

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Other	Preliminary Plans		Throughout the project there are multiple locations of "PROP. PLANTING BUFFER" shown. Should the Design Team match all locations / are the additional locations needed and/or what is the process to determine these locations. What plantings are expected if they need to be included?	The Design-Build Team shall match all planting buffer locations shown in the preliminary plans. Additional planting buffer locations may be incorporated if recommended by the Design-Build Team and approved by NCDOT and the County. The Department will rely on the Design-Build Team to propose appropriate planting types and quantities in accordance with project requirements and applicable standards.	No action needed
2	Project Special Provisions	22	4)	"All intersection and interchange reconfigurations shall include corresponding electronic traffic analyses files and a signing concept." Will a signing concept be required for each ATC on this project? The intersections are small (only one signalized intersection) and there are no type A/B signs.	No. A signing concept will not be required for ATCs on this project. The RFP will be revised to remove this requirement.	Revise RFP
3	Project Special Provisions	57	1st Paragraph	Given community involvement for a trail and the exorbitantly large number of buildings that need to be removed (approximately 50 structures), is there a possibility that buildings that are barely inside the ROW can be retained? If any conveyances originally done with the railroad include a "Right of First Refusal", this might play into our ROW negotiations.	Yes. When the County acquired the right of way, letters were sent to property owners notifying them of existing encroachments. Structures that directly conflict with the proposed trail will need to be removed. However, if the trail can be constructed safely and in compliance with project requirements while allowing a structure that is only minimally within the right of way to remain, removal of that structure will not be a priority.	No action needed
4	General	66	3rd Paragraph	"Construction shall include,...work items for the proposed eight-lane facility and repair of the control of access fence." Should this description of the facility be updated?	Yes, we will update the RFP to correct description.	Revise RFP
5	General	66, 82	List of Areas of Work	The list on p. 66 includes Pavement Marking Design and Sign Design. Rather than having Pavement Marking and Signing as separate sections in the 'SCOPES OF WORK', a paragraph of scope is included on p. 82. Can NCDOT verify if any additional information for final Pavement Marking and Signing design requirements or preferences will be provided?	No, we don't plan to provide any additional information. Signing and pavement marking plans won't be required as part of the technical proposal.	No action needed
6	General	67	2nd to last paragraph	Should we treat "recommended" values the same as "desirable"? Examples include: A) recommended value for shoulder from "Guide for the development of bicycle facilities 5th edition" is 5', typical from preliminary design shows 3'; B) offset distance to Safety Rail recommended is 2', 1' minimum is shown in the typical from preliminary design.	No. "Recommended" values are not the same as "Desirable," efforts should be made to provide width values as described in AASHTO, FHWA, NACTO, and NCDOT RDM guidance and widths that do not meet these values must be reviewed and a documented restraint must be identified.	No action needed
7	General	75, 76	5. MOT and Safety Plan	This section notes providing a TMPC as part of the proposal documents. Typically we've seen a description of the required TMPC also addressed in the Traffic Management Section. Please confirm if a TMPC is required as part of the Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria. It does appear there are some bullets under this section will not be applicable to this project.	Yes, it is required.	No action needed
8	Roadway	81	2nd Bullet	Can NCDOT provide a Design Speed for the greenway?	The greenway design speed shall follow the requirements in the 2024 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. In accordance with these references, the typical design speed for shared-use paths is 20 mph, with adjustments permitted based on grade, geometry, and site constraints. If constrained conditions necessitate a lower design speed, the Design-Build Team should document justification and coordinate with NCDOT for concurrence. Uploaded the Design Criteria to the Materials Available Site.	No action needed
9	Roadway	81	2nd Bullet	Can NCDOT confirm that the 1994 version of "NCDOT's North Carolina Bicycle Facilities Planning and Design Guidelines" is the most current version. The design criteria also lists the "AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities 2nd Edition (2021) : confirming this is an additional resource NCDOT wants the design team to use.	No. We'll revise the RFP to correct this. NCDOT's Complete Streets Policy replaced the older bicycle and pedestrian design documents in 2019, including the 1994 Bicycle Facilities Guidelines. The authoritative design resources for this project are AASHTO, FHWA, NACTO, and the NCDOT Roadway Design Manual.	Revise RFP
10	Roadway	81	2nd Bullet	If there are contradicting values/standards between the resources listed, which document controls?	Per the RFP on page 67 "Similarly, in the event of conflicting design parameters in the requirements herein and / or the applicable guidelines, standards and policies, the proposed design shall adhere to the most conservative values."	No action needed
11	Roadway	81	6th Bullet	Is this in reference to a specific sewer line / section / span the Team should be aware of or general statement for all sewer lines?	No, this isn't tied to any specific sewer line. It's a general statement that applies to all sewer lines.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
