

**Final RFP  
Questions & Answers  
125-161**

125. Do we need to provide an inspector for compaction testing for treadle and pre-cast slab installation?

**Answer:** The Design-Builder is responsible for Quality Control. Of course, this aspect can affect revenue collection.

126. Amendment 1 and Question 95 clarify that those Form Rs submitted in the SOQ do not need to be included in the RFP. Part ITP, C2.1C, and page C-1, states: Form R for Quality Manager should include an attached sheet that provides a description of experience in quality systems based on ISO 9001 if applicable. Should this attached sheet still be included in the proposal?

**Answer:** That is not applicable in this case, so no; you do not have to submit.

127. For the Detector Loops in the ORT Slabs we have the following question: RFP Part 3 §22.3.4 (Electromagnetic Loops) indicates using Item 680.5830\_\_25 for the Loop Detectors to be installed in the treadle slabs at ORT sites. That special specification, found in RFP Part 8, calls for the loops to be installed prior to casting concrete. At the ORT sites the treadle slabs will be installed under various stages, and precast concrete is being considered to be used in several locations. Installing the loop detector wires in the precast slabs and providing for connection between slabs and to the pull box at the roadway shoulder would complicate the installation. Would it be possible to install the loop detector wires by sawcutting the pavement after all of the slabs have been installed rather than casting them in place? This would be an installation that is the same as that used at numerous locations throughout the State.

**Answer:** No

128. Discussion Topic: Would the Authority and its Quality Assurance engineers consider using off-the-shelf collaborative software and web-based products to provide an efficient digital design review process both in design and for as-built plan reviews?

**Answer:** Yes

129. The tandem truck off-site routes of RFP Part 7, Section 3 send the Long Combination Vehicles (LCVs) over a variety of non-Thruway roadways. Please clarify whether or not it is the design-builder's obligation to assess the existing pavement thickness or condition of any of these roadways as relates to their use by LCVs.

**Answer:** No

130. Please clarify the Authority's requirements for lighting the ORT locations. Currently, all facilities have lighting: the toll plaza, the TUB building and parking, tandem parking lots,

commuter lots, etc. We assume the TUB building and parking will require site lighting, and that tandem and commuter lots will require lighting or retain existing lighting. Please clarify (1) whether the new through roadway should have roadway lighting and (2) whether the Communication Building and its associated parking area requires site lighting.

**Answer:** 1. No  
2. No

131. At Interchange 23, on the south side of the existing plaza, east of the existing toll booths, a wood-faced sheet-pile retaining wall runs along the frontage of the Division Maintenance Building parking lot. Does the Authority request any specific approach to roadside safety with respect to this wall?

**Answer:** You have to comply with the Highway Design Manual.

132. This question concerns RFP Part 3 §18.3.3. We want to make sure we understand the Authority's direction correctly. Paragraph 2 reads, "the Design-Builder shall remove and dispose of all existing guide railing, barrier systems and/or impact attenuators within the Project limits, and replace with new guide railing, barrier systems and/or impact attenuators if required, as per NYSDOT Standards and Authority practices." Taken by itself, this is unambiguous. However, consider the later part, "the limits of work for new roadside and new median barrier shall be the lesser of the following: (1) The point where barrier is no longer warranted unless specifically required elsewhere in the Project Requirements; or (2) The Design Builder will be responsible for upgrading all guiderail, median barrier and terminal end sections within the project limits to current standards. The Design Builder will be allowed to transition and connect new guiderail/barrier system into existing guiderail/barrier system not meeting current standards beyond the project limits..." Is the first sentence of (2) meant to be synonymous with paragraph 2? I.e., does the first sentence of (2) also mean "replace all guiderail within the project limits", as paragraph 2 says. Or does it mean, "assess all guiderail and upgrade to standards - if necessary - within the project limits, and then extend beyond (per the other text)..."?

**Answer:** Project limits at some locations were defined in Amendment #2. The other locations and their project limits shall be defined in Amendment #3. Design-Builder is responsible for providing guiderail within project limits that meet current standards if guiderail is within project limits and meets current standards, it can remain and it can be transitioned into if necessary. This will be addressed in Amendment #3.

