

DESIGN-BUILD FINAL Q/R

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**I-440, Widening from I-40 to I-24,
Project includes removing and replacing existing pavement**

Davidson 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: DB1701



July 5, 2018

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County
DB CONTRACT NO.: DB1701
DATE: 02/12/2018

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3, Sect. 1.4; Page 3	Please clarify the statement, “The Design-Builder shall comply with A documents? What are “A” Documents?	The document should read – “Approved NEPA Documents.” An Addendum will be issued to address this item.
Book 3, Sect. 2.2.e	The project end station does not agree with the plans. The plans state 1376+41.72 and the Contract states 1351+80.09. Please provide the end station to be used?	Station 137+41.72 is the correct end station for the project. This end station does not preclude the Design-Builder from performing the ramp repairs and replacements shown past this station. Specifically, the ramp repair work shown for RAMP EB OFF I-24 EB, RAMP WB ON I-24 WB, RAMP WB ON I-40 WB, and RAMP WB ON I-24 EB shall be completed as part of this project.
Book 3, Sect. 2.2.b	This section states that the ramps shall be designed to adhere to the latest edition of the listed design manuals. The scope calls for patching or pavement replacement only. Please clarify the specific ramp elements that are required to meet these guidelines?	In areas shown as ramp repairs or replacements in the plans, the ramp repair or replacement should match the existing geometrics of the ramp including but limited to elevation, cross slope, superelevation, and physical ramp dimensions. Ramps or portions of ramps shown as proposed ramps should meet the standards detailed in Sec. 2.2.b.
Book 3, Sect. 2.2.i	Section states that 16’-0” minimum vertical clearance must be maintained except where the existing clearance is less than 16’. Scope description in Sect 3.2 requires 16’-6” minimum vertical clearance. Please clarify which section governs or if both do based on existing?	The minimum final vertical clearance for the structures over I-440 is 16’-0”. The minimum vertical clearance for the I-440 bridges to be widened (over Lealand Lane, over Craig Avenue, and over I-65 & ramps) is 16’-6”.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3, Sect. 2.5.a	The first two sentences conflict. The first sentence states that all guardrail along I-440 and I-440 ramps shall be replaced. The second sentence states that only the guardrail indicated in the Design-Builder plans shall be replaced. Please clarify what guardrail is to be replaced?	All guardrails along I-440 and I-440 ramps shall be removed and replaced.
Book 3, Sect. 2.7.e	This section requires the dredging of ditches that have been silted in without indication of the limits. Since the silting conditions are not known, how is the Design-Builder to determine these limits for the proposal?	It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to do adequate investigation to determine the limits and quantities used for bidding this work.
Book 3, Sect. 2.7.h and 2.7.j	Sect. 2.7.h indicates that the Design-Builder is to inspect all existing pipes and repair and/or replace any pipes with noted deficiencies. Sect. 2.7.j gives a list of pipes that are to be replaced. How is the Design-Builder to determine which pipes require work for the proposal? How is the Design-Builder to Accurately Access the work pre-bid since you are requiring an inspection that cannot be done until after the Contractor is onsite? Please provide further guidance on how it is decided if a pipe requires replacement or repair?	The Design-Builder should utilize the provided SUE information to determine which pipes require work and incorporate those costs into their bid. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to do adequate further investigation to determine the limits and quantities used for bidding this work.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3, Sect. 4.1	Section indicates the lighting fixtures and supports will be determined with TDOT and the power company. How is the Design-Builder to determine this for the bid proposal? Can this be done prior to proposals?	The Design-Builder shall coordinate with TDOT's Traffic Operations Division and Nashville Electric Service regarding the lighting design.
Book 3, Appendix B	Please provide the .dgn file(s) and Bridge Inspection Report for I-440 over I-65 and RR.?	An inspection has not taken place since the repairs per the plans dated 2015 have been performed. An inspection is scheduled and the report should be available in early March 2018. DGN files are not included.
General	The geopak *.gpk file provided does not contain alignment and profile information matching the plan information. Please provide the *.gpk file with the plan matching information. Specifically, the following chains (and associated profiles) are missing: D440CTR DHILLSBOROPIKE DMURPHYAVE DNOLENSVILLEPI DRAMP-21ST-40WB DRAMP-21STEBOF2 DRAMP-21STWBOF2 DRAMP-21STWBOFF DRAMP-24WBTO440 DRAMP-40WBTO440 DRAMP-440TO65NB	The roadway design GPK (JOB32D) will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage. Alignments RR3, RR4, RR5 are contained in the survey GPK (JOB32J). No profiles are provided.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
	DRAMP-440TO65SB DRAMP-65NB440EB DRAMP-65TO440WB DRAMP-EBOFFI24 DRAMP-EBONI40 DRAMP-HILLEBNB DRAMP-HILLEBOFF DRAMP-HILLSON DRAMP-HILLWBOFF DRAMP-MURPEBOFF DRAMP-MURPWON DRAMP-NOLEEBOFF DRAMP-NOLENBON DRAMP-NOLENSBON DRAMP-NOLEWBOFF DRAMP-NOLNBONWB DRAMP-NOLSBONEB DRAMP-OFFI65SB DRAMP-WBOFFI40 DRAMP-WBOFF-WES DRAMP-WBONI24 DRAMP-WESTEBOFF DRAMP-WESTNBON DRAMP-WNBONEB DRAMP-WSBONEB DWESTENDAVE RR3 RR4 RR5	

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
	XCLV1230	
Reference DGNs	<p>The following dgn files are missing from the reference files provided:</p> <p>DVI440HillsboroMainlineXsections2.dgn DVI440PatternsMurphyEBOffRamp.dgn DVI440PresentSheetLayout.dgn DVI440ProfileEBLSheetLayout.dgn DVI440ProfileWBSheetLayout.dgn DVI440proposedSheetLayout.dgn DVI440PropRampRepair.dgn DVI440Shapes.dgn Functionals.dgn TDOTAerial2013.dgn</p>	<p>The TDOTAerial2013. DGN will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage. The other DGN files are working files used by the Owner's Representative in the preparation of the preliminary plan set. They are not available for use by Design-Builders.</p>
Book 3, Sect. 2.7.a	<p>Are stormwater management facilities only required when existing drainage patterns change and adversely impact areas outside the ROW?</p>	<p>If existing drainage patterns must be changed due to design of the Project, the Design-Builder shall design and construct a solution that does not adversely impact property owners outside the ROW.</p>
Book 3, Sect. 2.7.k	<p>Please provide the calculations that were used to determine the preliminary drainage design and layout?</p>	<p>GEOPAK Drainage files will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage. The GEOPAK Drainage files are provided for information only.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book 3, Section 8	Utility owner contact information is provided for PINs 119734.00 and 119735.00. Will this information be provided at a future date for PIN 125325.00?	A Utility Owner List will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.
SP108B	Will local street lane closures be allowed during the day if a detour is provided and all agencies approve?	No, this is not allowed per SP108B.
SP108B	Will a road closure be permitted on Lealand, Craig and/or Bransford if access is maintained for all residents and a detour is in place?	No, this is not allowed per SP108B.
Book 1 – Sect D. 2. B. 1); Page 17	Please Define “Major Subcontractors”? Since the Project is Design-Build and Design/Plans are Not Finalized will it be acceptable to List Packages intended to be Subcontracted in lieu of actual companies?	In the RFQ stated “that Major Participant” means any of the following entities: All general partners or joint venture members of the Design-Builder; all individuals, persons, proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability partnerships, corporations, professional corporations, limited liability companies, business associations, or other legal entity, however organized, holding (directly or indirectly) a twenty percent (20%) or greater interest in the Design-Builder; and the lead engineering/design firm(s)” All Major participants must be identified in the proposal if they are part of the key personnel in the Design Builder organizational chart.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Book 3 – Sect 2.6 Signage	How Is the Contractor to Verify Sign Reflectivity Pre-Bid to Determine Replacement? Please define the “Majority” of post Mounted Signs that need replaced with Break-away Post by Stating an Exact Number?	No additional sign reflectivity information will be provided by the Department. It is Design Builder’s responsible to determine the number of post mounted signs that require replacement with break-away posts.
	Please Clearly Define if Rolling Roadblock Closures Will be Permitted for Overhead Sign Installation?	Rolling roadblocks are permitted for the construction of overhead signs. An RFP Addendum will be issued to address this item.
Book 3 – Sect 13.1	Please Clearly Identify Who is Responsible for the Coordination and Cost of Archeological Inspections.	The Department is responsible for coordination and cost of Archeological inspections.
Book 3 – Sect 3.5 b.	Please clearly identify the exact meaning of deficient and identify the structures or portions which require removal?	No known structures (not covered in other sections) are currently identified as deficient. The intent of this section is to ensure all deficient structures within the project are repaired or replaced.
Preliminary Plans – PROPOSED LAYOUT	Please provide a key for the symbols, solid lines, and dashed lines on these drawings?	TDOT standard drawing RD-A-1 and RD-L-1 provide standard Department abbreviations and symbology.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Material	Will TDOT provide the aerial photo file (TDOTAERIAL2013.DGN) that was attached to the signing and marking, lighting and ITS plan rolls?	The TDOTAerial2013. DGN will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.
RFP Contract Book 3, Page 38 (Section 9.2.a) Are any streams and/or drainage ways considered to be "waters of the State or waters of the U.S."?	Are any streams and/or drainage ways considered to be "waters of the State or waters of the U.S."?	The Design-Builder should use the environmental documents made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.
RFP Contract Book 3, Page 11 (Guardrail) Page	Page 1 of the RFQ (Section A.2. Project Goals), item (i.) states "Provide a visually pleasing finished product." Is standard galvanized guardrail the intended to be used for the project? Or is an aesthetic treatment required?	Guardrail materials specified by TDOT Standard Roadway Drawings and TDOT Standard Specifications are acceptable for this project.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Contract Book 3, Section 2.2g	The RFP identifies 3 Design Exceptions for the project and that no additional shall be considered. The preliminary plans provided appear to require additional DE's as designed. Should the DB assume that additional DE's will be allowed based on the plans provided by TDOT, or that it will be the DB's responsibility to adjust the alignment as needed to only allow the three DE's described in the RFP?	The Design-Builders should make any required adjustments to the design to avoid additional Design Exceptions. Revised Preliminary Plans will be made available by the Department on the project webpage.
-----------------------------------	---	--

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Contract Book 3, Section 4a	The RFP states that DB should provide lighting to meet TDOT standard specification. The current specification includes both LED and HPS luminaires. Which will be required for this project?	The Design-Builder shall coordinate with TDOT's Traffic Operations Division and Nashville Electric Service regarding the lighting design.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

<p>RFP Contract Book 1, Section B3 and C</p>	<p>Section B3 states "The Department will utilize a Meets Technical Criteria (A+B+C) selection process in this procurement to award a Contract to the responsible Design-Builder that demonstrates it meets the technical criteria and can deliver the best combination of price and time and weekend closures (A+B+C) in the design and construction of the Project."</p> <p>Section C States "After evaluation of the Technical Proposal, the Department, as required by Department Rule 1680-5-4, Procedures for the Selection and Award of Design-Build Contract, will publically open and read the Total Contract Amount (A+B)."</p>	<p>The document should read – "After evaluation of the Technical Proposal, the Department, as required by Department Rule 1680-5-4, Procedures for the Selection and Award of Design-Build Contract, will publicly open and read the Total Contract Amount (A+B+C)." An RFP Addendum will be issued to address this item.</p>
---	---	--

<p>RFP Book No. and Section ID</p>	<p>Question</p>	<p>Reserved for Agency Response</p>
<p>(Cont.)</p>	<p>Please clarify that it is the Department's intent to use the A+B+C method for total bid evaluation, and not the A+B method described in Section C.</p>	

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

<p>RFP Contract Book 3, Section 2.3b</p>	<p>Section 2.3b states "Ramp repair and replacement work shall be performed in a manner as to require no concrete joints in the ramp travel lane." The Preliminary Plans show typical ramp patches as 6'x16' panel replacement, which as shown on the plans places the longitudinal joint of the patch in the travel lane on two-lane ramps. Should the DB assume for bidding purposes that concrete panel replacement on ramps should result in a 6'x16' patch, or that the patch only extend to the nearest lane line, i.e. a typical 6'x12' patch?</p>	<p>A patch extending to the nearest lane line on two-lane ramps will be acceptable.</p>
<p>RFP Book 3, Page 8 Or RFP Book 3, Page 18</p>	<p>There appears to be conflicting vertical clearance minimum requirements. Is the minimum vertical clearance for structures 16' -0" or 16' -6"?</p>	<p>The minimum final vertical clearance for the structures over I-440 is 16'-0". The minimum vertical clearance for the I-440 bridges to be widened (over Lealand Lane, over Craig Avenue, and over I-65 & ramps) is 16'-6".</p>

