RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 Interchange Modification at I-24, Phase 2 (IA)

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2101

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book #3, Section 3 Roadway, page 25 & 26	The RFP indicates 1) the Design-Builder shall video inspect and verify all existing drainage systems that are to remain in Segments 1 and 2 are clean, operable and determined to be hydraulically sufficient and structurally adequate. Any repairs, replacements, debris removal and/or deficiencies shall be corrected by the Design-Builder. 2) The Design-Builder shall replace or supplement any pipes or culverts that are deemed hydraulically or structurally deficient in the existing condition or as a result of this Project. Video inspection and supporting documentation shall be provided to the Department for concurrence, with the exception of Segment 3. Existing drainage structures and pipes within Segment 3 may remain. This direction requires video inspection of the drainage system and concurrence by the department, during the RFP phase, for re-use of existing infrastructure within Segment 1 and 2. Is it the Departments intent to have each DB team video inspect and assess the system or provide direction concerning cleaning, repairs, replacement, etc. to each DB Team for consistency across all teams?	The intent is for the Design-Build teams to develop their proposed drainage and determine if there are any existing drainage structures that may be used in their design. Once that determination is made, the Design-Builder shall video inspect and verify that those structures are clean, operable, hydraulically sufficient, and structurally adequate. The Design-Builder shall provide the video inspection and supporting documentation to the Department for concurrence as stated in the RFP.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book #3, Section 3 Roadway, page 20	The RFP indicates the vertical clearance over the CSX Railroad shall be a minimum of 23 ft., 6in. over the highest point of existing and future track. The functional bridge plans show the future track. No line or grade information has been provided for the future track to confirm vertical clearance. Is the Department able to provide this information or confirm that the existing track alignment will control vertical clearance required for the bridge?	CSX requires a vertical clearance of 23' 6" be maintained over the existing and future tracks. The *CSX Public Project Information* document (included on the project website) contains a typical section for future tracks.
Book #3, Section 9 Environmental, page 58	The RFP refers to the NEPA document and the environmental commitments. Page EC-1 of the Reevaluation indicates that the 2017 summer surveys for federally endangered Indiana bat and threatened norther long eared bat will expire April 1, 2023. Will the department require the DB Team to conduct new surveys prior to construction starting?	Yes.
Book No. 3, Section 1	Segment 3 appears to have language that duplicates areas of I-75 for resurfacing and restriping. Is one of them intended to be for 75 SB to 75 SB ramp since it appears to be the only section missing from phase 1.	This will be addressed in future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
General	Aside from the ADA ramps described in the RFP, are there any sections of sidewalk that must be replaced as well?	Sidewalks within the affected limits along S Moore Road and McBrien Road must be replaced. Additionally, any sidewalk or curb impacted by the design will need to be replaced.
RFP Book No. 3, Section 1, Page 3, 4th bullet	Existing drainage to remain at STA 155+34 looks like it actually crosses I-24 at 153+34.	The RFP language will be revised to state STA 153+34. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
Appendix A & RFP Book No. 3, Page 33	The pavement design in Appendix A does not mention prime or tack coat. The section titles "Pavement Design Report" on page 33 says prime shall be used but does not require tack coat. When is tack coat required on this project?	Tack coat and prime coat shall be included as part of the pavement design. Application rates shall meet Design Guidelines and Standard Specifications. This will be addressed in future addendum.
General	The survey appears to be missing some items from the phase 1 construction. For example: the wall listed in the RFP Book 3, Section 3, Page 16, Bullet 3. Retaining wall between 440+50 and 443+50. Potentially other items as well.	As-Built reference files will be added. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to verify survey information.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
General	Some linework is missing from the functional proposed DGN on 75. EOPs, shoulder lines. Potentially other items as well	Added to reference materials website by QR#1.
General	The only TINs we have are of the combined existing and proposed. Can we also get a TIN of the existing only?	Added to reference materials website by QR#1.
RFP Book #3, Section 3 Roadway, Page 16, 1st bullet	Repairing and stabilizing the slide on N Terrace: Is any specific information available for this slide? Such as - When it was first noticed - Has the movement changed - Have any repairs such as paving or filling the cracks been performed, Etc	The City of Chattanooga resurfaced N. Terrace in 2007 and patched the asphalt near the slide area between 2017 & 2019.
RFP Book #3, Section 3 Pavement Design Report, page 33, last paragraph	Appendix A is referenced for minimum design criteria for pavement related ATC's. Is the minimum ATC criteria the structural numbers (SN's) provided in the cover letter of the Recommended Pavement Design letter?	The minimum design criteria for pavement related ATC's shall include the structural number and designs shall use AASHTO 93. This will be addressed in future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book #3, Section 6 Geotechnical, Page 44, Geotechnical Reports	The second paragraph says foundation design recommendation reports shall be sealed. However, Soils and Geology and Retaining Wall reports are not mentioned. Should these be separate submittals?	All geotechnical recommendation reports shall be sealed.
