

Final RFP  
Questions and Answers  
204-224

204. Interchange B2 (Taconic): The design speed for interchange B2 was recently increased from 40 mph to 55 mph, resulting in the following deficiencies with the concept plan:

The design speed of 55 mph with an entrance ramp of 40 mph requires a ramp merge in approximately 600 feet, providing 300 feet for lane gap acceptance and 300 feet lane taper (per AASHTO Figure 10-72), which overlaps the left-turn lane for the maintenance yard driveway and could force vehicles negotiating the lane drop to stop in the thru lane to negotiate entering the left-turn storage lane.

The distance from the painted gore to the driveway is 840 feet, providing insufficient distance to accommodate the 600-foot ramp merge and 300-foot left turn lane.

In addition, the painted Continuous Green-T (CGT) intersection design requires a four-foot painted median or a four-foot concrete median to accommodate the signage required by MUTCD. This adds 110 to 165 feet of required shifting taper to the 600 feet of taper previously mentioned. Given these design deficiencies, what is the ultimate intent or reasoning for the increased design speed for this interchange?

**Answer:** The parallel design exit ramp shown in the concept plan meets the AASHTO requirements listed. The overlap with left turn lane may be added in final design by providing appropriate bay tapers and storage lengths. ACGT is not being proposed at this driveway intersection.

205. Amendment # 2 changed the Williamsville project limits to commence at South Cayuga Road as the easterly limit and end under the South Union Road overpass as the westerly limit. This raises two questions regarding superelevation on adjacent curves:

a. The PT for the horizontal curve to the east of the bridge appears to be about 150 to 200 feet within the project limits. Is the DB responsible for checking, and modifying if necessary, the superelevation transition for the curve? Or is the intent for the DB to match the existing cross slope at the project limit?

b. The PC for the horizontal curve to the west of the bridge appears to be directly under the bridge, and therefore slightly within the project limits. Is the DB responsible for checking, and modifying if necessary, the superelevation transition for the curve? Or is the intent for the DB to match the existing cross slope at the project limit?

**Answer:** a) The Design-Builder is to match (transition to) the existing cross slope at the project limit.

b) The Design-Builder is to transition to and match the existing cross slope at the project limits.

206. Amendment 2, ITP Section C4.3 requests the Proposer to submit a Gantt Chart supplied on Form G, presented in hard copy printed on an 11"x17" sheet. The Thruway provided an "editable" Form G Gantt Chart with the 2/15/19 Editable Forms Zip File. That file was in MS Word and was 8.5"x11" as opposed to the required 11"x17" dimensions. Can the Thruway provide a Form G Gantt Chart in MS Excel that is sized to the requested 11x17" dimensions?

**Answer:** Yes, In Amendment #5

207. Recently it was stated by Thruway Authority that the Exit 23, Route 9W intersection changes was previously a DOT project, but that Thruway Authority has taken over responsibility of this scope. Are DOT plans available for this scope of Work?

**Answer:** They were included in Amendment #4.

208. Has NYSTA made arrangements for State Trooper presence for traffic control? Does the Design-Builder need to include costs for State Troopers?

**Answer:** The State Police coordination is the Authority's responsibility based on proper notification by the by the Design-Builder. Design-Builder is not responsible for the costs.

209. Will NYSTA extend the deadline to ask questions if Amendments are released after this date?

**Answer:** This date? Please refer to the procurements schedule, ITP - Appendix A, Section 5.

210. A site visit revealed that a new VMS sign has been installed in the Lackawanna Terminus area, near milepost 431.1. Will this location be available as a fiber splice point?

**Answer:** No

211. Utility companies have indicated that poles and/or manholes located on Thruway right-of-way are the responsibility of NYSTA. Many of the poles identified in the RFP are on the right-of-way. Is there a contact available from NYSTA to discuss power from these poles?

**Answer:** No, you have to ask the question through our designated representative (our contact).

212. Part 3, Section 8.3.1.2 states "emergency backup generators currently exist within the TUBs that are to remain or immediately adjacent to those TUBs. At least eleven locations of supplement power backup generators are required." Part 3, Section 22.3 states "Any generators taken out of service at the ORT Exit sites shall become the property of the Authority." Does the NYSTA intend that the 11 inadequate generators be removed and replaced with adequate generators? Or should the Design-Builder plan to install an additional generator with parallel operating panels and breakers to supplement the existing system?

**Answer:** The NYSTA intends that the 11 inadequate generators are to be supplemental by the Design-Builder. The wording in the RFP shall be modified so the Design-Builder understands the intent of the supplemental generator and can determine how to connect the old and new.

213. RFP Part 3 Section 22.3.2 and Section 21.8.1 say that a slab containing the treadle, trench drain and loops shall be 22 inches. If we use cast in place concrete does the 22-inch slab continue full depth beyond the end of the loop detector? That would be different than the Thruway Standard Detail TA 690-02. If we use precast concrete slabs and have a seated slab that contains the treadle, but the loop detectors are in separate slabs do the loop slabs need to be 22 inches thick?

**Answer:** No, the loops can be in the 12 inch section. This will be corrected in Amendment #5, or #6.

214. A) If precast concrete slabs are used and a slab does not have a treadle, trench drain nor a loop detector in it does it need to have non-ferrous reinforcing in it? B) What about the dowels between slabs? C) Do they need to be non-ferrous if connecting to a slab with sensors in it?

