

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 13, 2026

- Q1. Can quantity workups please be provided for this project?
- A1. Quantity workups will be added as additional Supplemental Information for all prospective bidders to access. It will become available from the Authority's website and Bid Express.

May 21, 2026 (Original May 21, 2026 response to Q10 was revised on June 9, 2026)

- Q2. Page 18 of the Proposal Book list Supplemental Information Available for Bidders that is available either on the Authority's website or with the contract plans and proposal. This information was not with the plans and proposal, and we cannot find it on the Authority's website. Please provide the supplemental information.
- A2. Supplemental information referenced on page 18 of the Proposal is available to prospective bidders on the Authority's website.
<https://content3.thruway.ny.gov/business/contractors/documents/index.shtml>
Then search for the project under the Letting Date: June 17, 2026. There are currently two bullet entries with supplemental information. The original one dated April 28, 2026, and the second one dated May 12, 2026.
- Q3. Plan Sheet 112 and 114 Typical sections for the shoulder widening, call out 1.5" of Item # 404.09720025, but item is not included in the Bid Proposal. Please either revise the bid proposal or the Item # to match an item in the proposal and update the quantity accordingly.
- A3. Quantities for items 404.09720025 and 404.19790025 will be updated in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q4. Plan Sheet 136 depicts a plan view of the NYSTA mainline area surrounding the Smith Cove Road Bridge. The cross hatched legend, including the overhang areas, shows the milling of the deck to be paid under item 490.03. However, the note on sheet 155 above the deck on Section A_A states remove 4-1/2" of existing asphalt under item 202.2201 for the overhang portions. Please clarify under which item are we to remove the asphalt overlay in the overhang areas and adjust the bid item accordingly.
- A4. The applicable plan sheets will be revised to clarify the removal limits for Item 202.2201 and Item 490.03. Corresponding pay items will also be updated in a forthcoming amendment.

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 21, 2026 (Original May 21, 2026 response to Q10 was revised on June 9, 2026)

- Q5. Please clarify the detail on sheet 114, Typical Shoulder Reconstruction Detail, with regards to the underdrain, Item 603.98100402 and Note 1 on the same drawing. There are no details or notes on this sheet or any of the plan sheets referring to locations. NYSTA Standard drawings TA 605-01, Note 1 states the spacing should be every 250'. Is that the intent here. Also the reference to Note one on sheet 114 of the Plan Sheets, refers to cost of removal of the underdrain is covered under item 203.02, we are assuming that the note is just for the removal of the section of underdrain to install the wye fitting, is that correct. Also details on standard sheet TA 605-01 refers to different types of end details, plans show none. Please advise.
- A5. The intent was to replace any existing underdrain and lateral outlets located within the shoulder reconstruction limits. Stage 1 of the work zone plans will be revised to show the anticipated locations of underdrain replacement based on as-built drawings as well as indicate locations for new lateral outlets based on the 250' foot spacing shown on the NYSTA Standard sheet TA 605-01. The end detail to be used for each underdrain is dependent on the field conditions where the lateral outlets will be located. See typical outlet slope guidelines on the standard sheet when determining which end treatment to use. The cost for removing the existing underdrain will now be paid for under Item 206.0201. Quantities and plan sheets will be updated in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q6. Reference is made to the Left Should Restoration Detail on Sheet 114, from the detail it appears we are removing all of the asphalt that was placed for the staged construction to top of subbase, a total of 10.5 inches. The detail states that we are placing back 4" of topsoil, Item 610.1402 and 4" of Shoulder Back Item, 203.24000025, for a total of 8". What material is to be used to make up the remaining 2" alongside the edge of pavement, and under what items is the Contractor to be compensated for this material. Also is it the intent to place the Shoulder Back up material on top of the Topsoil. Please advise.
- A6. The left shoulder restoration detail will be revised to show 10.5" of shoulder backup material. This material will be rounded with a 4' VC at the shoulder break and sloped down at a 1V:4H slope to the top of the scarified subbase. The total width of shoulder backup is to be 4'. The topsoil will be placed at 4" thickness for the remaining width and will be placed up against the shoulder backup material. Quantities and plans will be updated in a forthcoming amendment.

