

DESIGN-BUILD FINAL Q/R

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Interstate I-75 at Interstate I-24 Interchange Modification

Hamilton County- TENNESSEE

**TO BE ATTACHED WITH COVER SHEET IN TECHNICAL
PROPOSAL**

**(Where conflict arises, the responses provided in this form
supersede the original Contract Book 1, 2, 3, and any
Addendum issued prior to the date an individual Q/R response
is posted. Addenda issued after a posted Q/R response supersede
any prior Q/R response.)**

CONTRACT NUMBER: DB1801



November 21, 2018

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: August 13, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-1	Reference Material	Can the Department provide the DB teams the MicroStation, GeoPak design files, design GPK, and GeoPak drainage files for the project?	Microstation and GeoPak will be added to the TDOT project website.
1-2	RFP Book 3, Page 11	Can station ranges be provided for Segments 1 thru 4.	Refer to RFP Book 3, Page 11 and functional plans to determine approximate stations ranges.
1-3	RFP Book 3, Page 15, Drainage Requirements	Is underdrain replacement required in segments only requiring asphalt overlay?	See RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design.
1-4	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General	Will a square feet of concrete pavement rehabilitation and concrete shoulder repair be established for the project?	No. RFP will be revised to address concrete pavement repair and joint repair for roadway and shoulders.
1-5	RFP Book 3, Page 18, Existing Drainage Systems	“The design of new, or modifications to existing (where feasible), hydraulic structures shall conform to HEC-26, Culvert Design for Aquatic Organism Passage.” Is HEC-26 to be followed (including embedment) for culvert extensions?	The language will be revised so that HEC-26 will only be required on new hydraulic structures. An addendum will be issued to address this item.
1-6	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - Design Requirements	Which TDOT superelevation table is to be used for the project (rural or urban)?	Table 3-10b, 2011 AASHTO Green Book
1-7	RFP Book 3, Page 32, Geotechnical Investigations	Does TDOT have a geotechnical report or any geotechnical information for the project? If so, can this data be provided to the DB teams?	Information will be added to the TDOT project website.
1-8	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General	What is the required minimum profile grade on interstate segments and ramp segments of the project?	Refer to RFP Book 3, Page 11-13, Roadway - General for profile requirements.
1-9	Functional Plans	The project beginning is shown across the Georgia/Tennessee state line. How is the work in Georgia to be handled?	All construction work is in Tennessee. Updated functional plans will be posted on the TDOT project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-10	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General	Can the design speeds be provided individually for all ramps on the project?	Refer to Book 3, Page 11, Roadway-General and Functional Plans for design speeds.
1-11	General	Will the DB teams have one-on-one meetings with TDOT during the RFP phase? If so, what is schedule of these meetings or how can a DB team request a one-on-one meeting?	See RFP Book 1, Pages 4-5, RFP Communication.
1-12	General	Will TDOT provide a debrief of the DB team's SOQ submittal before the submission of the technical proposal?	No. All debriefs will be conducted after the Design-Builder is selected.
1-13	RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design	Will TDOT provide the minimum pavement design criteria for pavement?	See RFP Book 3, Page 23, Roadway – Pavement Design Report and Appendix A – Pavement Design
1-14	RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design	Will TDOT provide a pavement design for the areas requiring asphalt overlays?	See RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design
1-15	RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design	In areas currently paved with OGFC and requiring overlay, will OGFC be required in the proposed design?	See RFP Book 3, Appendix A – Pavement Design
1-16	RFB Book 3, Page 23, Pavement Design Report	Can the proposed pavement types (concrete/asphalt, full depth, overlay) and location (travel lanes, shoulder) be provided individually for all ramps on the project?	Additional pavement guidance will be added to Appendix A.
1-17	RFP Book 3, Page 53, Permit Application Package Contents	Can TDOT confirm that a 26a Permit is not applicable to this project?	See RFP Book 3, Pages 50-56, Environmental – Permitting “The Design-Builder shall determine all of the permits required in order to perform the work.”
1-18	RFP Book 3, Page 18, Floodplain Requirements	Can the preliminary hydraulic modeling analysis be provided to the DB teams?	Items Included in Appendix B will be added to the TDOT project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-19	Functional Plans	The functional design presented in the preliminary plans deviates from the design presented in the approved IAR (i.e. the northbound on-ramp from the Exit 1 interchange at the Welcome Center) on the project website. Is it to be assumed that no further coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or revisions to the IAR are required for the functional design presented in the functional plans?	No additional coordination for the functional design presented in the functional plans will be required by the Design-Builder.
1-20	RFP Book 1, Appendix A	Can TDOT provide the forms listed in Appendix A?	All forms are included in the RFP Book 1, Appendix A.
1-21	RFP Book No. 3 Section 1	<p>In Section 1, reference is made to Appendix B for all department provided reference materials. Included on the Appendix B list of reference materials is a Preliminary Drainage Analysis and Geotechnical Reports. When looking on the project website, we do not see these items.</p> <p>In addition to the reference materials on Appendix B, the following items and/or information is needed and critical for the development of quality proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MicroStation and Geopak files for the Functional Plans Cross Sections as well as any design files used to create the ITS, Lighting, Utility and Signing & Marking Roll Plots. • Existing Bridge and Interstate Plans • Noise Model Information <p>Will the Department please provide the above items as soon as possible?</p>	Items Included in Appendix B will be added to the TDOT project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-22	Book 3, Drainage (pg 17)	RFP states that the re-use of existing drainage structures and pipes is encouraged. Does this include the 15” median drain pipes if they are hydraulically and structurally adequate?	See RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway – A new storm drainage system is to be installed along Segments 1 and 2.
1-23	Book 3, General (pg 1)	Please confirm that the paragraph five under 1. General refers to ALL design standards and guidelines (TDOT, AASHTO, MUTCD, etc.) and not just the TDOT Standard Specifications for the most current version to be used at the time of the Proposal Due Date.	See RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway
1-24	Book 3, General (pg 2)	Bullet 5 states that the widening of I-75 shall be performed using concrete pavement with asphalt shoulders as shown on the Functional Plans. The Plans do not show where the change of material type from asphalt pavement to concrete pavement shall occur on either the typical sections (sheet 2A) or the proposed layout (sheets 12A-15A) sheets.	See RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway
1-25	Book 3, General (pg 2)	Bullet 6 states that I-75 existing concrete pavement shall be rehabilitated. Will TDOT provide the quantities of existing pavement to be rehabilitated so every Design-Builder will be rehabilitating the same amount of pavement?	This item will be covered under a future addendum to the RFP.
1-26	Book 3, Roadway (pg 23)	In Segment 4, the RFP states that work on the inside concrete shoulders will include concrete pavement repair and joint repair. Will TDOT provide the quantities of existing shoulder and joints to be repaired so every Design-Builder will be repairing the same amount of shoulder and joints?	This item will be covered under a future addendum to the RFP.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-27	Book 3, Appendix A	The Pavement Design for the Ramps shows concrete pavement for the roadway and shoulders. Please confirm that the concrete pavement applies to all Ramps, including all of the interstate-to-interstate ramps. Please confirm where TDOT wants the transition from asphalt to concrete to occur at the ramps. Is it at the gore nose or the physical nose? This information isn't shown on the <u>Functional Plans</u> .	Additional pavement guidance will be added to Appendix A.
1-28	Book 1, ATC (pg 12)	Will TDOT consider allowing electronic submissions only of the ATCs rather than hard copies and electronic copies.	No. Refer to Book 1, Page 12 Alternate Technical Concepts for ATC submittal requirements.
1-29	Book 3, Appendix B	The Signing and Marking Layout roll plots provide the blue, brown and green Guide Sign panels and their locations. Can TDOT provide the sign size for each of the large blue, brown, and green guide sign panels?	No. The Design-Builder will be responsible for determining sign sizes.
1-30	Book 1, Section A (pg 10)	Will there be a delay to the schedule if TDOT does NOT provide plan comments within 10 business days?	No.
1-31	Book 1, Section D (pg 23)	Item i. states to provide a detailed Traffic Analysis and Mitigation Report as described in RFP Form RC IV; there is no report required as part of the Form RC IV. Please confirm if the Traffic Analysis and Mitigation Report is required.	RFP will be revised under a future addendum to address this item.
1-32	Book 1, Section A.5 (pg 8)	Will TDOT consider allowing electronic submissions only of the ATCs rather than hard copies and electronic copies.	No. Refer to Book 1, Page 12 Alternate Technical Concepts for ATC submittal requirements.
1-33	Book 3, Appendix B	Can TDOT provide the as-built plans for the project?	TDOT does not maintain project as-built plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1-34	Book 3, Drainage (pg 18)	RFP states that the D-B shall video inspect and verify existing drainage systems are clean, operable and structurally adequate. Is this requirement only for the existing drainage systems that are to remain after construction or is this requirement for all existing drainage systems, even if they are to be removed during construction?	RFP will be revised under a future addendum to exclude drainage that is to be removed under the project. Video inspection of the existing drainage system is only required for the successful Design-Build team.
1-35	Book 3, Signing (pg 21)	The RFP states that all existing sign footings shall be removed 12 inches below ground line. If the existing sign footings will be located within the proposed roadway or shoulder, do the footings need to be removed 12 inches below the surface or 12 inches below the bottom of the asphalt or concrete pavement?	Book 3, Page 21, Signing - RFP will be revised under a future addendum to require existing sign footings to be removed 12 inches below ground line or 12 inches below bottom of subgrade if located within the proposed roadway or shoulder.
1-36	Book 3, ITS (pg 28)	Under Field Investigations, Paragraph 2 states the D-B shall conduct the field survey and provide a complete list of all ITS field devices tracked by the Department. In Paragraph 4, it states that the Department shall provide a complete list of all assets being tracked by the Department. Who is to provide this list and if it is TDOT, when will this list be provided?	Book 3, Page 28, ITS, Field Investigations - Information referred to in Paragraph 4 will be provided under a future addendum to the RFP.
1-37	Book 3, Geotechnical (pg 33)	The RFP states that the Department may limit when drilling activities or other geotechnical work may occur. Can you provide when TDOT will restrict these activities	Refer to Section 104.04 TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction and Special Provision 108B.
1-38	Book 3, Geotechnical (pg 33)	The RFP states that the Department may require the D-B to immediately halt drilling activities or other geotechnical work. Can you provide when TDOT will require this work to stop?	Refer to Section 104.04 TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction and Special Provision 108B.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 @ I-24 Interchange, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: August 24, 2018

