

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

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

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 10/27/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-1	RFP Contract Book 1, Section 3	Contract Book 1, Section 3 of the RFP states that “a stipulated fee of \$100,000 will be awarded to each eligible Design-Builder on the short-list that provides a responsive bid, but unsuccessful, Proposal”. Will the Department consider increasing this stipend in light of the changes to the scope of the RFP and submittal requirements?	<b>The Department is not considering any increase of the stipend.</b>
7-2	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that “design of intersections must provide for future construction of cross walks and meet ADA requirements for future shared multi-use path”. Does the Department require the Design-Builder to construct concrete driveways (either standard or lowered) to accommodate the future sidewalk and shared-use path?	<b>Driveway profiles should be designed and constructed to accommodate the future sidewalk and shared use path.</b>
7-3	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 (Revision #4)	What is the proposed width of the relocated AT&T easement?	<b>This is will be determined after Definitive Design Plans are issued for Utility Coordination.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-4	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Will the Department consider scheduling one-on-one meetings with the Design-Builders to discuss the requirements of the proposed access road?	<b>The Department will review and respond to the access road design for each Design-Builder with the Initial ROW Exhibit comments. See RFP Addendum 4 for details.</b>
7-5	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder shall construct an access road to allow for access to Tracts 17 and 32”. Will the Department allow the Design-Builder to purchase either or both of these tracts in lieu of constructing an access road serving both?	<b>No, the access road is to be constructed to avoid purchase of access rights or total acquisition of the two tracts.</b>
7-6	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1”. Is it the Department’s intent for the Design-Builder to construct the access road using a design average daily traffic (ADT) of 0–100 vehicles per day or 101–400 vehicles per day?	<b>The access road shall be designed using average daily traffic (ADT) of 0-100.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1”. This standard drawing allows for the use of 2:1 side slopes. Is it the Department’s intent to allow 2:1 side slopes on the proposed access road?	<b>Yes, the low volume local road standard allows for 2:1 slopes.</b>
7-8	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the typical section for the access road [...] shall be designed per Std. Dwg. RD11-TS-1” and that “the access road shall end with a cul-de-sac with a ninety-six foot minimum outside diameter”. This diameter is generally intended to accommodate WB-50 vehicles; however, this design vehicle is not supported by the lane widths and other design standards provided in the TDOT Standard Drawing. Is it the Department’s intent to accommodate a WB-50 design vehicle on the proposed access road?	<b>the intent for the wide cul-de-sac is to accommodate delivery trucks and emergency vehicles turning around. The 96-foot cul-de-sac is selected to meet City of Spring Hill standards for dead end streets. See RFP Book 3 for the design criteria for the access road.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-9	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “a private driveway to Tract 17 and a field entrance to Tract 32 shall be provided”. Will the Department allow the Design-Builder to construct a field entrance to Tract 17 if the proposed design for the Project results in acquisition of the residence on Tract 17?	<b>No, one purpose for the access road is to serve the residence on Tract 17. The driveway should be replaced in-kind.</b>
7-10	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 (Revision #4)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.11 of the fourth revision of the RFP states that “the Design-Builder's access road design shall be submitted with the Initial Right-of-Way Exhibit Submittal and in the Technical Proposal [...] this submittal shall include the horizontal alignment, vertical alignment, and proposed ROW acquisition areas”. Is it the Department’s intent for the proposed ROW for the access road to cover proposed side slopes? If not, what is the proposed ROW width of the access road?	<b>It’s the Department’s intent for the ROW to cover the slopes, including any special ditches, and enough working room beyond the slopes (typically 10’) to construct slope ties to existing ground.</b>
7-11	Bridge Preliminaries	The bridge over Aenon Creek shows the measurement of the shoulder point to the top of the rail, while the bridge over I-65 shows the measurement of the shoulder point to the bottom of the rail. It is our understanding that TDOT’s current guidance is to measure to the bottom of the rail. Can you provide an answer on the preferred measurement?	<b>According to TDOT STD. DWG STD1-1SS the roadway width is measured to the top of the rail.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-12	RFP Book 3, Section 5.2	The following statement is included in the RFP, “The distance between light poles and bridge must be a minimum of 50ft.”. Our initial interpretation of this statement was to provide a lateral offset from the Buckner Rd. bridge over I-65 and the proposed light poles running parallel with I-65 in an effort to prevent the design builder from installing lights too close to the bridge. We assumed that the offset width would allow sufficient clearance during future maintenance operations. We also assumed it would help provide sufficient light spread under the proposed structure. Please verify the intent of the 50’ offset.	<b>The Department references the guidance of Section 15.3.5 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual. The 50ft minimum clearance distance is required for this project, as stated in RFP Book 3, to allow light spread under the bridge and to provide room for future maintenance.</b>
7-13	RFP Book 3, Section 5.2	“No high-mast lighting poles shall be placed outside the interchange quadrants.” Our initial interpretation of this statement was that high-mast light poles could not be outside the limits of the new interchange. We consider the interchange to be segment No. 2 (PIN 128576.00) with a station range along Buckner Rd of 138+00.00 to 163+70.00. Please specify what was meant by interchange quadrants?	<b>The four interchange quadrants are defined as the grass areas between the paved shoulders of Ramps A, B, C, and D and Interstate 65, limited by the Buckner Road Bridge over I-65.</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-14	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, “Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road” (Revision #3)	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the third revision of the RFP states that “a median opening shall be provided at STA. 134+30 within Segment No. 1. Within Segment No. 3, median openings shall be provided at a uniform spacing within a range of 880 feet and 1,760 feet”. What is the design vehicle for these median openings?	<b>The median openings for Tract 15 and the access road shall be designed for a WB-40. All other median openings are to accommodate U-turns of passenger vehicles.</b>
7-15	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 4.1; Median Island Details	Contract Book 3, Section 4.1 of the RFP states that “the new structure over Interstate 65 shall be wide enough to incorporate the [...] 12’ future shared-use path”. However, the median island details provide a width of 11’-2” ± at the locations of the overhead sign structures and flared single-slope concrete median barrier walls. Is it the Department’s intent to allow widths for the future shared-use path of less than 12’ along Bridge No. 1 at the locations of flared single-slope concrete median barrier walls to accommodate overhead sign structures, light standards, and other items?	<b>The Design-Builder may encroach a maximum of one foot into the shared-use path with the overhead sign support foundation.</b>
7-16	Median Island Details	Will the Department allow surfaces other than concrete, such as grass, in the 6” raised medians?	<b>The raised median along Buckner Road between DDI crossover intersections (the hatched area in the median island details) shall be 6” raised concrete as noted in the detail along with 6” sloping detached concrete curbs (see Std. Dwg RP-SC-1). All other limits of the raised median shall be raised grass (sodded) median with 6” sloping curbs as shown in the functional plans (see typical sections).</b>

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST  
FORM QR**