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 21, 2026 (Original May 21, 2026 response to Q10 was revised on June 9, 2026)

- Q7. Sheet Section A-A on Sheet 94, shows a cross section of the Approach and Sleeper slab. There are two notes referencing pay limits for the approach slab itself and the bottom slab of sleeper slab. There is also a note that states "Approach Pavement Begins and Ends" referring to the 2' top of the sleeper slab and Note B states that this 2' is included in the approach slab item. Please clarify the pay limits for the Approach slab, whether or not it includes the 2' top of sleeper slab.
- A7. Payment limits of the Approach Slab includes the actual approach slab length and then an additional 6' for the sleeper slab as shown in Section A-A on dwg. ST-54. No additional payment limits will be included for the 2'-0" of the approach slab extend above.
- Notes B and D refer to the work that is to be included in the cost of the Approach Slab Item, not additional pay limits.
- Q8. Reference Drawing ST-03 and Bid Items 210.480101 and 210.480102 for removal and Disposal of Miscellaneous ACM. The plans call for removal and disposal of existing bridge rail and 4" fiber conduit under LF pay items. Please clarify if payment under these items is intended to include full removal and disposal of the bridge rail/conduit assemblies, or only the ACM abatement portion identified within the removal limits.
- A8. Payment under the applicable linear foot pay items shall include all labor, equipment, and materials required for the handling, removal, and disposal of asbestos-containing material (ACM) associated with the existing bridge rail and 4-inch fiber conduit assemblies within the limits shown in the plans, in accordance with the Special Note titled "Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) with Remediation."
- Removal of the bridge superstructure shall be paid for under Item 202.120001. Refer to Sheets 45 and 46 (ST-05 and ST-06) for the applicable removal limits.
- Q9. Reference Drawing BLT-01, Pictures 2 & 3. Please confirm if the call out referencing the joint on the bridge over I-90 is a typo, or if there is another project location associated with this contract. Based on the contract documents, the Pine Hill Road Bridge should be over I-87.
- A9. This is a typographical error. This section of the Thruway is I-87, and the Pine Hill Road Bridge carries traffic over I-87, not I-90.
- Q10. **Referring to Drawing Number ST-52 (Pine Hill structure),** Please confirm that the formwork for the underside of the bridge deck is intended to be corrugated metal stay-in-place forms. Additionally, please confirm that this work is to be carried under the Superstructure Slab item.
- A10. Yes, the underside of the bridge deck is intended to be corrugated metal stay in place forms **for the Pine Hill structure only; For the Smith Clove structure, refer to Drawing Number GN-1, General Note #17.** The cost of the forms shall be included in the price bid for Item 557.1113 **for the Pine Hill structure, and Item 557.2119 for Smith Clove structure.**

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 21, 2026 (Original May 21, 2026 response to Q10 was revised on June 9, 2026)

- Q11. Is a hazardous materials report available for Pine Hill Road?
- A11. The Hazardous Materials Report will be added as additional Supplemental Information for all prospective bidders to access. It will become available from the Authority's website and Bid Express.
- Q12. In the Supplemental Information file, there is a document named "Village of Woodbury Scope of Work and Time Schedule". The first paragraph on the second page references "Appendix C" for the detailed scope of work. Can that appendix be provided?
- A12. Page 1 of this document contains the detailed scope of work from Appendix C.
- Q13. Where the superstructure slab is being replaced at Smith Clove Road (Sheet 154, DR-1), the plan sheet shows the cut line 19' off the fascia of the bridge. The existing deck to remain at the cut line will have a significant cantilevered section. Does this need to be temporarily supported?
- A13. The Contractor would be expected to verify the adequacy and stability of that condition prior to demolition activities, especially where temporary loading or altered load paths are introduced. This requirement is often addressed through the Contractor's means and methods, temporary works design, or an engineer's review. Refer to removal notes 25 and 26 on sheet 139 (GN-1). Additional details will be provided in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q14. On plan sheet 135 (MD-01), the Bridge Joint & Haunch Reconstruction detail shows the repair limits under Item 557.2119. Is the removal included in that item? Are there reinforcement details for the repair? If the intent is to keep the existing reinforcement intact, how should the contractor plan to install the 7/8 shear studs?
- A14. Removal work is included under Item 557.2119. Refer to Sheet 158, dwg. SRD-1, for applicable details. Existing reinforcement within the deck removal limits shall be removed, with the exception of 3'-10" of existing transverse reinforcement extending beyond the longitudinal staged deck removal line. The existing transverse reinforcement bars may be cut at this location and lapped with the proposed #5 transverse deck reinforcement. Refer to Sheet 161, dwg. DRD-2, for additional details.
- Q15. On Plan Sheet GN-1 (139 of 180), Note #66 indicates that paint removal operations will be paid under 570.160001 and 571.03. On Plan Sheet SRD-2 (159 of 180), Note #3 states that paint removal will be paid under 571.03. Based on review of the standard specification, these items are for the containment of paint waste during removal operations and disposal of paint waste generated by the removal operations. There was no specific language in either specification regarding the actual removal of paint from the structural steel. The standard specification for Item 574.030001 Structural Steel Painting: Localized does have language regarding the paint removal operation. Could you please clarify how paint removal will be paid for under this contract?
- A15. Removal of the paint system for the girder repairs will be paid for under Item 574.030001. Item 570.160001 will pay for the Class B containment, and Item 571.03 will pay for removal and disposal of hazardous paint waste containing lead from the site. Plan sheets will be revised accordingly in a forthcoming amendment.

