

**FINAL RFP**  
**Questions and Answers**  
**93–124**

93. Part 3, Section 22.3.2 requires the concrete slabs containing the treadle to be 22-inch PCC. The ORT Gantry Schematic in Part 7, Section 4 shows a ORT requirement for full depth asphalt at gantries. Please clarify.

**Answer:** Relook at Part 7, Section 4. It is concrete on the exit side and asphalt on the entry to the Thruway side.

94. In the Final RFP, Part 7, Section 17, the VMS Locations folder is empty. Is the information provided in the Draft RFP still applicable, or is new information forthcoming?

**Answer:** The VMS/DMS locations have been updated a few times. They should now all be up to date.

95. ITP Section C2.1 states, “The Proposer shall include Form R – Summary Individual’s Experience for each of the Key Personnel identified in the ITP Appendix A, outlining his/her experience and qualifications.” In ITP Appendix A, A12.1, Key Personnel includes the Quality Manager and Supervisor of Resident Engineers. These resume Form R’s were submitted during the SOQ state; is it necessary to resubmit these again with the RFP submittal?

**Answer:** Amendment #1 addressed this question. The answer is no.

96. Part 2, Section DB 112-5.2 states, “The Design-Builder shall assign a full time on-site Construction QC Engineer who may be the Resident Engineer working for the Independent Construction Inspection Professional Engineering Firm”, and it also states, “The Design-Builder’s Construction QC Engineer shall report directly to the Design-Builder’s Quality Manager.” Since there are four RE’s on the project that could be the Construction Quality Engineer, can they each report directly to the Supervisor of RE’s with the Supervisor of the RE’s reporting directly to the Quality Manager?

**Answer:** If that were the case then who is serving as the Construction QC Engineer. This appears to be a mixed question. The question we believe needs to be more specific.

97. Who takes possession of the old generators (approximately 40)? NYSTA or the Design-Builder?

**Answer:** The Thruway Authority. This will be clarified via amendment.

98. At Exit 28 (Selkirk), NYSTA's concept shows the Proposed Communication Building being accessed from the State Police facility. Has NYSTA already coordinated this with the State Police, or will that be the Design-Builder's responsibility?

**Answer:** The Thruway is responsible for coordinating with the State Police. There are no issues here. This is the Authority's property.

99. Section 22.3.8 of Part 3 includes a photo of a typical camera and illuminator installation using flexible conduit mounted on the outside of a gantry structure. Is it permissible to run power or communication cables through conduits mounted on the outside of ORT gantries? If power or communication lines are run on the inside of structural members is it required that they be housed in conduits?

**Answer:** Section 22.3.9 specifically addresses conduit requirements for the ORT sites. Flexible is not included. If inside the structural members, the lines have to be separated otherwise there will be interference.

100. Part ITP (1.9, page 6 and B2.2.3, page B-2) describe Form AAP-10 as a Solicitation Log for MWBE/SDVOBs. Form AAP-10, however, only allows input of DBE, MBE, and WBE designations and does not provide the SDVOB category in the Program dropdown. Will NYSTA please revise the form to allow this selection?

**Answer:** That will be corrected in the next Amendment.

101. ORT gantry conduit requirements: If the wiring is inside the gantry structure, do we still need conduit inside the gantry structure or does this only apply when the wiring is outside the gantry structure?

**Answer:** If inside, the cables and power have to be separated otherwise there will be interference. Handholes for connections, repairs, access to junction boxes, etc. are still required as per the RFP. Refer to 21.9.1.

102. Part 3 Section 22.3.8 states that "the Design-Builder shall provide and install three appropriately sized conduits for power cables, communication cables, and possible future addition of a second front camera in each instrumented lane." Can the two power and communication conduits be upsized as a substitute for the addition of a third conduit?

**Answer:** The quantity will be changed to two (2) via amendment.

103. What is the preferred directional drill depth requirements for the proposed conduits between the communication building and gantry footing?

**Answer:** Below the frost line or 42" whichever is greater for the different areas of the state. This will be included in an upcoming amendment.

104. How many days of MPT is the Design-Builder required to provide for Kapsch installation operations?

**Answer:** Kapsch could be there installing and testing for 30 days so the Design-Builders must be available or on call. The Authority does not believe that MPT will be required for that entire period assuming the Design Builder meets all the RFP requirements.

