

**Final RFP  
Questions and Answers  
225-248**

- 225) The Authority has answered a few questions regarding RFP Part 3 §16.3.1, and what widening work would or would not trigger a full-width mill and resurfacing. We just want to make 100% sure, so please consider what seems to be the "worst case" of this on the project. Exit 23 requires full-depth widening for a turn lane on the west side of Route 9W. Route 9W is 5 lanes wide. Our understanding of the RFP is that we should include the cost to mill and resurfaced Route 9W, 5 lanes wide, plus shoulders, adjacent to the lane widening area, in order to comply with §16.3.1; is that a correct understanding?

**Answer:** It is a correct understanding but not right at this location. We will clarify in Amendment #6.

- 226) There are 1 or more project locations within 100-year floodplains. A good example is Exit 30, where the existing toll plaza and connecting roadways are in the 100-year flood plain of the Mohawk River. We assume that providing flood resiliency measures of any kind, including elevating the roadway are outside of the Design Builder's responsibility for D800002; please confirm.

**Answer:** This is correct.

- 227) RFP Part 3 §3.2 advises the Design-Builder to "hold a pre-application meeting with NYSDEC and/or the USACE, as appropriate, within 60 days from NTP". Via Addendum #2, RFP Part 3 §3.3.9 (Wetland and Stream Information), under "Interchange Locations", text was added indicating that (a) the Design-Builder shall assess areas not previously assessed or delineated for wetlands, and (b) "the Design-Builder shall coordinate with the NYSDEC Regional office to determine permit requirements based on the work being proposed" and/or the "the Design-Builder shall coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District office to determine permit requirements based on the work being proposed". For actions (a) and (b), please confirm whether either, neither, or both may take place now, during the Proposal phase. We just wish to confirm you were not attempting to adjust the procurement rules with these agencies in interest of schedule, and that this is simply post-award clarification.

**Answer:** Neither can take place now. After Best Value determination if the Design-Builder wishes.

- 228) Please provide clarification for Exit 27. The Inventory table in Part 7, Section 18 suggests positive median protection based on the AADT ETC =10 being greater than 10,000 VPD. Part 7, Section2 Concept Drawing only shows delineators. Which is correct?

**Answer:** We believe Amendment #5 clarifies this issue.

- 229) Part 3, Section 15.3.1 states: "For each Gantry erection (Mainline Gantry or ORT Mini-Gantry), the work shall take place and be completed within 20 minutes (the short term closure), and those short term closures shall occur between 1:00 A.M. and 3:00 A.M. If the Design-Builder exceeds that time period allowed, whether it is the 20 minutes or the work occurs outside the 1:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. required..." Will NYSTA please clarify whether the short-term closure window ends at 3:00 AM or 3:00 PM?

**Answer:** It is 3:00AM. Typo will be corrected in Amendment #6.

- 230) Previous NYSTA projects have used epoxy coated steel dowels to connect treadle slabs to adjacent concrete slabs. Will this be permitted on this project at both Mainline and ORT locations?

**Answer:** Yes.

- 231) Article 15 of DB agreement indicates that August 4th is the project completion date. Page 12 of Part 3 indicates that Project completion is December 15, 2021. It was our understanding that the August 4th date is date to have all toll booths removed at all locations and traffic in final configuration and this may be on temporary pavement and temporary positive separation. Other work and final work in these areas can still take place after August 4th. A-3 of ITP indicates August 4th as toll booths removed with traffic operating in required lanes, correct number of lanes, in each direction relative to final condition. Please clarify/confirm what is required for August 4th.

**Answer:** Article 15 of the DB agreement was corrected in Amendment #5.

- 232) Are fiber reinforced polymer reinforcing bars required in all treadle precast slabs for Mainline gantry and ORT locations?

**Answer:** No, Amendment #5 we believe clarifies this issue.

- 233) The deadline to submit questions, per the Final RFP, is April 12, 12pm. If NYSTA releases an Amendment after this deadline (April 12, 12pm), will NYSTA extend the question period to allow teams to review the Amendments and submit questions?