TANY 26-17B / D215020

Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 21, 2026 (Original May 21, 2026 response to Q10 was revised on June 9, 2026)

- Q16. Respectfully requesting a two-week extension for this project due to it's complexity with the Thruway phases's to accomplish the reconstruction of the two bridges.
- A16. The letting date for this project will be changed from June 3, 2026, to June 17, 2026, in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q17. Given the complexity and staged nature of construction, completing detailed quantity takeoffs, and the multi-site aspect this contract, we respectfully request at least a two-week postponement of the current letting date, to give all bidders, their subcontractors, suppliers, and fabricators sufficient time to provide accurate and responsible quotes and bids.
- A17. See response to Question 16 above.

May 28, 2026

- Q18. Reference Bid Item 209.110311. Please clarify how the stone check dams are to be paid of if they are inclusive with pay item 209.110311.
- A18. There are no stone check dams in the job. Item 209.1311 replaces Item 209.110311. Additional details will be provided in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q19. Reference drawing WZTC. The drawings call out item 209.2301 Sediment Filter Log Temporary 12"; however, this item is not included in the bid item list. Please clarify if this work is intended to be included under bid item 209.110311 or if another bid item will be added.
- A19. Item 209.2301 has been disapproved. Item 209.1311 replaces Item 209.2301. Quantity remains the same. Additional details will be provided in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q20. For Clove Road Bridge, note 63 on Drawing GN-1 conflicts with ACM Special Notes on Proposal Book page 108.
- a. Drawings: pedestals / bearings
 - b. Proposal Book: bridge seat

The report provided in "supplemental info" seems to corroborate ACM on the bridge seat, but no mention of presence on peds/bearings. Please verify if it's on one or both bridge seats and clarify where ACM was actually identified and is expected, as the whereabouts and number of locations are important since it's a "lump sum" pay item.

- A20. Evidence of ACM was found on the bridge seats also. For estimating purposes, it should be assumed that the ACM is present on the bridge seat between each pedestal and on the bearings/pedestals at both abutments. Drawing GN-1 will be revised in a forthcoming amendment to clarify the locations of ACM.

TANY 26-17B / D215020

Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 28, 2026

- Q21. Steel Repair Table on Drawing SRD-1 conflicts with Framing Plan callouts on SFP-1, specifically at the End (North) Abutment. Please correct/clarify.
- A21. The pedestal numbers at the End Abutment have been relabeled on Drawing SFP-1 to match the begin abutment labeling. The girder repair locations at the end abutment have been corrected on Drawing SFP-1. Revised drawings will be available in a forthcoming amendment. No changes have been made to steel repair table on Drawing SRD-1.
- Q22. Pedestal and beam end steel repairs (R-1 & R-2) to the bottom flange and/or web directly above and in contact with the existing bearings will require structural lifting (585) at each location. Currently, Drawing SFP-1 shows 16 locations. A total of 15 each are indicated between pay items 585.01 and 585.02; please correct/clarify
- A22. Item 585.01 is used to pay for all structural lifting operations on the Smith Clove Road Bridge. The quantity for Item 585.01 will be revised in a forthcoming amendment and includes locations where steel repairs only need to be made. Item 585.02 is for use at the Pine Hill Road site.
- Q23. Note 3 on Drawing GLO-1 states, "Jacking shall not be performed under active traffic conditions. The location of jacking operations shall be coordinated with the lane closures on the Thruway mainline so that no live load is present in the vicinity of the steel repairs." Is the intent of this note to require Contractor not to perform jacking/lifting under live lane loads, or to require Contractor not to perform steel repairs that correspond with the live traffic in the traffic control plan (ref. dwg no BTCP-1), or both?
- A23. The Contractor shall not be allowed to conduct jacking operations under live loading. The Contractor may perform the steel repairs under live loading in accordance with the provisions of Section 585-3.04 of the NYSDOT Standard Specifications. The Contractor should consider the sequencing of lifting operations and steel repairs with the staging which will occur on Smith Clove Road below the Thruway mainline.

