Question 24
Page 24 of Addendum 2 included the following added text: “Overhead Sign mounted to Pier NB-13 at about Sta. 17+90 of Ramp RC”, however directive drawing GEN-02 did not add this overhead sign. Please confirm the successful proponent is to replace the sign structure mounted to Pier NB-13.

Answer
Confirmed, please refer to Addendum 3.

Question 25
Rehabilitation Contract D254956 Record plans, included as reference documents with the RFP, show 144 locations where existing bearings were replaced in the rehabilitation project with elastomeric bearings. At these locations, a built up steel bolster was installed and welded to the existing stringer bottom flange. Please confirm the following:

a) The existing elastomeric bearings are to be removed and replaced per RFP Part 3, Section 10.3 stating “Replace existing bearings with elastomeric bearings;”
Answer – Please refer to Addendum 2.
b) The existing steel bolster is to remain;
Answer – Please refer to Addendum 2.
c) If the steel bolster is to remain, the existing low pedestal may be replaced with a grout pad where a standard 6” minimum pedestal cannot be installed (as required)
Answer – Existing steel bolsters are to be removed if necessary to obtain the standard 6” minimum pedestal. Please refer to Addendum 3.

Question 26
RFP Part 6, Indicative plan drawing MIS-01 includes a table called “Sign Structure Details” which lists 5 existing sign structures to be replaced. Although many as-built and record plans appear to have been included in the reference documents, the actual as-builds for these sign structures, their support brackets and foundations are not provided. Are these documents available and can they be provided? Specifically, can you please provide:

a) The as-built information for cantilever sign structure before the station line on Ramp SB (please verify if this is on a drilled shaft, spread footing or wall mounted on the retaining wall;
Answer – Available information has been posted as reference documentation
b) The attachment details for the cantilever sign structure at Sta. SB 10+11.61 and as-built drawings for the retaining wall;
Answer – Available information has been posted as reference documentation. For Wall W-3, see BE 58-4, Sheet 173, For attachment details, see BE 61-1, Sheet 7.
c) The as-built information for the existing additional diaphragms at support bracket details for cantilever and gantry sign structures Serial No. N0051 and N0052 and
Answer - Available information has been posted as reference documentation. For diaphragms and support brackets for both structures, see BE 62-1, sheet 15R.
d) The existing attachment detail for cantilever sign structure at Sta. 27+73.88.
**Question 27**
With reference to the UHPC Shear Stud Pocket detail, please confirm the following:

a) The profile of the bottom of the precast panel is upturned at the pocket and would appear to expose the bottom of the transverse reinforcement. Please confirm our understanding and also clarify this detail. For instance, is the reinforcing steel to sit directly on the bottom of the form?

**Answer**
Yes, the transverse reinforcement should sit directly on the form.

b) Noting that the haunch concrete/grout is shown to be held back from the edge of the stringer, please clarify the Department’s intent with regards to how the panels are supported. Foam blocking? If so, is the foam required to be removed?

**Answer**
Foam shall not be used to support the panels, but can be used as a filler material in the pocket, removal is at the contractor’s option. The contractor is given autonomy to develop a panel support detail that does not compromise the haunch pocket and longitudinal joint durability.

**Question 28**
Is the department willing to consider open shear stud pockets (in lieu of details shown on the drawing No. PDP-01 in addendum 2) to facilitate accurate placement of new shear studs once, without the risk of removal and reinstallation of misplaced studs and added resulting delays re-handling and resetting panels while this occurs?

**Answer**
No.

**Question 29**
Q&A #20 states barrier/parapet must be installed for traffic impact duration to stop.

a. Will longitudinal grooving, protective sealing, and/or permanent pavement marking be required to be completed for traffic impact duration to stop?

**Answer** – Please refer to Addendum 3.

b. Or can it be assumed that if the deck is fully replaced and completed with parapets and barrier this work can be performed under daily temporary lane closures and not count towards traffic impact durations?

**Answer** - Please refer to Addendum 3.

**Question 30**
Please refer to page 40 issued in addendum # 2 regarding the crack repair by epoxy injection which states that the deck will be inspected 180 days after full live load exposure and after August 1st of the following summer. It states that the work stated above may require an uncompleted work agreement.

a. Is NYSDOT going to require an OCP insurance policy to cover the uncomplete work agreement?

