

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
QR#6 and Contract Book 3, Section 4, Noise Barrier Walls, Page 37	In QR #6, a question was asked regarding drainage behind noise walls located on slopes and in ditch bottoms. TDOT’s response indicated that “... Teams will be responsible to develop details for how drainage is addressed based on their final design of noise wall locations. Flows shall be collected behind the noise walls and released at wall ends or with underground conveyances.” This contradicts the RFP – Contract Book 3, Section 4, Noise Barrer Walls, Page 37 which states, “No gaps shall exist between the base of the barrier panels and the ground except as required to accommodate drainage.” This appears to permit gaps to allow drainage under noise barrier walls. Please clarify which approach meets the Department’s requirements.	The intent is for flows to be collected and taken through underground conveyances, not gaps between the bottom of the barrier and the ground. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
Contract Book 3, Section 3 – Roadway, Page 17 & 18	According to the RFP, Contract Book 3, Page 17, the Design Builder is required to include the following repair quantity: Hot Applied Fiber-Polymer Patching Material: 9,000 Pounds. However, according to the RFP, Contract Book 3, Page 18, the table indicates the quantity of Hot Applied Fiber-Polymer Patching Material anticipated in the scope is 6,500 Pounds. What is the correct quantity the Design Builder is required to include in their bid – 9,000 Pounds or 6,500 Pounds?	The correct quantity of Hot Applied Fiber-Polymer Patching Material is 6,500 POUNDS. This will be corrected in a future addendum.
RFP Book 3, Mitigation of Streams and Wetlands	Qualified site investigations suggest the presence of a potential stream at the 48” cross drain at appx. STA 177+00 RT. Should this feature be classified as a stream during the permitting phase, then the 36.2 functional feet of stream credits to be provided by The Department are unlikely to satisfy the project’s mitigation requirements. Preliminary research shows extremely limited availability of stream credits in the market. Will The Department authorize the sale of credits to the Design-Builder from banks in which The Department currently holds credit reservations? If so, at what cost?	This is considered a stream and will be addressed in a future addendum. Stream credits will be added to cover this area.

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, Noise Barriers	The TDOT provided Noise Model for NAA 21 only accounts for 3 lanes of traffic on I-24. The current RFP requires the construction of a 4th lane in this location. Will the Design-Builder be required to model noise in this area based on the 4 lanes being built or the 3 lanes in TDOT's model?	The Design-Builder is required to provide a noise model based on their design plans.
RFP Book 3, Mitigation of Streams and Wetlands	Addendum 5 of the RFP stated that: <i>“Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) was not required for the double barrel 8x7 box culvert extension near STA 153+34 on I-24 at the time of preliminary coordination by TDOT. If AOP is required based on the design shown in the Functional Plans prior to construction, it will be considered a changed condition.”</i> Will TDOT please expand this relief condition to include all culvert and pipe extensions required to construct the project as shown in the Functional Plans?	Relief for AOP only applies to STR-5. The intent is to provide relief, if AOP were to be required for scope of work currently shown on the Functional Plans. If AOP were to be required due to expanded work caused by the Design-Builder's plans, then TDOT would not participate.
RFP Book 3, Drainage QR Set 6	In Question and Response #6, TDOT allowed use of the existing 54" pipe under Belvoir conditional on the pipes structural and hydraulic adequacy. The top of the existing 54" pipe will not meet the minimum cover requirement (12" from bottom of flexible pavement) east of the Belvoir overpass. Will TDOT allow retention of the existing 54" pipe east of the bridge if cover requirements are not met?	Retainage of any existing drainage structures (allowed per the RFP & QRs) was never meant to relieve design standards, even if the hydraulically sufficient and structurally sound conditions are met. However, if substandard conditions are present for existing drainage structures to remain (i.e. cover), a mitigation strategy may be proposed by the Design-Builder and submitted to the Department for approval. The Department reserves the right to reject any mitigation strategy to substandard conditions.

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, Drainage Revised Functional Plans	<p>TDOT released revised Functional Plans dated 9/14/22 that show reuse of a 54" cross drain at STA 136+16. This crossing was not permitted for use in the RFP. Can this crossing be maintained? If so, use of this pipe, due to the invert elevation of the existing pipe, will result in substandard grades for storm water conveyances to Stream-5. If the 54" pipe is allowed to be retained, will TDOT permit downstream stormwater conveyances with substandard profile grades? (pg. 5-13 and 7-23 of Drainage Manual)</p>	<p>This crossing can remain if all pertinent requirements are met. However, substandard conditions of new drainage structures or conveyances is not allowed in any case. Regarding substandard conditions of existing structures that can remain, see above response.</p> <p>As a reminder, one of the goals of this project is to correct the drainage issues along I-24.</p>