Question 30.
Section 3.2.5.O of the Project Requirements (Part 3) states that the Design-Builder shall take over the maintenance and operation of the Laurel Hill Site Geotechnical and Environmental Instrumentation and Monitoring as described in Section 10.4.9. Section 10.4.9 of the Project Requirements (Part 3) does not exist. Please provide the missing specification section, or clarify/correct reference to be included in Section 3.2.5.O.

Answer: The referenced section should be Section 10.3.9. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP.

Question 31.
Section 6.2 of the Project Requirements (Part 3) references two tables, namely Table 6.1-1 and Table 6.2-1. There is only one table included in Section 6.2 and it does not have a title. Please clarify, what is Table 6.1-1 and what is Table 6.2-1 that are referenced in Section 6.2. Please provide the title for the Table that is provided in Section 6.2.

Answer: The title of the table in Section 6.2 is “Table 6.2-1 List of Third Party Agreements”.

The first paragraph in Section 6.2 should read:

Table 6.2-1 identifies current agreements the Department has entered into with third parties. Copies of such agreements, to the extent available, are included in the Contract Documents as provided in the Reference column of the table.

These changes will be reflected in the Final RFP.

Question 32.
Section 20 of the Project Requirements (Part 3) refers to the Draft Drainage Design Report that can be found on NYSDOT’s website for this Project. We were not able to locate this report on the website. Please clarify, where can the shortlisted teams obtain a copy of the Draft Drainage Design Report?

Answer: The Draft Drainage Design Report has been posted to the Project website as a Reference Document.
Question 33.
In Item 1 on page 2 of 5 of the NYSDEC Permit dated June 24, 2013, it references Construction Plans Figures 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d and 4e prepared by PB for NYSDOT. All activities authorized by this Permit must be in strict conformance with these Figures; however, we cannot locate these Figures. Please provide copies of these Figures to the shortlisted teams.

Answer: The figures referred to in the Permit are included in the Permit Application “USACE-NYSDEC Joint Permit Application” that is posted on the project website under Contract Documents.

Question 34.
Reference the Federal Aviation Administration Determinations dated 1/16/2012 that expired on 7/16/2013. Please clarify, will the NYSDOT obtain and update and/or an extension to these Determinations, or will this responsibility be pass onto the Design-Builder?

Answer: The Department has obtained Determination Extensions from the FAA for both Brooklyn and Queens. The extension is dated 7/8/2013 and is due to expire on 1/8/2015. The Determination Extensions have been posted to the project website under Contract Documents.

Question 35.
Section 7.1.2 of the ITP lists the Quality Evaluation Factors and Subfactors that will be used in the evaluation of the Technical Proposals. The ITP currently contemplates the use of a non-specific rating system in which each Factor and/or Subfactor are generally compared relative to each other, but are not assigned a specific number of points or percentage of the overall score. In order for the Proposers to better focus on those aspects of the design the NYSDOT considers most important, it would be extremely helpful if the NYSDOT quantifies each of the Evaluation Factors and Subfactors. Will the NYSDOT consider quantifying each Factor and/or Subfactor by assigning a point value, or percentage of the overall score, or some other method that defines the importance of each Factor and/or Subfactor?

Answer: No points will be assigned to these factors. The relative importance of each quality factor and subfactor is outlined in the RFP. Specifically, no further clarification of the rating system is necessary.

Question 36.
The table on Definitive Drawing DP-13 states that the building located at Block 2810, Parcel 161 in Brooklyn is to be partially demolished and property to be cleared for proposed at-grade street realignment. At the walkthrough on Friday, August 2, 2013, we asked what part or parts
of the building were going to be demolished. A representative of NYSDOT stated that plans showing the extent of demolition on this building would be provided to the shortlisted teams. Please provide the plans showing the extent of demolition on Block 2810, Parcel 161 in Brooklyn.

**Answer:** The statement that “plans showing the extent of demolition on this building will be provided” is incorrect. A description of the demolition limits is provided in the response to Questions 13 and 14. No further plans will be provided.

**Question 37.**
There are numerous buildings to be demolished in Brooklyn and Queens for this project. Specifically, by block and parcel number, they are:

- Block 2808, Parcels 108 and 113;
- Block 2811, Parcels 46, 47 and 48;
- Block 2812, Parcels 49, 50, 51 and 52;
- Block 2814, Parcel 98;
- Block 2515, Parcels 131, 132 and 133;
- Block 2516, Parcel 65;
- Block 2517, Parcel 54;
- Block 2519, Parcel 129.

Please provide as-built drawings for these buildings or, in the alternative, please provide contact information (name, telephone, etc.) from whom we can get as-builts for these buildings.

**Answer:** The Department does not have plans of the buildings to be demolished. The Design-Builder is responsible for obtaining any existing building information.

**Question 38.**
*Main Span Structure Type* - In the RFQ stage of the procurement, written public questions were asked regarding whether or not a faux cable-stayed and extradosed structure types would be allowed for the main span. The response to the question suggested these alternatives were not acceptable and the intent was for a cable-stayed bridge which structurally performed as such for the main span.

Considering the very short procurement period for this Project, we suggest NYSDOT clearly preclude ATC elements which will not be acceptable for the Project.
Please confirm whether or not a faux or extradosed solution would be acceptable for the mains? If faux and extradosed main span solutions are not acceptable, please confirm they will be precluded as ATC’s.

**Answer:** Alternative Technical Concepts (ATCs) are part of this Design-Build process/procurement. The Design-Build teams have the right to submit ATCs that they wish to pursue that provide equal or greater benefit to the Department than that defined in the RFP. The Design-Build teams have to decide for themselves which ATCs bring the most value to their team with respect to the time and cost of the ATC in pursuing this project. The Department will properly and vigorously consider all ATCs submitted.

With regard to this specific question regarding faux cable-stayed or an extradosed solution, the Department offers the following response. The structure type study completed by the Department and the significant solicited public input regarding the Main Span structure type support the implementation of a functional cable-stayed bridge. Therefore, the Department has determined that it will not accept an ATC which proposes a faux cable-stayed or an extradosed solution.

**Question 39.**
Monitoring Program at Laurel Hill Site – Part 6, Directive Drawings, Scope of Work for Monitoring Program, page 1 (page 87 of PDF). The first sentence, third paragraph states, “the installation of all equipment called for in this monitoring program shall be performed by a qualified contractor engaged by NYSDOT and supervised by a licensed professional engineer.” Please confirm the “engaged contractor” is a separate contractor from the Design-Builder.

**Answer:** Yes the installation of the Laurel Hill monitoring equipment will be completed in a separate contract. Two months after award of the Design-Build contract the Design-Builder shall take over responsibility for maintaining the monitoring and for continuing the readings until three (3) months after completion of all field work.

To maintain the monitoring program, the Design-Builder may utilize the same contractor that the Department selects to install the monitoring equipment but is not required to do so.

**Question 40.**
Monitoring Program at Laurel Hill Site - Part 3, page 31, paragraph J, states, In reference the Laurel Hill Monitoring Program, this section state, “The Department will install the monitoring program prior to award of the Design-Build Contract.” Does the installation of the program include all the additional monitoring equipment (i.e. wells, inclinometers as identified in Part
6)? Again please confirm the installation of the Laurel Hill Monitoring equipment is done in a separate contract.

Answer: See response to Question 39.