Question 24
Form U, Question #3: “Has the proposer or any team member assisted the Department in any phase of this project.”
Does this question refer to only this contract (D900033, Terry Rd. to Gibbs Pond Rd.) or to the entire Green Route 347 project?
Answer:
Yes, Question is only referring to contract D900033.

Question 25
NY Route 347 DB Contract Documents- Part 3 – Project Requirements, Section 18.3.2 states that the left shoulder widths shall be 2 feet wide. The horizontal curve between westbound Station NHW 170+00 and Station NHW 184+00 (between Terry Rd. and Southern Blvd.) as provided in the 2007 FEIS has a radius of approximately 2,850 feet which requires a Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) of 570 feet for the 60 mph design speed. With a 2 foot left shoulder through this curve and with the half-section barrier of the raised median at the outside edge of the shoulder the minimum SSD provided is approximately 415 feet which is only adequate for a design speed of 50 mph. Therefore it does not comply with the project requirements.

There are several options any of which could be chosen to address this non-standard design feature. These include:

- Increase the westbound left shoulder along the curve to a maximum width of approximately 9 feet to provide the required SSD. Impact/mitigation: Reduce the median width along the curve from approximately 30 feet wide to 21 feet at the narrowest point to widen the left shoulder.

- Revise the horizontal roadway alignment by increasing the curve radius to approximately 5350 ft such that the required minimum 570 feet SSD would be achieved with a two foot wide left shoulder adjacent to the raised median. Impact/mitigation: increasing the radius to 5350 feet would shift the roadway approximately 40 feet to the south at the center of the curve. If the typical cross section is maintained the shift would require obtaining ROW from at least 8 properties on the south side. On the north side the shift would require lengthening existing driveways to meet the shifted roadway and create additional landscaped area.

- Maintain the existing alignment and the two foot left shoulder; the SSD would be non-standard. Impact /mitigation: provide a non-standard feature justification report addressing the insufficient SSD. Add appropriate signage to advise drivers of the limited sight distance.

Given the fact that the Project Requirements in the RFP and the alignment as proposed in the 2007 FEIS would result in non-standard SSD, does NYSDOT have a preference as to which alternative should be implemented in the final design?
Answer:
Where the site distance criteria cannot be met, the shoulder width shall be increased to the extent required to meet the site distance criteria. This will be included by addendum.
Question 26
As per Part 3 section 18.1 “the eastern project limit shall be determined based on roadway
reconstruction required to satisfy the LOS for the intersection of Route 347 and Gibbs Pond Road plus 50
feet for milling and resurfacing”.

a. Based on the reference documents, it is our understanding that a noise wall will be built
south of the shared use path just east of Gibbs Pond Road in a future contract. Should we
include permanent features such as curb, shared use path, bus stop and shelter on the
south side of Rt. 347 east of Gibbs Pond Road when it is likely that these features will be in
conflict with construction equipment and could be damaged during the noise wall
construction in the future contract?
Answer:
All features constructed, which are to remain at the conclusion of this contract, are deemed
to be “permanent”.

b. Storm Water flows east of Gibbs Pond Road are ultimately destined for recharge basins to
be built in a future contract to the east. As such, this drainage system has not been
designed. Similarly, the horizontal alignment from Gibbs Pond to the east will also be
finalized in a future contract. Should we include permanent features to the project limit
such as drainage structures, pipe, median barrier, attenuator, median lighting, curb, and
sidewalk east of Gibbs Pond Road or should we include temporary features similar to the
way the eastern project limit was constructed at Mt. Pleasant Road in contract D900012?
Answer:
Please see response to question 26a.

c. Is it acceptable to have separate project limits, one for eastbound Rt. 347 and one for
westbound Rt. 347?
Answer:
Yes.

Question 27
Are colored photos allowed to be submitted in the technical writing?
Answer:
No.

Question 28
Are Logos allowed to be submitted in the proposal?
Answer:
No.
Question 29
Article 2, Escrowed Bid Documents to Be Held By NYSDOT on the Form BDEA outlines the procedure for delivering Bid Documents and indicates that all documents must be “Bates Numbered”.
As the Form BDEA is not submitted to the Department until after designation of best value and award of the job to the successful proposer, do we assume that the Bates Numbering is completed upon award; or, is the initial proposal submission to be Bates Numbered?
In searching the contract documents, we do not find reference to page numbering for any of the documents, only page limitations for certain portions of the submissions (technical writing, resumes, etc.).
Answer:
The initial proposal submission does not need to be Bates Numbered. Any documents included as part of the Escrowed Bid Documents submitted with the Form BDEA (after designation) need to be Bates Numbered prior to that submission.

Question 30
Regarding the February 1, 2016 answer to Question 17a:

a. Please confirm that the closed drainage system leading to WQB2 from the east is to be designed and constructed in Contract D00014 to accommodate the design storm water runoff from the existing and proposed roadway condition between the eastern terminus of Contract D00014 and the Route 347 high point located in proximity of the Route 347 intersection with Southern Boulevard and discharge this runoff directly into WQB2, as indicated in the Phase 2 RFP Section 18.3.1.2.
Answer:
The Design-Builder shall assume that the drainage system designed for Contract D900014 will accommodate the existing run-off from the Contract D900014 eastern terminus to the existing roadway high point located in proximity of the Route 347 intersection with Southern Boulevard.

b. Please confirm that the water quality basin WQB2 is to be designed and constructed in Contract D00014 will comply with all NYSDEC requirements for volume (CPV) control and for water quality control (WQv) including the design storm water runoff from the existing and proposed roadway condition between the eastern terminus of Contract D00014 and the Route 347 high point located in proximity of the Route 347 intersection with Southern Boulevard, as indicated in the Phase 2 RFP Section 18.3.1.2.
Answer:
The previous contract is not part of this RFP. The Design-Builder is required to meet the requirements of this RFP for this project. Please refer to the response to question 30 a. above and RFP addendum #2.

Question 31
Regarding the February 1, 2016 answer to Question 17b: Please confirm that the answer was intended to indicate “…base their design for the areas WEST of the intersection of Southern Boulevard...”.
Answer:
As stated in Addendum #2, the Design-Build shall assume that the drainage system designed for Contract D900014 will accommodate the existing run-off from the Contract D900014 eastern terminus to the existing roadway high point located in proximity of the Route 347 intersection with Southern Boulevard. It is the Responsibility of the proposer to determine the precise location of that high point.

Question 32
Will the design builder be provided with written authorization at NTP to act on behalf of the Department in dealing with NYS DEC, USACOE, FHWA, the Town of Smithtown, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, and utility companies with facilities that may be impacted by the project?

Answer:
No, the Notice to Proceed will be sent to the Best Value designated Firm as part of the RFP Contract. The Design-Build proceeds from that point forward as per the requirements of the RFP.

Question 33
Will the design builder be provided with written authorization at NTP to act on behalf of the Department in dealing with permittees and other adjacent property owners with access or seeking access to NY347 within the project area?

Answer:
No, as stated in the response to question 32 above.

Question 34
Are there any agencies or entities with whom the design builder is specifically precluded from acting on behalf of the department?

Answer:
No, the Design-Build may reach out to any agency deemed necessary. The Department is available to assist if the Design-Build so wishes.