Question #	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
2-1	Book 3, Appendix B	Can the department provide the CAD file of the existing wetland delineation limits as shown on the Present Layout sheets? The only wetlands shown in the base files are the in the HT075-05Proposed.dgn. These wetlands have been modified to show the final limits of the wetlands.	The updated survey file that includes the existing wetland areas, will be uploaded to the project website.
2-2	Book 3, Appendix B	The Preliminary Drainage Analysis wasn't provided as part of the additional information provided on TDOT's website on 8/13/18. Please provide.	Reference to "Preliminary Drainage Analysis" will be removed from the RFP. Drainage analysis will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
2-3	Book 3, Lighting (pg 22)	The RFP states that all existing lighting within the project limits shall be removed within the project limits. Please confirm if this includes the replacement of existing load centers.	Yes, replacement of the existing load centers is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
2-4	Book 3, Pavement Design (pg 23)	What pavement design guidelines does TDOT want the designers to follow - AASHTO 93 or AASHTO-ME?	AASHTO 93
2-5	Book 3, Roadway (pg 11)	In reviewing horizontal stopping sight (HSS) distance for the project, the segment of I-75 northbound and southbound within the route interchange does not meet HSS for 60 mph. The proposed roadway design has sight lines going through proposed parapets and median barriers. Will the Department correct this issue in the design or provide additional design exceptions?	TDOT is investigating this matter and will issue a response via future addendum.
2-6	Book 3, Roadway (pg 11)	In reviewing horizontal stopping sight (HSS) distance for the project, the bridge on the I-75 NB to I-24 WB ramp crossing over I-24 EB to I- 75 NB does not meet HSS for 60 mph. The proposed roadway design has sight lines going through the proposed parapet. Will the Department correct this issue in the design or provide additional design exceptions?	TDOT is investigating this matter and will issue a response via future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 at I-24 Interchange Modification, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No: DB1801

DATE: September 11, 2018

Question #	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3-1	Contract Book No. 1 Section A 8 Critical Path Method	Paragraph 2 states “The Design-Builder shall provide adequate time in the schedule for all parties involved with the Project to complete their work...” What period of time can the Design-Builder rely on for TDOT submittal reviews? The Design-Builder needs firm review periods that it can rely on to meet the requirements of the CPM Specification and to develop its proposal schedule and proposed calendar days.	Book 3, Page 6 states, “Ten (10) business days shall be allocated in the CPM Schedule for activities requiring the Department’s Review and Acceptance, or Review and Comment.”
3-2	Contract Book No. 1 Section A 8 Critical Path Method	Paragraph 2 states “The Design-Builder shall provide adequate time in the schedule for all parties involved with the Project to complete their work...” permitting agencies. What period(s) of time can the Design-Builder rely on for permitting agencies to complete their work? The Design-Builder needs firm review periods that it can rely on to meet the requirements of the CPM Specification and to develop its proposal schedule and proposed calendar days.	Book 3, Page 52 states, “The Design-Builder shall bear all cost and risks associated with applying for, obtaining, and complying with permits.” The Design-Builder will have to inquire with the permitting agencies directly to obtain this information, but the Department will not be responsible for delays to the project.
3-3	Contract Book 1 Section E 1(a)	The first paragraph states that the “Proposal consists of the Technical Proposal, the Price Proposal, and all required contract documents.” We assume that ‘all required contract documents’ means the Forms provided in Contract Book 2, Appendix C (except FORM CP&PB and FORM LC). Please confirm that this interpretation is correct. If not, please clarify what ‘contract documents’ are referred to.	The proposal shall include all the forms that mentioned in Book 1 under section I Forms.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 at I-24 Interchange Modification, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No: DB1801

DATE: September 11, 2018

3-4	Contract Book 1 Section E 2	We understand that the Price Proposal and bid bond will be submitted electronically; however, this project has not been posted on the internet site and we assume it will not be until the actual month of the ‘letting.’ Can the Department please provide an advance copy of the Price Proposal Schedule of Values that will be used?	The proposal schedule items are included in Contract Book 1 under schedule management.
3-5	Contract Book 1 Section I and Section O	Section I identifies the forms that are required to be included in the Technical Proposal, with Item 3 stating that FORM LC is to be submitted by the Apparent Design-Builder. Section O identifies the forms that must be included for a complete and responsive Proposal with Item 3 including FORM LC. Is FORM LC required to be included in the Technical Proposal or provided by the Apparent Design-Builder?	Form LC is required to be included in the proposal.
3-7	Contract Book 1 Section B 2	Will TDOT schedule a confidential meeting(s) to discuss ATC’s?	The Department will schedule a confidential meeting.
3-8	Contract Book 2 Section 1 – DBE Goal FORM TPSP	Section 1 states that the DBE Goal for this Project is 10%. On page 2 of FORM TPSP it states that the DBE Utilization Goal is 9%. Please clarify the DBE Goal for this Project.	The DBE Goal for this project is 10%. FORM TPSP will be revised under a future addendum to reflect this.
3-9	Contract Book 2, Appendix A, Special Provision 700, part 712.09	This section states, “The Department will pay for Uniformed Law Enforcement Officers provided by the Contractor at the invoice price of the work plus 5%”. Please confirm that cost for Uniformed Law Enforcement Officers should not be included in the Design-Builders cost proposal.	The Design Builders can include 2500 hours in their cost proposal. The Department will pay any hours exceeding 2500 with \$50 unit price as specified in the special provision, This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 at I-24 Interchange Modification, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No: DB1801

DATE: September 11, 2018

3-10	Contract Book 2 Special Provision 1240 Contract Book 3 On-The- Job/Apprenticeship Training	Contract Book 3 states that On-The-Job/Apprenticeship Training is required on this Project. Special Provision 1240 states that the number of training hours will be indicated in the Proposal and that payment will be made at the rate of \$0.80 per hour. What are the number of training hours required, is the total cost or value of training hours to be included in the Price Proposal, and how will the Design-Builder be paid?	The number of training hours will be in the bid file (EBS) with the unit price \$0.80 per hour.
3-11	Contract Book 3 Section 1 General Project Goals	The last bullet states, “Provide a visually pleasing finished product”. Does this goal require finishes beyond those incorporated into normal TDOT QPL products?	No.
3-12	Contract Book 3 Section 3 Deviations & Exceptions	Section 3 – Deviations & Exceptions states that no areas have been identified as requiring design exceptions, including existing shoulders in Segment 4, and that no design exceptions will be allowed without Department approval. It appears that there are other areas in the functional plans that would require design exceptions. For example, it appears that adequate horizontal sight distance is not provided on I-75 SB Bridges #2 & #3 and on Bridge #6. Will the Department approve design exceptions or design variances for substandard design, including these examples, found in the functional plans?	The Department is aware of these examples. The Department is processing the design exceptions for these areas. It will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 at I-24 Interchange Modification, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No: DB1801

