

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"> • Project Manager • Construction Manager • Design Manager • Safety Manager • Quality Control Administrator • Design Quality Control Manager • Construction Quality Control Manager • Environmental Compliance Manager • Movable Bridge Engineer • Movable Bridge Mechanical Engineer • Movable Bridge Electrical Engineer 	The Key Personnel positions for which information is 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?	The auxiliary motor to be driven by a VFD. (8/2/11) 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. (8/08/11)
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.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
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 be removed.
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?"	<p>DB Contract §9.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to change the "Additional Insured" requirement to "Named Insured". (8/8/11)</p> <p>Revised Response (8/22/11): Refer to Addendum No. 3 for corrected language.</p>
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"> 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. 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. 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 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 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. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. §9.1.1 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to move to Professional Liability 2. The requirements for the General Liability will be modified in Addendum No. 1. 3. §9.1.5 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the requirement 4. §9.1.6 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the clause. 5. §9.1.6.2 will be modified in Addendum No. 1 to remove the per occurrence requirement. 6. Refer to response to Clarification Question 12.

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)	<u>Section 2</u> 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 <u>Section 4</u> 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)	<u>Section 1.1</u> of ITP Exhibit C references an electronic copy of the price proposal. The <u>ITP Section 4.3.1</u> does not ask for an electronic copy of the price proposal. Please clarify.	<u>Section 1.1</u> 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.	<u>Section 3.2.3</u> of ITP Exhibit B and the language on <u>ITP Form C</u> require that the Proposer and any equity participants fill out <u>Form C</u> and be included with the proposal. <u>ITP Exhibit E</u> implies that <u>Form C</u> is also to be filled out by the Major Participants. Is <u>Form C</u> required to be submitted by the Major Participants if they are not an equity partner?	<u>ITP Form C</u> 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 <u>ITP Section 4.3.2</u> provides for the EPD's to be submitted after the Price Proposals. Please revise <u>Exhibit E</u> to remove the requirement of submitting the EPD's with the proposal	<u>ITP Exhibit E</u> 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?	<p>The future snow removal equipment could be similar to that shown in the following link: http://www.holder.on.ca/inst_tractor_c992.html#schematic. NHDOT established the weight at 10,000 lbs. to account for potential variations with other manufacturers. (8/8/11)</p> <p>Revised Response 8/22/11): The future snow removal equipment could be similar to that shown in the following link: http://www.holder.on.ca/inst_tractor_c992.html#schematic. NHDOT established the weight at 10,000 lbs. to account for potential variations with other manufacturers and inclusion of attachments (plow, sander, dump, etc).</p>
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</u> of the Technical Provisions 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.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
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.
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 updoaded 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 [http://www.cr.nps.gov/locallaw/gis/html/quals.html])</i>. The NNSHPO 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 updoaded to an FTP site during the week of 8/08/2011.
38	Vol. I (ITP)	§4.1.6 (pg. 24)	Section 4.1.6 of the ITP states that "submittals must be bound with all pages in a binder sequentially numbered. Each section, including appendices, exhibits, and forms, must be separately and clearly tabbed." We are assuming the tabs in the technical proposal do not count against the 80 page limit, please confirm?	The tabbed separators do not count as page numbers.
