

# Form QR

## RFP Question Request

**Project & DB Contract #:** SR 353 Bridge over Nolichucky River, LM 0.44 (DB2401)

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1 Section 1.3	RFP Book 1, Section 1.3 indicates that questions are due 11/15/2024. May the due date for questions be extended to 11/22/24 providing more time for Proposers to review the RFP and Reference Material?	See revisions to Section 1.3 (Procurement Schedule) in Addendum #1.  TDOT has extended the deadline to submit ATCs, but is holding the date for Proposers to submit questions and request for changes to the QPL.
Book 1 Form B	RFP Book 1, Section 3.2.2.2 states that the Proposer is to provide projects "that have been completed in the last 15 years". The header on Form B states "Summary of Comparable Contracts in Past Ten (10) Years".  Please confirm with projects need to be complete within the past 10 or 15 years.	See revisions to Form B in the Book 1 Forms posted on the Project website.  The RFP requirement to include projects within the last 15 years is correct. Form B has been updated to delete the inconsistency.
Book 1 Section 3.3 and Forms	RFP Book 1, Section 3.3 indicates that Volume II of the Technical Proposal is to consist of three sections: 1) Project Management Approach, 2) Design Approach, 3) Construction Approach. These sections are further detailed in sections 3.3.1 through 3.3.3.  RFP Book 1 also includes Response Category II-IV Forms that do not align with the three sections listed in Section 3.3 or their subsections. The forms include the following sections.  Response Category II: Organization and Project Expertise.  Response Category III: Project Understanding, Schedule Management, Project Management, Environmental Compliance, and Innovation.  Response Category IV: Technical Solution.  Please confirm if Proposers should respond to Volume II of the Technical Proposal per Sections 3.3.1 through 3.3.3 of Book 1 or if the Response Category Forms should be used.	See revisions to Section 3.2.2 and Section 3.3 in Addendum #1.  The forms for "Response Categories II-IV" were inadvertently added to the Book 1 Forms. These forms have now been deleted from the revised Book 1 Forms posted on the Project website. The Proposer may respond in free form following the order of the sections listed in Section 3.2.2 and 3.3.

## Form QR RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1 Form ATC	RFP Book 1, Section 2.2 details 12 items that each ATC shall include. There is also an ATC Submittal Form at the end of Book 1 which includes only 9 items, some with varying language from that of Section 2.2. Please confirm if the ATC Submittal Form is to be used and confirm the correct criteria to be submitted with each ATC.	See revisions to Form ATC in the Book 1 Forms posted on the Project website.  The form now matches the list of ATC submittal requirements in Section 2.2.
Book 1 Section 3.2.2	RFP Book 1, Section 3.2.2.2 states that the Proposer is to provide projects "that have been completed in the last 15 years". May the Proposer submit Form B descriptions on projects that are currently in progress and not yet complete?	See revisions to Section 3.2.2.4 in Addendum #1.  The Proposer <b>must</b> provide a minimum of four project descriptions for completed work over the last 15 years per the requirements of Section 3.2.2.4. However, the Proposer may also submit up to four additional Form B project descriptions to highlight on-going/current work.
Book 1 Section 3.1.1	RFP Book 1, Section 3.1.1 states that Proposers are to submit one original Technical Proposal and electronic copy on USB. May Technical Proposals be submitted electronically via email or file transfer link in lieu of providing the one original paper and USB submittal as indicated in the RFP?	See revisions to Book 1 (ITP), Section 3.1.1 in Addendum 2. The Proposer may submit its Technical Proposal electronically per the requirements of the ITP.
Book 1 Section 3.5.1	RFP Book 1, Section 3.5 indicates that Price Proposals shall be submitted electronically. Please confirm that Bid Authorizations are not required prior to submitting Electric Price Proposals.	A Bid Authorization is not required for submittal. Participation in the mandatory pre-bid meeting provided Bid Authorization.
Book 1 Section 3.5.1	RFP Book 1, Section 3.5 indicates that Price Proposals shall be submitted electronically. When does TDOT anticipate the letting to be available in Bid Express?	TDOT anticipates having Bid Express open at least 5 business days in advance of Proposal due date.
Book 1 Section 3.2.2.3	Book 1, Section 3.2.2.3 requires the Design-Builder's Project Manager (f) to "Be a registered professional engineer in the State of Tennessee." Please remove the requirement to be a PE in the State of Tennessee; revising the RFP (f) to "Be a registered professional engineer."	See revisions to Book 1 (ITP), Section 3.2.2.2 in Addendum 2.