DATE: September 11, 2018

3-13	Contract Book 3 Section 3 - Drainage	Section 3 of Contract Book 3 states “The re-use of existing drainage structures, pipes, etc. (except for underdrains) within the Project Limits is encouraged by the Department provided the facilities meet the requirements of the Contract and are not impacted by construction activities.” Is it the Department’s intent that even in areas or sections of the existing roadway where only mill and inlay is necessary and the existing underdrain is not impacted by construction it must be replaced?	See Book 3, page 11 under Roadway – General.
3-14	Contract Book 3 Appendix A	Appendix A does not provide pavement designs for I-75 Mainline or Spring Creek Road. We understand that an Addendum is forthcoming that will provide additional pavement guidance. Will the addendum also provide or clarify the pavement designs required for I-75 and Spring Creek Road?	The pavement design for I-75 was addressed in Addendum #1 dated 8/24/18. The pavement design for Spring Creek Road will be addressed in a future addendum.
3-15	Contract Book 3 Appendix A	Appendix A provides the pavement design for Ramps. Is this pavement design to be used for the entrance to (Ramp G) and exit from (Ramps F) the Welcome Center?	Yes, this was addressed with Addendum #1 dated 8/24/18.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75 at I-24 Interchange Modification, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No: DB1801

DATE: September 11, 2018

3-16	Standard Specifications, Section 106.06 Field Laboratory	Please confirm if a Type A or Type B Laboratory is required for this contract.	<p>A Type A and/or Type B lab is required dependent on the material being utilized per TDOT Specifications and Supplemental Specifications. Producers providing the type materials listed at the link below must be on TDOT's producers list. Only those facilities included on TDOT's Producers List for the material categories listed are approved for use on TDOT projects.</p> <p>https://www.tn.gov/tdot/materials-and-tests/producer-list.html</p>
3-17	Standard Specifications, Section 722 Field Office	Please confirm if a Type 1 or Type 2 Field Office is required for this contract.	Type 2 will be required.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: September 14, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-1	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans – Ramp D	In reviewing the horizontal alignments on the project, there are PI's without horizontal curves where the deflection angles exceed industry standard of practice (approximately 25 minutes for a design speed of 50 MPH). Will the Department concur these PI's will be acceptable design elements on the Ramp D alignment?	PI's shown in Functional Plans for Ramp D are acceptable.
4-2	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	In reviewing the acceleration lane length of Ramp F, the current configuration does not meet the minimum acceleration length of 793 ft as defined in Green Book tables 10-3, and 10-4. Will the Department concur that the shorter acceleration lane length shown in the functional plans is acceptable? If not, will the Department require a design exception for the shown acceleration lane?	The Design-Builder shall design Ramp F to meet the minimum acceleration length shown in the Green Book. No design exception will be considered related to this situation.
4-3	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	In reviewing the horizontal alignments on the project, the several spiral lengths used do not meet the minimum spiral length as defined by equations 3-26 and 3-27 in the Green Book. Additionally, there are spiral lengths that exceed the maximum length of a spiral as defined by equation 3-28. Will the Department concur that the spiral lengths shown in the functional plans are acceptable? If not, will the Department require a design exception for these spirals?	The Design-Builder shall be required to meet the Green Book requirements for all spiral lengths. No design exceptions will be considered related to this situation.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-4	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	The design speed (based on the radii given in the functional plans) for Ramps G and F are below the lower range (50%) of the Highway Design speed as shown in Green Book Table 10-1. On page 10-89 under the section labeled “General Ramp Design Considerations” the Green Book states “... <i>lower design speeds may be selected, but they should not be less than the low range presented in Table 10-1.</i> ” I-75 mainline design speed equals 60 MPH and Ramp G design speed equals 20 MPH. This represents a speed differential of 40 MPH. Table 10-1 states the speed differential should not exceed 30 MPH at the lower range (50%). Will the Department concur that the design speed differential shown in the functional plans is acceptable? If not, will the Department require a design exception for the design speed differential on these ramps?	Functional plans will be revised to provide 25 mph design speed on Ramp F. Ramp G alignment ties into an existing condition. A deceleration lane of adequate length will be provided. The speed differential shown in the functional plans is acceptable.
4-5	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway-General and Functional Plans section does not specify the design speed for Ramps A, B, C, D, E, F, G & H. Will the Department provide the required design speed for these ramps?	Refer to RFP Book 3, Section 3 (Roadway, Design Requirements) (Page 11- Last Paragraph).
4-6	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	RFP Book 3, Page 12, specifies dimensions for inside and outside shoulders for Ramps G & F however the existing ramps have curb and gutter typical section. Is it the Department’s intent to have curb and gutter along the proposed portions of Ramps G & F?	No curb and gutter is proposed along ramps G & H within the project limits.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-7	RFP Book 3, Page 24, Bridges General	RFP Book 3, Page 24-26, Bridges General does not specify any requirement for concrete pavement at the bridge ends. Will the Department require concrete pavement at the bridge ends?	It is current TDOT Structures Division policy to place concrete pavement at bridge ends for structures on all Interstate and State Routes as shown on the functional plans.
4-8	RFP Book 3, Page 23, Roadway – Pavement Design Report and Appendix A – Pavement Design	Can the Department provide the minimum design criteria and required design methodologies to aid the design builder in ATC pavement designs?	A pavement schedule has been provided showing the minimum allowable paving. ATC development will fully be the responsibility of the design-builder.
4-9	General	Will the Department provide the GeoPak Drainage files for the project?	The Department will not provide it.
4-10	RFP Book 3, Page 11, Roadway - General and Functional Plans	If Ramp G & F require curb and gutter on the proposed segments, will Table 3-10b, 2011 AASHTO Green Book still be the applicable superelevation table for these ramp segments?	No curb and gutter is proposed along ramps G & H within the project limits.
4-11	Functional Plans and GPK Data	<p>The profile for I-75 SB to I-24 WB has the following discrepancies between the GPK and the functional plans. Which is profile correct functional plans or GPK?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a 42.31' curve with a PVI of 842+46.88 that is in the GPK but not shown in the plans. 2. There is a 100.00' curve with a PVI of 828+91.71 that is shown in the plans but is not in the GPK. 3. There is a 100.00' curve with a PVI of 830+05.11 that is shown in the plans but is not in the GPK. 	The profile on the functional plans is correct. Updated GPK files will be posted on the website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-12	Reference Material Functional Plans	On Sheet 2 of the functional plans, the superelevated typical section of I-75 shows the inside lane on the low side of the superelevation to be sloped to the inside shoulder at a 2%. However, with 8% superelevation rates for much of the project, this would be a 10% rollover. Also, the functional plans cross sections show the inside lane slope matching the superelevation. The inside lane matching the superelevation is the standard practice for this type of interstate. Please confirm which is correct. Typical Section or Cross Sections?	The typical section on the functional plans will be revised.
4-13	Reference Material Floodplain Feasibility Reports	In each of the provided floodplain feasibility reports, it is stated that the City of East Ridge rules and regulations for Water and Sewers (Title 18, Section 18-502 (5ii)) states: <i>“For land within the one hundred (100) year flood plain, no net increase in fill may result from the fill activity except by council approval.”</i> As part of the project, and as shown in the functional plans, there is a net increase in fill in East Ridge, specifically around/adjacent to the welcome center. Has TDOT received council approval for the fill activity? If not, will TDOT be seeking this approval?	As a state agency, TDOT will not be seeking local government approval. Coordination has taken place between TDOT and the City of East Ridge.
4-14	Reference Material D-List Re-Evaluation +	The D-List Reevaluation provided as reference material refers to several attachments and appendices that apparently were part of the re-evaluation document. Can the Department provide these attachments and appendices?	Yes. Information requested will be posted to the website.
4-15	RFP Contract Book 1 FORM QR	Are the Department’s responses to questions provided on FORM QR contractually binding? If so, what is the order of precedence of the responses (re: RFP Contract Book 2, Section L)?	Yes. Form QR responses are contractually binding. The Form QR will be part of the technical proposal.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-16	RFP Contract Book 1 Section D 3	Section D 3 indicates that a CPM Time Schedule meeting the requirements of the Contract be include in Response Category III. CPM schedules for a project of this magnitude and complexity can often be very large and more easily reviewable when printed on 11x17 inch paper. Is the CPM Schedule included in the maximum 75-page count limitation? Can the CPM Schedule be provided on 11x17 inch paper (printed double-sided) and in a separate binder as an appendix or attachment to the Technical Proposal?	Refer to Book 1 Section E.1 a for paper size requirements, Category II through IV page count limitations, and organization. (Pages 24-26).
4-17	RFP Contract Book No. 1 Section D 4	Section D 4. Response Category IV: Technical Solutions, paragraph b, states “Conceptual plan drawings, etc. within the Technical Proposal (These plans are in addition and separate from the ROW Acquisition Sheets required in Contract Book 3...” Can the Department confirm that the Conceptual Plans, drawings, etc. are not included in the Technical Proposal maximum 75-page count and that these drawings, etc. be provided in a separate binder as an appendix or attachment to the Technical Proposal?	Yes, the Conceptual Plans, drawings, etc. are not included in the Technical Proposal maximum 75-page count and that these drawings, etc. be provided in a separate binder as an appendix or attachment to the Technical Proposal.
4-18	RFP Contract Book 1 Section E	Section E states that ‘double-sided pages’ shall be used and that responses to Response Categories II through IV are limited to a maximum of ‘75-page count (not pages).’ Our interpretation is that printing shall be double sided and that each side of the ‘double-sided’ page counts as 1 page towards the 75-page maximum page count. Is this correct?	75 sheets of paper

