

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

Project & DB Contract #: I-40 Resurfacing and Rehabilitation Shelby County (DB2501)

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1 – 1.1 Book 3 - 1.3	The RFP makes multiple references to the Simplified Functional Plans. The only plans under the reference file folder are identified as preliminary plans. When will the Simplified Functional Plans be provided? Or are the preliminary plans to be considered the Simplified Functional Plans?	The Preliminary Plans listed on the project website will be re-named to be called the “Simplified Functional Plans” to match the references in the RFP.
General Question	At what point is an ATC required versus generally accepted design practice or contractor means and methods?	The RFP will be revised to add clarification on when a deviation requires an ATC.
Book 1 Section 1.1.1	Section 1.1.1 states that the existing pavement “has deteriorated due to Alkali Silica Reactivity (ASR)”. Will the Department provide evidence or testing data that was used to identify ASR in the existing pavement?	TDOT will provide all available data/test results on the project website.
Book 1, Section 1.1.2	Owner Furnished Materials: When will the addendum with Geotechnical Borings be provided?	Geotechnical borings will be provided on the project website.
General	Are there limitations (allowed or disallowed) for soil improvement methods permitted for this project?	Proposed soil improvement methods shall meet or exceed TDOT requirements.
Book 1 Section 1.1.2	Can the locations and depths of the geotechnical borings be provided in advance?	Geotechnical borings approximate locations will be provided to the proposers.

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 3.8	Can the Department provide the traffic data, including percent trucks, for the mainline and the ramps within the project limits?	<p>TDOT will provide traffic data for the mainlanes and ramps for the project limits to the proposers on the project website.</p> <p>Proposers can use the following TDOT weblink for current traffic data  <a href="#">Traffic Lines   State of Tennessee Downloadable GIS Data</a></p>
Book 3 Section 8.2	<p>Provided TMP shows a typical of 10.5' lanes. Per the RFP, minimum lane width is 11'.</p> <p>Which one prevails?</p>	<p>The Draft Traffic Controls Plans indicate a lane width of 11' which matches the 11' Lane width indicated in RFP Book 3, Section 8.2 first paragraph.</p> <p>The Design-Builder may propose ATCs to maintain minimum lane widths.</p>
Book 3 Section 3.8	Book 3, section 3.8 says the proposed pavement design schedule has been developed in the Simplified Functional Plans. The pavement schedule is provided on the preliminary plans but the schedule is not applied to any of the typical sections. Will the pavement design, by layer, be provided?	<p>The base pavement design will be provided to the proposers. The pavement design schedule in the Simplified Plans set will be superseded by the new pavement design.</p> <p>Proposers will be allowed to submit ATC's they would like to use.</p>
Book 3 Section 3.8	Section 3.8 states "the Design-Builder may propose an ATC for pavement design ..." Will a preliminary pavement section be provided?	<p>The base pavement design will be provided to the proposers. The pavement design schedule in the Simplified Plans set will be superseded by the new pavement design.</p> <p>Proposers will be allowed to submit ATC's they would like to use.</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1 Section 1.1.2 Book 3 Section 3.6	<p>The RFP states, No improvements will be made to overhead signs. The RFP also states that roadway signs shall be in strict accordance with the current edition of the MUTCD. Which statement takes precedence?</p> <p>The RFP states no improvements will be made to overhead signs but, they are introducing a choice lane for Exit 5 which requires arrow per lane or diagrammatic signing.</p>	<p>The intent of the project is not to repair overhead sign structures as outlined in Book 3, Section 5. The sign panels mounted to overhead structures do not need to be replaced. Where the roadway surface is raised, ground mounted signs may need adjustment to meet the minimum separation distance as indicated on TDOT standard drawing T-S-9.</p> <p>The existing permanent lane configurations within the project limits shall be maintained.</p>
Book 3 Section 3.6	The RFP states that all sign sheeting shall be Type 3 Prismatic or better. Does the Department have an inventory of non-compliant signs available?	<p>The intent of the project is not to replace sign panels mounted to overhead structures or ground mounted signs. Where the roadway surface is raised, ground mounted signs may need adjustment to meet the minimum separation distance as indicated on TDOT standard drawing T-S-9.</p> <p>The existing permanent lane configurations within the project limits shall be maintained.</p>
Book 3 Section 3.8	Will an ATC be considered for a mainline or ramp pavement design that deviates from either 30M ESALs and/or SN 5.185 based on the Design-Builder's own evaluation of traffic and subgrade?	RFP Book 3, Section 3.8 indicates the Design Builders may propose ATCs which must meet the 30M ESAL Requirements and the minimum AASHTO SN number indicated.