12	Roadway	82	4th Bullet	Which Department with Henderson County owns the right of way? Henderson County GIS lists it as owned by Ecusta Rails2Trails LLC. Is there a concern that this could revert back to railroad ownership, and if so, should that be considered during our design?	Conserving Carolina owns Ecusta Rails2Trails LLC, and Henderson County holds a 100-year lease on the corridor. While the Rails-to-Trails legislation allows for the theoretical possibility of reversion to railroad ownership, this should not be considered in the design.	No action needed
13	Structures	84	1st Paragraph / 4th Bullet	Who is responsible for determining the structural capacity and condition of the existing Bridge 10 girders for the span to remain over the French Broad River? Is the Design Build Team responsible for all inspection and existing load rating?	The Design-Build Team should be responsible for all inspection and existing load rating.	No action needed
14	Structures			Are there any aesthetic requirements or considerations for the pedestrian bridges or project as a whole? The RFP does not reference the provided rendering or the aesthetics of the existing section of the Ecusta Trail.	The pedestrian bridges should match the design and aesthetics of the bridges completed on the adjacent project. The RFP will be revised to clarify this requirement.	Revise RFP
15	Structures			Are there any required wearing surfaces, deck material requirements or other details for the pedestrian bridges?	NCDOT does not prescribe a specific wearing surface, deck material, or proprietary treatment for the pedestrian bridges beyond the requirements included in the RFP and applicable design standards. The Design-Build Team shall select bridge deck materials and wearing surfaces that comply with AASHTO, NCDOT structures criteria, durability requirements, slip-resistance expectations for shared-use paths, and long-term maintenance considerations. All proposed materials and details are subject to NCDOT review and approval and must be ADA PROWAG compliant.	No action needed
16	Structures			Are the Bridges to be loaded with Vehicular Live Load H10 as required by AASHTO Guide Spec for Ped Bridges or are we using Pedestrian and Bicycle Loading only as described in the inspection and load rating report?	The bridges for this project should be designed for AASHTO H-10 vehicular live loading. The Design-Build Team shall design the pedestrian bridges using the pedestrian and bicycle loading criteria reflected in the inspection and load rating report and the design requirements outlined in the RFP. H-10 vehicular loading will account for maintenance and emergency management vehicles that may need access to the facility during operations.	No action needed
17	Structures			Based on the Bridge 10 PGD: Are there any required railing materials or details, bollard materials or details, or other details for the pedestrian bridges? (Examples include: NCDOT bollard are steel in concrete footings which cannot be used on a timber deck; provided PGD railings appear to be concrete whereas the provided rendering appears to be weathering steel.)	There are no required railing materials or proprietary details for the pedestrian bridges beyond what is included in the RFP and the Bridge 10 PGD. The PGD details are conceptual only and do not establish material requirements. The Design-Build Team shall provide railings that meet all applicable AASHTO and NCDOT standards and are compatible with the selected bridge materials and configuration. Bollards are not permitted on the trail, and the preferred approach is to match the design used on the adjacent completed section.	Revise RFP
18	Structures			Who is responsible for determining the structural capacity and condition of the existing Bridge 10 bents for the span to remain over the French Broad River? Is the Design Build Team responsible for all inspection and existing load rating?	The Design-Build Team should be responsible for all inspection and existing load rating.	No action needed
19	Hydraulics	85	3rd bullet	Paragraph states 2-year design frequency for greenways and multi-use trails. Since the project is within railroad ROW, do railroad hydraulic design standards need to be considered?	Design the greenway and trail following the standard greenway/multi-use trail guidelines. You don't need to follow railroad hydraulic standards, but make sure to check any structures upstream.	No action needed
20	Hydraulics	85	5th bullet	Can CMP be retained under the greenway?	The preference is to evaluate the existing CMP pipe sizes and replace them with RCP where appropriate.	Revise RFP
21	Hydraulics	85	6th Bullet	Can a minimum future land use percentage be provided by NCDOT?	No, NCDOT will not provide a minimum future land use percentage. The Design-Build Team should follow the applicable guidelines.	No action needed
22	Hydraulics	86	4th Bullet	What is involved with the Hydraulics Project Manager acceptance, and will it be performed during procurement or during final design? The main span of the FBR bridge is to remain, so can that review by the Hydraulics Project Manager be performed now so we know how to proceed?	The Hydraulics Project Manager and the Division will review the design provided during final design.	No action needed
23	Hydraulics	86	7th Overall Bullet	Should this paragraph reference the 2024 Standard Specifications?	Yes 2024, will revise the RFP.	Revise RFP
24	Hydraulics	86	Storm Drainage Section	Should minimum pipe sizes and types for railroads be used?	No, it is no longer a railroad. Follow greenway and multi-use guidelines, analyze if structures are upstream.	No action needed
25	Hydraulics	87	10th Bullet	Is there a maximum allowable spread for greenway bridges?	No	No action needed
26	Hydraulics	88	3rd bullet	Do railroad design standards need to be considered for stormwater management design? Are discharge increases to railroad ROW allowed?	Railroad design standards are not required for stormwater management. Existing drainage patterns should be maintained, and reasonable increases in discharge are anticipated and acceptable.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
