February 14, 2013

MODIFICATION NUMBER 2

to the
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
for the
SIGN INVENTORY DATA COLLECTION SERVICES
Contract #C030797

Dear Interested Party:

Reference is made to the subject solicitation wherein the following changes are hereby incorporated:

1. **The RFP Proposal Due Date has Changed from February 6, 2013 to March 6, 2013, 2:00 PM EST.** Also please note that the Proposal Evaluation period will begin in March 2013.

2. RFP Page 22, Section IV.B, Table: after last item:

   | Submit Department of State Certificate (conditional) See RFP Section IV. f.

   **Add:**

   □ Complete and submit all future **RFP Modification Acknowledgement Forms** as instructed.


4. RFP Corrections to Attachment **Titles** on RFP Pages 8, 32, 33, and 89.

   **Delete:**
   9. Sign Inventory
   10. Intersection Nodes

   **Substitute:**
   9. Sign Gdb Documentation
   10. Sign Geodatabase
5. Attachment 9 Gdb Documentation: The Sign Support attribute “Breakaway” has been amended and is now for NYSDOT use only and does not need to be collected by the selected Consultant.

6. After RFP Attachment 13, Add RFP Attachment 14, Questions and Answers Set Two.

All firms are reminded that proposals are due March 6, 2013 at 2:00 PM (EST).

No other provision of the solicitation is otherwise changed or modified.

A one-page mandatory ACKNOWLEDGEMENT reply is attached. To ensure that your proposal is deemed to be responsive to the RFP, acknowledgement receipt of RFP Modification #2 is required by all firms submitting proposals. Acknowledgement instructions are to be found on RFP Modification #2 page number three. Thank you.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT: MODIFICATION NO. 2
Request For Proposals Contract #C030797
SIGN INVENTORY DATA COLLECTION SERVICES

An authorized representative of your firm or organization must acknowledge receipt and acceptance of this Modification No. 2 by signing and returning one copy of this Modification to the undersigned via inclusion in the Contract Section of your firm’s Part II Cost and Contract Proposal to NYSDOT.

ACKNOWLEDGED AND ACCEPTED:
BY: ______________________________
NAME: ___________________________
TITLE: ___________________________
FIRM: __________________________

NYS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
BY: original signed by: Barbara Sonenberg, for WILLIAM A. HOWE
   Director, Contract Management Bureau
Attachment 14

Questions and Answers SET TWO
Request For Proposals for Contract #C030797
SIGN INVENTORY DATA COLLECTION SERVICES FOR NYSDOT

**Question 64**: Is NYSDOT open to data collected by Video Van if the sign point coordinate is guaranteed at 1 meter accuracy (same as GPS)?

**Answer 64**: Yes.

**Question 65**: Are overhead signs to be included in the inventory?

**Answer 65**: Yes.

**Question 66**: Will the 96000 signs include Overhead Sign Structures inspected by Collins and C. V. Associates? If yes, can a consultant take the overhead sign information from NYSDOT folders in Region 8 and include it as part of the report?

As we understand, no retro - reflectivity testing was done during the Overhead Sign Inspection. If consultants can use existing data for overhead sign structures, then they only need to do the retro - reflectivity testing for those signs.

**Answer 66**: While the Department does possess an overhead sign inspection inventory, it has been decided not to use that data source for this contract. It is a Structures inventory designed to assess and record the physical condition of overhead mounting structure, not the sign panels per se and the data can be very dated. For this contract the Department is requiring that all attribute data, condition rating, photos and retroreflectivity ratings be done during the period of the contract.

**Question 67**: Are there software applications other than OEM installed ArcPad on the Trimble devices on which the Consultant is required to provide training?

**Answer 67**: The Consultant is required to train on ArcPad and the use of the ArcPad data manager extension in ArcMap.

**Question 68**: Please identify all elements of software within the scope of required training.

**Answer 68**: ArcPad, ArcMap.

**Question 69**: While it appears that no exceptions to the prospective CONTRACT will be accepted based on the language in the RFP, does a proposer have the opportunity to offer a technical solution with exceptions to specific, existing technical requirements while accepting all contract terms and conditions?

**Answer 69**: To submit a responsive proposal, a firm needs to address all of the RFP’s technical requirements while accepting the RFP’s draft contract. Any proposals which either fail to address specific RFP requirements (or address them to a lesser degree than envisioned) will meet with lower technical scores (for the requirements in question).

