

## Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

The following Matrix includes NHDOT's response to clarification questions submitted by shortlisted Proposers regarding the RFP for the Memorial Bridge Replacement Project.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
1	Vol. I (ITP)  Vol. II – Book 1 (DB Contract)  Vol. II – Book 1 (DB Contract)	ITP Exhibit B Section 3.2.5  DB Contract Appendix 1  DB Contract Appendix 7	Section 3.2.5 and Exhibit D (Form E) of the ITP state that resumes for the key personnel listed below are to be submitted prior to the July 18, 2011 deadline for approval by NHDOT. As there is some discrepancy between this list of key personnel and the list of key personnel in the Design-Build Contract Appendices (Appendices 1 and 7), can we assume that the ITP is correct and that we are required to submit resumes for approval for only those positions listed below? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Manager</li> <li>• Construction Manager</li> <li>• Design Manager</li> <li>• Safety Manager</li> <li>• Quality Control Administrator</li> <li>• Design Quality Control Manager</li> <li>• Construction Quality Control Manager</li> <li>• Environmental Compliance Manager</li> <li>• Movable Bridge Engineer</li> <li>• Movable Bridge Mechanical Engineer</li> <li>• Movable Bridge Electrical Engineer</li> </ul>	The Key Personnel positions for which information is to be submitted are shown in Appendix 7 of the DB Contract. ITP Form E and the definition in Appendix 1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
2	Vol. II – Book 2 (Tech. Prov.)	Section 7.7.7.1.D (pg. 112-113)	Subparagraph D. requires that the bridge service feeders be extended from the service transformers to the bridge south tower. But subparagraphs P. and Q. require the ENGG and transfer switches to be located under south approach. Is it the intent to run the electric service feeders to the south tower, and then change direction and go back to the location of the transfer switches, or should the electric service feeders simply go directly	Bridge service feeders and the feed from the Emergency Generator should be routed to the ATS. Power from the ATS should be routed to the south tower.
3	Vol. II – Book 2 (Tech. Prov.)	Section 7.7.7.3 (pg. 115)	This section requires use of an inverter duty gear motor, but there is no mention of an auxiliary VFD for this motor. Is it the intent to require use of a VFD to control the auxiliary drive?	<del>The auxiliary motor to be driven by a VFD. (8/2/11)</del> <u>Revised Response (8/8/11):</u> Technical Provision §7.7.7.3 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to specify the auxiliary motor is to be driven by a Flux Vector Drive.
4	Vol. II – Book 2 (Tech. Prov.)	Section 1.5.b (pg. 4)	This section requires a back-up natural gas generator," but Section 7.7.6.1, 4th paragraph, the wording is "two emergency diesel generators." Is diesel or natural gas required?	Technical Provision §1.5.b and §7.7.6.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to indicate two "emergency natural gas generators" are to be placed in the area under the Scott Avenue Bridge.
5	Vol. II – Book 2 (Tech. Prov.)	Section 7.7.6.3.C (pg. 108)	This section requires that trunnion bearings shall be bronze-bushed". Will spherical roller bearings per AASHTO 2007 LRFD Design Specifications for Movable Highway Bridges be acceptable for the main trunnion bearings? This would greatly reduce the size of the span drive motors and machinery and would reduce the future operating and replacement costs.	The RFP will be will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to allow spherical roller bearings that meet <i>2007 AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Specifications</i> . Changes will be made in Technical Provision §7.7.6.3.C and Special Provision §801.2 subsections 1.1.3, 1.2, and 1.3.
6	Vol. II – Book 3 (Spec. Prov.)	SP 801.2, Section 1.1.3, 1.2 and 1.3 (pg. 1-2)	These sections require bronze-bushed bearings. Will spherical roller bearings per AASHTO 2007 LRFD Design Specifications for Movable Highway Bridges be acceptable for the operating drum, pinion, and deflector bearings? This may further reduce the size of the span drive motors and machinery and would reduce the future operating and replacement costs.	Refer to response to Clarification Question 5.
7	Vol. II, Book 3, (Spec. Prov.)	SP 801.3, Section 1.1.3 (pg. 1)	This section requires 1-1/2" diameter operating ropes with a minimum breaking strength of 125 tons. Will smaller operating ropes be acceptable if per AASHTO 2007 LRFD Design Specifications? This may reduce the size of the operating drums and would reduce the future operating and replacement costs.	Special Provision 801.3, §1.1.3 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to indicate the size, strength, and number of ropes need to meet the requirements of the <i>2007 AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Specifications</i> based on the operating loads associated with the design. The prescriptive rope size will removed.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
8	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	Section 9.1.5 (pg. 59)	The Professional liability coverage Section 9.1.5 requires a 10 year Extended Reporting Period. However, later in this section it states that the policy period and the Extended Reporting Period shall not be less than 3 years. This is inconsistent with the 10 year requirement noted earlier. Please clarify what is required noting that a 10-year Extended Reporting Period will add significant cost to the project.	DB Contract §9.1.5 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to require a 3 year Extended Reporting Period.