**Answer** – No, please refer to Addendum 3.

b. If so, how will the OCP be paid for?
Question 31
Please refer to page 40 issued in addendum # 2 which states that all cracks wider than 0.02 inches in width shall be injected as per Item 555.80020001 – CRACK REPAIR BY EPOXY INJECTION (RESTORATION). We find this tolerance to be extremely stringent as there are many variables that are not in the design-builders control which may have an effect in any cracking that the deck may exhibit. Some of these variables include the fact we are to design a deck on an existing substructure and steel superstructure which we did not design, in addition we are being instructed on where to provide expansion joints and link slabs. As per the RFP we are also being instructed that we cannot utilize top mount anchors for the setting of the precast panels however these insert anchor locations are engineered to put minimal stresses on the precast panels to reduce and/or eliminate any cracking. The use of side mounted lifting devices will not be in the optimal positions to reduce stresses in the precast panels and will increase the likelihood of cracking.

a. Due to these factors we request that NYSDOT provide an allowance for which crack repairs will be handled. It is impossible to determine costs for something which is largely out of the design-builders control.

Answer – The requirements have been revised, please refer to Addendum 3.

Question 32
Please clarify if there are any demolition shielding requirements and criteria.

a. Is there any specific psf load that must be met?

Answer – Yes, please refer to Addendum 3.

b. Is a secondary shielding required in any or all areas?

Answer - please refer to Addendum 3.

Question 33
In regard to Ramp RD, the RFP allows for 6 weekend closures to complete this work. Note that there will still be work remaining in between and after the weekends to complete the parapet which must be cast in place to accommodate the installation of the lighting conduit. Please confirm that it is acceptable to leave temporary construction barrier and a small work area on either side to allow for the construction of the permanent parapet without incurring a penalty.

Answer
Please refer to Addendum 3.

Question 34
Can the revised feature file for the alignment, updated per Addendum #2 please be made available?

Answer
Yes, this information has been posted as reference documentation.

Question 35
Can the structural model used to determine the stiffness of the substructure please be made available?

Answer – Information (calculations) regarding the stiffness of the substructure and bearing has been posted as reference documentation.
**Question 36**
NYSDOT’s current specification for Item 576.2200016 – Bridge Downspout System (Fiberglass) specifies an 8% minimum slope for installation of FRP drainage pipe. Please clarify if a Special Specification will be added to the Final RFP, Part 8 as an addendum, to allow the 8% minimum slope to be reduced (flattened), or if a different pipe material or liner may be used that would accommodate a minimum specified slope that is flatter than 8%. If so, please specify alternate pipe material(s) that would be acceptable to the Department under this Contract.

**Answer** – The 8% requirement will not be changed. Please note that Bridge Drainage is to be designed consistent with the Bridge Manual, Section 5 including FHWA’s Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 21.

**Question 37**
A previously submitted question asked “Project requirement Part-3 Section 10.3 require new TL-5 Concrete Barrier. Can the parapet and median barrier be precast?”, to which NYSDOT’s response was “Yes”. We are unable to locate a bolt-down precast barrier (fascia or median) that has been crash-tested and is approved as a TL-5 rated barrier. If NYSDOT is aware of a bolt-down precast barrier that is currently approved as TL-5 rated, could you please share that information? **Answer** – NYSDOT is unaware of a bolt-down precast barrier that is currently approved as TL-5 rated.

Otherwise, we assume that any bolt-down precast barrier unit would require full-scale crash testing in order to be approved for use on this project – please confirm/clarify. **Answer** – correct, any team proposing a bolt-down precast barrier unit would need to perform full-scale crash testing in order to be approved for use on this project.

**Question 38**
Regarding Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 10.3 – Design Requirements, our understanding of the requirements regarding the as-cast and final deck thicknesses and diamond grinding is as follows:

a. All new concrete deck slabs, whether cast-in-place or precast, require a minimum ¼” overpour with diamond grinding, such that the final (minimum) deck thickness after diamond grinding is 9-1/2”. The minimum depth of diamond grinding for cast-in-place or precast deck slabs in this scenario is ¼”.

**Answer** – All details using UHPC require a ¼” overpour above the deck surface (precast or cast-in-place) prior to diamond grinding. Diamond grinding shall be to a depth to provide a smooth wearing surface with minimum deck thickness of 9.5 inches. With this in mind, the minimum grind over the UHPC material is ¼”.

b. If a combination of cast-in-place and precast deck slabs is used, the entire deck surface between expansion joints shall be overpoured a minimum of ½” (above the 9-1/2” nominal deck thickness). The entire deck surface between expansion joints shall be diamond ground a minimum of ¼”. In this scenario, the final deck thickness for the cast-in-place and precast deck slabs will be 9-3/4". **Answer** – See above response.

Can NYSDOT please confirm if the above understanding is correct, or clarify?