**Question 70**: Is it permissible to submit more than one proposal each complete on its own with required Parts 1 and 2?
Answer 70: Yes, it is permissible to submit more than one proposal each complete on its own with required Parts 1 and Parts 2. However, the firm must provide a footer on each page of each proposal clearly identifying it with the firm’s name, and Technical Proposal A, Cost Proposal A, or Technical Proposal B and Cost Proposal B. Different color binders should be used for each complete submission. These measures are necessary to ensure that the proposals are evaluated separately. Furthermore, one proposal may not reference the second proposal – that is, each proposal must be complete on its own.

Question 71: Does NYSDOT expect that all 24 trainees participate in a single two day training session?
Answer 71: Yes.

Question 72: If the proposer prefers to train groups smaller than 24, does Task 2 require that each individual trainee receive 2 days of training?
Answer 72: Yes.

Question 73: Can we propose an alternative to ArcPad and Trimble as a training and data collection tool for DOT staff?
Answer 73: No, ArcPad and Trimble are the equipment and software that NYSDOT possesses.

Question 74: The answer to question #53 previously provided indicates that reflectivity must be measured on both background and legend while the answer to question #40 suggests that reflectivity measurements are not required if a visual method is selected for reflectivity assessment. Can you please clarify whether or not reflectivity measurements are a required part of any technical solution?
Answer 74: The MUTCD (Section 2A.08) allows for several different methods for rating sign retroreflectivity condition management. Each method has its own requirements. The contractor must choose a single method. The measured sign retroreflectivity method requires the measurements. The visual nighttime inspection method has other requirements.

Question 75: Do we need to collect retroreflectivity measurements for engineering-grade signs?
Answer 75: Yes, if measured sign retroreflectivity is the selected MUTCD method for retroreflectivity assessment.

Question 76: Can signs with a Rating of 4 and lower be eliminated from the retroreflectivity testing?
Answer 76: A sign panel’s retroreflectivity assessment is optional IF its overall condition rating is 4 or less.

Question 77a: Are we allowed to propose our own method to assess retroreflectivity of an asset (per 2009 MUTCD document)?
Answer 77a: Yes.
Question 77b: Is there a list that outlines the retroreflectivity levels at the time of sign installation, for comparison purposes and for evaluating retroreflectivity degradation?

Answer 77b: No.

Question 78: The requirement to inventory the location of all sign mount stubs and attribute each mount with the presence or absence of a breakaway mount will almost certainly require a pedestrian working in the median and the ditch of all roadways. Is NYSDOT convinced that the value of this data warrants the resulting impact on worker safety, cost and traffic disruption?

Answer 78: The Sign Support attribute “Breakaway” has been amended and is now for NYSDOT use only and does not need to be collected.

Question 79: According to the language under the "Special Protective and Highway Liability Policy" insurance requirements on page 43, a policy form providing equivalent coverage is acceptable. What does NYDOT consider to be an acceptable alternative to the Special Protective and Highway Liability policy?

Answer 79: The Special Protective and Highway Liability Policy requirement has been deleted via this Modification #2.

Question 80: What is the anticipated start date of this contract?

Answer 80: Late Spring/Early Summer 2013 is the anticipated start date for this contract.

Question 81: Is this considered short time work?

Answer 81: RFP Section II.B (Page 9) states: “The term of the agreement shall be 18 months, which includes six months to provide a contingency in case of unforeseen circumstances. All work for this contract is to be completed within twelve months from date the Notice to Proceed is given."

Question 82: What are the speed limits of the highways associated with this RFP?

Answer 82: The speed limit is an attribute in the RIS data provided in Attachment 13 of Mod 1. As this is not the official source for speed limit records, the accuracy of the data is not warranted.

Question 83: What permits are required for this work? Is the contractor responsible for the cost and what are the costs annually?

Answer 83: The consultant is required to determine which permits are needed given the technical solution being proposed. Department permits can be found on: nypermits.org

Question 84: Does the DOT have an idea of the number of signs on non-state owned roads at intersections with DOT-roads? The RFP Section III.B.1.a. (Page 13) states, “Stop signs along with other Department Signs within the State Right of Way will be included in the survey, on side roads at their intersection with State Highways.”  ‘ Is there a better definition or more comprehensive listing of what those other signs might include?

Answer 84: In the absence of a inventory, it is not possible to be precise. The number of signs will vary widely according to the type of intersection and the MUTCD guidance that is
applicable. A typical rural intersection will have “stop ahead”, “stop”, street sign, and perhaps navigation signs. The RFP contains the best available information to guide proposal submission.

