

Final RFP
Questions and Answers
24-92

24. Is it possible to have meetings and submittals/reviews between Best Value determination and NTP?

Answer: Yes, but there are many logistics that have to be worked out that fall primarily on the Design-Builder. Things such as where is the Design being done, is Design Quality Control plan approved, is the safety plan approved, the amount of non-conformance issue in the Designs (if any), and the list goes on. The Authority wants this Design-Build to be successful and shall work to add to and not subtract from the project progressing, as long as the Design-Builder stays the course and meets the project requirements. Issues complicate “fast track” design. Issues such as non-conformance design, process, and quality control procedures.

25. RFI Reviews – What durations should we expect?

Answer: It depends on how many, how complex the question, if the question is clear etc. etc. but the Authority is committed to providing quick turnarounds.

26. Design change reviews – What is their duration?

Answer: Again, same as previous answer. A Design change also indicates that the Design-Builders original thoughts were not well thought out or careless and this cannot be an occurring theme, as this will slow things down. If the design change is easily justified, the turnaround should be relatively short.

27. How about NCR Reviews and approvals – What is their duration?

Answer: NCRs – We hope we do not see many because that will bog the system down. If the Design-Builder’s justification is weak this process could drag on but we can’t commit to a specific time frame because each NCR will have different issues. The best answer the Authority can provide is do not have any NCRs.

28. What about design exceptions? How fast can they be approved.

Answer: First, nothing guarantees that they will be approved. Secondly, if the Quality Assurance Engineer is doing over the shoulder reviews and is part of the design process and reviews, it should not be problematic as a design exception and approvals of such should be fast.

29. The TL-5 Barrier in Section 10 of Part 3 is confusing.

Answer: This will be corrected with amendment #1. It only applies to bridge structures.

30. Can the Thruway clarify how far out obligation extends to minimizing the final impervious footprint; do we only remove what is shown (least case), do we maximize removal (most case), or is it left to our judgment site by site?

Answer: The Authority does not want to continue maintaining pavement that is no longer needed by current design standards. So based on the Design-Builder's alignments and meeting the requirements of the RFP unless specifically stated in the RFP that certain pavement areas shall remain, all areas no longer being utilized shall be removed and constitute the reduction of pavement footprint.

31. Are there any prohibitions against using recycled pavement as subbase on D800002?

Answer: No, but be aware the Design-Builders shall follow the specifications relative to gradations etc. Failure to do so will stop this practice in its tracks.

32. We believe some lanes are 13', not 12'. How do we address this at the treadle/precast?

Answer: The precast slabs can be 12' and the area between the precast side and the shoulder (the 1-foot or 2-foot discrepancy) shall be full depth asphalt areas.

33. Are Communication Buildings in the median areas acceptable?

Answer: Yes, this was stated before in Q&A on the draft RFP.

34. Terminus locations are missing from Section 19 of Part 7

Answer: All raw data for the Terminus locations was posted on 3/4/2019.

35. Will Authority accept gantry design w/o new geotech borings, but rely on existing information to meet AASHTO and NYSTA Standards?

Answer: That is the Design-Builders risk based on the geotechnical engineer's opinion for each site. If the result proves to present problems the consequences and means of resolution rests on the Design-Builder and would result in a documentation for an NCR. This is strictly the Design-Builders decision.

36. How long can we run on ungrouted slabs?

Answer: Design-Builders risk. Damage to slabs shall require replacement and can have significant consequences. Suggest Design-Builders talk to their precasters.

37. Relative to Kapsch needing 30 calendar days to install and test a gantry site. Please clarify what constitutes a gantry site.

Answer: For each Communication Building used on the mainline gantry sites or Terminus location sites constitutes "a site".

38. Will there be some sort of form for the Kapsch work stating that the work has been completed and Kapsch can begin?

Answer: The Authority is working on checklists for both Kapsch and Thruway (ORT Exit Sites) where Thruway personnel have to be notified. Both checklists shall be provided in Amendment #2.

39. Mainline Gantries must be protected by "appropriate barrier system" confirm this is precast, that can transition to guiderail?

Answer: Yes, it can be concrete barrier, but it is a function of the deflection distance as stated in the RFP. Even if outside the clear zone, some appropriate protection system is required.

40. Exit 20W has issues relative to the maximum superelevation allowable for ORT Exit Sites. It contradicts with current directives and within the allowable Tolling zone.

