

| | |
|----------|---------|
| Project: | BO-2418 |
|----------|---------|

| No. | Document Section | Page | Paragraph/Bullet | Comment/Question | NCDOT Response | Changes to RFP or Other Actions |
|-----|----------------------------|------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Project Special Provisions | 5 | 2nd Paragraph under Contract & Liquidated Damages | Please confirm that the Final Completion Date is September 30, 2031. If correct, can you provide insight as to why it's so far out? | The date that was used was a placeholder. The updated final completion date is October 28, 2028, will be included in the Final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 2 | Project Special Provisions | 59 | 1 | Please clarify the steel pipe rail handrail detail that is desired. | If the Design-Build Team's design results in a need for handrail for fall protection, an appropriate handrail shall be designed and constructed that is consistent with handrails on other NCDOT facilities | Revise RFP |
| 3 | General | 63 | | Will the department be providing the following CADD Files: CON Design file, PRL Design File, ELN Design File, SUE Design File, WET file, FS Container File, etc.? The survey and terrain does not quite run to the radius turnouts of First St and only provides information to the back of existing sidewalk throughout. Will there be additional survey and terrain provided for the full study area/proposed typical section/project limits as described in the RFP? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | No action needed |
| 4 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 2 | Can the Department clarify the limits of the MUP for the base bid? The RFP indicates approximately 2200 LF of MUP from the north end of Bridge 730411 to River Park North; this conflicts with the cover page (0.919 miles) and the contract items sheet (1.100 miles). | The base bid for the MUP extends from the South Tar Greenway, south of Bridge 730411, to the driveway access to Pitt County parcel number 20547. Updated the Cover Page and Items Sheet to reflect the 4,500 LF. | Revise RFP |
| 5 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 4 | The NCDOT Roadway Design Manual states a 2 ft shoulder should be used, and the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities states a 5 ft shoulder is recommended. Please clarify the desired shoulder width for the greenway design. | 2' shoulder | Revise RFP |
| 6 | Roadway | 67 / 68 | Multiple | Bullet 2 of Page 67 indicates the MUP width should be 10-ft wide south of the bridge. Bullet 6 of Page 68 indicates there should be no taper in the proposed MUP south of the bridge, indicating the 8'-5" width should be maintained to the connection with the South Tar River Greenway / Town Common. Please clarify the desired MUP width south of the bridge. | The MUP south of the bridge should taper from the width on the bridge to 10 feet wide at the South Tar Greenway | Revise RFP |
| 7 | Roadway | 68 | Bullet 2 | The 2024 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities recommends a 6-foot utility strip between the face of curb and a multiuse path. The latest NCDOT Roadway Design Manual specifies a 5-foot utility strip. However, the RFP (page 68, bullet 2) states that the utility strip should be maintained where it exists, implying that it is not required where it does not currently exist. This appears to conflict with both manuals. Could you define the minimum width of the utility strip and if it is required throughout Greene St including areas where there is currently not a utility strip? | The current utility strip width should be maintained. If there isn't one now you can put it against back of curb. If utility conflict is present please bring to our attention and we can discuss. | Revise RFP |
| 8 | Roadway | 68 | Bullet 3 | This bullet states guardrail should be installed to protect both approaches to Bridge 730411. On the south approach, there is insufficient room to add guardrail with standard length of need without conflicting with the existing crosswalk for the South Tar River Greenway. Please clarify if the guardrail should be added, shifting the crosswalk south to accommodate the guardrail? | The guardrail should be added and the greenway connection shifted as needed | Revise RFP |
| 9 | Pavement Management | 69 | 1 & 2 | Bullet 1 in the Pavement Design section specifies an S9.5C surface course for the full-depth portion of N. Greene Street, while Bullet 2 specifies an S9.5B surface course for the mill-and-replace portion. Should these surface course materials be different? | Surface courses should be the same - use S9.5C. Per City discussion with Division change to S9.5B | Revise RFP |
| 10 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 1 | Should the first bullet be revised to say "Modify, supplement or replace the existing bridge rail"? And is there a minimum Test Level desired for the 54" tall barrier? | Modify or supplement - replacing will likely add too much dead load. Will discuss internally about the minimum Test Level. Meeting existing conditions. | No action needed |
| 11 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 3 | There appears to be a discrepancy between the Greenway Scope and the Structures Scope. The Greenway Scope requires an 8'-5" concrete MUP on the bridge and the Structures Scope says to "widen the existing sidewalk to the maximum width that can be achieved while maintaining the minimum roadway shoulder widths and reducing the vehicle travel lanes to 11 feet in width". Our review of the existing bridge plans indicates that the 8'-5" MUP width will not fit on the bridge given the lane and shoulder requirements. Please revise the two scopes to eliminate the discrepancy and clarify the requirements. | There is no discrepancy. Based on the as-built plan set, the rail-to-rail width is 10.5 meters, which is 34.4 feet. That equates to two two-foot shoulders, two eleven-foot lanes, and the remainder would be the MUP (calculates to 8'-5") | No action needed |
| 12 | Structures | 72 | 1 | Will NCDOT Structures Management Unit provide a copy of the current load rating to the design-build teams? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | No action needed |
