US 77 Upgrade From Kingsville to Driscoll RFP
Q&A Matrix #2
(September 4, 2012)

Kim Soucek, Michael S., Joanna H, Jack I, Beau, Jeromy, John M, Josh H., Nishant, Michael, Dieter, Bill, Paula

No.	RFP Section/ Page No.	Question / Comment	Response
28	ITP Section 1.6, pages 4 & 5	**Category 3 -** The procurement schedule does not match the cover. Which is the correct schedule?	The schedule will be revised on the final RFP. Please note that proposals will now be due 12/14/12.
29	ITP Section 2.2.3(d) page 9	**Category 2 -** Who are the stakeholders of the project?	Check ITP Appendix Exhibit A for Stakeholders list.
30	ITP Section *3.2 Page 21*	**Category 3 -** When is the scheduled completion date of the VE study?	See answer to question #24 on RFP Matrix 1.
31	DBA Para 2.1.3.3 and 13.2.3	This appears inequitable that TXDOT wants a free ride for change orders under $10,000. Can this provision change where TxDOT is responsible for the cost of all TXDOT-directed changes.	No change will be made.
32	DBA Para 4.3.1	Given that TXDOT repeatedly emphasizes that the DB Contractor must achieve the schedule and considering the "substantial liquidated damages" to be assessed against the DB Contractor if the schedule is not achieved, we believe it is totally inappropriate that the Float should be considered as a "Project Resource" accessible by both parties. We believe the Float is a DB Contractor resource and only the DB Contractor should control the Float. Can this provision be changed?	No change will be made.
33	Book 2 Section 11.2.2, Page 11-1	**Category 3 -** Please verify that no SE is required on US 77 Business/FM 428 cross street.	No SE is required on the US 77/FM 428 T-in intersection.
34	Book 2 Section 11.2.2.2, Page 11-1	**Category 4 -** Should this be N/A or None? Please provide a note on what N denotes.	"N" stands for "No" in table 11-2.

35	Book 2 Section 12.3.1.1 & 12.3.2 Page 12-3	**Category 3 -** The design frequencies may change between revisions which could affect the sizing of structures and substantially effect the DB Contractor's costs and proposal amount. Can the reference to the latest edition be removed on **all** manuals and define the manual dates to be used for the proposal? The DB Contractor should not be responsible for changes in design standards that were not part of the proposal documents.	The latest manuals, one month before the RFP proposal due date, will be the effective contractual date for this Project. The RFP documents will be updated to reflect that change.
36	ITP Section 1.3.1, pg 2 AND Book 2 Sections 12.3.5.2.2, pg 12-7 & 11.2.2, pg 11-1	**Category 3 -** Table 11-1 in Section 11 defines the functional classification for Mainlanes as Rural arterial instead of freeway. This functional classification would result in 25-yr frequency for culverts and small bridges which contradicts Section 12.3.5.2.2 Design Frequency which states "For interstate highways, the design flood to be used in the detailed design shall be 50-yr frequency". AND, The hydraulic design manual on page 4-14 states "Federal directives require interstate highways, bridges, and culverts be designed for the 2% AEP flood event. AND, if this is a future interstate freeway, should the functional classification be freeway.	The mainlanes functional classification will be revised to "Rural Freeway" in the final RFP.
37	Book 2 Section 12.3.2, pg 12-3 & pg 12-4	**Category 3 -** Request that these requirements be removed since they may not be attainable due to flat and shallow topography.	Will change to "DB contractor shall design all storm sewer systems such that the hydraulic grade line for the design frequency event is at or below the flow line of curb inlet, the top of grate inlet, and the top of a manhole cover. AND Table 12-1: Pipe Design Criteria Design Element: Minimum Vertical Clearance (Cover): 1 ft in graded areas and below the base of pavement structure."
38	Book 2 Section 12.3.2.1, pg 12-5, Table 12-1: Pipe Design Criteria	**Category 3 -** 'Hydraulic Design Manual allows 18" minimum diameter for truck lines. We request the TP be revised to allow 18" minimum diameter for truck lines due to flat and shallow topography and existing 18" conduit that can be salvaged.'	24" is a local requirement for this Project.
39	Book 2 Section 15.2.1, pg 15-1	**Category 3 -** Does TxDOT have or intend to develop a Aesthetic concept plan for the project?	TxDOT will provide an Aesthetic concept to the successful Developer. Developers are to use $500,000 for the Project aesthetic budget in their estimate. RFP Documents will reflect that change.
40	Book 2 Section 16.3.7.2, pg 16-2	**Category 3 -** Will TxDOT develop the traffic signal timings for the construction phase signal adjustments if necessary?	Developer will be responsible to do traffic signal timing during construction if necessary.