39	Vol. II (Book 1)	Attachment 3 to Appendix 14	NH and ME highway and heavy wage rates are provided in the RFP documents. The heavy rates are incomplete and vary significantly between the states. Please provide wage rates for each state for all applicable trades. Additionally, please provide direction as to how to determine when the different states rates apply during the construction of the project.	<p>The missing trade wage rates are not provided during the procurement phase and must be requested after execution of the DB Contract.</p> <p>The Design-Builder may choose to pay the wage rate for work performed in each of the two counties, in which case the Design-Builder must breakout the payrolls where the work was performed. Otherwise, the Design-Builder may choose to pay the higher wage rate of the two counties for the work performed and will not need to breakout each payroll.</p>
40	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.14.1 (pg. 147)	Section 7.14.1 of the Tech. Provisions states "The piers and abutment for the Kittery Approach Spans shall be founded on bedrock". Would steel piling driven to bedrock satisfy this requirement at the abutments?	Yes, piles driven to bedrock meet the criteria.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
41	Vol. II (Book 1)	§12.1.4 (pg. 73)	Section 12.1.4 of the DB Contract states that the maximum payment for work authorized by NTP 1 is \$500,000.00. This amount does not sufficiently cover the costs for mobilization, bonds, insurance, NTP1 submittal preparation and early design efforts. In determining the maximum payment amount, did the NHDOT consider the significant design effort that is required to commence before and during the NTP1 period to achieve the project schedule? Please consider raising this value to \$2 million dollars.	<p>NHDOT will modify the reimbursement limit in Addendum No. 2 to \$2,000,000 (from \$500k) to allow for early bridge demolition activities. Prior to this change, the \$500k limit was a fair and reasonable amount to obtain the Project Management Plan (PMP) approval. The Design Builder's diligence to obtain approval of the PMP will reduce these costs and risks.</p> <p>The NTP1 reimbursement limitation provision is intended to allow the Design-Builder to begin work with an emphasis on obtaining approval of the PMP, which includes the Project Schedule and administrative, design and construction protocols and procedures. After the PMP is approved, NHDOT will issue the full NTP2.</p>
42	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP Exhibit D (pg. 6)	ITP Form N-2 starts at month 1 after NTP1. Will there be regular monthly payments starting with month 1 of NTP1?	Per §12.2 of the DB Contract, the Design-Builder may provide an invoice for reimbursement as early as the first month following NTP1 through completion of the Project Schedule, provided the invoice meets the requirements of the Contract. The payment amount may be restricted by the issuance of NTP2 (§12.1.4 of the DB Contract).

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
43	Vol. II (Book 1)	§12.1.4 (pg. 73)	Section 12.1.4 of the DB Contract provides contract remedies in the event of a delay to NTP2. So that the design build teams can properly address the risk and likelihood of a delay to NTP2, please provide an explanation and justification as to how the NHDOT determined the 270 day and 21 month delay periods respectively. It is unclear how such a delay could be anticipated.	<p>The DB Contract provision requires the Design-Builder to honor the Contract Price for 180 days from the Proposal Due Date (changed from 270 days in Addendum No. 1). The 180 days was derived by adding the (approximately) 3 months between the Proposal Due Date and NTP1 and another 3 months for the issuance of NTP2, which is short if not reasonable.</p> <p>Additionally, if extraordinary delays cause the issuance of NTP2 to be greater than 21 months after the Proposal Due Date, then the Contract Price and time can be adjusted as mutually agreed to by both Parties. While NHDOT does not foresee conditions which would cause this provision would be invoked, the clause is added for both Parties protection.</p>
44	Vol. I (ITP)	§4.2.2 (pg. 26)	Please provide clarification pertaining to Form L – Escrow Agreement and whether it should be included with the Technical Proposal or Price Proposal. Please refer to ITP Section 4.2.2, which states “A copy of the Escrow Agreement shall be provided with the Technical Proposal...”, as well as ITP Section 4.3.2, which states “A copy of the executed Escrow Agreement shall be included in the Technical Proposal as specified in Section 4.2.2.” Then, contradictory to these two instructions, please refer to ITP Exhibit E, Price Proposal, where the Escrow Agreement (ITP Form L) is listed as item B. However, the “ITP Section Cross-Reference” is Section 3.4 of ITP Exhibit B, which states “A copy of the Escrow Agreement (Form L) shall be provided with the Technical Proposal...” Please confirm the Escrow Agreement – Form L is to be submitted in a separate envelope, included with the Technical Proposal Package, and not within the Price Proposal.	<p>Proposers shall submit three executed Escrow Agreements (ITP Form L) with Escrowed Proposal Documents (EPDs) as noted in §4.3.2 of the ITP. Proposers shall submit one copy of ITP Form L in a separate envelope with the Technical Proposal, as noted in §4.2.2 of the ITP.</p> <p>A copy of the Escrow Agreement is not required to be submitted with the Price Proposal. The ITP Exhibit E, Summary and Order of Proposal Contents, will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to show the Escrow Agreement (ITP Form L) to only be included with the Technical Proposal and the Escrowed Proposal Documents (EPDs).</p>

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
45	Vol. I (ITP)	§4.3.2 (pg.27)	Please provide clarification pertaining to the Escrowed Proposal Documents (EPDs). Please refer to <u>Section 4.3.2 of the ITP</u> (Price Proposal Submitted to Escrow), which states “Proposer shall submit one set of EPDs (“Escrowed Materials”) to the Escrow Agent chosen by Proposer...The documents shall be in separately sealed containers...and delivered to the Escrow Agent...” Then, please refer to <u>Section 2.2 of ITP Exhibit C</u> (EPDs), which states “The Price Proposal shall contain Proposer’s EPDs, which shall be delivered separately into escrow as provided in <u>ITP Section 4.3.2.</u> ” Then, please refer to <u>ITP Exhibit E</u> (Summary and Order of Proposal Contents), Price Proposal, where the EPDs are listed under item D (Appendices). Please confirm the EPDs are to be submitted in a separate envelope, delivered to the Escrow Agent, and not included in the Price Proposal Package.	The Escrowed Proposal Documents (EPDs) and the three executed Escrow Agreements (ITP Form L) are to be delivered to the Escrow Agent for retention. No EPDs are to be included with the Price Proposal.