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
<p>RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5.c) OR 1440 Preliminary Plans Sheet 23-A</p>	<p>Does the Department intend for the inside parapets on the 1-440 & 1-65 bridge to be 51 inches tall to match rest of the project's 51" Median barrier? And if so, is the Design-Builder to provide Special PR Design Detail Drawings for a 51" bridge parapet?</p>	<p>The inside parapets for both bridges are to be 51 inches tall. Refer to standard drawing STD-1-1SS. Modifications for the height and width will be required, but a special design will not be required.</p>
<p>RFP Book 3, Page 10 (Section 2.3 Ramps) And/Or 1440 Preliminary Plans</p>	<p>Neither of these two documents appears to identify the "Limit of Construction" on each interchange ramp. Could the "Limit construction" be identified for all ramps? Also can TDOT identify Limit of Concrete on these ramps?</p>	<p>Limits of ramp construction are shown on the preliminary plans. A detail regarding limits of concrete ramp paving will be provided in the revised preliminary plans. Revised Preliminary Plans will be made available by the Department on the project web page.</p>
<p>I-440 Preliminary Plans</p>	<p>Ramp WB on I-24 WB from 8000+00 to 8033+56.51, Ramp WB off I-40 12003+53.87 to 12006+81.41, Ramp EB on I-40 13003+89.38 to 13007+21.36, and Ramp WB on 1-24 EB, are we to use the 15 million ESALS Ramp Design?</p>	<p>Use 15,000,000 ESALS for Ramp Design.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
I-440 Preliminary Plans	When Ramps extend as a defacto part of the travelway, do we use the 15 million ESALS Pavement Design or the 30 million ESALS Pavement Design?	Ramp pavement type is Portland Cement Concrete. Use the 30,000,000 ESALS for the portion of the ramp that extends into the travelway. The pavement type for the travelway will be asphalt pavement. A transition from the asphalt pavement on the mainline to the ramp pavement which will be concrete will be required outside the limits of the travelway and ramp taper transitions to the mainline. The ramp pavement is a 15,000,000 ESALS concrete pavement design.
1-440 Preliminary Plans RFP Book 3, Page 62-64 (Appendix A Pvmt Designs)	What pavement section is to be used on the outside shoulder at gore areas?	Use the pavement design for the outside shoulder of the mainline pavement design in the gore areas.
RFP Book 3, Page 10 (Section 2.3 Ramps, subsection 2.3.a)	This section refers to an “I-440 Concrete Ramps Repair Report located as an Appendix A in this Contract Book 3 (Project Specific Information). However, we can’t seem to locate the Ramp Repair Report. Appendix A (page 64) is only the ramp pavement design. Please advise as to the location of that Ramp Repair Report.	This document will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Material	Please provide the CADD files for the existing bridge structures that are to be widened (Bridges over Lealand Lane, Craig Avenue, I-65 and CSX Railroad).	These were done before CADD, so there are no CADD files.
Reference Material	Will TDOT provide the criteria files that were used to develop the cross sections for the preliminary plans?	TDOT will provide the x-sections for the preliminary plans for information only
Reference Material	Will TDOT provide the MicroStation files for two ramp improvement projects (Projects 2 and 3)?	TDOT will provide the Microstation files for these two projects.
Contract Book 3, Section 2.7.k	Book 3 Section 2.7.k states “A preliminary drainage analysis was completed and the resulting design is shown in the plans that accompany this document.” Will this analysis be made available to the Design-Build teams?	It will be posted on the website for information only
Reference Material	The existing surface TIN file for I-440 on TDOT’s webpage for I-40 under the surveys folder does not extend out to the existing right-of-way line. Is there a later version that does extend to the ROW line?	There is not a tin file that extends to the existing ROW throughout the corridor. In areas with rock cuts or noise walls, the survey limits were only extended to those features.
RFP Book 3, Page 27 (Section 7.a of the Right-of-Way Scope of Work)	Will TDOT be responsible for obtaining all Easements and/or Agreements from CSX Railroad?	The State Railroad Coordinator will be assisting with the coordination between the Railroad and the Design Builder. The coordination effort will culminate with the executed Agreement with the Railroad.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad)	Could you make available the shop drawings for the modular expansion joints for these bridges?	These drawing are not available.
RFP Book 3, Page 27 (Section 7.a of the Right-of-Way Scope of Work)	A delay of up to 15 months for Railroad Agreements is noted. It says “this is an estimate and acquiring these agreements may take longer”. In order to develop the required schedule and number of days for project completion, will TDOT establish a fixed duration for this	No fixed duration will be supplied. The duration of time is mainly dependent on how quickly the plans are generated and how quickly the Railroad’s plan review comments are addressed by the designer. CSXT is committed to aid the Department in
RFP Book 1, Page 17 (Section 3. Resp. Cat. III) RFP Book 3, Page 34 (Section 8. Utility Coord.) Design-Build Std. Guidance, Page 30	In order for us to build the required project schedule, will TDOT review and approve Readiness-For-Construction plans in phases and/or segments? And does this also apply to statute TCA-54-5-854 for Utility Investigation?	TDOT will review and concur on design and construction plans. For Utility all the details are in the utility Scope of work in Book three.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
General Question	DB1701 consists of 3 projects: 1. I-440 from I-40 to I-24 2. I-440 Int. at Murphy Road EB Ramp Queue 3. I-440 Int. at 21st Ave/Hillsboro WB Ramp Queue Does pricing need to be broken down for each of these projects?	The pay items are detailed in the RFP book 1 for all projects.
RFP Contract Book 3, Page 50 (Section 12.1.g) While	While TDOT allows for closure of I-65 through lanes and four left turning fly-over ramps to I-65 from I-440, no mention was made of Franklin Pike (SR-6). Nor is it mentioned in SP108B. Is the temporary closure of SR-6 allowable?	Temporary closure is allowable for SR-6. The Special Provision 108B will be revised to indicate that. It will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.
RFP Book 1, Page 14 (Section 3. Selection Procedure)	Is 4 the maximum number of weekends that the closures can occur for "C: Weekend Closure"? Is there a penalty for utilizing more weekend closures than what is identified in the bid?	The liquidated damages are \$1,000,000 per weekend or \$10,000 per hour per lane.
RFP Book 2, Special Provision SP108B	Is there a financial incentive to finish the job in advance of the committed (per Design Builder's bid) number of "B" days?	This selection process A+B+C in this procurement will allow to award this Contract to the responsive Design-Builder that can deliver the best combination of price and time and weekend closures (A+B+C) in the design and construction of the Project.
RFP Book 2, Special Provision SP108B	Will TDOT consider allowing segments of I-440 to be completely closed for a period of time and waive penalties?	Any deviation from the RFP needs to be addressed by ATC. Any allowable lane closure or full closure is detailed in SP108B.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

<p>RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad)</p>	<p>Could you make available the shop drawings for the tub girders for these bridges?</p>	<p>The Department has the shop drawings on microfilm. If the Design-Builder is interested in a particular component or section of the bridge; he can request a print out some of these pertinent sheets.</p>
<p>RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad)</p>	<p>Could you make available the bridge inspection report for these bridges?</p>	<p>There is not a current inspection report. This bridge underwent major repairs in 2016 and is due to be inspected in March 2018.</p>
<p>RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad)</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad) Will a before and after crack inspection be required for these structures?</p>	<p>It is not required for these structures.</p>
<p>RFP Book 1, Page 2 (2nd Paragraph) Vs. RFP Book 1, Page 3 (2nd bullet under “Additionally, the designer shall be responsible for:”)</p>	<p>Please provide more clarity on Utility responsibility of the Design Builder. • Is the design builder responsible for all costs associated with utility relocations (including design, coordination and construction)? • Or simply responsible for coordination of utility relocations?</p>	<p>I-440 is NOT CH86 and there is no additional ROW being acquired, so only Utility Coordination Cost would be responsibility of the Design Builder, Utility relocation would be NO COST unless the Design Builder needs to acquire ROW for his design. So any Utility cost associated with that Design will be the Design Builder’s responsibility</p>
<p>RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.4a</p>	<p>This section states “The Design-Builder is to perform a design level investigation and report to augment the wall repair information in the RFP and submit within the proposal. The Department will use this report to determine final wall repair areas and the final wall repair areas will be distributed to the Design-Builders for bidding purposes.”</p> <p>There appears to be some confusion regarding when this report is to be submitted and how it is to be used for bidding purposes. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The Design Builder needs to submit the report no later than 3-12-18, and the final wall repair areas will be distributed to the Design-Builders by 3-30-18</p>

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Documents; Preliminary Plans	These plans represent a significant design effort, and contain design layout, detail and requirements. Please clarify to what extent the Design-Builder can rely on these plans in preparing the Proposals and to complete the Final Design.	These plans are for information only, it is the Design Builder's responsibility to verify all the provided information.
No Reference	Can archived field drawing for mainline bridges be made available?	There are no archived field drawing for mainline bridges
RFP Contract Book 3, Section 2.2a	Can the DB base their bid on the current approved version of the Standard Drawings as of the proposal due date?	Yes, unless it will be changed by addendum

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: 02/22/2018

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Contract Book 1, Section D.4.d	Book 1 Section D.4.d states, "The Technical Proposal shall include half-size plan sheets depicting those elements required by the RFP." Please provide more detail of how this differs from what is requested in Book 1 Section D.4.c? Which "elements" of the RFP are you referring to? Do these plans count toward the 75-page maximum page count?	Section D.4.d describes the format in which Section D.4.c is to be submitted. The "elements" referred to in Section D.4.d are those as described in Section D.4.c. These sheets will not count toward the 75-page maximum per Section E.1.a.1).
Contract Book 1, Appendix, Form RC IV	Form RC IV – Response Category IV: Technical Solution, Item 11 states, "Attach a copy of any approved ATCs used in this Technical Proposal." Will the inclusion of the ATCs count toward the 75-page maximum page count?	The ACT's will not count toward the 75-page maximum per Section E.1.a.1).
Reference Material	Will TDOT provide the hourly traffic counts on all of the I-440 ramps? Will TDOT provide the hourly ramp counts on the I-65 ramps to Wedgewood Avenue and to Armory Drive.	Traffic count data will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
Reference Material, Preliminary Design	Will TDOT provide structural calculations for the I-440 Bridge over I-65 conceptual plan shown in the I-440 Bridges to Widen file located in the Preliminary Design folder of the Reference Material.	This information will not be provided by the Department as it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to ensure the proper design of any structure within the project and each Design-Builder may provide a unique design.
Book 1	Will TDOT consider a meeting with the Design-Builder to discuss ATCs, confidential questions, and proprietary information?	Yes, The Department will meet with each Design-Builder.
Book 1, Section J.1	Book 1 Section J.1 states, "...the Department may hold one or more mandatory pre-proposal meetings with all Design-Builders prior to the Proposal Due Date." The RFP references this meeting occurring no later than May 11, 2018. The deadline for this potential meeting is within one (1) week of the proposal due date and would not be beneficial since the design and price proposals will be in the final stages. A pre-proposal meeting would be more beneficial if held earlier in the proposal phase as it would allow the Design-Builder to discuss project approach and request clarifications. Will TDOT consider such a meeting?	There are no mandatory pre-proposal meetings with all Design-Builders prior to the Proposal Due Date for this project. The Department is meeting for a one on one confidential meeting prior to the Proposal and ATC due date.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
RFP Book 3, Page 18 (Section 3.2.5.d)	This section requires replacement of existing concrete pavement at bridge ends. Since these were recently replaced, do these need to be replaced again?	Yes, the existing concrete pavement at bridge ends is to be replaced.
RFP Book 3, Page 19 (Section 3.3 Noise Barrier Walls)	Could the TNM model input and output information be made available to the Design Builders?	The TNM model will not be available to the Design Builders. The Noise walls shall have the same configurations as identified in the Environmental Document.
Book 3, Sect. 2.5.a	Should the impact attenuators on the project be replaced as part of the project?	All impact attenuators (including galvanized and powder coated) along I-440 and I-440 ramps shall be removed and replaced within the project limits. All impact attenuators shall be galvanized and in accordance with TDOT Standard Roadway Drawings and TDOT Standard Specifications.
Book 3, Sect. 3.3 and 3.4	Can noise wall construction/repairs be completed at night?	Noise wall construction/repairs shall only be conducted during daytime hours. More details will be addressed by forthcoming addendum.
Contract Book 3, Section 2.2.v	Book 3 Section 2.2.v, states, "Design-Builder shall not dispose of any material within interchange areas located within the Project..." It is common construction practice to place wasted soil from the project within the project right-of-way to minimize borrow on future projects. Please define material and clarify if the Design-Builder may place soil within the TDOT right-of-way.	The Design-Builder is allowed to dispose of excess material in embankment areas within the project right-of-way with the exclusion of those areas referenced with Book 3 Section 2.2.v. Excess material used for embankments shall meet the requirements specified in the most current version of the TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The Design-Builder shall obtain approval from the Department before disposing of any excess material within the right-of-way.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

<p>Contract Book 3, Section 2.7.h</p> <p>Contract Book 3, Section 2.7.h (Cont.)</p>	<p>The Design-Builder is responsible for verifying if the existing drainage systems are clean, operable, and structurally adequate. These requirements are vague and difficult to quantify repairs and replacements. Please define “structurally adequate”.</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to verify the existing drainage system, the Sue information is for reference only. The Design – Builder shall perform all drainage design, structural design, hydraulic/hydrologic design, Roadway component geometric configurations shall be designed to provide adequate drainage per TDOT Standards.</p>
<p>Book 3, Section 3.2.1.a</p>	<p>Book 3 Section 3.2.1.a states, “Overage of repair quantity...shall be paid...as defined in RFP Book 3 Chapter 13.7.” Section 13.7 is not included in the RFP. There are Overage Payment items located in 13.5. Please confirm the Chapter reference stated in 3.2.1.a.</p>	<p>The overage reference should be to Section 13.5.</p>
<p>Book 3, Section 3.2.3.k</p>	<p>Book 3 Section 3.2.3.k references replacing the existing Noise Barriers on the parapets on the EB & WB Bridges over Lealand Lane. Please provide more information for design requirements for these noise walls.</p>	<p>The new Sound Barriers are to be placed (height, material, etc.) per the reference material in the “Noise Walls” folder [project website]. Reference AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Eight Edition (2017) for design criteria.</p>
<p>Form QR dated 2/12/2018 Page QR-3, First Question Response</p>	<p>The provided answer to the first question of page QR-3 states that the proposer shall coordinate with Traffic Operations Division and NES. Is it now permissible for the proposers to contact the supplied list of utilities providers and CSX Corp in spite of the Book 1 4.g clause?</p>	<p>The Design-Builders can contact/coordinate with any third party. Coordination/contact with TDOT Traffic Operations is not allowed prior to NTP. Any questions or concerns have to come through QR form.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