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 3.8	<p>Section 3.8 states minimum SN of 5.185 and traffic loading of 30M ESALs. According to the AASHTO 1993 equations and serviceability parameters from TDOT's Pavement Manual, this equates to a subgrade CBR of approximately 9. Provided test results from RFP-Phase borings show subgrade CBRs much lower than 9. Will the Department confirm the subgrade CBR value used to develop the RFP-stated SN, and/or will an ATC be considered for a mainline or ramp design that uses a different CBR based on the Design-Builder's own evaluation of subgrade?</p>	<p>The SN number used in Book 3, Section 3.8 was developed prior to the CBR data being available using the nomograph in Chapter 2 of the 1993 AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures and the design parameters outlined in TDOT's Pavement Design Manual, Section 5.4.2 &amp; 5.4.3.1</p> <p>With CBR data available, the SN number indicated in Book 3, Section 3.8 will be revised by addendum to 5.436 using the nomograph in Chapter 2 of the 1993 AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures and the design parameters outlined in TDOT's Pavement Design Manual, Section 5.4.2 &amp; 5.4.3.1</p> <p>Proposers can develop pavement design ATCs for TDOTs review and approval which meet the minimum requirements indicated in Book 3, Section 3.8</p>
Book 3 Section 3.2	<p>The existing 32"/36" center barrier does not meet height standards.</p> <p>Is TDOT expecting that to be upgraded to meet current standards?</p> <p>Do we need to replace it? Or can we convert to taller constant slope face with a cast-in-place detail we've used on other projects?</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to not upgrade the concrete barrier within the project limits to current standards.</p> <p>RFP Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements second paragraph indicates the Design Builder will be responsible to identify the need for special design details and shall provide special design drawings for TDOT's review and approval.</p> <p>Proposers can submit ATCs to upgrade the barrier height for TDOTs review and approval.</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Scope Book 3 Section 3.2	<p>Do existing culverts/closed drainage features need to be investigated for damage and potential repair/replacement?</p> <p>If overlay is 6"+ is TDOT expecting to see a special detail to raise the grates?</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to not perform repair/replacement for existing culverts.</p> <p>RFP Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements second paragraph indicates the Design Builder will be responsible to identify the need for special design details and shall provide special design drawings for TDOT's review and approval.</p>
Scope	<p>Does ITS need upgrading?</p> <p>Nothing in RFP so assume no</p> <p>Are we impacting anything any sensors in the pavement?</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to not upgrade the ITS system.</p> <p>Along I-40 within the project limits, no ITS sensors are in in the pavement.</p>
Reference Materials Book 3 Section 8.2	<p>The MOT Concept Plans dated 2-6-2025 show three lanes in each direction for some areas, but the RFP Book 3 Section 8.2 notes that only two lanes much be maintained in each direction.</p> <p>Which prevails?</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 8.2 Temporary Lanes Closures indicate a minimum of two (2) travel lanes must be maintained as specified in SP108B.</p>
Scope	<p>The RFP does not mention any upgrades to the existing high-pressure sodium lighting.</p> <p>Field visits identified power issues with exposed wiring on top of existing barrier.</p> <p>Does the department want the lighting upgraded to LED?</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to not upgrade the illumination system.</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Materials	Is the Department open to different ramp configurations and different merge vs. free-flow conditions than shown in the MOT Concept Plans dated 2-6-2025?	<p>The proposer may submit ATCs to revise the MOT indicated in the draft Traffic Control Plans (TCP).</p> <p>Revisions to the draft TCP must meet all TDOT requirements, Work Zone Standards, SP108B and Chapter 6 of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).</p>
