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Question 75:
**Directive Plan BP-01:** Horizontal Stopping Sight Distance for Ramp SE does not meet standard for Curve SE3 Sta SE 14+35.90 to SE 15+42.91 (125’ proposed; 155’ required). This is not listed as a non-standard feature in Part 7 – Engineering Data. Will the Non-Standard Justification Form be provided for this element and added to the list of non-standard features in Part 7?

**Answer:** Please see Addendum #3.

Question 76:
The non-standard features listed below are based on design information in the FINAL RFP Indicative plans and are not listed as non-standard in Part 7 – Engineering Data. Will the Non-Standard Justification Forms be provided for these elements and added to the list of non-standard features in Part 7?

- Ramp SE Superelevation: Curves SE2 and SE3 require 8% superelevation; indicative plans show 7% superelevation.
- Ramp SS Superelevation: Curve SS1 requires 6% superelevation; Curves SS2 and SS3 require 5% superelevation. Indicative plans show 4% superelevation.
- Ramp SN Minimum Vertical Clearance: Sta SN 122+07 to SN 122+35 has MVC < 14.5’ (minimum 13’-3” proposed; see markups on GP-11).
- Edgewater Road Minimum Vertical Clearance: Sta ES 20+76 to ES 21+80 has MVC < 14.5’ (minimum 13’-7” proposed; see markups on GP-3 and RP-5).

**Answer:** Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 77:
The following non-conforming features listed below are based on design information in the FINAL RFP Indicative plans. Will these elements be added to the RFP as Non-Conforming features?

- Ramp SE/SN gore: rollover rates exceed 18% at SE travel edge; gore slopes exceed 11% (see markups on GP-11)
- Ramp SE/ES gore: gore slopes exceed 50% (see markups on GP-11)
- Intersection sight distance at Edgewater Road/EB Bruckner Boulevard due to Pier 4 (see RP-5)

**Answer:** Non-Conforming features will not be provided
- See drawing PRO-8 for transition and cross slopes along SE/SN gore. Refer to section 5.7.3.3. of the NYSDOT HDM for Superelevation transitions
- Ramp SE and ES profiles are revised in addendum #3. Gore slopes details are provided.

The design-builder can modify Pier 4 location or intersection striping to allow for proper sight distance, indicative plans have been revised in Addendum #3.

Question 78:
**Final RFP Part 6 Drawing GN-1 Note 2.2.2, GN-03 Note 6.2.2:** Final RFP Part 6 directive drawing GN-1 Note 2.2.2 states "From STA. ES 36+10 to STA. ES 42+20 existing bridge deck shall receive milling and 1" PCC overlay in accordance with NYSDOT Special Specification 584.4000009." Directive drawing GN-03 as part of the Amtrak/CSX coordination has Note 6.2.2 state "from STA. ES 36+10 to STA. ES 42+20 existing bridge deck shall receive milling and 1" PCC overlay, excluding area under existing right-side barrier to remain." Please clarify which note governs.

**Answer:** Dwg GN-1, Note 2.2.2 governs and was updated in Addendum #2.
Question 79:
Final RFP Part 6 Drawing GN-2 Note 2.2.9 and 6.2.9: Final RFP Part 6 directive drawing GN-2 Note 2.2.9 states "all existing barriers shall be replaced with single-slope barrier." Directive drawing GN-03 as part of the Amtrak/CSX coordination has Note 6.2.9 which states "all existing west side barriers from STA. ES 36+10 to STA. ES 42+20 shall be replaced with single-slope barrier." Please clarify which one governs. If GN-2 Note 2.2.9 governs, please confirm fencing conforming to Amtrak requirements as shown on drawing TYP-13 is required.
Answer: Drawing GN-2, Note 2.2.9 governs. Fencing conforming to Amtrak requirements as shown on drawing TYP-13 is required.

