

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.
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 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).
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	<p>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?</p> <p>If so, what limiting factors should the Design Builder consider?</p>	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?	Both Nashville Electric Service and Metro Public Works have responded that no conflicts are present on the projects.

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	<p>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?</p>	<p>This information has been posted on July 19, 2018 on the project website..</p>

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.
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.