105. How many days of MPT is the Design-Builder required to provide for NYSTA to support the ORT gantry equipment installation?

**Answer:** Thruway personnel will be there 14 days to install and potentially test. The Authority does not believe that MPT will be required for that entire period assuming the Design Builder meets all the RFP requirements.

106. Will NYSTA please clarify the specifications for the VMS signs?

**Answer:** You will have to be more specific. The VMS sign pertains to the Newburgh (Exit17) locations and the DMS pertains to all other identified locations.

107. Will NYSTA set up and/or maintain CEES for this Project?

**Answer:** Yes, that is the plan.

108. Is it safe to assume each division field office will be set up in their respective section, requiring 4 separate CEES projects? How will the real time quantities be shared with main project field office (Supervisor of Resident Engineers/Office Engineer)?

**Answer:** The contract will be administered as one CEES contract/project. One field office will be designated as the main project field office with copies of daily reports sent via e-mail to the main field office for entering of quantities into CEES for payment. Originally signed reports will be forwarded to the main project office for incorporation into the final records.

109. CEES can manage the pay items and certs, but cannot manage submittals, RFIs, Daily Reports, etc. How will the RFIs, Daily Reports, etc., be managed?

**Answer:** The Authority explained that Projectwise is available but per the RFP the Design-Builders can propose an alternative. NYSDOT has accepted alternatives in the past. The system the Design-Builder suggests is subject to Authority approval.

110. Regarding Project TAB 17-4:

a. Will Project TAB 17-4 be constructed in a manner that will allow for future 70 MPH traffic near the Lackawanna Tolls?

- b. Will the soon-to-be-constructed pavement have the proper banking and clearance for the overhead structure at the 219 bridge?
- c. Will median barriers, drainage, and concrete pavement be placed in a manner that will fit the required banking for 70 MPH traffic under the 219 bridge?

**Answer:** a.) As stated before in previous question, Lackawanna is 70 mph but is designated to be in an Urban setting. Amendment #2 shall address this. The  $e_{max}$  therefore will change.  
b.) With the Urban setting and the  $e_{max}$  potentially lowered with the changes in Amendment #2 you should see that the vertical clearance associated with the 219 bridge should be no less than fifteen (15) feet.  
c.) The requirements of the RFP stated as written, with the exception as noted above to be issued in Amendment #2, still apply.

111. Please clarify if the Design Builder is required bear the cost to repair damage caused by Third Parties (traveling public) to Thruway Property, such as guiderail, signs, attenuators, etc.

**Answer:** See answer to question #49

112. RFP ITP §C3.3.2 (Work Zone Traffic Control) reads, "provide a narrative describing the proposed WZTC at each Gantry removals and Toll Plazas to be demolished .... " (a) Please clarify: is "Gantry removals" a typo? (b) Please clarify: do you require a narrative specific to each site, individually, or is this left to the Design-Builder's interpretation or preference?

**Answer:** a) yes, it is a typo. Will be corrected via an amendment.

b) No, we need to specify the locations and be specific. That will be corrected in the upcoming amendment.

113. 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:** Amendment #1 should have provided more clarity, if not please ask the question again.

114. RFP ITP §C3.3.2 (Work Zone Traffic Control) reads, "provide a narrative describing the proposed WZTC at each Gantry removals and Toll Plazas to be demolished .... ". Please clarify: do you require a narrative specific to each site, individually, or is this left

to the Design-Builder's interpretation or preference?

**Answer:** See answer to question #112

115. RFP Part 3 §23.3 (Interchange Work -General Requirements) discusses the proposed legislation routes for tandem trucks, and says, "all turning movements shall be improved, where required, to ensure the Tandems can properly remain in the correct travel lanes." Please clarify whether the improvements must allow the tandem trucks to remain entirely within a single travel lane.

**Answer:** Yes, that is the requirement as stated in the RFP

116. Several major project locations lack Microstation/InRoads files in the Reference Documents. These include TB-Lackawanna (no DTM, mapping outdated vs. 2017 as-built), TB-Ripley (no DTM, no mapping), TB-Williamsville (no DTM), and TB-Canaan (incomplete western end DTM, mapping). Are any more files for these sites or others forthcoming, or should we plan to use only what has been provided to date?

**Answer:** Most of the locations referenced in your question were already posted and made available. All information is now available, except for the western end of Canaan which will have to be the Design-Builder's responsibility to do supplemental mappings as they deem necessary based on their design.

