

Project & CMGC Contract: SR-1 Bridge Replacement (CMGC13)

#	Section	Question	Department's Response
1	2.5.4 Proposal Attachments	Section 2.5.4 permits up to three pages of supplemental materials. For the supplemental materials section specifically, can proposers utilize 11x17 pages where each 11x17 page would count as only one page toward the three-page supplemental materials limit rather than the standard two-page count?	See revisions to item #4 in Section 2.5.4 in Addendum No. 1 that now match the page limit for the supplemental materials listed in Section 3. The Proposer may elect to use an 11" by 17" page to present its supplemental materials, but as noted in Section 2.4, all 11" by 17" pages will count as two (2) pages towards the assigned page limits.
2	Section 1.1	The RFP notes a requirement to maintain at least one lane of travel in each direction throughout the project, while the preliminary traffic control drawings and report appear to depict maintaining two lanes in each direction for certain phases. Please clarify whether maintaining two lanes in each direction is a requirement or option under consideration, or if proposers should assume one lane in each direction as the governing requirement for planning, estimating, and phasing.	The requirement noted in the RFP is to maintain at least one lane of traffic in each direction throughout the construction phase. The preliminary traffic control drawings and Concept Report included in the Reference Materials illustrate potential concepts that maintain two lanes in each direction. However, the Proposers may assume one lane in each direction as the minimum requirement for planning, estimating, and phasing, while there are opportunities to maintain additional lanes to be investigated during the preconstruction phase.
3	Section 1.1	The concept report indicates a three-span structure with a steel I-beam superstructure, while the line, grade, and typical section drawings appear to depict a five-span structure utilizing concrete bulb-tee girders. Please clarify the Department's current design intent regarding the superstructure type.	The Concept Report is preliminary by definition. The Line and Grade Package (included in the Reference Materials) represents the Department's current design intent regarding this question and other related design items.
4	Section 1.1	The concept report typical traffic control section for phase 1 depicts demolition of approximately 21.67 feet of the existing north bridge structure, which appears to include partial demolition of the existing pier. Please confirm whether any structural analysis or calculations have been performed to evaluate the feasibility of this partial demolition and to identify whether temporary support or falsework would be required.	The Line and Grade Package includes advanced design concepts from what was included in the Concept Report. There is no additional information available at this time that has not already been provided in the Reference Materials.
5	Section 1.1.1	Does the Department have directional (eastbound and westbound) AADT data for the project limits, or is the AADT information provided in the final report representative of combined traffic volumes and the only data available at this time?	Currently available traffic data is on a Department website for the Proposer's reference here: https://tdot.public.ms2soft.com/tcds/tsearch.asp?loc=Tdot&mod=TCD S
6	Section 1.3	Is any additional information available regarding the horizontal and vertical alignment of the existing gas main within the project limits? Please also clarify whether relocation, adjustment, or protection of the gas main is anticipated to be performed under this contract or by others. If this scope is not yet defined, should potential impacts be treated as a project risk to be addressed during the preconstruction phase rather than assumed in the base construction scope?	1) Additional survey information, including location of the gas line, is available upon request by each Proposer. To request the .dgn files, please complete the CADD Disclaimer Form now included in the "01 General" folder in the Reference Materials and return an executed form to Amber Warren (TDOT's primary point of contact for this procurement). 2) This is still being investigated and will be discussed with the CMGC Contractor during the preconstruction phase. 3) This is at the Proposer's discretion as to whether it considers this a risk and how it can use the CMGC process to help reduce this risk.
7	Section 1.3	Please clarify whether any relocation or adjustment of the overhead utilities located on the north side of the alignment is anticipated as part of this project, or if they are expected to remain in place. If any impacts to Phase 1 construction are identified but the scope and timing are not yet defined, should those impacts be treated as a project risk to be addressed during the preconstruction phase rather than assumed in the base construction scope?	1) This is still being investigated and will be discussed with the CMGC Contractor during the preconstruction phase. 2) This is at the Proposer's discretion as to whether it considers this a risk and how it can use the CMGC process to help reduce this risk.
8	Section 1.5	Is a preliminary or milestone-level project schedule available to further clarify anticipated key dates? This information would be helpful for proposers to better understand the Department's schedule priorities during preconstruction and construction.	See milestone schedule in the Reference Materials provided with this Addendum No. 1. Note this is a preliminary schedule and subject to change as the preconstruction phase advances.
9	Section 2.5.2	Per bullet point number 5, will TDOT be providing Form C for acknowledgement of addendums?	Yes. See the form included with the addendum letter posted to the Project website.
10	Section 2.5.3.1	May a single individual serve in multiple Key Personnel roles on the project (e.g., Project Manager also serving as the Lead Cost Estimator), provided the individual meets the qualifications and availability requirements for each role?	This is at the discretion of the Proposer and will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.

#	Section	Question	Department's Response
11	Section 4	Will the CM/GC Contractor be responsible for providing engineering and design services for any non-standard or contractor-designed elements required to complete the work, temporary shoring systems, falsework, or other specialty systems not fully detailed in the contract documents? If so, please clarify whether these designs are to be sealed by a Contractor-retained Professional Engineer and how such responsibilities will be addressed in the GMP.	Yes. See Section 3.4.8 of the CMGC Standard Guidance, which describes (as examples) potential CMGC Contractor scope to prepare non-standard or contractor-designed elements for the work, including site preparation plans, shop drawing preparation, and early acquisition or fabrication of materials.
12	Section 4	Please confirm whether contractor-designed elements will be subject to formal TDOT review and approval or review for conformance only.	This process will follow the Department's standard design-bid-build process.
13	Section 1.1.2	The RFP states that Federal Funding is involved. Currently no DBE requirements are listed, but could that be added later?	Currently the direction from FHWA is to not include any DBE requirements for the Department's procurements and contracts. However, this position may change at the time of preparing a construction contract for the project (or portion thereof), by which the Department will work with the CMGC Contractor to integrate any noted goals at that time.
14	Concept Report (RFP 1.1.2)	Was the original concept report revised and replaced in the Reference Materials on the website? If so, will the original be made available to all proposers?	The preliminary cost information was redacted/removed from the original Concept Report because the information was dated and is no longer applicable (as superseded by the Line and Grade Package). No other information in the Concept Report was changed.
15	Section 1.1.2	Is the environmental document still expected to be completed by Spring of 2026?	See revisions to Section 1.1.2 in Addendum No. 1 that pushes clearance into Spring of 2027. However, the Department sees value in onboarding the CMGC Contractor as scheduled to support advancement of the environmental documents (e.g., the Biological Assessment) and permit application process to expedite clearance and hold the anticipated construction NTP date.