

Final RFP
Questions and Answers
175 – 185

175. Is there exterior lighting requirements for the Communication Buildings?

Answer: Correction to question #130 – There are requirements for exterior lighting for the Communication Buildings. Please see Amendment #3.

176. Did you receive an answer from your legal on question #159?

Answer: In the event that the Design-Builder abandons performance of the work before achieving AETC Completion and/or Project Completion, the Design-Builder is liable for both: 1) liquidated damages as enumerated in Article 15 of the Agreement for failure of the Authority to obtain the benefits of AETC Completion and/or Project Completion on the identified dates; and 2) all other actual damages associated with the Design-Builder's abandonment of the work (except damages pertaining to the Authority's delay in receiving the benefits of AETC Completion and/or Project Completion on the identified dates).

177. Is the answer to Question #147 correct?

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 approved per the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide 4.5.1 – Signs, Signals, Lights, Breakaway Luminaire Support, etc. approved.

178. There has been no written clarity for question #11?

Answer: Disregard the answer to question #11. The Design-Builder shall follow the appropriate specifications and the requirements of the RFP. Our apologies for the misinformation. This will be corrected in Amendment #4.

179. Will NYSTA allow Temporary Concrete Barrier (NYSDOT Standard 619-01 or approved equivalent) to be used as a permanent form of positive protection?

Answer: No

180. At ORT sites where existing lighting is in place, is the Design-Builder required to relocate lights located within the construction footprint? Certain lights seem to be in place for the sole purpose of lighting the existing toll plaza. Can these be permanently removed if they are in conflict with the proposed work if the Design-Builder provides temporary lighting throughout construction and demolition operations?

Answer: No and yes to the two questions asked.

181. Are there any FAA coordination requirements for the installation of a gantry near the Buffalo Niagara International Airport? If so, is the Design-Builder responsible for that coordination?

Answer: See answer to question #5 of Pre-Draft RFP Meeting Q&A's.

182. Will NYSTA provide specific guidance on the required horizontal and vertical dimensions and required number of character rows of DMS signs?

Answer: Yes, the special specifications in Part 8 will be modified to address this issue. Expect to see it in Amendment #4.

183. It is our understanding that some of the TUBs to be removed may provide power to Tandem Lot lighting and possibly other electrical or communication devices. Do these need to be reconnected somehow or are we to assume that everything at TUBs to be removed are to be terminated per section 25.2.2(f) of Part 3?

Answer: We are working on providing directions on these issues. Posting of information expected in Amendment #5 if not sooner.

184. Statewide – General Questions

- a. For gantries installed on the mainline, is the intent of the existing narrow shoulder to remain the same even if the highway design manual requires a newly reconstructed shoulder to be 10ft? (Follow up to Q&A #56)

Answer: See answer to question #56. The Authority is not looking for “hour glass” configurations on the Thruway involving short distances. That presents a safety issue. Since the Design-Builder is potentially dealing with a short segment of highway 204' minimum, the shoulder should remain constant before, during, and after placement of the concrete and gantry.

- b. ORT Civil Work – generally at each toll booth the cross slope is very flat, is it the intent of the Authority to chase that to create a 2% normal crown (or whatever is required) or do we just remove and match each end (Follow up to Q&A #61). Appears that this is answered in Addendum #1 Sxn 16.4.A, asking to double check.

Answer: Yes, we believe it was answered in Section 16.4A, Amendment #1. Further clarification should be in Amendment #3.

- c. Form SP – It was stated in one of the RFP meetings that it was up to the D/B to tell the Authority how many gantries they were going to have so that they could amend Form SP for each D/B team's proposal. Is it number of gantries or number of communications buildings?

Answer: Looking to see if this can be modified. Our intention is to do so but it may be in Amendment #5. It would require a revision to the WPS Form as well.

- d. Invasive Species – There is phragmites in the vicinity of some ORT sites. Our interpretation of the RFP is if we do not encroach on the area with Invasive

Species, we leave them alone. Please confirm?

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

- e. Temporary Lighting at Tandem Lots – Is the D/B team responsible for lighting the tandem lots starting at Contract Award? Do we need to install temporary lighting at the prescribed locations until the permanent can be installed?

Answer: No.

- f. Part 3 Section 18.3.4 – request clarification on “...from the Thruway ramp gore area to the...” Depending on interpretation this could be in 2 places. A graphic could clear this up.

Answer: Graphics were provided in Amendment #3. Hopefully this makes things much clearer.

- g. Part 3 Section 16.4, Addendum #1 – refers to the limit of barrier in defining the project limits but does not clearly define the limit of barrier.

- i. Is the intent of this section to require barrier along the entire length of the median connected ramps at the interchange locations?

Answer: Amendment #3 both drawings and text changes should clarify.

- ii. If so, does the requirement apply to interchange 47, whose connected median ramp AADT in 2030 is below 10,000 vehicles per day, as noted in Part 7 Part 18?

Answer: The interchange to interchange connection, which interchange 47 is, was spelled out in Section 23 and concrete barrier was required. See Amendment #3. We will look to see if Part 7, Section 18 needs a change in Amendment #4.

- iii. If concrete barrier is required along the entire length of the median, it will obstruct sight distance for the left-turning direction on the ramp (the outside ramp of the trumpet). Will a design exception be granted for this condition or will the ramp need to be realigned to provide the required sight distance?

Answer: Read the requirements of Part 3, Section 18.3.4 with the modifications of Amendment #3.

- iv. The HYS DOT HDM requires a left shoulder width of 6' at these ramps. Will a design exception be granted for the left shoulder if barrier is required?

Answer: Amendment #3 with the better-defined project limits “hopefully” clarified the Design-Builder’s responsibility and what shall be done under the work limits as previously defined.

185. Can you provide more clarification of question #141?

Answer: b) This was addressed in Amendment #3, more clarification on project limits. This will be addressed as a nonstandard feature in the Design-Report. The Design-Builder does not have to correct.