

## 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
Reference Documents/RFP Book 3	The ITS roll plots do not show the new location of DMS at STA 98+60. The ITS and Signing and Marking Plans do not show a new overhead sign at this location. Please confirm that it is the departments intent to install a new overhead sign structure and DMS device at STA 98+60.	A new DMS device @ STA 98+60 is required.
Reference Documents/RFP Book 3	Book 3 – Page 40 states “ <i>The Design-Builder shall maintain the existing fiber conduit, electrical conduit and communications to the greatest extent possible.</i> ” The ITS roll plot shows a completely new fiber-optic system. Please confirm that the Design-Builder may maintain existing Fiber-Optic systems where possible.	Existing fiber may be maintained where possible if communication to each component operating on it can be maintained.
Reference Documents/RFP Book 3	When the Design Builder maintains the existing “ <i>fiber conduit to the greatest extent possible</i> ”, as required by Book 3, Page 40, and splices new Fiber Optic cable into the existing 72 F/O Trunk Line, can 72 F/O cable be used in lieu of the 144 F/O cable shown on the ITS roll plot.	All new fiber must meet SP725.
RFP Book 3	<p>RFP Book 3 states: “<i>The Design-Builder shall maintain the existing CCTV cameras to the greatest extent possible during construction. If relocation of CCTV cameras is required, then CCTV cameras within the Project limits shall be removed and replaced with proposed CCTV cameras meeting the requirements of Special Provision 725.</i>”</p> <p>Are there any requirements TDOT will impose, beyond physical conflicts with proposed construction elements, that will mandate relocation of existing CCTV cameras?</p>	If anything obstructs the line of sight of a CCTV as required by the special provision, the camera may require relocation. Also note that “proposed construction elements” will include utility relocations.

## 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, Page 24	<p>The RFP states:</p> <p><i>“The Design-Builder shall acquire all applicable municipal drainage plans, watershed management plans, and records of citizen concerns. The Design-Builder shall acquire all pertinent existing storm drain plans, bridge hydraulic studies, and/or survey data, including data for all culverts, drainage systems, storm sewer systems, and bridge sites within the Project limits. The Design-Builder shall also identify existing drainage areas and calculate the estimated runoff to the highway drainage system. The Design-Builder shall analyze existing storm drainage systems, culverts (boxes and cross pipes), and open channels impacted or affected by the Project design.”</i></p> <p>Is the Design Builder permitted to communicate with local municipalities in regards to their existing drainage systems during the procurement phase so that the drainage design included in the Design Builder’s proposal complies with this section of the RFP?</p>	Yes.
RFP Book 3, Maintenance	<p>The Segment 3 scope of work is limited to resurfacing, restriping, and overhead sign modification. Will the Department consider adding language limiting the design builder’s maintenance obligations within Segment 3 from edge of paved shoulder to edge of paved shoulder excluding roadside guardrails and barriers?</p>	No, due to project traffic control extending throughout these areas.
Follow-up question QR-2 Responses, page QR-1	<p>Can TDOT clarify whether pipe video needs to be submitted and approved during the RFP phase of whether the video inspection requirement is intended for final design only?</p>	If the DB Team plans to retain any “allowed” existing pipes as a part of their design, video shall be provided during RFC plan development. However, TDOT cannot guarantee approval/disapproval of pipes to be retained without the required information.

## 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
Contract Book 3, Traffic Signals, page 31	Can TDOT provide the existing signal plans for the intersections referenced in the first paragraph?	TDOT does not have existing signal plans.
Contract Book 3, Roadway, page 16, Segment 2, 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet	Can TDOT elaborate on the specific requirements associated with “rehabilitating the existing concrete”? If panels are undamaged, can they be retained? Is full removal and replacement of all concrete pavement required within those limits? Are partial slab replacements allowed?	Rehabilitation of concrete slabs is covered in SP502A. Estimated quantities for full depth repairs and spall repairs are included in Book 3. Partial slab replacements are allowed in accordance with the SP.
Contract Book 3, Drainage, page 25, 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet	The RFP states, “For the purposes of the design, the DB Team shall assume that the capacity of the existing structure is the limiting factor for this drainage system.” Can the Department confirm our understanding that if the proposed drainage flow entering the culvert doesn’t exceed the existing drainage flow entering the culvert, then the DB Teams aren’t responsible for mitigating any capacity deficiencies with the culvert?	No. It is assumed that the proposed drainage flow does not exceed the capacity of the box culvert at STA 153+34 based on the Functional Plans. There will be additional flow with the added impervious area.
Follow up question to Noise Barrier Wall Meeting on Wednesday Aug 03, 2022	In an effort to ensure equity and provide the best value to TDOT, will TDOT consider allowing the design build teams to bid off of the functional plans with an analysis being performed post award. Any differences identified post award could be addressed with a supplemental?	No, this is not possible.