46	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.1	<u>Section 7.7.1 of the Tech. Provisions</u> (Navigational and Roadway Clearances) requires that the “Bridge span lengths, roadway and navigational clearances (21’-0” minimum vertical clearance over Mean High Water) shall be provided or greater than as shown on the Project Schematics in the Reference Materials.” Understanding the intent to maintain this vertical clearance/dimension beneath the Lift Span section (between Piers 2 & 3) of the Bridge only, please confirm that the 18’-0 dimension(s) shown on sheet 120 of the Reference Drawings is not applicable/required.	The minimum navigational vertical clearance between Piers 2 and 3 shall be equal or greater than 21’ and 150’ over Mean High Water with the lift span in the down and up positions, respectively. The minimum clearance for the Memorial Bridge fixed spans will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to require 18’ over MHW. The Kittery Approach Spans may be less than the 18’ clearance.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
47	Vol. II (Book 2)	§6	Section 6 of the Tech. Provisions (Environmental), and Section 502 of the Standard Specifications withstanding, it is not clear to us who will be the legal generator of the waste developed during the removal of the existing lead paint. Will the legal generator of this waste be the State of New Hampshire or the State of Maine?	State of New Hampshire is considered the Generator (per <u>§6.3.2 of the DB Contract.</u>
48	Vol. II (Book 2)	7.7.6.3.E (pg. 110)	This section requires that "motor couplings shall be fully flexible tapered grid couplings with a dual load path." Will full flex gear type couplings be acceptable for the motor couplings? Grid couplings have been known to have fatigue problems in the past. Current motor controls remove the need for the extra shock absorption provided by the grid couplings.	Provide grid couplings that accommodate both misalignment and shock absorption in accordance with Section 6.7.9.3 of the <i>AASHTO LRFD Movable Bridge Specification</i> . The current motor controls provide potential for shock loads in a malfunction or during troubleshooting.
49	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.6.3.W.6-8 (pg. 112)	This section requires that the cranes "shall pick at a rate of 10 feet per minute." Will higher pick rates be acceptable? Some cranes come standard with 14 or 16 feet per minute pick rates. Utilizing a standard crane would be a cost savings verses a special order.	<u>§7.7.6.3 of the Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified to require a standard crane that provide pick rates in excess of 10 feet per minute.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
50	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.6.3.W.7 (pg. 112)	This section requires that the bridge crane in the machinery room have a "capacity to pick the largest piece of machinery in the machinery room." To meet this requirement a 10 ton lift will be required to pick the primary reducer. On many other bridges, it is assumed that the reducer will never need to be lifted by the machinery crane and will only be lifted during major rehabilitation. Therefore, most machinery room cranes do not have the capacity to lift the reducer. If this is an acceptable assumption, the crane could be downsized from a 10 ton capacity to a 2-1/2 ton capacity capable of picking all the machinery except the reducer. The decreased capacity needed for the crane and crane supports would reduce costs.	<u>§7.7.6.3 of the Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to allow the crane capacity to be reduced to be less than the weight of the reducer provided the crane has the capacity to lift the top half of the split reducer housing and a written reducer removal plan be provided.