Question 80:
Final RFP, Part 6, WB Bruckner Blvd. and Expressway Dwg. No. FR-06 to FR-08 Directive Drwgs– Both bearing lines are specified to have expansion bearings. How are these bridges restrained longitudinally?
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 81:
Final RFP Part 6, Edgewater Ramp SE, Directive Plans BP-01 & FR-01, Directive Conceptual Plan ES-S-01, and Indicative Plans GP-11 and TYP-08: The West Abutment of Ramp SE is called out as both a cantilever abutment (Indicative Plan Dwg GP-11) and an integral abutment (Directive Dwg BP-01, FR-01). Dwg TYP-08 shows foundation with 2 drilled shafts. Amtrak/CSX Coordination Directive Conceptual Plan Dwg ES-S-01 shows locations for two deep foundations at this abutment. Please clarify the abutment type; is the Department is specifying an integral abutment with drilled shafts? If so, please provide the design requirements as it is a non-standard design configuration not covered by RFP requirements.
Answer: BP-01, FR-01, GP-11, and TYP-08 are revised in Addendum #3, as well as Part 3 Section 14.

Question 82:
Part 6 – RFP Plans, Drawing TYP-01 – Minimum vertical clearance under structures is indicated to be 21’-0” minimum. Directive Note 7.1.9 on Drawing GN-6 indicates that a 20’-0” minimum vertical clearance be provided above Amtrak top of rail, and 21’-0” provided for CSX. Please revise Drawing TYP-01 – Minimum vertical clearance under structures to reflect the 20’-0” & 21’-0” conditions.
Answer: Directive notes governs. Drawing TYP-01 has been revised in Addendum #3 to show 20’-0” minimum vertical clearance above Amtrak.
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Question 84:
The geometry of Bruckner Expressway shown on Part 6 – Directive Drawing AL-2 and the profiles shown on Indicative Drawings PRO-01 and PRO-02 do not match with the Non-Standard Feature provided in Part 7 of the RFP. The Stopping Sight Distance will be lower than the existing (horizontal and vertical) at the end of Contract 1, so the design cannot be made for the proposed value of the Non-Standard Feature. Please revise the Non-Standard Features for the configuration of Bruckner Expressway at the end of Contract 1.

Answer: This is a temporary condition until Contract 3 is built and therefore, will not need a NSF Justification. (Note: This is the western portion of the contract where we are tying in.)

Question 85:
Based on other recent design-build projects in the area, would NYSDOT allow epoxy or galvanized reinforcement in place of stainless steel reinforcement?

Answer: No, deck reinforcement shall be stainless steel.

Question 86:
Final RFP Part 6 Drawing PED-TYP-01 proposed typical section looking west has a note that states "Amtrak approved barrier (only on side open to tracks) (typ.)" Please provide a typical detail or specification for typical Amtrak approved barrier and clarify this barrier is not the same as Amtrak approved fencing.

Answer: D90047 Part 5 Special Provisions, SP-12 Amtrak Railroad Requirements includes drawing ET-1446-D “Electrified Territory OH Bridges Typical Protection Barrier” that includes details for the barrier, inclusive of the curved protective fence.

Question 87:
As per GN-3 Note 3.2.1 "existing intersection at eastbound Bruckner Boulevard shall be modified to accommodate truck turning from two right turn lanes. . . Reconstruct parapet at CSX Railroad retaining wall as required for the turning radius." GN-7 note 7.6.2 "reconstruct retaining wall and extend parapet along eastbound Bruckner Boulevard to accommodate 15’ sidewalk above in line with the CSX portal." In order to achieve 15’ sidewalk from Bruckner Boulevard through the turning radius on Edgewater, a new structure would be required above the CSX portal. Please clarify if this is the design intent.

Answer: Please refer to Addendum #2.

Question 88:
Reference document - CSX Public Project Manual dated 12-20-2018 - Construction Submission Criteria Section VII. Track Monitoring Note A states "When work being performed has the potential to disrupt the track structure, a work plan must be submitted detailing a track monitoring program which will serve to monitor and detect both horizontal and vertical movement of the CSXT track and roadbed." Please provide CSX track monitoring thresholds for horizontal and vertical movement.

