

Final RFP
Questions and Answers
1-18

1. Will NYSTA provide existing utility mapping in CADD for the 34 ORT Exits similar to the reference documents provided for the interchanges and terminus locations?

Answer: No, not in CADD. We are beginning to load in the reference folder the utility permit plans by exit. This is the best information we have available and the loading of the data will occur as we receive it. It is reference material.

2. Will NYSTA please confirm that a 4 ft wide median with no inside shoulders shall be provided at the ORT Exit gantry locations where positive barrier and/or delineators are required?

Answer: This is not an accurate interpretation. There currently exists at the ORT Exit sites four (4) foot medians leading from the Thruway into the Toll Plaza area. That median area needs to be carried through the new ORT Exit site alignments. So, whether it is positive separation or delineators, a minimum of 1 foot left shoulders shall be required. This will be addressed in the first amendment.

3. NYSTA shared the gantry plans for four gantry spans as reference documents in December. These were 122 ft, 124 ft, 50 ft, and 72 ft span designs. Are Design-Builders expected to use these as standards for mainline tolling locations?

Answer: These were reference documents that were provided. They meet the requirements as stated in the RFP for the mainline gantries and Terminus locations. They are however, not required to be used. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to decide if they choose to utilize the reference documents understanding that the requirements of the RFP still apply.

4. Regarding Resident Engineers: will NYSTA accept experience as Engineer-In-Charge for NYSTA and/or NYSDOT as equivalent experience to Resident Engineer experience?

Answer: Yes, as long as the individual meets all the other requirements for qualifications.

5. Will NYSTA provide editable versions of the forms (word, excel)?

Answer: Those editable forms were posted on 2/15/2019.

6. Part 2, DB 109-6, pages 184-187 states that the Design-Builder shall submit a request for payment by the 5th day of each month. Part 2, DB 109-5.2, page 184 states that the Department of Engineering has determined it will require an audit period of 30 days for all progress billings. Part 2, DB 109-7.3, page 189 states that within 30 days after receipt by the Authority of an acceptable request for payment, the Authority will pay the Design-Builder the amount of the request.

Will NYSTA please clarify this process? It currently seems that the Design-Builder submits on the 5th of the month for the previous month's work. The Authority's Project Manager then sends the estimate to the Department of Engineering for a 30 day audit. After approval, it is forwarded to the Authority who has another 30 days to provide payment. This is essentially a 60 day turnaround for payment and Design-Builder will have to work an average of 75 to 90 days without receiving payment.

Answer: While a period of 30 days is allowed for audit per the specification we expect this will be much less and generally should be able to be completed within a few days. Also, while an additional 30 days is allowed per the specification once the request is found to be acceptable, we anticipate the time to generally be approximately half of that, although this may vary based mainly on the workload of the OSC. Our goal is to complete the entire process from request submittal to issuance of the check within 30 days or less.

The Design-Builder will submit payment by the 5th day of each month. Sect 109-5.2 allows up to 30 days to audit the payment request. Note that the Department of Engineering includes the field staff and the Authority's Project Manager as part of the Dept. of Engineering. For a standard payment request, which does not include an order-on-contract, we anticipate that the D-B and our field inspection staff have been working together and there are no surprises on the submitted payment request. In this case, the field staff would perform a brief review of the request and if no errors are found it will be forwarded to NYSTA HQ for processing. At this point, the payment request is considered to be acceptable.

Once the payment request is received at HQ, it is entered into our system by our Contact Management office after which it is circulated for approval by the Office of Construction Management, the Chief Engineer and the CFO. This process is typically completed in 5 working days or less. The request is then forwarded to the Office of the State Comptroller for final approval. The time from submittal to the OSC until issuance of the check is typically 5-10 working days.

7. Will NYSTA be providing more (and more detailed) wetland information about any of the locations, or is it each Proposer's responsibility to investigate further where needed? For many locations, no information has been provided at all.

Answer: You have to be more specific about your request. In general, nothing more on the Mainline gantry or Terminus sites. These wetland assessments were provided. At the interchange locations, wetland delineation were provided at a number of sites. No wetland assessments or delineation were provided at any ORT sites and the Authority is

not anticipating doing any. The Special Exits sites none were done and none are anticipated to be needed based on the scope of work.

8. Part 7, Section 16: Open toll lanes requirements are missing for Exits 16, B2, B3, and 23 and for the Woodbury and Canaan termini. Will these be provided?