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-19	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 5	Section 5. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) directs the Proposers to refer to the ITS Roll Plots provided as Reference Material for guidance in regards to proposed ITS facilities. These roll plots indicate the scope of ITS work extends to E. Brainerd Road on I-75 and to Belvoir Ave on I-24. These limits are well beyond the project limits described in Section 1. Can the Department clarify/confirm the ITS scope and construction limits of the ITS work to be included in Contract DB1801?	The scope of the ITS work shall match the limits of Section 1 as defined in the RFP. Revised ITS Roll Plots showing the Section 1 limits will be made available.
4-20	RFP Contract Book No. 3 Section 7 Right-of-Way	Section 7. Right of Way, states "... Department does not anticipate the need for additional Right-of-Way." Please confirm that no right-of-way services are to be provided by the Design-Builder and that no ROW Acquisition sheets are required for the Technical Proposal or final plans.	Refer to Book 3, Section 7 (Right-of-Way) for Design-Builder requirements.
4-21	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 9 Environmental	Section 9 of RFP Contract Book 3 states that the Design-Builder is to adhere to all project commitments included in the NEPA document. Can TDOT confirm that the Design-Builder is only responsible for the commitments and requirements that are applicable within the DB101 construction limits? For example, the approved NEPA identifies five noise barriers that are feasible and reasonable but only the noise barrier North of I-24/I75 Interchange between Spring Creek Road and Eastgate Loop is within the DB1801 construction limits and hazardous materials are identified on the S. Moore Road and McBrien Road bridges over I-24 which is outside the DB1801 project limits.	Design-Builder will be responsible for project commitments within the project limits.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-22	Addendum #1 Procurement Schedule	According to the revised procurement schedule, the anticipated deadline for TDOT issuance of the last Addendum is November 2nd and the Technical and Price Proposals are due November 9 th . This schedule only provides 1 week between the last addendum and submission of the proposals. Depending upon the significance and magnitude of changes, 1 week is no sufficient time to make changes, if needed, to the Technical Proposal and perhaps even the Price Proposal. We request that a minimum of 2 weeks be schedules. Will TDOT revise the schedule to provide for 2 weeks between the last addendum and the proposal submission date?	Per RFP contract book 1, section c Addenda: “The Department may issue Addenda up to five (5) Calendar Days prior to the Proposal Due Date, unless the Department extends the Proposal Due Date concurrent with the issuance of the Addendum.
4-23	Book 3, Section 5 ITS Roll Plots	Per the RFP: “The Design-Builder shall maintain the existing fiber conduit, electrical conduit and communications to the greatest extent possible. If fiber conduit relocation is required, the Design-Builder shall design and install the relocated fiber line and splice it into the existing fiber line prior to the start of any roadway construction.” This suggests that it is permissible to only replace the segments of fiber optic trunk cable where impacted by roadway construction. However the ITS roll plots show new fiber optic trunk cable beyond the limits of roadway construction. Please clarify that the ITS roll plots are correct in terms of where the new fiber optic trunk cable and reel end splices shall be installed.	This section refers to the possibility that existing fiber optic and electrical conduits & cables may have to be relocated or replaced with new, temporary cables & conduits during construction to maintain ITS communications throughout the project limits. All ITS infrastructure shown on the ITS Roll Plots, including fiber optic trunk cable shall be all new. Revised ITS Roll Plots depicting the Section 1 limits defined in the RFP will be made available.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-24	RFP Book 3, Section 5	Per the RFP: “The Design-Builder shall reuse the existing DMS support structures to the greatest extent possible.” Also per the RFP: “All proposed DMS signs and supporting equipment shown on the ITS Roll Plot shall be new. All existing DMS signs and supporting equipment shall be removed and returned to the Department at a location to be determined.” Please clarify if an existing DMS structure can be used.	All proposed DMS signs and supporting equipment shown on the ITS Roll Plots shall be new. The RFP & the ITS Roll Plots shall be revised to reflect this.
4-25	Reference Material, Book 2, Section 8.2.1.1.a	Per the RFP, “CCTV Camera System shall be placed at fixed locations as shown on the Plans to provide full coverage within the project limits including the mainline travel lanes and shoulders.” Please provide further clarification of the Department’s definition of “full coverage.” Should this include all of the paved areas including the on and off ramps, underneath bridges/overpasses, full shoulder coverage including pavement adjacent to barrier walls, with no video obstruction due to signs and/or landscaping?	See Book 2, Section 9.2.1.1.a. Full coverage shall include travel lanes, paved areas, on and off ramps, under bridges/overpasses and full shoulder coverage w/o obstruction due to barrier walls, signs, and/or trees.
4-26	RFP Book 3, Page 26, Noise Walls	RFP Book 3 states “The top of wall elevation shall not be less than the top of wall elevation as shown in the noise analysis.” The roadway stationing used in noise analysis (Appendix F – CE document) related to NAA 7 do not match the functional plans stationing. Will TDOT provide updated stations, offsets, and elevation for the proposed noise wall?	A re-evaluation of the noise analysis will be conducted on the Design-Builder’s final design to determine the exact location and limits of the noise wall. The stationing of the updated noise analysis will be consistent with the Design-Builder’s stationing used in the plans.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-27	RFP Book 3, Page 26, Noise Walls	If the proposed noise wall cannot be placed on the levee, will TDOT provide updated stations, offsets, and elevation for the proposed noise wall?	Functional plans will be revised to relocate the portion of the noise wall that is on the levee.
4-28	Floodplain Feasibility Report I-75/I-24 and Ramp D Bridges Over Spring Creek	The report states, “It is not likely that 100-year backwater can be brought into compliance with TDOT’s guidelines.” Is TDOT allowing a variance from the guideline that states a maximum of 1.0 ft. backwater can be imposed by a proposed bridge?	<p>The context of that statement about compliance with TDOT’s backwater guidelines relates to the existing bridges:</p> <p>The existing bridge at South Chickamauga Creek causes 1.4 feet of backwater.</p> <p>The existing bridges at Spring Creek cause 1.9 feet of backwater.</p> <p>This cannot feasibly be overcome by the proposed design. A design variance for backwater will not be required, but a design that causes no increase to BFEs is desired/encouraged.</p>
4-29	RFP Book 3, Drainage	If the Design-Builder, in process of building the project, encounters damaged existing drainage pipes and/or structures, how will TDOT compensate the Design-Builder for this work? Will this be considered “extra work”?	Design-Builder will be responsible for verifying the condition of all pipes within the project limits that are to remain.
4-30	RFP Book 3, Structures, Page 24	The RFP states the mainline I-75 bridges over Spring Creek must be new. Would the Department allow the reuse of the existing mainline I-75 bridges over Spring Creek in whole or in part if it was shown to be a feasible option by the Design-Builder?	Refer to Book 1, Section B.2 (Alternative Technical Concepts – Submittal Requirements and Authorization to Use) (Page 12).