Answer: Per note D of the CSX Public Projects Manual VII. Track Monitoring, “If any movement has occurred as determined by the Engineer, CSXT will be immediately notified…” “Engineer” is defined as “CSXT Engineering Representative or a GEC authorized to act on the behalf of CSXT” in the CSX Public Project Manual. i.e. – thresholds for CSX are determined by CSX representatives in the field or upon receipt of information provided by the field.
Question 89:
Directive Drawing FR-01 calls for Piers ES-7, ES-8, and ES-9 to be Integral Piers. Directive Drawing DET-01 calls for Piers ES-6 and ES-10 to have Integral/Inset Pier Caps. Indicative Plans TYP-04, TYP-05, TYP-9A and WZXS-ES-02 show piers ES-1, ES-5, ES-10 and ES-11 to be Integral Piers. Please provide clarification on where integral Piers are required.

Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 90:
Regarding steel coating of existing steel to remain, please clarify the following:

a. BIN 2075352, EB Bruckner Expressway over Amtrak/CSX: Existing painted steel girders can be reused and new girders will be added for the bridge widening. Do the existing girders need to be repainted, or can painting be limited to touch-up of paint that is damaged during construction? Do the new girders need to be weathering steel? Do they need to be painted?
b. Please confirm that for BINs 1066669 Sheridan Expressway and 1076690 Westchester Ave Exit Ramp the existing steel to remain does not need to be painted except for areas of paint removed or damaged during construction activities.

Answer:

a. The existing girders are weathering steel and are subject to the partial protective coating requirements for weathering steel as specified in section 8.2.1.2 of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual. The new girders shall be weathering steel and are subject to the partial protective coating requirements for weathering steel as specified in section 8.2.1.2 of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual.
b. For BIN 1066669 Sheridan Expressway, painting is not required except any areas that are exposed or damaged during construction activities. For BIN 1076690 Westchester Ave. Exit Ramp, painting requirements are provided in Addendum #3.

Question 91:
Final RFP Part 3 Section 17.3.2.1: Part 3 of the RFP, Section 17.3.2.1, G) states if additional service points are required, NYCDOT-DSL will request new service from Con Edison upon approval of the design. Further, H) states for the Community Area location east of Bronx River Avenue, lighting illumination level required is 1.5 to 2.0fc. The NYCDOT-DSL will not be responsible for the maintenance of this Community Area nor providing power feed from NYCDOT Street Lighting distribution system (not NYCDOT Jurisdiction). The NYSDOT will be responsible for the maintenance of new lighting system installed and hence their standards and requirement for illumination levels to be followed for the location.

Question: Confirm who will be responsible for requesting new service from Con Edison for the NYSDOT lighting area.

Answer: The Design-Builder will be responsible for new service from Con Edison. This will be clarified in future addendum.
Question 92:
Final RFP, Part 3 Section 18.3.6: Part 3 of the RFP, Section 18.3.6 states the CCTV deployment shall consist of furnishing and installing High Definition IP CCTV camera assemblies at one (1) probable location with two cameras (Westbound Bruckner Expressway west of Whitlock Ave) east of the proposed Ramp ES with one camera facing the proposed interchange ramps and one facing Bruckner Expressway. The camera assembly location shall be designed and installed such that the line of sight of the camera is in the center line of the desired field of view when the camera is in the mid-point of the desired motion between the limit stops. The desired field of view is ½ mile in either direction of the roadway. The camera mounting shall be positioned towards the road and shall provide the desired views. The new pole shall be in compliance with NYSDOT standards. The minimum mounting height for the camera assembly on a CCTV pole is 60 ft above the highway.

Question 1) Please provide NYSDOT details and specification for this pole.