9	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	Section 9.2.1 (pg. 60)	Under Section 9.2.1 it states "At the option of NHDOT, the insurer shall either reduce or eliminate deductibles. Is this applicable now that the CCIP requirement has been removed?"	DB Contract §9.2.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to delete this option.
10	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	Section 9.2.3.d (pg. 62)	Section 9.2.3 (d) requires notification to NHDOT if limits/coverage have been reduced or modified. Is this applicable now that the CCIP requirement has been removed?"	DB Contract §9.2.3(d) will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to delete this notification requirement.
11	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	§9.1 (pg. 56)	NHDOT requires that it be a Named Insured on the contractor's general liability, auto liability, umbrella liability, pollution liability and professional liability policies. Did the section intend to ask for Additional Insured status versus Named Insured now that the CCIP has been removed?"	DB Contract §9.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to change the "Additional Insured" requirement to "Named Insured".
12	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	§9.1.6.2 (pg. 60)	The insurance requirements state that the builder's risk coverage limit shall be equal to the greater of: a) \$100 million, or b) the probable maximum loss (PML) of the project plus soft cost expense. 1. What should contractors use as the PML value? 2. What should contractors use as the amount of soft cost expense?	1. DB Contract §9.1.6.2 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the probable maximum loss threshold.  2. The soft cost can be assumed to be at \$10M. However, this is not required due to the change noted above.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
13	Vol. II, Book 1, (DB Contract)	§9.2.8 (pg. 63)	<p>Section 9.2.8 Commercial Unavailability of Required Coverages states that NHDOT will consider alternative insurance packages where the contractor, in good faith, is unable to reasonably meet the coverage or terms of coverage requirements in Section 9 Insurance. The following list of items are intended to advise NHDOT of areas where there is the potential to consider alternative insurance coverage or terms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 9.1.1 General Liability requires that the coverage be extended to include design professional errors and omissions. We believe this is unintended in the General Liability section as separate Professional Liability Insurance is required in Section 9.1.5 and would be the appropriate coverage form for this exposure.</li> <li>2. The General Liability section also requires that the contractual liability exclusion in the policy be deleted which may not be achievable with contractor insurance carriers.</li> <li>3. A standard Professional Liability policy will not respond to one Insured suing another Insured. Professional liability policies have cross liability exclusions making this requirement unachievable</li> <li>4. The Builder's Risk coverage has a requirement that no coinsurance will apply. Builders risk policies are generally written with a 100% coinsurance clause in order for the insurable amount to match the completed value</li> <li>5. The Builder's Risk requirements for \$50mm flood and earthquake are per occurrence. Contractor carriers will most likely insist limits, if available at this level, be on an aggregate basis.</li> <li>6. A Builder's Risk policy will generally only cover the actual cost to rebuild plus soft costs expenses. That amount may be less than \$100 million. Carriers may not write a policy for \$100 million if the PML plus soft costs, (insurable value), is less than \$100 million.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. §9.1.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to move to Professional Liability</li> <li>2. The requirements for the General Liability will be modified in Addendum No. 1.</li> <li>3. §9.1.5 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the requirement</li> <li>4. §9.1.6 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the clause.</li> <li>5. §9.1.6.2 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the per occurrence requirement.</li> <li>6. Refer to response to Clarification Question 12.</li> </ol>

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
14	Vol. II, Book 2, (Tech. Prov.)	§2.9.1 (Pg. 15)	Section 2.9.1 requires project office be within one mile of the Project ROW. Can the office be in Kittery?	Yes, the Project Office may be located in Kittery.
15	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP Exhibit B §2 (pg. 1)  ITP Exhibit E (pg. 1)	Section 2 of ITP Exhibit B states “The Technical Proposal shall be limited to an aggregate of 80 pages (if double sided, 40 sheets), plus the executive summary, resumes, appendices and exhibits containing required forms, graphs, matrices, schedule, drawings and other pertinent data.” It is not clear which documents listed in Exhibit E Section B- Proposers Information Certifications & Documents are included in the page count as defined above. Please clarify.	The 80 page limit pertains to the Technical Proposal, which is the content noted in Subsection C of ITP Exhibit E (which refers to Section 4 of ITP Exhibit B). Subsections A, B, and D are not included in the page limitation.