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4-31	RFP Book 1, Page 23	The RFP states “The Technical Proposal shall include half-size plan sheets depicting those elements required by the RFP.” Do the half-size plan sheets count towards the 75 page technical proposal page count?	The 75 sheets don’t count towards the 75 page technical proposal. It could be added in a separate binder.
4-32	Book 3, Pavement Design	The pavement design in Appendix A does not provide information for Spring Creek Road. Also, the traffic data pdf provided as part of the Reference Material does not include traffic information for Spring Creek Road. Please provide both.	<p>Pavement design for Spring Creek Road will be added to Appendix A. This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.</p> <p>Traffic data for Spring Creek Road will be added to the Reference Material.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: September 26, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-1	RFP Book 3, Page 74, Miscellaneous – Welcome Center	Can the maximum time of closure of the Welcome Center (currently 21 calendar days) be revised to allow a longer closure?	The Department is reviewing this and if an extension of the allowed closure time of the Welcome Center is deemed appropriate, an addendum will be issued.
5-2	RFP Book 2, Page 11, Date of Commencement and Completion of Services – Completion Dates	In consideration of the likelihood of a USACE Section 404 permit being required, will the Department consider extending the “not later than” date to accommodate the time required to acquire this permit?	The Department will revise the “not later than” date to August 31, 2023.
5-3	RFP Book 2, Special Provision SP108B	SP108B states, “In addition to temporary lane closures, the Design-Builder will be allowed up to four (4) weekend closures of interstate-to-interstate ramps within the interchange.” Is this four (4) weekends per ramp or a total of four (4) weekends for all ramps?	The Design-Builder will be allowed up to a TOTAL of four (4) weekend closures of interstate-to-interstate ramps.
5-4	Book 3, Section 9 Environmental, Mitigation of Streams and Wetlands	Does the Department have available stream or wetland mitigation credits earmarked this project?	No.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-5	Book 3, Roadway, General Book 3, Addendum A	<p>Under the Segment 4 description in Section 3 Roadway, General (pg 11), I-75 is to be widened with outside asphalt shoulders.</p> <p>In Appendix A, the Pavement Design Tables on pg 72, the I-75 (Segment 4) is to have an outside shoulder of B – Concrete Pavement.</p> <p>Please clarify what the I-75 Segment 4 outsider shoulder material is to be.</p>	Segment 4 should read “will consist of widening the existing roadway and outside shoulders with concrete, rehabilitating the existing concrete pavement, extending existing cross drain culvers, widening the Chickamauga Creek bridge, and constructing retaining walls, guardrail, signs and pavement markings.
5-6	ITS	For the ITS, please clarify how many fibers in the 12-strand fiber optic drop cables shall be spliced to the fiber optic trunk cable for each ITS site that will contain an Ethernet switch.	There will be four (4) fibers out of the 12-strand fiber optic drop cables that will be spliced into the fiber optic trunk cable for each ITS site that will contain an Ethernet switch.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-7	<p>Book 3, Section 5 Book 2, Section 11.3</p>	<p>Book 3 Section 5 states the following: “The Design-Builder shall remove and replace the existing RDS detection devices and support structures with all new RDS detection devices and support structures that meet the requirements of Special Provision 725”, “ All the existing RDS devices and support structures shall be returned to the Department,” and “If an existing light standard is utilized as a RDS support structure, the Design-Builder shall not remove the light standard, only the RDS equipment.”</p> <p>Book 2 states the following: “The various mounting configurations include: attaching to new light standard poles where the wiring shall be installed inside the pole; attaching to new CCTV poles where the wiring shall be installed inside the pole, and attaching to existing light poles where conduit risers will be required on the outside of the pole.”</p> <p>These statements seem to be in conflict with each other. Should the existing light standards that are used only for existing RDS equipment be removed or shall they remain in place given that the existing RDS equipment will be removed? Can new RDS equipment be co-located on the same light standard pole as a new luminaire?</p>	<p>Refer to Book 3, Section 3 (Lighting) (Page 22) for lighting requirements.</p> <p>If there are existing light standards that are used only for existing RDS equipment and the new RDS equipment is to be installed in the same location, the light standard can remain in place. If new RDS equipment is not to be replaced in the same location, the existing light standard is to be removed.</p> <p>New RDS equipment can be co-located on the same light standard pole as a new luminaire.</p>
5-8	Reference Material	Please provide the most recent Structure Memorandums?	It will be posted on the website

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-9	Book 3, Section 3	Is the intent of the BMPs to be temporary or permanent?	Best Management Practices are to be used in the design for both temporary and permanent measures.
5-10	Book 3, Section 3	Are stormwater management facilities required to detain the added impervious area? Are there any requirements on allowable proposed flow at outfalls?	TDOT does not currently have a detention policy that requires peak discharges or volumes to be controlled at outfalls.
5-11	Book 1, Section D.2.b.1, Page 18	Please define the terms “Major Subcontractors” and “Major Participants” and state the difference between the two if any?	The term, “Major Participants” is defined in the Design-Build Guidance.
5-12	Book 1, Section D.4.c., Page 23	Book 1 states, “The Technical Proposal shall include half-size plan sheets depicting those elements required by the RFP.” Will 11 x 17 paper work instead of the standard half-size sheets?	Yes, that will be acceptable
5-13	Book 1, Appendix, Form RC-IV	Form RC IV, Item 11 states, “Attach a copy of any approved ATCs used in this Technical Proposal.” Will the inclusion of the ATCs count toward the max page count?	The inclusion of the ATCs will not count toward the max page count
5-14	Book 1, Section E, 1.1, page 26	Response Categories II-IV states, “The forms provided for response shall be used for the information requested.” Every Category will require additional space, can the actual forms not be included, but the Proposal structured in the same order as the information that is being requested?	That will be acceptable