Answer: The 60-foot pole will be covered under DOT Item No. 680.170060011. Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 93:
Final RFP, Part 3 Section 18.3.7.2: Part 3 of the RFP, Section 18.3.7.2 states all conduits shall be either hot-dipped Rigid Galvanized Steel (RGS) for overhead connections (670.2003) or PVC-coated Galvanized Steel for underground connections (670.2306). All fittings and conduit bodies shall be of same material as conduit. Typically, PVC-coated Galvanized Steel is called out for exposed installations (as specified in lighting section of RFP), and RGS is called out for underground connections.

Question: Please confirm the RGS is required for overhead connections and PVC-coated Galvanized Steel conduit is required for underground installations as required in 18.3.7.2.

Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 94:
Final RFP Part 7 - Baseline Survey Report: We note that the Baseline Survey Report is Part of the Contract Documents. Understanding that the Proposers and successful Design-Builder have the associated right to rely on the information contained in this Baseline Survey Report we would strongly suggest that the Department have the respective consultant who prepared it Sign and Seal it in accordance with NYS law to assure it was developed to the appropriate Standard of Care. Doing so should minimize the Project’s exposure from any errors associated in the development of this important document.

Answer: The Baseline Survey Report (dated 9/5/2018) is included in Part 7 of the RFP. The Land Surveyor certification is in Section 2(vi) of this report.

Question 95:
Final RFP Addendum #1, SP-13 NYCT Requirements: The Additional Notes state:

3. The contractor to establish a subway walls monitoring program to monitor for vibrations and settlements.

Question: Please clarify exactly what must be monitored in the subway wall monitoring program and the associated thresholds (alert/action levels) required by NYCT on this project.

Answer: D90047 Part 5 Special Provisions, SP-13 New York City Transit Requirements General Notes #5, #10 and #28 describe vibration and movement thresholds. A monitoring plan must be developed and submitted to NYCT for “critical locations”
Question 96:
Final RFP Addendum 1 - Part 5 - SP-13, NYCT General Notes and Indicative Drawings TYP-10 and TYP-11: The NYCT General Note 13 states, "the influence line shall start at the bottom of the subway structure and extend from the 1H:1V to 2H:1V slope depending on the soil properties and ground water table..." Indicative Drawings TYP-10 and TYP-11 show the influence line from the ITR Subway at a fixed 1H:1V. Please confirm the Proposers can use the 1H:1V and please add to the Directive Drawing notes so it is clear to all Proposers and avoids a conflict with the NYCT General Notes.
Answer: This is not confirmed; the Design Builder perform the necessary geotechnical investigations and shall comply with the NYCT requirements. This will be clarified in future addendum.

Question 97:
Final RFP Part 6, Indicative Plans, Drawing No. PRO-8 – The Transition 1 sections provided on this drawing indicate a maximum rollover of 8% (i.e.; +1% SE through the gore to -7% SE on Ramp SE) at SE Sta. 12+00. The Ramp SN & Ramp SE profiles begin to diverge significantly beginning at the proposed abutment near SN Sta. 117+70 through the physical gore near SN Sta. 118+50 at the new Ramp SE bridge over the railroad. A check of the maximum rollover at SN Sta. 118+00 yields approximately 17% based on the SN & SE profile grades, superelevation rates and gore width. Is it the intent of the Department that the maximum rollover be 8% (per HDM 5.7.13 Rollover Exhibit 5-21, Maximum Rollover Rates) through the gore area between SN Sta. 117+70 to SN Sta. 118+50?
Answer: Plans and Profiles for Ramp SN, ES and SE are revised in Addendum #3 and #5.

Question 98:
Final RFP, Part 6 Indicative Plans – Approach to Bruckner Bridges over Railroad: Dwg. No. RP-4 indicates that the Interim Connections for EB Bruckner Boulevard, EB Bruckner Expressway, WB Bruckner Expressway and WB Bruckner Boulevard tie into a proposed approach slab for the bridges over Amtrak/CSX. Directive Notes 7.2.4, 7.2.5, 7.3.4 and 7.3.5 on Dwg. No GN-6 clarified in Addendum No. 1 that the Interim Connections are to be constructed with full depth HMA from the begin of the Bruckner construction to the west approach slab of the bridges over Amtrak/CSX. However, Dwg. No. TYP-15 shows constructing full depth HMA to the backwall of the bridges over Amtrak/CSX. Is it the intent of the Department to construct full depth HMA to the backwall of the bridges over Amtrak/CSX?
Answer: Yes, TYP-15 is correct and applies to the western approach only, no approach slabs will be required on the western approach to Bruckner Bridges over railroad. Please refer to Dwg RP-4 in Addendum #3.

