

# 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.