RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

PROJECT: Region 4 Bridge Bundle - Carroll, Fayette, Haywood, Lauderdale, and Madison Counties - Tennessee

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1901 **DATE:** 2/27/2020

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-1	Design Build Standard Guidance 2.7 Submittals	Section 2.7 states "All submittals shall be stamped by the Design-Builder's Construction Project Manager, a Professional Engineer licensed in Tennessee." Please confirm the Design-Builders Construction Project Manager is not required to be a Professional Engineer licensed in Tennessee.	According to the RFQ, the Design-Builder's Project Manager is not required to be licensed as a Professional Engineer in Tennessee. The Design Manager is required to be a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Tennessee and will be responsible for sealing all submittals.
QR4-2	Book 3, Section 9.3 Temporary Lane/Road Closure	The RFP states that, "…detours in excess of twenty-five (25) miles in length require approval through re-evaluation of the NEPA document." The PCE for Madison Co. identifies a detour route, which is greater than 25 miles in length and states that per the FHWA, the processing of a D-List CE will be completed in-house (TDOT). Will any coordination with FHWA be required, and what will the timeframe be for review and approval? Also, will the D-List CE be solely for the detour, or will the entire document be updated to replace the current PCE?	For the Madison County site, two detours (official and local) were identified in the approved PCE, which were coordinated with FHWA. The FHWA concluded that the NEPA document could be processed as a PCE since there was a proposed local 7.1-mile detour. If there are no deviations from the detours as documented in the approved PCE and Reevaluation, no further coordination would be required for this site relating to the detour. If the official detour (30.6 miles) or the local detour (7.1 miles) is modified, the Design-Builder must determine if a Reevaluation is needed. If a Reevaluation is determined to be necessary, the Design-Builder would provide a Revaluation for the entire project site, not just the detour.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-3	Book 3, Appendix A, Carroll Co. Design Criteria	The design criteria for Carroll Co. states, "Existing berms adjacent to SR-436 and Reedy Creek, if disturbed, are to be reconstructed inside Temporary Construction Easements as shown in the Functional Plans." Do the right-of-way and temporary construction easements need to be exactly as on the Functional Plans? Will TDOT want to maintain the proposed ditch line within permanent right-of-way or is the way it is shown on the functional plans acceptable?	As stated in the RFP, if existing berms are disturbed they shall be reconstructed inside temporary construction easement. The limits of the temporary construction easement shall be established based on the Design-Builder's design and are not required to match what is shown in the Functional Plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-4	Book 3, Section 5, Structures	The RFP states, "The Design-Builder shall conduct and submit a load rating analysis for each of the new bridges to be constructed." What software is the Design-Builder to utilize for the load ratings and in what format should they be submitted to TDOT?	The bridge load ratings shall be performed utilizing AASHTOware BrR. The load rating shall include the following vehicles: HL-93, AASHTO HS-20-44 (both Truck and Lane Loading), AASHTO H-15-44 (both Truck and Lane Loading), AASHTO Type 3 Vehicle, AASHTO Type 3S2 Vehicle, AASHTO Type 3-3 Vehicle, AASHTO SU4 Vehicle, AASHTO SU5 Vehicle, AASHTO SU6 Vehicle, and AASHTO SU7 Vehicle. In addition to the above AASHTO vehicles, the bridge shall be load rated for the passage of a Test Permit Vehicle, two Annual Permit trucks and a Class 10 Gravel Truck, the FHWA EV2 and EV3 vehicles. The analysis method to be used is restricted to Load and Resistance Factor Rating (LRFR). The Design-Builder shall provide deliverables for this task consisting of an electronic report file, in PDF Format, for the Final Load Rating Report. In addition, electronic copies of the model data files shall be provided to the Department. The report shall include an executive summary section with a table of load rating factors for each bridge and vehicle rated. The report shall also include, AASHTOWare Bridge Rating Overall Summary sheets outlining the rating results for the controlling interior and exterior members.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-5	Book 3, Appendix A, Structure Design Criteria	The RFP, nor any of the reference documents identify the criteria to be applied for the culvert embedment depth. Please identify what criteria should be applied for the design.	The culverts shown in the Functional Plans were designed utilizing HEC-26 in an effort to look at a worst case scenario for project scope and limits for the hydraulic structures. The Design-Builder shall determine permitting requirements for each site and including the associated culvert embedment requirements.