Question 99:
Final RFP Part 6, RFP Plans, Directive Note 3.3.5, TYP-07: The referenced note states – ‘North of Westbound Bruckner Boulevard from Sta. ES 23+70 to ES 26+00, the area directly below Ramp ES shall be fenced with eight-foot high chain link fence on both sides. The fenced area shall be paved, section to include ....’ . Typical Section 7-7, Drawing No. Typ-07, at approximate Sta. ES 23+70 illustrates a paved Service Road with a 12'-0” minimum paved width. This is inconsistent with the Directive Note as stated above and the pavement hatching in the CADD files for the Indicative Plans, which show paving between the outer limits of Ramp ES. Is it the intent of the Department to update Typical Section 7-7 to match the directive note? i.e. to show paving between the outer limits of Ramp ES with fencing?
Answer: Paving will be to the outer limits of Ramp ES from Westbound Bruckner Blvd (ES 23+70 to ES 27+00 and SE 14+20). TYP-07 was revised in Addendum #3.
**Question 100:**
ITP Form BB identifies a 5% bid bond. The New York State DOT Standard Specifications under Section 102-6 provide the bid bond should be 25%. What is the correct bid bond percentage?

**Answer:** Since this is a Design Build project, DB Section 100 applies. According to DB 102-06 the bid bond is 5% which is also shown in DB 102-15 Sample Form of Bid Bond.

**Question 101:**
Part 5 Special Provisions provides details related to the insurance provided by the different rail companies operating on the track adjacent to almost the entire project. Insurance carriers have asked for daily track activity to help them underwrite this exposure. They want to know the exposure of freight trains and passenger trains. Is this information available or can it be requested and provided?

**Answer:** There was a Train Survey, included in the reference documents. The proposer(s) could also review publicly posted Amtrak/MTA schedules for additional information. Ref Doc: CSX Train Survey_20190124

**Question 102:**
Part 5 Special Provisions Exhibit C details the insurance requirements for Amtrak. Does Amtrak want their own dedicated annual $5M-$10M policy or can that policy be for Amtrak, CSX and the MTA?

**Answer:** All Railroads shall have a dedicated policy.

**Question 103:**
Part 5 Special Provisions Exhibit C on professional liability insurance asks for annual policy limits. Because of the scope of this project, it is highly likely that project specific professional liability insurance will be purchased and that insurance covers the project terms and does not reinstate annually. Amtrak has to be advised that their professional liability requirements conflict with the overall contract requirements for professional liability insurance as their requirements are drafted for companies who have annually renewals of their corporate/master professional programs that most likely will not be used on this project.

**Answer:** Refer to Special Provision 12 Exhibit D (Part 5 Special Provisions), for the Professional Liability Insurance requirements for the project terms which include “at least 3 years following completion of all services”.

**Question 104:**
Part 5 Special Provisions Exhibit C and Exhibit D limits of professional liability conflict. Exhibit C says $2M and Exhibit D says $5M. What is the correct limit required?

**Answer:** Exhibit D contains project specific certificate of insurance requirements for Protective Liability, which governs, and requires $5M per claim and $5M annual aggregate. As information, Special Provision 12 (Part 5 Special Provisions “1. Work on Property Owned by Amtrak - Amtrak Temporary Permit to Enter – Design Builder shall execute latest version of Amtrak’s Temporary Permit to Enter to work on property owned by Amtrak. Sample Documents are included in this Specification.” Exhibit C is a sample of a Temporary Permit to Enter and includes general information for insurance.
Question 105:
Part 5 Special Provisions Special Notes on Railroads indicate the MTA requires a railroad protective insurance policy with limits of $2M/$6M. MTA's says the policy of RRP will be taken out "singularly". Does that mean that the MTA requires their own dedicated RRP with limits of $2M/$6M and renew annually?

