

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

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

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 09/24/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-1	Book 3, Section 3.7, and Signing and Marking Roll Plots	Reference QR#2-22; Are the signs (with signal ahead flashers) along Lewisburg Pike considered mast arms or cantilever signs? Will these use the same mast arms as the signals?	<b>The referenced signs with the flashers on Lewisburg Pike shall be placed on mast arms in advance of the signal. Mast arms shall be similar to those used for the signals.</b>
5-2	Book 3, Section 3.2	How shall the grass median be stabilized? Do you want to specify sod or can it also be seeded with mulch?	<b>Median shall be stabilized with sod.</b>
5-3	Book 3, Section 3.5	Reference to QR#3-28, are there any known special circumstances on the project that required specific hydraulic analysis software packages to be utilized?	<b>There are no known special circumstances of which the Department is aware that would supersede the TDOT Drainage Manual.</b>
5-4	Book 3, Section 3.5 and Functional Plans	The existing 5x6 box culvert under I-65 to be extended is not a standard shape in the TDOT standard drawings. Is the size listed correctly? If so, will this be a special design element?	<b>The Design-Builder shall confirm the size of any structures within the project limits. If non-standard sizes are encountered, the Design-Builder is responsible for the design and cost associated with that design for any special designs that meet the concurrence of the department.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-5	Book 3, Section 3.7, and Signing and Marking Roll Plots	If signs on the functional plan layout extend beyond the ETSA boundary, will this require a NEPA reevaluation?	<b>The Department is working to clear the areas where signs are located outside of the current ETSA.</b>
5-6	Book 3, Section 5.0	Where will the 4 spare 2" conduits connect on the Buckner Ln. approach? Does the City have a standard for junction/pull box placement? Is there a specific area identified for these facilities? MTEMC has stated that their requirement is 500ft between pull boxes	<b>This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.</b>
5-7	BK 3, Section 3.5- Drainage	The project is in a largely rural area with no current residential/ commercial development upstream.  Are we to size the drainage structures based on current drainage area conditions and assume future upstream developments will employ on-site detention to match predevelopment flow?	<b>Drainage structures should be designed based on current conditions. Future development will be required to provide its own on-site detention.</b>
5-8	BK 3, Section 3.5- Drainage and Functional Plans sheets 7 and 8	Will the existing 10x7 box culvert under I-65 at STA 535+35 +/- remain in place with only minor repairs and no additional hydraulic conveyance? If so, will the proposed structures up and downstream need to be sized assuming the existing box remains in place or size them as if all structures in line are appropriately sized?	<b>The existing structure referenced will remain with only repairs completed under this contract. The proposed structures up and downstream should be sized assuming the existing box remains.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-9	BK 3, Section 5.2 Lighting Pg. 27	Ramp C Lighting – Please confirm the intention for the lighting at the interchange. Is it to light the entire merge area for the two-lane ramps or until both lanes are merged with I-65?	<b>The lighting on Ramp C shall extend until both lanes are merged with I-65.</b>
5-10	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	<b>It is still under review</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-11	Book 3, Section 8.0 Utility Scope of Work Pg. 38 & 39	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?	<b>It is under review.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-12	<p>Book 3, section 10 Construction Scope of Work, Pg. 54</p> <p>Book 3, Section 6 Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work Pg. 29</p>	<p>Our team is requesting the Department provide design criteria to evaluate use and/or replacement of phosphatic soil. Based upon the subsurface information provided, phosphatic soils will be present throughout the roadway corridor at or near subgrade in most of the cut sections. The workability and strength of this material can be greatly affected by several factors such as moisture content and the level of phosphate. First, what are the Department's design criteria, to be utilized by the D-B teams, to determine whether phosphatic material is acceptable for use as embankment within the project limits or if the material would need to be disposed of off-site (for example, PI greater than 35; moisture and/or phosphate are in excess of specific limits)? Second, if phosphatic material is encountered at subgrade, what are the Department's design criteria to determine if the material needs to be undercut (for example, PI greater than 20)? Third, if the Department's undercut requirement criteria are met, what are the Department's design criteria for the depth of undercut and material to be used to replace the phosphatic material (for example, undercut subgrade 3 feet and replace with graded solid rock)?</p>	<p><b>Unsatisfactory materials which cannot be properly compacted may be undercut and replaced by materials identified in Section 203.02.B of the Standard Specifications. Phosphatic soils may be undercut and replaced or treated to achieve proper compaction. The geotechnical report and investigation is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to determine the cost of any undercutting related to the project and incorporate the cost into the price bid for the work.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-13	Book 1, Section 5 Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines, as amended in Addendum #1. Pg. 7	TDOT has indicated Addendum #2 to the RFP and Functional Plans are forthcoming. As Addendum #2 has not been received as of 9/10/2020, we would request that TDOT extend the ATC and Initial DDI Design, Lighting, and Right-Of-Way Acquisition (Exhibit) due dates to allow for review and potential submittal of additional questions and/or ATC(s) based on information contained within.	<b>The schedule was revised in Addendum 2 and is being evaluated for any applicable changes.</b>