133. The RFP Part 7 Section 15 concept plan for Exit 35 shows a "new additional tandem lot" adjacent to the Dewitt service area, but RFP Part 3 §24.3.3 (Exit 35) and §13.3.2.1 (Lighting Locations) do not mention it. Please clarify if this additional lot is to be constructed, and if new illumination is to be provided and to what level.

**Answer:** Yes, it is to be constructed. This will be addressed in Amendment #3, see Section 20.

134. At the TB Woodbury, the RFP text or concepts do not seem to specifically address the removal of the existing pedestrian bridge. Please provide the Authority's requirement for that work.

**Answer:** Yes, the pedestrian bridge is to be removed. It is part of the Toll Booth structure. It will be addressed in Amendment #3.

135. At Exit 44, the RFP Part 6 concept drawing indicates, "Existing TUB and driveway to remain". RFP Part 3 §1.3 (Scope of Work - Major Items) includes Exit 44 in the list of required TUB removals. Please clarify whether the TUB and/or its driveway are to remain.

**Answer:** This was addressed in Amendment #2. The TUB and driveway is to be removed.

136. The RFP requires Communication Buildings for the mainline gantries and ORT sites: (a) For the mainline Communication Buildings, are parking areas required to be paved? Are vehicle paths from parking areas to the building itself required to be paved? Are sidewalks required, and if so of what material? (b) For the ORT Communication Buildings, are parking areas required to be paved? Are sidewalks required, and if so of what material?

**Answer:** This was addressed in Amendment #2. Yes, the parking areas are to be paved, the vehicle access driveways are to be paved, and the walking paths to the Communications door are to be paved.

137. At Exit 49, east of the existing toll plaza, an existing culvert and limited right-of-way constrain the roadway width. The RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept plan appears to address this limitation by using a narrow shoulder across the culvert. Please confirm that the Authority will accept this same solution from the Proposer.

**Answer:** Yes, the narrow shoulder is an existing condition and it is anticipated to remain and shall be addressed as a non-standard feature in the Design Report for this project.

138. RFP Part 3 Section 23 describes legislative routes for Tandem Trucks. Are any permanent signs required to indicate the tandem truck off-site routes?

**Answer:** No

139. Can existing pavement markings or WZTC temporary markings be scarified or abraded to remove on a pavement surface that will be the final surface?

**Answer:** Existing pavement, yes. New Pavement, no. This question is phrased differently than what was asked at the one-on-one meeting. This will be addressed in Amendment #3.

140. RFP Part 3 §16.3.3 (Milled and Resurfaced Roadways) states that, "minimum mill and inlay depth at tie-transitions shall be 2 inches". Will this treatment be allowed on existing composite pavements where the existing concrete is reputed, believed, or found to be in fair to poor condition, or will a greater depth of milling be required in that case?

**Answer:** Isolated repairs might be required and that would be via force account, if encountered.

141. RFP Part 3 §18.3.2 (Design Requirements) indicates an 80 MPH design speed for TB Woodbury. On the southbound side, an existing vertical curve in an area mostly unaffected by the primary work of this site has a stopping sight distance (SSD) of 790 feet, compared to the required SSD of 910 feet for an 80 MPH design speed. a) Should we propose a reconstruction to improve the vertical geometry here? We offer this as a specific example among many project-wide on the major roadways: it is unclear to us to what lengths the Authority wants us to go to achieve the RFP design speeds. We are concerned about the risk of assuming you will accept design exceptions for these, if you ultimately will not. And we are concerned about including the cost of major improvements in our bid that you do not desire.

**Answer:** a). No  
b). This will be addressed in Amendment #3, more clarification on project limits.

142. On some ramp locations (for example Exits 27, 30 and 37), existing median delineators extend from the plaza to terminate near the ramp's overpass or underpass of the Thruway mainline. On the system side of the termination point, where the undivided median is presently not delineated, will the Design-Builder be required to install delineators pursuant to Note 1 which appears on all Concept Plans in Part 7, Section 2 and RFP Part 3 §18.3.4?