Answer: This problem has been corrected in amendment #1 where the 8% cross slope on entry to the Thruway system shall be allowed at this location only and tolling zone has been expanded toward the intersection and also shortened on the opposite side, on the exit side from the Thruway.

41. 22.3.13 states there is one TA installation crew per division. When NY Division crew is not working in NY Division, can it go to other divisions?

Answer: Amendment #1 addresses the number of Authority crews to be available per division and the opportunity to provide assistance to adjacent divisions.

42. 16.3.1 states that no partial-width full depth reconstruction will be permitted. The photo in Part 7 Section 14 shows partial-width full depth reconstruction.

Answer: You are referring to isolated concrete repairs. That requirement is different from full depth reconstruction on the Mainline or Terminus locations or elsewhere due to modifications in alignment or the addition of a new lane. If it is just concrete repairs, you need only to address those areas highlighted in Section 14 of Part 7. Cracks addressed as per the RFP.

43. Part 7, Section 14 shows 26 locations that need full depth reconstruction. Are we to assume the remaining 25+ locations have no full depth pavement reconstruction required?

Answer: Yes, that is correct. Just those shown in Section 14 of Part 7.

44. Request Hour by Hour traffic counts for each exit so we can plan plaza canopy/booth demo.

Answer: That information has been provided in the raw hourly volume section 19 of Part 7. Every location should be there with the missing locations posted on 2/2/2019 and the description of the traffic data posted on 3/4/2019.

45. Will the Thruway Authority consider what NYSDOT is pursuing with NYSDEC relative to the 2-step process involving the SWPPP plan and process?

Answer: The Authority did investigate and is adopting the same process for this Design-Build and for future Design-Builds. The Authority has also been in contact with NYSDEC. This has been added via amendment #1.

46. Common practice is to dispose of excess material within NYSTA ROW. Will this be the practice here?

Answer: That depends on the specific requests, the type of material to be wasted, if future projects are anticipated for these areas. The Design-Builder may have to submit requests after chosen as "Best Value" and those sites would be investigated. This request would more than likely have to be submitted as a "value engineering request" unless elsewhere in the RFP a specific area is identified, which has not been the case as of March 5, 2019. We want to work with the Design-Builders to save costs but without specific locations identified, we can't provide any clearer direction.

47. Pre & Post Construction Surveys required on all structures and building within 100 feet of vibration or settlement causing construction activities. Do you want us to perform these surveys on TA Property (TUBs, Shops, State Police, etc.)?

Answer: No, we do not believe this to be necessary. Only private buildings or businesses.

48. How will 3rd party damages to NYS Thruway property within our work limits be handled. Is the Design-Builder involved? If we are directed to make repairs, is this covered under a contract change or force account?

Answer: Yes, the Design-Builder is involved, particularly in the project limits, as defined in amendment #1. In the work limits that depends on a number of different

variables. Firms may want to bring this up at the one on one meetings.

49. Is the Design-Builder responsible for the cost of any maintenance repairs to Thruway Property, such as potholes in pavement, pavement markings, damage to signs, etc.?

Answer: Only within the project limits, not the work limits. See project limits definitions in recent amendment #1.

50. Conflict in Stated Goals Restate Project Goals are 20% MWBE and 0.5% SDVOB in the Standard Clauses NYSTA Contracts.

Answer: This has been corrected via amendment #1. The MWBE goal is 20%, SDVOB goal is .5% and the table of EEO goals is added in ITP Appendix A Section 7.1.

51. Stipend – How did the Authority come up with their dollar value? Advocate to increase significantly to allow innovation and cost savings to the Authority and the patron.

Answer: It is based on a variable number of things in determining the stipend. How directive has the Authority been, how much innovation opportunity do we believe exists, the schedule requirements etc. The Authority has already increased the stipend from \$300,00 to \$350,000.

52. Utilities – Syracuse Bundled Bridges D-B RFP missed the mark on existing utilities. How is the Authority assuring that there are NO significant utility issues?

Answer: We cannot assure that there will not be utility issues. However, utility permits that have been secured at the Thruway are being provided as they become available. They contain drawings of locations of the utilities associated with the permit. These are being posted as reference documents on the Design-Build webpage. Many have been posted already. Design-Builders should monitor this reference document. When dates change associated with the permits new information has been added.

53. Maintenance – Is the Design-Builder responsible for maintenance along the Thruway? Ex. Potholes, Guide Rail hits, etc.