Question 85: If traffic control is needed to ensure safety during data collection, will NYSDOT provide this control?
Answer 85: NYSDOT will not be providing traffic control. The Consultant will be responsible for all traffic control.

Question 86a: Clarification questions based on the NYSDOT answer to the previously submitted Question 8: RFP Section III.B.1.a. (Page 13) states: “The project will inventory all Department signs within the State Right of Way, including stop signs and other Department signs on side roads at their intersection with the State Highways. The contract will also document other standard MUTCD signs located on side roads facing the travel direction approaching the state route.” Could you please specify a distance from the intersection on other jurisdiction roadways that are required to be included? Please clarify how many feet into the side roads will be included in the sign inventory data collection.
“Answer 8: All signs within 150 feet from the centerline of the State Highway are required to be included.”
Does this answer include signage in the ROW that is not maintained by NYSDOT?
Answer 86a: Yes.

Question 86b: Are there situations where frontage roads are running parallel within 150 feet of project roads?
Answer 86b: If the frontage road is included in the RIS_CenterLineMiles20121012 layer which scopes the roads included in the contract, yes; if not then no. The 150 foot buffer defines the signs to be included at the intersection only.

Question 86c: Assuming the previously provided estimate of 95,000 sign mount locations did not include this signage, what is the estimated number of signs based on this specification?
Answer 86c: These signs were included in the estimate.

Question 87: What is the overall projected level of effort regarding the funding of this project?
Answer 87: Please see RFP Modification #1 Answer #1: No. It is the Department’s practice not to release independent estimates for competitive best value solicitations where cost is a factor in the consultant section process. It is up to the proposing firms to propose competitive cost of these services to the Department.

Question 88: Under Section II. A. Project Objectives there is reference to estimating costs from historical information for similar data collection equipment and efforts in New York using typical cost per lane mile averages. Can you provide references to these efforts?
Answer 88: RFP Modification #1 deleted reference to typical cost per lane mile averages.

Question 89: RFP Section III. B. 1. Task 1: Sign Inventory\Geodatabase a, Schema mentions that other standard MUTCD signs located on side roads facing the travel direction approaching the state route (will require documentation). What are the MUTCD codes of the other signs to be documented, or is there a more specific, comprehensive listing available?
Answer 89: The section refers to “other” signs in the sense of “additional”. There is only one list of MUTCD codes.

Question 90: RFP Section III. B. 1. Task 1. A Schema, second paragraph, last sentence clarification: “The contract will also document other standard MUTCD signs located on side roads facing the travel direction approaching the state route”. Would guide signs on side roads located beyond the State Highway right of way (e.g. Route 5 junction ahead, etc.) be considered as part of the inventory requirement?

Answer 90: DOT is aware that there are some signs in outlier locations. If the sign is not listed in RIS_CenterLineMiles20121012 layer or within the 150 ft buffer at an intersection it is not included in the contract.

Question 91: The RFP states: “Project routes found to be under major reconstruction or widening and or relocation will be documented as such and omitted.” Is this completely under the sole discretion of the winning contractor or is this upon approval of the COTR?

Answer 91: It is at the discretion of the NYSDOT.

Question 92: The MUTCD standard for maintaining minimum retroreflectivity (2A.09) states that; “Public agencies or officials having jurisdiction shall use an assessment or management method that is designed to maintain sign retroreflectivity at or above the minimum levels in Table 2A-3”. The preferred method outlined in MUTCD under the support section of 2A.09 maintains that a visual nighttime inspection from a moving vehicle during nighttime conditions”. Is a daytime inspection utilizing a RoadVista model 922 handheld retroreflectometer acceptable as long as it meets MUTCD standards?

Answer 92: Yes, as long as it meets MUTCD standards.

Question 93: Can further information and/or assumptions be provided as to the number and type of grade-separation interchanges (i.e., cloverleaf, diamond, etc.) included in the highway network of the Region?

Answer 93: No simple count exists. The RIS data provided in Attachment 13 of Modification No. 1 contains information which may be of use. Roadway_Type = Ramp and BIN_Number identifies a section of road that has a bridge.

Question 94: Can information be provided as to the sheeting types that are currently known to be in service?

Answer 94: Sheeting type unknown.

Question 95: Does NYSDOT have documentation when the sign panels currently in service were installed? Do the panels have bar codes or stickers on the back side?

Answer 95: No.

Question 96: Are there any specifications for file size/resolution of the digital images? File naming convention?

Answer 96: Refer to Modification #1 (Attachment 13, Answer 10b).