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-15	Book 3 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS	Is it the intent that the fiber line relocation occur before any roadway construction within the area of the relocation or roadway construction within the jobsite?	Within the area of relocation.
5-16	Book 3, LIGHTING	This section states that all lighting is to be replaced within project limits including underpass lighting, local streets and welcome center? Please clarify exactly which lights. (i.e. does this include the lights inside the Welcome Center?)	All lighting within the construction limits are to be replaced. This will include any lighting on ramps to the Welcome Center that are within the construction limits. Lights outside of the construction limits in the rest area are not included.
5-17	Book No. 3 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS	Please provide the locations where the existing DMS signs and supports are to be returned to the Department?	TBD
5-18	RFP Book No 3 – Project Specific Information (Page 6) – Functional Plans Drainage Maps (Pages 47-47A)	RFP Book No. 3 states that within the project limits, there are 8 major outfalls that the design builder shall use to discharge surface runoff from the project right of way. The Drainage Map in the Functional Plans lists 12 outfalls. Please confirm exactly which outfalls can be used.	Due to the limits of phasing that TDOT has selected for the project, there are actually 9 outfalls for the project. In addition to the 8 listed in Book No. 3, the 48” RCP at Sta. 693+66.27 is within the project limits for this contract. The other outfalls shown on the Drainage Map that are east of the 8’x8’ box culvert are not within the project limits. The RFP will be revised to add this outfall under future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-19	QR – 2-2 & Appendix B	QR 2-2 States that reference to “Preliminary Design Analysis” will be removed from the RFP. Drainage analysis will be the responsibility of the Design Builder. Will the Department be furnishing a SUE Report for the project?	No.
5-20	RFP Book 3, Appendix A, Pavement Design Section A	Remark 1 on Pavement design “A” states 7” of PERF “A-mix” To be applied at equal lifts. Is this remark meant for item 307-03.01, AC MIX (PG76-22) GR “A”?	Yes
5-21	Book No. 3 Project Specific Information (Page 13) – Book No. 1 Prohibited Design Builder Communications (Page 7)	Book 3 states “The Design Builder shall not impact the Brainerd Levee Pump Station located within the existing R.O.W. For clarification please contact Bill Payne, City Engineer”. Book No. 1 states that the Design Builder shall not contact stakeholders regarding the RFP. Can Design Builders contact Public/Private Utilities within the ROW concerning their facilities?	The Design-Builders shall not contact stakeholders staff regarding the RFP content or the requirements for the Project. Stakeholder staff includes employees of the Department, city(ies) and county(ies) in which the Project or any part of it are located during the procurement phase.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-22	RFP Book 3, Section 4, Page 26	This section states, “The golf cart path and greenway shall have adequate protection for pedestrians, proper lighting, and remain open at all times during project duration.” What are the minimum dimensions of the path and greenway that must be maintained?	The cart path and greenway must have a clear, unobstructed width of not less than six feet (6’) and any section under bridges must be covered and have a clear and unobstructed ceiling height of not less than eight feet (8’). The interior of the covered walkway shall be lighted at all times. Lights shall be installed on the ceiling and the level of illumination shall be the equivalent of that produced by 100-watt, 1,700-lumen minimum, standard incandescent lamps enclosed in vandal-resistant fixtures and spaced fifteen feet (15’) apart.
5-23	RFP Book 3, Section 3, Page 13	What does the Design-Builder have to do to manage the pumps & levee?	The Department is setting up a meeting with the City to discuss this and will provide more detailed information once it is available.
5-24	RFPR Book 3, Section 3, Page 14	The section states, “Deviations from horizontal (greater than 5.0 feet) and vertical alignment (any change) as shown on the Functional Plans will require an Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) with Department approval.” Can the ATC requirement be removed for vertical deviations?	The RFP has been revised to delete the ATC requirement related to vertical alignment deviations. However, the Design-Builder is responsible for ensuring no negative impacts result from the proposed realignment.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5-25	RFP Book 3, Appendix A	Can the Department provide the required structural number for alternate pavement designs?	The required structural number is 6.26. This information has been added to Appendix A.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: October 3, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-1	RFP Book No. 3 Section 2 Project Management, Construction Quality Management Plan	Paragraph 3 of this section states “the Construction Manager shall be responsible for QC during construction and ensuring QC testing and inspections are performed in accordance with the CQMP and the Contract Documents.” We understand that it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to insure construction inspections are performed in accordance with the CQMP. Please confirm the Department will provide the construction inspectors to perform all construction quality control and quality assurance testing and inspections and that the role of the CQM’s quality staff is to ensure that the Work Product has been checked and/or inspected by TDOT CEI staff and found in compliance with the Contract Documents.	The Department will perform QA/QC for this project. Book 2, Section A – 11 refers to the Quality Plan as outlined in Chapter 2 of the Design-Build Guidance.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-2	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3 and Appendix A	The description of Segment 4 states that the existing road is to be widened with concrete pavement and outside asphalt shoulders. Appendix A provided with Addendum 1 states that the outside shoulders in Segment 4 are to be concrete. Can the Department confirm the required pavement design for outside shoulders in Segment 4?	The description of Segment 4 should read "...will consist of widening the existing roadway and outside shoulders with concrete, rehabilitating the existing concrete pavement, extending existing cross drain culvers, widening the Chickamauga Creek bridge, and constructing retaining walls, guardrail, signs and pavement markings." This will be revised in an upcoming addendum.
6-3	Amendment #2	Amendment #2 revises the design speed for I-75 and the interstate-to-interstate ramps. Amendment #2 also clarifies that the Design-Builder is responsible for IAR modifications and approvals needed because of deviations from the Functional Plans or the IAR. Who is responsible for the modification and approval of the IAR due to the change in design speed and if TDOT is responsible, will the modification and approval be accomplished before submission of the Technical and Price Proposals or post award? If post award, what period of time can the Design-Builder rely on for this process to be completed?	TDOT is already processed the concurrence letter to FHWA for the design speed.
6-4	Book 1, A.4.g. Communication (Page 7)	Is communication with regulatory officials allowed for purpose of further defining permit requirements?	Any questions or concerns must be submitted through the QR form to TDOT. Please refer to response 5-21

