NEW YORK STATE | Bridge Authority

KATHY HOCHUL
Governor

DR. MINOSCA ALCANTARA
Executive Director

JOAN MCDONALD
Chair

Date: August 28, 2026

Subject: **BA-2026-OE-012-PS RFP Questions and Clarifications**

1. The specialized nature of the required services and the expedited timeline for deliverable submission may constrain opportunities for meaningful participation by qualified EEO-certified firms. Would the Authority be willing to review the established participation goal and consider a reduced participation requirement or granting a waiver for this solicitation?

   The Authority maintains the overall MWBE and SDVB goals, however in the Appendix A it is noted that MWBE goals for this contract are N/A. Credit will be given for supporting the goals in evaluation of proposals and no waiver will be required should a proposal be received without an MWBE and SDVB utilization plan.

2. Section 3.3 states M/WBE/SDVOB goals are 36% (18% WBE/12% MBE/6% SDVOB). Appendix B II.A. calls for 30% M/WBE participation goal (12% for MBE and 18% for WBE), and the NYSBA M/WBE-EEO Policy Statement lists "N/A" for M/WBE goals. Can the Authority clarify which is correct?

   See response to question 1.

3. Is this procurement funded in whole or in part with federal funds or is subject to any federal contract or grant flow-downs?

   This procurement is not funded in whole or in part with federal funds.

4. Section 3.2 states the fee proposal shall constitute an all-inclusive fee proposal yet Appendix O does not include profit in the instructions, should prospers include profit % within Exhibit C: Total Cost Summary?

   Please include proposed profit with pricing details proposed as described in Exhibit C.

5. Has the Authority conducted any risk-based assessments of the structures to identify the event associated with Maximum Probable Loss (MPL)? i.e, terrorist attack, wind related event, vessel collision.
   a. Has the Authority conducted any detailed wind evaluations of the structures to determine if this is a probable risk to any of the structures.
   b. Has the Authority conducted any detailed vessel collision risk evaluations to determine if this is a probable risk to any of the structures.
   c. If none of these risk-based assessments have been completed, we would recommend that these be completed as part of this scope of services. Please advise if this should be added to the scope of services, expected to be completed in time for the 2027 evaluation.

RESPONES as indicated above

A. No. While the original structures were built to standard code, we have not conducted a detailed, modern wind-hazard evaluation accounting for recent extreme weather patterns.

B. Yes. A vessel collision risk study was completed recently following the NTSB recommendation. The report concluded that fender systems and pier strengthening are generally required to meet the AASHTO method thresholds for new structures.

C. The Engineer shall proceed with the core 2027 evaluation by clearly documenting their risk-based assessment assumptions in the final report's "Limitations and Baseline Conditions" section so they can be easily updated should any specialized risk studies be conducted. The Authority is seeking the most cost-efficient solution for this bridge cost valuation that is due November 15, 2026.

6. Due to the constrained time frame for the evaluation due in November, would the Authority consider an indexing of currently published values from 2025 to arrive at total replacement costs (TRC) and a percentage assigned to each structure to estimate Maximum Probable Loss (MPL). Then in 2027 conduct a detailed evaluation of all bridge quantities and appurtenances (including any necessary risk-based assessments) to develop a full unit cost-based replacement estimate?

Utilizing the 2025 valuation data to be indexed for procurement of insurance for 2027 is currently not being considered and the Authority is seeking the most cost effective solution to provide valuations by November 15, 2026.

7. Section 2.1 last paragraph describes providing an indexing to TRC and MPL based on recognized construction index for a period of nine years subsequent to the 2026 submission, however it states this is optional by the Authority and will only be executed six months from the report deadline. Is this the entire nine-year period that may be awarded? Or will this award happen each year? Also, if we complete an interim solution in 2026, then a detailed final solution in 2027, should we also provide this indexing cost for the next 9 years?

Indexing TRC and MPL are defined as optional incremental work beyond the development of the TRC and MPL initial deliverable November 15, 2026. The Authority will evaluate and consider whether exercising the additional indexing option years at a future date.

8. The scope of services seem to present different expectations for TRC, Section 2.2.B states that "The TRC shall represent the present-day cost to demolish and completely reconstruct a bridge structure with a modern equivalent facility…", however, under Section Authority Assumptions, page 40 3rd bullet, says "TRC includes full demolition, debris removal, and full reconstruction of the facility. It does not reflect a modern equivalent facility." Please clarify the expectations for TRC.

The expectation is replacement of the existing structure for all structures other than the Walkway Over The Hudson. The Walkway Over the Hudson the Authority would look to construct a pedestrian structure, not a railroad freight structure with a pedestrian deck. All cost to be determined for in-kind replacement, additional cost to bring up to present standards are not included

9. Can we assume that full as-built drawings for all structures are available, including any appurtenances that have been added to the structures over the years of service?

The Authority is preparing to provide all of this information to the selected proposer with notice to proceed immediately upon award.