5-14	Book 1, Section 5 Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines, as amended in Addendum #1. Pg. 7	TDOT has indicated Addendum #2 to the RFP and Functional Plans are forthcoming. As Addendum #2 has not been received as of 9/10/2020, we would request that TDOT extend the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal due date to 12/04/2020 to allow for the incorporation of addendum #2 into our designs and construction program	<b>The schedule was revised in Addendum 2 and is being evaluated for any applicable changes.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-15	Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements. Pg. 15	The RFP indicates a 17'- 0" minimum vertical clearance over the ultimate number of lanes and shoulders of Interstate 65 described in Section 3.2 for the bridge over Interstate 65 is required. Is an additional 6" required for future pavement or does the 17'-0" take this into account.	<b>See QR 4-4.</b>
5-16	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 Design-Builder'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?	<b>It is still under review</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-17	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 (Revision #1)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the first revision of the RFP states that "the use of 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road should be used based on Case II slopes as applicable within the interchange access control and only by approved Alternate Technical Concept along Buckner Road". Is it the Department's intent to allow the use of 2:1 slopes along Buckner Road within Segment No. 2, Interstate 65, and all interchange ramps without an approved Alternate Technical Concept?	<b>Any 3:1 slopes in the Functional Plans being proposed to change to 2:1 must be approved through an ATC.</b>
5-18	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?	<b>The details of the pedestrian barrier will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.</b>



## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-19	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 (Revision #2)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the second revision of the RFP states that “all proposed guardrail along Buckner Road shall be placed at the location required to accommodate the future sidewalk and multi-use path (see Standard Drawing S-PL-6). Right-of-way shall be notched such that proposed guardrail and terminals are within the proposed right-of-way”. Is it the Department’s intent to require that all proposed guardrail along Buckner Road be placed at the back of the future sidewalk and multi-use path (requiring the notched right-of-way), and not at the back of the proposed curb?	<b>All proposed guardrail shall be placed such that it will be in the location required when the future sidewalk and multi-use path is constructed.</b>
5-20	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.6	Contract Book 3, Section 9.6 of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any and all compensatory mitigation of impacts to environmental features (streams and/or wetlands) for the Project”. Where on-site mitigation of impacts may occur, will the Department allow impacts from one segment to be mitigated in another segment?	<b>This is allowed.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-21	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.7	Contract Book 3, Section 9.7 of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall determine all permits required in order to perform the work”. Will the Department require the Design-Builder to obtain separate permits for Segments No. 1, 2, and 3?	<b>The Design-Builder is not required to separate the permits by project segment.</b>
5-22	Question Request #2-17	The Department's response to QR #2-17 states that "supports in the median are allowed as long as no other condition in the RFP is violated and they are properly protected or outside the clear zone." Is it the Department's intent to require the protection of sign supports in the median within the clear zone on all project segments or only on Interstate 65?	<b>All sign supports within the clear zone on all routes and ramps shall be protected.</b>
5-23	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 Design-Builder to negotiate the placement of field entrances with affected property owners during the right-of-way acquisition phase?	<b>The final row plans shall include a field entrance for each property owner. During negotiations the property owner may request to move this entrance to another location on their property, which is part of the negotiation process. The Design Builder shall evaluate the requested alternative location and ensure that the driveway can be designed to meet all design requirements specified in the RFP. Any cost associated with that Design shall be the Design Builder’s responsibility.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-24	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?	<b>It is still under review.</b>
