

<b>RFP Questions/Responses</b>	
<b>#1</b>	<p>Question: Page 3 indicates that the project is being funded with a Roc the Riverway Grant administered through NYSDOT and page 8 indicates that the design shall be progressed in accordance with the current version of the LAFAP manual. Please confirm if NYSDOT will be participating in the reviews/approvals of the various project submittals as this will affect our proposed schedule and budget.</p> <p><b>Response: NYSDOT is administering this particular ROC The Riverway grant for this project and thus is required to conform to the process outlined in the LAFAP manual for (ie. design reports).</b></p>
<b>#2</b>	<p>Question: Also, per the above please confirm that a preparation of design approval document is not required by NYSDOT for this project. The various scope items in the RFP all show preliminary design as “not in contract”. Typically for a project following LAFAP rules under NYSDOT administration some sort of approval document would be required even for an element specific rehab such as this (albeit a simplified FDR). Also, section 6 on page 14 and section 7a on page 15 both allude to an IPP/FDR having been prepared. If this is the case, can we get a copy of this document?</p> <p><b>Response: The IPP has been provided on the RFP Website along with the 2010 study. The IPP/FDR will be prepared by the consultant and will serve as the scoping report and the design approval document. Please refer to NYSDOT Project Development Manual for additional information. Per the Project Development Manual, For simple projects, activities may occur during the Scoping Stage and Design Phase I, however, separate reports are not required and the appropriate documentation will be included in the Initial Project Proposal/Final Design Report.</b></p>
<b>#3</b>	<p>Question: From the 2010 Study, six recommendations were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reconstruct West abutment</li> <li>2) Reconstruct East abutment</li> <li>3) Remove existing timber railroad ties</li> <li>4) Various steel repairs</li> <li>5) Add scour protection</li> <li>6) New bridge deck and railings</li> </ol> <p>Has anything been done toward addressing any of these ? I’m guessing no but wanted to be sure.</p> <p><b>Response: No work has been performed to stabilize the existing bridge since the 2010 study.</b></p>
<b>#4</b>	<p>Question: Is there any ability for us to get access from on top and/or below ? I believe the east side is where the missing spans are so no go there. The west side has a corridor that extends below the St Paul bridge would be possible.</p> <p><b>Response: The missing spans occur on the west end of the bridge. At one point the bridge was able to be accessed from the east (St. Paul) side. The current condition of access at the east side is unknown. Consultants should be prepared to provide equipment necessary to access the bridge.</b></p>

#5	Question: Does the City own the ROW on both sides of the river that are planned for the trail extension phase ? It appears yes by there are encroachments on the west side.
<b>Response: The City has ownership of the adjacent railroad corridor that is proposed as a extension o the El Camino Trail in a future phase.</b>	
#6	Question: Indicated in the RFP that Part I-V shall be provided by the Consultant, however, Page 9 indicates that Parts I-III are not in the contract for this RFP. The intended scope appears to be Part IV (Design Phase V & VI) to include Bidding and Construction Services only. However, further in the RFP as shown in the Draft Scope of Services (pg 13-24 of the RFP) indicates a larger Scope of Services. Please clarify.
<b>Response: The City of Rochester's Bridge RFP template contains some boilerplate language describing that consultants shall provide Reports, Plans, and estimates described in Parts 1-5. On page 9 (item #4) it further clarifies which Parts are included in the scope of this project. This project is has been authorized by NYSDOT to proceed as a "simplified" project, and therefore formal reports are <u>not</u> required for scoping, preliminary design, etc., although there is still an abbreviated portion of that scope must still be performed as a part of Part IV.</b>	
#7	Question: General Bridge improvements as listed in Section A (Pg 10) of the RFP outlines the scope of engineering to stabilize the existing structure. The anticipated scope is defined as the Design Phase V&VI to stabilize the existing substructure & what structure remains in place currently, correct? Therefore, we are assuming that there is no design requirements for replacement of the missing Spans 1 and parts of Span 2 truss sections at this time? Is this a correct assumption? We are assuming that will be part of the design/construction for the deck and surface improvements? Assume that \$500K is for the existing frame only? Please clarify.
<b>Response: The objective of this project is to stabilize the existing structure as is, and halt further deterioration.</b>	
#8	Question: All proposed designs to stabilize the existing structure (currently in place) are anticipated to be based on past data, studies, surveys and inspections which were completed roughly 9-10 years ago. The current scope of services (Design V & VI) does not anticipate additional inspections, studies or surveys needed to review the current condition of the bridge structure or anticipated to be included in the overall fee of \$500K? It is assumed that the only inspection required within the overall fee would be for Special Inspection on any steel renovations on the existing bridge structure for the proposed stabilization. Is this a correct statement?
<b>Response: As noted on page 15 of the RFP, the consultant is to perform an in-depth bridge inspection to confirm the findings of the 2010 bridge inspection. Any additional survey deemed necessary for the project should be performed as described on page 14. Any adjustments to the scope are to be documented in the IPP/FDR prepared by the consultant.</b>	
#9	Question: I know there is no pre-proposal meeting scheduled, however, is there any way to access an area to safely view the current condition of the bridge? Both abutments have a lot of overgrown brush making it difficult to even view the existing structure.
<b>Response: The 2010 bridge inspection has been provided on the City's website to provide an understanding of the condition. Methods of access should be a part of the consultants proposal for the project.</b>	
#10	Question: Has all of the funding been put in place for the renovation? It appears that the funding is coming through NYSDOT? Past feasibility studies indicated the cost to be \$2.6M, when is the next phase anticipated to restore/replace the decking/railings? Will it be the same source of funding?
<b>Response: Funding has not yet been secured for the next phase of the project.</b>	