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?	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. The Construction Field Office will collect tickets upon delivery, total them daily, and calculate and document appropriate adjustments to be paid
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 8th 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	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: Page QR-3 – "An inspection is scheduled and the report should be available in early March 2018." Page QR-17 – "This bridge underwent major repairs in 2016 and is due to be inspected in March 2018." 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.	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-Builders 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 structurally 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	Section 2.7.j states "It is the Department's intent to salvage as much of the existing system as possible." 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.). Please provide clarity on the intent of when reuse of the existing storm system is allowed.	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.

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	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". 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". Please advise which document governs for this project?	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.
3.31	RFP Book 3, Section 2	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. Will this be allowable?	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.

RFP QUESTION REQUEST
FORM QR

Question Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
3.32	Preliminary Plans	The Preliminary Plans show several locations annotated with the note "EXIST. JERSEY BARRIER (TO REMAIN)." 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. In reviewing the proposed cross-sections, the proposed new pavement section does not tie to existing to allow for the existing barrier to remain. 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?	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.

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 any 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.