

Form QR
RFP Question Request

Project & DB Contract: Timber Bridge Bundle One (DB2506)

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
Book 2, Appendix B SP105C	This special provision has been removed from the Final RFP. Does the Department anticipate that Railroad Requirements will not be needed on this project (specifically at the Bridge 46 site)? If the Railroad later deems these provisions are required, will the Department reimburse the Design-Builder for the associated costs (insurance, flagging, etc.) by Supplemental Agreement?	Yes, the Department believes railroad requirements will be needed in some form, but the extent of those requirements will be driven by the Design-Builder's final Definitive Design Plans at Bridge 46. See revisions to Section 7 in a forthcoming addendum to include specific Department and Design-Builder railroad coordination requirements. This includes discussion on how to compensate the Design-Builder if additional railroad requirements (insurance, flagging, etc.) are imposed via this coordination process.
Book 3, Section 1.3	Does the Department have an update on the availability of the TEER Document?	The document will be provided when available (likely in the next two weeks). All current environmental commitments required of the Design-Builder were included in the final RFP (see Section 8 of Book 3).
Book 3, Section 8.3.6	The Final RFP is now requiring the inspectors performing the required twice weekly inspections to have a valid certification from the "Fundamentals of Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Level I" course and licensed professional engineer or landscape architect. Please confirm this is correct and not a Level I or a professional engineer or landscape architect.	The Department's edits to the final RFP were incorrect. There are four options to confirm an EPSC inspector's qualifications per TDOT's EPSC Inspection Manual. See revisions to Section 8.3.6 in a forthcoming addendum that will revert the narrative to the previously listed four qualification options.
General - RFP Books 1 & 2	Please confirm there is no DBE required on this project.	Confirmed.
Book 3, Attachment A	Two pavement schedules are provided which have different Base thicknesses (6-inch vs 9-inch). No direction is provided on where to apply the different Pavement Schedules. Please clarify the requirements.	As noted in the final RFP, the Department updated the pavement schedule to what is in the current Attachment A (see the "clean" version of Book 3 for the revised Attachment A with 6 inches of base thickness). The final RFP redlines show the strikeout of the old pavement schedule followed by addition of the new pavement schedule.
Book 3, Attachment B	There is conflicting information regarding shoulder widths between the concept reports and the roadway design data. For bridges 47 and 48, the concept reports call for 2-foot shoulders and the Design Criteria calls for 4-foot shoulders. Please clarify the requirements.	The roadway design data in Attachment B of RFP Book 3 for Bridges 47 & 48 is incorrect. See revisions to Attachment B in a forthcoming addendum to note the 2-foot shoulders at these locations.
Book 3, Section 4.2	The last paragraph on page 22 identifies three options to identify proposed low girder elevations. The word "or" is used between the three options. Please clarify if any of the three options are acceptable.	Yes. See revisions to Section 4.2 in a forthcoming addendum to further clarify that any one of the three options are acceptable.
Book 3, Section 4.3	Section 4.3 calls for the concrete channel beams at bridge 49 to be saved and salvaged. Bridge 49 has steel beams. Please clarify the requirements.	TDOT replaced Bridge 49's steel beams with concrete channel beams in 2024. See the 2024 Inspection Report provided in the updated Reference Materials (to be posted after 10/17; see updated index for more information).