Answer: See answer to Question #49

54. Kapsch Time – RFP states 30 days per location, is that per gantry or per interchange/terminus? Example, if the Design-Builder has 4 gantries for an interchange (2 EB & 2 WB) does the 30 days still apply?

Answer: The 30 days for Kapsch work applies to each Communication Building associated with whatever gantry areas. See answer to Question #37

55. Future Considerations – Should the Design-Builders be providing gantries for possible mainline lane additions?

Answer: No

56. Mainline Shoulders – If the existing median shoulder is greater than 6ft, say 10ft or 12ft, should the Design-Builder narrow the shoulder, so no tolling equipment is required over that shoulder? Example, Exit 40 to 39 has full depth 12ft shoulders on the median side.

Answer: No, the shoulders have to be consistent with the rest of the interstate. The Authority does not want nor will accept narrowing and widening of shoulders along the mainline

57. Lackawanna Terminus – it appears that the ongoing project to the east of the Terminus was designed and is being built with a 70 MPH design speed and we to design and build to an 80 MPH design speed, possibly resulting in the Design-Builder needing to remove/reconstruct a fair amount of brand-new pavement.

Answer: At Lackawanna Terminus location, the design speed is 70 mph, not 80 mph. In addition, Lackawanna and Williamsville are considered to be in an urban area. That aspect will be addressed in a future amendment.

58. Erie Section “Go Live” – Depending on what we are given in the Authority’s presentation.

Answer: The Erie section “Go Live” date was changed to no more than 30 days prior to the overall AET “Go Live” date. See amendment #1

59. Mainline gantry stairway width (RFP 21.3)

Answer: The Stairway requirement has been changed to 24” rail to rail in amendment #1

60. Index and OSI equipment cutsheets

Answer: The cutsheets can be found on pages 146-151 and 152-153 of 214 in Part 8.

61. Removal of all non-standard/non-conforming systems/features within Project limits (RFP 18.1) Clarification on the definition of project limits Existing ramps with radii that are less than the 40 MPH design standard

Answer: Project limits have been specifically defined for the different areas of project in amendment #1.

62. Interchange 23

Existing SB ramps and NB Exit Ramps have radii less than required for 40 MPH design speed Concept plans show a slip ramp from TUB towards I-787. Is this required? Left turn movement onto Route 9W

Answer: The Design Builders are not required to upgrade the radii of existing SB ramps and the NB ramps at Exit 23. No, that is not a slip ramp from the TUB. The concept/indicative plan has been reissued under amendment #1 to provide clarification.

63. Interchange 25

Is a 70 MPH design speed required when ramps on either side of this area have lower design speeds (I-890 50 MPH; I-88 WB 35 MPH)

Answer: Interchange 25 information relative to design speed has been updated in amendment #1.

64. Interchange 25A

Confirm no tandem connection needed from tandem lot to I-88 WB.

Answer: That is correct

65. Special Exit 35

Confirm no tandem connection needed from tandem lot to I-90 WB.

Answer: That is correct

66. Interchange 39

a. Would it be possible to exit the tandem lot on the I-690 off ramp?

Answer: No, also in amendment #1 a modified concept plan.

67. Will deceleration shoulder be required at locations with Communication Building in the median?

Answer: Yes, but the Thruway does not want, as the RFP states, any deceleration or acceleration lanes under the mainline gantry.

68. Please confirm that WB-109D is the acceptable design vehicle for Tandem Routes prescribed.

Answer: Yes

69. Part 3, 18.1, page 88 states: In addition, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for the removal of non-standard and non-conforming systems/features that currently exist within the Project limits, whether they are affected by the proposed work or not, and replacement with systems meeting current Authority Standards.
- a. Will NYSTA please clarify the project limits?
 - b. Some existing ramps have radii that are less than the 40 MPH design standard - is it the Design-Builder's responsibility to bring these up to standard?

Answer: Amendment #1 addresses this question.

70. Will a 14 ft. wide inside shoulder similar to NYSTA's standard detail for U-Turns be required at locations where we are providing access to a communication building being constructed in the median?

Answer: See Answer to Question #67

71. The Interchange 23 concept plans show a slip ramp from the TUB towards I-787. Is this required?

Answer: No, see Answer to Question #62

72. The left turn movement from the ramp to Route 9W Northbound at Interchange 23 does not allow a tractor-trailer to successfully make this turn without lane encroachment. Will NYSTA please clarify the intent of this turn?