## 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
<p>RFP Contract Book 1 – Instructions to Design Builders – Section 5. Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines</p>	<p>The RFP was released on 5/27/2022, but critical information to bid the project, including project survey and functional plan DGNs (6/28/2022), noise wall and utility information (7/8/2022), and drainage models (7/28/2022) were not posted until much later. Several other critical items and clarifications, including an anticipated Addendum #3, have been promptly requested by the Design-Build team but are still outstanding.</p> <p>Due to the delayed release of critical information and further RFP/scope clarifications, the Design-Build team is left with a fraction of the time left to incorporate the changes and provide a bid by the current due date of 9/30/2022. Would the Department consider extending the procurement schedule, allowing the Design Builder to incorporate this information and provide an accurate bid?</p>	<p>The Department does not plan to extend the procurement phase of the project.</p>
<p>Functional Plans – I-75 Bridge over CSX &amp; S. Moore Road Bridge over I-24</p>	<p>During our review of the provided structural functional plans and our preliminary designs, we noted discrepancies in proposed beam depths for the bridge over CSX and bridge on S. Moore Road over I-24. Our analysis, in conjunction with the TDOT standard beam section properties and PCI Bridge Design Manual Chart BB-3, indicates that a deeper beam than the 27” x 48” composite spread box beam is required.</p> <p>Can the Department review the preliminary design shown in the functional plans for these bridge locations to verify the proposed beam depths?</p>	<p>Functional Plans have been revised and posted on 8/15/22.</p>

## 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 Addendum 1, Page 36, Paragraph 6	<p>States:            “Any deviation from the bridge design shown in the Functional Plans will require a separate Deviation from Standard letter from the Railroad unless the design meets all Railroad and TDOT design criteria.”</p> <p>Question:            If any change, no matter how minor, is made to the functional plans, will the separate Deviation from the Standard letter or design to meet the CSX Railroad requirements be based on the Jan. 2022 manual as posted to the TDOT design build website or to the new CSX Manual released Mar. 2022? The March 2022 manual change dictates that any new bridge is required to “<b>Clear</b> Span” the railroad right of way, rather than just “Span” the right of way as dictated in the Jan. 2022 manual.            A clear span would require a significantly deeper structure which would require roadway grades that cannot be met per the RFP requirements without an ATC. Would an ATC be required to provide a bridge that meets the TDOT and Railroad requirements?</p>	<p>Any deviation that does not meet or exceed the clearances shown will require a separate Deviation from Standard approval. No, an ATC is not required for a bridge that meets the TDOT and Railroad requirements.</p>
Reference Materials	<p>The EBR provides features identified on a quad map; at this scale, conversion of these features to a plan set where estimations on impacts can be assessed may include a large amount an error. Can the shape file(s) of the identified features be provided in accordance with TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines Section 4-300 and 4-301 so that a more accurate estimate of jurisdictional feature impacts can be determined and associated mitigation requirements if necessary?</p>	<p>All CADD and survey files have been uploaded to project website. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder verify the accuracy of these files.</p>
1-on-1 Discussion	<p>Please confirm that an Addendum will be issued that will require all teams to submit noise model updates for either following the noise wall location as shown in the RFP Plans or any relocation of the noise walls.</p>	<p>The RFP language has been amended in Addendum 3 requiring an updated noise studies</p>

## 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
Addendum #1	Please confirm that there will be a future Addendum that removes the 45 MPH speed design for crossroads reference in Addendum #1	This was addressed in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Page 3 Book 1 Page 3	Signals at intersection are mentioned in Book 3. They are not referenced in Book 1. Please clarify.	Addressed in Addendum 1.
Reference Materials	Please provide survey control point calculations and any available QC checklists for the survey database provided.	The Design-Builder shall verify the ground survey and survey control before utilizing in the design of the Project. In addition, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for field surveys and support activities, such as, but not limited to geotechnical investigations, ROW stakeout, construction stakeout, etc.