

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

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

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2001

DATE: 8/19/2020

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-1	RFP Contract Book 1, Section A.2.b; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3	Contract Book 1, Section A.2.b of the RFP states that "the Design-Builder shall not request more than six ATCs". However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "the Design-Builder shall not request more than eight ATCs". What is the maximum number of ATCs that the Design-Builder may request?	The maximum number of ATCs is eight. It will be addressed by a forthcoming addendum.
2-2	RFP Contract Book 1, Section 3.b.3, Pay Item No. 716-99.50	Contract Book 1, Section 3.b.3 of the RFP states that "Snowplowable Pavement Markings to be excluded thru interim design segment of LIC No. 1 under [Pay Item No. 716-99.50]". Does the Department require the use of snowplowable or raised pavement markers on Segment Nos. 2 and 3?	Snowplowable Pavement Markings shall be used where required by Chapter 4 of the TDOT Design Guidelines.
2-3	Special Provision 407IC	Is it the Department's intent to require intelligent compaction on all project segments or only on Interstate 65?	The intent is to be used only on Interstate 65.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-4	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 1.3; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.7	Contract Book 3, Section 1.2 of the RFP states that the signing and striping exhibit provided by the Department is for information only. However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.7 of the RFP states that "signs shall be constructed as shown in the signing and marking roll plots". To what extent will the Department allow deviations from the signing and marking exhibit in the Design-Builder's signing plans?	The Design Builder shall construct the signs as shown in the signing and marking roll plots. No ATC or changes will be accepted during procurement or as Value engineering after the contract is signed.
2-5	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road shall be designed to meet or exceed a rural arterial functional classification. However, the maximum superelevation rate, typical section, and other design elements listed for Buckner Road in the contract book reference an urban arterial functional classification. Shall the Design-Builder design the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road, including the maximum superelevation rate, to meet or exceed a rural arterial or urban arterial functional classification?	The Design-Builder shall design for an Urban Arterial classification as noted in Section 3.2. regardless Buckner Road is currently classified as a Rural Arterial.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-6	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for Buckner Road shall be designed to meet or exceed a maximum grade of 4%. However, the Department's design standards allow for a maximum grade of 6% for rural arterial roadways and 7% for urban arterial roadways. Is it the Department's intent to restrict the maximum grade on Buckner Road to 4% or to allow the maximum grade listed in the design standards?	It is the Department's intent to restrict the maximum grade on Buckner Road to 4%.
2-7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Horizontal and Vertical Requirements"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the proposed horizontal and vertical alignments for the diverging diamond interchange crossovers shall be designed to meet or exceed a design speed of 25 miles per hour and lane widths of 15'. What are the limits of the crossovers?	The crossover is defined from the PC of the first curve at the western approach to the PT of the last curve at the eastern approach.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-8	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3; Functional Plans, Sheet 2	The "Cut Section Ditch Detail" in the functional plans does not include a 1–2' buffer between the back of sidewalk/multi-use path and the top of the foreslope that appears on some of the Buckner Road typical sections. Additionally, Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "grass strips (15' on the left and 11' on the right looking forward on survey) shall be provided", which does not include or reference the 1–2' buffer. However, Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "no ATC will be considered that [...] proposes the elimination of or reduction in width of the grass strips", which also does not include or reference the 1–2' buffer. Is it the Department's intent to include this buffer in the typical sections? If so, does the Department consider it to be part of the grass strips?	The Design-Builder shall design in accordance with standard drawing MM-TS-2. The grass strip identified on the drawing (dimension "D") shall be 5'. The resulting buffer (dimension "C") would be 7.75'. The 11' and 15' grass strips referenced in Section 3.2 refer to the distance from the back of curb to the back edge of the future sidewalk or multi-use path. Sheet 2 of the Functional Plans will be revised.
	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 9.9	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "grass strips and side slopes [for Buckner Road] shall be sodded". However, Contract Book 3, Section 9.9 of the RFP states that "sod or seed and mulch shall be used for permanent stabilization". Is it the Department's intent to allow seeding and mulching throughout the project, only outside the grass strips and side slopes on the proposed Buckner Road, or not at all?	This will be addressed in a forthcoming Addendum