5-25	Question Request #2-20; Functional Plans	The Department's response to QR #2-20 states that "field entrances will be required [along Buckner Road]". However, the functional plans do not include median openings along Buckner Road. Will the Department require the Design-Builder to include median openings along Buckner Road, either at the intervals specified in the Department's design standards or to accommodate the field entrances?	<b>Median opening locations will be addressed by a future addendum.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-26	CB-3; Appendix A	RFP Contract Book 3 Appendix A provides a full depth pavement buildup for Lewisburg Pike. Cross-sections provided by TDOT indicate widening the road with the full depth pavement buildup shown in Appendix A and leveling of the existing roadway. Please clarify if the intent is to remove the existing pavement and place full depth pavement buildup across the full width of proposed Lewisburg Pike, or if this will be accomplished with leveling, and if so what leveling course should the DB be assumed to use.	<b>The full-depth pavement for the widening shall be done with the pavement design of Appendix A. The Design-Builder shall mill 1.25” and overlay the existing pavement with 1.25” ACS (PG70-22) GR “D” Mix. Appendix A will be revised in an upcoming addendum.</b>
5-27	CB-3 Addendum #1; Section 5.0; pg 26	RFP Addendum #1 states, “The two spare 2” conduits shall run for the full length of project along each side of Buckner Road terminating near the signal at Lewisburg Pike.” TDOT specifications require a different pull box spacing depending on if the conduit is conveying electrical wiring for signals, electrical wiring for lighting, or fiber optic lines. Please clarify the future intent of the spare conduits.	<b>This will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-28	Book 1, Section E.1.a.1	<p>"Contract Book 1 Section E.1.a.1, states that the proposal responses to RC II through IV shall be limited to the combined maximum total of 75 page count and that all information submitted in RC II through IV will be counted in calculating page count, regardless of format or medium.</p> <p>Please clarify if the following will be counted towards the 75-page count:</p> <p>(1) Half-size plan sheets to be included in RC IV (CB 1, Section D.4.d)</p> <p>(2) CPM Schedule to be included as part of RCIII (per Form RC III and CB 1, Section D.3.b.1)"</p>	<p><b>Half-sized plan sheets will not be counted against the page count limit, however, the CPM Schedule will count against the page count limit for Response Categories II through IV.</b></p>
5-29	CB-3 Addendum #2	<p>Addendum #2, Section 5.2 states "The illuminance method shall be used (Values of Average Maintained Minimum, Average/Min., and Max/Min shall be in accordance with Chapter 15 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual)..." The "Max/Min" value is not listed in Chapter 15 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual, however the Veiling Luminance Ratio, LV<sub>max</sub>/L<sub>avg</sub> is shown in Table 15.3. Please clarify if the Department requires "Max/Min" values, and if so, will the Department please provide those values?</p>	<p><b>The max/min values shall be 6:1. The Department no longer uses "Veiling" since IES &amp; AASHTO came up with the BUG rating.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-30	CB 3; Section 3.5	<p>Per RFP Section 3.5, The Design-Builder shall embed culverts for aquatic organism passage for all streams in accordance with the requirements of FHWA Hydraulic Engineering Circular (HEC) 26, “Culvert Design for Aquatic Organism Passage”. HEC 26, Section 7.5.3 suggests the recommended embedment depth should be a minimum of 2 feet and then filled with natural substrate materials to match the existing stream elevations. However, TDOT Drainage Manual Section 6.04.1.1.1.3 suggests a 1 foot embedment below the stream bed and then filled with natural substrate materials to match the existing stream elevations. Please confirm whether the DB shall meet the TDOT Drainage Manual or FHWA HEC-26 embedment depth requirements.</p>	<p><b>Section 6.04.1.1.1.3 of the Drainage Manual does not specifically address aquatic passage. The Department requires the following criteria be met by its designs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The upstream and downstream inverts of the culvert should be buried/embedded to a depth of 20% (box culverts) or 30% (circular culverts) of the culvert height to allow a natural bedload to cover the bottom of the culverts</b></li> <li>• <b>The width of the base flow culverts should be approximately equal to the average channel width upstream and downstream from the proposed culvert</b></li> <li>• <b>Natural channel materials should be installed into the new culverts to satisfy the embedment criteria. Materials should be approximately the size and composition of bed materials upstream and downstream of the culverts and should meet the criteria in HEC-26</b></li> </ul>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-31	Functional Plans	<p>According to the Functional Plan, Property Map Sheet 3B and the R.O.W. Acquisition Table Sheet 3F, indicate Tract 17 as "Loss of Access". Per Present Layout Sheet 15, the proposed cut line and proposed R.O.W. (C.A.) &amp; Fence run directly through the existing structure labeled 2-S-BR. Res., as well as smaller structures in Tract 18. Can the department please indicate the intent with these structures, as it appears that structure demolition will be required in both Tract 17 and 18, in addition to any loss of access in Tract 17.</p>	<p><b>Structures on a tract identified as “Loss of Access” shall be demolished and removed. A temporary construction easement will be required to remove any structure outside the proposed ROW. Refer to the TDOT ROW Manual for additional information.</b></p>
5-32	RFP Section 9	<p>Has the City identified any potential stream mitigation sites?</p>	<p><b>The City completed a Visual Stream Assessment in May of 2020. This document can be viewed at the City webpage below:</b></p> <p><a href="https://www.springhilltn.org/420/Reports">https://www.springhilltn.org/420/Reports</a></p>