**Answer:** Design-Builder is required to meet requirements of Part 3, Section 18.3.4 at Exits 27, 33, 34, 37, 38, 56 and 57. Replace and provide additional delineators per specifications and RFP requirements, including bridge areas. At interchange 47 and Exit 48, the current delineators to meet the proper spacing requirements as stated in the RFP. This will be addressed in Amendment #3.

143. All Concept Plans in Part 7, Section 2 bear an identical Note 2, which reads "WHEN POSITIVE PROTECTION IS PREMATURELY TERMINATED FOR A TURN LANE OR DRIVEWAY, "CARDS" SHALL BE USED TO THE EXTENTS OF DOUBLE YELLOW LINE." The only concept plan in this section that clarifies the longitudinal extent of CARDS is for Exit 41 Waterloo, where a call-out shows CARDS extending to the stop line of the local street. However, it is unclear whether the Exit 41 drawing is representative of all ORT sites. Please clarify the longitudinal limits where CARDS and double yellow lines are required per Note 2.

**Answer:** This will be addressed in Amendment #3. The RFP text (wording) shall govern and the CARDS shown on Exit 41 shall be removed, but CARDS are still required.

144. Part 3, Section 18.3.3, third paragraph describes the limits of work for new barrier. Do these same provisions also apply to the limits of work for new delineators? For example, if both the plaza and ramps warrant median delineators per the RFP's traffic-volume based criteria, and existing substandard median delineators extend more than 500 feet beyond the project limits on the opposing undivided Thruway ramps, may the Design-Builder limit the new installations of median delineators to the plaza?

**Answer:** See answer to question 142.

145. The criteria they have listed to be eligible for the incentive payment does not seem to make sense. Item 2, 4 & 5 detail temporary features (temp pavement at toll location, temp barrier). Item 3 however states that all pavement repairs are to be completed. In the case of Williamsville the entire plaza is to be reconstructed so you would go in once to reconstruct everything, including where the tolls are and get to your final cross slope. For Exit 24 the repair areas do not encompass the entire plaza but the current concept plan shows reconstructing it in order to meet the design requirement, making the stand alone repairs obsolete. If we can discuss with them and the repair requirement is not as it reads it makes achieving the incentive a lot more realistic and still a large benefit to the Authority.

**Answer:** We believe the requirements as stated in the RFP are clear. Maybe, your question needs to be reworded or clarified relative to a discrepancy.

146. With respect to opposite direction ramps with AADT at ETC+10 greater than 10,000 vehicles per day, the Authority had asked that we revisit the wording of the RFP and call to attention if we believe the RFP is not clear. Taking Exit 23 for example, the Authority expressed that the RFP is meant to ask for a permanent concrete barrier from gore to gore across the plaza area, and then positive separation that does not have to be concrete barrier beyond the plaza area, along the ramps, back to the mainline Thruway or connecting highways. We have reviewed this further and we believe there is a lack of clarity. Please review the RFP wording at Part 3 §18.3.4. The wording of this section is considered together with RFP Part 7 Section 18 "Toll Plaza Positive Protection Inventory", which for Exit 23 shows Y/Y (Plaza/Ramp) for needing Positive Protection. The section heading for §18.3.4 reads, "Median Protection Requirements for Opposite Direction Ramps". The second sentence then reads, "For Interchanges 23 (etc.), positive separation will consist of permanent concrete barrier from the Thruway ramp gore area to the connecting highway gore (ramp terminus location)"; the third sentence reads, "Median barrier meeting current standards is required at all other opposite direction ramp locations where the AADT of ETC+10 exceeds 10,000 vehicles". Our question is whether Sentence 2 is speaking specifically to the plaza area, and Sentence 3 is speaking to the ramps that extend from the mainline Thruway to the plaza area. We do not believe this is clearly defined.

**Answer:** Amendment #3 we believe will clarify this issue. We are specifically defining the project limits at all locations except the Mainline gantry location and Terminus locations where the Design-Builder sets the project limits based on their design, the requirements in the RFP and meeting current standards.

147. This question is generally related to RFP Part 3 Section 13 (Lighting). At various project sites, we will provide new or replacement lighting where we interpret it is required per the RFP. When we place light poles along a Thruway roadway, please identify if there is a minimum setback that is required from edge of pavement to face of pole, including when the pole has breakaway design.