51	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.4.2.11 (pg. 107)	This section requires the maintenance/inspection platform to have "vertical adjustment on the hangers that allow the platform to be suspended from 42" to 6'-0" below the floor beams and or truss bottom chords." The platform rides on beams attached to the bottom of the floor beams. If we assume these beams to be 12" tall, then the platform rails near the hangers must be less than 30" high to achieve the 42" vertical distance from the platform to the bottom of the floor beam. A 30" high rail does not meet OSHA standards. Is it acceptable to increase the 42" minimum vertical adjustment in order to satisfy OSHA requirements for rail height?	<p>The OSHA minimum rail height requirement of 42 inches must be maintained. §7.7.4.2.11 of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to require a vertical post on each side of the rail and a hinged section of top rail that could folded down to clear the rail when the platform is located 42 inches below the floor beam. (8/15/11)</p> <p><u>Revised Response 8/22/11:</u> The OSHA minimum rail height requirement of 42 inches must be maintained. Where the railing would be interrupted by the carrying rails, a vertical post could be provided on each side of the rail and a hinged section of top rail that could fill between the posts and provide the 42" height when the platform is in a lower position.</p>

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
52	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.4.2.11. (pg. 107)	This section requires "removable rails" for the maintenance/inspection platform. What is the desired intent for the rails to be removable? A potential design is to have the platform designed as a truss with the top chords acting as the rails. For that design, removing the top chord "rails" would significantly affect the structural capacity of the platform.	The rails are to be capable of being removed for improved access to the platform (with alternate fall protection in place). Therefore the railing shall not be part of the structural support system.
53	Vol. II (Book 2)	7.7.6.3.S (pg. 111)	This section requires that the "span locks shall be located adjacent to the live load bearings, engaging through a receiving socket mounted through the lift span floor beam." Is it acceptable to have the receiving socket mounted to the bottom flange of the lift span floor beams instead of mounted "through" the lift span floor beams? Mounting the socket to the bottom of the floor beam would require a much shorter lock bar and therefore reduce cost.	The lock bar length can be reduced only if the socket is mounted eccentrically to the end floor beam. Therefore the receiver socket can be mounted below the end floor beam provided that the design accounts for the eccentric loading due to span operation with the lock bars driven.
54	Vol. II (Book 2) Vol. II (Book 3)	§7.7.6.3.F (pg. 110) 2.11.1 of Section 801 (pg.18)	§7.7.6.3.F of the Tech. Provisions states "all shims used for aligning machinery shall be stainless steel." §2.11.1 of Special Provision 801 states "shims shall conform to the requirements of ASTM A709, Grade 36, except that thickness less than 1/4-inch shall be stainless steel." Please clarify the desired material for shims.	§7.7.6.3.F of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 2 for consistency with §2.11.1 of Special Provision 801.
55	Vol. II (Book 2)	7.7.2.1 (pg. 103)	This section requires that "all welding and fabrication shall be performed in conformance with the current AASHTO/AWS D1.5 Bridge Welding Code". For many previous bridges we have specified AWS D1.1 for welding of the machinery components. Is it acceptable to use AASHTO/AWS D1.1 for welding of machinery components and weldments?	All welding and fabrication shall be performed in accordance with AASHTO/AWS D1.5 Bridge Welding Code.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
56	Vol. II (Book 2) Vol. II (Book 3)	§7.7.7.2.N. (pg. 115) §7, 2.3.C.7 of Section 810/40 94 43 (pg. 7)	§7.7.7.2.N of the Tech. Provisions indicates run time of 4 hours minimum for Uninterruptable Power Supply (UPS) for the PLC. Special Provisions indicates run time of 60 minutes minimum. Both times are quite large considering a backup generator/automatic transfer switch is being used. A 30 minute run time may be more than adequate considering that ATS power transfer times are typically in the seconds range. Could requirement be changed to 30 minutes?	§7.7.7.2.N of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to reduce the generator run time during an extended power outages to 60 minutes.
