

# Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001

## RFP Questions and Answers

### Questions 1- 42

1. Will the CADD alignment files (i.e., files with the \*.alg extension) that correspond to the alignments shown on preliminary plans in the project design reports be provided to the Proposers?

**Answer:** Yes, these files have been posted.

2. In both the Draft RFP and Final RFP versions of Form WPS, there exists a Work Item for "Demolish and Construct USGS Gaging Station" on each Structure (BIN) except for BIN 1020079. What is this Work Item, or was it input by mistake?

**Answer:** The input is a mistake. It will be corrected via an amendment. Please note, so as to not delay your work on these sheets, the WPS for BIN 1020079 is correct, so all other BINS will replicate that BIN WPS. The amendment will also correct the erroneous placement of the "fixed" percentages at the bottom of the WPS sheets.

3. Do you have a sample of the Form G - Gantt Chart that has been filled out? This chart is new to us and is rather confusing and we want to make sure we are providing the detail that the NYSTA is looking for.

**Answer:** Yes, one will be posted as a reference document

4. The forms contain a number of track changes. Some of them seem as though they can simply be accepted, however, others look as though they still need to be addressed by the Authority.

For example:

- On Form PEB, there is a track change that states "to be revised".
- Form SA includes track changes that says "update stipend amount," "update PIN," and "Insert Contract No."
- Form SCD includes a track change that appears to be for the reviewer ("Review for interim milestones and impacts to traffic criteria; be sure part 3 is consistent) and others that say "Table SCD-2 to be included as appropriate; if no Interim Completion Milestone is to be included in the project, then delete." and includes further track changes in the Notes on the second page that seem as though they need to be addressed by the Authority.
- Form SP includes a track change that says "Verify Force Account Amount"
- Form WPS includes a track change that says "Revise based on Payment Schedule in Part 3"

Question: Will the Authority be issuing new forms that have addressed the track changes, and that include no further track changes?

**Answer:** These are comments for those that are putting together the RFP. Instructions so things are not missed in the RFP. They have no relevance to the Final RFP and should be ignored. Proposers should have received a clean copy and they should not have been available for viewing. A new version shall be posted.

5. Initial Baseline Progress Schedule - 3 pages is not sufficient UNLESS expectation is only summary level detail Form G – Gantt Chart...the current 4 page limit should be sufficient IF bulleted items in C4.3 is essentially only "level" of detail Authority desires

**Answer:** An example of the filled out Gantt chart will be posted as a reference document. If further expansion of the # of pages is necessary, please request such.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

6. Any general comments by Authority relative to time / schedule / project duration?

**Answer:** No

7. Are ATC required to be submitted in the Design Builders proposal?

**Answer:** Yes, if the proposer is utilizing the approved ATC – see Appendix C Section 3.2.1.

8. Can project limits be further clarified?

**Answer:** Project limits are set by the Design-Build Team. It is essentially the work limits for profile and transition of highway work to meet existing pavement within the required design standards. If elements continue beyond those project limits that begin within the project limits such as guiderail, those elements require addressing but do not extend the project limits. This will be clarified in the RFP by amendment.

9. Contract Documents Part 3 – Project Requirements: What is the Authority’s guideline or project requirement when differing guiderail treatments exist on either side of I-90 prior to bridge replacement? For example, should the existing guiderail be replaced in kind or a specific uniform type be installed? (i.e. W-beam or Box Beam). If a specific type is to be uniformly used on each side, which type is preferred?

**Answer:** No, not in-kind replacement. The Design-Builder must use the current Authority standards for replacement of guiderail and/or bridge railing. This will be further clarified by amendment.

10. Contract Documents Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 6.2.3 Right-of-Way Markers: The Final RFP states “The Design-Builder shall monument all Permanent Easements and FEE acquisitions and provide new ROW markers for missing ROW markers with similar concrete monuments at that bridge site in accordance with the Authority Standard sheets, Highway Design Manual, and NYSDOT ROW Mapping Procedure Manual. Since there are no anticipated ROW acquisitions (FEE or PE), please clarify the intent.

**Answer:** Should the Design-Builder find that ROW Markers are not on site and the location warrants a ROW modal as per the HDM/Authority standards/and NYSDOT ROW mapping procedure manual than the Design-Builder shall provide and install the same type of markers that exist there. This applies whether a ROW fee or permanent easement were part of the process or not.