Scope	<p>Based on field investigations and bridge inspection reports there are several bridge joints that need to be repaired/replaced.</p> <p>Is TDOT expecting joint replacement or membrane replacement within joints?</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 5.1 Bridge Deck Repair indicates the bridge joints within the project limits to be repaired, cleaned and sealed.</p> <p>The third paragraph indicates: If required and agreed upon by TDOT, the Design Builder shall be responsible for any identified joint repairs necessary for installing the proposed asphalt layer over the bridge deck.</p>
Scope	Bridge railing heights do not meet standards, is TDOT expecting to modify the height to meet standards?	<p>The intent of the project is to not upgrade the concrete barrier within the project limits.</p> <p>RFP Book 3, Section 3.2 Design Requirements second paragraph indicates the Design Builder will be responsible to identify the need for special design details and shall provide special design drawings for TDOT's review and approval.</p> <p>Proposers can submit ATCs to upgrade the barrier height for TDOTs review and approval</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 Section 3.2	The existing profile has a long stretch of 0% grade. Does TDOT have any history of hydroplaning in this area that would warrant changing to a 0.3% minimum?	<p>The intent of the project is to not improve the grade of I-40. Crash reports are available from the following TDOT website for a nominal fee. <a href="https://apps.tn.gov/purchasetncrash/index">https://apps.tn.gov/purchasetncrash/index</a></p> <p>If the crash reports indicate hydroplaning is a cause for a crash, the proposer may submit an ATC.</p> <p>Minor increases in roadway grades to improve safety are acceptable except in areas where there are vertical clearance issues.</p>
Book 3, Section 3.9	<p>Section 3.9 states "...The Design Builder should remove curb on the two loop ramps as indicated in the Simplified Functional Plans." However, the Plans available on TDOT's website appear to show shoulder modifications on three loop ramps.</p> <p>Can TDOT please clarify whether the intent is to modify two or three loop ramps? If only two loop ramps are to be modified, could TDOT specify which two ramps are included in the scope?</p>	<p>The Simplified Functional Plans indicate three Ramps (D, H &amp; N) to be modified as indicated in RFP Book 3, Section 3.9.</p> <p>The second sentence in paragraph 1 in RFP Book 3, Section 3.9 will be revised by addendum to state: The Design-Builder <i>shall</i> remove curbs on the three Loop Ramps (Ramps N, H &amp; D) as indicated in the Simplified Functional Plans.</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 2, Appendix B	<p>In the table of Special Provisions provided in Book 2, Special Provisions 109A and 109B are listed as included in this project.</p> <p>Given that this is a lump sum contract, can TDOT please clarify whether it is their intent to include these provisions? Additionally, if included, please clarify how fuel and material adjustments would be calculated and compensated under a lump sum contract structure.</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to use SP109A and SP 109B as indicated in RFP Book 2, Appendix B.</p> <p>RFP Book 2, Appendix B will be revised by addendum to include completed copies of SP109A and SP 109B containing the following information:</p> <p>For SP 109A, the estimated price per gallon of fuel and the month/year for the Price Index will be based on March 2025.</p> <p>For SP 109B, the “Basic Bituminous Material Index for the project will be provided.</p> <p>Fuel and material price adjustment procedures are indicated in both SP’s.</p>
Historic Lighting Plans (Included in online reference material)	<p>The historic lighting plans are included in the reference materials provided on TDOT’s website.</p> <p>Could TDOT please clarify whether the historic lighting is included in the scope of this project? If so, please provide additional details regarding the extent and limits of the lighting work required.</p>	<p>The plan sheets for the historical lighting are provided for reference only to the proposers.</p> <p>The intent of the project is not to replace any lighting except if impacted by construction activities.</p>