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 28, 2026

Q24. Is the new bridge joint (566.01) indicated on Drawing SRD-2 to be replaced within all six (6) work zone stages? If so, please revise drawings and quantities to show temporary barrier in Stages 1, 2, 4, and 6 to accommodate safe working conditions to facilitate such work and add respective pay item(s) for such quantities, as there is no pay item for a bridge joint, only 567.63 Bridge Joint Seal. Please verify if the entire associated existing deck/haunch header limits shown on Drawing MD-01, are to be removed and replaced across all stages (shown on SFP-1 as "limits of header construction") in its entirety, as depicted on SRD-1 detail and paid under 557.2119.

A24. The proposed bridge joint on each approach to the Smith Clove Road Bridge has been eliminated and replaced with a joint seal item (Item 567.51000016) which will be installed full width across the begin and end approaches of the bridge. This seal can be applied with the proposed staging and does not require additional temporary barrier to be installed.

Item 567.63 will only be applied to the longitudinal joint between the NB and SB bridge decks.

The deck/haunch header replacement has been reduced to just 19 ft. width on both fascias and on each approach. Drawing SFP-1 has been amended to remove the "limits of header removal".

Various sheets have been amended to clarify this detail. Quantities and items have been added and adjusted as needed.

See Amendment 2 for more details.

Q25. We kindly request a minimum 2-week bid date extension due to this being a complex multi-site project, and multiple subcontractors and suppliers requests for the same, compounded by the Memorial Day holiday.

A25. See response to Question 16 above.

Q26. Contractors are required to utilize the MWBE Solicitation Log (TA-W1055) to document Good Faith Efforts, but we're unable to find the required form. It doesn't appear to be available on the Forms, Reports & Guidelines page on the NYS Thruway Authority's website. Could you please provide this form and/or let us know where we can find the most current version?

A26. The DBE/MWBE Solicitation Log (TA-W1055) has been discontinued. To document Good Faith Efforts in place of this form, please refer to items 3 and 4 on the Good Faith Efforts Requirements list, available here: <https://www.thruway.ny.gov/sites/default/files/2025-07/gfe-requirements.pdf?v=1779974066>

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

June 01, 2026

- Q27. On plan sheets BA-1, EA-1 & EA-2, a total of 5 EA., 1/16th inch cracks are included in the SPALL DAMAGE TABLES. Are the crack repairs to be included in the 582.0051 item and paid by the cubic yard?
- A27. Correct. Necessary repairs for the 1/16th inch cracks are to be included in the quantity paid for Item 582.0051, paid by the cubic yard. The Contractor will be expected to sound the concrete around the crack and determine the required limits for repair needed with the Engineer in the field.
- Q28. There is a soldier pile and lagging wall shown for the end abutment. The begin abutment has a similar condition with over a 9-foot vertical excavated face 5-feet in front of the existing abutment. This is shown on drawing ST-18. Please clarify if a soldier pile and lagging wall will be added to this abutment as well.
- A28. Based on the record plans and available subsurface information, the begin abutment is founded directly on rock and therefore will not need excavation protection in the same manner as the end abutment which is founded on soil.
- Q29. Drawing ST-25 plan view and elevation Y-Y both show lagging going to the proposed GRES wall. Please provide connection details for the lagging to GRES wall connection.
- A29. There is no connection from the lagging to the GRES wall. The plan view on ST-17 and ST-25 shows the lagging stopping at the stage line. However, the lagging will remain in place from stage 1 and would need to be modified for the soldier pile installation in stage 2.
- Q30. Drawing ST-25 note 5 directs the contractor to completely remove lagging and soldier piles. The soldier piles are shown with concrete backfill which prevents them from being pulled. Additionally, the soldier pile wall system will need to remain in the stage 1 area in order to construct the GRES wall. Similarly, the soldier piles in the stage 2 area would need to remain to continue supporting the existing abutment as the backfill commences from bottom of excavation upward.
- A30. Note 5 on ST-25 will be removed. Soldier Pile and Lagging will remain in place and buried. This will be corrected in a forthcoming amendment.
- Q31. Contract Drawing GN-1, Note # 58 states that all reinforcement bars shall be epoxy except for the bridge concrete barrier. The table on Drawing SRD-2, lists "B.) Single Slope Concrete Barrier including Epoxy Reinforcement." Please clarify what type of reinforcing steel is to be used for the Single Slope Concrete Bridge Barrier for this bridge.
- A31. Epoxy coated reinforcing steel is to be used in the single slope concrete bridge barrier. The note has been corrected on the amended version of drawing GN-1 issued in Amendment 2.

