Question 16

16A - Addendum #1 states counting of traffic impact days start if “traffic cannot be physically restored to it’s original, unobstructed configuration”. Please confirm that if traffic merges from 2 lanes to 1 lane on a structure such as ramps NB and NX, the taper must be kept at that location, in order to not trigger the start of counting of traffic impact days.

Answer
Confirmed.

16B - Please also clarify if an existing taper is shifted in direction from a “right lane ends” to “left lane ends” or vice versa, would this start counting of impact days?

Answer
Please refer to Form SCD Note 4 and the definition of a Traffic Impact Day.

Question 17

Addendum #1 created a SSRW – Directive Repairs item in Form SP, and removed the repair of deteriorated steel members in Form WPS for all except BIN 106666B. Payment method for steel repairs is reiterated in Part 3 Section 10.3. Directive drawings do not list any existing superstructure steel repairs for BIN 106666B / Ramp RC. Please clarify what deteriorated steel member repairs are intended for payment under Form WPS for BIN 106666B.

Answer
The are no directive repairs noted for BIN 106666B/Ramp RC. Please refer to Addendum 2.

Question 18

At about Sta. 17+90 of Ramp RC, there is an overhead sign mounted to Pier NB-13, not listed under Part 3 Section 12.3.2.1. Please clarify if this sign is to be removed and replaced, or to remain in place.

Answer
Please refer to Addendum 2.

Question 19

Addendum #1 Directive Plans revised the steel repair tables on drawing SR-05 to say “Suggested Repair Types”. Are proposers now to base the steel directive repair work on the listed typical steel repair quantities with 20% contingency, or is that now a “suggested” quantity?

Answer
Please refer to Addendum 2.

Question 20

20A - Addendum #1 Form SCD defines stop counting of traffic impact days as when all permanent work is completed with no further disruption to traffic. Please clarify whether this requires restoration of all travel lanes and shoulders at Directive Plan proposed widths, with all parapet barrier and median barrier in place on the mainline, for counting of traffic days to stop.
Answer
Yes

20B - If median barrier past project limits was removed, will they need to be restored in order for counting of traffic impact days to stop?
Answer
Yes

Question 21
The Draft RFP states that the Quality Manager shall dedicate no less than 100% of their work time to this project, but the SOQ only required no less than 30% at the time of its submission. What is the intention of the Department in making this change?
Answer
Initial oversight, size and scope of project dictated change.

Question 22
We would like to formally request the CAD files for the site at grade. We seem to have only received the CAD files for the elevated structures and nothing below them. Please include alignments and profiles for the existing at grade roadways as well
Answer
The Department is investigating. If the files are available, they will be posted.

Question 23
Part 3, Section 10.3 of the final RFP requires a 9.5" reinforced concrete deck. Per section 5 of the NYSDOT Bridge Manual, the preferred approach to corrosion protection of reinforcing steel is either epoxy coated or galvanized reinforcing. For the 40 year service life required of the deck (ITP section A2), there is no need to use stainless steel reinforcing, with use of an appropriate corrosion protection strategy, which would represent a significant cost savings to the DOT. Please confirm if the DOT would entertain the use of non-stainless steel reinforcing if a rigorous, probabilistically based corrosion protection plan can demonstrate the requisite 40 year service life.
Answer
DOT will not entertain the use of non-stainless steel reinforcing.