27	Hydraulics	88	FEMA Regulated Streams	Will a HEC-RAS 1D model be provided for the French Broad River? The current information on the FRIS website is old HEC-2 data from 1978 which is very problematic and difficult to resolve. Also, 2D models are not currently being allowed for submittal by NCFMP.	The Department will provide a preliminary HEC-RAS 1D model for the French Broad River. Teams should not rely on outdated HEC-2 data from 1978. No rise is anticipated; however, if revised models show increases, the Effective model must be used, following FEMA guidance to recreate the model or providing a 6-section model that ties to the Effective model.	Request for Material
28	Hydraulics			The CE states: Floodplain culverts should be added under the rail line in the Costa Floodplain near Blythe Mill Creek to provide better floodplain and wetland habitat functions. Can additional direction be provided for sizes, number of pipes, etc?	Floodplain culverts in the Costa Floodplain near Blythe Mill Creek should follow floodplain or equalizer pipe guidelines. Pipes should be sized and spaced to fit the floodplain, avoid clogging, and support floodplain and wetland functions.	No action needed
29	Geotechnical Engineering	92	3rd bullet	The geotechnical scope provided in the RFP appears to be scope language for standard roadway projects. Given that the project is for a pedestrian trail on the order of 12 feet wide with bridge structures on the order of 20 feet wide, will the Department consider reducing the number of borings per bent to 1?	The RFP will be updated to 1 boring per bent.	Revise RFP
30	Erosion and Sedimentation Control	108	9	The Project Commitments recommend Design Standards for Sensitive Waters. However the RFP erosion control design only calls for Q10 designs instead of Q25. Please verify which is correct.	RFP will be revised to include Q25 design and requirements for ESA delineation.	Revise RFP
31	Environmental Permits	124	2nd paragraph	What date will NCDOT deliver the updated plant surveys?	According to the September 2025 NRTR, the plant surveys were completed in 2025.	Request for Material
32	Environmental Permits	124	2nd paragraph	What date will concurrence for each of the mussel species identified in iPAC be provided by USFWS/NCDOT?	Concurrence for mussels may depend on the extent of the temporary and permanent work required for bridge removal and construction.	No action needed
33	Environmental Permits	124	3rd paragraph	Will the NCDOT programmatic agreement for bats apply to this project and avoid the TOYR for tree clearing?	Biological surveys are scheduled for 2026 to determine compliance requirements. In the Environmental Document the Biological Conclusion for Appalachian Elktoe and Longsolid is unresolved. Surveys will need to be completed for those species. Also, the Biological Conclusion for Gray Bat and Tri-colored Bat is unresolved, with the expectation of utilizing the WNC Bat PBO.	No action needed
34	Environmental Permits	124	3rd paragraph	Will NCDOT provide culvert/structure bat inspection results and forms? What date will this be provided?	Yes, once completed.	Request for Material
35	Environmental Permits	124	4th paragraph	Will NCDOT provide a signed PJD or AJD from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? What date will this be provided?	Signed PDJ to be provided.	Request for Material
36	Public Information	128	13th Bullet	What is expected with the drone footage that is provided (i.e. pictures, videos, height of flight, etc.)?	Can be used to create project videos and/or visualizations.	No action needed
37	Transportation Management	133	1st Paragraph	The RFP notes to the Design Build Teams are to follow Guidelines for the Level of Pedestrian Accommodation in Work Zones. Will the Department be providing the Level of Pedestrian Accommodation required?	Yes. Levels will be provided in next RFP. Most cross streets are most likely "Absence of Need".	Revise RFP
38	Utilities	142	4th paragraph	Is this monitoring limited to concurrent relocations, or does it also apply to advance relocations as well?	This requirement applies to the any utility relocations the DBT is responsible for coordinating the relocation of.	No action needed
39	Utilities	142	4th paragraph	If work is being done without notification and monitoring, will the DB Team still be responsible for confirming correct relocations?	Yes, it is the responsibility of the DBT to coordinate the utility relocation work.	No action needed
40	Utilities	142	4th paragraph	What level of horizontal and vertical accuracy is required for monitoring efforts?	Utilities should be installed as indicated on their approved relocation drawings. The horizontal and vertical accuracy shall be considered acceptable if the installation complies with the UAM, as well as the horizontal and vertical separation requirements for crossing and parallel utilities, as specified in the UAM, the utility's design specifications and requirements, and applicable local, state, and federal regulations.	No action needed
41	Utilities	142	4th paragraph	When the DB team identifies a relocation that is being installed on an alignment that does not match the UBOs, and will be in conflict with proposed greenway construction, what rights/remedies does the DB team have to rectify the improper install or to stop work from continuing on an incorrect alignment. In other words, does the DB team have authority to stop or must it be an NCDOT rep?	The DBT is responsible for coordinating utility relocations, which generally includes managing the relocation schedule, layout staking for utilities, and construction observation. If relocations are being installed incorrectly, the DBT may request that the Utility pause installation until a solution can be determined and is responsible for coordinating with the Utility Company to resolve the issue. NCDOT will provide support and direction as needed in this scenario.	No action needed
42	Utilities	142	4th paragraph	If the install does not match the UBOs, but does not conflict with proposed greenway construction, what responsibilities does the DB team have in reporting the incorrect install?	If the relocation is not installed in accordance with the approved relocation plans / Utility Agreement, the DBT must submit a Plan Revision to document the change and provide updated UBO sheets. If the proposed relocation does not conflict with the proposed work and meets the requirements of the UAM, the new relocation may remain in place.	No action needed