Answer: Yes, the files have been corrected. Exit 16 is not included as part of the information. One lane shall remain open at all times. This last statement will be addressed in the first amendment. Part 7, Section 16 was replaced on 2/19/2019.

9. CAD files for existing utilities are missing for Exits B2, B3, 17, 18, 19, 20E, 20W, 21, 21B, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 29A, and 30, the Canaan terminus, and all mainline areas. Will these be provided?

Answer: See the answer to Question #1

10. As-built plans have not been provided for the existing facilities. These are critical for evaluation of the structural implications of removing individual toll booths from under the canopies (i.e. exit 17 for example). Will as-builts be provided?

Answer: Yes, the As-Builts for Exit 17 Newburgh have been posted to the reference files. Posted on 2/19/2019.

11. Part 3, Section 26.3, sixth paragraph in red-lined version: The last sentence of this paragraph indicates the Design-Builder is to backfill the trenches after Adesta completes the tests of fiber connection from the splice locations to the racks. This implies that the trenches must remain open from the time they are excavated for inner-duct installation until after fiber is pulled and tested, which could be a significant amount of time. Is this NYSTA's intent?

Answer: That is the Design-Builder's decision and assessment of risk as to whether that open cut is done early or closer to when the Design-Builder schedules Adesta to run the fiber, connect to the rack, and splice location.

12. Some of the NYSTA concepts show gantries placed in taper locations where lanes are being added or dropped. Is this a permissible design? If so, is a different treadle configuration required (i.e. different than 10-foot wide centered in a 12-foot lane)?

Answer: The ORT sites are conceptual designs and the allowable mini-gantry locations are requirements, in that the mini-gantry area shown on the concept plans is where the mini-gantry shall be placed (limits). In the ORT Exit RFP section and other sections of the RFP there are allowables and restrictions relative to sites and tapers etc. etc.

13. Part 3, Section 22.4.1, Exit 27 Amsterdam states, "The Design Builder shall construct an ORT zone to the east of the toll plaza and Maintenance driveway where the ramps split.....". In Part 7, Section 2 – ORT Concept Plans, the layout for Int. 27 – Amsterdam Plaza shows the potential toll zone east of the existing toll plaza but not completely east

of the existing Maintenance driveway. Does the requirement in Part 3 mean east of the proposed location of the Maintenance driveway? In other words, is it permissible to locate the gantry adjacent to the existing Maintenance driveway which is to be removed?

Answer: Yes, it is permissible to locate the gantry adjacent to the existing maintenance driveway, which is to be removed. The text wording in Part 3 Section 22.4.1 shall be modified via the first amendment.

14. Part 7, Section 19 – Traffic Data – Will NYSTA be providing traffic data for the Williamsville, Lackawanna, and Ripley terminus locations?

Answer: Yes, that traffic data has been added to Section 19. Traffic data (the raw traffic data) in Part 7, Section 19 did include Williamsville and Lackawanna. The other terminus locations of Canaan, Woodbury, and Ripley however were missing. That data has been added. It was posted on 2/21/2019.

15. Part 7, Section 6 – Asbestos and Hazardous Materials – Will NYSTA be providing Asbestos and Hazardous Materials reports for the remainder of the project locations?

Answer: The Authority is working on this information, but more than likely the results will have to be issued via an amendment and that amendment will occur closer to the last amendment deadline. Some information regarding the Erie Section was not posted but was recently loaded in the Part 7 – Engineering Data, Section 6. Specifically, Exits 56, 57, 57A, 58, 59 and 60 were posted on 2/22/2019.

16. Re. the Lackawanna terminus location: are contract documents available for the current active construction project at this location (including any field changes)? What is the existing Overhead Bridge Clearance proposed by the current project? What is the superelevation proposed by the current project?

Answer: These documents were posted as reference documents on 2/5/2019.

17. Trying to open the files within the “Sample of minor Gantry” folder supplied by NYSTA is not working. They are .dgn files but both the construction team and designers are not able to get them to open properly. It was suggested that a reference file may be missing. Can the Authority look into this issue?

Answer: That issue should be corrected now. Corrected on 2/21/2019

18. Can the Thruway provide contacts at Kapsch, OSI and Inex or provide clearance for the shortlisted firms to contact each of them directly for the OTR locations without risk of being disqualified for contacting a no-contact firm?

Answer: No, shortlisted firms cannot talk to Kapsch or any other company who is providing third party services for the Thruway. If you have questions, you must submit them in writing following the protocol in the RFP.