11. Mohawk Street is also NY State Route 28. Will the design plans need to have a coordinated plan review with NYSDOT Region 2?

**Answer:** No

12. Contract Documents Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 15.3.5 Closure Restrictions for BIN 1020079: Is the requirement to maintain 2 travel lanes southbound to be interpreted as the 1 southbound through-lane and the 1 left turn-lane?

**Answer:** Yes, this will be further clarified by amendment.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

13. Oriskany Boulevard is also NY State Route 69. Will the design plans need to have a coordinated plan review with NYSDOT Region 2?

**Answer:** No

14. The RFP states that 6-foot shoulders are required for Oriskany Blvd (below the Thwy). Does the proposed design have to build out these widths (which would create awkward transitions into the unreconstructed areas) or can we just create a typical section that accommodates this width at a later date?

**Answer:** No, this data is based on the functional classification, volume, design speed, etc. for ETC+ 30 and since the bridges are required to have a service life of 75 years or more, it enables the reconstruction of the road in future years without the Thruway Bridge imposing restrictions from these standards.

15. With regard to the Mohawk floodwall comment/question, who has jurisdiction on structure and are as-built available?

**Answer:** DEC has jurisdiction. The record plans have been posted.

16. Also at the Mohawk floodwall, Is it acceptable to modify the floodwall as long as the integrity is maintained throughout construction and final configuration satisfies RFP requirements?

**Answer:** No, do not touch the floodwall. It needs to remain as is, as DEC plans to inspect the system immediately after completion. Damaging the existing system violates the condition of the RFP. The Design-Builder will be solely responsible for repairs and if the system is compromised, the Design-Builder owns the problem and costs and delays associated with it. However, the RFP does state the new wingwall configuration has to tie into the wall at an elevation higher than the existing wall.

17. Can we make contact with utilities and NYSDOT? – Do we need to notify the NYSTA if we do?

**Answer:** No, Design-Builders must ask the Authority for initial contact and the Authority will participate. After such contact, the Design-Builder is welcome to follow-up with the utility on their own. No, the Design-Builder can not contact NYSDOT. Work through the Authority.

18. At Miller's Grove Bridge, is it required in the RFP that the 'gap' between the bridges be filled in.

**Answer:** No, there is no such requirement.

19. At the Bear Trap Creek Bridge, does the NYSTA have a preference leaving the existing bottom slab in place or not?

**Answer:** The RFP requires the removal of all super structure and in this case the entire substructure.

20. Will further Utility Meeting's be coordinated by NYSTA with the potentially impacted Utilities?

**Answer:** The Design-Builder is responsible to identify where they believe conflicts exist other than the Electrical line at Oriskany (where the first utility meeting was conducted). Once justified, the Authority will coordinate the meeting with the utility owner at the site or in the Authority office (Design-Builder's choice). After the initial meeting, the

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

Design-Builders are free to contact the utility owner on their own. If multiple proposers have the same concern about a utility at a particular site then the meeting will be a group meeting of all concerned, similar to what occurred at Oriskany. These issues should be identified as soon as practical. Provide the utility owner and the bridge site location (MP) to the Authority's designated representative.

21. When is the Design Builder cleared to communicate with the Third Party Utilities as conflicts appear likely?

**Answer:** See answer to question 20.

22. Is the Thruway waiting for the design builder to provide a design before they move their fiber optic?

**Answer:** Per the final RFP it is intended to move the fiber optic lines at the three (3) bridges prior to the Notice to Proceed to locations as stated in Part 4 – Utilities.

23. Will Army Corps be involved in concept and design approval? Engaged prior to RFP Response?

**Answer:** No.

24. Clarify intent and scoring importance of the Aesthetics?

**Answer:** No different then what was explained at the draft informational meeting. It is part of technical submission evaluation. There is no separate weighting. The Design-Builder should be creative and innovative. The Authority just does not want to see flat, bland concrete surfaces. It could also involve shapes of substructures, color, etc. The flat concrete surfaces need to be enhanced.

25. Why is every bridge to look different?

**Answer:** The Authority wants it this way. It is a required and failure to do so may result in the proposal being declared non-responsive.