43	Signing	Signing Strip Map '2024-09-26 BL-0078 PMP.pdf'	Project-wide	Can NCDOT verify that the level of traffic control devices shown at each crossing on the provided '2024-09-26 BL-0078 PMP.pdf' strip map is correct (signalized, RRFB, All-Way Stop, Stop on Y-Line, Stop on Trail)?	They are correct. Please confirm that the stop conditions are in the right locations; typically, we stop traffic on the greenway, not on the mainline.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
44	Signal Systems	154	Section IV, Paragraph 1	"The Design-Build Team shall develop and implement all temporary and final coordinated signal system timing plans for the closed loop signal system (CLS) along US 64 (Brevard Rd.) at SR 1203 (McKinney Rd./Old US 64) in Etowah." Existing signal plans on the NCDOT Traffic Signals website show signal 14-0738 (US 64 at SR 1203 (McKinney Road)/Old US 64) as isolated. Nearby signal 14-0737 (US 64 at SR 1424 (Brickyard Road) 375' to the West, is also shown as isolated. However, the most recent Google Street View (October 2025) shows radio antenna at each signal pointing to the other. Can NCDOT verify if the closed loop signal system to be timed ONLY consists of these two signals 14-0738 and 04-0737? Can NCDOT verify that they are communicating wirelessly? If so, is it NCDOT's preference to retain the existing wireless communication?	No, these two signals do not have signal coordination timing but are connected together so we have communication using Maxtime. Yes, they are connected wirelessly.	No action needed
45	Signal Systems	153	ICTs 2, 3, and 4	ICT 2 is for failure to repair a damaged NCDOT Fiber Optic Communications Cable and Restore Communication. ICTs 3 and 4 are for Failure to Reestablish NCDOT Fiber Optic Communications. Can NCDOT provide details on location and type of existing NCDOT Fiber Optic Communications cable?	There is no NCDOT fiber optic at either signal, will revise the RFP to remove ICT #2.	Revise RFP
46	Signal Systems	153-154	ICT 5	ICT 5 is for Failure to Restore Communication for permanent and temporary CCTV Cameras integrated with the MRTMS. Can NCDOT provide locations of CCTV Cameras to be provided?	There are no plans to install CCTV Cameras at either intsection, will revise the RFP to remove ICT #5.	Revise RFP
47	Standard Specifications	160	3rd bullet	The geotechnical scope provided in the RFP appears to be scope language for standard roadway projects. The RFP requires subsurface drainage to be installed if groundwater is within 6 feet of the subgrade. Will the Department consider removing this requirement for pedestrian structures?	Will Revise the RFP	Revise RFP
48	General	66	3	Assuming "eight lane facility" and "control of access" fence are typos. Please confirm.	Yes that is a typo, will revise the RFP.	Revise RFP
49	Roadway	81		Is there any desire for parking areas? If so, any preferred sites identified?	No parking areas.	No action needed
50	Roadway	81	2	The most current version of NCDOT's NC Bicycle Facilities Planning & Design Guidelines is from 1994 and is no longer referenced on the NCDOT CONNECT site. Please confirm that Teams should follow this guideline in addition to the others listed (AASHTO, PROWAG, and ADA).	See response to question #9.	Revise RFP
51	Roadway	81	3	Can the Department define the proposed shoulder width for the greenway?	The proposed greenway shoulder width is defined in the design criteria, available on the Materials Available Site. The width should match that of the adjacent completed project to maintain consistency.	No action needed
52	Roadway	83	2	Can NCDOT provide plans for the first phase of the Greenway that was already constructed?	Uploaded to the Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
53	Structures	84	1	Do the culverts on the project need to be replaced or repaired?	Uploaded the Redline Drainage Plan Submittal and Pipe Data Sheets to the Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
54	Structures	84		What is the design live loading for the bridges? PGD plans show H-9, which is unusual.	See response to question #16.	No action needed
55	Structures	84		Are approach slabs required for any or all of the bridges?	No.	No action needed
56	Structures	84		Is there a minimum desired cap depth for end bents? 4-ft (based on scaling PGD plans) seems large for pedestrian bridges.	Match the adjacent completed sections of the Ecusta Trail.	No action needed
57	Geotechnical Engineering	93		Is there a minimum pile size to be detailed?	No	No action needed
58	Geotechnical Engineering			Are there any as-built drawings, construction records, design loading information, and/or inspection records for Bridge 10? Specifically, the foundations in the French Broad River proposed to remain.	Will provide if available.	Request for Material
59	Geotechnical Engineering			What are the design life requirements for the bridge structures? Specifically bridge 10 where existing foundations are proposed to remain.	"Design Life" per AASHTO LFRD is 75 years	No action needed
60	Geotechnical Engineering	93	First bullet	Are the Bridge 10 foundations proposed to remain subject to the embedment requirements in this bullet?	The information referenced is for new foundation and will not apply to Bridge 10	No action needed
61	Geotechnical Engineering	92	3rd Paragraph	Are the Bridge 10 foundations proposed to remain subject to the boring requirements in this section?	A geotechnical investigation is not required for Bridge 10	No action needed
62	Project Special Provisions	4	Item B	Please provide base index price for Diesel #2 Fuel.	Information is included in the Final RFP	Revise RFP

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
63	Project Special Provisions	6		Please provide bidding index prices for each steel category.	Information is included in the Final RFP	Revise RFP
64	Project Special Provisions	7		Please provide a date for the bidding indices selling price.	Information is included in the Final RFP	Revise RFP