**Answer:** So breakaway can be in the clear zone, otherwise if not a breakaway they have to be protected. The breakaway light supports have to be MASH appraised per the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide 401 – Signs, Signals, Lights, etc. approved.

148. The RFP at ITP §3.2.1 (Design Narrative) says, "Describe any Design Non-Conformances or aspects of the Design that do not conform to the Project Requirements and/or Standards listed in the RFP. Any Design Non-Conformances or designs that do not conform to the Project Requirements and/or Standards listed in the RFP, have not been approved by the Authority, and have not been described in the Proposer's Proposal will be rejected by the Authority after Contract Award." Add a RFP Form for entering any Non-Conformances in list format (such as Location, Citation of Standard, Criteria, Proposed Non-Conformance).

**Answer:** This will be addressed in Amendment #4. The Authority will take the suggestion under consideration.

149. With Addendum #1, RFP Part 3 §3.3.3 provides considerably more guidance regarding SWPPPs. We have a nuanced follow up question that the RFP does not directly address. NYSDOT HDM Chapter 8, NYSDEC SPDES GP 0-15-002, and NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual all clearly define and differentiate "New Development" and "Redevelopment Activity". However, there is language in these documents that imply that a developer may need to meet New Development standards where their project site affords the space and conditions to do so. We ask that the Authority clarify whether we need to design permanent stormwater quantity and quality controls to New Development or Redevelopment guidelines.

**Answer:** It is expected the requirements for permanent controls at a site will be based on a combination of New Development and Redevelopment requirements. The Design Builder shall consider areas of pavement replacement (i.e. toll plaza removal and replacement with travel lanes) as Redevelopment. Areas of new impervious surfaces (i.e. access roads, new parking areas, etc.) shall be considered New Development.

150. RFP Part 3 §16.3.1 describes various requirements for full-depth reconstruction, including instructions related to partial-width full depth reconstruction (not allowed) and permanent widening's. The RFP does not seem to specifically address shoulder-only reconstructions. Please clarify if a shoulder may be reconstructed full depth without triggering the need to reconstruct or overlay adjacent travel lanes. Please include in your response whether a median may be reconstructed for the sole purpose of installing median concrete barrier, without triggering the need to reconstruct or overlay adjacent travel lanes in both directions.

**Answer:** Amendment #2 should have clarified this.

151. The RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept for Exit 30 calls for pavement marking hatchings to define an entrance to the Construction Lot. Is the intention that we remove and do not replace any existing guiderail along this frontage?

**Answer:** No.

152. This question is generally related to RFP Part 3 Section 16 (Pavement Design and Construction). As relates to the possible need to mill existing PCC pavement at some locations, does the Authority have a typical depth of cover that has been used for slab construction?

**Answer:** No, usually the mesh is higher than we anticipate.

153. In the LCV regulation, the westbound tandem lot at Exit 61 (TB-Ripley) is defined as “breakup” only and the eastbound lot is “makeup” only, and the Thruway ends at the toll barrier. Based on this regulation, it seems there would not be a reason for a tandem in the westbound lot to access the eastbound travel lane (a single-trailer truck, already allowed on local roads, could leave the westbound lot). An off-site route for tandem trucks is illustrated for Exit 61 in RFP Section 7 Part 3. Please confirm whether an off-site routes and any consequent improvements are needed at this location.

**Answer:** No, you are correct. It will be addressed in Amendment #3, the Authority anticipates the intersection improvements on Shoreline Drive will still be required but for tractor trailers only.

154. The RFP Part 7, Section 2 Concept for Exit 56 identifies the ramps as getting "Positive Protection Barrier". The RFP Part 7 Section 18 "Inventory/Existing/Proposed Conditions for Median Protection between Opposing Lanes in Plazas and Interchanges" identifies the ramps as only getting delineators, based on an AADT ETC+10 being less than 10,000 vehicles per day. Please clarify which solution the Authority requires - barrier or delineators - for the Exit 56 ramps.