16	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP §4.3.1 (pg. 26) &  ITP Exhibit C §1.1 (pg. 1)	Section 1.1 of ITP Exhibit C references an electronic copy of the price proposal. The ITP Section 4.3.1 does not ask for an electronic copy of the price proposal. Please clarify.	Section 1.1 of Exhibit C will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the reference to electronic copies of the Price Proposal, only hard copies are required.
17	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP Exhibit B §3.2.3 (pg. 4), ITP Exhibit E (pg. 1), and ITP Form C.	Section 3.2.3 of ITP Exhibit B and the language on ITP Form C require that the Proposer and any equity participants fill out Form C and be included with the proposal. ITP Exhibit E implies that Form C is also to be filled out by the Major Participants. Is Form C required to be submitted by the Major Participants if they are not an equity partner?	ITP Form C is to be provided for Equity Participants of a Proposer's team. Major Participants that are not Equity Participants are not required to submit Form C.
18	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP §4.3.2 (pg. 26) & ITP Exhibit E, (pg. 1)	ITP Exhibit E requires the inclusion of the EPD's with the price proposal however ITP Section 4.3.2 provides for the EPD's to be submitted after the Price Proposals. Please revise Exhibit E to remove the requirement of submitting the EPD's with the proposal	ITP Exhibit E will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the requirement for the EPDs to be submitted with the Price Proposal.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
19	Vol. I (ITP)  Vol. II (Book 1)	ITP Form G  DB Contract Attachment 8 to Appendix 14.	Certain M/E components that are required for the lift span are not available domestically. A recent MassDOT lift bridge project was delayed because an FHWA buy America exemption was required. Can a process be established now to request Buy America exemptions in order to avoid potential delay during construction?	Proposers should provide a list of specific items for verification of the applicability of the Buy America provision. The waiver process is about 6 months and unlikely is to be granted.
20	Vol. II (Book 2)	§6.2, Table 6-1 (pg. 64 -65)	Table 6-1 of the <u>Technical Provisions</u> summarizes the anticipated permits needed and their current status. Some of the permits current statuses were not updated to the date of the RFP issuance. Please update the table to the current status and provide copies of any permit applications that have been submitted.	Table 6-1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to provide the updated status.
21	Vol. II (Book 2)  Vol. II (Book 3)	§7.7.2.1 (pg. 103).  §801, Article 1.2 (pg. 1)	Can the <i>1988 AASHTO Movable Bridge Design code</i> be used in lieu of the current <i>AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Code</i> for certain specific items? Specifically the open gears and wire ropes?	No. Use the current <i>AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Specifications</i> .
22	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.14.1 (pg. 147)	Section 7.14.1 of the <u>Technical Provisions</u> requires the Kittery Approach to be designed in accordance with the <i>Maine DOT Bridge Design Guide</i> . The <i>Maine DOT Bridge Design Guide</i> , Section 3.2 states "The Live Load used for the Strength I limit state the Maine Modified Live Load which consists of the standard HL-93 Live Load with a 25% increase in the Design Truck." This load is higher than what is required for the main truss spans and the Scott Ave. approach bridge. Is this increased load required for the Kittery approach bridge design?	§7.14.1 of the <u>Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to waive that requirement of the Maine DOT Bridge Design Guide.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
23	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.2.2.F (pg. 104)	Can a cut sheet of the sidewalk snow removal equipment that determines the sidewalk loading be provided?	The future snow removal equipment could be similar to that shown in the following link: <a href="http://www.holder.on.ca/inst_tractor_c992.html#schematic">http://www.holder.on.ca/inst_tractor_c992.html#schematic</a> . NHDOT established the weight at 10,000 lbs. to account for potential variations with other manufacturers.
24	Vol. II (Book 2)  Vol. II (Book 3)	§7.7.6.3.B (pg. 110)  §801.3, Article 1.1.3, (pg. 1)	Section 7.7.6.3.B of the Technical Provisions requires the operating ropes to be extra-improved-plow steel. <u>Special Provision 801.3</u> , Article 1.1.3 requires the operating ropes to be extra-extra-improved-plow steel. Please clarify.	Consistent with Clarification Question No. 7, <u>Special Provision 801.3</u> , <u>§1.1.3</u> and <u>§7.7.6.3.B of the Technical Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the prescriptive type of steel. The operating ropes need to meet the requirements of the current <i>2007 AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Specifications</i> .
25	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7 (pg. 112)	Please provide clarification for the operational redundancy requirements on the following items: A. Type of “secondary” control system desired B. Number of PLC systems C. Level/type of redundancy to be used for field devices D. Confirm that fully redundant power and control wiring is not required E. Confirm that no redundancy is required for the touch screen interface	A. The secondary control system shall be PLC-based per <u>§7.7.7.2.B of the Tech. Provisions</u> B. Two PLC systems are to be provided per <u>§7.7.7.2.B of the Tech. Provisions</u> . C. <u>§7.7.7.6.D of the Tech. Provisions</u> will modified in Addendum 1 to require field devices to be provided with backup to provide redundancy. D. Fully redundant power and control cable is not required as long as sufficient spare conductors are provided E. Provide a spare touch screen interface.