57	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7.2.B (pg. 114)	"A fully redundant PLC-based control and monitoring system shall be provided....." More clarification may be required. We interpret this to mean a system with a redundant PLC processor (CPU). Please confirm if this meets the requirements.	The intent is to provide redundant PIC's. No redundant I/O's are required.
58	Vol. II (Book 3)	Section 810/26 32 14	Are required specifications available for natural gas generators?	No. The Design-Builder will be responsible for preparing the design based on the parameters of his design.
59	Vol. II (Book 3)	§2.7.G of Section 810/26 40 10 (pg. 5)	Bridge Control Cabinets - "Conductors shall be stranded copper not smaller than No. 10 American Wire Gauge." 10AWG seems excessive for control cabinets. AASHTO specifications require minimum 12AWG for bridge structure conductors and minimum 14AWG for within control consoles and control panels. Using 10AWG would require larger panels, and 10AWG wires are often too large for the wiring terminals of most standard PLC equipment. Could requirement be changed to 14AWG for control cabinets?	Special Provision 810/40 94 43 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to allow 14AWG conductors for control cabinets. (8/15/11) <u>Revised Response (8/22/11):</u> §2.7.G of Special Provision 810/26 40 10 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to allow 14AWG conductors for control cabinets.
60	Vol. II (Book 3)	§3.1.C of Section 810/26 24 19 (pg. 7)	"Mount MCC on 4 inch high concrete pad" Suggest that MCC's should be mounted on vibration isolators for machine house and operators house in lieu of concrete pads. Please confirm.	Special Provision 810/26 24 19 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to require MCC's mounted in the machinery room and control house to be mounted on vibration isolators at a minimum of 4 inches above the floor height.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
61	Vol. II (Book 3)	§2.10.C of Section 810/26 40 10 (pg. 7)	Motor Control Center - "Shall be rated for a 208-Volt" Suggest that this should be changed to 480-Volt to match motor requirements elsewhere in the specifications.	<u>Special Provision 810/40 94 43 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to require the MCC to be rated for 480 Volts. (8/15/11)</u> <u>Revised Response (8/22/11):</u> <u>§2.10.C of Special Provision 810/26 40 10 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to require the MCC to be rated for 480 Volts.</u>
62	Vol. II (Book 3)	§3.2.F.2 of Section 810/26 40 20 (pg. 14)	"The MCC shall distribute power to all motors and controls for operation of the bridge, auxiliaries, climate control system, and lighting systems." We propose the use of 480V power distribution panels be permitted. Using power distribution panels in conjunction with MCC's (for motor circuit breakers and starters) may reduce costs and save some space.	The 480V power distribution panel shall be powered from a breaker in the MCC.
63	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.4.2.11 (pg. 106)	Please clarify if a single maintenance traveler is moved from span to span as needed or if there is one under each span for a total of three.	A single maintenance/inspection traveler shall be provided for use under any of the three truss spans. Refer to Addendum No. 1 for revisions.
64	Vol. I (ITP)	§1.4 (pg. 4)	Per §1.4 (Procurement Schedule) of the ITP, the Technical Proposals will be submitted on 9/14/11 and the Department will not be opening the Price Proposals until 10/20/11. Will the Department consider extending the due date for the Price Proposals to 10/05/11?	<u>§1.4 of the ITP will be modified in Addendum No. 2 to change Price Proposal Due Date to 10/17/11 (at 12:00 noon) and Escrowed Proposal Document (EPDs) Due Date to 10/17 (at 2:00 pm).</u>

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
65	Vol. I (ITP)	§4.3.1 (pg. 27) ITP Exhibit B §4.2.3 (pg. 10)	<p><u>Section 4.3.1</u> of the ITP states that “All parts of the Proposal that indicate pricing information shall be included in the sealed Price Proposal container.” However <u>Section 4.2.3</u> of ITP Exhibit B states that the “Proposal shall provide a life cycle cost analysis of the project for a period of at least 15 years from completion of the project.” This section relates to the Technical Proposal and not the Price Proposal. This analysis could provide pricing information within the technical proposal. Furthermore, now that the Price proposal is not to be submitted till October 17th, it will be difficult to prepare an accurate Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) for the September 14 submittal because the Cost Proposal will not be complete.</p> <p>Please clarify the requirements of the LCCA to be included in the Technical Proposal on September 14th.</p>	<p><u>§4.3.2</u> of ITP Exhibit B (Technical Proposal Instructions) requests the approach used, the assumptions, and the cost analysis results. The estimated cost information provided should reflect information pertaining to the results, not the actual Price Proposal amount. Yes, the Technical Proposal Evaluators are subjected to some cost information, but are not influenced by the foreknowledge of the Price Proposal amount.</p>
