

Final RFP Questions and Answers 288 - 303

288) Please amend 14.2.D to indicate the sublimit of insurance that represents the value of the property of New York State that will be held in the care, custody and/or control of the Design-Builder. Property of others is not included unless specifically endorsed via sublimit that must be a specific dollar amount.

Answer: Article 14.2.D will remain as is.

289) Please clarify if the 22" Precast Treadle section needs FRP. RFP Questions 213 and 214 discuss requirements for use of FRP reinforcing at treadle slabs. Part 3 Sections 21.8.1 and 22.3.2 have recent changes to where FRP reinforcing is to be used, and no FRP is required in the treadle slab. Please verify that Part 3 Sections 21.4 Last Paragraph and Section 22.5 Last Paragraph should have been edited as well to state that no FRP is required in the 22" Treadle Slab.

Answer: You are correct. They will be edited in the next amendment.

290) Can the Authority clarify what the requirement is for sign structures that are no longer needed after toll related signs are removed? It was our understanding that the structures would be removed. However, the new document in Part 7 - Section 8 provides information that contradicts what we originally thought we understood. For example, at MP 430.9 EB there is a sign structure that has 2 signs on it, both are toll related and must be removed leaving the structure without a sign. The structure also has lights on it. In the new Part 7 - Section 8 information was added and it states that the signs are to be removed but the lights are to remain on this structure. Obviously, the structure must remain if the lights are to remain. There are at least 12 structures where lights are to remain, therefore, the structure shall remain.

Answer: We don't know where the overhead sign structures are said to be removed. Only sign panels. The Design-Builders have the opportunity to reuse some overhead sign structures for permanent signing as shown in Part 7, Section 8. The only conditions that sign structures have to come down is if they conflict with gantry placement, as per RFP, within certain distances.

291) In Draft RFP Q&A Question #7 NYSTA clarified that new treadles are not required at exit 17. Given this, please verify if the following requirements for other ORT sites still apply to exit 17: 1) Is new concrete pavement required in proposed exit lanes (18' before and 18' after treadle)? 2) Is new full depth

asphalt and loop detectors required for the entry lanes (36 FT)? 3) Is full depth reconstruction required for all areas from 4' in front of the bullnose to 4' past the bullnose? 4) Is the 3" asphalt overlay (added in addendum #5 in part 3 section 16.3.2.1) required to be applied over all existing concrete pavement within the project limit?

Answer: Exit 17 is not an ORT Site

- 1) No
- 2) No
- 3) No
- 4) No

Reread Section 24 of Part 3. It spells out specifically what the Design-Builder has to do.

292) Regarding Special Exit 17 (RFP Part 3, §24.3.2 and Part 7 Section 15). The RFP concept implies that wide lanes are to remain in the final condition. (1) Please confirm that final lane widths should be similar to existing (with toll dividers removed), as opposed to reduce to a lesser width such as 12 feet; identify the desired minimum or maximum lane widths if possible. (2) This facility was subject of considerable investment to build the current conditions. The existing plaza appears to have flat cross slopes; is it required to provide an overlay at this site to correct cross slopes? (this would include installing new treadles).

Answer: Once again, reread Section 24 of Part 3. None of what was asked was required in the RFP. In summary – remove the specified toll booths, patch the void left by the toll booth removal, toll booth protection of toll booth near to the toll booth removed, striping, VMS install, delineators to preserve existing traffic separation and signage installation.

293) The RFP Part 7 Section 14 pavement repair drawing for Exit B1 has the north edge of the northerly pavement repair clipped off (possibly) by the title block. Please clarify the required limits.

Answer: This will be corrected in the next amendment.

294) RFP Addendum #6 at §12.3.3.4 (Traffic Signals) and §12.3.3.5 (Microwave Detectors; formerly Loop Detectors) gave new instruction. The language is not fully clear to us as to whether the microwave detection applies only for Exit 23 approaches, or whether it applies to other locations (such as Exit 34 at Route 13 and Exit 21B at Route 9W). Please confirm whether these other exits are to use loop detection for new or replaced left turn detection, or microwave detection.

Answer: There is only one location where signal (new) is required and section 12.3.3.4 applies only to Interchange 23.

295) Addendum #3 (4/1/19), Section 22.3.2 in the 4th paragraph down on Page 114 mentions the concrete slabs containing the....loops shall be 22 inch thick reinforced PCC utilizing Are the loops field cut in or cast in during the precasting? Are the slabs supposed to match thickness with the adjacent treadle slab at 22" or are they to be 12" thick?

Answer: 12" thick, Part 7 Section 4 is correct. Section 22.3.2 will be corrected via amendment

296) In accordance with NYSTA Specification DB 102-8.4 C) Material Suppliers 60% of an expenditure to a MWBE material Supplier will be counted towards the MWBE Goal. According to most current NYSDOT Specifications 102-12 D. 3. 100% of the expenditure to an M/WBE Material Supplier will be counted toward the M/WBE goals. Will NYSTA revise the M/WBE participation requirements to be the same as NYSDOT?

Answer: No.

297) Amendment # 5 modified Section 16.3.2.1. The amendment states "all existing concrete pavement to remain as permanent with travel lanes at ORT Exit locations shall be repaired, crack sealed, tack coated and overlaid...".

a. Does this apply to existing asphalt overlaid concrete pavements within the project limits?

Answer: No, unless specifically called out to do so elsewhere. Slight modification requirement in next amendment.

b. Does this apply to the entire project limits or just the "transition areas" referenced in section 16.3.2?

Answer: What transitional limit in 16.3.2.? It applies within the project limits.

c. We point out a possible discrepancy in paving depths between 16.3.2.1 (2" + 1") and 16.3.3 (2")

Answer: No, the first is the required overlay, the second is milling asphalt and putting back 2". Two different scenarios.

d. We point out similar potential discrepancies with section 16.3.2.2.

Answer: Same as C above. Include "exposed" concrete pavement not asphalt overlaid concrete pavement.

Please clarify the Authority's intent for the design requirements at this location.

Answer: See answers above but we will provide amendment.

298) Is box beam guide rail acceptable for median positive protection barrier?

Answer: That's the responsibility of your engineer's to decide based on current standards.

299) Are treadles required in shoulders greater than 6' wide that need to be fully instrumented?

Answer: Treadles no, we cut in strips in new asphalt. Fully instrumented, yes, that's required.

300) If available, please post a conformed RFP with all amendments. A version with and without track changes would be helpful.

Answer: It has always been our intention to post a conformed document after the final amendment is posted.

301) Where no median guiderail/delineators are present, should proposed guiderail/delineators end at project limits? Example: The concept plan for Interchange B2 (Taconic) shows proposed delineators extending beyond the Project Limits; however, there are no existing delineators and no end location is indicated.

Answer: See Section 16, it defines proposed limits and work limits guiderail/delineators are part of the work limits. Refer to Section 18, Part 7 as well.

302) **Correction to Question #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 Design-Builders have to meet the current design standards as stated in the RFP

303) 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 was corrected via Amendment #6.