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-10	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "The typical section shall include Type 6-33 curb and gutter on each side". Is it the Department's intent for the Design-Builder to use standard detached 6" concrete curb for the raised grass median?	Design-Builder shall use 6" Sloping Detached Concrete Curb as shown on standard drawing RP-SC-1.
2-11	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Buckner Road"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "The typical section shall include Type 6-33 curb and gutter on each side". Will the Department allow the use of standard 6-30 curb and gutter?	6" Sloping curb (Type 6-33) shall be used per note 2 of standard drawing RD11-TS-6A
2-12	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Interstate 65 and Ramps"	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the length of Bridge No. 1 is to be based on the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65. Shall the horizontal and vertical alignments of the proposed ramps, particularly where they tie into Interstate 65, also be based on this ultimate typical section?	No. TDOT will address this during the future widening project on Interstate 65.
2-13	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Typical Section Requirements for Interstate 65 and Ramps"; Preliminary Bridge Layout of Bridge No. 1	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that "the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65, on which the [Bridge No. 1] length is to be based, consists of the following: [...] 12' inside shoulders on each side of I-65". However, the preliminary bridge layout of Bridge No. 1 does not provide 12' inside shoulders where Bent No. 1 encroaches on the median. Is it the Department's intent to allow this exception for the ultimate typical section of Interstate 65?	This will not be a design exception for the DB project, but could be a potential design exception for the future widening. The Department's intent is for the Design-Builder to accommodate the width shown in the typical section shown labeled as "future" in the functional plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-14	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2, "Additional Design Requirements"; RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4	Contract Book 3, Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the "design of intersections must [...] meet ADA requirements for future shared multi-use path", but does not include or reference the proposed sidewalk on the south side of the proposed Buckner Road. Contract Book 3, Section 3.4 of the RFP additionally describes the construction of a median refuge at the crossover locations. Is it the Department's intent for the Design-Builder to include curb ramps in the construction of this project beyond the median refuges? What accommodations, if any, does the Department expect for the future sidewalk on the south side of the proposed Buckner Road?	Design-Builder's design shall meet ADA requirements for future sidewalk as well. The only curb ramps included in this project are at the median refuge.
2-15	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3	Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "deviations from the Functional Plans horizontal alignment (greater than 10.0 feet) will require an ATC with Department approval". Will the Department allow deviation from the functional plans' vertical alignment greater than ten feet without an approved ATC?	Changes in the vertical alignment of the Functional Plans does not require an ATC unless it causes work to occur outside the environmental technical study area or otherwise violates the RFP.
2-16	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.3; Functional Plans Sheet 3B	Contract Book 3, Section 3.3 of the RFP states that "no ATC will be considered that [...] places the eastern crossover in such a manner that access to Tract 18 is lost". However, Tract 18 has been subdivided since development of the RFP and functional plans in such a manner that the proposed Buckner Road cannot provide access to all lots. What is the Department's intent regarding approval of ATCs involving the eastern crossover or other areas of the project given the subdivision of Tract 18?	Access to the subdivided tracts will be addressed in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-17	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.7; Proposed Signing and Striping Exhibit	Contract Book 3, Section 3.7 of the RFP states that "signs shall be constructed as shown in the Signing and Marking Roll Plots" and that "the Design-Builder shall design the [overhead sign] structure to support signs across the entire length of the travel way". However, the proposed signing and striping exhibit shows overhead sign structures on Buckner Road extending only to the median. Additionally, the lateral locations of the sign anchor bases are located on proposed side slopes. Is it the Department's intent to allow overhead sign structures to extend only to the median, as shown in the proposed signing and striping exhibit, or to have them extend across the entire length of the traveled way? What does the Department require regarding protection of sign anchor bases?	<p>The Design-Builder's structural design shall be done assuming that applicable sign loadings are placed along the full length of the travel way beneath the structure. See Chapter 14 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>All overhead support structures in the clear zone shall be protected as shown on standard drawing S-PL-1.</p>
