

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: Interstate 65 Interchange at Buckner Road, Williamson County, Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 10/14/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-1	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3.2 requires I-65 resurfacing from the southernmost log mile for the beginning of Ramp B or Ramp D auxiliary lane (whichever is furthest south) to the northernmost log mile for the end of Ramp A or Ramp C auxiliary lane (whichever is furthest north). Please clarify if the log mile should be taken at the Design Builders southernmost and northernmost extent of the furthest ramp taper (stations 499+15 and 573+22 if not different than Functional Plans), corresponding to a fractional log mile, or if the Department requires the surfacing to extend past these points to the nearest whole number log mile.	The Design-Builder's mill and overlay limits for NB and SB Interstate 65 do not need to be extended to the next whole number log mile. The limits of the mill and overlay along I-65 should be defined by the extent of the proposed ramp auxiliary lanes/tapers and shoulders constructed adjacent to I-65. Additionally, if any existing pavement or pavement markings are disturbed beyond the limits defined above, the Design-Builder must extend the mill and overlay limits to include those disturbed areas.
6-2	Reference Material, Survey Files, ROW Acquisition Table	Please provide a ROW acquisition table spreadsheet reflecting the most recent tracts per the functional plans dated 9-19-20. Also, please provide this spreadsheet unlocked.	This information is available on the project web site.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-3	Revised Functional Plans dated 9/18/20	Sheet 14A in the revised functional plans dated 9-18-20 depict "Additional Environmental Technical Study Area". Will the Department be responsible to provide the additional environmental study, or will this be the responsibility of the design builder?	The Department is working to obtain environmental clearance of this area. All other changes in environmental impacts shall be the responsibility of the Design-Builder for NEPA re-evaluation, technical study updates or other action as required for environmental clearance.
6-4	Book 3, Section 5.2 (Revision language in Addendum #2 sheet 18 of PDF)	The RFP states that allowable wall pack lighting will be provided on the project website. None can be found at this time 10/7/2020. Without this information, we are presently unable to complete the photometrics for the portion of I-65 between the ramp gores. The under-bridge lighting is a critical component to the overall max/min values associated with the photometrics in this area.	Wall pack lighting is shown in the Proprietary Item Request and Justification for Street Lighting pages 16 thru 19 listed on the project website.
6-5	Functional Plans	As noted in the revised functional plans dated 9/18/2020, will the ETSA boundaries and NEPA document be updated by TDOT? What is the timeline for the NEPA document re-evaluation?	See QR6-3. This clearance is currently anticipated to be provided no later than the date of award of the Design-Build Contract.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-6	Book 3, Section 1.3	Culvert Inspection Reports are listed as material to be provided on the project website. This information is not listed on the website at this time 10/7/2020.	This information has been added to the project website.
6-7	QR4-9	Has the Department determined if Right-of-Entry prior to the Initiation of Negotiations will be allowed?	Right-of-Entry will not be allowed prior to Initiation of Negotiations.
6-8	QR5-10: Bk 3, Section 3.2 – Design Requirements, DDI Traffic Operations Design Requirements. Pg. 17	VISSIM – Please provide a list of assumptions for all traffic parameters, signal timing, and driver behaviors for the VISSIM model to provide a consistency baseline for all teams	The Vissim model requirement has been removed from the RFP.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-9	QR5-11: Book 3, Section 8.0 Utility Scope of Work Pg. 38 & 39	<p>After a meeting with AT&T regarding the existing fiber optic line along the east side of I-65, we learned they will not begin any work (construction, design, or ROW/Easement procurement) until they have definitive plans from the Design Build project team. After AT&T has these plans, their tentative schedule would take them at least 14 months between easement procurement, design and contractor procurement, and construction before the line has been relocated, which will be more than half of our maximum allowable construction period under the contract. Based upon this information - first – will TDOT provide a timeline to all Design-Build teams for the relocation of the AT&T line for all bidders to use as a basis for our bid proposals? Second, will TDOT extend the project completion time due to the amount of time required by AT&T to complete their relocation work?</p>	<p>This has been addressed in Addendum 4.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-10	QR5-16: RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2; Question Request #3-21	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "concrete barriers (51" shall be constructed to allow for a center 12' shared-use path on the bridge over Interstate 65". However, the Department's response to QR #3-21 states that "the Design-Builder shall submit its proposed barrier wall for the shared use path on the bridge over Interstate 65 as an ATC for approval". As a required portion of the work, this submittal does not fit the requirements of an ATC submittal and creates a situation where rejection of the DesignBuilder's ATC would result in a non-responsive bid. Will the Department consider creating a separate submittal for the proposed barrier wall design outside the ATC process?	The pedestrian barriers were addressed in Addendum 2 and detail information will be added to the project website.
6-11	QR5-18: RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 (Revision #2)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the second revision of the RFP states that "The 51" single slope barrier on the bridge over Interstate 65 shall extend off the bridge toward the median refuge. The 51" single slope barrier shall transition to a 6" curb over a distance of fifty (50) feet as it approaches the median refuge ramp". Given the addition of the pedestrian barrier in the second revision of the RFP, is it the Department's intent to remove this requirement?	The pedestrian barriers were addressed in Addendum 2 and detail information will be added to the project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-12	QR5-24: Question Request #2-20	The Department's response to QR #2-20 states that "field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]". Will the Department require the construction of frontage or side roads to access affected properties not adjacent to proposed right-of-way?	This has been addressed in Addendum 4.