<p>Form QR dated 2/12/2018 Page QR-7, Fourth Question Response</p>	<p>The response states “No known structures are currently identified as deficient.” Is this limited to the structures identified in Book 3 Section 3? Does this also pertain to any other structures on the project not listed (I.e. Foster Ave, Hillsboro Rd, Nolensville Rd, 21st, Granny White Pike, Belmont Blvd, etc.)?</p>	<p>The response is referring to structures not already identified. It is not in reference to the bridges over I-440.</p>
<p>Form QR dated 2/12/2018 Page QR-12, Second and Third Questions</p> <p>(PLEASE SEE SHADED SECTION OF PAGES 31A, 32A, AND 33A OF PRELIMINARY PLANS)</p>	<p>Ramp limits and pavement Design clarification. Please see attached sketch of WB I-24 Ramps from approximately M/L station 1376+00 to P.O.T. M/L station 1342+81.10. The Department has advised to use a 15,000,000 ESALS design, but then states to use a 30,000,000 ESALS design for the portion of the ramp that extends into the travel way at which point the pavement will become asphalt. Can the Department graphically show us, in your opinion where this point occurs? And will a 30,000,000 ESALS Concrete Pavement Design be provided by the Department?</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to verify all the information provided in the preliminary plans. The A detail showing typical limits on concrete ramp paving has been provided in the revised preliminary plans. The 15,000,000 ESALS design shall be used for the portion of the concrete paving extending into the travel way.</p>
<p>Form QR dated 2/12/2018 Page QR-16, Third Question</p>	<p>As a follow-up to third question response on page QR-16 that states the liquidated damages are \$1,000,000 per weekend or \$10,000 per lane hour, will the liquidated damages for a fifth or more weekends be \$1,000,000 or \$2,880,000 per each?</p>	<p>It is only four weekend closures are allowed. For any additional delay, it will be \$1,000,000 per weekend or \$10,000 per lane hour liquidated damages.</p>
<p>Form QR dated 2/12/2018 Page QR-17, Fifth Question</p> <p>RFP Book 3, Section 3.4a</p>	<p>Will the Department implement the same provision for Rock Scaling and Trimming as the Department has in Book 3, Section 3.4a for Noise Walls?</p>	<p>The Department will not be implementing this procedure for rock scaling and trimming.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

General Question	Due to the highly variable discretion shown by the Department in regards to the limits of concrete ramp paving, will exact limits requiring concrete paving please be shown for each ramp and location?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to determine the final ramp design. A detail showing typical limits on concrete ramp paving has been provided in the revised preliminary plans.
General Question	Maintenance of existing I-440; prior to turnover to the Design Builder, will the Department have the all potholes and deficiencies fixed? If not, what level of serviceability is the Design Builder expected to maintain? Due to the exceeding poor quality of the riding surface, will the Department add unit pricing for paving and patching of potholes and maintenance?	The potholes will not all be repaired. Many potholes keep appearing and the concrete is failing every day. The contractor will be required to patch potholes within 24 hours or earlier as requested by the engineer and he will be held liable for any damages that a car sustains. So the contractor will have to determine his method of repair to get them fixed timely and to also maintain traffic as required. More details will be made available by the Department in the Reference Material Section of the project webpage.
RFP Book 3, Page 9 (Section 2.2.r)	Given the limited geotechnical information, the depth to refusal varies from 1.7'to No Refusal. Is TDOT requiring the Design-Builder to include all costs associated with Undercut and/or Geotechnical remediation? Or would it be handled as on typical TDOT projects?	The Design-Builder should include all costs associated with undercut and/or geotechnical remediation in their bid price for the work.

**RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR**

I-440 Preliminary Plans	Will the crash wall be required to be extended at Bent 5 of the I-440 bridge over I-65 and CSX RR?	Crash walls are to be included for any substructure elements as needed per AREMA and CSX clear zone requirements.
-------------------------	--	---

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: March 13, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.1	GENERAL QUESTION	While conducting the required field inspection of the existing Noise Walls, we observed damaged areas of bridge parapets (particularly at the expansion joints). Will the design/builder be responsible for making repairs to these "popped"/spalled deficiencies?	Yes, spalled concrete areas on bridge parapets are to be repaired as part of this project.
3.2	Preliminary Plans (Sheet 22 and/or 23)	There is an OH power line that crosses the I-440 tub girder bridges at I-65 located toward the west end of the bridges. What is the elevation of the low point with respect bridge deck surface? What is the voltage of the lines? Do these lines need to be raised? And are there any other power lines on the project that need to be raised in order to meet code?	It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to evaluate all vertical clearance requirements throughout the project. Overhead utility elevations have been provided in the survey for the project. The appropriate utility owner should be contacted to determine the line voltage.
3.3	GENERAL QUESTION	Could TDOT provide a narrative for updates to RFP since 1/16/18 posting?	The addendum will be tentatively issued on 3-13-18.
3.4	GENERAL QUESTION	It appears as though some of the "NEW" or updated files on the project web site have dates that are older than the ones they replaced. Which file has precedence?	The updated files provided on the project website are the most current for use on the project.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.4	Noise Technical Report for I-440 (dated October 2017) And NEPA Document	Has TDOT/FHWA verified or confirmed that the LOS D traffic projections used for the 6-lane build scenario in the October 2017 Noise Technical Report sufficiently represents the 8-lane concept being proposed in the Design-Build RFP and that no updates or reevaluations of the noise study are required to maintain clearance under NEPA?	The noise study accounts for the auxiliary lanes of the 8-lane sections separately from the through lanes, so a noise study update would not be required.
3.5	Preliminary Plans And RFP Book 3, Section 4. Lighting	The scope regarding proposed lighting seems to have conflicting direction. The Preliminary Plans indicate existing light standards to be removed and relocated. However, the scope in the RFP indicates they are to be removed and replaced. Since this could have a significant difference in placement of new poles, please clarify intent. Which is correct?	The Preliminary Lighting Plans will be revised to resolve the conflict and provided on the project website. For reference, the language provided in Book 3 of the RFP supersedes all other RFP books and reference documents.
3.6	Preliminary Plans And RFP Book 3, Section 4. Lighting	30% plans do not show electric service points. Can TDOT provide service points for lighting?	It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to coordinate and determine proper service points for lighting. Further lighting details will be forthcoming in an addendum issued by mid-April.
3.7	GENERAL QUESTION	When will TDOT issue the EBS File for computer bidding?	The Department will issue the EBS file a week before the Bid opening

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.8	GENERAL QUESTION	The standard Special Provisions are written and intended to be used with a different method of contracting other than Design-Build, how will fuel and bituminous payment adjustments be handled by TDOT on the design-build project?	<p>These adjustments will be handled as discussed in sections 7.2.10 Item Quantity Tickets and 7.2.11 Items Documented Using Worksheets of the Design-Build Standard Guidance.</p> <p>The Construction Field Office will collect tickets upon delivery, total them daily, and calculate and document appropriate adjustments to be paid</p>
3.9	RFP Book 3, Section 2.7 (Drainage and Subsurface Utility Exploration)	The Segment Reference information in the "10-27-17 Video Reports" does not match location information in the individual DGN files. For example, the report has NRJB-1 – NRMH1 (page 51 of PDF) and the "440 SUE Chains.dgn" shows information like STORM 4, STORM 4A, STORM 4B, etc. with points ranging from 150-158 and 298-310. Is there a document that equates the Video Report information with the DGN information?	A revised Excel spreadsheet will be posted on the project website that provides updated location reference information for the SUE points.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.10	Contract Book 3, Sections 2.2.c, 2.2.d, 2.2.e & Preliminary Plans	Book 3 of the RFP states the proposed inside and shoulder widths for the proposed roadway. Sections 2.2.c and 2.2.e require a minimum 10' inside shoulder with a 12' outside shoulder, and Section 2.2.d requires a minimum 11' inside and 12' outside shoulder. Where concrete barrier is proposed in the median and outside, the RFP Preliminary Plans typical sections show the concrete barrier within the shoulder limits. This is reducing the effective usable shoulder width to less than the minimum widths specified in the referenced sections of Contract Book 3 and conflicts with TDOT standard drawing RD01-TS-5W. Please confirm that the proposed concrete barrier can be within the minimum shoulder width, as show in the RFP Preliminary Plans."	For Sections 2.2.c and 2.2.e, the minimum inside shoulder width should be 10' from the inside edge of pavement to the base of the concrete barrier. For Section 2.2.d, the minimum shoulder width should be 11' from the inside edge of pavement to the centerline of the concrete barrier.
3.11	Reference Material, Preliminary Plans, Noise Wall Inspection Report, Noise Barrier Memo	The RFP Preliminary Plans and the Bowlby & Associates Noise Barrier Memo call for replacing the existing noise wall between Sta. 1197+65 and Sta. 1210+04. The Noise Wall Inspection Report and the RFP Preliminary Plans identify repairs to the existing noise wall within the same limits. It appears that these repairs will not be required, since the wall will be replaced in this area. Please clarify this discrepancy.	Noise barrier repairs will only be required for the segment of the existing noise barrier (approx. Sta. 1193+00 to Sta. 1197+65) that is to remain.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
	Reference Material, Preliminary Plans	It appears that there are additional cross drains for which culvert sections were not provided in the RFP Preliminary Plans. Please confirm that no work will be required for these cross drains?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to prepare the project's final drainage system design. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine any modifications or work required on existing cross-drains or the need for additional cross-drains.
3.12	Book I, Section D Tech Response Categories and Scoring, Response Category III Schedule Mgmt (page 17).	A CPM Schedule is to be included in the proposal. As this will be several pages please consider excluding the CPM schedule printout from the total page count restriction.	The CPM is a part of the total page count restriction.
3.13	Book I, Section E Proposals, 1 Price Proposal (page 24).	The last paragraph on Page 24 references a "EBS" file and electronic bid bond. When will TDOT post the EBS file and electronic bid bond form?	The Department will post the EBS file and the electronic bid bond a week before the Bid opening.
3.14	Book I, Section E Proposals, 1, Technical Proposal (page 25).	The paragraph on Response Categories II through IV states "maximum total of 75 page count (not pages). Please clarify if this means 75 pages (front and back would be 2 pages) or 75 sheets.	The maximum is 75 page count which means 38 pages.
3.15	Book I, Section E Proposals, 1, Technical Proposal (page 25).	For categories II – IV, the paragraph states "the forms provided for response shall be used for the information requested". As every category will require additional sheets, we request that we not include the actual Response Category Forms but format each section in the same order as the information requested on those forms.	The Design Builder's request is accepted.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.16	TDOT Form QR Response 2/12/2018	Per the most recent QR responses preliminary calculations are being made available to the Design-Builders for drainage. Can the preliminary analysis associated with the I-440 over I-65/RR bridges at the I-440/I-65 interchange be made available as reference material to the Design-Builder as well? Was an evaluation of the existing structure conducted for the proposed concept during preliminary design?	A preliminary evaluation of the existing structure for the proposed concept was performed. Structural calculations are the responsibility of the Design Builder; preliminary calculations are not provided.
3.17	TDOT Form QR Response 2/12/2018	Per response to first question on QR-17, please provide the existing tub girder shop drawings for all sheets related to with pier caps and abutment diaphragms.	All available shop drawings will be made accessible.
3.18	Reference Material	Please provide all historical bridge inspection reports related to I-440 over I-65/RR bridges.	Historical bridge inspection reports will be available.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.19	Contract Book 3, Section 3.1.m	Please clarify the requirement of RFP Book 3, Bridge Scope Item 3.1.m regarding the load rating analysis. The scope only addresses conducting and submitting a report. How are potential retrofits to the existing structures to be addressed should the structure not rate since final design will not be completed during the proposal stage? Was an evaluation conducted on the existing structures during preliminary design to verify that the proposed widening concepts could rate without additional retrofits?	The live load carrying capacity of the existing structure is not required to be increased. New bridge elements are to meet AASHTO LRFD 8 th Edition criteria. The preferred load rating is to be AASHTOWare Bridge Rating (formerly Virtis). CSiBridge would also be acceptable.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.20	TDOT Form QR Response 2/12/2018	<p>Per the QR responses the following statements are provided in the responses to questions requesting inspection reports for the I-440 Bridge over I-65/RR:</p> <p>Page QR-3 – “An inspection is scheduled and the report should be available in early March 2018.”</p> <p>Page QR-17 – “This bridge underwent major repairs in 2016 and is due to be inspected in March 2018.”</p> <p>Please confirm that both, the inspection and reporting, will be completed in March and provided to the Design-Builder such that appropriate considerations can be made to meet RFP Book 3, Bridge Scope Item 3.1.o requirements.</p>	The inspection report has been posted to the project website.
3.21	Reference Material	What is the RFP requirement for CCTV coverage of the corridor? Maximum distance, field of view, specific objects to monitor, etc.?	Proposed CCTV cameras shall meet the requirements in SP 725. The proposed CCTV camera(s) should cover the same distances and field of view as the existing camera(s).
3.22	Reference Material	What is the RFP requirement for RDS coverage of the corridor? General or maximum distance between detectors, lanes (mainline, ramps)?	It the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the design of the RDS system in accordance with TDOT standard. The system shall provide the same coverage as the existing system at a minimum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.23	Reference Material, Preliminary Design	Are the VDS detectors at 1194+00 to be re-installed on the new structure? Upgraded? Can they be relocated to the new CCTV pole? Or deleted and replaced by the RDS at 1013+79?	The VDS detectors shall be relocated to the new structure.
3.24	Reference Material, Preliminary Design	DMS cabinet at 1194+00 is shown as proposed. Please confirm this supporting equipment cannot be reused.	It the Design-Builders responsibility to determine if the existing DMS equipment can be reused in the proposed design. Any reused ITS equipment shall meet the requirements set forth in SP 725.
3.25	Reference Material, Preliminary Design	What is the RFP requirement for spread spectrum sites (RDS at 1062+59, 1161+22, 1230+00, 1247+78, 1247+82, 1331+59 and the receiver paired receivers near 1049+62, 1167+46, 1235+97, 1348+66)? Will a fiber connection be required to be installed during this project?	Fiber connections are required for these devices.
3.26	Preliminary Plans, Sheet 5A	The provided S.U.E. Information for the 18" pipe segment identified on Sheet 5A of the Preliminary plans (downstream of A13), shows cracks and that joint repairs are needed. This pipe is not proposed to be replaced in the Preliminary Plans nor does the RFP require it to be replaced. Is the Design Builder required to replace this pipe?	This pipe shall be replaced. Note from Section 2.7.h that the Design-Builder shall video inspect the drainage systems to ensure that they are clean, operable and structurally adequate. If there are any pipe with questionable structural adequacy, the Design-Builder should include the cost of replacement in their bid. The term "structurally adequate" will be defined in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.27	Preliminary Plans, Sheet 29A	The provided S.U.E. Information for the pipe downstream of Structure #BB24 appears to have a communications cable penetrated through the pipe. Is the Design Builder required to replace the storm sewer pipe to avoid the utility line or can the utility remain in its current location?	The Design Builder shall design the proposed drainage system to avoid/eliminate the conflict with the utility.
3.28	TDOT Drainage Manual	The TDOT Drainage Manual indicates that flanked inlets should be provided at sag locations. The Preliminary design does not indicate flanked inlets. Will the Design Builder be required to add flanked inlets in sag areas for this Project?	The Design Builder has been provided the preliminary design calculations/ Geopak Drainage file (for information only), the final drainage design and spacing of the flanking inlets is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.29	RFP Book 3, Section 2.7.j	<p>Section 2.7.j states “It is the Department’s intent to salvage as much of the existing system as possible.”</p> <p>However, the RFP also requires the design to be in accordance with the Department’s Drainage Manual. There are numerous existing storm sewer pipes that do not meet all of the Department’s Drainage Manual criteria (i.e.: minimum slope, minimum velocity, flow capacity of pipe, maximum pipe length, etc.).</p> <p>Please provide clarity on the intent of when reuse of the existing storm system is allowed.</p>	<p>The intent of the preliminary design was to use as much of the existing storm system as possible within reason and in concurrence with acceptable engineering/TDOT practice. The final drainage design should convey a 50-year design storm without overtopping the existing/proposed catch basin/ manhole grates. The Design Builder has been provided the preliminary design calculations/ Geopak Drainage file (for information only), the final drainage design is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.30	RFP Book 3, Section 2.j.k	<p>It appears the criteria for HGL has contradicting guidance within the TDOT Drainage Manual versus RFP. Per TDOT's Drainage Manual (7.03.04.2), "...if the entire system is designed for the 50-year storm frequency, the HGL check will not be needed".</p> <p>Per RFP, 2.j.k, "The design is intended to convey the 50-year design without any overtopping of the existing/proposed catch basin's/inlet's grates or manhole covers".</p> <p>Please advise which document governs for this project?</p>	<p>The proposal language shall govern for evaluating the existing trunk lines within the project's limits. If the 50-year design discharges can be conveyed without any overtopping of the existing / proposed catch basin/ inlet grates or manhole covers, this will be acceptable to the Department.</p>
3.31	RFP Book 3, Section 2	<p>There are several existing storm pipes that are "to remain" as shown in the Preliminary Plans that do not meet the minimum slope criteria established in the TDOT Drainage Manual.</p> <p>Will this be allowable?</p>	<p>The minimum slope criteria was not strictly adhered to when evaluating the existing drainage system. If the pipe slopes are within reason and the required minimum velocity and/or discharge can be obtained for a 50-year design criteria, as stated above, the Department would accept salvaging the trunk line rather than replacing it.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.32	Preliminary Plans	<p>The Preliminary Plans show several locations annotated with the note “EXIST. JERSEY BARRIER (TO REMAIN).”</p> <p>Through most spirals and curves on the project, the proposed superelevation rate and transition does not match the existing conditions. This includes areas where the intent of the plans is to keep existing barriers in place.</p> <p>In reviewing the proposed cross-sections, the proposed new pavement section does not tie to existing to allow for the existing barrier to remain.</p> <p>In these areas, should the Design-Builder plan to replace the existing barrier as a result of the proposed superelevations or, will the Design-Builder be allowed to use a non-standard shoulder rollover (if it does not exceed 7%) to meet the required 60 mph superelevation rate on the traveled lanes and tie the shoulder to the existing barrier elevation?</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to determine if the existing jersey barrier can be retained in the final roadway design. If the existing jersey barrier cannot be retained, the jersey barrier will need to be replaced per TDOT standard and the cost of the replacement will need to be included in the price bid for the work.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.33	RFP Book 3, Section 3.4.a & Response to QR-RD 02-12-18 V2 Final	Regarding the Department's response to the previously submitted noise-wall investigation for bidding purposes, would the Department consider an alternative option similar to the bridge deck repair scope?	The Department will consider an alternative option similar to the bridge deck repair scope. This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.
3.34	RFP Book 3, Section 2.2.v.	The last question on page QR-3 of TDOT's Answers to Questions dated 2/22/18 states ...dispose of excess material in embankment areas... Is the excess material to only be placed in existing fill/embankment areas per the owner provided cross sections or if material is allowed to remain on site will the Department designate the areas and limits/restrictions there within?	The Design-Builder is allowed to dispose of excess material in embankment areas within the project right-of-way with the exclusion of those areas referenced with Book 3 Section 2.2.v. Excess material used for embankments shall meet the requirements specified in the most current version of the Tennessee Department of Transportation Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The Design-Builder shall obtain pre-approval (after NTP) from the Department before disposing of <u>any</u> excess material within the right-of-way. The placing of any excess material shall not impact any existing trees on the project. Any material wasted off-site shall be done in accordance with TDOT's - Procedures for Providing Offsite Waste and Borrow on Construction Projects (2017).