Answer: All Railroads shall have a dedicated policy.

Question 106:
Part 4 Utility Requirements makes references to Con Edison specifications and EO drawings for all Con Edison items be provided as a reference documents as discussed at the utility meeting?

Answer: Con Edison has provided specifications and EO's which are relevant to this project. These are posted as reference documents.

Question 107:
Addendum #1 included revisions to section 20.3.1 of Part 3 of the RFP. The text stating “Full Depth HMA or PCC shoulder at the Design Builder’s option” has been crossed out. However, section 20.3.2 (Mainline and Ramp Pavement on Subgrade) still includes the following text “New/reconstructed mainline and ramp permanent pavement on subgrade shall consist of Portland cement concrete pavement structure for all travel lanes and a full depth asphalt or PCC shoulder that meets or exceeds the following characteristics.” Please clarify whether a full depth asphalt shoulder is permitted in light of the revised version of section 20.3.1.

Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 108:
Directive note 3.2.16 calls for existing PCC pavement on Edgewater Road to be milled and overlaid between Stations EW 9+80 to EW 27+00. However, according to Google Street view, this roadway has an asphalt top course and is likely standard NYC composite pavement. Please clarify if intent is to just mill and overlay asphalt pavement on Edgewater road within these limits.

Answer: Correct, the intent is to mill and overlay Edgewater road within the limits shown on the Directive Notes.

Question 109:
Part 6, Indicative Plans (GP-9) and Acquisition Plans
The Indicative General Plans (GP-9) show a proposed driveway connecting from Parcel 61 to Garrison Avenue. Please confirm that this driveway is required to be constructed by the design builder and provide the specific requirements for this driveway.

Answer: This driveway is required to be constructed by the design-builder, requirements to meet NYSDOT HDM Chapter 5, for commercial driveways and the 608 Standard Sheets.
Question 110:
Record Plans_D258775_ITS Contract 2002

Reviewing the reference document titled “Record Plans_D258775_ITS Contract 2002” it appears the existing distribution and backbone cables are spliced near Bryant Avenue and approximately 4000 feet away north of Westchester Avenue. Considering the existing distribution and backbone may be impacted by the structural work on Ramp SS. Question: are additional new splice locations allowed in the distribution and backbone cables?
Answer: All splicing shall be done in accordance with applicable codes.

Question 111:
Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 16.3.2.1

Reviewing the RFP, there is limited discussion of the existing bascule bridge along Bruckner Blvd. and Bruckner Expressway. Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 16.3.2.1 indicates two overhead gantries on either side of the bridge shall be removed. Reviewing available as-built plans and historical photos, these gantries once supported traffic signal heads, and downstream gates used to exist. It is understood the bridge no longer moves and is not included in this contract.

Question: Please confirm the requirements of Chapter 4J. Traffic Control for Movable Bridges in the National MUTCD and NYS Supplement are not applicable to this contract, and no additional conduits need to be considered for potential future work.
Answer: Traffic Control for Movable Bridges in the National MUTCD and NYS Supplement are not applicable to this contract.

Question 112:
Final RFP Part 3 Section 14.3 - Painting Requirements for Superstructure Steel

RFP Part 3, 14.3.1.M states: “Superstructure steel shall be ASTM A709 Grade 50W, except for the new steel associated with the Bronx River Bridge widening at BIN 107819, as that steel will be painted. Uncoated weathering steel beams embedded in integral pier shall be protectively coated for the length of the Beam embedment into the pier plus an additional 12” beyond both sides of the piers.”

