

Final RFP
Questions and Answers
261- 267

261. Does NYSTA have a preference for single phase or three phase power at mainline gantry locations?

Answer: The preference is three-phase power; however, it is not a requirement.

262. Section 20.3.3 notes that the cameras “shall be able to view the entire lot including the entering and departure locations.” It also states “The cameras required for the access gate area shall be mounted so that Thruway TSOC can identify the single trailer seeking backside access to the tandem lot.” At interchanges 46 and 47 it does not appear that a single camera can meet the viewing requirements for the entire tandem lot and for the access gate. Can the Thruway verify if the “Y” under the camera needed column of Table 20-1 refers to the camera at the access gate and/or a camera at the existing tandem lot?

Answer: The Design-Builder has to determine what action they need to take, the “Y” under the camera needed means the Authority recognized that the existing camera at that location could not meet the needs and an additional camera was needed. In the case referenced, the Authority indicates that adding this new camera to the existing traffic pole provides no benefits, so a new pole is needed.

263. Exit 42 (Geneva) does not appear on the list of fiber connectivity sites in Section 12.3.2.1. Upon review of the as-builts and a site visit, it appears there is an existing fiber optic cable installed in the existing TUB that connects to the mainline fiber, along with existing communications equipment in the TUB. Would the Design-Builder be permitted to install fiber from the proposed VMS at this location into the TUB for this location, even though it is not listed in Section 12.3.2.1? A similar situation appears to occur at Interchange 37 as well. Can the proposed VMS at interchange 37 utilize fiber cables to the TUB for communications?

Answer: Yes, this needs to be corrected via Amendment #7.

264. Table 20-1 notes that the existing camera and/or pole shall be raised at interchange 35. Can the Thruway clarify which existing pole is to be referenced? If the pole referenced is an existing mainline/interchange pole that is already 50' tall, would it be acceptable to install a 70' pole in order to accommodate the request to raise the camera? If yes, would additional special provision language be provided?

Answer: Yes, the wording needs to be revised. It should not be a “shall”. See Amendment #7.

265. Will the new camera required at the tandem lot for interchange 33 be required to view the entrance of the new park and ride, or just the entry/exit points of the existing tandem lot?

Answer: The entry/exit points of the existing tandem lot only.

266. Part 3, §12.3.3.6 “F) Conduits between Span or Mast Arm poles and nearest junction box shall include a 2 21-inch RGS and a 4-inch RGS.” What is a 2 21-inch RGS?

Answer: We believe Amendment #6 addresses this issue.

267. What non-standard/non-conforming features will be included in the Design Approval Document?

Answer: It is the Design-Builders responsibility to check the design report for non-conforming and/or non-standard features.