65	General	70 & 71		The RFP notes we are to provide an electronic copy of the technical proposal, but goes on to request this electronic copy to be submitted in a sealed package. Are we to assume this is meant to indicate our electronic copy should be on a small USB style thumb drive inside a sealed package?	Yes, please provide a USB thumb drive inside a sealed envelope.	No action needed
66	General	69		Page 75 of 264 requests the Design-Build team to specify the duration, in days, for ICT #1. Can further explanation be provided as to what duration is being asked for, since ICT #1 is simple lane closure restriction and associated LDs during the restricted hours and days?	Will revise the RFP to remove the duration for ICT #1. The duration (in days) would essentially be the life of the project.	Revise RFP
67	General			RFP states a total of 5 submitted ATCs, but mentions 5 are allowed prior to the Final RFP and 3 after. Is the overall total 5 (combo of before and after) or up to 8 total?	Two ATC's were allowed prior to Final RFP and three ATCs after the Final RFP.	No action needed
68	Transportation Management	141	3rd Bullet	Can you please provide further definition as to what is meant by multi-vehicle?	Per Section 1101-7 of the 2024 Standard Specifications for Roads and Structures, "the hauling of equipment or materials to or from the project with delivery at intervals of less than 5 minutes or results in more than one vehicle at a particular work site at a time."	No action needed
69	Lighting			The RFP did not address pedestrian lighting but the Synopsis document noted it would be in the scope of work. Are pedestrian lighting requirements expected?	No lighting requirements.	No action needed
70	Roadway	81		Page 81 indicates the trail needs to comply with ADA. For sections of the Greenway/MUP in road ROW will PROWAG apply?	All proposed materials and details are subject to NCDOT review and approval and must be ADA PROWAG compliant.	No action needed
71	Roadway	82		Page 82 indicates that driveway aprons are to be repaired to preconstruction conditions – is this to match existing condition or use standard driveway aprons?	Match the existing condition.	No action needed
72	Roadway	82 and 105		Page 82 indicates Henderson Co has acquired all ROW anticipated for the project – do we need to ROW services during the pursuit of the project if this is the case? Related to the above, Page 105 section II infers ROW will need to be purchased with the statement "The Right of Way Recommendations shall be completed prior to the Design-Build Team making offers to purchase the right of way on these sites of concern."	The need to require right of way is not anticipated.	No action needed
73	Structures	85		Can NCDOT provide full build-out land use projections if different from existing?	No, the Department does not have land use projections.	No action needed
74	Hydraulics	88		Page 88 indicates that the design team needs to develop a stormwater management plan. Will the existing gravel rail bed be considered to be a impervious or partially impervious surface for the purpose of developing this management plan?	Gravel is generally considered impervious, but railroad ballast may be treated differently because its large voids can allow infiltration. Any newly placed or compacted stone—such as widened sections or riprap—may be considered impervious. The final determination will depend on the permitting agency's reviewer.	Revise RFP
75	Roadway	81		What is the required design speed for the greenway?	See response to question #8.	No action needed
76	Roadway	81		Are there minimum radii required for this project?	The Design-Build Team shall establish appropriate radii in accordance with the applicable AASHTO bicycle and pedestrian design guides referenced in the RFP, considering the selected design speed, grades, sight distance, user comfort, and site constraints. The proposed radii shall be submitted to NCDOT for review and approval.	No action needed
77	Roadway	81		Are curves to be superelevated? If so, is superelevation required to be in direction of the curve? The plans provided show minimum radii curves with adverse superelevation.	See design criteria. Uploaded to Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
78	Roadway	81		What is the minimum cross slope transition?	See design criteria. Uploaded to Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
79	Roadway	81		Are compound and/or broken back curve acceptable?	See design criteria. Uploaded to Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
80	Roadway	81		At driveway crossings will the path end and tie into the existing driveway or will the path be constructed across the driveways and the driveways tying to it?	The Design-Build Team shall ensure proper grading, drainage, accessibility, and sight distance at all driveway crossings and submit proposed details to NCDOT for review and approval. Driveway crossings must be as close to ADA (5% grade max) without causing operational issues for the driveways/trail crossings. It may be that individual driveway crossings need to be reviewed with IMD and Traffic Safety in design review.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
81	Roadway	81		Are detectable warning strips required at all roadway crossings, are they required at driveway crossings?	Detectable warning surfaces are required at all public roadway crossings, consistent with PROWAG and ADA requirements. Detectable warning surfaces are not required at driveway crossings unless the driveway functions as a public street or otherwise meets the definition of a pedestrian street crossing under PROWAG. The Design-Build Team shall identify all locations requiring detectable warnings and submit them to NCDOT for review and approval.	No action needed
82	Other			The plans currently show planting buffers, are those required as part of this contract?	See response to question #1.	No action needed
83	Structures			What is the minimum offset for handrail?	The Design-Build Team shall determine the appropriate handrail offset based on applicable AASHTO pedestrian and bicycle design guidance, NCDOT standards, and the proposed bridge configuration. The proposed offset shall be submitted to NCDOT for review and approval. The NCDOT Roadway Design Manual provides this information in 4-14-1-1.	No action needed
