Kosciuszko Bridge Replacement project – Phase 1
Contract D900011
Final RFP Questions and Answers 246 thru 270

Question 246.
We note what appears perhaps be an inherent contradiction in the Aesthetic Lighting requirements:

Part 3, Section 14.3. 5 states, “The aesthetic lighting scheme shall at a minimum illuminate all of the main span and back span stay cables as well as all faces of the main span towers full height, i.e. from the top of the tower footings to the top of the towers,. Aesthetic lighting shall also be provided along the length of the main span and back span edge girders. The lighting scheme shall minimize avian/bird impacts in accordance with the Kosciuszko Bridge Project Reevaluation Statement, January 2011 and utilize LED fixtures to the maximum extent feasible.”

Page 23 of the Reevaluation Statement Says states the lighting system should, “...avoid spotlighting...” and, “...if and aesthetic lighting system is used, it should be shut off during migration system”. This effectively suggests a very minimal aesthetic lighting system.

We are concerned the aesthetic lighting requirements outlined in Part 3 of the RFP are perhaps more than the Reevaluation Statement envisioned and want to make sure we are designing and pricing a compliant system in terms of both Part 3 and the Reevaluation Statement.

Please confirm the intent is to fully illuminate all elements of the bridge as prescribed in Part 3 while using the necessary shielding to minimize sky glow. We note extensive shielding will be required and state of the art fixtures will be required to achieve to fully illuminate the bridge as required while minimizing sky glow.

Answer: The intent of the aesthetic lighting design is to fully illuminate all of the elements of the main span and to avoid “spot lighting” in favor of surface “wash lighting” and “flood lighting. The use of LED fixtures and arranging the location and mounting of the luminaires for ease in aiming will allow for light control so the light will fall mostly on the surfaces being illuminated. Additional shielding can be added if necessary. Typical “spot lighting” with large, uncontrolled HID sources is to be avoided. Using optically controlled luminaires along with a dimming/control system will limit the effect of lighting on migratory birds and other wildlife. The aesthetic lighting circuits are to be controlled with contactors allowing all or portions of the lighting to be turned off during migration periods.

Question 247.
During Section B3.3 B) stated: “Provide a life-cycle cost analysis, consistent with the methodology and process steps described in FHWA 02 047, Life-Cycle Cost Analysis Primer, that includes all scheduled maintenance, impacts to traffic costs, expected maintenance intervals,
and cost in 2013 dollars using a discount rate of 3%; The Life-Cycle Cost Analysis shall not include the Proposer’s Proposed price for the Base Project or Base Project plus the Option.” Please advice more details with respect to the “impacts to traffic costs”, so that we can provide estimates consistent with Department’s expectations.

Answer: Per Addendum #6, “The impact to traffic costs shall be calculated assuming a user delay cost of $10,000 per lane closure hour.

Question 248.

For the engineer’s field office, referenced in Part 3 - Section 2.7 Computer and Networking requirements or Section 637 of the NYSDOT Standard Specifications, there is no information about network, server, cabling, and internet. Does the DB team have to provide any additional items besides the 24 notebook computers? If so, please list these items.

Answer: See response to Question 178.

Question 249.

It is mentioned that Form SP will be provided in Excel on the project website, when will this form be available?

Answer: The Excel file for Form SP will be available on the project website by November 19, 2013.

Question 250.

Due to addendum, page numbers within the Final RFP have changed. This also applies to all the editable forms. Will the Department provide a complete conforming version of the Final RFP?

Answer: The Department will provide a complete conforming version of the Final RFP on the Project website.

Question 251.

Does the Form AAP10 need to be submitted in the editable pdf version (as provided) or can it be reproduced in excel and saved as a pdf file?
Answer: Proposers must submit the editable version of From AAP10 provided by the Department.

Question 252.
Can language for Waiver of Consequential Damages be incorporated into the Final RFP?
Answer: See response to Question 239.

Question 253.
*Technical Proposal* - ITP Appendix B – Page Count - We suggest the department allow 1-11x17 in place of 2-8.5x11’s to allow Proposer’s more latitude in Technical Proposal presentation. As such we would suggest the ITP clarified in regard to page count to allow 1-11x17 z-folded in lieu of an 2-8.5x11s. Please confirm this is acceptable to the Department and make the minor change suggested change in the ITP.

Answer: The Department will allow Proposers to utilize 1-11”x17” sheet in place of 2-8.5”x11” sheets. This change will be issued by Addendum.

Question 254.
*Final Addendum* – The ITP Section 1.6.1 indicates Final RFP Addendum on November 19, 2013.

a. Please consider providing Proposers with a conformed RFP incorporating all Addenda in a track changed document.

Answer: The Department will provide a complete conforming version of the Final RFP on the Project website.

b. Please also consider allowing each Proposer 3 business days to provide any final and last questions (limit 5 per Proposer).

Answer: The Department appreciates the suggestion but the Final RFP with all revisions as posted to the web site on or about November 20, 2013 in both a track changed version and a complete untracked version will be the basis for the proposer’s submittal and on which the evaluations criteria will be predicated. No further questions will be entertained.
Question 255.

