

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 Materials, Drainage Calculations	The Drainage area contributing to the discharge to the dual 8X7 culvert is approx. 1600ac. Using USGS equations (from streamstats) as per the manual, the 50 yr discharge is about 1350 cfs. The 50-year WSEL overtops I-24 and the HW/D > 1.5 (Hydraulic design of highway culvert-HDS5 guidelines). Since the discharge entering the existing dual box culvert is the limiting factor (as per RFP) of our ability to retain the box culvert, this can only be achieved by storage and routing. If our design provides storage in the upstream limits of the channel, does that meet the RFP requirements?	A preliminary box culvert analysis, completed in April 2022, has been uploaded to the project website. RFP Addendum #5 provides guidance concerning hydrology calculations and culvert design for $Q_{50} > 500$ cfs. Stormwater storage is not permitted.
RFP Book 3, DRAINAGE/Floodplain Requirements (page 27)	The second paragraph of this section refers to regulatory floodways. For clarification, is the term floodway referring to the non-encroachment area mapped for SFHAs studied by detailed methods, and NOT the full area inundated in the regulatory flood? In some contexts, the words floodplain and floodway are used interchangeably, and we wanted to be certain that is not the case here.	The proposed work associated with Phase 2 is not intended to impact any FEMA-defined regulatory floodway. The terminology was not interchanged. Since Spring Creek has a regulatory floodway defined on the FIRM, it was important to have the floodway language in the RFP for Phase 2; but, the proposed roadway, box culvert extensions, retaining walls, fill slopes, etc. shown in the functional plans only affect the floodplain inundation area of Spring Creek.
Reference Materials: Noise Model	The TNM models have 2-lane access roads (North Terrace and South Terrace), whereas there are actually 3-lanes. It appears that the model accounted for the full width of the access road pavement (~40ft) and the traffic for the full 3 lanes by loading 2 lanes' worth of traffic on the outside access road lane. Should this assumption be carried forward or should a new noise model show 3 lanes with more traffic noise moved slightly closer to the receivers. This could result in more impacts, and less abatement from the noise wall.	The highlighted text is the methodology TDOT used to model the frontage roads in the TNM. However, alternative methodologies can be used. Such methodologies must meet specifications in the RFP, TDOT procedures, and FHWA guidance. Documentation of methodologies used shall be included in the TNM submittal.

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, Section 3, Existing Drainage System, Page 23	The median drainage on I-75 from STA 454+50 to around STA 486+00 is shown to remain in the functional plans. With the addition of a NB travel lane in the superelevated section, additional inlets will be needed to account for the additional spread. The existing system was constructed using 15” pipe. Is the 15” pipe allowed to remain (if hydraulically sufficient) even if inlets are added? This will affect approximately 3100’ of median barrier and concrete shoulder pavement if changed.	Contract Book 3, Pages 24 (amended by Addendum #5) and 25 (amended by Addendum #3) detail Segment 2 drainage requirements.