

Final RFP
Questions and Answers
249-260

249. Referencing RFP Part 3 §13.3.1.2 (Lighting: Removal of Existing Equipment), please clarify how the Authority would like us to address removal of non-necessary tower lighting. At Exit 25A specifically, there are some tower lights associated with the tandem lot; we assume those will remain. There is a separate tower light at the existing plaza location. This light will not be necessary, but it is an expensive removal. Please advise: (1) Should the Exit 25A tower light at the plaza be removed?; (2) Generally, does the Authority want to salvage any such lighting when it is removed; (3) Is there any restriction on reusing removed lighting fixtures elsewhere, if they are in good condition and suitable for the new location?

Answer: 1) No, you do not have to remove the tower lights at Exit 25A. If light towers are in the way of your design and construction, you can take them down and you do not have to replace.

2) Yes, the Authority wants the salvage materials.

3) The only lighting required is that of the Tandem Lots and the new Park and Ride Lots. We are not asking for the Design-Builder to fix, remove, or replace any lighting. No, we do not want you to reuse removed lighting fixtures. There are requirements for lighting and the old fixtures will not meet those requirements.

250. ITP Appendix A, A12.2 Quality Evaluation Weighting, “Note Regarding Quality Evaluations and Proposal Format Compliance”: Item B) prohibits the inclusion of pictures, renderings, or graphics on narrative pages. However, some of the information required to be addressed in the narrative (particularly in the design approach sections) would be much more clearly presented using sketches. For example: designs, configurations, and locations of the mainline and ORT gantries; type, size, and what is included in Mainline Gantry Communications Buildings; changes to the ORT Exit Site alignments and pavement footprints; proposed location and configuration of ORT Communication Buildings, generators, and other equipment, etc. Would NYSTA consider removing the prohibition on the use of graphics in some narrative sections of the technical proposal?

Answer: No, there is a requirement for design drawings under Appendix C3.2.2 and your narrative can reference those drawings.

251. The answer to question 84 indicated that no imagery backgrounds were allowed on design drawings. However, there are locations where CADD files are not available, and aerial imagery is the only available mapping to use. At these locations is aerial imagery acceptable for design drawings?

Answer: No, there was available survey supplied for each location required to be submitted. We reduced the number of locations to be submitted and we expect to see design drawings.

252. Part ITP, 2.2.2B, page 11 states: However, subject to the limitations in the ITP Section 1.8.3, a Proposer may communicate with a subcontractor that is on both its team and another Proposer's team, provided that each Proposer has obtained a written certification from the proposed subcontractor that it will not act as a conduit of information between the teams. Proposers shall provide the Authority's Designated Representative with all written certifications received from its subcontractors.

Should this be included in our proposal submission and if so where?

Answer: These should have been presented as you received them and provided to the Authority's designated representative. This was for your protection and the protection of the procurement process. The Design-Builder's should provide these as soon as they are in possession of them. Do not wait for the proposal due date.

253. The RFP Part 6 Indicative Plan for Exit 23 was modified via Addendum #2 to show specific project limits and to annotate the I-90 EB ramp into the existing plaza's final horizontal curve as "R=443', e=8%"; these are the parameters associated with 40 MPH design speed, based on HDM Chapter 2 tables and exhibits. It would require full-depth reconstruction to provide 8% superelevation on this curve, and the transitions would be non-standard, given the constraints of the adjacent overpass. Our analysis of existing conditions indicates the preceding horizontal curve (at the cloverleaf) has a design speed of 30 MPH. We propose that the R=443' curve also be assigned a design speed of 30 MPH, as a design exception or as a direction from the Authority. That change makes the curve compliant in its existing configuration, and has no real effect on the final operations, considering the short length of the former plaza area that has been assigned a 50 MPH design speed in RFP Part 7 Section 18. Please review and confirm whether we can proceed with the 30 MPH design speed.

Answer: The curve can be designed for 30 MPH and will be justified as a non-standard feature in the Final Design Report. The minimum vertical clearance under the interchange bridge shall not be allowed below 14' 6". This information will be included in Amendment #6.

254. At Exit 57A (Eden-Angola): The concept plan shows the lane width of 12' at limit of work, but the existing lanes prior to the plaza entry are approximately 15'-6" to 15'-9". Please confirm existing lane width shall be met at the limit of work.

Answer: Yes, transition at project limits from proposed lane width to existing lane width at work limits.