66	Vol. II (Book 2)	§12.1.4 (pg. 74)	<p>This section references the ENR New Hampshire Region Construction Cost Index (CCI) as an index to be utilized in determining a cost adjustment to the Project. We contacted ENR for information regarding this index and were informed that it does not exist. We were told that they only have a single Construction Cost Index that is updated monthly. Please confirm that the intent is to utilize the monthly ENR Construction Cost Index, or provide more detailed information regarding the index that will be utilized.</p>	<p><u>§12.1.4</u> of the DB Contract will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to indicate the ENR Construction Cost Index (CCI) for "Boston" will be used as a means of adjusting the Contract Price if NTP2 is delayed beyond 180 days from the Proposal Due Date.</p>

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
67	Vol. II (Book 2)	§6.2, Table 6-1 (pg. 64 - 65)	<u>Table 6-1 of the Technical Provision</u> summarizes the anticipated permits needed and their current status. Have the permit applications satisfactorily addressed the installation of a fender system to satisfy the design parameters issued in Addendum No. 1? If not, will the NHDOT amend the applications accordingly?	Space has been provided around the pier for a fender system. The design on the fender system will determine if the permit application covers the proposed fender system. NHDOT believes the permit will accommodate a design that meets the criteria.
68	Vol. II (Book 1) Vol. I (ITP)	§21.1 (pg. 151) §4.3.2 (pg. 27)	<u>§21.1 of the DB Contract</u> states file cabinet can be provided for escrow documents and located at NHDOT office while <u>§4.3.2 of the ITP</u> requires documents be located at proposers selected escrow agent. Please clarify escrow requirements and escrow agreement form requirements.	Per <u>§4.3.2 of the ITP</u> , the EPDs are to be submitted to the Escrow Agent. After execution of the DB Contract, the EPDs shall be transferred (per <u>Article 4(b) of the Escrow Agreement, ITP Form L</u>) and maintained in the NHDOT Project Office per <u>§21.1 of the DB Contract</u> .
69	Vol. II (Book 3)	Special Provision Section 550	Please clarify the painting/specification requirements for the interior surfaces of box section	NHDOT would recommend the use of paint system E (moisture cure urethane with black finish) for the interior of box sections which has the best corrosion protection properties. NHDOT used this on box sections of the Allenstown truss. This assumes that the interior of boxes are not going to be inspected per se like a box girder bridge. In the case of large box girders, the color is almost always white for visibility. Since the boxes are dark green on the outside, and have either porthole openings or lattice bars, white interior that would show against the dark green and look a bit odd.
70	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.6.3.2.1 (pg. 99)	Minimum pipe size inside diameter is required to be 18" for parallel laterals, 24" for laterals under roadways and 24" for trunk lines. Can the storm sewer pipes be size based upon actual design calculations/needs and the above general requirements waived?	<u>§7.6.3.2.1 of Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to indicate 15" for lateral pipes, 18" for lateral pipes under pavement, and 18" pipes for trunk lines.
71	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.8.8.1 (pg. 124)	Please confirm the design of the control house must comply with NH State Building code and City of Portsmouth codes for life safety and construction.	Control house will need to comply with City of Portsmouth fire safety code and NH State building and fire safety code.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
72	Vol. I (ITP and ITP Exhibit E)	§5.6.2 (pg. 38) ITP Exhibit E (pg. 2)	§5.6.2 of the ITP states "...Form P submitted with the Price Proposal...". Please confirm ITP Form P is submitted with the Technical Proposal, as identified in ITP Exhibit E (pg. 2).	Yes, ITP Form P is to be submitted with the Technical Proposal as identified in ITP Exhibit E. §5.6.2 of the ITP will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to change the comparison to ITP Form O.