TANY 26-17B / D215020

**Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

June 01, 2026

- Q32. Concrete Drawing CRD-1 shows details for Partial Depth Removal of Structural Slab and Replacement with Concrete, and Full Depth Removal of Structural Slab and Replacement. These (2) two details call out contract item 582.0051. However, the table provided on CRD-1 only calls out repairs for the pedestals at the abutments under item 582.0051. In addition, the table on Drawing CRA-1 calls for all of the repair locations to be paid under item 582.0061. Please provide locations of the partial and full depth structural slab repairs as these locations are not called out on the Drawings. In addition, please review Note #38 on Drawing GN-1 as it calls for repairs greater than 12" deep to be repaired using item 582.0061. This does not seem correct.
- A32. Details and tables relating to repairs to the structural deck slab have been revised in Amendment 2. Item 582.0061 has been removed from the contract. The pay item for concrete repairs shown on the partial depth and full depth repair details on Drawing CRD-1 has been changed to Item 582.0052. The repair locations table on Drawing CRA-1 has been revised to show the work being paid for under Item 582.0052. The intent of Drawing CRA-1 is to indicate the locations where repairs may be needed based on field inspections of the bridge. The contractor shall verify the locations in need of repair and determine, with approval of the engineer, the types of repair required at each location. The cost of verifying repair locations and making repair type determinations shall be included in the cost for Item 582.0052.

Note 37 (old note 38) on Drawing GN-1 has been revised to clarify how concrete abutment repairs will be paid. This will be corrected in a forthcoming amendment.

June 03, 2026

- Q33. With the 3' offset plus the 1.5:1 slope the excavation will encroach on the main line roadway and will require some sort of SOE or traffic switch. Please advise.
- A33. The excavation in from of the existing pier column should only extend approximately 2'-6" deep and can be achieved by a vertical cut. The structural excavation is only paid 3'-0" beyond the face of the column. 5' from the excavation is a pinned barrier to protect the excavation as shown on dwg. TC-01.
- Q34. The location for proposed end abutment footing conflicts with the location for the soldier pile #8.
- A34. Footing will have to be poured up against the soldier pile. The top of the rock socket should start at the bottom of the proposed footing.

TANY 26-17B / D215020
Replacement of Pine Hill Road Bridge over I-87 at MP 47.58,
Rehabilitation of I-87 Bridge over Smith Clove Road at MP 47.04,
and Resurfacing and Safety Improvements on I-87 Between MP 46 and MP 48 in Orange County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

June 09, 2026

- Q35. Response to RFI 07 (Question 33) references excavation for the existing pier column. Our question refers to the proposed footing which requires a cut of approximately 8.6 from existing grade (539) to bottom of footing (530.5) (see sheet ST-32)
- The 3' offset dimension from footing we referenced in our RFI is to install forms for the footing. Is the intent to come up with some kind of SOE that the Authority will not pay for? Typically, SOE that protects traffic is designed by the Authority.
- A35. The record plan drawings, (from Contract CT53-11), indicate that the existing footing is founded directly on rock. In addition, the proposed pier footing has been designed bearing on the top of sound rock as identified in the 2024 subsurface boring investigation. Based on the available boring logs and subsurface information, it is anticipated that the proposed footing excavation will be keyed into the rock, with the rock face serving as the form for the footing concrete placement; therefore, separate formwork was not anticipated.
- Q36. "Lump Sum (LS)" Bid Items for two of the three sites (locations) are provided for Nighttime Operations. However, based on the plan drawings and quantity work-ups provided, there is not such an item for Smith Clove Road Bridge Rehab site. Please provide a third 619.240x bid item, as nighttime work is likely to be necessary for certain tasks/activities associated with Thruway Bridge Rehab work over Smith Clove Rd due to TA 619-30 lane closure charts.
- A36. The Authority agrees with the Contractor's observation regarding nighttime operations at the Smith Clove Road Bridge Rehabilitation site. A third location-specific Nighttime Operations item will be added to the contract to address anticipated nighttime work associated with the Smith Clove Road Bridge Rehabilitation work. The additional bid item will be incorporated in a forthcoming amendment to the Contract Documents.

June 10, 2026

- Q37. We kindly request a bid date extension due to number of addendums and changes, with multiple subcontractors and suppliers' requests for the same, to assemble a responsible and competitive proposal.
- A37. The letting date for this project will be changed from June 17, 2026, to June 24, 2026, in a forthcoming amendment.