255. These questions pertain generally to RFP Part 3 Section 17 Drainage and Stormwater, for locations where median concrete barrier is required by the RFP. We wish to interpret where conditions require median drainage inlets vs. where they might not. (1) Does the Authority mandate that a highway inside/left shoulder must drain toward the median, away from the travel lanes? The specific case is when a concrete median barrier is being placed at the existing roadway crown - can the crown be retained or should there be reconstruction specifically to create median drainage? (2) Is the answer the same for ORT, Interchange, and Terminus sites alike? (3) With respect to Authority long-term maintenance, where median drainage inlets are proposed, does the Authority have any preference or requirements that the inlets are connected longitudinally, then transversely to an outfall (reducing the number of transverse crossings) or whether the inlets are piped laterally (reducing the accumulation of flow but requiring longitudinal pipes)?

Answer: 1) You have to follow the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual, Chapter 8.

2) Yes.

3) There is no preference, but the Highway Design Manual governs and as long as you meet those requirements you are fine.

256. For Exit B2, the RFP Part 7 Section 2 concept establishes a facility driveway location and a project limit about 600 feet south of the driveway. Between the driveway and the southerly project limit, there exist asphalt right shoulders for only a short distance on both sides of the highway; the remainder is without shoulders, typical of the Taconic State Parkway section. With respect to conforming with design standards, does the Authority expect the Design-Builder to provide full shoulders to the project limit, or may the existing conditions be retained in that regard?

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

257. Regarding the RFP Part 3 §23.3 legislative routes shown on the Part 7 Section 3 concepts, in our assessment new traffic signals are necessary to enact these routes at Exit 33 (for the driveway to Route 365) and at Exit 45 (for the left turn from Route 96 southbound to I-490 ramp to eastbound). Please confirm whether the Authority considers new traffic signals to be within the Design-Builder's scope for these sites.

Answer: No. The legislative route for Exit 33 is also being removed.

258. Please clarify the Authority's requirements for pavement substructures; specifically, (1) Is a 4-inch course of asphalt-treated permeable base required for all full-depth HMA sections, or is the selection location-specific?; (2) Is a 4-inch course of cement/asphalt-treated permeable base required for all PCC sections, or is the selection location-specific? Current CPDM seems to have removed language about use of permeable base under PCC. Would asphalt -treated be acceptable under PCC if

required as cement-treated is being phased out due to longevity concerns by multiple other states? (3) Application of the NYSDOT CPDM for some full-depth locations indicates that subgrade improvement "Select subgrade" (i.e. below the granular subbase excavation) may be warranted. Does the Authority have any requirements for or against replacing existing select subgrade or requiring in new locations?

Answer: 1) No, the permeable base is not required.

2) No, the permeable base is not required.

3) No, just follow the CPDM.

259. Addendum #4 added this text to §15.1, "as a general rule, when work on the Thruway system is ongoing, the Design-Builder is allowed to reduce the posted speed limit by 10 mph for the safety of the workers and travelers as travel way surfaces or adjacent areas are under construction." (1) As per RFP §15.3.3, after Cashless Tolling is activated, toll plazas will be signed for 20 MPH, with signs mounted on the plaza canopies. Once the toll booths are removed, can the 20 MPH signs be relocated (or replaced) to ground-mounted positions alongside the roadway? This will keep traffic flow steady but speeds low, since the roadway will NOT be in its final state (e.g., cross slopes could be sloped in the wrong direction during the shifting of traffic, taper lengths need to remain short as vehicles leave the booths before entering into the gantry, etc.); (2) Can the reduction be more than 10 MPH; i.e., can the reduction go from 65 MPH to 55 MPH to 45 MPH? This would be for areas where trucks/traveling public will be driving on the shoulders or at the terminus/interchanges to increase the speed but not to the final condition speed limits.

Answer: 1) No, first they are advisory signs established due to the toll booths. Based on the geometrics, the Design-Builder shall establish the appropriate speed for the conditions that exist and can then alter (lower) that speed by 10 MPH with appropriate work zone traffic control signing.

2) You need to follow the MUTCD and the current standards for Work Zone Traffic Control Solutions.

260. Regarding existing signs - Part 7 Section 8 documents on the last 2 pages approximately 179 signs to be removed, with no locations specified. Will specific locations be given? A rough inventory of existing toll-related signs resulted in a number considerably higher, including OH mounted signs on gantries, some with lighting attached. Will sign removals include lighting and sign structure removals as well? Is it the Authorities' intention to remove all toll-related signs?

Answer: 1) No.

2) All toll related signs both ground mounted and overhead within the Design-Builders work limits shall be removed by the Design-Builder.