73	Vol. I (ITP)	§4.3.3 (pg. 26)	The only remaining items required in the Price Proposal binder is the Proposal Security (Form K-1 or K-2) and Price Information (Forms N-1, N-2, and O); however, as stated in the RFP, Volume I, Section 4.3.3, Page 26, "One (1) original and two (2) certified copies of the Proposal Security shall be provided with the Price Proposal, and shall be in a separate envelope labeled "[Proposer Name]: Proposal Security for the NHDOT Memorial Bridge Replacement Project." Please confirm "A. Proposal Security (Form K-1 or K-2)" shall be removed from the Price Proposal binder (as the Escrow Agreement and Escrowed Proposal Documents have previously been removed in Addendum No. 1 and 2), and separately sealed with the Price Proposal package.	Yes, the Proposal Security (ITP Form K-1 or K-2) are to be submitted in a separate envelope with the Price Proposal. ITP Exhibit E will be modified in Addendum No. 3 for clarification.
74	Vol. I (ITP)	ITP Forms A, K-1, K-2	All RFP documents, including Exhibit D – Required Forms, have been provided in Adobe PDF format. We are able to fill these out within Adobe; however, the following forms request the bidder remove instruction brackets and replace with applicable information: Form A and Form K-1 and K-2 (as well as Form M – although we do not need to fill-out at this time). If possible, please provide the native files of these forms.	The native files will be emailed to the Proposer's Authorized Representative for their use in preparing their Proposal during the week of 8/29/11.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
75	General	Technical Information	Are there any studies or test data available which would provide information on the condition of the reinforcement steel in piers two and three.	No reinforcing is identified in piers 2 and 3 on the original plans. Proposers may schedule an appointment (through NHDOT Authorized Representative) to review the cores taken through the piers.
76	Vol. II (Book 3)	§2.10.C of Section 810/26 40 10 (pg. 7)	§2.10.C of Special Provision 810/26 40 10 (Motor Control Center) states "Enclosure shall be NEMA/EEMAC Type 3R". Nema 3R enclosure rating may increase the standard 20" width for MCC sections specified in §2.2.B.4 of Special Provision 810/26 24 19 (pg. 2). (An Allen Bradley 3R enclosure increases width for standard 20" section to 25"). If motor control centers are in interior conditioned areas, especially in the control house, could requirement be changed to Nema 12?	§2.2.B.4 of Special Provision 810/26-24-19 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to allow a width greater than 20 inches. §2.10.C of Special Provision 810/26-40-10 will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to accept NEMA 1, NEMA 3R, or NEMA 12 in interior continually conditioned areas.
77	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7.4 (pg. 115)	§7.7.7.4 of the Tech. Provisions states "Condensation space heaters shall be provided to protect against corrosion within the motors". The machinery room will be heated to 60 deg F for winter design. Normally heaters are not specified for small motors in heated areas. Request consideration to remove this requirement for small motors inside the machinery room.	§7.7.7.4 of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to remove the condensation space heater requirement for small motors inside the machinery room.
78	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.6	Will an alternative socket design for the counterweight ropes be considered provided these sockets meet or exceed the functional requirements for strength, materials, and other applicable provisions of the Federal Specification, and have been used on movable bridges previously?	Alternative socket designs will be considered provided they meet the requirements Section 6.8.3.3.7 of <i>AASHTO LRFD Movable Highway Bridge Design Specifications</i> . Alternative socket designs also provide mean/methods for tensioning and rope replacement utilizing readily available equipment. Block sockets are not allowed.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
79	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.6.3.S (pg. 111)	Per §7.7.6.3 S of the Tech. Provisions, “Span locks shall be located adjacent to the live load bearings, engaging through a receiving socket mounted through the lift span floorbeam. The span lock operators shall be mounted to the approach span steel.” Will the mounting of the span lock actuators on the lift span, driving into a socket mounted either on the tower steel or on the top of the pier, be allowed in order to simplify and make less expensive the electrical conduit runs?	§7.7.6.3 of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to permit the mounting of the span lock actuators on the lift span, driving into a socket mounted either on the tower steel or on top of the pier. Suitable (OSHA compliant) access to the actuators and receivers must be provided if this alternative is chosen.