84	Structures			Is handrail required on all bridge approaches? If so is there a minimum length?	Look to previously completed sections of Ecusta Trail to follow same details, handrails on all bridges and safety rail on all approaches to bridges.	Request for Material
85	Geotechnical Engineering			If the old rail sub ballast and/or aggregate base layers are still present along the corridor and in suitable condition will NCDOT allow these with rehab to be used in place of new ABC?	Yes. There is no empirical evidence that historical use as a rail line resulted in contamination of the soil or ballast. Abnormal conditions that may indicate the presence of hazardous, contaminated or toxic conditions should be addressed during construction in accordance with Standard Specification 104-25.	No action needed
86	Other			Does the Department desire any benches, trash cans, bike repair stations, or other site furnishings to be incorporated into the plans?	No	No action needed
87	Other			Does the department want collapsible bollards or a similar barriers provided where the greenway will cross vehicular travelways to deter vehicles from driving on the greenway?	No bollards.	Revise RFP
88	Other			When the DB team visits the site is it acceptable to drive vehicles down the existing ROW for the purposes of inspecting the existing conditions?	Yes, coordinate with Marcus Jones at Henderson County to schedule a field visit.	No action needed
89	Hydraulics			Will a HEC-RAS model be provided to the team to develop the hydraulic studies for each bridge?	The Department is providing a preliminary model, no rise is anticipated but if there are increases in revised models the Teams will need to use the Effective model and use the FEMA guidance on how to recreate the model or provide a 6 section model that ties .	Request for Material
90	Hydraulics	85	6	Can NCDOT provide the land use projections that may be different from existing?	No, the DBT shall research and provide this information.	No action needed
91	General			Will the Department provide guidelines and standard details for the planting buffers?	See response to question #1.	No action needed
92	Project Special Provisions	2		Can night work or scheduled work on US 64 be completed without liquidated damages?	No	No action needed
93	Project Special Provisions	2		Is the fiber optic cable located by survey? If so, is it along the railroad corridor or US 64?	Surveys and Test hole reports have been uploaded to the Materials Available Site.	Request for Material
94	Project Special Provisions	43		Is there any available subsurface information for bridge #10? Subsurface information was provided for bridges #7, 8 and 9.	No subsurface information will be provided for Bridge #10.	No action needed
95	Project Special Provisions	62	3	Is the aesthetic intent for the pedestrian safety rail to match the safety rail installed on the completed portion of the Ecusta trail?	Yes	No action needed
96	General	66	3	In indicating all the work items for this project, it then states this project is a proposed eight-lane facility and repairing a control of access fence. This would need to be revised to properly explain the project.	See response to question #48.	Revise RFP
97	Roadway	81	2	Is there a requirement to provide ADA compliant access to the greenway? Including, but not limited to, parking, connecting pathways, curb ramps, etc.	Yes. The Design-Build Team must provide ADA-compliant access to the greenway where the project interfaces with public facilities, including parking areas, connecting pathways, and curb ramps, in accordance with PROWAG and ADA requirements. The RFP does not require new parking or additional access points beyond those identified in the contract; however, all access locations included in the project scope must meet current accessibility standards. Proposed details shall be submitted to NCDOT for review and approval.	No action needed
98	Roadway	81	4	Per the RFP, it states the design-build team is responsible for all fees and permits. What fees and permits are anticipated?	Including but not limited to Environmental Permits, Traffic Signal Review Fee, and encroachment submittals, if necessary.	No action needed
99	Pavement Markings	82	5	Please advise if a 90% Signing and Pavement Marking Plan will need to be provided within the technical proposal.	Signing and pavement marking plans are NOT required for the technical proposal.	No action needed
100	Pavement Markings	82	5	What permanent pavement marking type is to be installed on the greenway and roads where applicable?	Greenway markings - Heated-in-place thermoplastic characters/symbols and IMP (Integrated Multipolymer Pavement Marking Lanes) for all roads where the greenway crosses.	No action needed
101	Roadway	83		When will NCDOT provide Right of Way correspondence?	No correspondence will be provided.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
102	Structures	84		In structural bridge design, are we to assume only pedestrian loading? Please advise if the intent of the new bridges is to match the existing bridge design on the previously constructed portion of the trail.	The preference is to match the existing bridge design on the previously constructed portion of the trail.	No action needed
103	Structures	84		Is top down construction a requirement for building the approach spans?	No that is not a requirement.	No action needed
104	Structures	84		Please advise if the design-build team is responsible for full inspection of riveted plate girder span and supports.	Design-Build Team is responsible for full inspection of riveted plate girder spans and supports.	No action needed
105	Structures	84		Are there any plans available on bridge #10 main span?	Will provide if available.	Request for Material
106	Structures	84		When cleaning and painting on bridge #10, if any unforeseen damage is found, will this be considered extra work?	Yes, that would be considered extra work.	Revise RFP
107	Structures	84		Within the Structures scope of work, it indicates a rail height of 54" to be utilized. If a proposed bridge span length is less than 100' would a bridge rail height of less than 54" be acceptable? Per the latest NCDOT standards, a minimum handrail height of 42" is required.	Railing on truss should match existing Ecusta Trail truss bridges (54" to top of rail and 48" to top of handrail)	No action needed