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.35	I-440 Landscape Schematic Plans (Preliminary Plans Folder)	The Landscape schematics lists Leatherleaf Viburnum or similar for one of the shrub types. Leatherleaf is not on the approved list. However, Arrowwood is. Could you please clarify what is the acceptable shrub type?	Arrowwood Viburnum (Viburnum dentatum) is in the approved list of TDOT (Landscape Design Guidelines), instead of the Leatherleaf Viburnum and should be used in the project.
3.36	I-440 Landscape Schematic Plans (Preliminary Plans Folder)	Could you please specify minimum plant size and caliper for all plants listed in the landscape schematic plans?	Plants sizes are covered in Section 10.b of RFP Book 3.
3.37	SP108B	It is highly likely that a significant effort will be involved in maintaining the existing pavement until such time that it can be reconstructed. Will Liquidated Damages apply for lane closures associated with daytime pothole repairs?	No, liquidated damages will be applied for the lane closure, but prior coordination shall occur between the Design-Builder and the Department regarding the lane closure. Liquidated damages related to potholes in SP108B are still applicable.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: March 22, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.1	Reference DGNs	The following “dgn” files are missing from the reference files provided: I440_DrainageBasemap.dgn	This is a working file used by the Department and will not be provided to the Design-Builders.
4.2	General	Please provide the backup for the drainage areas and time of concentration in the drainage Geopak file?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to prepare the project’s final drainage system design.
4.3	Reference TIN	Please provide the existing ground model that extends out to the proposed noise wall location?	The existing ground TIN file provided on the project web site is the only existing ground model available to the Design-Builder from the Department. It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility to verify and update (as necessary) the survey for the project.
4.4	Book 3, Article 3.3, Noise Barriers	Please provide the shop drawings and as-built plans for all existing noise barriers. This is critical to determining a proper plan of action for the repairs.	Shop drawings and as-built plans for the existing noise barriers on the project are not available from the Department.
4.5	Book 3, Article 5, ITS	The ITS fiber optic will be relocated to the outside shoulder as part of this work. May FO conduits be suspended from the outside bridge copings? And be surface mounted along the face or back of Noise Walls	The Design-Builder shall not surface mount the ITS fiber optic line to the front or back of the noise walls nor the parapet wall of the bridges. This item 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
4.6	Book 3, Sect. 4.1	Section indicates the lighting fixtures and supports will be determined with TDOT and the power company. How is the Design-Builder to determine this for the proposal when contact with TDOT personnel is not allowed during the bid phase?	This item will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.
4.7	Book 3, Sect. 4	Do the new light poles have to match adjacent poles that are to remain? Are High Pressure Sodium luminaires to be used? Is there any preference for luminaires and photometric curves. Are the existing underpasses to receive new lighting?	This item will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.
4.8	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 7	Please confirm that there are No ROW Acquisitions planned or required for this project? Please Remove Section 7 From the specifications or qualify its use for ATC or other.	No ROW is anticipated on this project. Section 7.a references the easement requirements for Railroad ROW. Section 7 will not be removed from the RFP. Any additional ROW and easements is dependent on the Design-Builder’s final design.
4.9	Book 3; Project Requirements - Section 7	Please describe in detail what the Design Builders Role(s) and Responsibilities are Assisting/Obtaining the Permanent Easement from CSX RR?	Section 7 has been updated with additional guidance regarding the Design Builders Role and Responsibilities regarding this subject. (RFP Addendum #1 3/13/18)