Answer: We believe this was resolved in Amendment #1

73. At Interchange 25, is a 70 MPH design speed appropriate when the adjacent curve on I-890 has a radius that is less than the standard for 70 MPH?

Answer: This again was resolved in Amendment #1

74. Will NYSTA please confirm no connection is needed from the tandem lot to I-88 WB at Interchange 25A?

Answer: See Answer to Question #64

75. Will NYSTA please confirm that no tandem access is needed from the tandem lot to I-90 WB at Special Exit 35?

Answer: See Answer to Question #65

76. At Interchange 39, would it be possible to exit the tandem lot onto the I-690 off ramp?

Answer: See Answer to Question #66

77. Part 3, 21.3, page 98 states: The minimum stairway interior width shall be 42" (inside of railing to inside of railing. NYSTA reference documents currently show a maximum stairway width of 22" at other NYSTA locations - will NYSTA revise this requirement?

Answer: See Answer to Question #59

78. Will NYSTA please provide detailed drawings for the Inex and OSI mounting equipment?

Answer: No, you were given the mounting brackets and the Design-Builders can talk to the vendors relative to the other information and develop their own drawings.

79. In off-system tandem improvement locations where shoulders need to be widened to accommodate tandems (i.e. Washington Ave Extension, Fuller Road Roundabout, etc.) is full width mill/fill required per Part 3, 16.3.1?

Answer: This will be clarified in Amendment #2.

80. It appears that wetland permitting greater than the RFP lists will be required for this project. Will NYSTA please clarify?

Answer: You have to be more specific. This is a general/overall question. Identify issues at locations.

81. Will NYSTA please confirm the number of entry and exit lanes at Exit 49 as this may impact the existing box culvert under the ramps?

Answer: Amendment #1 provided a change at Exit 49. Please identify if you believe the issue still exists.

82. These questions pertain to RFP ITP §C3.2.2 Design Drawings: (a) the Paragraphs A-E do not seem to require drawings showing the final mainline conditions after the Toll Barriers are removed at the 5 Terminus Sites (Canaan, etc.) - please confirm no drawings for that work need to be included in Proposal Volume 2; (b) the Paragraphs A-E do not seem to require drawings showing any improvements along the off-site tandem routes (legislative routes) - please confirm no drawings for that work need to be included; and (c) when providing drawings in response to Paragraph C (final alignment of interchanges), does the plan coverage need to extend to show all related parking facilities in their entirety, or is the roadway the subject of review?

Answer: See amendment #1. If after reading the amendment and still have questions, please resubmit.

83. For the design drawings submitted with the Technical Proposal (refer to ITP §C3.2.2), does the Authority direct any limits on the drawing scale used by the designer?

Answer: These are supposed to be design drawings developed and submitted on 11"x17" sheets.

84. For drawings submitted with the Proposal (drawings required by ITP §C3.2.2), does NYSTA have any preference or restriction with respect to aerial imagery backgrounds? I.e., are we free to use aerial backgrounds against line work, or would you request that we do not, or that we use it only for sites that lack an existing survey, for example?

Answer: These are design drawings. No imagery backgrounds.

85. RFP ITP Section C3.2.2. D says, "The cross sections should show as a minimum: lanes, shoulders, railings, barriers, Communication Buildings and reduced footprints of infrastructure". Please compare that wording to Paragraphs B and C, which state that the "plans" should show such information. Please clarify if Paragraph D should read, "the plans should show as a minimum "

Answer: See Amendment #1. If after reading the amendment and still have questions, please resubmit.

86. There may be locations on the project where the Design-Builder proposes to tie into existing drainage systems. RFP Part 3 §17.3.4 (Connections to Existing Systems) requires calculations to ensure sufficient capacity in the existing system. But, what of the condition of the existing systems: can the Authority provide any condition information on existing systems, or state what we can assume for purpose of the price proposal?

Answer: No, we cannot provide conditions.

87. Implementation of RFP Part 7 Section 3 Tandem Lot Routes may require widening of pavements. RFP Part 3 § 16.3.1 (Full Depth Reconstruction), requires full pavement width milling and resurfacing adjacent to any full-depth widening. Does this requirement apply both to the Thruway system and to the off-site tandem lot routes?

