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Question 17
Regarding RFP Part 3, Section 3.3.3 – Soil Erosion and Water Pollution Control and Section 17.3.2 – Connections to Existing Systems, we are proposing to proceed with the Phase 3 proposal design based on the assumption that key stipulations in the Phase 2 RFP Part 3, Section 18.3.1.2 – Water Quality Basin WQB2 and Culvert replacement, through the final Phase 2 RFP Amendment #2, have not been revised after award of the Phase 2 contract. The Phase 2 RFP Part 3, Section 18.3.1.2 stipulations read in part:

“This pond shall be designed to accommodate both the required WQv and CPv for this project as well as the estimated required WQv and CPv for the future NY347 reconstruction project from Terry Road to Southern Blvd. (Within State ROW)...”

[The pond referred to in the stipulation is the Water Quality Basin WQB2 located on the east bank of the Nissequogue River on the north side of Rt. 347 that was to be constructed as part of the Phase 2 work.]

“The existing NY 347 storm drainage system will be replaced with a closed drainage system on NY 347 between Mount Pleasant Road and Terry Road, and interconnected leaching systems for side streets.”; and

“The new proposed drainage system east of the Nissequogue River shall be a positive drainage system that shall discharge directly into the storm water pond east of the Nissequogue River as described above.”

Based on the above information we have the following two questions for NYSDOT:

a) Are Phase 2 drainage system pipes east of the Nissequogue River sized to accommodate the storm water runoff flow from the Phase 3 project area, between Terry Road and the Rt. 347 corridor profile high point just east of Southern Boulevard, to the Water Quality Basin WQB2?

Answer:
The Proposer shall assume the drainage system designed for Contract D900014 will accommodate the existing run-off from contract D900014 eastern terminus to the existing roadway high point located in proximity of the Route 347 intersection with Southern Boulevard. The Proposer should use this as the limiting capacity of contract D900033 proposed discharge into contract D900014 proposed drainage system unless additional measures are incorporated in the proposed drainage solution of D900033. This will be clarified by addendum.

b) Can the Final NYSDOT Drainage Design Report, approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and the approved Notice of Intent (NOI) from the Phase 2 project be posted to the project web site to confirm the above assumptions?

Answer:
The Prospers shall base their drainage design for the area east of the intersection of Southern Boulevard on the answer to question 17a, and the addendum to be issued.
Question 18
The pattern of existing sidewalks and grass strips on the side streets within the project limits is not consistent. Portions of side streets have sidewalks on both sides, some side streets have sidewalk with a grass strip between the sidewalk and street, and some side streets have a sidewalk only on one side with no grass strip between the sidewalk and street. Is it NYSDOT’s intention to replace the existing sidewalk and grass strip condition in-kind if impacted by the project, or is the intent to implement a design with a consistent sidewalk and grass strip on all of the project side streets? If the later, please provide the desired sidewalk and grass strip widths and their respective orientation to the curb.

Answer:
At a minimum, the sidewalk(s) on the local streets impacted by the project should be replaced with 5 foot wide concrete sidewalk(s) to the side road reconstruction limit, transitioning back to the existing sidewalk(s) that continues along the local street. If ROW allows, grass strips should be constructed between the back of the curb and sidewalk. However, grass strips less than 3’ will not be allowed. This will be clarified by addendum.

Question 19
We believe the provided information and the LOS requirements do not allow for full compliance of the RFP as currently presented. Can the Department confirm that indeed the requirements presented along with the LOS requirements are attainable and a full compliant proposal can be submitted on the RFP proposal due date?

Answer:
The Department has reviewed this concern and has identified some relevant flaws. Therefore the Department, via a addendum, will remove the LOS requirements as currently stated and provide the following additional project requirements:

Table of Turning Bay Lengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>DIRECTION/ MOVEMENT</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE TAPER LENGTH IN FT</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE TURN BAY LENGTH IN FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NY ROUTE 347 AT SOUTHERN BLVD.</td>
<td>NB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB RIGHT TURN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB RIGHT TURN</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB RIGHT TURN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY ROUTE 347 AT LAKE AVENUE</td>
<td>NB RIGHT/THRU</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB RIGHT TURN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please disregard the answer to question 11 which was previously posted. Final timing will be provided by INFORM. This also will be included by addendum.

In addition the Department will extend the proposal due date to March 8, 2016 via addendum and other modifications to the procurement schedule. Also the Department shall increase the stipend amount to $115,000 to cover in part this re-work. The Department apologizes for this inconvenience.

**Question 20**
Please provide clarification regarding the role in general of NYSDOT / DQAE in the context of the review and approval process for pre-cast concrete items in the DB process. In particular, please advise regarding the need or lack thereof for Working Drawing Sheets (WDS) when submitting fabricator working drawings or Fabricator Request Sheets (FRS) when submitting other acceptable fabrication drawings.

**Answer:**
The Responsible Engineer, designated by the Design-Builder, shall approve shop drawings. The DQAE shall act in the capacity as spelled out in section111-10, 111-12 and appendix 112-C, Section 3.1 of the RFP. The Design-Builder shall provide copies of the approved and accepted shop drawings to the Department Inspectors located at the fabricators.

**Question 21**
Are the Release for Construction (RFC) fabrication drawings stamped by DQAE, DB QC staff and the fabricator’s PE satisfactory to fulfill the Materials Bureau’s role described in MP05-04?

**Answer:**
DQAE – No
Responsible Engineer – Yes
The Quality Control Plan should address the required signatures for fabrication drawings, relative to other D-B staff.

**Question 22**
Do the lane closure restrictions given in Part 3 Section 15.3.4 of the RFP for the 2-EB and 2 WB lanes of the 4-lane roadway of Rt 347 apply to the 5-lane roadway section (2-EB lanes and 3-WB lanes), or are they different for the 5-lane section i.e. can two lanes in the WB direction of the 5-lane section be closed in the off peak hours between 10PM and 6 AM?

**Answer:**
A single lane closure will allowed in the Route 347 WB three lane section 10 AM - 3 PM, and 10 PM - 6 AM. This will be added by addendum.

**Question 23**
In order for consultants to develop the optimized signal timing for determining the turning lane requirements based on the 2035 peak hour volumes, the existing signal timing/phasing is needed. Please provide the existing signal timing and phasing sheets for the signalized intersections on Rt. 347 at Southern Boulevard, Lake Avenue South and Gibbs Pond Road.

**Answer:**
Turning lane configuration will be added by addendum. Please refer to question 19.