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.10	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 6	Please define what Geotechnical Work is required by the Design Builder beyond verifying Bridge, Lighting, Signing and Wall Foundation requirements?	The Design-Builder is responsible for performing any geotechnical engineering required for the design and construction of the project as referenced in Section 6 of Book 3 of the RFP.
4.11	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 12.2	Please confirm that all Temporary Pavement Markings are to be 8 inches in width?	All temporary pavement marking should be in accordance with TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines, TDOT Standard Drawings, and Standard Specifications.
4.12	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 2	Please confirm the width required for all Permanent pavement markings? Please provide the special provision for Contrast striping?	All permanent pavement marking should be in accordance with TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines, TDOT Standard Drawings, and Standard Specifications. The special provision will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.
4.13	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 2.7	Please confirm when TDOT is requiring the Design Builder to Video the Existing Storm System Lines? Is it the intent that the Design Builder is to hazard a guess at how much of the system can be reused? Please verify that the design builder is only responsible to replace the 4 lines in 2.7J and all other replacements will be extra work?	Pipes requiring replacement are not limited to the pipes shown in 2.7.j. It is the Design-Builder responsibility to utilize industry standard methods to determine any other pipes meeting the requirements for replacement. The Design-Builder shall include the cost of those replacements in the price bid for the work.
4.14	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 3.4	Please confirm that the only Noise Wall Repairs the Design Builder is responsible for is that Square Footage shown in the reference material and only at the locations given? Please provide the criteria to be used for any design-level inspections required?	Refer to Addendum #2 (3/15/2018) regarding this question.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.15	Book 2; Contract – Section A – 8.	Please confirm where ROW Acquisitions are expected? If not expected please correct this section.	No ROW is anticipated on this project. Section 7.a (RFP Book 3) referenced the easement requirements for Railroad ROW. Any additional ROW and easements is dependent on the Design-Builder’s final design.
4.16	Book 2; Contract – Section A – 11.	Please identify clearly & exactly what Quality Control Testing the Design Builder is to include? What Quality Inspection the Design Builder is to Perform? What QA/QC the Designer Builder is to Pay For? Is the Design Builders role only verification?	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.
4.17	Book 2; Contract – Section G– 1.	Please Verify that TDOT is Requiring the Design Builder to have \$1 Million Errors and Omission Policy? Will TDOT Consider Requiring a \$5 Million Project Specific Policy from all bidders?	No change will be made to the Errors and Omission insurance policy requirements.
4.18	Book 2; Contract – Section G– 1.	Please verify that there is no requirement for All Risk insurance and the Design Builder is not required to carry Builders Risk Insurance?	Per the Design-Build Standard Guidance (2.16. Insurance), the Design-Builder is required to have commercial general liability insurance, professional liability insurance, and railroad protective public liability and property damage liability insurance. Neither “All Risk” or “Builder’s Risk” insurance is required under the Design-Build Standard Guidance. Builder’s risk insurance covers the contractor’s materials, equipment and property related to the construction.
4.19	Book 1; E. Proposals – Section 3	Please Increase the Stipend to \$300,000 for the Responsible, Unsuccessful Proposers?	The stipend amount will not be increased.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.20	Book 2; Contract – Special Provision 109A	Please Add an Option to the Contract that allows the Design Builder to Option Out of participation in fuel adjustments?	No “Option Out” option will be added.
4.21	Standard Specifications Section 106.06	Please Verify That the Design Builder Does Not Provide TDOT with a Field Office or Lab for this Contract? If this Is Required Please Provide Specifications and Details?	The Design-Builder shall provide a Field Office consisting of an office trailer with electrical service, HVAC, and working bathroom (with sewer) and running water. The trailer shall have minimum size of 12’ wide by 50’ long. The trailer shall include two desks, a conference table with a minimum seating capacity of 12 people, one plans table, and 30 chairs, and 4 filing cabinets. The design builder shall also provide a gravel parking area (at a minimum). The Field Office and parking area shall also be fenced for access control.
4.22	Book 3; Project Requirements – 2.5.c	Please Provide a description of the intended method of Transitioning the New Median Barriers in to and through the Existing Center Bridge Piers?	The Design-Builder shall use TDOT Standard Drawing S-SSMB-4 (most current version).
4.23	Book 3; Project Requirements – Section 2.7	Do pipe outlets on the project exhibiting evidence of scour or excessive erosion need to be addressed in this project?	Yes, the Design-Builder shall address these conditions in their final drainage design.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.24	Preliminary Plans & Drainage Standard Drawings	<p>On the Preliminary Plans Present Layout, several existing CB's are labeled "Exist. CB to be removed and replaced" and show that the existing pipe is to be utilized in the Proposed Layout. Based on the elevation provided for the existing CB invert and the Standard Drawings "minimum design depth" for the new structure, the minimum design depth won't be met for the new structure if the existing pipe is to be used in the proposed design. One case is at STA. 1014+42, 71' left where the existing catch basin is 3.10' deep with an existing 18" pipe. The proposed replacement structure (A16) is a Type 28 Catch Basin with a minimum depth of 3.74' with an 18" pipe. Will the minimum depth requirement be waived in order to utilize the existing pipe, if the existing pipe is found to be hydraulically sufficient?</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design the final drainage system for the project. The Design-Builder shall follow the standards stated in the RFP document. The preliminary drainage design has been provided for information purposes only.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.25	Preliminary Plans & Drainage Standard Drawings	<p>Can the minimum depth requirement for proposed catch basins, per the Standard Drawing, be waived if the new pipe is to be located under valley gutter, in locations where flanking inlets and/or additional inlets are needed to control spread, in order to utilize the existing cross pipe? One case is "Ramp EB OFF MURPHY RD." where the existing catch basin is located at STA. 103+58, 8' right at what would be considered the sag. The existing catch basin is 3.19' deep with an existing 18" pipe. A Type 28 Catch Basin (B24) is shown on the Proposed Layout to replace the existing catch basin. A Type 28 Catch Basin (single grate) has a minimum depth of 3.74' with an 18" pipe. However, spread analysis indicated that the Type 28 Catch Basin at the sag location would result in the spread exceeding the allowable shoulder width. In order to maintain the spread within the allowable shoulder width, additional double grated catch basins would be needed up and down station from the sag location plus the standard flanking inlets. A Type 29 Catch Basin (double grate) has a minimum depth of 4.05' with an 18" pipe and a "drop across the bottom of structure" of 0.33'. The new piping to tie the additional catch basin to the existing cross drain pipe would be located under the proposed valley gutter. The existing cross drain pipe at this location is hydraulically sufficient.</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design the final drainage system for the project. The Design-Builder shall follow the standards stated in the RFP document. The preliminary drainage design has been provided for information purposes only.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.26	Preliminary Plans & Drainage Manual	The Preliminary Plans Proposed Layouts show at all of the sag locations, that a single grate catch basin is used. An example is the median Catch Basin (D3) Type 31 (single grate inlet on both sides of the barrier wall) located at STA. 1103+33. The Drainage Manual Section 7.03.3.2 indicates “a sag point will normally include two curved vane grates”. Are the double grated catch basins for sag points being waived?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to design the final drainage system for the project. The Design-Builder shall follow the standards stated in the RFP document. The preliminary drainage design has been provided for information purposes only.
4.27	Preliminary Plans & Drainage Manual	If double grated inlets are required at sag locations and flanking inlets are also required at sag locations, are double grated inlets and flanking inlets required at sag location on ramps?	Yes, standard double grated inlet and flanking inlets combinations are required at sag location on ramps with curbs on the shoulder.
4.28	Preliminary Plans	If flanking inlets are required for ramps and the flanking inlet location is beyond the limits as shown on the Proposed Layout, as in the case of “Ramp WB ON MURPHY RD.” Catch Basin B20 at STA. 207+85.81 is located at what would be considered the sag. The construction limit is located at STA. 207+68. Will the ramp construction and valley gutter be extended to the flanking inlet location, the valley gutter only be extended, add the flanking inlet with no ramp or valley gutter extension, or omit the flanking inlet?	Ramp construction limits shown in the plans are preliminary and for information only. It is the Design Builders responsibility to determine the final limits of ramp construction based on their final design.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.29	Preliminary Plans & LiDAR Data	<p>The minimum vertical clearances shown on the preliminary plans do not match the clearances using the point cloud information provided (I-440 Bridge PODS). For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Marlborough-Richardson: Plans say 16.42' at the WB Travel Lane; Point Cloud shows 16.17' at the EB Travel Lane •Granny White: Plans say 16.76' at the WB Edge of Shoulder; Point Cloud shows 16.27' at the EB Edge of Shoulder •Woodlawn: Plans says 16.99' at the EB Travel Lane; Point Cloud shows 16.14' at EB Travel Lane. <p>These 3 are given for example only. We fear there may be more discrepancies. Which is good/correct?</p>	The preliminary plans are for information only. It's the Design-Builders responsible to verify and update the survey and the plans as necessary, to prepare their final design and construction plans.
4.30	GENERAL QUESTION	Can the Design Builder assume that TDOT already conducted utility coordination for the two ramp queue projects (TDOT PIN Nos. 119734.00 and 119735.00)?	The Department is handling the utility coordination on these two projects only. TDOT PIN 119734.00 has received respond "No Conflict" or "Not on project" from all utilities except Metro Public Works (response not received as of this writing). TDOT PIN 119735 has received respond "No Conflict" or "Not on project" from all utilities except Metro Public Works and Nashville Electric Service (response not received as of this writing).