Book 3 pages 24, 25, 26, 39	The RFP discusses replacing structurally deficient pipes. If the design build team determines they are hydraulically sufficient and can be retained, who determines they are structurally deficient, the Team or TDOT? Will TDOT review the videos, make their own determinations, and notify the Team?	The Design-Build team makes the initial determination and shall provide the video inspection and supporting documentation to the Department for concurrence as stated in the RFP.
Book 3, page 24	In the event that an extremely deep junction box is necessary, can a blind box be used instead of a manhole? Is there a depth that can be provided for guidance?	Blind junction boxes are not allowed.
Book 3, Drainage section	Information has been provided concerning the Brainerd levee. Is there an expectation that the levee not be affected by construction? If so, does it need to be replaced to any specific criteria (i.e., elevations, side slopes, etc.)?	See Book 3, Design Requirements (currently page 21). The last paragraph discusses the City of Chattanooga's flood protection system and expectations related to it.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3, page 23	Does TDOT know of any specific proposed drainage improvements in the area, and if so, can plans be provided?	TDOT is not aware of any other drainage improvements within the project area.
Book 3, page 24	The next to last paragraph states that the Team shall replace all drainage structures in Segment 1 from 74+00-179+00 except for the pipes listed. Does replacement of *structures* include inlets AND pipes?	The intent is to replace all drainage structures, including inlets and pipes, other than those listed.
Book 2, page 17 M.6. & Book 2, FORM TPSP - Page 2	Book 2, Section M.6. states there is a DBE Utilization Goal of 9% for this project. However, the Technical Proposal Signature Page Form TPSP states on page 2 that the DBE Project Utilization Goal is 10%. Please confirm the correct DBE goal required for the project.	TDOT intends to revise Book 2 to state a 10% DBE goal. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
Contract Book 1, Page 2, 2nd paragraph	Can the department provide the traffic analysis files used to generate the IAR?	Any pertinent traffic data is provided in the IAR.
Contract Book 1, Page 4, Segment 2 Scope, 2nd bullet	RFP reads, "no modifications to the existing structure allowed." Does this include temporary deck drains to manage spread during MOT patterns?	This language was intended to require a new structure and not allow existing elements to be reused in the proposed structure. The use of temporary deck drains will be allowed in accordance with the *CSX Public Project Information* document.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 1, Page 8, Schedule	Will the department consider a staggered technical proposal and price proposal submittal, as long as the opening date remains the same?	No.
Contract Book 1, Page 12, ATCs	Will the department consider all electronic ATC submittals?	Not at this time.
Contract Book 1, Page 23, Response Category IV	What are the requirements of the Traffic Analysis and Mitigation Report identified in bullet i?	This language will be deleted from the RFP in a future addendum.
Contract Book 1, Page 24, Proposal Requirements	Will the department consider all electronic proposal submittal?	Not at this time.
Contract Book 2, SP624, Storm Drains	Can the department provide more detail on the bin wall referenced in "x. Storm Drains."?	“x. Storm Drains” is a part of the section D. entitled “Bin Wall (See QPL for Approved Manufacturer/Supplier”. There are 5 pages of information related to the bin wall referenced.
Contract Book 3, Page 40, ITS	Can the department provide more information on the requirements for encasing conduit?	See SP725.
Contract Book 3, Page 20, 4th paragraph (NEPA document)	Can the department provide the preliminary wetland/stream boundary files used to determine Phase 2 impacts?	This information is included in the original survey.
Contract Book 3, Page 23, Drainage, design requirements	Are longitudinal pipes under a travel lane acceptable in a temporary condition?	No.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 3, Page 23, Drainage, design requirements	Can the department provide the drainage files used for analysis and design?	GeoPak Drainage files will be added to the project website.
Contract Book 3, Page 23, Drainage, design requirements	Can the department provide the temporary spread requirements for MOT phases?	See RFP Book 3, Page 20. And TDOT Drainage Manual.
Contract Book 3, Page 23, Drainage, design requirements	Are there specific replacement requirements for CMP pipes?	See TDOT Drainage Manual for pipe selection criteria.
Contract Book 3, Page 23, Drainage, design requirements	The RFP references a 50-year design storm and the TDOT Hydraulic Design Manual references a 100-year design storm. Can the department clarify which design storm governs?	The TDOT Hydraulic Design Manual requires design for a 50-year storm and check overtopping for a 100-year storm (Table 4-1).
Contract Book 3, Page 30, Overhead Signs	Can the department provide the DGN and Guide Sign files used to generate the signing and pavement marking roll plots provided to the shortlisted teams?	The files will be added to the project website.