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-5	Book 2, E.4 Compensation - Payments for Extra Work (Page 11) Design-Build Standard Guidance 2.11.2 (Page 17)	If differing site conditions are encountered between the Geotechnical Report provided by TDOT in the RFP and Geotechnical Investigation performed by the Design-Builder per Book 3 (page 32), will this constitute extra work that is eligible for additional compensation?	No. The Geotechnical Report provided by TDOT is for informational purposes only. As stated in Book 3, page 32, "The Design-Builder shall determine the amount and level of the geotechnical investigations to cover geological risks associated with this Project." The Design-Builder shall be responsible for the Final Geotechnical Report
6-6	Book3 4. Structures - Noise Walls (Page 26) Functional Plans 16A & 17A	It is stated that, "The traffic face of the walls shall be absorptive where designated in the plans." No such designation is shown on plans; thus, can we assume this is not applicable?	A noise study will be conducted based upon the Design-Builder's design. A determination of the wall's face type will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.
6-7	Book 1 Appendix B - Reference Documents Geotechnical Reports (Page 73)	Will TDOT provide the raw gINT files for the soil boring data?	The raw files will be added to the project website.
6-8	Book 1.B.3 Calendar Days (Page 15) & Book 3 - Liquidated Damages (Page 7) SP108B (Page 1, 2, 3)	Are the various amounts of liquidated damages, noted in SP108B in addition to those set forth in TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction dated January 1, 2015, Section 108.09, Table 108.091-.	In accordance with Section 105.04 of the TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction dated January 1, 2015, in case of discrepancy, SP108B shall supersede the Standard Specifications. Therefore, the Liquidated Damages shown in Table 108.09 are not applicable to this project.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-9	Reference Material/ Hydraulics Spring Creek	Will TDOT provide the cross-sections from the hydraulic designer shown on Exhibit A-5 from the Floodplain Feasibility report over Spring Creek as a DGN or Shape file format?	The cross-sections will be added to the project website in Shape File format.
6-10	Book 3, Section 9 Page 47	The RFP in the referenced section states that the Design-Builder is responsible to make sure all features from the EBR are field verified. The Design-Builder is also responsible for any mitigation for impacts to environmental features included in the EBR or additional features identified prior to and during construction. Is it the Department's intent that the Design-Builder base all wetland mitigation costs for their bid on the wetland boundaries provided in the EBR as shown in the functional plan survey files? If additional features are identified during construction or the limits of already identified wetlands increase, will the Department compensate the Design-Builder for these additional mitigation costs?	The Design-Builder is responsible for all mitigation costs associated with the project. If additional features are identified during construction or the limits of already identified wetlands increase, the Department will not compensate the Design-Builder for these additional costs.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-11	Book3 9. Environmental/ Permits	Page 53 states, "Section 26a is not applicable because the project is located outside of TVA's jurisdiction." However, Page 56 under Water Quality Specific Requirements references, "Section 26a of the TVA Act of 1933.. . which implies that this permit is required. Please clarify whether or not a Section 26a permit is required. If so, does the completion schedule account for the long duration for acquiring this permit?"	The RFP language on page 53 will be revised in a future addendum.
6-12	RFP Book 3, Page 13, General	Can TDOT ask the City of Chattanooga to provide a detailed explanation of how the levee/flood system operates (including flood control features)? Specifically, detailed information on how the pump stations operate and when, pump station plans, pump station equipment details and specifications, and any requirements for the pump station outlets in the interchange. How is the pump station discharge handled within the interchange infield areas? What modifications can be made to the pump station outlets (i.e. change in outlet location/elevation/slope, change in travel path of outlet discharge, additional outlet pipe length, and any other critical factors related to the outlets)?	This question was answered in QR5.
6-13	RFP Book 3, Page 26, Noise Walls	Can TDOT please provide SP 718NB for use by the Design-Build teams at this time?	This is included in RFP Book2.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6-14	RFP Book 3, Page 18, Existing Drainage Systems	If the Design-Builder encounters unknown, damaged drainage structures during construction, will TDOT be open to participating in cost-sharing with Design-Builder to repair/replace these structures?	The referenced section states, “The Design-Builder shall video inspect and verify existing drainage systems are clean, operable and structurally adequate... Any repairs, replacements, debris removal and/or deficiencies shall be corrected by the Design-Builder...The Design-Builder shall replace or supplement any pipes or culverts that are deemed hydraulically of structurally deficient in the existing condition or as a result of this Project.” The Department will not bare any costs associated with damaged drainage structures encountered during construction.
6-15	Book No. 3 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS	Please provide the locations where the existing DMS signs and supports are to be returned to the Department?	Decommissioned DMS signs and supports should be delivered to the TDOT Maintenance at: 7512 Volkswagonn Drive Chattanooga, TN 37416 Please contact the Region 2 Operations Engineer at (423) 510-1132 to arrange delivery.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: October 3, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-1	RFP Book 3, page 44-45 Compensable Utilities	Utility relocation is compensable when the utility company has prior rights-of-way or compensable interest. What is included in the definition of compensable interest? Private easement?	When a utility is off our ROW the Department considers them to have a compensable interest. This means that any utilities located off our ROW that need to be relocated are reimbursable. Any replacement easement costs associated with that utility would also be reimbursable/compensable.
7-2	RFP Contract Book 3, Page 72, Appendix A	Addendum 2 provides SP503, detailing diamond grinding of the PCC in Segment 4. The Pavement Design (A) as specified in the Pavement design table attached in Addendum 1 shows asphalt overlay of this same area. Please clarify if Asphalt overlay is required after profile grinding segment 4.	Asphalt overlay is not required for existing concrete pavement in Segment 4. The RFP will be revised in an upcoming addendum.
7-3	SP 718NB Regarding Sound-Absorbing Noise Barriers: Section 2.1	What is the Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) of the proposed sound-absorbing noise barrier panels?	A determination of the wall's face type will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7-4	REP Book 3, Page 64, Temporary Lane/Road closure and Reference materials: I75 Traffic Control Pages 2 and 4.	On Spring Creek Bridge is traffic to be maintained in 1 lane each direction (i.e., 2 total lanes) or 2 lanes each direction (i.e. 4 total lanes)? The Traffic Control reference materials show 1 lane each direction. Please clarify?	One lane in each direction (2 traffic lanes) will be allowed for activities shown in Phases 1 and 2 on traffic control reference materials. Two lanes in each direction (4 traffic lanes) will be required during all other phases of project construction.
7-5	Reference Material – “Walls and Bridges” PDF files & “Functional-Plans” PDF Files	The Typical Sections on “Functional -Plans” do not match the Typical Sections on “Walls and Bridges” and the Cross-sections on “Functional -Plans”. Finished Grade locations are also differ from each other. Please clarify.	The “Walls and Bridges” have been updated and will be posted to the project website.
7-6	Reference material – “Walls and Bridges” PDF files	On the Preliminary Layout sheet for Bridge No. 10, bridge deck Finish Grade elevations appear to be incorrect. With proposed BT-63, low girder elevation is approximately 677.24, is there any concern with this reduced clearance or freeboard?	The “Walls and Bridges” have been updated and will be posted to the project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: October 3, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-1	Contract Book 2 Table of Contents Insurance and Bonding Requirements Page 12 – G1	States, “Design-Builder shall maintain in full force.....all of the insurance coverage’s required under Design-Build Standard Guidance”. Then, Design-Build Standard Guidance 2.16. a Commercial General Liability says “Combined single limit per occurrence shall not be less than the dollar amount indicated in the contract.” Thus the question, what limit is TDOT requiring?	The Contractor shall provide proof of adequate and appropriate general liability insurance providing liability coverage in an amount not less than \$1 million dollars per occurrence and \$300,000 per claimant, naming the State of Tennessee as an additional insured. This is the standard minimum amount of general liability insurance coverage required in TDOT’s construction contracts.
8-2	Design Build Standard Guidance, Insurance 2.16	Professional Liability says, “The Design-Builder shall provide the Professional Liability (Errors and Omissions or “E&O”) Insurance through this Design consultant”. Then, Contract Book 2, G 1 says “The Design-Builder, being an independent contractor, agrees to maintain errors andn omissions insurance in such an amount (\$1,000,000.00 minimum) and form as agreeable to the Department. Thus the question, is the Design Builder required to carry Professional Liability as well as the Design Consultant? If so, is \$1,000,000.00 required limit?	No, the Design-Builder shall provide the Professional Liability (Errors and Omissions or “E&O”) Insurance through the Design consultant, as stated in the Design Build Standard Guidance at Section 2.16(a) Insurance.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-3	Contract Book 3 Table of Contents 7 Right-of-Way Page 41	Specifies “Fidelity Bond: The Design-Builder shall furnish a fidelity bond in the amount of \$250,000.00 with the State being made the insured for the period of time from the first offer to the owners until all tracts have a recorded deed or vouchers submitted for condemnation, in such a form as approved by the State. The bond shall indicate the State’s ROW project number (both Federal and State numbers if applicable)”. Thus the question, can they provide us a sample form?	There is no standard form for the fidelity bond, but the Department will post an example on the website.
8-4	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3 - Roadway	The Typical Section for I-75, STA 406+62.00 to 443+85.00 and the Proposed Layouts provided in the Functional Plans indicate that the existing pavement is to be widened were necessary to provide from 4 to 6 travel lanes with appropriate travel lane and shoulder tapers from 436+05 to 443+85 NB and from 439+95 to 443+85 SB. The Functional Plan Cross Sections indicate that existing pavement is to be widened to accommodate a future 5th lane from 436+05 to 443+85 NB and from 439+95 to 443+85 SB. Can the Department please clarify the scope of pavement widening required from STA 439+95 to 443+85 NB and SB?	Refer to Book 3 Section 3 page 12. Widening from station 439+95 to 443+85 will include a future 5 th lane. Functional plans show lane configuration for Phase 1, which represents the work to be performed under this project. The ultimate number of lanes is shown in the Interstate Access Report (IAR)-Ultimate Design, which is to be completed under a future project.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-5	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 9 - Environmental	Has TDEC and the USACE accepted the jurisdictional determination of the water features as portrayed in the approved D-List Categorical Exclusion and in the TDOT Environmental Boundaries Report?	<p>The Department has not conducted a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) with the USACE or a water resource verification with TDEC on this project. The Design-Builder should be directed to Section 9 of the RFP which states, in part:</p> <p><i>“The Design-Builder is responsible to make sure all features from the Environmental Boundaries Report (EBR) ,provided by the Department’s Region 2 Environmental Tech Office, are field verified.”</i></p>
8-6	FORM QR Question/Answer 4-15	The response to Question 4-15 was that FORM QR will become part of the Contract and that the Department’s answers is contractually binding. What is the order of precedence of FORM QR and the responses (re: RFP Contract Book 2, Section L)?	Where conflicts arise, the responses provided in the QR form supersede the original Contract Book 1, 2, 3, and any Addendum issued prior to the date an individual Q/R response is posted. Addenda issued after a posted Q/R response supersede any prior Q/R response.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8-7	FORM QR Question/Answer 7-4	<p>The first paragraph on page 64 of RFP Contract Book 3 states that “the Design-Builder will maintain the existing number of lanes throughout construction “. SP108B states the temporary lanes closures on Spring Creek are only allowed during certain times and on certain days of the week with liquidated damages applied if the Design-Builder fails to comply. The response to Question 7-4 states that only two lanes of traffic are required to be maintained on Spring Creek during Phase 1 and 2. Based on this response, our understanding is that the Design-Builder is not required to maintain the existing number of lanes on Spring Creek and that closing two of the four existing lanes on Spring Creek will not be subject to the SP108B time restrictions and liquidated damages. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.</p>	<p>One lane in each direction (2 traffic lanes) on Spring Creek Road will be allowed only for activities shown in Phases 1 and 2 on the traffic control reference materials. Two lanes in each direction (4 traffic lanes) on Spring Creek Road will be required during all other phases of project construction. The language in Book 3 of the RFP will be revised to agree with the above response in a future addendum.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: November 2, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9-1	RFP Book 3, Page 28, ITS	Will the Design Builder be required to utilize TDOT's on-call representative for locating the existing ITS fiber line on the project? Will TDOT's on-call representative be required to be present on site during all ITS fiber line work?	No. The Design-Builder is responsible for ensuring that no loss of power or communications between existing ITS field devices and the Transportation Management Center occur. The Design-Builder will decide how to accomplish this and will not be required to utilize a specific firm for locating existing elements.
9-2	RFP Book 3, Appendix A, Pavement Design	Are the layer coefficients in <i>The AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures (AASHTO, 1993)</i> acceptable in the design of pavement ATC's for this project? If not, what layer coefficients are to be used for pavement ATC's on this project?"	As previously stated in the response to Question 2-4, Design-Builders should use <i>The AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures (AASHTO, 1993)</i> .