RFP Part 3, 14.3.2.C states:“ BIN – Paint all (existing and proposed) structural steel between Pier 1 and Pier 7. All existing steel surfaces shall be cleaned and painted consistent with NYSDOT Standard Specification 573 (Structural Steel Painting: Field Applied - Total Removed). All new structural steel shall be prepared and painted consistent with NYSDOT Standard Specification Section 572 (Structural Steel Painting: Shop Applied). Paint shall be Federal Standard 16515 Canadian Voodoo Gray. These aforementioned two Sections in Part 3 appear to contradict one another. Please confirm all new structural steel superstructure girders, diaphragms and superstructure components (excluding widening and or retrofits of existing bridges components) shall be uncoated weathering steel except for the portions over piers (integral or not) and abutments which shall be painted a protectively coated extending 12” beyond both sides of the substructure element. Please update RFP sections 14.3.1.M and 14.3.2.C and any other Contract Documents to clarify the Departments intent.
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.
Question 113:
Final RFP - Part 6 Directive Drawing FP-06
Based on the girder depth indicated on Directive Drawing FR-06, the minimum superstructure depth including the deck and haunch would be approximately 4.7’. As noted on Indicative Drawing PRO-4 the structure depth is shown as 4.0’. Please clarify what structure depth was assumed for the profile of WB Bruckner Boulevard Bridge over Amtrak/CSX. This question also applies to the EB Bruckner Mainline Bridge over Amtrak/CSX, Directive Drawing FR-08 - Indicative Drawing PRO-2
Answer: Framing plans and Profiles are updated in Addendum #3.

Question 114:
Final RFP, Part 3 and Part 4
Part 3 and Part 4 of the Final RFP do not indicate the allowable outage durations for the 20” and 12” watermains on the Eastbound and Westbound Bruckner Boulevard bridges, respectively. 
Question:
1) Please clarify if long-term outages of these mains will be permitted, the duration of long-term outages allowed along with any time-of-year restrictions, and any restrictions on which watermain must be replaced first.
2) In addition, please clarify if both water mains may be shut down at the same time (concurrent outage).
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 115:
Final RFP
The Final RFP does not provide a duration for design reviews for Amtrak/CSX/MTA. This is a schedule unknown and poses a significant risk with no remedy for all bidders. To mitigate this risk, we suggest NYSDOT define a review period for the three railroads that bidders can rely upon in our schedule and at what stage(s) of the design development submittal process the Railroad review(s) will occur for work impacting/above/adjacent to railroad property.
Answer: Please refer to Addendum 2.

Question 116:
Addendum #1, Part 6, Dwgs. GN-6, GN-7
Notes 7.1.1 and 7.4.3 of the General Notes Sheet states that the existing EB Bruckner Expressway and Boulevard superstructures may be "REPURPOSED/REUSED". During the Final RFP Informational Meeting, NYSDOT stated that the existing superstructures will no longer be re-used as a commitment to Amtrak & CSX acceptance to NYSDOT's directive concept plans in the RFP. Please clarify this directive requirement.
Answer: Notes 7.1.1 and 7.4.3 of the General Notes Sheet are correct.
Question 117:
Addendum #1, Part 3, Section 14.3.1.M
Part 3, Section 14.3.1.M requires that uncoated weathering steel beams embedded in an integral pier shall be protectively coated for the length of the beam embedment into the pier plus an additional 12 inches beyond the pier on both sides. Painting requirements in Section 14.3.2.C apply to BIN 1075819. Section 8.2.1.2 of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual (2017) allows the use of paint or other coating. Please clarify the painting requirements for uncoated weathering steel beams (i.e. primer, full 3-coat paint system, or other).
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 118:
ITP A12.1.6
Please indicate submittal requirements for the required 3D animation, specifically any packaging and organization to be noted in Appendix C, Table C
Answer: The requirements for the 3D animation are listed in ITP Appendix C Section C3.2.3 3D Animation:
As part of their Technical Proposal, the Design-Builder shall submit a 3D animation in Windows Media Video (WMV) format that presents the key elements of their design concept and approach.
Please see Addendum #5 for clarification in Section 25.1.