## Form QR RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 2 Appendix C and Section 3.2.5	Please confirm in Form COI, included in Appendix C of Book 2 is to be included in the Technical Proposal. Book 1, Section 3.2.8 details "Identification of any organizational conflicts of interest" but does not require submittal of the Form COI.	See revisions to Book 1 (ITP), Section 3.2.8 in Addendum 2. The Proposer only needs to provide an executed Form COI in response to this section.
Book 2 SP625.49	RFP Book 2, Special Provision Section 625.49 states that testing methods such as "concrete coring, cross-hole sonic logging (CSL), and/or thermal integrity profiling (TIP)" shall be used to determine the extent of any defects that may be present. However, this requirement conflicts with the TDOT Structural Design Guidelines, Chapter 10, Bridge Foundation Design, Section 5, which indicates that CSL testing shall be performed for all drilled shafts.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2. CSL testing is required on all drilled shafts per Structures Design Guidelines, Chapter 10.
Book 2 SP625.49	Please confirm that Design-Builder is required to perform CSL testing for all drilled shafts.	The Department will perform the CSL testing.
Book 2 SP 625.51	Special Provision Section 625.51 states that shafts six feet in diameter and larger require 3D tomography. However, this requirement conflicts with the TDOT Structural Design Guidelines, Chapter 10, Bridge Foundation Design, Section 5, which indicates that 3D tomography shall be performed for all drilled shafts. Please confirm that the Design-Builder is required to perform 3D tomography for all drilled shafts.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2. 3D tomography will be required for shafts that are six feet in diameter and larger per Special Provision Section 625.51.
Book 3 Section 1.1	Per Book 3, Section 1.1 the "Project Limits" are defined as "the Project length is approximately 0.4 mile (2,200 feet), extending from Station 11+00.00 to Station 33+00.00." Please clarify the length of the project limits along the river.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.3 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 1.3	The Department-provided Reference Documents include survey data files, including ORD files. The survey data provided has an adjustment factor of 1.00000. This means that it has not been adjusted to the local grid. Will the Design Builder be required to calculate the adjustment factor and adjust the Department-provided survey data?	See revisions to Book 3, Section 1.3 in Addendum 2.

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

<b>RFP Book No. and Section ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Reserved for Agency Response</b>
Book 3 Section 1.3	When will survey control be established for this project and which party shall establish control?	See revisions to Book 3, Section 1.3 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 1.3	The Department-provided survey documents does not include any bathymetric survey information. Does TDOT have a bathymetric survey conducted after the hurricane flood event that may be provided?	See revisions to Book 3, Section 1.1 in Addendum 2. The Department does not have a bathymetric survey. The Design-Builder must perform its own bathymetric survey.
Book 3 Section 4.1	RFP Book 3, Section 4.1 Design Requirements, last paragraph (page 16 on sheet, pdf page 366/391) indicates that “the new structure shall provide a minimum of 1-foot clearance over the previous 100-year elevation”. The bridge elevation shown in document 135866-08-Bridge Conceptual Plans (sheet 1 of 2) indicates a Low Girder Elevation of 1423.56 ft (near bridge begin STA 17+62.00). Please confirm that the low girder elevation of 1423.56 ft provides a minimum of 1-foot clearance over the previous 100-year flood elevation (as required by section 4.1)	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 4	Please confirm that TDOT is acceptable with proposed bridge low chord elevations and anticipated scour depths being determined from existing hydrologic documents (FEMA and TVA studies), and not future documents or methodologies incorporating Metrologic or flood data from Hurricane Helene.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 4	Please confirm that bridge deck drainage is allowed to discharge directly to the Nolichucky River. TDOT's standard bridge deck drainage details (dwg. STD-1-2SS) suggest that direct discharge is permissible.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 4	The Base Technical Concept plans indicate that the new bridge abutments are integral abutments. Please confirm that semi-integral abutments can be used in lieu of integral abutments	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2. TDOT does not allow semi-integral abutments at locations where an expansion joint is not needed.

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 4	<p>Recent significant flood events have resulted in owners specifying project-specific flood event impact loads on in-water structures such as bridge piers (e.g., impact from a floating debris or other similar heavy / large object).</p> <p>RFP Book 3, Section 4 Structures does not include project-specific criteria for a flood event impact load for the design of new in-water bridge piers. AASHTO 3.7.3 addresses floating debris and a calculated "debris raft" impact load on bridge piers. Please confirm there is no project-specific flood event impact load and please confirm that AASHTO 3.7.3 should be used for the design of flood event impact loads.</p>	<p>Yes, AASHTO 3.7.3 shall be used for the design of debris impact loads.</p>
Book 3 Section 4	<p>Per Note 3 on Sheet 1 of the 135866-08 Bridge Conceptual Plans, the bridge is assigned to Seismic Design Category (SDC) B. Per Section 14-103.03 of the TDOT Structural Design Guide, SDC B "plastic hinging forces in the columns of all substructures shall be determined in accordance with Guide Specification Section 4.11.2. All elements not part of the ERS shall be designed to remain essentially elastic when the forces associated with plastic hinging are applied to the structure." Please confirm TDOT's intent for this structure to follow the design requirements in SDC B, provided the SD1 value of 0.152 is near the 0.15 limit between SDC A and SDC B.</p>	<p>See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2. Design requirements for SDC B is required.</p>
Book 3 Section 4.3	<p>Book 3, Section 4.3 states, "The Design-Builder shall remove all remnants of the existing bridge." Is it correct to assume this requirement pertains only to remnants within the Project Limits and does not include remnants washed downstream outside the Project Limits.</p>	<p>See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.3 in Addendum 2.</p>

