

# RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

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

DB CONTRACT No.: DB2101

DATE: 07/06/2022

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book #3, Page 36, Noise Barrier Walls	<p>On a previous question, TDOT responded that “all pertinent information for the noise wall design is included in the ROW ReEval NEPA document, on the project website.” However, the information provided on the website does not include the TNM models (FHWA's Traffic Noise Model) used to generate the TDOT Noise Technical Report, December 2021.</p> <p>Please provide the TNM models necessary to develop our design and quantities.</p>	<p><b>Uploaded to project website.</b></p>
RFP Book #2, Appendix B, Special Provisions	<p>Special Provision 718NB for Sound-Absorbing Noise Barriers is included on the list of Special Provisions but was not included in the RFP. Please provide Special Provision 718NB.</p>	<p><b>Included in Addendum on project website.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book #3, Section 10	Will TDOT allow traffic to be split in the MOT plan for I-24?	<p><b>It will be considered as an ATC. At a minimum the ATC should include the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length of split</li> <li>• Time duration of split traffic</li> <li>• Construction ingress/egress points</li> <li>• Overall signing plan</li> <li>• Typical section and plan layouts</li> <li>• Conceptual drainage</li> </ul>
RFP Book #3, Section 10	Will longitudinal pipe under a travel lane be acceptable in a temporary condition if removed for the permanent condition?	<p><b>Existing longitudinal pipes under travel lanes will only be allowed in a temporary condition if removed or grout filled prior to the ultimate configuration. No additional longitudinal pipes will be allowed.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Documents, RFP Book #3	The Functional Plans call for the existing I-75 concrete pavement to be diamond ground south of the profile	<b>This will be addressed in a future addendum. Diamond grinding of existing concrete pavement from Phase I will not be required, except for areas that need to meet ride specifications (i.e. at profile tie-ins, etc.).</b>
Reference Documents, TDOT Design Guide	The Functional Plan profile for I-24 includes profile grades as low as 0.3%. Chapter 7, Section 7.03.1.1 states <i>“To facilitate the flow of water through the gutters of curbed pavements, the designer should attempt to maintain a minimum longitudinal slope of 0.5%. The minimum allowable slope should be no less than 0.4%. It may be difficult to provide these minimum grades in areas of extremely flat terrain. However, minimum grades may be maintained by the use of a rolling profile.”</i> Will the Design-Builder be allowed to use the profile as shown in the functional plans?	<b>No curb and gutter shall be allowed on I-24. The profile as shown may be used, provided all drainage requirements are met.</b>
Reference Documents	Will TDOT please provide resurfacing and construction limits for the roads intersecting North and South Terrace.	<b>Limits are as detailed in TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines</b>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Documents	<p>The Moore Road profile at South Terrace ties down with a 20' vertical curve with a K value of 5.01. Per TDOT's Functional Classification Map, Moore Rd. is a Minor Arterial. Per standard drawing RD11-TS-3B the K value should be 37 for a sag with a 30 MPH design speed. Correcting the profile will extend the grading limits as shown in the Functional Plans and require additional ROW. Please clarify whether or not the RFP will be amended to permit this reduced K factor.</p>	<p><b>This will be addressed in a future addendum. The Moore Road profiles will be revised in the Functional plans.</b></p>
Reference Documents	<p>TDEC/USACE regulatory policy may obligate the final project water resource permits to include commitments to modify or replace existing culverts, cross drains, or lined ditches conveying water resources such that they support Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP). Since the final project permit will not be finalized until after the bid is submitted and proposers are restricted from communicating with regulatory agencies, will The Department please add language to the RFP specifying the Design-Builder's obligation with regards to AOP or otherwise stating that such obligations would be addressed by a Change Order?</p>	<p><b>This will be addressed in future addendum.</b></p>
RFP Book 3 Appendix B	<p>Contract Book 3 requires the existing box culvert to be repaired in accordance with recommendations provided in Appendix B. Appendix B only provides a diagram of observed deficiencies but does not prescribe any specific repair. Please add a list of specific repairs required to Appendix B.</p>	<p><b>Repair details will be provided in a future addendum.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book 3 Section 3	<p>Construction of the project is heavily dependent on the retention of the existing double barrel 8X7 box culvert at STA 155+34 as the primary outfall for the project’s drainage system. Several unquantifiable factors such as structural condition, potential obligations related to contiguous sections of this outfall that are off-ROW, or the imposition of permit requirements to provide aquatic organism passage could lead to significant increases in the scope of work that cannot be reasonably anticipated or mitigated in proposer’s bid submissions. Will The Department please add the following underlined text to Contract Book 3-3? Roadway – Drainage – Existing Drainage Systems:</p> <p><u>“The Design-Builder is responsible to perform the following scope of work with regard to the existing box culvert at STA 155+34:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Perform maintenance scope as prescribed in Contract Book 3, Appendix B</u></li> <li>- <u>Design the project drainage system such that the hydraulic capacity of this culvert is not exceeded</u></li> <li>- <u>Extend the northern end of the culvert as needed for final road widening design</u></li> <li>- <u>Repair any damages caused by the Design Builder in the execution of the work</u></li> <li>- <u>Make modifications necessary to add or abandon tie-ins from existing or proposed interstate drainage systems</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Any scope associated with the Box Culvert at STA 155+34 beyond the responsibilities listed above due to existing structural condition or third-party requirements (including permitting) shall be added to the Contract by a Change Order.”</u></p>	<p><b>The scope of work will be clarified for the box culvert in future addendum.</b></p>

## RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book 3/SP 108C	SP 108C introduces liquidated damages for failure to complete the project by the stipulated completion date. Will these damages be assessed in addition to the \$30,000/\$100,000 damages for failure to meet the project completion date listed in SP 108B? Does The Department envision a scenario where the completion date LD's of SP 108C would be assessed, but the completion date LD's of SP 108B would not be assessed?	<b>SP 108C will be removed from the contract.</b>
Follow-up question QR-1 Responses, page QR-7, 1st question	Based on the question response, the design builder is responsible for maintenance from the execution of contract. It is our understanding that this includes maintenance of the entire ROW from begin project to end project. It includes items such as litter removal, mowing, pavement repair, and guardrail repair. Items excluded would be incident management, and snow and ice removal. Are there any other exemptions?	<b>It should be noted the Design-Builder is not exempt from some aspects of incident management for incidents caused by or related to construction activities and/or traffic control (e.g. queue protection, debris removal, etc.). There are no other exemptions.</b>
Addendum 1, Book ,3 Section 3	This section added that TDOT has an approved Deviation from Standard letter from CSX. Can the Design Builder get a copy of that letter?	<b>Yes. Will be added to the project website.</b>
Reference materials	Drainage files (GDF files) have been provided, but they are only for the I-24 segment. Could we get files for the I-75 segment as well?	<b>Yes. Will be added to the project website.</b>
Reference materials	Can the Design builder get a copy of all commitments that are not included in the IAR?	<b>All commitments are listed in the RFP or the reference documents.</b>