Contract Book 3, Page 32, Lighting	Can the department provide the Lighting roll plot referenced in the last paragraph of the lighting section?	The reference to the Lighting Roll Plot will be deleted. All requirements for lighting design are already included in the RFP. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
Contract Book 3, Page 32, Lighting	Can the department specify the required design year storm for temporary pipes needed for construction of culverts?	See TDOT Drainage Manual.
Contract Book 3, Page 33, Pavement Design Report	Can the department provide all files, including the traffic data set, used to generate the Pavement Design Report?	All data used to develop the pavement design including traffic data has already been provided.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 3, Page 34, Structures, Bridges, 1st paragraph	The new CSX Project Procedures Manual requires new bridges over the railroad to span the entire railroad right-of-way. The Functional Plans provided by TDOT don't show the bridge over the railroad spanning the entire railroad right-of-way. What are TDOT's requirements for the bridge length over the railroad?	See Book 3, Section 1 General Project Description; Scope of Work, Segment 2.
Contract Book 3, Page 36, Noise Barrier Walls	Can the department provide the Noise model files used to develop the noise wall design?	All pertinent information for the noise wall design is included in the ROW ReEval NEPA document, on the project website.
Contract Book 3, Page 41, CCTV	Can the department provide the requirements for minimum and maximum spacing for CCTV cameras for the purpose of DMS message verification?	See SP725.
Contract Book 3, Page 41, Dynamic Message Signs (DMS)	Can the department clarify if the existing DMS located at approximately STA 98+75 will be removed prior to construction?	The removal and replacement of the DMS on I-24 near STA 98+75 is part of this project.
Contract Book 3, Page 41, Dynamic Message Signs (DMS)	Can the department clarify if the Existing DMS installed in phase 1, located at approximately STA 440+00 will be exempted from the requirement in line 3 requiring all equipment to be new.	The DMS located on I-75 that was replaced during Phase I will be exempt. See ITS Roll for Phase II.
Contract Book 3, Page 42, Maintenace of Communication and Electrical power to ITS Devices.	Can the department clarify if temporary trailer mounted its devices will be pemitted for use for maintenance of communications purposes?	Temporary trailer mounted ITS devices may be permitted for individual devices. This will be addressed in future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 3, Page 53, Utilities	RFP indicates " A utilities conflict matrix of existing utility facilities is provided for reference only on the Project website". Please verify this matrix is on the website or is identified as such.	This will be added to the project website.
Contract Book 3, Page 62, 2nd paragraph (Section 404 permit)	Can the department provide the Section 404 permitting and the ARAP/401 permitting materials (application and approval) for Phase 1?	These files will be added to the reference material website.
Contract Book 3, MOT Section, page 75	Will ramp closures be permitted for some or all ramps within the project limit? Various ramps in the project limits are in conflict with existing and some ramps are changing from exit to entrance ramps, or vice versa. Has there been any consideration for potential closures with detours?	This will be addressed in future addendum.
Contract Book 3, MOT Section, page 75, 7th paragraph	Can the three lanes of required traffic along I-24 and I-75 be split around barrier or do they have to remain together with standard striping only?	Traffic lanes, for traffic traveling in the same direction, cannot be split and must remain adjacent to each other at all times.
Contract Book 3, MOT Section, page 75, 9th paragraph	For two complete roadway closures over a weekend, is TDOT agreeable to traffic using North and South Terrace as detour, assuming two lanes can be provided? Language in SP108B seems to suggest that would be acceptable/preferred.	Yes, N. Terrace and S. Terrace can be used during full weekend closures. However, the detour on the Terraces is only allowed between the existing ramps at S. Germantown Road and temporary ramps near STA 89+00.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 3, MOT Section, page 74, 6th bullet	RFP states that the DB Team shall insure drainage spread across all traffic lanes does not exceed allowable spread. Will maintaining the existing spread into the travel lane be acceptable? For example, if the current roadway has 2' of spread into the travel lane, will we be able to match the existing 2' spread if we shift traffic?	See RFP Book 3, Page 20. And TDOT Drainage Manual.
Appendix A - Pavement Design Report	Can the department provide all files used to develop the pavement design recommendations? Can the department confirm the traffic data set used to develop the pavement design recommendations?	All data used to develop the pavement design including traffic data has already been provided.
General	Can the department provide the CAD files for the as-built PDFs provided to the short-listed teams?	These files will be added to the Reference Material site.
General	The department references the replacement of a number of elements (drainage pipes, signs, etc.) within the project limits. Can the department clarify the extents of the project limits?	Project Limits are defined in RFP and Functional Plans
General	Can the department provide all CADD files related to the functional plans on I-75? Some information is missing.	All applicable CADD files for the functional plan have been added to the Reference Material site by QR#1.