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 7.2.2	Book 3, Section 7.2.2, states that "The Department is using the Base Technical Concept to coordinate with the respective utility owners on the relocation for the four utilities in conflict with the Project." Please provide the coordinated utility design and relocation schedule information.	The Department is using the Base Technical Concept, as provided to the Proposers in the Reference Documents, to coordinate with the utilities. See revisions to Book 3, Section 7.2.2 in Addendum 2 for the Department-provided relocation date of the four listed poles.
Reference Material > 06 Roadway > 135688-08-Line and Grade Plans- Roadway	The Line and Grade plans show the construction of a new cul-de-sac located on OO Moore Road. This work is not listed in Book 3, Section 1.1 Scope of Work. Please confirm that the construction of the new cul-de-sac is included in the design-builder's Scope of Work. If so, what are the design requirements for this work, i.e. County/TDOT, design vehicle? If the new cul-de-sac is included in the Scope of Work, please confirm that the design-builder does not need to make any improvements to OO Moore Road.	See revisions to Book 3, Section 3.2 and in Addendum 2. The construction of the new cul-de-sac shall be included in the Scope of Work. Design standards for the cul-de-sac have been included in Section 3.2. OO Moore Road will not be improved outside of the limits of the cul-de-sac.
Reference Material > Geotechnical Report, Section 3.1 Geologic Conditions	The provided geotechnical report states that the bedrock is susceptible to the hazards of irregular weathering, cave and cavern conditions, and overburden sinkholes. What is the expectation if karsts/voids are encountered during construction of the drilled shafts? Particularly if concrete loss occurs during the concrete pour.	Within this area, and East TN in general, there is a risk of potential sinkholes and/or karst activity. If a solutioning, void, or potential sinkhole is encountered, the Design-Builder will be responsible for its means and methods to resolve the issue.
Reference Material > Geotechnical Report	Table 4 Drilled Shaft Tip Elevation of the Geotechnical report (on pdf page 16/60 of the document - A24109.02271 Geotechnical Report - SR-353 Emergency Bridge Repair - Washington Co - 10-28-24) interprets "competent rock" in boring B-1 to be at elevation 1358.2 feet despite an RQD of 8 percent. This low RQD value indicates that "competent rock" is likely to be deeper than the bottom of the boring (elevation 1357.5 feet). Is there a requirement for a minimum thickness of competent bedrock below an end-bearing drilled shaft?	TDOT Geotechnical Guidelines define competent rock as having no more than three instances of rock discontinuities, voids, or very weathered seams greater than 2-inches or a single discontinuity of greater than 6 inches in a 10-foot core run.

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 4.1	The RFP states that “the new structure shall provide a minimum of 1-foot clearance over the previous 100-year flood elevation. The previous 100-year flood elevation is not defined in the Base Technical Concepts and is not possible to determine this elevation with previous conditions based on data provided of current conditions. Should the highwater elevation of 1422’ as shown in the existing plans be used for establishing this clearance?	See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 2.
Book 3 Section 6.2.2 and 3.2	<p>The RFP 6.2.2.2 states, “The Department does not anticipate the need for any temporary construction easements outside of the Planned ROW Limits to complete the Project.”</p> <p>The RFP 3.2 states “The two existing field entrances, as depicted on the Base Technical Concept, shall be replaced at approximately the same location and in a similar fashion as the original.”</p> <p>According to TDOT Design Guidelines Section 2-1500.00, driveways and field entrances will require temporary construction easements to tie down beyond the proposed ROW limits.</p> <p>Is it the Design-BUILDER’s responsibility to acquire construction easement for these entrances or will TDOT acquire these?</p>	The Base Technical Concept has been revised so that the drive-way tie-downs occur within the Planned ROW Limits.
Book 3 Section 4.1	Addendum #4 revised the bridge hydraulic sizing based on 50-year hydraulics (for meeting TDOT conveyance requirements) and 100-year backwater impacts (for meeting FEMA requirements). Based on our interpretation of Addendum #4, there is a high likelihood that the 100-year event would overtop (or inundate) the bridge low chord elevation. Please confirm that the proposed bridge design needs to meet inundation requirements.	Confirmed. See revisions to Book 3, Section 4.1 in Addendum 5.