2-18	Functional Plans, Sheets 2 to 2A	Several of the Buckner Road typical sections in the functional plans include a note that reads: "3:1 slopes or flatter are desirable. 2:1 slopes are applicable in areas where [...] cost warrants a steeper than 3:1 slope". The delivery method of this project will result in 2:1 slopes being warranted by cost across all areas to which these typical sections are applicable. Is it the Department's intent to allow the use of 2:1 slopes in these areas?	<p>It is the intent that 3:1 slopes be used to limit the amount of guardrail installed along Buckner Road. The use of 2:1 slopes should be used only to limit impacts to environmental features or if needed to stay within the current environmental study area.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-19	Functional Plans, Sheets 2 to 2A1	The typical section for the proposed Buckner Road bridge over Interstate 65 features a 2' separation between the edge of traveled way and the proposed bridge parapet. However, the typical sections for the remainder of the proposed Buckner Road feature a 2'-9" separation between the edge of traveled way and the curb face. Is it the Department's intent for these distances to be different? If so, how does the Department require the transition between them at the bridge ends to occur?	The bridge parapet will transition on the wingpost as shown on standard drawing STD-1-1SS. The shape of the approaching roadway curb shall transition for a distance not to exceed 5' as needed to ensure a consistent flow line.
2-20	Functional Plans, Sheets 3, 4A-14A	The functional plans do not include driveways or other accommodations for access along the proposed Buckner Road. How does the Department require access to be provided to tracts adjacent to the proposed Buckner Road, if at all?	Field entrances will be required. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
2-21	CB-3; Section 5.2; pg 27	RFP states, "The area of the interchange is defined as follows...Interstate 65 northbound and southbound lanes from northern ramp junctions to the southern ramp junctions." Please clarify if roadway lighting is required along the I-65 ramp acceleration/deceleration lanes and tapers.	Transition lighting will be required beyond the limits defined in Section 5.2 in accordance with the TDOT Traffic Design Manual along the ramps/auxiliary lanes and Buckner Road. The RFP will be updated to reflect this change.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-22	CB-3; Section 3.7; pg 21	RFP states, "Overhead cantilever signs will not be allowed." The Conceptual Signing Plan shown in the IAR appears to reflect signing layout requirements as per MUTCD Figure 2E-12 which depicts a cantilever exit arrow sign at the gore, not the overhead truss span structure required per the RFP, and depicted in the Signing and Striping Exhibit. Please confirm that overhead cantilever signs will not be allowed.	Overhead cantilever signs are not allowed.
2-23	CB-3; Section 5.1	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 5.1 states, "The Design-Builder shall coordinate the signals at the interchange using a fiber optic connection." Please confirm that fiber optic cable is required to coordinate the signals at the crossovers of the Diverging Diamond Interchange only, and installing fiber optic cable and coordinating the signal at Lewisburg Pike or future signal at Buckner Lane to the DDI signals is not required in this contract.	The fiber optic connection is only required to coordinate the crossover signals.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-24	Functional Plans	The R.O.W. Acquisition Table, shown on Sheet 3F, separates the "Area to be Acquired" and the "Easements" into the 3 project segments: LIC. No. 1, Interchange, LIC. No. 2. If R.O.W to be acquired from one property tract is split between 2 or more project segments, will this require a separate R.O.W. acquisition process to be completed for that tract in the applicable project segments?	Yes, it requires a separate R.O.W. acquisition process to be completed for that tract in the applicable project segments.