Form QR

RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1, Section 3.4.1 Book 2, Section 3.4.2	<p>Section 3.4.1 in Book 1 and Section 3.4.2 in Book 2 both outline requirements for Level 2 personnel to be assigned to the project; however, the lists of required personnel in these two sections do not align.</p> <p>Specifically, Book 1, Section 3.4.1 includes a “Design Lead Engineer – Geotechnical” and “Construction Lead – Structures/Bridge Repair,” which are not reflected in Book 2. Additionally, the “Traffic Control Supervisor” is listed as a Level 2 position in Book 1, whereas the submitted SOQ designated this role as Level 1.</p> <p>The RFP also addresses a designation of “Design Lead Engineer – Maintenance of Traffic” that was not included in the original SOQ Level 2 listing.</p> <p>Can TDOT please clarify the required list of Level 2 personnel for this project? Also, Could TDOT verify if acceptable practices would allow a single individual to occupy more than one role on the list?</p>	<p>RFP Book 2, Section 3.4.2, will be revised by addendum to be consistent with RFP Book 1 Section 3.4.1 to include the following Level 2 personnel: Design Lead Engineer – Geotechnical and Construction Lead – Structures/Bridge Repair.</p> <p>The required list of Level 2 personnel is outlined in RFP Book 1, Section 3.4.1.</p> <p>If a single individual occupies more than one Level 2 role, they must meet the requirements of Design-Build Standard Guidance Chapter 2, Section 2.5.6 (b)(1)&amp;(2).</p> <p>TDOT’s preference would be to have one person per Level 2 role to limit disruptions should dual Level 2 personnel leave the project.</p>
Book 3, Section 1.1 Book 3, Section 3.4	<p>Section 1.1 states, “Install all permanent guardrail segments to MASH TL-3 standards and install new guardrail to shield fixed objects including non break-away supports in the clear zone.” Section 3.4 further states, “All permanent and temporary safety appurtenances (signs, guardrail, etc.) shall meet current TDOT standards and shall have all required Department certification documents.”</p> <p>Could TDOT please clarify whether it is the Department’s intent for <i>all</i> existing guardrail within the project limits to be upgraded to meet MASH TL-3 standards—including at bridge ends where such upgrades would necessitate modifications to existing bridge rail?</p>	<p>The intent of the project is to upgrade all permanent guardrail segments with no modifications to existing bridge ends, to MASH-TL-3 requirements using the current TDOT Guardrail Maintenance standard drawings for the approach ends of the bridge.</p> <p>For the trailing end of the bridge where MBGF is warranted for clear zone protection, TDOT’s Guardrail Connection S-GRC-5 standard may be appropriate given the MBGF shoe fits into the existing slot on the concrete rail.</p> <p>The Design-Builder shall replace end terminals with MASH TL 3 using a guardrail height transition per Std Dwg S-GRS-4.</p>

Form QR  
RFP Question Request

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 1, Section 1.3	<p>We respectfully request a four-week extension on all future project deadlines. This additional time would help ensure the highest quality in our submittals and allow us to fully address project requirements. We believe that upcoming information TDOT will be providing is essential to developing the most schedule- and cost-effective design and construction solutions for the project. Please confirm if this extension can be granted, and if so, provide updated milestone dates accordingly. The proposed revised dates are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confidential (One-on-One) Meetings: ATC discussions May 7, 2025 – TBD Local Time</li> <li>• Deadline for submittal of Form QR, requests for QPL determination, organizational or Key Individual change requests, SOQ conflicts of interest update, and/or alternate technical concepts (ATCs) May 19, 2025 – 4:00 PM Local Time</li> <li>• Deadline for TDOT’s last response on Form QR, requests for QPL determination, organizational changes, SOQ resubmittals, and/or alternate technical concepts (ATCs) determination Deadline for issuance of last addendum May 26, 2025 – 4:00 PM Local Time</li> <li>• Technical Proposal and Price Proposal Due Date June 13, 2025 – 10:00 AM Central Technical Proposal emailed to TDOT/PM Price Proposal through Bid Express</li> </ul> <p>We appreciate your consideration of this request and your continued partnership throughout the procurement process.</p>	RFP Book 1, Section 1.3 will be revised by addendum to reflect updated milestone dates. These dates are TBD.