QR4-6	Book 3 Section 3.1 Roadway, Section 6 ROW, Section 8 Environmental	The RFP states that if the DB needs additional ROW, Permanent or Temporary Easement, outside of the limits shown on the Function (30%) Roadway Plans, they shall be responsible for any and all additional environmental technical studies and completion of the re-evaluations of the NEPA document, modification, and approvals to the ROW appraisals and acquisitions, utilities coordination/relocation and any environmental permits necessary. If the DB adjusts the ROW beyond the limits of the Function Plans, but still within the NEPA boundary, is a re-evaluation of the NEPA document required under any circumstance? Or are there changes within the NEPA boundary that would not trigger a re-evaluation?	If the Design-Builder adjusts the ROW beyond the Proposed ROW limits, proposes changes to the scope, or shifts/extends the alignment shown on the Functional Plans or for any other changes, a Reevaluation will be necessary for the entire project site. The Design-Builder must determine if a Reevaluation is needed for any changes.
QR4-7	Book 1 Section D.4.d	Book 1 Section D.4.d states, "The Technical Proposal shall include half-size plan sheets depicting those elements required by the RFP." Do these plans count toward the 75-page maximum page count?	Half-size plan sheets will not count toward the 75-page limit as shown in the RFP. Response provided in QR3-1 will be amended in the final QR form.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-8	Book 1 Section D.4.i	Considering the low ADT on the project roadways and the absence of the requirement to provide a detailed Traffic Analysis and Mitigation Report from Book 3 of the RFP, it is our understanding that providing a detailed Traffic Analysis and Mitigation report in Response Category IV of the Technical Proposal, as stated in Book 1 Section D.4.i, is not required. Please confirm.	A detailed Traffic Analysis and Mitigation Report will not be required. Response Category IV forms shall be completed as shown in Book 1 of the RFP.
QR4-9	Reference Material – Geotech Reports	TDOT has provided preliminary site investigation data, as well as various liquefaction assessments based on different theoretical and empirical methodologies. Some of the methodologies indicate the potential for liquefaction to the depth of explorations, requiring any preliminary pile design to extrapolate data below the borings/CPT soundings. Please provide a preference for the methodology used to evaluate the liquefaction potential.	For the preliminary site investigations Idriss and Boulanger (2008) method was used to evaluate the liquefaction potential from the SPT "N" values obtained from the borings. In addition, CPT-based liquefaction was analyzed using the GeoLogismiki software Cliq version 3.0. The Design-Builder is responsible to perform their own liquefaction analysis according to AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications to determine the depth of liquefaction and what mitigation at the supports would be necessary to prevent it or design for it.
QR4-10	Book 3 Section 8.2	Does this project have access to the TDOT owned or managed mitigation bank and if so please provide a list of contacts for TDOT owned or managed mitigation banks for the HUC 8 areas of these locations?	The Bridge Bundle Project does not have access to TDOT mitigation banks or credits.
QR4-11	Book 3 Section 8.2	Is there a reduced mitigation credit purchase fee for use of a TDOT mitigation bank?	This is not applicable, see response to QR4-10.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR-RFP-4

	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
QR4-12	Book 3 Section 8.2	The NEPA documents state that "on site mitigation is preferred over credit purchase" may the DB assume that TDOT is prepared to perform owner required tasks for onsite mitigation such as recording a deed restriction and in perpetuity maintenance by a third party?	See response QR4-13.
QR4-13	Book 3 Section 8.2	If TDOT does not prefer to perform deed restriction and in perpetuity maintenance of onsite mitigation may we assume that off-site credit purchase is preferred?	The Design-Builder shall be responsible for mitigation requirements deemed necessary by the regulatory agencies.