**Draft Asbestos Assessment & Design Report (Buildings)** - The said reports are Reference Documents and are not part of the Contract Documents. Because the Proposers have not had access to the buildings or bridge to perform asbestos testing and it is not practical in the amount of time available, Proposers must rely on the reports to price this Work. We suggested these reports be part of the Contract Documents considering the amount of reliance Proposers must have in them.

**Answer:** The Draft Asbestos Assessment and Design Report (Buildings) shall be made a Contract Document. This will be issued by Addendum.

Question 256.

**Con Edison Distribution/ Transmission Lines** – Please clarify the Design-Builder’s scope of work regarding relocation of above distribution and transmission lines within the Project. Is the Design-Builder responsible for these relocations?

**Answer:** See Con Edison’s Guidelines for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Under these guidelines, specifically Note 5, it states that “currently Con Edison plans to perform all specialty work including cable pulling, splicing, and cable removals and all overhead work. Structures, trenching, disposal, remediation (etc.) and conduit is to be done by the Design Build Contractor. Material will be provided by the people doing the work. Support may be required by Design Build contractor to provide access or items such as MPT.”

Question 257.

**Underground & Petroleum Storage Tanks** – Part 3, Sections 3.2.5, 4.3 & Draft Contaminant Management Plan Sections 3.7, Table 5, and Appendix G – The referenced portions of the Contract Documents make reference to underground and above ground storage tanks containing anything from petroleum products to unknowns of who knows what. The Contract Documents also suggest that the Design-Builder is to remove and dispose of these tanks as they are discovered through the course of constructing the Project. Considering the contract documents provide no real information to price or quantify this scope of work, and the variation in price and quantity could verify, please clarify how the Design-Builder is to price? Please clarify if encounters of underground tanks are to be covered under the provisions of DB 104?

**Answer:** The Design-Builder is responsible for the removal and disposal of any known underground or above ground storage tanks. If additional tanks are encountered during
construction, the Design-Build will not be responsible for any cost or schedule impacts associated with the removal and disposal of the tank.

Question 258.

*Visual Quality and Lighting section of Technical Proposal* – In reference to Final RFP Questions and Answers 175 thru 187, Response to Question 182 states, "The RFP will be modified by Addendum to require a separate Visual Quality and Lighting technical section for the Base plus Option in addition to the Base Project." For the Technical Proposal submission, will the Visual Quality and Lighting Plan for the Base Project be required for Volume 2A and the Visual Quality and Lighting Plan for the Base Project + Option will be required in Volume 2B?

**Answer:** Per Addendum#6, the Visual Quality and Lighting Plan for the Base Project is required in Volume 2A and the Visual Quality and Lighting Plan for the Base Project + Option is required in Volume 2B.

Question 259.

*Inspection of Buildings and Connectors* – The demolition of the Buildings and Connectors associated with the Project affords many opportunities to subcontractors, particularly DBEs. We have received multiple requests for an opportunity to inspect the buildings and existing connector structure a final time prior to bid submission. Please consider allowing Proposers and prospective subcontractors a final opportunity to visit the buildings and connectors to be demolished on the Project.

**Answer:** The Department will arrange for an additional site visit on November 19, 2013. Proposers are to meet at Sgt. Dougherty Park at 9am. Access to the Karp property will be limited, due to the fact that it is currently occupied. Access to the property will be from the outside only. All other properties and the connector structure should be fully accessible for viewing. Please notify the designated representative by Friday November 15, 2013 of your intent to be at the site and whom shall be accompanying your firm to the site, so the Department knows the size of the group and who will be in attendance.

Question 260.

*Proposal Drawings* - Section B1.0 – General Instructions of the Final RFP “Instructions To Proposers, Appendix B, states: “All design drawings submitted with Proposals shall be printed
single-sided on 11" by 17" sheets, and all as-printed text font sizes on plans shall be at least 8 points.” Please confirm Drawings conforming to Section 20.9.6 of the NYSDOT HDM (Text and Dimension Scales and Sizes) are acceptable considering the Standard is 1/16” text height (6.25 point text) for a B-size (11x17 drawing).

It makes sense the 11x17 drawings submitted as our Design Plan be developed in accordance with the NYSDOT CAD Standards as they will be post award.

Answer: Yes, drawings that follow the NYSDOT HDM standards are acceptable. This will be clarified by addendum.

Question 261.

RFP Book 3 states that the elevator shall have an internal clear space of 5 feet x 6 feet. This is significantly in excess of what is typically provided in cable stay bridge towers. Considering the short operating height of the elevator, it would be more reasonable to provide a an elevator size of 3 feet x 4 feet. Please confirm that an elevator size of 3 feet x 4 feet is permissible or otherwise specify a more reasonable size of elevator.

Answer: An elevator with an internal clearance of 3 feet x 4 feet is permissible. This will be issued by Addendum.

Question 262.

Is the Design-Builder responsible for developing the Project’s website?