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9-3	RFP Book 3, Page 26 and previous QR, Noise Walls	If the Design-Builder can design and construct the proposed noise wall in the same location and heights required in the provided noise analysis, will a new noise analysis be required for the proposed noise wall?	If there are no changes to the roadways or cross-sections, there is no need to re-evaluate the barrier. If there are any changes to the roadway or cross-sections, the barrier effectiveness would need to be re-evaluated to ensure it still provides the noise levels that will be provided in a future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-75, Hamilton County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1801

DATE: November 11, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-1	RFP Book 3, Page 50, Mitigation of Streams and Wetlands	Does TDOT have credits available for purchase for possible mitigation needs on the project?	No. TDOT does not have mitigation credits available for purchase; this is the sole responsibility
10-2	RFP Book 3, Page 47, Environmental Boundaries	If additional features are found in the Environmental Boundary verification, is it the design-builders responsibility to bear the full cost of any mitigation needed?	Yes, the Design-Builder shall bear all responsibility for additional features found in the Environmental Boundary verification, including but not limited to mitigation costs.
10-3	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 3 – Roadway	This section requires sod on all proposed slopes. Please clarify if there is a minimum grade of slope where sod is required or if the intent is for all disturbed area to be sodded.	The intent is to place sod on all disturbed slopes.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-4	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 4 – Structures	TDOT posted Standard STD-8-6 on October 3, 2018. The Standard states “See Contract Plans for Location of Emblem.” Is this Standard applicable to this Project and if so, which bridges in the interchange require the Tennessee three-star emblem and what is the location(s) on each where the emblem is to be placed?	Tri-Star emblems shall be required on abutments and pier caps of all new bridges. (Example a single span bridge would have 4 emblems). Emblem size and locations shall be shown on the Design-builder’s proposed bridges plans for review and concurrence by the Department
10-5	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 8 - Utilities	This section states that the Design Builder is responsible for the cost of utility relocations resulting from the Design-Builder’s methods of operation. In cases where utilities are in conflict with the permanent construction as proposed in the functional plans but also require more extensive relocation to support normal means and methods, who will be responsible for the relocation costs? (e.g. the pole-line crossing Spring Creek Rd. is a permanent vertical clearance conflict AND a crane operation conflict.)	The Design-Builder is responsible for the cost of all necessary utility relocations if it is not inside TDOT ROW. The relocation of the pole-line will be the responsibility of the utility owner as long as they are within TDOT ROW. It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to verify it.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-6	RFP Contract Book 3 Section 10 – Construction	This section states the Transportation Management Plan shall include plans for providing Queue Protection/Smart Work Zone during various traffic control operation. Please clarify the type and number of devices – if any – that The Department will require for Queue Protection and/or Smart Work Zone on this project.	Reference to Smart Work Zone will be deleted via future addendum. Special Provision SP712PTQ (Book 2) includes requirements for queue protection.
10-7	RFP Contract Book 2 Appendix B Special Provision 109A Special Provision 109MA	What is the estimated price per gallon for this project and is that the same as Fp in the formula for calculation of the payment adjustment?	The estimated price per gallon of fuel for this contract is \$2.48. It is the same for SP109A and SP109MA.
10-8	RFP Contract Book 2 Appendix B Special Provision 109A Special Provision 109MA	Will the Fuel Indices that is posted on the TDOT website be applicable for the Index for Bidding (Ib) and Index for Current Month (Ic) for this Project?	The estimated price per gallon of fuel for this contract is \$2.48. It is the same for SP109A and SP109MA.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-9	RFP Contract Book 2 Appendix B Special Provision 109B	Will the bituminous material indices that are posted on the TDOT website be applicable for the Basic Bituminous Material Index (Ib) and Monthly Bituminous Material Index (Ic) for this Project?	The “Basic Bituminous Material Index” for this project is \$543.75 per ton.
10-10	Contract Book 2, Appendix B	Can the department provide SP 625 for use by the Design-Build teams at this time?	The following Special Provisions will be added to the RFP via future addendum: SP503DB, SP604CR, SP604H, SP604HD, SP625, SP626, and SP627PVD.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-11	Book 3, Section 4 (Structures)	<p>This section of book 3 states "All exposed surfaces of the parapets, slab cantilevers, concrete beams surfaces, abutment beams, end walls, wing walls, bent caps, and columns of the bridges shall receive a texture finish, mountain grey, AMS STD-595 color No. 36440. except the top and traffic face of the parapets which shall be white, AMS STD 595 Color No. 37886. "</p> <p>This conflicts with "Scope of Work" notes on each bridge layout sheet of the Functional Walls and Bridges plans, which identify areas to receive a texture finish, (i.e. "Apply texture coating to parapet, bents, and abutments.")</p> <p>Please confirm the intent is for all exposed surfaces of each bridge as noted in Book 3 of the RFP to receive texture finish, rather than the scope of work notes for each bridge of the Functional Plans.</p>	The language in RFP Book 3, Section 4 (Structures) reflects the Department's requirement for texture finish related to bridges.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-12	RFP Contract Book 1 Section E. Proposals	When does the Department anticipate making the bid files available on Bid Express?	11-16-18
10-13	FORM QR Additional Reference Material	When does the Department anticipate providing the remaining additional reference material identified by the Department in responses to questions?	November 13, 2018.
10-14	RFP Contract Book 3 4.0 Structures	Book 3, 4.0 Structures, Noise Walls states that concrete for noise wall panels and posts must have a minimum compressive strength of 3,000 PSI. SP 624 states Noise Wall panels should not be shipped until achieving the required concrete strength of 5,000 PSI. Please clarify the required minimum concrete strength of Noise Wall panels and posts.	The language in Special Provision SP624 is what is required. The conflicting language in Book 3 of the RFP will be deleted via future addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-15	Book 3, Pavement Design	In a previous Q/R (3-14), TDOT responded that the pavement design for Spring Creek Road will be addressed in a future addendum. This has not been done yet; please provide.	The pavement design for Spring Creek Road was included in the addendum #3.
10-16	Book 3, Section 5, ITS Roll Plots	In previous responses to questions (4-19, 4-23) about the limits of ITS work, TDOT has stated that revised ITS roll plots depicting the Section 1 limits will be made available. Please provide this roll plots or provide station limits to better define the limits.	ITS roll plot showing project limits was uploaded to TDOT's project website.
10-17	RFP Contract Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	Although this is a Non-Chapter 86 project, will TDOT want the utility companies to relocate any affected facilities as part of the Roadway Contract, or to relocate either "Prior To" or "In Conjunction" with their own forces? And, along those same lines, will TDOT review of any Contracts for relocation to be included as part of the Utility Coordination that is to be done by the Design / Build Contractor?	TDOT doesn't have a preference. Since this is not a Chapter 86 project, TDOT has no way of requiring a "Prior To" relocation. If there are any relocation contracts, TDOT will need to review them.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-18	RFP Contract Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	Is there any information available for the location of the Water facilities that are on this project? We have not been able to locate any existing water facilities in the area around the Visitors Center, only Water valves, so there is obviously some information missing for these facilities on this project that will need to be identified in order to assess any potential conflicts.	It is the successful Design-Builder's responsibility to verify the ground survey and survey control before utilizing in the design of the project. In addition, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any field surveys and support activities. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for confirming the utility locations, confirming the type of facilities, identifying the utility owners and determining the cost responsibilities in order to coordinate the relocation of any utilities in conflict with the project.
10-19	RFP Contract Book 3 Page 61 & 62 Maintenance During Construction	Is the D/B responsible for snow and ice removal during the project construction period or will TDOT provide these services?	TDOT will provide snow and ice removal during the project construction period.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-20	1Q/R #5 for RFP, Question 5-22	States in the Agency Response: The interior of the covered walkway shall be lighted at all times. Is this “covered walkway” the same as the cart path? By “lighted at all times” does this mean that the lighting installed here is not controlled by a photocell or other device? The drawings provided do not show any existing lighting here? Is there existing lighting? Is it served by the existing roadway lighting circuit? If not, where is it served from?	The covered walkway is an Environmental Commitment included in the D-List Categorical Exclusion document, in regard to the South Chickamauga Creek Greenway. There is currently no covered walkway, therefore no existing lighting. Power service to the walkway lighting is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
10-21	Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	If we do a design for a Utility is the contract between the Utility and the Design-Builder subject to TDOT review?	TDOT will review all contracts between the Design-Builder and the Utility.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-22	Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	No water line is shown at the Visitor Center only meters. My question is could this water line be considered a private line since it is on TDOT property and who would be the contact for locate information?	It is the successful Design-Builder's responsibility to verify the ground survey and survey control before utilizing in the design of the project. In addition, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any field surveys and support activities. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for confirming the utility locations, confirming the type of facilities, identifying the utility owners and determining the cost responsibilities in order to coordinate the relocation of any utilities in conflict with the project.
10-23	Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	Is the Application for Utility Use and Occupancy Agreement required for existing utility crossings?	There should already be a completed Application for Use and Occupancy Agreement on file for any existing crossings. No additional applications needed.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
10-24	Book 3, 8. Utilities Page 42-46	What is the status of design/construction for the proposed WWTA new crossing of I-75 and the placement of manholes along the west side? Has construction started, as builds available or 100% plans available? Has this crossing already been approved by TDOT?	The plans have been submitted to TDOT but have not been reviewed or approved. No work can be done until the permit is issued.