**Answer:** A) No C) No

B) No

215. Part 3, Addendum 1 section 22.3.13 ORT Ramp checklist conflicts with ORT responsibility Matrix in section 22.3.14. For example, 22.3.13 states that DB is responsible to mount and verify angle of OSI laser scanner as part of turnover checklist prior to TA mobilizing to complete their work. Section 22.3.14 Matrix reads that TA is responsible to install OSI laser scanner and associated in line surge suppressor. DB will not be able to confirm proper angle of OSI laser scanner until after TA completes its portion of the work. Can the OSI Laser scanner item be removed from DB's ORT ramp checklist?

**Answer:** No, Design-Builder responsible for OSI Laser scanner installation. This conflict shall be corrected in Amendment #5.

216. Are the RT 9W intersection improvements required to be completed prior to Go Live? Are they required to be completed by the toll booth removal deadline of 8/4/2021?

**Answer:** Thank you, this work needs to be completed prior to the AETC "Go Live" date. This will be in Amendment #5.

217. Part 2, Appendix 112C, Section 4.4.2 states that "All domestic off-site materials sampling and testing for QC/QA operations will be performed by the Authority in a manner similar to what is done for traditional Design-Bid-Build projects, . . . ." Also, Part 2, Appendix 112A, page i, first bullet in the middle of the page states " All domestic off-site materials sampling and testing for QC/QA will be performed by the Authority". Does this mean that all fabricated components that are subject to plant inspections, such as gantries, prefabricated communications buildings, treadle slabs, precast concrete slabs in general, and other components will be plant inspected by

the Authority or its representatives? A) What would happen if the fabrication takes place outside of New York State where a traditional Authority provided QC/QA inspector may not be working? B) What is your intention for the Design/Builders role in offsite plant inspections?

**Answer:** A) Yes, with exception of the prefabricated Communication Buildings because they are required to meet all NYS Building codes and provide certification to that affect.

B) Need to understand because we do these plant inspections it relieves the Design-Builder from bearing any expense associated with the plant inspections. However, if we inspect and don't approve, the Design-Builder has no recourse. They cannot say ship it anyway because they have no one in the plant. If they want the right to do that the Design-Builder has to incur the cost of the plant inspection and provide qualified individual(s) in the plant(s).

218. In Addendum #3, the Concept Plan for Interchange 24 (Washington) places the Limit of Project prior to the end of the R=1060', e=7.4% geometric improvements to Ramp "ES". Is this ramp improvement to be deleted from the scope of work?

**Answer:** Essentially, yes. Ramp improvements are limited to the project limits. See Amendment #4, and #5.

219. In Addendum #2, Part 3, Section 26.3 requires that the Communication Buildings have foundations resembling that of a "crawl space." What is the minimum vertical clearance to be provided in the crawl space? What are the requirements for where/how access is to be provided?

**Answer:** Just meet the requirements as currently stated in the RFP.

220. With regard to the Project Limits shown on the Google images in Part 7, is the Design Builder required to provide a new pavement surface within the entire limits shown, even if all other required improvements can be completed within a shorter distance?

**Answer:** No.

221. NYSDOT has adopted EI 17-008, entitled "RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF WEAK-POST W BEAM, HPBO TERMINALS, AND HALF-SECTION CONCRETE BARRIER" effective May 1, 2018. Will the Authority be implementing this design criteria for this project?

**Answer:** Refer to Section 1.6 of Part 3, NYSDOT EI are required to be followed.

222. Exit 19 (Kingston) – The zone designated for the ORT gantry placement indicated in the Concept Plan in Part 7 does not provide for the minimum 150-foot separation from the adjacent existing sign structure. Please advise as to NYSTA's preferred resolution of this conflict. Note that if the gantry is moved to the west of the designated zone, the space available for the acceleration lane and merge taper for the NB NYS Route 587 to I-87 ramp would be substandard.

**Answer:** This conflict will be addressed as part of Amendment #5.

223. Please clarify the extent of the ORT roadway design requirements, specifically regarding the 40-mph design speed. This is of concern for ORT Exit 20W (Saugerties). Beginning immediately west of the toll plaza to be removed is an existing horizontal curve with a 90-foot radius. Route 32 is immediately adjacent to this curve. The existing cross slope of the ORT roadway at Route 32 is "level" (assume NC, but rough measurements show ~1.5%). At a 40-mph design speed this curve would need a radius of 4,770 feet which would extend beyond the available ROW and would require significant redesign/reconstruction of Route 32. It should also be noted that the on/off-ramp immediately east of the toll plaza (curvature actually begins in the toll plaza) does not appear to be designed for 40 mph. The on-ramp does not have a signed speed but has a horizontal curve of approximately R=410' with a cross slope of 3.8% which correlates to a design speed between 30 and 35 mph. The off-ramp is signed 35 mph, but has a horizontal curve of R<1,000' and a cross slope of 2.7% which correlates to a design speed of approximately 30 mph. Would NYSTA please clarify the design criteria used for its concept layout, since it doesn't appear to match what is specified in the RFP?

**Answer:** The horizontal curves (Ramp curves) shall be treated as non-standard/non-conforming features in the Design Report

224. Part 3, Section 22.4.1 at Exit 27 states, "The Design Builder shall construct an ORT Zone to the east of the toll plaza and maintenance driveway where the ramps split with 2 lanes and a shoulder in each direction with delineators for a Design Speed of 40 MPH - Semi-direct Connecting Ramp." This is consistent with the concept plans provided under Part 7, Section 2; however, in Part 7, Section 18, the table of Toll Plaza Protection Inventory indicates that Positive Protection through the toll plaza area is required. Please clarify if positive protection or delineators are required through the toll plaza area.

**Answer:** Part 7, Section 18 is correct. The Part 7, Section 2 and Part 3, Section 22.4.1 shall be changed via Amendment #5.