Answer: Yes, it applies to the Thruway system. Offsite tandem routes will be addressed in Amendment #2.

88. Please clarify if the Design Builder is required bear the cost to perform any maintenance to Thruway Property, such as pavement (potholes), guiderail, signs, attenuators, etc.

Answer: See Answer to Question #49

89. RFP ITP §C3.2.2 (Design Drawings) lists the Design Drawings to include in the technical proposal, and is consistent with Table C, Format of Volume 2 (see entry for Volume 2, Attachment A). ITP §C3.3.2 (Work Zone Traffic Control), albeit discussing the work zone traffic control narrative, states at Paragraph B that the Design-Builder must "include typical sections by phase ... " This wording has been included on past NYSTA/NYS DOT design-build projects, and we have out of caution included phase drawings in the technical proposal submittal. Please clarify that you only require WZTC drawings for the sites listed in §C3.2.2 and, if possible, re-state C3.3.2 Paragraph B for clarity.

Answer: See Amendment #1, if after reading the amendment and you still have questions, please resubmit.

90. RFP Part 7 Section 18, "Proposed Conditions Table for Interchanges & Terminus" includes a column for "Design Speed at Interchange and Terminus Locations". Proposed design speeds in that column range from 40-80 MPH, varying by location. Exit 25, for example, has a proposed 70 MPH design speed. The designer's ability to construct improvements for 70 MPH design speed is constrained by existing lower speed ramps coming into and out of the project area. Please advise whether NYSTA has considered this, and if you are requesting significant improvements beyond the plaza area to achieve a 70 MPH design speed. Other locations have similar constraints.

Answer: This was addressed in Amendment #1.

91. These questions pertain to RFP ITP §C3.2.2 Design Drawings, together with Table C (Format of Volume 2). §C3.2.2, Paragraph E requests "plans, elevations and cross sections ... of the primary structural elements of the Mainline Gantry structures", but does not specifically ask for the same for ORT gantries. For ORT gantries, Paragraph E asks for a "table of minimum vertical clearances to be provided". However, Table C asks for "plan designs of Mainline Gantry and Mini-Gantry Structures (i.e. ORT structures)". Please clarify: should Paragraph E be revised or interpreted to require ORT gantry structural drawings, in addition to vertical clearance info.

Answer: See Amendment #1. If after reading the amendment and still have questions, please resubmit.

92. DISCUSSION: We would like to discuss implementation of the NYSDEC General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002). "Completing" as SWPPP sufficiently to submit a Notice of Intent requires extensive design development before we can determine E&SC plan layouts and permanent water quality and quantity measures (on projects that require); this is usually inconsistent with the early start demands of a design-build project. An October 2018 presentation by NYSDOT at an ASHE dinner meeting indicated that a 2-Step process had been or was being established between NYSDOT and NYSDEC; it would allow a Temporary Initial Work Permit and a Final Buildout Work Permit. To our knowledge, no formal information or confirmation of this process is found on NYSDEC, NYSDOT, or NYSTA websites, bulletins, or manuals (a) Please clarify what you know of this process and whether it may be used for D800002. (b) We would like to discuss what approaches are acceptable to NYSTA: one SWPPP per site, including mainline gantry sites in the SWPPP for the exit they displace, grouping sites by Division, one overall SWPPP, etc. (c) What approaches does NYSTA anticipate NYSEC is on board with? (d) RFP Part 3 §3.3.3 (Soil Erosion and Water Pollution Control) says that the Design-Builder shall submit an MS4 Acceptance Form. On NYSDOT Design-Builds, NYSDOT HOM Chapter 8 Appendix B directs the O-B to answer "No" to NOi question #42 (Is this project subject to the requirements of a regulated traditional land use control MS4?); likewise NYSTA has asked that we check "No" on past design term agreements. Please confirm that an MS4 Acceptance Form is required, and if this is to ensure a review opportunity for NYSTA, please describe the review timeframes and requirements. (e) For NYSDOT Design-Builds, only a notification letter is required to disturb more than 5 acres at one time; does NYSTA follow the same policy?

Answer: This was addressed in Amendment #1 in and we adopted the NYSDOT process.

93. RFP Part 7 Section 14 identifies pavement repairs to be implemented in conjunction with other required work; as of 02/16/19, 26 locations are shown in Section 14. Please confirm Section 14 is complete and no further pavement repair drawings are pending for other sites.

Answer: That is correct.