80	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7.1 (pg. 112)	§7.7.7.1 of the Tech. Provisions states that both main drives/motors and auxiliary motors shall be powered by the emergency generator. Due to the harmonic characteristics of Flux Vector (and other types) of drives, and the size of the main motors, the generator will end up being quite large and expensive. This will also produce potential space concerns when locating a generator this size. It is more cost effective (both in purchase price as well as operating and maintenance costs) to size the generator to operate the auxiliary motors only? Would this be considered acceptable?	§7.7.7.1 of the Tech. Provisions will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to allow the generator to operate the auxiliary motors only.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
81	Vol. II (Book 2)	§7.7.7.3 (pg. 115)	§7.7.7.3 of the <u>Tech. Provisions</u> states that the auxiliary motor shall be controlled by a Flux Vector Drive. As there will be mechanical skew control (i.e. not needed to accurately vary individual motor speed for skew control), use of a much simpler two speed auxiliary motor has numerous advantages. As a means of backup operation, a two speed motor eliminates the complexities and possible failure modes of an electronically controlled drive, making this a more reliable and more easily maintained system. Eliminating the Flux Vector Drive significantly reduces the size of the emergency generator (if it is agreed that the generator need only run the auxiliary motor) saving substantially on initial as well as operating and maintenance costs. Would using a two speed auxiliary motor be considered acceptable?	§7.7.7.3 of the <u>Tech. Provisions</u> will be modified in Addendum No. 3 to allow the use of a two speed auxiliary motor, as long as the auxiliary motor meets all other requirements for the auxiliary motor stated in the RFP.
82	General		Are we required to submit rebar schedules during the post award phase?	Yes. Refer to the definition of "Working Drawings" in <u>DB Contract Appendix 1</u> , which cites Article 105.02 of the <i>NHDOT Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction</i> for criteria pertaining to Working Drawings.
83	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1 (pg.)	Will the Department consider removing the reference in §9.1 (paragraph one) to "project specific limits"?	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
84	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1 (pg.)	Will the Department consider removing the requirement in §9.1 (line 12-14) that NHDOT and Maine DOT be a named insured on the professional liability policy?	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
85	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.1 (pg.)	Will the Department consider removing the reference in §9.1.1 (line 5) to "exclusively for the project and Project ROW" and replace with "policy to have per project aggregate endorsement"?	Refer to Addendum No. 3.

No.	RFP Volume (unless request is of general application)	Section and Page No. (if a general question, so note)	Question/Comment	Department Response
86	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.1 (pg.)	Will the Department consider replacing the fire legal liability limit in §9.1.1 (line 7) with \$100,000 and delete "not less than replacement value of the portion of the premises occupied"?	No change will be made to this requirement in the RFP.
87	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.1 (pg. 57)	Will the Department consider replacing the words "owners and contractors protective" in §9.1.1, (page 57, line 2) with "contractors protective"?	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
88	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.4 (pg 58)	Pollution, removed the need to not to have an insured vs insured exclusion. However on page 62, item (c) adds it back in again.	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
89	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.4 (pg 58)	Site Pollution Policy: Want the design builder to purchase a policy to cover cleanup of unexpected material, really their exposure and you are responsible for the deductible. Would be hard to get a retro date prior to your start date and to cover known conditions , without a great deal of information. Owner really should not make you responsible	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
90	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.5 (pg. 59)	Professional Liability Insurance: The Department removed the need to not to have an insured vs insured exclusion. However on page 62, item (c) adds it back in again	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
91	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.6 (pg. 59)	Builder's Risk is to be maintained until end of project. Is that a defined date? Seems substantial completion a better end date.	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
92	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.6.2 (pg. 60)	Builders Limit is \$100MM. If the project cost less than \$100MM, then the limit cannot be \$100MM	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
93	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.1.6.2 (pg. 60)	All deductibles or SIR above \$25K must be approved by DOT. The Design-Builder should determine, not DOT.	Refer to Addendum No. 3.
94	Vol. II (Book 1)	§9.2.3 (pg. 62)	Item C brings in the issue of insured vs. insured exclusion?	Refer to Addendum No. 3.