41	Book 2 Table 18-1	**Category 3 -** Limits TCP ability for drainage. Is this flexible?	Table 18-1 will be removed
42	ITP Section 1.4	**Category 3 -** When will the following reference documents for the schematic become available: DGN File of Schematic, Geopak GPK file for Kleberg Co. with the horizontal and vertical alignments, TIN file of the existing and proposed terrain, Background image files, MicroStation resource/ symbology files used?	DGN and GPK files were uploaded on 7/27/12 on the project secure RFP website. Other RIDS will be posted as they become available.
43	CMA	Term of Maintenance Agreement / Price and Payment – the language is such that it appears that terms NTP2 and NTP3 may be extended unilaterally vs. by bilateral agreement, with pricing and terms fluctuating solely by the ENR CCI over the subsequent terms. Is it the intent to have costs subject to the ENR CCI only within negotiated 5 year terms, or applied unilaterally through extensions NTP2 and NTP3 at the owners discretion?	The issuance of NTP2 and NTP3 is within the sole discretion of TxDOT, although TxDOT may not issue NTP3 unless NTP2 was also issued. The annual Maintenance Price (which is derived from the winning proposer's proposal) is adjusted every year to take into account fluctuations in ENR CCI over the previous year. This price mechanic would operate following the issuance of NTP2 or NTP3. There is no special price readjustment in connection with the issuance of either NTP2 or NTP3.
44	CMA	Regarding securities, under "Retainage", the owner is requesting a 10% Retainage Bond, and also Performance and Payment bonds covering the sum of the remaining maintenance contract cost. While retainage can be withheld under the contract provisions, would the Retainage Bond not make the coverage requested by the Performance and Payment Bonds redundant?	TxDOT will lower the retainage bond percentage to 4%.
45	Hydraulic Design Manual Chap. 9, pg 9-12, Section Roadway/ Bridge Profile	**Category 3 -** Is US 77 or Future IH 69 considered an emergency evacuation route?	Yes
46	Schematics	Which schematic was approved by FHWA / TxDOT? This is the schematic that we need to use to develop the ATCs.	The schematic dated April 2012 and uploaded on 7/27/12 in the RID section of the project secure RFP website was approved by FHWA.
47	Book 2 Section 8.2.2	Section 8.2.2 of the Technical Provisions requires the DB contractor to prepare separate pavement designs, including overlay design for US 77 portions to remain. Does TxDOT intend to provide a more prescriptive plan for requirements of the overlay pavement design, i.e. will the overlay be required to provide crack seal, or other type seal prior to overlay?	Yes

48	ITP Exhibit B	Exhibit B of the ITP section 3.0 (c) Proposal Security, conflicts with the order of Exhibit E, section C – Project Development Plan. Should Exhibit B of the ITP section 3.0 order of contents be rearranged to match that of the Exhibit E.	Exhibit E will be conformed to order outlined in Exhibit B in the final RFP.
49	ITP Section 1.4, pg 3	**Category 3 -** Can TxDOT provide these RIDs that are not included in the Draft RFP: GPK for Kleberg County, HMR files (aerials) and 3D Topo DGN files for schematics, geotech that is not part of existing bridge as-builts	See response to question #42.
50	Book 2 Section 12.2.2, pg 12-1	**Category 3 -** The technical provisions are silent on project requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Please address the details as to what is required and who is responsible.	DB Contractor will be responsible for preparing all documentation necessary to obtain the 404 permits on behalf of TxDOT as part of the necessary government approvals for the Project. [DBA section 3.7.1 requires that "DB Contractor shall obtain all other Governmental Approvals..." Moreover, Book 2, section 4.3.2 states that "The DB Contractor shall document how they will comply with the terms and conditions for Section 404 permit(s) issued to TxDOT by the USACE"]
51	Book 2 Section 12.3.1.1, pg 12-3	**Category 3 -** The table shows recommended values and minimum values, e.g. frontage road storm sewer has recommended design frequency of 5-yr and minimum design frequency of 2-yr. What will this project require?	Text will be changed in the final RFP to "DB Contractor shall use the recommended design frequencies listed in Table 4-2 of the *TxDOT Hydraulic Design Manual"*
52	Book 2 Section 13.2.1, pg 14-1	**Category 3 -** Does TxDOT intend for this check to be made with AASHTO LRFD Service I group loading, considering the effects of scour for a 100-year event and will TxDOT allow the new SB Frontage Road bridge over San Fernando Creek to be checked against this criteria?	Yes. The TxDOT Geotechnical Manual states that the design flood event is the 100 year event or the overtopping event, if overtopping occurs prior to the 100 year event. The foundations are to withstand the 100 year scour with a factor of safety of 2 or more or the overtopping scour with a factor of safety of 2. The loading condition for this analysis would be AASHTO LRFD Service I group loading. In addition, the check flood would be the 500 year event and the foundations would need to be able to withstand the effects of scour for that event with a factor of safety of 1 or more. Again AASHTO LRFD Service I Group loading would apply as well. Yes, this criteria would apply to the SB Frontage Road Bridge.
53	Book 2 Section 12.3.5.2.4, pg 12-8	**Category 2 -** Several existing bridge/culvert structures are to be used in place. If the existing crossings and existing conditions do not currently meet hydraulic performance criteria will TxDOT require the DB Contractor to upgrade/replace them?	RFP language will be updated.
54	Book 2 Section 12.2.2, pg 12	**Category 2 -** Since the Instructions to Proposers bars us from communicating with Project Stakeholders, will TxDOT conduct any advance coordination with the City of Bishop, or any other	Yes.

