

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 "...lower design speeds may be selected, but they should not be less than the low range presented in Table 10-1." 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 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>