**Answer:** No. Per Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 8.3.5, “*The Department will host and maintain the Project’s website. The Design-Builder shall support the Department by providing applicable photos, graphics, visualizations and drawings.*”

Question 263.

Addendum #6 revised RFP Part 3 Project Requirements Section 7.1.2.2 Technical Solutions Part D Visual Quality and Lighting to require two separate narratives along with accompanying graphics. Should we assume that the renderings to be submitted with the base project show only the EB structure and that the renderings to be submitted with the base plus option show both the EB and WB structures, including the future WB approach spans?
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Answer: Yes renderings to be submitted with the base project should show only the EB structure and the renderings to be submitted with the base plus option show both the EB and WB structures, including the future WB approach spans

Question 264.
Addendum #6 has added the following requirement for visual quality in RFP ITP Appendix B: Section B3.4.2 Base Project Plus the Option - The Proposer should include a narrative describing the proposed construction methods and construction sequence for the Base project plus the Option that meets all of the requirements outlined in Section B3.4.1 above. We assume the description noted above is an error and that we need to describe the visual quality and lighting plan for the base plus option.

Answer: ITP – Appendix B, Section B3.4.2 will be revised by Addendum to state the following:
“The Proposer should provide a Visual Quality and Lighting Plan for the Base Project plus the Option that meets all of the requirements outlined in Section B3.4.1.”

Question 265.
The Department’s response to Question 206 indicated “The power distribution equipment including provisions for throw over should be located on the bridge in a location that can be accessed by maintenance forces on the deck. This will be issued by Addendum. Based on this answer, can we consider this to mean that equipment mounted below the deck and accessed by way of a ladder over the side of the bridge (or elevated roadway) to a working platform, or a manhole in the roadway with a ladder to a working platform would be a reasonable and acceptable arrangement?

Answer: Yes, equipment mounted below the deck and accessed by way of a ladder over the side of the bridge (or elevated roadway) to a working platform, or a manhole in the roadway with a ladder to a working platform would be a reasonable and acceptable arrangement. Please mount equipment so that it visually is not obtrusive.

Question 266.
A Joint Permit Application was submitted for NYSDEC Tidal Wetland, Use and Protection of Waters Permits, Water Quality Certification and US Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit (NWP) 15 in August 2012. The NYSDEC permit has been issued. In addition, the Coast Guard issued a permit for the new bridge structure. What is the status of the US Army Corps of
Engineers permit? Is the US Coast Guard permit considered confirmation of NWP 15 consistency?

**Answer:** The US Coast Guard permit is considered confirmation of the Nation Wide Permit 15. No further permit is required from the USACE. This will be clarified by Addendum.

**Question 267.**

Page 5 of the Laurel Hill Monitoring Program (Part 6 – RFP Plans) states that “vibrations will be recorded at the bulkhead using one (1) triaxial seismograph Instantel brand, model MiniMate Plus or BlastMate III to monitor and collect data during the construction period”. Will this be accomplished via remote access “real time” monitoring equipment, or will the monitoring equipment require the contractor to take regular readings from the monitoring device? In addition, the document states that the seismograph will be checked on a “regular basis” by the contractor. Please define “regular basis”.

**Answer:** Either remote or direct readings are acceptable. Please assume that the seismograph must be checked weekly.

**Question 268.**

Should the completion of the permanent display or interpretive sign that illustrates and interprets the history of the Kosciuszko Bridge and Thaddeus Kosciuszko be included in the scope of work (Design) or has it been completed already?

**Answer:** The display/sign referred to in this question is not part of the Design-Build Contract.

**Question 269.**

Under Section 4.2.1 Stay Cable- Anchorages D., there is a requirement for additional capacity of five percent additional holes in each anchor head for contingency and this applies to each stay cable and cannot be grouped. To comply with the special provision as written, all anchorages should be designed for an increase of at least 5%. We believe this is overly conservative and would result in the upsizing of cable anchorage units and corresponding anchorages at the deck and in the pylon as well as increased stay pipe diameters. Current industry practice regarding provisions for increased stay cable loads has been to look at the stays in groups of 3 adjacent stays and evaluate the available excess capacity in any group of 3 adjacent stays. On recent projects the increased capacity has been either 5% or 3%. We would like NYS DOT to confirm if it would be an option to provide 5% extra capacity for the cable stays but grouping the cable
stays in groups of 3 adjacent stays. Also we want to know if it would be acceptable for the department to prove the fatigue tests for the cable stays by previous tests carried out for similar anchor size with no new tests involved.

Answer: The option to provide 5% extra capacity for the cable stays but grouping the cable stays in groups of 3 adjacent stays is acceptable to the Department.

It would be acceptable to demonstrate conformance to the specified anchorage fatigue tests using previous tests carried out for similar anchor size with no new tests involved provided that the same tests have been performed as those specified in the RFP.

This will be issued by Addendum.

Question 270.

Would the Department consider the need of internal damper for the cable length above of 240 ft. long as suggested by most of the cable-stays standards?

Answer: Yes the Department would consider the need for an internal stay cable damper for a stay cable length above 240 feet. This will be issued by Addendum.