	ITP Section 2.2.3(c), pg 9	Stakeholder, in order to ascertain planned updates and expansions for facilities crossing the Project?	
55	Book 2 Section 13.2.2, pg 14-2	**Category 3 -** Since sidewalks on vehicular bridges are technically structural attachments to a vehicular bridge, it seems reasonable that the sidewalks would be designed using only the appropriate provisions in the *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*. In case of conflict between specifications, is it TxDOT's intent to use the provisions of the most restrictive code, or to defer to the *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications* since the *AASHTO Guide Specifications for Design of Pedestrian Bridges* is just that – a guide?	The more restrictive code will be used as stated in DBA section 1.2.5 "the provisions that establish the higher quality, manner or method of performing the Work or use more stringent standards will prevail."
56	Book 2 Section 13.2.11, pg 14-4 ITP Section 1.3.1, pg 2	**Category 2 -** Several existing bridges are to be used in place. Will a separate survey be required for each bridge or can a single survey that includes all existing bridges satisfy this technical provision. Also, if the existing bridges do not currently meet Interstate standards will TxDOT require that fact to be addressed in the pre-condition survey, and will TxDOT require the DB Contractor to upgrade the existing bridges to Interstate standards (if such upgrades are indicated)?	A separate survey will be required for each bridge. RFP language will be updated.
57	Book 2 Sections 15.2.1 & 15.3.4, pg 15-1 & 15-3	**Category 2 -** TP15 is entitled *AESTHETICS AND LANDSCAPING*, has numerous references to landscape design, yet it can be construed that no landscaping is to be included in the Proposer's price. Additionally, the Proposer is to account for undefined alternatives of concept. In the interest of fairness it would be helpful if TxDOT were to establish a more definitive scope of aesthetics and landscaping for the Project (that also considers the treatment, if any, to sign bridge structures and traffic signals).	See response to question #39.
58	Book 2 Section 15.3.5, pg 15-3	**Category 3 -** Does TxDOT intend for this to apply to all bridges, whether new or existing and whether overpass or waterway crossing?	See response to question #39.
59	Book 2 Section 16.3.2, pg 16-1	**Category 3 -** Will the DB Contractor be permitted to utilize existing signs in their current locations, or to relocate existing signs to new locations in their "as-is" condition, whether or not they meet current standards for structure, graphics and reflectivity?	Existing sign can be reused only during construction and moved as needed, provided they are suitable and meet standards. All new signs will be required at construction completion though.

60	Book 2 Section 16.3.8	**Category 3 -** Please provide more detail on the disposition of existing lighting. As examples, if existing lighting does not meet current standards will TxDOT require them to be replaced; or, if they do meet standards, can they be re-used anywhere on the project?	Salvage of existing lighting will need to meet current standards.
61	Book 2 Section 17.2	**Category 3 -** In order to determine an extent of UG work please provide detail as to the connection point(s) along the Project for the ITS system, and please confirm that the intent of the ITS scope is to require a total of two cameras and two DMS boards.	The RFP will be updated to required 5 cameras and no DMS. Conduit will not be required and wireless transmission will be used between the ITS components.
62	Book 2 Section 18.3.1.2, Table 18-1	**Category 2 -** Bearing in mind that the US 77 facility is two-lane in each direction, both in existing and new configurations, will TxDOT consider modifying this requirement to allow a lane to be closed at off-peak periods as a standard practice and without special approval?	See response to question #41
63	Book 2 Section 11.2.2	**Category 3 -** *Based on the Roadway Design Manual the correct design is on the schematic. The Roadway Design Manual(chapter 3 section 6 pg 3-69) shows for a rural frontage road that the widths should be as in schematic 4'-12'-12'-8'. The widths shown in the technical provisions are minimums for a curbed urban frontage roads (roadway design manual chapter3 section 3 table 3-1.)*	The final RFP will be revised.
64	Book 2 Section 12.2.2, pg 12	**Category 3 -** Locations shown on the TxDOT Schematic for overlays far exceeds what is listed in the text of the Technical Provisions. Please clarify in detail the locations and limits of intended overlay for existing pavements.	The final RFP will be revised.