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
4.31	TDOT Response to Questions Dated 3/13/18 Question 3.26	The provided response indicated it is the DB's responsibility to conduct an inspection either before or after successful award. How will verification of the inspection and concurrence of the report be made?	The Design-Builder shall be required to supply the video inspection of the existing drainage system as part of the Project Records for the project.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: April 3, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.1	Addendum 1, Contract Book 3, Sections 12.1.d, 12.1.e, 12.1.f	Addendum 1 included new requirements listed as 12.1.d, 12.1.e, and 12.1.f. Did TDOT intend to replace the existing sections in the RFP with these new sections, or should the Addendum 1 sections have been numbered 12.1.j, 12.1.k and 12.1.l to append Section 12.1?	The new requirements (12.1.d, 12.1.e, and 12.1.f) did not replace any existing sections. The new requirements were placed in the appropriate section and the numbering of preceding requirements were adjusted accordingly.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.2	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2.3.k	<p>The existing I-440 over Lealand Lane Bridge does not have concrete noise barrier panels. RFP Book 3 Item 3.2.3.k dictates that the noise barrier on the bridge is to conform with Special Provision 718NB. Special Provision 718NB, 1.0, 3. indicates the system shall include a reinforced concrete component. There is no reference to a bridge installation in Special Provision 718NB. Is it TDOT's intent to replace the noise barrier on the bridge over Lealand Lane with a concrete noise wall?</p> <p>If a concrete noise barrier is required, the extra weight will impact the capacity and load rating of the existing beams as well as dictate changes to the exterior parapet to facilitate the new panel connection. Will TDOT allow a lighter "in-kind" replacement system that may be able to utilize the existing parapet connections?</p> <p>Please provide plans for the existing noise barrier system on the bridge.</p>	No, the Department's intent is to not use concrete. Refer to QR questions dated 2/22/2018 on project website. See page QR-4 and third question on the sheet.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.3	RFP Preliminary Plans	<p>There appears to be additional HSSD issues with the proposed roadway design resulting in sight lines going through existing piers and proposed median barrier. Will the department provide additional design exceptions for these locations for the 60 MPH design speed? The anticipated HSSD issues for inside and outside lanes at PI stations are as follows:</p> <p>1049+55.37 1109+20.37 1113+46.98 (55MPH not met) 1136+62.69, 1166+53.57 (55MPH not met) 1253+63.47 1277+93.22</p> <p>Additional HSSD for outside lane is 1299.36.33.</p> <p>If the department feels these curves meet HSSD, can the calculations be provided to the DB teams?</p>	This item will be addressed in forthcoming addendum and plans revision.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.4	QR Response 1, QR-17, 4th Question	Please confirm that if the means and method that the DB contractor employs to widen the bridges at Lealand Lane and Craig Avenue is hindered by the existing overhead lines within TDOT right-of-way, TDOT will direct the Utility Owner to relocate the overhead lines and the relocation cost will be the responsibility of the Utility Owner.	Utility coordination is the Design-Builder's responsibility. Any cost incurred for the utility relocation, due the Design-Builder's choice of means and methods, is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.5	RFP Contract Book3, Section 8 (Utilities)	<p>This is to seek further clarification regarding the handling of utilities on the project. Based on previous answers to questions, we understand that the cost and risks of relocation work will be the responsibility of the utility owners. The Design-Builder's only obligation is to coordinate that relocation work. A key component of that coordination effort is to ensure the utility owners perform their work in a timely manner.</p> <p>Under the applicable statutes, TDOT has the authority to require utility owners to perform their work on a schedule that is consistent with the completion of the Project and that would not interfere with the Design-Builder's work. We assume that the authority and other rights of TDOT under the applicable statutes are being delegated to the Design-Builder or that TDOT will commit to exercise their rights on the Design-Builders behalf when it becomes necessary to avoid delays to the work. Please confirm?</p>	Yes, Department will assist the Design-Builder in resolving delays due to utility owners' work schedule/progress.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.6	<p>RFP Contract Book 3, Section 8.r (Utilities)</p> <p>Standard Specification 108.07 B</p>	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 8.r states: <i>“No additional compensation or time shall be granted for any delays, inconveniences, or damage sustained by the Design-Builder or its Subcontractors due to interference from utilities or the operation of relocating utilities.”</i></p> <p>Standard Specification 108.07 B, Excusable, Non-Compensable Delays, includes Utilities as an example of such delay that would provide a time extension.</p> <p>Considering the Department’s response to questions stating that this is a non-Chapter 86 project and the responsibility being delegated to the Design-Builder as referenced in the question above, would TDOT allow the time relief provided by the Standard Specification?</p>	<p>Time extension will be evaluated utilizing the procedures outlined in Section 108.07.</p>
5.7	Lighting	<p>We request that TDOT provide lighting specifications as part of the RFP and not defer to post NTP coordination with the Traffic Operations Division. This way DB Teams will evaluate and price to the same requirements.</p>	<p>This item will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum, however, the successful Design-Builder will still need to coordinate with the Traffic Operations Division</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.8	Highway Advisory Radios (HAR)	<p>There are currently (5) Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) Beacon signs on the as-built plans and ITS device list.</p> <p>These are not shown on the ITS or Signing and Marking Roll Plots.</p> <p>Are the HAR beacon Signs to be retained or replaced?</p>	The existing HAR beacon signs are to be retained.
5.9	ITS Fiber Optic Communication Infrastructure	Would TDOT be willing to provide the existing fiber allocation and bandwidth capacity currently in use?	The Department will provide this information to the successful Design-Builder during the design phase.
5.10	First set of TDOT Responses (Dated 2/12/18)	<p>Rock Scaling: First set of Department answers to questions, QR-5 last question, in light of the Department paying unit prices for additional work on Uniformed Police Officer, Changeable Message Boards, Bridge Deck Repairs, and now Noise Walls; due to subjectivity and differences of opinion, will the required Rock Scaling and Trim Blasting be covered in a manner similar to the Noise Barriers, with Contractor assistance, where Department concurrence of quantities to be included in the pricing and provisions for overage?</p>	As stated in the previous QR questions dated 2/22/2018 - The Department will not be implementing this procedure for rock scaling and trimming. Additional Rock Scaling and Trimming information will be supplied on the project website.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.11	TDOT Standard Specifications	Per Standard Specification Section 203.10 Basis of Payment, The Department will pay for Undercutting at the unit price per cubic yard... ..and if unsuitable material not described in the Plans is encountered and no contract unit price has been established for Undercutting, the Department will pay for this work at a rate per cubic yard equal to 1.5 times the contract unit price for Road and Drainage Excavation (Unclassified)... As owner and beneficiary will the Department, either establish an Undercut pay Item for the contractors to provide pricing or state a base line quantity of Undercut to include in the Proposal and then pay for any overages either by Force Account or mutually agreed Unit Price during construction?	No additional payment will be made regarding undercutting. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to determine the cost of any undercutting related to the project and incorporate the cost into the price bid for the work.
5.12	GENERAL QUESTION	Due to the Department's requirement for T.V. inspection of existing storm drainage system prior to bid with the estimated inspection costs and associated Traffic Control in excess of the provided Stipend, will the Department reimburse the unsuccessful bidders for costs expended to meet this burden?	Video inspection of the existing storm drainage system is only required for the successful Design-Build team.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.13	TDOT Standard Specifications Follow-up to Response 4.21	The question references the Standard Specifications Section 106.06 Field Laboratory (which is required for testing and incidental to the appropriate items of work), the answer discusses a Field Office (Type 2) which is not required by the RFP but is covered in section 722 of the Standard Specifications. Will the Department answer the bidders 106.06 question?	No field laboratory will be required as part of this project.
5.14	TDOT Standard Specifications Follow-up to Response 4.21	In response to the answer of Question 4.21, will the RFP be modified to require a full Section 722 Type 2 Field Office?	The RFP will not be modified. A Type 2 Field Office meeting the requirements listed in Section 722 of the Standard Specifications.
5.15	TDOT Standard Specifications Follow-up to Response 4.21	In response to the answer of Question 4.21, are the requirements of Section 722 of the Standard Specification going to be modified by the Department?	The RFP will not be modified. A Type 2 Field Office meeting the requirements listed in Section 722 of the Standard Specifications.
5.16	TDOT Standard Specifications Follow-up to Response 4.21	In response to the answer of Question 4.21, per Section 722.02 of the Standard Specifications please define and identify a site location that the Department deems both satisfactory and convenient to the project.	It is responsibility of the successful Design-Build team to coordinate with the Department, after award, to determine an appropriate location for the field office.
5.17	GENERAL QUESTION	If a similar A.T.C. is proposed by multiple teams and the “concept” is not approved for one bidder, are the other bidders to assume that their A.T.C. is not approved for any other team?	Each ATC is evaluated individually by the Department and in accordance with the RFP.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.18	RFP Bk 2, Page 12 Section G.1 Insurance Requirements	The requirement for Errors and Omissions Insurance in Book 2 Agreement G.1, will the Department be a named additional insured on this policy?	No, the Department will not be named additional insured per Book 2, Section G.1 as it is the Design-Builders responsibility to provide the final design for the project utilizing his design consultant firm.
5.19	RFP Bk 2, Page 12 Section G.1 Insurance Requirements	As this project is to be a turnkey design and construct contract and is 100% covered by Payment and Performance Bonds with a Standard Warranty why is the Department requiring an Errors and Omission Policy?	Errors and Omissions Insurance Policy is for the design consultant firm. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to provide the final design for the project utilizing his design consultant firm
5.20	RFP Bk 1, Page 7 Section 5. Procurement Schedule/ Submittal Deadlines	Will the Department please either move the Anticipated Date of Last Addendum up a week to May 4th from May 11th or push the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal back a week to May 25th in order of provide two weeks for the bidders to have adequate time to incorporate any pricing or technical changes and allow time for reprinting of the required documents effected by the last Addendum?	No changes will be made to the RFP schedule.
5.21	TDOT Response to Questions Dated March 13, 2018	Follow up to Question 3.3: Will the Department issue the requested narrative of updates?	RFP Addendums were released on 3/15/2018 and 3/20/2018.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.22	GENERAL QUESTION	In response to the Departments requesting more than a "Concept" for review of A.T.C.'s, will the Department either adequately supplement the Stipend or reimburse the teams costs for the additional engineering and pricing evaluation it is desiring to see?	No supplement to the stipend will be provided by the Department.
5.23	RFP Bk 1, Page 25 Section 2. Proposal Opening	Should a bidder be informed their Technical Proposal is deemed non-responsive, will their Proprietary Pricing Proposal be returned unopened?	If the Technical Proposal is deemed non-responsive, the bid will be returned unopened to Design-Builder.
5.24	RFP Bk 1, Page 7 Section 5. Procurement Schedule/ Submittal Deadlines	Will the Department consider splitting the Technical and Pricing Due Dates and so that only if the Technical Proposal passes do the bidders submit the Pricing Proposal?	The Department will not consider splitting the Technical Proposal and Pricing due dates.
5.25	General	Does the Department plan any repairs to the existing I-440 roadway surface before the project is awarded?	The Department will overlay portions of I-440 before the project is awarded. Information regarding this overlay project has been made available on the project website.
5.26	Pavement Design	What data was used to calculate the ESAL's used for the I-440 pavement design.	The I-440 ADL (Average Daily Load) data supplied by the Department was used to determine the equivalent single axle load (ESAL) data. The ESAL data was then used in determining pavement design structural numbers. Structural numbers were calculated using the AASHTO 1993 Design procedure.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.27	<p>RFP Book 1, Page 13 Section 2.e ATC INCLUSION IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL</p> <p>RFP Book 1, Page 25 Section 1a.</p>	<p>This section states that if an ATC is approved, it may be incorporated into the Technical Proposal. However, this seems to conflict with a later statement in the same section indicating that “Approval of an ATC in no way implies that the ATC will receive favorable review from the Design-Build Review Committee”. Does that mean that the inclusion of an Approved ATC in our Price Proposal, which might receive an unfavorable review from the Design Build Review Committee, has the potential to cause the entire technical proposal to be rated as “FAIL” or will it “Pass” with the ATC now being disapproved and the additional cost and/or time related to the ATC begin added back?</p>	<p>Inclusion of an approved ATC will not cause the Technical Proposal to be failed.</p>
5.28	<p>RFP Book 1, Page 25 Section 2) PROPOSAL PRICE</p>	<p>If an ATC has a certain element that does not meet or exceed all minimum contract requirements, but that ATC has been approved indicating a variance from said requirements, TDOT can still require the D/B to meet the minimum contract requirements at no additional compensation?</p>	<p>During the course of the project if the approved ATC becomes not feasible or unworkable due to Geotechnical, Environmental or other requirements, it will be the Design-Builders responsibility to provide the minimum requirements of the RFP without additional compensation.</p>
5.29	<p>RFP Book 1, Page 27 Section 2) UNBALANCED PRICING</p>	<p>Will TDOT’s detailed cost estimate be made available during the procurement process?</p>	<p>The final estimate will be shown upon the award of the project.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
5.30	RFP Section 3 page 15, 3.1.l.	Are erection plans and calculations required to be submitted as part of the technical proposal? Or is it the intent for them to be provided after the award of the contract?	These details are not required as a part of the Technical Proposal, they will be required during the design phase. Please refer to the Design Build Standard Guidance for review plan review procedures.
5.31	RFP Bk1, Page 22, Section 4.c.	Per this section, the design builder shall “identify the appropriate design criteria for each feature if not provided”. Please define “feature”?	Feature is defined as an element of design that is covered under the listed design standards, specifications, special provisions and standard drawings detailed in the RFP.
5.32	RFP Bk1, Page 22, Section 4.d.	This section says “shall include half-size plan sheets depicting those elements required by the RFP.” Will 11” X 17” plans be acceptable? Or will they be required to be 12” X 18”?	Yes, 11”x17” sheets will be acceptable. These sheets may be included in a volume 2 submitted with the Technical Proposal with any other detail sheets (such as an additional expanded CPM) and will not be counted in the 75 page restriction.
5.33	Follow-up to QR question 3.30	Will the HGL check be needed for the proposed drainage design?	If the Design-Builder proposes to utilize existing storm sewer pipes in their proposed drainage design, the HGL check for the drainage system will be required. If the Design-Builder proposes a completely new drainage system (either in whole or as a self-contained sub-system of the whole system), the HGL check will not be required.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: April 9, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
6.1	BOOK 3, SECTION 4 – LIGHTING SCOPE OF WORK. ADD #5 BOOK #3, Sect 4.g	Please Provide the Model, Type, and Requirements for the Lighting Luminaires to be included for this Project. This is a Critical Item that needs to be specified to finish this portion of the design? This is not in the Reference Material.	Lighting Specifications have been added to the Reference Material.
6.2	BOOK 3, SECTION 3.3 – NOISE BARRIER WALLS & ADD #2, Page 4, Ans #3, & ADD #5, Page 2, Ans #1	Is the Replacement of the Noise Barrier Wall on the West Bound Lealand Bridge Required? There is No Condition Report, No Wall Number, No Wall Plan. Please clearly State if this Noise Wall is to Be Removed and Replaced.	The noise barrier wall on the westbound Lealand Lane Bridge does not require removal or replacement.
6.3	ADD #5, ITDB Page 14 & SP108B	Is it TDOT's Intention to Charge \$100,000 per day Liquidated Damages based on the Design Builders Proposed Finish Date Specified in their Part B? Is it Further Intended for the Dollar amount of Part B to be as much as 1157 Days x \$100,000 = \$115,700,000?	It is the Departments intent to utilize \$100,000 per Calendar Day for the "B" portion of the bid and establish liquidated damages in the amount of \$100,000 per Calendar Day as provided in Addendum #3.