**Answer:** Usually the last amendment deals with non-significant items and provides more clarification. If in the Authority's opinion the amendment warrants changes that are significant and Design-Builders need an opportunity to react we will adjust the schedule. However, based on questions there has to be a last day for the last amendment and this can't be Q&A's after that date. The Authority also wishes not to affect the final NTP date.

- 234) The RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept for Exit 40 calls for removing the current driveway to the maintenance facility (driveway located west of the toll plaza). Maintenance vehicles would enter the yard from the east, via a shared driveway constructed for

maintenance and tandem truck use, as show in the concept. Does the design-builder need to make any further improvements, such as gate removal or changes, pavement improvements or expansion, or parking alterations to improve the connection between the new driveway and the maintenance yard?

**Answer:** No, only to the extent that they interfere with new pavement area.

- 235) At Exit 48, immediately north of the existing toll plaza is a driveway that is blocked off by a concrete barrier. The RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept does not call for any pavement removal of this driveway. Still, we assume this driveway is not meant to be put back in service in the final condition. Please confirm.

**Answer:** 15' of pavement removal from ramp will be required. This will be corrected in Amendment #6.

- 236) RFP Part 3 §18.3.4, for opposite direction ramps with AADT at ETC+10 below 10,000 vehicles, requires separation using “striping, rumble strips, and delineators”. We understand this to mean all three elements are to be provided. There are some opposite direction ramps that have delineators but lack rumble strips. Exit 40, from the I-90 WB on/off ramp convergence to the toll plaza is on example. This location has striping and delineators, but lacks rumble strips. To add rumble strips would require replacement of the delineators. Please consider revising the RFP such that locations with existing delineators may remain without addition of CARDS, and locations that lack both delineators and CARDS shall receive both delineators and CARDS.

**Answer:** We will look at this. If changed it will be in Amendment #6.

- 237) RFP Part 3 §25.2.2, Paragraph A applies to for Exit 17 (Newburgh), according to the RFP. This section states (for all sites), “The Toll Booths shall not be removed by the Design-Builder until all electronic cashless tolling is activated.” Because Exit 17 is Toll-in-Place, this requirement doesn’t seem to allow construction of the project. Please clarify how that Paragraph A should be applied relative to Exit 17.

**Answer:** As written in the RFP. Can’t take it down earlier, we still have to collect cash tolls until AETC goes live.

- 238) The RFP Part 3, Section 22.4.1 General Requirements reads:

There currently exist 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. Whether it is positive separation or delineators, a minimum of 1 foot left shoulder shall be required.

Part 7, Section 2 of the RFP provides schematics of the median as 4 feet. Concrete barrier will provide positive median protection that is current with the standards while also providing a 1 foot left shoulder while other median barrier systems will not. Is it intended that the 4 foot wide median is a minimum requirement or does the 4 foot wide median need to be carried through the ORT tolling Zone?

**Answer:** RFP Part 3, Section 22.4.1 will be revised in Amendment #6 to read as follows: Whether it is positive separation or delineators a minimum of 1 foot and maximum of 4' left shoulder shall be required. Changes to existing four (4) foot median width must be properly transitioned with required tapers to ramp design speed.

- 239) The revised concept drawing for the Williamsville Toll Plaza shows the existing WB left side travel lane cross-hatched beyond the project limits (South Cayuga Road). Is the D-B responsible for this work?

**Answer:** Those concept drawings are suggested solutions. Your engineering solution may be different or the same. The hatched area in the concept plan is necessary from a traffic flow and safety perspective. As professional engineers, or firms that are stamping drawings you have to create safe operations. There are non-conforming features and non-standard features in this project and will be documented as the Design Report for the Design Builders Reference.

In this instance there are only 2 lanes that are required in that direction. Three are currently there and you have to taper to two. How you do that in the work area limits is your responsibility and it has to meet current standards. In this area you don't have to reduce the footprint but in the project limits you do. We provided a suggested solution but your thoughts or design on how to handle this may be different.

- 240) Section C3.2.2 E requires "Table or drawings showing minimum vertical clearances for every lane in each direction". However, in many of the gantry locations, 3-D survey information is not available. The proposer can show a table indicating what the minimum standard is and that it will be met, as a minimum but cannot show the actual planned vertical clearances for every lane without additional survey. Is this approach sufficient?