117. With respect to ITP Appendix C, Table C (Format of Volume 2), please clarify: We interpret that the Authority wants Volume 2, Attachment A Design Drawings in an 11x17 binder, implying the drawings will not be folded. For other sections that have 11x17 content (A2, Attachment 8), can or should 11x17 pages be Z-folded?

**Answer:** Yes, they should be folded. Similar to what was required in the RFQ.

118. RFP §22.3.2 (ORT Toll Lane Requirements) calls for 12-foot-wide travel lanes, consistent with RFP Part 7 Section 4 ORT Ramp Gantry Schematics. In some cases, lanes approaching the tolling area may be wider than 12 feet. Please provide clarification as to whether the Authority requires that travel lanes taper down to 12 feet exactly, or whether 12 feet is a minimum width.

**Answer:** The travel lanes need to be 12 feet. We will issue an amendment to provide clarity.

119. These related questions concern RFP Part 3 §22.3.2 (ORT Toll Lane Requirements).  
(a) The 6th paragraph reads, "If the treadle is constructed within pavement superelevation transitions, the maximum cross slope shall not exceed 3 degrees." Please clarify if this should read "3 percent", or if "3 degrees" is correct. (b) Please note the last paragraph in the same section, which reads "cross-slope through the plaza shall not exceed 3% ... ". If your answer to (a) is that "3 percent" is correct, what different guidance is conveyed by the last paragraph? (i.e. if the plaza is 3% or less, the

treadle slab would also be 3% or less).

**Answer:** a) This should read 3 percent. This will be corrected via an amendment.  
b) That is correct.

120. RFP Part 7 Section 2 Concept Plan for Exit B1 indicates a "Potential Tolling Area" extending both south and north of the existing toll booths. RFP Part 3 Section 22.4.1 (Final RFP p. 138) says, "the Design Builder shall construct an ORT zone at the south side of the existing toll plaza" (i.e. disallows the north side). Please clarify which section is authoritative.

**Answer:** This will be corrected via amendment. The concept plan is correct.

121. We call your attention to RFP Part 3 §25.2.2 (Exit 17 Partial Toll Booth Demolition). Under that section, several paragraphs are applicable to all toll booths - not Exit 17 - and we request that you edit this section for clarity.

**Answer:** This will be clarified in an amendment.

122. Many passages in RFP Part 3 and many figures in RFP Part 7 use the terms "positive protection" and "positive separation", and use them somewhat interchangeably. Yet, these terms are not defined in the RFP or NYSDOT Highway Design Manual, and "positive protection" - generally a term applied to work zones - has a different meaning than we believe NYSTA intends with "positive separation". Please clarify by defining these terms for 0800002. In particular, please clarify which project sites or portions of sites require an impassable barrier (concrete barrier, median railing) to separate traffic.

**Answer:** We don't believe there are issues relative to this terminology. The RFP states that at the interchanges concrete barrier is required to separate opposing traffic. Part 7 Engineering Data, section 18 there is a table that specifies where positive protection is required. That positive protection is the Design-Builder's responsibility based on their design alignment and deflection distances of the rating systems they choose to use to meet current standards.

123. RFP Part 7 Section 5 Concept Plans for TB-Lackawanna and TB-Ripley provide acceleration and deceleration accommodation for Thruway facilities connecting to the mainline. TB-Williamsville has a TUB and driveway to remain, but no acceleration or deceleration prescribed by the RFP. Please clarify if the Authority has any directive for this site, or if this is left to the Design-Builder's interpretation and engineering judgment.

**Answer:** The salt shed Lackawanna location is providing access to the salt shed, which means frequent deliveries, and access during the winter months and Ripley is dealing with the parking areas. Williamsville is just a driveway for the TUB Location so no acceleration or deceleration ramps are required.

124. Please clarify the design-builder's responsibility for toll booth demolition at Exit 16. The RFP states that we are responsible for the 1-87 southbound Exit 16 Harriman Toll Plaza. Is this the entire plaza (11 booths total) or only a section dedicated to the 1-87 Southbound exit lane?

**Answer:** No, the Design-Builder is only responsible for the toll booth removals associated with I-87 southbound exit land. The 11 other toll booths will be gone and will be removed under an on-going Design-Bid-Build contract.