108	Hydraulics	85		Is the expectation for all cross drainage to solely meet the minimum 2-year design frequency as mentioned in the current version of the RFP? If not, please advise of any other design frequency the Department would prefer for cross drainage.	Follow greenway and multi-use guidelines, analyze if structures are upstream	No action needed
109	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Will the Department entertain any other types of major drainage structures in lieu of bridges for the first three major stream crossings? Specifically, sites 7, 8 and 9 that are existing railroad bridges.	Yes, if that structure in question is in the backwater of the FBR and the U/S Structure is a culvert, then a structure that doesn't cause an increase upstream shall be considered.	No action needed
110	Hydraulics	85 & 86		If the hydraulic design criteria in the latest version of the RFP can be achieved, can the hydraulic conveyance for any major drainage crossing (four existing bridge crossings) and any other jurisdictional crossings be less than what the existing structure provides?	As long as it's as good or better.	No action needed
111	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Will the proposed cross drainage pipes on jurisdictional streams need to be buried per NCDOT guidance?	Yes, if the pipe is replaced. If the pipe remains it can be grandfathered.	No action needed
112	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Will existing open end drainage pipes within the railroad right of way at NCDOT road crossings need to be brought up to the latest NCDOT standards?	If it needs to be replaced and it's a NCDOT road crossing, yes it needs to be up to NCDOT standards unless there are some constraints that prohibit meeting the standard.	No action needed
113	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Are there any limitations to the use of alternate pipe for this project?	Follow the pipe material selection guide.	No action needed
114	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Is there a minimum spacing of the floodplain culverts for the floodplain near Blythe Mill creek and Gash Creek Crossing?	The Design Build Team needs to submit a design for review - spacing will be reviewed at that time.	No action needed
115	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Will a 36" pipe be the minimum size for the required floodplain culverts per green sheet project commitment?	Typically a 36" is the minimum size for a floodplain culvert/wetland equalizer pipe size, if fill constrains arise, 24" - 30" maybe considered.	No action needed
116	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Does the Department plan to video inspect all existing cross pipes under the railroad bed?	No	No action needed
117	Hydraulics	85 & 86		Please advise if the Department will allow hydraulically adequate cross drainage pipes to be retained and lined with an approved pipe liner?	Yes, The Department may allow, and if any liner is added increases will need to be evaluated.	No action needed
118	Hydraulics	87		Which design year frequency should be utilized for all proposed storm drainage design?	Follow greenway and multi-use guidelines, analyze if structures are upstream.	No action needed
119	Hydraulics	87		Are there any contaminated sites within the proposed project limits? If so, will sealed stormwater drainage systems including cross drainage pipes be a requirement?	Contaminated sites were removed within the project limits. In the unlikely event that contaminated soils are encountered, sealed stormwater drainage system may be required.	No action needed
120	Geotechnical Engineering	92	2nd Paragraph	The provided soil borings for the structures do not meet the intent of the RFP regarding boring depth below estimate pile tip elevation. The RFP required 2 borings per bent. Would the design team be permitted to only drill 1 boring/bent due to the bridge width being only 12 feet wide?	The RFP will be updated to 1 boring per bent.	Revise RFP
121	Geotechnical Engineering	100	3rd Bullet	The RFP states that the geotechnical firm which prepares the original foundation designs shall be responsible for any necessary changes to the foundation design revising analysis, recommendations, and reports as needed. Since foundation design recommendations were provided as part of the pursuit information, will the design team be responsible for submitting new foundation reports based on the anticipated deeper drilling required at each bridge structure?	The provided foundation recs are for information purposes only. The DB team can modify the preliminary design without involving the previous reports provided.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
122	Geotechnical Engineering	105		Will the railroad ballast be a suitable fill material product?	Yes, as long as it meets the intent of the proposed use. Some improvement may be needed. There is no empirical evidence that historical use as a rail line resulted in contamination of the soil or ballast. Abnormal conditions that may indicate the presence of hazardous, contaminated or toxic conditions should be addressed during construction in accordance with Standard Specification 104-25.	No action needed
123	Environmental Permits	126		What size floodplain culverts are required and what is their location?	36" however the Department may consider smaller based on fill height.	No action needed
124	Environmental Permits	126		Can area maps be provided for stream inputs? Currently, the area and lengths are listed.	The final NRTR has been uploaded to the materials available site.	Request for Material
125	Transportation Management	131		Will a boater safety plan be required for work in and over the French Broad River?	Yes, will revise the Environmental SOW to include a River Use Communication Plan.	Revise RFP
