

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 52-61**

52. (5) CONTRACT DOCUMENTS PART 2 – GENERAL PROVISIONS, DB 107-21.2 Restoration of Disturbed Areas Within the ROW & DB 109-11.3 Project Completion

Are mainline crossovers to be considered temporary and therefore required to be removed along with associated restoration under this Contract Work before Project Completion?

**Answer:** This is the Design-Builder's option to leave or remove. Understand, if the crossovers stay, there are implications in treating them as permanent, impervious surfaces for the long term, additional maintenance requirements for the Authority etc. etc. are just a few items that would have to be addressed.

53. (6) In follow-up to Q&A #43, please confirm then if the Design-Builder and its Lead Geotechnical Engineer will not consult the "Regional Geotechnical Engineer" to obtain the *Mr* value as stated in the NYS Comprehensive Pavement Design Manual?

**Answer:** That is correct, your lead Geotechnical Engineer will provide the *Mr* value and someone from your organization will check (per your quality control plan) and we will do Quality Assurance Oversight. There will have to be engineering based logic and rational procedures for its determination, just like everything else designed, constructed, etc.

54. The Oriskany Blvd. existing highway section consists of (2) 4' +/- shoulders, (4) 12' +/- travel lanes, and (1) 16' +/- continuous left turn lane, for a total width of 72'. The RFP states that proposed section shall have 12' lane widths and 6' shoulders. Is the RFP intent for the Proposers to reconfigure the existing Oriskany Blvd. section within the project limits to provide (2) 6' shoulders, (4) 12' travel lanes, and (1) 12' continuous left turn lane?

**Answer:** As was mentioned at the draft informational meeting, the purpose of the design criteria for non-Authority Roadways is to provide using the functional classification of the Roadway the requirements for the Roadway for ETC+30. That way the bridge being replaced does not restrict the local entity from meeting design standards in future years. No, the proposers do not have to reconstruct the Roadway to meet those standards. The proposers do have to provide standard tapers and striping alignments if the non-Authority Roadways are altered in anyway. See answer to question 14 previously provided.

55. I noticed that Form G is in both Volume 1 and Volume 2. In the past we have seen NYSDOT eliminate one of the references via addendum. Can you let us know which volume you would like Form G in?

**Answer:** This correction was made from the Draft RFP to the Final RFP and it can be found in the track change version that was posted and also handed out at the One on One meetings. Form G is only required in Volume 2 and found under Appendix C of the ITP.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 52-61**

56. We have the following additional question to ask regarding the D800001 RFP:

- When using an approved ATC, is it acceptable to include in the final proposal only the ATC approval letter and the Form ATC that was submitted seeking approval? Or, are the entire contents of the ATC approval request required to be included with the proposal, i.e. the drawings and any supplemental reference documents?

**Answer:** The entire content of the ATC approval request is to be included meaning the drawing /sketches but not supplemental reference documents i.e. research papers or studies. The ATC approval letter is required.

57. Following-up on today's meeting, we understand the Authority will be initially contacting Buckeye Partners' Right of Way department, and requesting engineering information on behalf of the Project.

As requested in the meeting, it would be important for us to understand:

- (1) relative to additional fills being placed over their facilities during the course of the Work, both increasing existing & the introduction of fills beyond current limits, if, to what extents, and which lines are encased
- (2) if the Authority has any general comments relative to the provided ROW Use Restriction Specification - Revision 5

**Answer:** Initial information was pooled on 11/16/2017. It included lines with casing and the lengths of the casing and profiles of the oil line at the five (5) bridge locations. We will provide additional information as it becomes available, along with Buckeye's contact. If the Authority has any general comments on the ROW use restrictions Specifications – Revision 5 we will provide them. If we cannot obtain Buckeye information relative to fill limits. The Authority will provide direction on that item.

58. Any further restriction documents by Utilities imposed on the Design-Builder (specifically at BIN 5009929 where several services are buried between the curb and existing pier footings on both sides of Oriskany Blvd)?

**Answer:** No further restrictions by any other utilities have been identified.

59. In consideration of the pending addendum to the Final RFP and possible formal engineering review by Buckeye Partners of our technical solutions, we kindly request the Proposal due date be extended by a minimum of 10 days – to Monday, December 18th.

**Answer:** The Authority will consider this request.

**Syracuse Division Bundled Bridges Contract # D800001**  
**RFP Questions and Answers**  
**Questions 52-61**

60. In consideration of the pending addendum to the Final RFP, we kindly request the deadline for questions to the Authority be extended at least 2 days beyond the addendum's issuance.

**Answer:** Any extension of the proposal due date will have an effect on the date of last addendum and the Q&A dates. However, the extension of those dates will follow proportionately as the original dates in the procurement schedule. i.e. If the extension date of the proposals is adjusted 10 days, so would the addendum date and the Q&A date.

The Authority will provide an extension of the proposed due date, addendum date, and the Q&A but the length of the extension is yet to be determined but will be provided in the next addendum. Anticipate no less than a week and no greater than two weeks.

61. Please confirm if Proposer's are authorized to contact Buckeye Partners.

**Answer:** No, not yet. Information was provided to Buckeye (the information is found as a reference document posted 11/22/17). We gave Buckeye this base information based on what was provided in the Design Reports for BINS 5512980, 5512790 and 5510090. The information provides the oil line location with approximate fill levels and additional fill levels anticipated with the new structures. The Authority is asking for their expedited review and approval to move forward with such additional fills. We believe there is enough information for Buckeye to give the Authority a determination. We also believe the results will be positive. The Authority also recognizes that the Proposers design(s) will vary from what has been provided. Once we get the results back, we will provide the general available additional fill requirements. At that point, the contact information will be provided. The reason for the delay in the contact information is based on what we get back 1,2, or all 3 proposers may not need to contact or all 3 may need to contact Buckeye or maybe only a few. If the proposers contact them right now, Buckeye will shut down and progress will halt. If after the general requirements are provided along with the contact information and proposers need a further extension, requests will have to be made.