**Answer:** We will provide clarification in Amendment #6.

- 241) The RFP Part 7 Section 15 concept for Exit 35 indicates "TUB and Driveway to be Removed". Exit 35 is not listed in RFP Part 3 §1.3 does not include Exit 35 among the TUB demolitions. RFP Part 7 §24.3.3 states to remove "toll plaza canopy, Toll Booths, toll islands, toll lane pavement, and south driveway to TUB"; this is indicate of the TUB remaining and using the north driveway. Please clarify which parts of the RFP are correct.

**Answer:** Part 7, Section 15 is incorrect and will be corrected in amendment #6. The

TUB is to remain.

- 242) An RFP Q&A #165 pointed out a disparity between the RFP text and concepts for TB-Ripley. In response, Addendum #4 revised RFP Part 7 Section 5 concept to say "TUB and Driveway to be Removed". However, RFP Part 3 §1.3 was not revised, and still does not include this TUB among the TUB demolitions. We believe the concept drawing is your intention, but please confirm by revising Part 3.

**Answer:** The TUB is to be removed. Part 3, Section 1.3 will be corrected via Amendment #6.

- 243) For Exit 19, there remains a mismatch of information with respect to the tandem truck ingress/egress. Via Q&A #173 and a revised RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept issued with Addendum #3, we understand that tandem trucks will use, exclusively, the driveway west of the existing toll plaza for ingress/egress, whereas the driveway to Route 28 will not be for tandem trucks. However, the RFP Part 7 Section 3 tandem lot route, which seems to be source of confusion, has not been retracted. (1) Please confirm that the Part 7 Section 3 drawing is void and no improvements are needed for off-site tandem routes. (2) Also, the concept plan shows delineators west of the plaza, which seems inconsistent with the maneuvering needs (no left turns in or out of the tandem truck driveway) and inconsistent with the traffic separation identified in Part 7 Section 18. Please confirm only delineators are to be provided.

**Answer:** 1) Yes, Part 7, Section 3 drawing will be corrected in Amendment #6.  
2) There are no left turns allowed in or out. Yes, Part 7, Section 18 needs to be modified. Amendment #6 will address this conflict.

- 244) At Interchange 27, a separate building is located near the toll plaza. It is our understanding that this building holds the communication equipment to provide redundant fiber optic connectivity for the entire NYSTA fiber network. The fiber as-builts provided do not appear to show this building or the path of any fiber cables that enter the building. Will more information regarding the location of this existing fiber be provided?

**Answer:** See Amendment #6. Security Transmittal.

- 245) Part 3 Section 9.3.8 indicates that vibration monitoring is required for structures within 100 feet of work producing vibration. Does this apply to structures on the NYSTA ROW? Or is this for adjacent property owners?

**Answer:** See answer to Question 47.

- 246) Table 20-1 in section 20.3.4 notes that no cameras or gates are needed at exit 61 (MP 494.50), but it has a "Y" under the "add to existing traffic camera pole" column. Can you clarify if a camera is required to be added to an existing traffic camera pole, or if any other equipment is required to be added to an existing pole at this location?

**Answer:** Yes, a camera is required. This will be corrected in Amendment #6.

- 247) Table 20-1 in section 20.3.4 notes that no camera or gate is needed at exit 39 (MP 289.53), but it has a “Y” under the “add to existing traffic camera pole” column. Can you clarify what new equipment is to be added to the existing camera pole since there is no proposed camera or gate required? If equipment is required to be added to an existing camera pole for the tandem lot, could the Thruway clarify which camera pole is to be utilized?

**Answer:** Yes, there is a camera requirement . This will be corrected in Amendment #6.

- 248) Section 12.3.2.1 of the RFP indicates that the proposed VMS at interchange 35 (Carrier Circle) can be connected via fiber to the existing TUB building. Other parts of the RFP indicate that the existing TUB at exit 35 is to be removed. Can you clarify if the proposed VMS at this interchange shall be connected via fiber to a different facility?

**Answer:** No. The TUB is to remain. See Amendment #5.