



February 11, 2025

## RESPONSE LETTER NO. 1 TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Project Title: **Snowden Pedestrian Bridge No. 879043**  
Project No.: **20240235**

**A. Email from Mr. Jesse Brown, from BCS Fabrication; on January 28, 2025, at 11:29 AM  
(email attached)**

**Question No. 1:** BCS is an AISC certified pedestrian bridge fabricator based in Loveland, CO. I was looking over the plans and saw the pedestrian bridge being called out for Contech or approved equal but could not find any qualifications for bidding the pedestrian bridge portion.

Can you please send me those if this bridge is available to bid? The scope list states installation of the pedestrian bridge only. Has this bridge already been purchased and the scope is installation only?

**Answer No. 1:** The prefabricated steel truss pedestrian bridge shall be provided by manufacturers listed on the Department's List of Qualified Metal Fabrication Facilities, as per FDM 266.3.1. If proposing an alternative to the Contech system, the design loading must not exceed the values specified in SHEET B-1, and the truss reactions must be equal to or less than those specified in SHEET B-4. Additionally, all specifications and dimensions must exactly match those of the Contech design, including clear width, span length, and the clear space between the proposed bridge and the existing one. Refer to SHEET B-4 for further details.

The pedestrian bridge has not been pre-purchased. The awarded contractor will be responsible for both furnishing and installation, as specified under Pay Item No. 460-7. This includes the steel trusses, floor system, deck, bearings, railing, fencing, and all associated components, in accordance with FDM 266.3.3.

**B. Email from Mr. Steven R. McNamara, from Anzac Contractors, Inc; on February 4, 2025, at 10:37 AM (email attached)**

**Question No. 1:** The SFWMD Permit was discussed and one of the MDC representatives mentioned that the permit requires "Maintenance Dredging". Unless we are missing something, the plan do not indicate any dredging in the canal. Please clarify.

- Answer No. 1:** Canal dredging area and limits are shown in sheets 7, 8 and 15 of 39. Please refer to the plan set in the 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf for the most up-to-date information.
- Question No. 2:** Plan Sheet #2, Note #1 refers to "Alternate 1" being chosen by MDC. Can you please clarify what "Alternate 1" refers to?
- Answer No. 2:** In the early stages of the project, a Bridge Development Report evaluated four different structural alternatives. The selected option, Alternative 1, consists of a single-span prefabricated steel through-truss with a constant depth. This alternative has been fully developed in the plan set provided in 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf
- Question No.3:** Plan Sheet #2, Note #2 – are the plans considered 100% now and if so can you confirm that all comments were addressed and incorporated in the bid documents?
- Answer No.3:** All comments have been addressed in the 100% submittal. Please refer to the plan set in the 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf for the most up-to-date information.
- Question No. 4:** Plan Sheet #32, Pile Data table shows a Required Preform Elevation of "25". Please confirm that this is meant to be "-25"?
- Answer No. 4:** The required Preform elevation is -20. Please refer to the plan set in the 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf for the most up-to-date information.
- Question No. 5:** Based on experience in this area, rock is very hard. Would the County consider changing the Required Preform Elevation to the same as the Minimum Tip Elevation of -31?
- Answer No. 5:** The minimum tip elevation is -20. Please refer to the plan set in the 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf for the most up-to-date information.
- Question No. 6:** The plans do not indicate which piles are the Test Pile location. Please clarify.
- Answer No. 6:** Sheet B-2, Note 1 indicates that all four (4) piles are designated as 'Test Piles.' Please refer to the plan set in the 20240235\_Solicitation\_Documents\_Vol\_II.pdf for the most up-to-date information.

**END OF REQUEST FOR INFORMATION No. 1**

Sincerely,



Tiondra Wright  
Chief, Capital Improvement Division.  
Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW)

TW: tw

cc:

Marco Movilla, DTPW  
Gabriel Delgado, P.E., DTPW  
Laurie Johnson, SBD  
Caesar Suarez, SBD  
Project File

Katherine Fernandez, DTPW  
Ryan Fisher, P.E., DTPW  
Maylin Torres, SBD  
Eric Perez, SBD  
Clerk of the Board

**Snowden Pedestrian Bridge No. 879043**

**RPQ No. 20240235**

**Request for Information No.1  
(RFI)**

**E-MAILS ATTACHED**

**From:** [Jesse Brown](#)  
**To:** [Movilla, Marco \(DTPW\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Clerk of the Board \(COC\)](#)  
**Subject:** RPQ 20240235 - Snowden Pedestrian Bridge No. 879043  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 11:28:42 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL  
SOURCE

Hey Marco,

BCS is an AISC certified pedestrian bridge fabricator based in Loveland, CO.

I was looking over the plans and saw the pedestrian bridge being called out for Contech or approved equal, but could not find any qualifications for bidding the pedestrian bridge portion.

Can you please send me those if this bridge is available to bid?

The scope list states installation of the pedestrian bridge only.

Has this bridge already been purchased and the scope is installation only?

Thank you,

**Jesse Brown**

**T:** +1-706-892-4351

**E:** [jesse@bcsfab.com](mailto:jesse@bcsfab.com)

**W:** [www.bcsfab.com](http://www.bcsfab.com)



**From:** [Steve McNamara](#)  
**To:** [Movilla, Marco \(DTPW\)](#)  
**Subject:** SNOWDEN PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE - PREBID RFI  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 10:37:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL  
SOURCE

Hi Marco,

As discussed during the Prebid Conference on 1/29/25, we had the following questions:

1. The SFWMD Permit was discussed and one of the MDC representatives mentioned that the permit requires "Maintenance Dredging". Unless we are missing something, the plan do not indicate any dredging in the canal. Please clarify.
2. Plan Sheet #2, Note #1 refers to "Alternate 1" being chosen by MDC. Can you please clarify what "Alternate 1" refers to?
3. Plan Sheet #2, Note #2 – are the plans considered 100% now and if so can you confirm that all comments were addressed and incorporated in the bid documents?
4. Plan Sheet #32, Pile Data table shows a Required Preform Elevation of "25". Please confirm that this is meant to be "-25"?
5. Based on experience in this area, the rock is very hard. Would the County consider changing the Required Preform Elevation to the same as the Minimum Tip Elevation of -31?
6. The plans do not indicate which piles are the Test Pile location. Please clarify.

Thanks,

**Steven R. McNamara**  
*President*

**ANZAC CONTRACTORS, INC.**

7475 SW 50<sup>th</sup> Terrace  
Miami, FL 33155

305.669.1986 Office

305.986.0480 Cell

[Steve@AnzacContractors.com](mailto:Steve@AnzacContractors.com)

[www.AnzacContractors.com](http://www.AnzacContractors.com)