26. Aesthetics requirements continue to cause confusion on our part. A12.1.2.2 implies that formliners are desired but 10.3.2 indicates a lower standard.

i. 10.3.2 - Aesthetics treatments may include form lines, or other creative methods (i.e. recessed panels) to introduce distinctive Aesthetic enhancements on wingwalls, abutment stems, piers, and concrete parapets/barriers.

ii. A12.1.2.2 - The use of formliners or other means to produce attractive, other than flat concrete surfaces is necessary.

**Answer:** There is no indication that formliners are required. Formliners are not required, they were used as an example as was the recessed panel. The Design-Builder should use their judgement and be creative.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

27. Are treatments required on the traffic side of concrete bridge barrier? The standards for prescription and do not appear to give flexibility for form liners, form lines, or essed panels, and they are generally light color for visibility.

**Answer:** Treatments are not required on traffic side of the concrete barrier. The rest of the question is confusing. There is no prescription at all, just the requirement to provide aesthetic treatments. See the Final RFP. Some clarification will be provided in the amendment.

28. There is conflicting information between the RFP and the FDR. We assume that the RFP governs and that items in the FDR such as showing a future lane where the existing piers are located can be ignored. Is this correct?

**Answer:** The RFP governs. However, the RFP needs modification via amendment to addresses this issue. The Design Reports are reference documents.

29. FDR states minimum and desired lane / shoulder widths whereas the RFP generally shows the desired as required. Is this directive or can the minimum widths in the standards be used?

**Answer:** The RFP governs unless an ATC is presented with proper justification and subsequently approved. The RFP governs. The Design Reports are reference documents and reference documents are not part of these contracts.

30. Where bridge shoulder widening is required, how far on the approach highway does this widening need to be carried?

**Answer:** Standard taper lengths.

31. In RFP Part 3, Section 1.10 it is stated that "CADD formatting for Design and As-Built Plans shall conform to the Authority's CADD Drafting Standards and CADD Design Standards in effect on the Proposal due date." In section 5.3.3 it is stated that "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for ensuring that information submitted is compatible with the applicable NYSDOT/NYSTA CADD standards, software and operating systems and formats." Please clarify which standards apply and provide a link to those standards.

**Answer:** The Authority does not have an independent Set of Standards for CADD. When you see NYSDOT/NYSTA or NYSTA/NYSDOT, it generally implies that they are one of the same. In other words, the Authority uses what NYSDOT uses.

32. In RFP Part 3, Section 1.5 – Design Codes and Manuals, the NYSDOT Bridge Manual is listed but the NYSTA Structures Design Manual is not listed. Is it the Authority's intent that the requirements of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual will govern on this project rather than the NYSTA Structures Design Manual?

**Answer:** Yes, we will be using the NYSDOT Bridge Manual, with the exceptions as noted (if any) in the Part 3 requirements.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

33. In addition to the long-term (15 day) lane restrictions, are daily off-peak restrictions allowed?

**Answer:** This particular wording in the RFP seems to have created a bit of confusion, which means that it needs to be reworded. Much of the discussions were all over the place. The general intent of the of the 15 days is to limit the erection of barrier at the beginning of job and leaving it in place for the duration of all the work. It is the Authority's belief that this will create issues and require modifications creating conflicts, which the Authority wishes to avoid. The RFP will be modified via amendment to clarify.

34. For the 15-day lane restrictions, can the time be split up (e.g., 5 days for demo at the beginning of the phase and 10 days later on during reconstruction?

**Answer:** Yes, the time can be split up, but see the answer to Question 33.

35. What responsibility, if any, does the Proposer have during construction to assure that the construction operations do not interfere with the function of the flood control section. Not only as this applies to the actual structure, but also as it applies to having a portion of the abutment removed and thus eliminating the benefit of the floodwall itself?

**Answer:** Your question implies that there is a requirement in the contract/RFP that states, "The contractor shall maintain flood control measures". That is not the case; the contractor does not have to provide that control during construction.

36. Can NYSTA provide the hydrologic/hydraulic model for Bear Trap Creek? This will avoid a lot of questions.

**Answer:** This was posted on 09/17/2017 in the reference documents.

37. Table 3-1 in the RFP provides the NYSDEC Article 15 Stream Classification and Allowable Work Periods. Are the dates in the RFP derived from an MOU between the NYSDEC and NYSTA? Can the proposer base their construction schedule on the allowable work periods anticipated from the NYSDEC through an individual permit?