126	Transportation Management	135		Per the RFP, type II barricades are indicated to be installed. There is no roadway standard drawing or approved product listed for type II barricades, even though they're acceptable per MUTCD. Please advise if type II barricades are to be utilized or if the NCDOT standard type III barricades are the intent.	Either Type II or Type III may be used depending on the application (e.g. pedestrian/cyclist, automobile, etc.). Type III's cannot be used when ADA compliance is required.	No action needed
127	Structures	84	5th paragraph	Can cleaning and repainting of the old RR girders be included into the RFP language because the modification of the girders could be construed just as structural.	Will revise the RFP to include cleaning and painting existing girders that remain in place.	Revise RFP
128	Right of Way			Property owned by Henderson Co/ Ecusta Rail2Trails LLC and others- will ROW documents need to be recorded to allow NCDOT to access and construct the project?	See response to question #12.	No action needed
129	Right of Way			We researched the deed that we think covers the areas previously owned by the Railroad and contains the project limits. There are 114 recorded plats noted in the deed description. Titles may be needed to determine clouds on the title such as right of first refusal. Is this a safe assumption?	There should not be any ROW acquisition tasks for this project.	No action needed
130	Right of Way			Structures that are within the railroad ROW: are recorded easements needed to remove structures (including ones that completely within the project footprint and ones that are partly in/out)?	Our intent is to remove only those encroachments that directly interfere with trail construction.	No action needed
131	Right of Way			Has relocation been completed for structure that need to be demo'ed?	No	No action needed
132	Right of Way			If ROW is needed to be acquired can claim reports be utilized (small take areas with no damages) that typically saves project funding?	There should not be any additional ROW needed.	No action needed
133	Geotechnical Engineering			The concept plans provided with the RFP indicate six wall locations on both the left and right sides of the alignment. The geotechnical information provided with the RFP only includes wall inventory for Walls 1RT and 6LT. Will the Department be providing geotechnical information (i.e. inventory) for the remaining wall locations?	No, additional information will not be provided	No action needed
134	Geotechnical Engineering			Based on the information provided in the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, the report indicates that due to the activities associated with the Corridor's historical use as a rail line, the potential impacts from contaminants typically associated with railroads represent RECs. Are we to consider that soils and ballast along the rail corridor itself are contaminated? If so, will excavated soil/ballast need to be stockpiled on site for disposal by the Department in accordance with the RFP?	There is no empirical evidence that historical use as a rail line resulted in contamination of the soil or ballast. Abnormal conditions that may indicate the presence of hazardous, contaminated or toxic conditions should be addressed during construction in accordance with Standard Specification 104-25.	No action needed
135	Project Special Provisions	56	1st Paragraph	Should septic systems also be included in the list of items that will be negotiated post-award?	Yes, will revise the RFP in Addendum 1.	Revise RFP
136	Roadway			There is an existing hole/gap within the Existing Terrain file at the beginning of the project prior to the first bridge. See attached picture for reference. Also, from viewing the preliminary files provided to us, we believe we have found and request to receive the file from the 2nd image that we believe was used to supplement the currently provided existing terrain file.	The clipped and unclipped version of that file are now uploaded to the materials available site. If that hole was filled, it would have been filled with lidar data.	Request for Material
137	Structures	83	2nd Bullet / 3rd Bullet	The second bullet states: All bridges shall match the type design and aesthetics of the bridges on the adjacent project (BL-0007). The third bullet states: All bridges shall have a concrete deck. The adjacent project bridges have timber decks. Please clarify which deck is required.	Correct, all bridges shall have a concrete deck.	No action needed

Project:	BL-0078 - Ecusta Trail
----------	------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
138	Environmental Permits	124	1st Paragraph	Can the Department confirm the River User Communication Plan and Bridge Construction and Demolition Document will require approval by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)? Is there an expected timeframe for the approval to be obtained after submittal?	The USACE will require at least a Bridge Construction and Demolition Document, and likely a corresponding River User Communication Plan. This document will be part of the permit application for the project and timeframes are the same as permit application processing. However, the Corps does encourage early review of this document to help ensure the Plan does not slow down the permitting process.	No action needed
139	Environmental Permits			During a recent site visit, the DB Team observed several features labeled as jurisdictional in the NRTR and wex file that appeared to have changed after Helene. Some of these features may no longer be potentially jurisdictional. Can the Department provide an update on the status of the PJD submittal and if it has not been provided to the USACE, would a revisit be possible? If helpful, we could provide locations of a few of the features that now have a questionable status.	The Department would appreciate receiving a list of potential features that may have been changed or significantly altered by Hurricane Helene so that they can be investigated. However, agency staff are currently prioritized on project permitting efforts related to Helene recovery, which is expected to continue for some time. As a result, the Department recommends that teams proceed under pre-Helene assumptions throughout the procurement process, as it is unlikely this work could be completed before summer 2026.	No action needed