2-25	Functional Plans	The Property Map shown on sheet 3C depicts Tract 31 is within the proposed R.O.W. for this project. However, this tract has been struck through on the R.O.W. Acquisition Table. Please confirm a portion of Tract 31 property is necessary to be acquired, and it was erroneously struck through on the R.O.W. Acquisition Table.	Acquisition on Tract 31 is necessary for the Functional Plans design. This will be corrected in an upcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-26	CB-3; Section 4.3	The first paragraph under section 4.3 states "the exposed face of all retaining walls (excluding the retaining walls at the Interstate 65 Bridge) shall receive an ashlar stone finish approved by the Department". The second paragraph states "For cast-in-place concrete retaining walls (excluding the retaining walls at the Interstate 65 bridge), all exposed surfaces shall receive an applied texture coated finish of Mountain Grey". Is the Design-Builder to assume that all exposed concrete retaining walls, whether Cast-in-place or other method (MSE), should have an Ashlar Stone pattern and texture coated with the Mountain Grey?	Yes, for all walls excluding any walls along Interstate 65 which shall be finished per Section 4.2 of the RFP.
2-27	Proprietary Item Request	The City of Spring Hill is requesting specific street light fixtures and poles to be used on all lighting projects within the City. Please clarify if these proprietary lighting items are to be used along the proposed interchange ramps and I-65 auxiliary lanes.	The poles and light fixtures provided are to be used along Buckner Road. Additional information will be provided in an upcoming addendum to clarify what poles and fixtures can be used on the ramps and auxiliary lanes.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-28	CB-3, Section 3.5	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3.5 states, "The Design-Builder shall...adhere to the latest edition of the TDOT Drainage Manual." Section 8.04 of the TDOT Drainage Manual states, "The need for permanent stormwater storage should be considered for any project which affects an area of one or more acres." If a pre-construction vs post-construction stormwater analysis results in the need for additional retention or storage, should the Design-Builder assume that storage facilities must be located on project ROW or Permanent Drainage Easement?	All drainage for the project shall be designed inside the proposed ROW or in a drainage easement.
2-29	Buckner Interchange NEPA approved Document	Page 19 of the Buckner Interchange NEPA approved documents states, "...final noise abatement decisions will be made during the final design process." The document does not require noise abatement in the functional plans based on the noise analysis. Will any modification to the horizontal or vertical alignments warrant a noise model reanalysis to determine potential abatement.	The Design-Builder shall assess the effects on proposed design changes to the noise analysis that was included in the NEPA document. If the Design-Builder's analysis conclude that noise abatement measures are required, then it shall be completed by the Design-Builder at his expense.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-30	CB-3; Section 3.2; pg 15	RFP states, "Grass strips (15' on the left and 11' on the right looking forward on survey) shall be provided." These grass strips are to accommodate a future multi-use path as per the Functional Plans. Please clarify if these future impervious multi-use paths are to be accounted for in the drainage analysis or should the analysis only account for a pervious grass strip.	The Design-Builder's drainage design shall include these areas as impervious.
2-31	CB-3; Section 5.2; pg 27	RFP states "All Lighting shall be 4000k LED lighting." However, on pages 1 and 2 from the Proprietary Item Request document the Holophane High Mast LED III series lighting fixture with Color Temperature of 3,000K. Can TDOT please clarify what the Color Temperature should be for the High Mast LED fixture?	Lighting shall be 4000k LED. The proprietary item list will be updated under a future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

QR#	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-32	Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements, Subsection <i>DDI Traffic Operations Design Requirements</i>	Reviewing the language in the RFP for the VISSIM model, it appears the primary question would be what exactly is the study area required for the model? Does the VISSIM template file establish the study area? For example, are the design build teams required to do the model for just the interchange and Buckner Road, or do they do the model from I-840 down to Saturn Parkway?	The area to be included in the model is that which is directly impacted by the proposed improvements, which includes all proposed ramp merge and diverge points along I-65, the I-65 mainline within the proposed interchange limits, the proposed ramp intersections with Buckner Road, and proposed Buckner Road including the intersection at Lewisburg Pike. It does not need to include adjacent interchanges along I-65. Traffic turning movements for the study should be obtained from the Reference Materials on the project web site.