26	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7 (pg. 112)	There is currently no protection specified for the span in the open position where a limit switch is typically used. Is a limit switch required for span over-travel position sensing/indication?	Yes. <u>§7.7.6.G of the Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to specify that redundant field devices shall be used for nearly closed, fully closed, nearly open fully open and over travel sensing indication.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
27	Vol. II (Book 3)	§810, Sub-Section 26 24 19, Article 2.4 (pg. 6)	The motor starters in the motor control center are specified as circuit breakers. Should they be specified as MCP's (motor circuit protectors)?	Yes. <u>Special Provision 810</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to specify the motor starters to be MCPs.
28	General		Prior indication by the NHDOT was that the electronic files of all 11"x17" drawings issued with the RFP would be made available to the bidders via an ftp site. When are the files expected to be available?	The requested CADD files will be uploaded to an FTP site during the week of 8/02/2011 with some supplemental CADD files provided during the week of 8/8/2011.
29	General		Can copies of the design calculations on which the 2008 and 2011 plan sets were based be made available to the bidders?	Copies of the design calculations associated with the 2008 rehabilitation project are available for review at NHDOT Bridge Design office.
30	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.2.2 (pg. 104) and §7.14 (pg. 147-148)	The advanced notice of additional RFP addendums sent on August 2, 2011 provides vessel collision criteria for the Memorial Bridge, particularly Piers 2 & 3. AASHTO LRFD Specifications Section 3.14.1 requires that "All bridge components in a navigable waterway crossing, located in design water depths not less than 2.0 ft, shall be designed for vessel impact".  Do these criteria apply to Piers 1 & 4? Is there a vessel collision criteria for the Kittery approach piers?	No. The Vessel Collision loading does not apply to Piers 1 & 4 or the Kittery Approach Spans as they are not in the navigable waterway.
31	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7.9 (pg. 116)	What is a "company radio" as referenced in the RFP?	The company radios are handheld radios with both standard and marine bands. It is owner provided.



No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
32	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.2.2 (pg. 104)	AASHTO LRFD would suggest a design wind speed of 105 mph versus the 100 mph specified in the RFP – which speed should we use?	For clarification, <u>Section 7.7.2.2 of the Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to specify the wind load is to be in compliance with the current AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design specifications. The base design wind velocity with the lift span down is 100 mph. The actual wind speed will vary based on project specific characteristics, such as heights, surrounding environment, etc.
33	Vol. II (Book 2)	§6.2.1, Table 6-1	Can all project permit applications for the Maine portion (Maine DEP and Army Corps, etc.) be posted to the project's website for reference use?	Yes, the Maine permits will be provided as Reference Documents when available.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
34	Reference Document	Memorandum of Agreement w/ SHPO, Article 13.	<p>When developing the vibration thresholds and preparing the Vibration Monitoring Plan, the Design-Build Contractor will contract with an individual trained in Historic Architecture or closely related field. The individual will have five years of professional experience as a Building Conservation Specialist and will have successfully completed three building conservation projects where he/she has taken into account the effects of different levels of vibration on historic masonry and frame buildings. The standards cited herein are the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards 62, Fed. Reg. 33, 707 (June 20, 1997/Historic Architecture</i> [<a href="http://www.cr.nps.gov/locallaw/gis/html/quals.html">http://www.cr.nps.gov/locallaw/gis/html/quals.html</a>]). The NHSPO will provide the names and contact information of at least three individuals who would be qualified to perform such services.</p> <p>Can NHDOT provide the names of qualified persons to provide such services, or can the Design-Build teams directly approach SHPO to inquire about qualified individuals?</p>	The Proposers may contact SHPO to acquire the names of qualified persons to provide the required services.
35	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP Exhibit B §3.2.5.1 (pg. 4-5)	When can we expect to receive our letter approving the key personnel submitted on July 18th?	The letter will be provided by August 12, 2011.
36	Reference Document	CADD Files	The "Base ground model" or Digital Terrain Model (DTM) as included by NHDOT in RFP Addendum 8/2/11 appears to be missing. Can this DTM be provided?	The requested CADD files will be uploaded to an FTP site during the week of 8/08/2011.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
37	Reference Document	CADD Files	Profile cut sheets transmitted as part of RFP Addendum 8/2/11 did not include the reference files for the PROFILES (i.e. only borders). Can the profile reference files be provided?	The requested CADD files will be uploaded to an FTP site during the week of 8/08/2011.