**Answer:** The concept plans showing positive protection in the toll plaza area is correct. The Ramps are not shown but Part 7, Section 18 requires delineators. We will correct this via amendment.

155. The RFP Part 7, Section 2 Concept for TB-Williamsville includes suggested exit ramp geometry for I-90WB to I-290 NB/SB. The I-90 WB design shows 3 lanes, with the left lane for exit only to I-290 SB, the right lane for exit only to I-290 NB, and the middle lane being a "decision lane" that is oriented through for I-290 SB, but can exit to I-290 NB. Please refer to AASHTO Green Book (2018) Figure 10-55 B1 and B2, which show preferred and alternate designs for this situation, which is called "auxiliary lane introduced for effective distance in advance of exit". The RFP concept falls considerably short of the desirably distances in this figure. We have developed alternate designs for (a) a 2-lane parallel exit ramp that meets design standards (best case), and (b) a 2-lane parallel exit ramp with substandard lengths of auxiliary lanes (intermediate case). Our alternates have greater impacts than the RFP concept. Please review and comment.

**Answer:** See Amendment #3. Project limits are redefined and clarified.

156. RFP Part 3, §22.4.1, under Exit 58 (Silvercreek), states, "the Design Builder shall construct an ORT zone to the south of the existing toll plaza 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 RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept for this location. However, reading further in §22.4.1 is an apparent contradiction; it reads, "C. Exiting Traffic, the 2 exiting lanes shall taper to 1 lanes with shoulder after the ramps merge to meet the existing lane configuration and through the Toll Zone and then widen to 2 lanes to meet the 2 lane ramp diverge at Rte. 5/20". Please review and clarify the number of proposed exiting lanes in advance of and through the Toll Zone.

**Answer:** This will be corrected via Amendment #3.

157. Can we take pavement cores in the shoulders at proposed mainline gantry locations?

**Answer:** Yes, it does require permits for the locations but the Thruway will expedite such requests. Please cc the designated contact when requesting such permits.

158. a) AS SUBMITTED: Part 1, Article 19 Self Performance states that the Design Builder must self-perform with its own organization Contract Work amounting to not less than 51% of the original total Contract Price, and Subcontractors are excluded. Although Kiewit Infrastructure Co. (KIC) is the Design-Builder, we submitted our Statement of Qualifications and were prequalified by the Authority as a Team consisting of KIC and 3 dedicated, exclusive Construction Subcontractors – D.A. Collins, Union Concrete and Construction, and O’Connell Electric Co. This team had been formed in consideration of the unique and extensive resources required by this Statewide project to ensure adequate resource availability. We request that the work that is self-performed by these 3 dedicated, exclusive, prequalified Construction Subcontractors be included in the amount used to calculate the 51% requirement.

**Answer:** As stated in the one-on-one meeting, if this were to change it would have to change for all Design-Builders. This is not confidential and we provided an answer that we would look at this if implemented it would be in Amendment #3.

b) SUGGESTED CHANGE: Part 1, Article 19 Self Performance states that the Design Builder must self-perform with its own organization Contract Work amounting to not less than 51% of the original total Contract Price. In order to utilize competitive, specialized, Subcontractor pricing, and present best pricing to the Authority, we request this % be lowered to 30%

**Answer:** See answer to #158 a) above.

159. Please confirm that the Actual Damages listed in Article 15 of the D/B Agreement are only recoverable by the Authority separately from the specified Liquidated Damage rates in the event that the Design/Builder abandons performance of the Work before achieving AETC and/or Project Completion.

**Answer:** Our legal team is looking at this. We await an answer.

160. Power Allowance - was an item created for the Utility Company costs for providing services? If so, can temporary power be included in the allowance, if required?

**Answer:** No specific item was created. Costs for power to Communication Buildings that involves power companies, are covered under the draw down force account item on Form SP.

161. Given the number of Q&A, will the written responses be part of the Contract?

**Answer:** Q & A’s are never part of the contract. They provide clarification of what has already

been stated. If the clarification is significant, it is issued by amendment making it part of the contract or if the question points out a contradiction or a discrepancy and amendment is issued to correct the error and thus becomes part of the contract.