6.4	ADD #5, ITDB Page 14 & SP108B	Changing the Part B Value from \$15K to \$100K is a very significant change. Could be taken that this is a Cardinal Change after the ATC period. Please extend the ATC Period to April 13, 2018 so Design Builders have Time to Incorporate this into their Designs, do ATC's, and Prepare Estimates?	The ATC deadline will be extended to April 13, 2018, this will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: April 26, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.1	Drainage Analysis	<p>From our analysis there are several more pipes that are to be replaced in addition to the pipes that are proposed in the RFP concept plans.</p> <p>We have seen a significant increase in the quantity for number of inlets and the total length of pipes from the concept plans. The increase is due to several factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ requirement to meet hydraulic capacity, ▪ determination if an existing pipe can be salvaged or needed to be replaced (from field reconnaissance and review of SUE videos), ▪ construction feasibility, ▪ proposing flanking inlets at sag locations with connecting pipes to sag inlet and ▪ correcting the plans for type of catch basins <p>Is it the Department's intent to provide revised RFP concept plans and if so, will the plans address these items?</p>	<p>No changes will be made to the drainage concept shown in the RFP plans. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to prepare the final drainage design for the project. The concept drainage design shown in the RFP plans is for information only.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.2	Environmental Document	The environmental document indicates that according to TDOT's noise policy, new questionnaires were to be sent to benefited residents and property owners at NAA 13 (Linmar Avenue) via certified mail, and that the questionnaire responses will be the decision for the barrier location. Has this occurred? Is input from the questionnaire included in the Noise Barrier Memo dated December 26, 2017?	Yes. The certified mailing was completed. No changes to the noise barrier design or location were required.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.3	ITS Roll Plots	<p>These questions are in regards to the relocation of the median fiber optic line called for in Requirement 5.2.b.</p> <p>Section 4.3.3 of SP 725 indicates that cable breaks and reel end splices are permitted only as shown in the Plans.</p> <p>What is the expectation of the Department regarding mid-span splices?</p> <p>Is there an expectation for maximum allowable splice loss between reel end splice or a link loss budget for this project?</p> <p>Must the relocated fiber line be spliced at the nearest upstream and downstream reel end/butt splice or will a mid-span splice be allowed if the splice loss introduced is within the link loss budget?</p> <p>If mid-span splices are not allowed, please provide the location of the nearest upstream and downstream reel end/full butt splice in order to estimate the length of fiber optic cable required for the median fiber relocation.</p>	<p>Mid-span splices are not allowed. Splices shall be performed at the Type E pull box. Completed fusion splices shall have no more than 0.10dB optical loss as measured in accordance with Section 4.2.4.2 in the SP.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.4	Submittal Review and Approvals	<p>What can the Design Builder expect regarding the involvement of NES for approval of plans, material submittals, and inspection of the proposed lighting infrastructure?</p> <p>Specifically, will approval from NES, or Nashville Metro (in addition to TDOT) of RFC plans be required to begin work on the ITS and lighting infrastructure.</p>	Approval from NES (in addition to TDOT) will be required for lighting to begin work, but not on ITS. ITS work will only require approval from TDOT ITS.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.5	Addendum 3, Contract Book 3, Section 4.d	<p>Section 15.4.1 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual includes the following:</p> <p>“Components of illuminance design include the average maintained horizontal illumination (Eh), or quantity of light, and the uniformity ratio (Eh/Emin), or quality of light, maximum veiling luminance (Lv), and veiling luminance ratio (Lv to Lave).”</p> <p>Addendum 3 of the RFP included in section 4.d stated the following:</p> <p>The illuminance method shall be used (Values of Average Maintained Minimum, Average/Min, and Max/Min shall be in accordance with Chapter 15 of the TDOT Traffic Design Manual). Photometrics for the whole project shall be generated, submitted, and concurred by Traffic Operations Division before starting a complete detailed design of the project.</p>	The design-builder shall meet the illuminance method in accordance with Chapter 15 including “Values of Average Maintained Minimum, Average/Min, and Max/Min”.
7.6	Underpass Lighting	Does Requirement 4.c for underpass lighting apply to the Leland overpass and Craig Street overpass? The underdeck lighting for these two structures would light local streets not I-440.	Yes, underpass lighting is required at Leland Lane and Craig Avenue.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.7	Book 1, Section D.4.c, E.1.a, and O.2	<p>RFP Contract Book 1 states in various places that ROW Acquisition sheets shall be submitted in Adobe.pdf format on CD with the electronic copy of the Technical Proposal.</p> <p>Please clarify if anything needs to be included on the CD with the electronic copy of the Technical Proposal if the DB does not anticipate any ROW Acquisition.</p>	ROW Acquisition sheets will be required due to Railroad Easement acquisition being required for this project, even if the Design-Builder does not anticipate any ROW Acquisition.
7.8	SP108B and Book 1 B.3	<p>SP108B states that punchlist items are not included in the calendar day count; while Book 1 states that punchlist items are included in the calendar days.</p> <p>Although Special Provisions are not specifically listed in the Order of Precedence, they are attached to Book 2 so it is assumed they are higher in order than Book 1.</p> <p>Please verify SP108B's language stating that punchlist items are not included in the calendar day count govern over the conflicting language in Book 1.</p>	Book 1 will be revised to eliminate the conflict in a forthcoming addendum.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.9	BOOK 3 SECTION 2.2.C-2.2.E	<p>The RFP states that the outside shoulders shall be "12' (includes 2.5' from proposed valley gutter)."</p> <p>In the Department provided typical sections, plan sheets, and CADD Files, for the station ranges below and others, the outside shoulder width varies from 8' to 10' with valley gutter. Currently, this does not meet minimum shoulder widths required per the RFP. Please clarify if we are to follow the RFP or the widths shown on the costing plans.</p> <p>Sta. 1053+08 to Sta. 1071+25 EB/WB Sta. 1133+26 to Sta. 1141+45 EB Sta. 1218+30 to Sta. 1236+15 EB Sta. 1248+10 to Sta. 1257+93 WB</p>	<p>For the station ranges listed in the question, the concrete valley gutter is not proposed on the shoulder. In these locations a standard 12-foot shoulder (10-foot stabilized) is to be used. Annotated/highlighted proposed layout sheets have been provided in the reference material section of the project website.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.10	BOOK 3 SECTION 2.2.AA BOOK 3 SECTION 2.2.C-2.2.E	<p>RFP Addendum 3 Book 3 Section 2.2.aa provided 8 total locations where HSSD issues resulted in wider inside shoulders to be provided.</p> <p>Book 3 Section 2.2.c, 2.2.d, and 2.2.e requires 12' outside shoulders throughout the project limits. The total width of roadway required per the RFP results in major field issues including, the full removal and replacement/relocation of noise walls, Cross-line (overpass) structures needing to be replaced to accommodate wider roadway envelopes and widening of mainline structures that are not shown to be widened on the costing plans.</p> <p>Station Ranges: 1258+54 through 1299+95 (WB) – Physical constraints not allowing 12' shoulder 1309+35 through 1316+04 (WB) - Physical constraints not allowing 12' shoulder 1349+05 through End Project - Physical constraints not allowing 12' shoulder</p> <p>Please clarify the requirements/intensions of Addendum 3, or will TDOT allow deviations from the required 12' outside shoulder dimensions.</p>	<p>For the station ranges listed in the question, annotated/highlighted proposed layout sheets have been provided in the reference material section of the project website. These proposed layout sheets delineate the appropriate shoulder widths for these locations.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.11	BOOK 3, SECTION 4- LIGHTING SCOPE OF WORK	Will TDOT provide the existing Electrical Service point locations?	It is the responsibility of the Design Builder to coordinate with the appropriate utility owner to establish electrical service point connections.
7.12	BOOK 3, SECTION 2.5 – GUARDRAIL AND BARRIERS	<p>In areas along the project corridor where existing rock walls and other roadway hazards are located within the clear zone and currently do not have guardrail protecting the obstruction, will the Design-Builder be required to install guardrail at those locations?</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EB I-440 between Sta. 1098+25 and Sta. 1100+95 – wall is within 18’ of the existing edge of travel lane. • WB I-440 between Sta. 1025+00 and Sta. 1032+00 – wall is within 16’ of the existing travel lane. 	<p>The preliminary plans are provided for information only. It is the Design Builder responsibility to determine the need, the final location, and the final design of all necessary roadside safety hardware/equipment.</p> <p>In regard to hazards already protected by concrete barriers (Sta. 1025+00 and Sta. 1032+00 and Sta. 1098+25 and Sta. 1100+95), it is the Design Builder’s responsibility to determine if existing concrete barriers along I-440 can meet current standards and be reused in the proposed design. Additional guardrail is not required where existing barrier walls provides adequate protection.</p>
7.13	BOOK 3, ADDENDUM 3 SECTION 4.f	Addendum 3 Section 4.f states “High mast lighting will not be allowed under this contract to prevent excessive light pollution in residential areas. All existing high mast poles located at the I-65 and I-40 interchanges shall remain in place”: and Section 4.g states “Design-Builder shall use LED luminaires for entire project including ramps. Design-Builder shall only use LED fixtures approved by Nashville Metro. (see reference material).” Are the existing high mast lights to converted to LED luminaires?	The existing high mast light shall not be converted to LED luminaires.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.14	Addendum #3, RFP Contract Book 3, Section 4.b	<p>Section 4.d of Addendum #3 states: "All existing light standards located along entire length of I-440 (STA. 13003+89.38, MM 0.2 to STA. 1351+80.09, MM 7.0) shall be removed. This includes lights on surface streets and at interchanges and overpasses that are brown in color and on the I-440 circuit. New lighting standards and luminaires shall be designed to assure that I-440 has adequate lighting to meet TDOT Standards."</p> <p>Regarding "lights on surface streets and at interchanges and overpasses," will TDOT provide the limits for this scope, or is the DB to assume that these limits would not extend further than the construction limits shown in the Preliminary Plans?</p> <p>Is it the Department's intent to also remove and replace the following: -Light pole foundations -Wiring and conduit -Pull Boxes -Control Centers</p> <p>Pricing related to this scope could vary significantly between DB teams without further clarification from the Department regarding scope. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The Design Builder will be responsible for replacing surface street lights that are brown in color and on the I-440 circuit only. Other surface street lights that are not on the I-440 circuit are to remain in place.</p> <p>It is the Design Builder's responsibility to determine if existing elements of the existing lighting system along I-440 can meet current standards and be reused in the proposed lighting design.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
7.15	Reference Material, Geotechnical Project Memorandum (4-24-17) and Rock Removal Estimate (3-27-18)	<p>Upon review of the Department's Geotechnical Project Memorandum and Rock Removal Estimate, most of the required scope is clear, for the exception of the work on the masonry wall areas.</p> <p>What is the Department's intent regarding repair of the masonry walls shown within the report?</p> <p>Please provide additional detail on the requested work associated with the masonry walls.</p>	<p>The masonry wall repairs will consist of replacing or repairing any loose stones and/or mortar/grout to create a solid and safe face and replace any missing backfill. This does not exclude the possibility of isolated loose or missing stones on other masonry walls that aren't specified in the report.</p>
7.16	Preliminary Plans	<p>The preliminary plans show full-depth patch locations on various existing concrete ramps. Reviewing the condition of these ramps, it appears likely that more areas could require repair before the end of the project.</p> <p>Would the Department consider adding a unit price pay item similar to the deck repairs or noise walls to cover additional required patching areas?</p>	<p>Any additional ramp repairs shall be included in the Lump Sum items bid. No unit price pay item will be added to the contract.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: May 25, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8.1	RFP Book 3 and 13.5. a – Addendum #3	Addendum #3 Provided a “SPOT REPAIR” quantity of 12,600 SF for Noise Wall Repairs. What are the revised quantities for specific repair areas (i.e., length & width) that are referenced by the I-440 Noise Wall Inspection Report and drawings? What is the basis of payment for the 12,600 SF? Where is it? How is it Paid? Please see attached reference drawings?	The basis for the 12,600 SF quantity is the information presented in TDOT Noise Wall Inspection Report and the information provided to TDOT in DB Team supplied noise wall inspection reports. Noise wall repairs up to 12,600 SF should be included in bid items. Repairs over 12,600 SF will be paid per RFP Contract Book 3. No further information will be given regarding the locations of noise wall repairs along I-440.
8.2	Environmental Commitments	What are the quadrant limits of Granny White Pike and Gale Lane north of I-440? Does this area extend to the replacement of light standards behind the Noise Wall East of Granny White Pike?	The Design-Builder should refer to the project Environmental Documents for further guidance regarding the limits at the Granny White Pike and Gale Lane intersection.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8.3	Book 3 section 2.7.h - Addendum #1	The existing 60" RCP between STA 1047 & 1051 (WE 11 to WE10), has multiple infill runners & one infill gusher located along the joints of the pipe. According to addendum No.1, page 14, 2.7.h, concrete pipes meeting the criteria with transverse cracks that are open greater than 1/8" will require replacement. Due to the location of this pipe (19' deep and crossing I-440 diagonally under Murphy Road), would the department consider alternatives to repairing the pipe joints, rather than full replacement?	Any deviation from the RFP must be addressed by ATC.
8.4	SP 602 – Steel Structures	What is TDOT going to spend on QA inspection of structural steel? How much should the design builders include in their bids for Steel QA inspections?	The costs for Steel Inspection (QA) are paid for by the Department in accordance with SP 602 and Section 602.04.B of the TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The Design Builder is responsible for inspection costs that exceed these limits.
8.5	Bk 3 – Section 3.2.5	Please confirm if thermal control related to heat of hydration for mass concrete structural elements will be required by TDOT. If so, please provide max temperature and/or temperature differential limits to be followed.	See TDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. No additional thermal controls related to placement of mass concrete are included.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8.6		<p>The Department provided “I-440 ShldrColorSheets (New 4-24-28)” show four (4) locations that are color coded to be “6’ stabilized shoulder” but the Department Plans, typical sections and CADD files show to be 4’ stabilized shoulders. Please confirm the following locations can be less than 6’ stabilized shoulders.</p> <p>Sta. 1268+40.11 to Sta. 1271+34.43 Sta. 8032+52.34 to Sta. 8036+14.30 Sta. 8025+96.43 to Sta. 8029+57.59 (shoulder transition) Sta. 8029+57.59 to Sta. 8032+52.34</p>	<p>The referenced shoulder locations are 6’ stabilized shoulders.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8.7	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 7.a	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 7.a lists three easements that the Department will be responsible for obtaining at the EB and WB bridges over the CSX Railroad near Charlotte Avenue– Permanent Easement: 1,609 SF, Air Rights: 34,192 SF, and Temporary Construction Easement: 35,989 SF. The section also states “If the design builder requires additional area for construction purposes on this bridge it will be the Design Builders responsibility to acquire the additional easements following the Uniform Act and the TDOT ROW Manual.” The preliminary plans provided by the Department do not show the location/limits of any of these easements. Will the Department please provide the easement line work, so the design-teams can design to stay within the provided easement limits?</p>	<p>The Permanent Easement reflects the existing bents in Railroad ROW. The Air Rights Easement reflects the existing superstructure of the bridge. The final easement limits will be dependent upon the Design-Builders design.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
8.8	RFP Contract Book 2, Appendix B, Special Provision 105C	Special Provision 105C requires the services of two flagmen whenever construction impacts the railroad as outlined by the special provision. Special Provision 105C also states that the Railroad has allotted 200 flagging days to the Contractor for the project. Please confirm that the allotted 200 days includes two flagmen for 200 days?	2 flagmen are allotted for the 200 days.
8.9	RFP Contract Book 2, Appendix A, Special Provision 700, Subsection 712.09/RFP Contract Book 3, Section 13.5.a	Special Provision Subsection 712.09 states, “The Department will pay for Uniformed Law Enforcement Officers provided by the Contractor at the invoice price of the work plus 5%, not to exceed \$50 per hour...”. However, Uniformed Police Officer is included in Section 13.5.a for payment for select quantity overruns for a payment of \$50 per hour. Please confirm that the Design-Builder’s Price Proposal shall not include costs for Uniformed Law Enforcement. Also, please clarify how costs for Uniformed Law Enforcement will be paid by TDOT.	<p>An item number will be added with fixed hours and fixed dollar amount in the forthcoming addendum. This will be in similar fashion to the Trainee item.</p> <p>The Design-Builder is to include 2,500 hours in their bid. Any hours in excess of 2,500 will be paid for according to Book 3 Section 13.5.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

