lighting, aesthetic lighting, inspection traveler, and accommodation for the future ITS system. The only items to be excluded from the Westbound Main Span shall be expansion joints, signage, pavement markings, roadway lighting, bikeway/walkway railing and fencing. This clarification will be issued by Addendum.

**Question 127.**

Supplying original black & white photographs was a standard requirement before the use of digital cameras. Page 18 in the archaeological work plan specifies that both black and white and color photographs are required. Typically, digital images in color are acceptable. Are Black and White images required?

**Answer:** Color prints and digital images are acceptable. This change will be issued by Addendum.

**Question 128.**

Section 233 permits are required for any archaeological work on state lands in New York. This requirement is mentioned on page 23 of the archaeological work plan. Archaeological work cannot proceed on state lands without the permit. Is there a complete list of State owed lands potentially impacted by the project?

**Answer:** The State owned Right-of-Way is shown on the Acquisition Plans and Maps.
Question 129.
How many Phase II archaeological surveys should be included in the scope and budget for monitoring and what type of documentation (i.e. letter report, full report, field consultation) is necessary for submission to the agencies following Phase II fieldwork?

Answer: The Design-Builder shall assume three Phase II archaeological surveys will be required. Full reports, including the results of any intensive documentary studies, will be required by the review agencies upon completion of the fieldwork. This will be issued by Addendum.

Question 130.
The response to Question 73 states that the 1'-6" clear horizontal distance shall be provided "to the nearest obstruction ". Please confirm that this only refers to obstructions associated with the stay cable system and associated hardware since the question was related to Project Requirements: Clause 11.3.1.4 N) 2). If on the other hand the 1'-6" clearance is also required to other obstructions such as for example tower legs and lighting poles please clarify. In the latter case we suggest that an Addendum would be necessary to formalize this additional requirement.

Answer: The 1′6” clear horizontal distance only pertains to obstructions associated with the stay cable system and associated hardware. This will be clarified by Addendum.

Question 131.
ITP Section 3.1 indicates that ATC submissions have to be in writing, using Form ATC to the Department’s Designated Representative’s email address. On the other hand, ITP Section 3.2.2 states that the submission of ATC submittals should include seven (7) hard copies and one electronic copy (CD). What is the correct procedure for ATC submittals? Please clarify.

Answer: ATC submissions should follow the requirements in both ITP Section 3.1 and Section 3.2.2.

Question 132.
The Asbestos Report indicates that some buildings like the “Karp Building” were not tested for asbestos. Please advise if a report will be forthcoming prior to the proposal due date. Please indicate if there will be an allowance for asbestos testing for these buildings.

Answer: Since the issuance of the Draft Asbestos Assessment, the Department has completed the asbestos assessment survey of Lee Stone (M29R1), Premier Poultry (M30), Wing Sing
(M76), and Lu Transports (M80R1). The updated Asbestos Assessment Report will be provided to Proposers on the Project website.

No further asbestos surveys will be completed by the Department. The buildings located on Map 28 and Map 31 will not be able to be sampled and tested in advance of the proposal due date. Proposers should make necessary provisions in their cost proposal to account for the costs associated with such asbestos removal and abatement at these sites. It is noted that a preliminary asbestos survey was completed for Map 28 and the results and assumptions are provided in the Asbestos Assessment Report.

Question 133.
Final RFP indicates to remove existing structure to 2’ below grade. Do the Design-Builder’s remove the existing piles (entire length) that interfere with the proposed foundation design? If so, please provide type, dimension and length of the existing piles.
Answer: The Design-Builder shall remove all existing structures, including piles, to 2’ below grade. The Design-Builder shall also remove the portion of an existing structure that interferes with the Design-Builder’s scope of work. The Design-Builder is not required to remove the piles beyond 2’ below grade.

Question 134.
If the entire pile needs to be removed and extends beyond the Raritan Clay Layer, what NYSDEC permits/ permission is required? What provisions are required to prevent cross-contamination?
Answer: Pile removal shall not extend below the Raritan Clay Layer.

Question 135.
Clarify the design criteria and extent of drainage required. Are drainage structures and pipe required under the WB Approaches and Main Span?
Answer: The Design-Builder shall not be responsible for the construction of the Westbound Approach Span drainage structures. However, the new drainage structures and outfalls that are constructed as part of the Contract, including the connections to the outfalls for the future Westbound roadway drainage, shall be designed and sized to accommodate the future Westbound roadway drainage.

Question 136.
The answer to Final RFP Question 33 states the Design–Builder is financially responsible for the handling and disposal of any contaminated material that requires removal as part of the Design-Builders activities related to this project. Who is the generator of the contaminated and or hazardous material?

Answer: The cost of the handling and disposal of contaminated materials shall be included in the Design-Builder’s lump sum bid, however the Design-Builder will not be the generator of the contaminated or hazardous material.

Per DB 104-4.3 “...Design-Builder shall not be required to execute any hazardous waste manifests as a “generator” with respect to Hazardous Materials encountered within the Project Limits, and Hazardous Materials encountered within the Project Limits shall be disposed of, if at all, utilizing an EPA identification number or other appropriate legal device obtained by, and carried in the name of, Department or another Person designated by the Department."

Question 137.
Initial Baseline Schedule – ITP B5.2 –we have the following specific questions on the Department’s P6 network servers:

A. B5.2.1.A states, “Proposer’s should submit up to two Requests for Access...” Considering many Proposers are comprised of Joint Ventures of 3 or more Principal Participants, we suggest increasing this to limit to up to 4 users per Proposer.

Answer: As requested, the Department will permit 4 users/teams to be granted access to the Department’s P6 network. Proposers that wish to increase the user access should submit the request form with the identified new user(s) to Peter Russell at their earliest convenience.

B. The response to Public Question #87 suggests, “...Proposers should make a copy of their existing schedule on NYSDOT’s server and then modify the copy to represent the Base Project Plus the Option schedule and save it as such”. We have found that when we save from copies (save as) we can in no way edit the Must Finish dates, title, or much of anything in files “saved as” another name. The ability to save the Base Project as the Base plus Option Project is imperative to Proposer’s ability to develop their P6 schedule through the Department’s network in a timely fashion. We have provided the Department with a direct point of contact on this matter and look forward to collaborative resolution.

Answer: The Department’s specification provides instruction for changing a P6 schedule project “ID” or project “name”. Regarding the Must Finish by Dates, the date field has recently been removed from all Proposers’ schedules by the Department. If the Proposer wishes to create an Activity that is Constrained to
calculate dates, float, etc., they have the ability to do such. Such an activity, appropriately named, could serve as an equivalent to the Must Finish activity but be within a Proposer’s control. As an alternative, if Proposers wish to have NYSDOT add a date to the currently cleared Must Finish date field, then they should submit this date with a request to Peter Russell no later than November 25, 2013.