Question 119:
Part 6, Dwgs. FR-03 and BP-01
Directive Plan FR-03 and BP-01 identify the begin abutment of Ramp SE to be designed as an integral abutment. Based on Section 11.2.1 of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual (2017), it appears that the begin abutment of Ramp SE cannot utilize an integral abutment because it does not meet the following requirement:
- Integral abutments require a single row of cast-in-place concrete piles or steel H-piles (with preference for steel H-piles due to the ductility requirements). The requirement to use integral abutment limits the foundation type options allowed for by the RFP. Based on provided soil boring information, the nearest borings are historic borings X-161 and B-142 (75 to 100 feet away, respectively) that indicate bedrock is between EL +7 and +13, while the existing ground surface at the proposed integral abutment is as low as EL +20. A short pile driven to rock would not provide adequate lateral stability of the abutment. Therefore, drilled shafts may be preferable over steel H-piles.
Please confirm and clarify that the NYSDOT will incorporate the use of a conventional abutment in lieu of the integral abutment specified in the directive design of Ramp SE.
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3 for updated Part 3 Section 14, FR-03, and BP-01.
Question 120:
Final RFP, Part 4
The existing 20" and 12" Water mains are shown to be replaced along the entire length of Bruckner Blvd. (20" along south side, 12" along north side). Therefore, during this replacement, these watermains will need to be completely shut off. During the shutdown period, will a temporary bypass be needed to supplement the water main to feed the hydrants and local businesses. If yes, what size pipe shall be needed in the temporary condition.
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 121:
In addendum #2 issued on February 25, 2019 the procurement and key date schedule was modified on page A-3 of the ITP. The proposal due date was moved three weeks along with the dates for things such as last day for questions, addendums, the date for NYSDOT to respond to ATC's however the ATC submission date was not changed. WE request that NYSDOT extend the final date for proposers to submit ATC's from March 8, 2019 to March 29th. This is especially important given the fact that the 4th one on one date was moved to the week after this submission date.
Answer: This has been revised in Addendum #3.

Question 122:
Addendum #1 included revisions to section 20.3.1 of Part 3 of the RFP. The text stating “Full Depth HMA or PCC shoulder at the Design Builder’s option” has been crossed out. However, section 20.3.2 (Mainline and Ramp Pavement on Subgrade) still includes the following text “New/reconstructed mainline and ramp permanent pavement on subgrade shall consist of Portland cement concrete pavement structure for all travel lanes and a full depth asphalt or PCC shoulder that meets or exceeds the following characteristics:”. Please clarify whether a full depth asphalt shoulder is permitted in light of the revised version of section 20.3.1.
Answer: Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question 123:
Final RFP - Part 6 Directive Drawing FP-06
Based on the girder depth indicated on Directive Drawing FR-06, the minimum superstructure depth including the deck and haunch would be approximately 4.7’ . As noted on Indictive Drawing PRO-4 the structure depth is shown as 4.0’ Please clarify what structure depth was assumed for the profile of WB Bruckner Boulevard Bridge over Amtrak/CSX. This question also applies to the EB Bruckner Mainline Bridge over Amtrak/CSX, Directive Drawing FR-08 - Indictive Drawing PRO-2
Answer: Framing plans and Profiles are updated in Addendum #3.
Question 124:
Final RFP, Addendum #2, Page A-3
In Addendum 2, several procurement dates shifted. One exception is the Final Date for Proposers to submit ATCs (March 8th, 2019). The 4th One-One meeting now falls later than the final date to submit ATCs. The "Issue Date for Final Addendum", "Final date for Proposers to respond to conditional approval of ATC’s" and "Issue date for Answers to Proposers Questions" are one-two weeks prior to the Bid Date of May 8th, 2019.

Question: Please confirm that the Final ATC submission date will be shifted later via future Addendum to extend the ATC submission period later than the 4th One-One.

Answer: This was revised in Addendum #3.