**Answer:** The requirements of Table 3-1 are standard from DEC. This is a requirement so no, the Design-Builder cannot base their construction schedule on the allowable work periods anticipated from DEC. DEC provided the requirement stated in the RFP.

38. Section 18.3.3 refers to "Authority Standards" for new barrier systems. Does the NYSTA have their own standards or do the NYSDOT standards apply?

**Answer:** In the RFP, it states that if conflicting codes, standards, etc., then the more restrictive applies. See Part 3, Section 1.

39. The RFP states that there is a 3 page limit for the CPM (based on 11x17 paper and minimum 8 font). With the Project's multiple Bridge sites and necessary work activities that are required to properly develop this CPM for submission with our Proposal, would the Authority consider changing the CPM page limit to 4 pages (based on 11x17 paper and minimum 8 font)?

**Answer:** The Authority will change the allowable page limit to six (6) pages. This will be done via an amendment.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

40. The required Narratives that need to be written have a maximum number of pages that can be submitted, as stated in the RFP. We feel that with the number of structures included in the project there may be a need to include one or two more pages in certain Narratives to effectively cover each of the structures. Will the Authority allow one or two additional pages in Narratives included with our Proposal?

**Answer:** There has to be standardization for all proposers so we don't allow proposers to choose how many pages for each quality factor. The Authority will consider adding pages. We will provide such direction in the next amendment.

41. Form SCD – Specific Defined Completion Milestones; Contract Documents Part 5 – Special Provisions, SP-6.1 Payment Reductions and Liquidated Damages: Would the Authority please clarify what constitutes the start for duration / defined completion milestones at BINS 5512980 & 5512790. If staged construction is proposed & one-way alternating lane of traffic maintained throughout construction, how is duration to be proposed? If temporary lane closures are utilized, prior to closure of these bridges, with flagging operation to collect field data for design (i.e. geotechnical borings) is this time to be included in the duration?

**Answer:** Yes, this section needs modification in the RFP. In a nutshell, although the RFP will expand upon this explanation, when closing the structures and utilizing the detours the duration begins on the physical closure date (when barrier is erected and the detour is in effect). The closure period ends when the barrier is removed and the detour signs are covered/removed permanently. For staged construction, the duration begins when the alternating one-way traffic is activated (via signal etc.) and ends when both lanes of traffic are operational and the signal is deactivated. In both instances temporary lane closures are allowed for obtaining engineering data, investigatory work, sign erection, sign uncovering. However, this work shall only be conducted between the hours of 9AM–3PM each day (if so chosen). Whether closure or staged construction the duration shall be entered on Form SCD.

42. Contract Documents Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 15.3.5 Closure Restrictions for BIN 1020079: We assume “reductions” essentially means temporary elimination of 1 northbound lane. Are reduced lane widths and / or shoulder widths to be interpreted as “reductions”?

**Answer:** For both BIN 1020079 and BIN 5009929 there appears to be confusion. The RFP states the following for BIN 1020079:

For BIN 1020079, on Mohawk Street 2 travel lanes southbound and 1 travel lane northbound shall be maintained as a minimum during construction. These reductions can last no longer than 15 calendar days total, for work to remove and replace eastbound mainline structures of BIN 1020079 and 15 calendar days total, for work to remove and replace westbound mainline structures of BIN 1020079. The left turn signal must be maintained.

This will be modified via amendment and the time allotted will double essentially, as the change. The times of the reductions can be split but the overall number of calendar days shall be limited to 30 days for eastbound and 30 days for westbound or 60 total days. That will be the requirement of the RFP. The 2 travel lanes southbound (are for

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 1- 42**

the left turn lanes) and the 1 travel lane northbound is restricted to 30 and 30 or 60 total days.

The required lane widths during construction for the BIN 1020079 is found in Part 3 Section 15.3.6. Those restrictions are not associated with the 30/30 or 60 day total.

The same explanation applies to BIN 5009929. The RFP states:

For BIN 5009929, on Oriskany Blvd. 1 lane in each direction shall be maintained during construction. These reductions can last no longer than 15 calendar days total, for work to remove and replace eastbound mainline structures of BIN 5009929 and 15 calendar days total, for work to remove and replace westbound mainline structures of BIN 5009929.

The time duration will also change to 30 days eastbound and 30 days westbound or a total of 60 days. This will be clarified and revised in the next amendment.