

Final RFP
Questions & Answers
162-174

162. Interchange 19 shows two new tandem lot entrances: one along Route 28 and one adjacent to the existing TUB building. The turning template provided and (confirmed by our template runs) shows that the tandem lot access along Route 28 has a much more significant impact than shown in NYSTA's concept plan. This access would widen the existing crosswalk and extend past the fenced-off area with the communications tower. The driveway would also require significant fill as just north of the fence, along Route 28, is when Route 28 begins transitioning to an overpass. The embankment is steep, and there also appears to be some type of runoff/basin/headwall in the grass area between the existing tandem lot and Route 28. In addition, the purpose of this access is unclear. Trucks are restricted to right-in/right-out, and this access would only be needed if trucks miss the right-in/right-out entrance from the mainline. If the intent is for trucks heading northbound on Route 28 trucks to enter the lot, an ingress only access along Route 28 could be provided with a much smaller footprint. The right-out to NB Route 28 can be accomplished by the other proposed access (no loss of ingress/egress directionality). Please confirm that our interpretation of NYSTA's concept is correct and advise if the suggested alternative is acceptable.

Answer: No, it requires clarification and will be provided in Amendment #3.

163. For Exit B2 (Taconic), Amendment 2 increased the design speed from 40 mph to 55 mph. This increase in design speed triples the minimum acceleration length for the SB receiving lane shown in NYSTA's concept plan (from 300' to 900') which is too long to fit before the off-ramp to Upper Cady Road. Please clarify the current intent. Should the receiving/acceleration lane become the thru lane continuing onto Taconic State Parkway, while the right-hand lane becomes exit-only at the off-ramp to Upper Cady Road?

Answer: This location relative to the acceleration length for SB receiving lane in the NYSTA concept plan is being dealt with as non-conforming feature in the design report.

164. There are VMS locations identified by NYSTA that are outside of the NYSTA legal ROW. What is the process for construction in these areas? Are additional permits required? If so, is the Design-Builder or NYSTA responsible for obtaining them?

Answer: The Authority is responsible for securing a Statewide permit for these

locations as well as obtaining a statewide permit for performing WZTC on the NYSDOT Roadways/interstates/etc.

165. At Ripley, the concept drawings show the alignment going thru the existing TUB, whereas the RFP states that the TUB is to remain. Please clarify NYSTA's intent.

Answer: This needs to be corrected. Expect new concept drawing in Amendment #4.

166. At Ripley, the proposed westbound entrance to the tandem lot does not appear feasible for the following reasons: steep grade, existing well within the entrance alignment, and existing transformer. Further, the concept drawing shows work outside the right-of-way. Please confirm NYSTA's intent to implement the concept as shown or provide a revised concept drawing.

Answer: See answer to question #165.

167. At Ripley, the turning radius improvements from Shortman Road to the EB on-ramp appear to work in 2-D. However, upon closer review, the grade difference and close proximity and near parallel alignment of the on-ramp to Shortman Road will result in a very steep grade that cannot meet standards. Is NYSTA aware of this issue, and is additional guidance forthcoming?

Answer: See answer to question #153 and # 165.

168. Is tandem lot traffic data available for the following locations: Batavia (Exit 48), Lackawanna (Exit 55), Hamburg (Exit 57), and Du kirk (Exit 59)?

Answer: First, Lackawanna does not have a Tandem Lot. Second, at the other locations Batavia (Exit 48), Hamburg (Exit 57) and Dunkirk (Exit 59), we do not have detailed counts like we do at the Interchange location Tandem Lots but information summery is available in the reference documents.

169. Raw traffic data, taken over many months and subject to differences in interpretation, has been provided by the NYSTA for determining the number of lanes required to be open during construction at the tollbooth sites. For example, at Exit 61 Eastbound, there are over 8700 data points with only 165 (less than 2%) of these data points exceeding 1100 VPH. The data points over 1100 VPH are scattered over the year at various times with no set pattern, except most are during the summer months or near a holiday. We believe it is reasonable to conclude that by avoiding holiday weekends and the summer months that anticipated hourly traffic is less than 1100 VPH and only one lane is required

through the tollbooths. Please confirm this approach or provide a definitive method to determine allowable windows within the data set that the 1100 threshold is not exceeded.

Answer: Your information is correct. There are times of the year where traffic volumes are higher and holiday times as well. If you stay outside those times and the data provided shows reduced traffic vs. the times that you are working at a particular site, you should use the data relative to that time of year (within that month) and not by the day.

170. Section 16.1.C – Pavement Design and Construction Scope indicates, “Toll plaza area pavement removal locations, interchanges, ORT Exit Sites, and Terminus locations including approaches, to the extent they need to be reconstructed, repaired, and/or resurfaced.” Is the DB required to remove and replace the entire pavement section under the canopy, or just repair where the toll booths, barrier, and curb are removed?

Answer: This information is in Part 7, Section 14. Under the next Amendment #3. The graphical display (figure) to clarify this requirement shall be moved to the front of Section 14.

171. Please provide Pavement Work History/Asphalt Depths and Age/2018 DPI data or graphic for Exits 40-47 (roadway ramps between the mainline and connecting roads) and for Mainline from MP 351.4 to MP 378.2 (graphic was not included in the Reference Documents).

Answer: This information was posted in the reference documents on 3/29/2019.

172. ITP Appendix C, C.4.3 Gantt Chart: Would NYSTA consider removing the requirement for the Gantt Chart / Form G to be included in the proposal? It takes quite a bit more time to prepare than one would think, and the Design-Builder’s schedule information is already presented in detail in the Initial Baseline Schedule. Also, it appears that Form G is of minimal value to the evaluators in scoring the teams, as it is only worth 3 points (the least of any of the scored items).

Answer: No

173. Per Part 3, Section 22.4.1 – Exit 19 Kingston and Part 7, Section 3 – Tandem Lot Routes, the proposed tandem lot access to NYS Route 28 is to be right-in/right-out. A compliant design would have several impacts due to the existing conditions in the area. Because NYS Route 28 rises to an overpass just north of the proposed access, the footprint of the access embankment would be

wide. This is further exacerbated by the large radii required for the turning movements at NYS Route 28 (which are not accurately reflected in Part 7, Section 3 – ORT Locations Concept Plans). Constraints in close proximity to the proposed access are the ADA crosswalk and drainage swale to the south and a fenced-off area and communications tower to the north. One or more of these will be impacted by providing this right-in/right-out access for tandem vehicles. Please confirm that this interpretation of the requirements is correct and that the potential impacts are as anticipated by NYSTA. Note that it would be possible to design this access for a right-in movement for tandem vehicles and a right-out movement for a Single-Unit Truck with minimal impacts, if that would provide the needed functionality.

Answer: The conceptual plan is being modified to clarify the ingress and egress parts. It should be in Amendment #3. For clarity purposes the “proposed tandem lot access to NYS Route 28” as stated in your question is incorrect. That access is for employee vehicles, maintenance vehicles and single tractor-trailers. No Tandems. The Tandems access via the Thruway Tolling area – right in and right out-. The amendment should clarify this.

174. Part 3 Section 20.3 does not provide requirements for the communication equipment needed for the access gates and the CCTVs at the tandem lots. What are the requirements for connectivity to the access gates and CCTVs? Will NYSTA provide information similar to what is provided in Part 3 Section 12.3.2.1?

Answer: Between the secure section that was transmitted to the designated representatives and the appropriate special specifications the Design-Builder Teams should have all the information for the CCTVs including connectivity. Future clarification of the access gates will be provided in Amendment #4.