PROJECT: I-440, Davidson County

DB CONTRACT No.: DB1701

DATE: April 22, 2018

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.1	Preliminary Plans	The new PDFs showing stabilized shoulder widths and locations indicates 6' stabilized shoulders in areas where concrete valley gutter is proposed (ex. Sta. 1295+00 to Sta. 1300+00). Is the 6' dimension to the flow line of the concrete valley gutter or to the edge of asphalt paved shoulder?	The 6' dimension is from the flow line of the concrete valley gutter to the edge of travel way.
9.2	RFP Book 3, Section 2.2.f	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 2.2.f states "...The existing 32-inch median barrier located in this segment (along the inside edge of shoulder) shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed design reference section 2.2.e.</p> <p>There is not an existing 32-inch barrier along the inside edge of shoulder of I-440 EB. Should this refer to the outside edge of shoulder?</p>	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.3	Book 3; 3.2.5.a	Preliminary plans show existing electrical cabinets at approximately Station 1238+00. There is no indication on the plans of any underground utilities coming from this location. Please provide existing electrical plans showing underground power in this location so it can be determined if there will be any utility conflicts with the structure excavation for new bridge piers.	The locations of utilities shown within these plans are for information only. The survey, including utilities, is to be field verified and updated by the successful Design-Builder.
9.4	Book 1, E.3 and RCIV-2	The required traffic analysis is quite extensive. Please consider increasing the Stipend \$100,000 to cover the cost of this analysis added in Addendum #6	The stipend was increased in Addendum #6 to accommodate this extra cost.
9.5	Addendum 6, RFP Book 2 Section D.3 and Special Provision SP108B Project Completion and Liquidated Damages	Please consider specifying a capped (Not To Exceed) amount for all Liquidated Damages (Hourly and Daily-Attributed to Parts B & C). These Compounding Damages are Excessive.	There is no cap in place on Liquidated Damages, as indicated in Addendum #7, SP108B
9.6	Reference Material, Traffic Impact Assessment	In the information provided there are illustrations with Origins and Destinations of traffic on I-440. Significant shares of both Origins and Destinations are attributed to "Arterials." Please provide a breakdown by Arterial.	This data will not be provided.
9.7	Reference Material, Traffic Impact Assessment	Please provide a truck percentage associated with the Origins and Destinations Data.	This data will not be provided.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.8	Reference Material, Traffic Impact Assessment	The volume diagrams show the freeways. Will TDOT provide similar volume diagrams for the State Route and City Street segments contained in the Traffic Analysis Segments List?	This information has been posted on July 19, 2018 on the project website. June
9.9	Reference Material, Traffic Impact Assessment	Will volumes for arterial segments require adjustment to prepare a study forecast for analysis? (Are the volumes all representative of the same year? Were all the counts made on weekdays of non-holiday weeks while schools were in session? Have seasonal or day of week adjustments been made to the counts?)	Adjustments of this type will not be required.
9.10	Design-Build Standard Guidance, Section 5.2.12 (b)	TDOT Design-Build Standard Guidance, Section 5.2.12 (b) indicates independent design checks are required and shall include analytical checks using independently-derived calculations to evaluate structural adequacy and integrity of critical structural members. Please define the extent of independent checking for this project and the “critical” structural members requiring an independent analytical check.	The Design-Builder is responsible for ensuring that an adequate quality control/quality assurance plan is in place and utilized which includes an independent design check of structural elements. The Department does not intend to further delineate the criteria defined in the Design-Build Standard Guidance Manual.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.11	RFP, Contract Book 3, Section 7.a	<p>TDOT is proposing an expedited construction schedule and several bridges require railroad coordination and executed agreements. Please address how railroad coordination will be conducted to allow the Design Builder to meet the aggressive construction schedule without being assessed liquidated damages associated with potential delays for railroad coordination out of the Design Builder's control. Note that RFP Section 7.a indicates that "work on bridges over CSX railroad (near I-65 and near Glenrose Avenue) cannot commence until the Department has executed railroad agreements" and "the process of acquiring the railroad agreements cannot begin until the Design Builder provides the Department final bridge plans."</p>	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.
9.12	RFP, Contract Book 3, Section 7.a	<p>Acquisition of R/W from the Railroad is required for the CSX Bridge near Charlotte Avenue. Previously (and since removed) RFP Section 7.a indicated this would potentially take up to 15 months to execute the agreement. The RFP also requires final plans from the Design Builder prior to TDOT moving forward on the ROW acquisition. Please address how ROW acquisition will be conducted to allow the Design Builder to meet the aggressive construction schedule without being assessed liquidated damages associated with potential delays for ROW acquisition out of the Design Builder's control.</p>	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.13	RFP, Contract Book 3, Section 12.1.m (Addendum 6)	RFP Addendum 6 allows construction on the I-440 over I-65 bridge after segmented interstate closures are completed but requires 3 lanes in each direction to be maintained. Would the Department consider reducing the number of required lanes to 2 in each direction to allow more working room and safety cushion for the ongoing construction operations on the I-65 bridge once the segmented closures on I-440 are completed?	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.
9.14	RFP, Addendum 6	Addendum 6 has influenced significant changes to the pursuit of the project including the revision of construction phasing and maintenance of traffic schemes. It has added the requirement for an extensive traffic analysis report. Also, considerable changes will have to be made to the estimating and scheduling efforts made by the Design Build Teams thus far. Please consider increasing the stipend above the \$180,000 as shown in Addendum 6.	The stipend was increased in Addendum #6 to accommodate this extra cost.
9.15	RFP, Contract Book 3, Section 12.1.m/SP108B (Addendum 6)	Would TDOT consider allowing the Design Builder to determine the I-440 segment closure dates?	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.16	RFP, Contract Book 3, Section 12.1.m (Addendum 6)	A January 2019, Segment 1 closure will be difficult to accomplish due to the time required for execution and coordination of design, utility relocations, geotechnical investigations, bridge girder procurement and material fabrication, railroad coordination and permitting. Please consider delaying the start of the Segment 1 Closure.	This has been addressed in Addendum #7.
9.17	General Question	When looking at the order of precedence, Book #3 is before Book #2, so that any potential conflicts between Book #3, Book #2, and the 108B, makes Book #3 superior, correct?	This has been addressed in SP108B in Addendum #7.
9.18	General Question	Will the date for questions be extended, since there is an addendum forthcoming?	The date for questions will not be extended.
9.19	RFP Book 3, Section 2.3.c	RFP book 3, Section 2.3.c States “All existing ramp striping and marking (in their entirety) shall be removed and replaced with new contrast striping and marking.” Does this include all ramps at the I-65 interchange in their entirety? All ramps tying I-440 to I-40 and I-24 in the entirety? Can the Department be more prescriptive regarding the limits of this scope?	Yes, it includes all ramps at the I-65, I-40, and I-24 route interchanges and all system interchanges along I-440.
9.20	Preliminary Plans, Sheets 14 and 14A	The preliminary plans show 3 locations of existing guardrail removal along U.S. 431 and the loop ramps connecting I-440 to U.S. 431. The proposed plans do not show any guardrail replacement for those removals. Is it TDOT’s intent to remove and not replace the guardrail in those locations?	It is the Design-Builders responsibility to determine the need and final placement of all safety hardware. Revised sheets have been posted on July June 19, 2018 on the project website for information only.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.21	General question, Design-Build QC checklist	Will TDOT provide a Design-Build QC checklist similar to what they have for Preliminary and ROW checklists for Design-Bid-Build projects?	The Design-Builder may use the checklists provided on the Design Division's website.
9.22	General question, New Stabilized Shldr. Color Sheets PDF	The new PDFs showing stabilized shoulder widths and locations indicates 6' stabilized shoulders in areas where concrete valley gutter is proposed (ex. Sta. 1295+00 to Sta. 1300+00). Is the 6' dimension to the flow line of the concrete valley gutter or to the edge of asphalt paved shoulder?	The 6' dimension is from the flow line of the concrete valley gutter to the edge of travel way.
9.23	TDOT Design Division Drainage Manual, Section 8.04.1	Section 8.04.1 of TDOT Design Division Drainage Manual requires "Each stormwater outfall which discharges directly into a stream or other natural water resource with a drainage area of one acre or greater may have a written evaluation assessing whether the roadway project would result in increased runoff at that point, the potential impacts of the post-project release rates, and whether stormwater storage should be provided". Given the project's limited ROW and the design storm being 50-yr, will the requirements of Section 8.01.2.1 be applicable to this project if the proposed flows meet the 50-yr HGL criteria and do not worsen the existing condition of the downstream facilities at the outfall locations?	If the proposed drainage design conveys the 50-year design without any overtopping of the existing/ proposed catch basin's/inlet's grates or manhole covers and does not adversely impact property owners outside the ROW, the drainage design will meet the requirements set forth in Section 2.7 of RFP Book 3.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.24	RFP Book 3, Section 13.6.b	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 13.6.b requires communicating with neighboring public agencies including Metro Nashville. Given the project's proximity to Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County's (Metro) jurisdictional limits many of the stormdrain outfall structures from the project connect to/discharge to the Metro's jurisdictional limits. Per Metro's Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM), any project that increases post-development runoff is required to meet detention, easement requirements.</p> <p>Please clarify if Metropolitan Department of Water and Sewerage Service (MWS) will be involved in review of water quantity, water quality control and floodplain coordination if the proposed improvements impact their jurisdictional limits.</p> <p>Will TDOT consider the timelines for reviews involved from (MWS) if a need arises for such reviews?</p>	The Design Builder will not be required to go through the MWS official review and approval process.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.25	RFP Book 3, Section 2.7.d	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 2.7.d of the RFP contract book 3 mentions “Provide appropriate outlets of the underdrains as specified by the Department Standard Drawings”.</p> <p>The Std. drawing for underdrains requires underdrain system to discharge at low points OR have outlets at maximum intervals of 190 to 210 feet throughout the limits of the project. Since the project improvements require underdrain systems outlet to the stormdrain system, it appears the outlet locations (inlets/catch-basins/manholes) are spaced at more than 210’ separation distance. Will the Department accept a deviation from requirement of 190-210’ interval separation in lieu of proposing additional stormdrain structures solely for the purpose of underdrain outlets?</p>	The Design-Builder shall meet the 190 to 210 feet requirement.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.26	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2.5	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 3.2.5 Bridges Over I-65 and Railroad (EB & WB) in Req. No. 3.2.5.e states that the scope of work requires the contractor to “extend in kind or replace modular expansion joints at abutment.” Please provide any additional information, such as shop drawings indicating the specific joint type or detailed inspection findings that can assist in determining the viability of extending the existing joints.	Shop Drawings for the existing joints have been posted on July 19, 2018 on the project website (as available). June
9.27	125325-00-MainlineSoilsGeoRpt-GES1912416.pdf	As per the referenced Geotech report, Groundwater was encountered in Boring-30 under Section 3 – Groundwater. The second paragraph indicates that piezometer were installed along the westbound shoulder, and are available to be monitored. Can the Department provide readings that have been taken from these piezometers?	After installation of the piezometers, readings were taken on 9/7/2017. Piezometer 1 (PZ-1) indicated that the bottom of the hole was sloppy mud which was at 16 feet. Piezometer 2 (PZ-2) showed to be dry. No other readings were taken. Piezometers were left in place, but no further monitoring has occurred.
9.28	RFP Book 3, Section 2.2.v	There will be a significant amount of material that will be removed from the site. The RFP describes the use and limitations of TDOT ROW for excess material. Will the Department consider working with the successful Design Builder to identify potential TDOT ROW outside of the project limits for possible material waste sites? If so, what limiting factors should the Design Builder consider?	The Design-Builder shall refer to TDOT’s - Procedures for Providing Offsite Waste and Borrow on Construction Projects (2017). For concrete material refer to Addendum #7. The use of any TDOT ROW outside the project limits would be subject NEPA re-evaluation.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.29	RFP Book 1, Section A.1	Book 1, Section A.1, paragraph 6 references a “sealed Price Proposal.” Please clarify that the price will be submitted electronically and that a sealed hard copy is not required.	The sealed Price Proposal shall be submitted on BidX and a hard copy is not required.
9.30	RFP Book 2 Special Provision 725, Section 1.5.8 Burn-in Period	<p>Section 1.5.8 of Special Provision 725 states that following successful completion of the conditional acceptance test for the ITS system, the newly installed system must operate successfully for a (3) month Burn-In period. After a successful Burn-In period, a Final Inspection must occur and after successful completion, Final System Acceptance will be granted.</p> <p>Please clarify that Project Substantial Completion can be given provided conditional acceptance of the ITS system, and that the (3) month Burn-In period can be completed after Substantial Completion?</p>	The three (3) month Burn-In period is considered after the Project Completion Date provided by the Design-Builder.
9.31	QR Dated 4/26/2018, Question 7.3	The Department’s response to question 7.3 states that splices shall be performed at the Type E pull box. Can the Department please provide stationing/locations for these Type E pull boxes?	It’s the Design-Builder responsibility to determine the need and location of any Type E pull boxes utilized in the design.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.32	Addendum #6, RFP Book 3, Section 4.b	<p>Addendum #6, RFP Book 3, Section 4.b states “All wiring, conduits, pull boxes, luminaires, cabinets and any other necessary items/components needed to provide a fully functional lighting system shall be new items.”</p> <p>Please confirm that this statement means that no existing lighting elements within the corridor may be reused, even if found to be in sufficient condition and up to current code standards?</p>	<p>Yes, the referenced statement means that no existing lighting elements within the corridor may be reused in the proposed design.</p> <p>Salvageable equipment shall become the property of the Department.</p>
9.33	RFP Book 3, Section 11.h	<p>RFP Book 3, Section 11.h states that “Sod shall be used for permanent stabilization and be placed....on all newly graded cut and fill slopes as work progresses.</p> <p>Will the Department consider seeding and mulching in lieu of sodding?</p>	<p>The Department will not consider seeding and mulching in lieu of sodding for permanent stabilization.</p>
9.34	General Roadway Question	<p>Can the Design-Builder assume that existing stabilized base material in the roadway be reused “as is” if it passes a proof roll or other testing procedures?</p>	<p>It is the Design-Builder’s responsibility, with Department concurrence, to determine if the base material is suitable.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.35	RFP Book 3, Section 2.6	RFP Book 3, Section 2.6 Signage, states that the Design Builder shall replace all signs that do not meet retro-reflectivity requirements and that a majority of the post mounted signs shall be replaced with new break away sign supports and signs. MUTCD requires that agencies implement a sign assessment and management method to maintain signs at or above minimum retro-reflectivity levels and provides several options for implementation of the requirement including replacement cycle based on age of the sign and retro-reflectivity testing among others. This would determine whether signs on I-440 can be reused or not. The Design Builder requested existing reflectivity data (replacement cycle; method to assess sign condition; sign inventory data) which has not been provided.	This data will not be provided.
9.36	QR Dated 3/22/2018, Page QR-9	QR #4 published on 3/22/18, page QR-9, question 4.3 states the Department is handling the utility coordination on Pin 119734.00 and 119735.00. For Pin 119734.00, all utilities stated “No Conflict” or “Not on Project” except for Metro Public Works. For Pin 119735.00, all utilities stated “No Conflict” or “Not on Project” except for Metro Public Works and Nashville Electric Service. Has the Department received responses from these utilities in regards to these two projects?	<p>Both Nashville Electric Service and Metro Public Works have responded that no conflicts are present on the projects.</p> <p>It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to coordinate with all utilities regarding their design.</p>

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.37	RFP Contract Book 3, Section 7.a	RFP Book 3, Section 7.a lists three easements the Department will be responsible for obtaining. In QR #8 published on 5/25/18, page QR-4, question 8.7, the Department describes the locations of the easements. Will drawings/sketches be provided showing property owners and graphical representation of the limits of each easement? Are air rights/easements required for work being performed under the CSX overpass at Nolensville Pike? Are temporary or permanent easements required to complete the deck repairs? We understand that there are air rights for the existing superstructure, but what are the limits of the air rights? Are they edge of superstructure to edge of superstructure or 5 feet outside to 5 feet outside?	This information has been posted on July 19, 2018 on the project website.. June

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.38	RFP Response Category IV, Item 14	The Generalized Service Volume Tables to be used by the Design-Builder in the Traffic Impact Assessment do not precisely cover all of the typical sections of the arterial roadway segments listed in the Traffic Analysis Segments List. For example, State Route 24 (US Route 70, Hermitage Avenue) from Willow Street to Cauley Drive is a three-lane facility with one reversible lane, a typical section which does not have corresponding annual average daily values or peak hour two-way volumes listed in the Generalized Service Volume Tables. How should the Design-Builder calculate the operational performance for these segments?	This information has been posted on July 19, 2018 on the project website. June
9.39	QR Dated 3/13/2018, Question #3	Referencing the Department's response to Question #3 of QR 3/13/2018, the Department is requesting existing bridge parapet's be repaired as part of the project. Will the Department establish a bid quantity for concrete parapet repairs to be included in the Lump Sum and establish a bid price for over runs similar to the deck repair scope?	These areas of repair are to be assessed similar to the substructure repair areas. The department does not plan to establish a bid quantity and price for overruns.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
9.40	Addendum #6, Book 2 Special Provision 108B	<p>Addendum #6, RFP Book 2, SP 108B states “In addition to temporary lane closures, the Design-Builder will be allowed up to two (2) full weekend closures of I-65, including the I-440 at I-65 interchange ramps as specified in RFP Book 3. A weekend is defined as between Friday at 9:00 P.M. to Monday at 5:00 A.M. outside of the holidays, major events, and segmented interstate closures discussed in RFP Book 3. For each hour, or portion thereof, in which the I-65 full weekend closure is not completed and open to traffic, the sum of \$7,500 per hour per lane shall be deducted from the monies due the Design-Builder, not as a penalty, but as liquidated damages.”</p> <p>Please confirm that this revised language, added via Addendum #6, means that if work requiring full shutdowns of this interchange to widen the I-440 over I-65 bridge is not completed in the two provided weekends, the LD’s are \$7,500 per lane-hour and will not be capped at \$1,000,000 per weekend per previous versions of the RFP?</p>	Any lane closures not allowed in SP108B or Contract Book 3 shall be subject to Liquidated Damages as specified in SP108B.