| 13 | Structures | 72 | 1 | Is a load rating required as a final deliverable for the project (i.e. should a plan sheet similar to STD. No. LRF1 be included in the final structure plans)? If so, the existing bridge was designed using the Strength Design Method and the AASHTO Standard Specifications, not per LRFD. Should the final bridge load rating be done using Strength Design or LRFR? | Yes, LRFR Sheet using LRFD to be included in the plans. Include the sheet with the numbers. | No action needed |
| 14 | Structures | 72 | 1 | The paragraph on this page states NCDOT SMU "has reviewed the existing structure and determined that it can support additional dead load for a sidewalk/MUP width of up to 9 feet. It is the responsibility of the Design-Build Team to rate the existing bridge for the work they propose". How were the existing bridge foundations considered by SMU as part of their determination? Will the design team have to consider foundation capacity as part of the load rating? If so, please provide all construction records associated with the bridge foundations. | Foundations were not considered in SMU's determination of the addition load to achieve 9' sidewalk. The DB team will be responsible for checking foundation capacity for the final condition. The foundation capacity will not be part of the load rating. | No action needed |
| 15 | Hydraulics | 75 | 2nd to last | Can NCDOT define the existing shoulder width on the low side of the bridge deck? Currently there is no striped shoulder, and the existing bridge plans indicate a 13.78-ft (4.2 m) width inclusive of left lane and shoulder. | Based on the as-built plan set, the rail-to-rail width is 10.5 meters, which is 34.4 feet. That equates to two two-foot shoulders, two eleven-foot lanes, and the remainder would be the MUP | No action needed |
| 16 | Hydraulics | 76 | Last Paragraph | Since the design build team will need to coordinate with the local floodplain administrator to ensure NFIP compliance is met, will this project go through the SFC submittal process? | No, it will be prepared with the "same information", but it will go through the local floodplain administrator and they will decide if they review it or if it goes to FEMA for review. It will not be submitted through the NCDOT's SFC Process with any of the NCDOT's logos/paperwork. | No action needed |
| 17 | Hydraulics | | | Will the department be responsible for all fees associated with floodplain compliance (i.e. SFC Package Fees, CLOMR Fees, etc)? | FEMA Fees are paid for by the owner of the facility, City of Greenville. | Revise RFP |
| 18 | Hydraulics | | | If a CLOMR is required, will the design build team be responsible for the LOMR after construction? | Yes | Revise RFP |
| 19 | Hydraulics | | | The effective HEC-RAS model was downloaded from FRIS. The upstream bridge at N.Pitt Street is not included in the model. Will the department require us to add this bridge to the model? If the bridge needs to be added to the model, will the department provide the additional surveys along N. Pitt Street? | This is not a Department requirement; it is a FEMA requirement. The Engineer of Record is responsible for verifying the effective model against the published FEMA data and developing the duplicate effective, corrected effective, and revised models as needed. As part of this effort, an existing conditions model may be required to account for structures that were built but not included in the effective model and to evaluate any associated impacts. The Design-Build Team is responsible for providing any supplemental survey data needed to support the modeling. | No action needed |
| 20 | Geoenvironmental | 78 | DESCRIPTION OF WORK | Please provide more detail as to the anticipated scope of the Department's UST investigation once the DB team notifies the Department of a UST. Scope items such as SUE level of investigations, property research, etc. are of interest. And regarding the Department removing aforementioned USTs and contaminated soils, please provide more detail as to the anticipated scope of the Department's responsibility, i.e. what will the defined LOD be, how/if the site will be backfilled, how/if the site will be repaved or resurfaced, etc. | The level of geoenvironmental investigation will depend on the anticipated project impacts, including the amount of proposed right-of-way and easement acquisition. When warranted, a Phase II investigation may include a file review, geophysical survey for potential orphan USTs, and soil sampling. Based on the findings, the Department will provide right-of-way acquisition recommendations. If USTs are identified, the Department will work with the Design-Build Team to determine whether they can be avoided through design. If avoidance is not feasible, the Department will obtain the necessary access and coordinate removal. UST removal and any required remediation will be completed by the Geoenvironmental Section prior to construction. The extent of any removal, remediation, backfilling, paving, or site restoration will be determined based on site-specific conditions and investigation results. This project currently has a low probability of impacting the identified geoenvironmental sites of concern, and in many cases additional investigation is not warranted due to limited or no impacts. | No action needed |
| 21 | Public Information | 99/100 | Next to last paragraph / Bullet 2 | Remove paragraph regarding Technical Proposal since one is not required. Is Bullet 2 on Page 100 missing? | Revised in the final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 22 | Utilities | 116 | 4 | Should the following statement be revised since there are utilities currently on the existing bridge? "No attachment of utilities to bridges will be allowed". And if there is a utility attachment that needs to be modified as part of the structural modifications, is it ok to reattach the utility to the bridge? | It is not anticipated that any utility other than potentially the electrical system in the sidewalk will be affected. Provision does not apply to existing bridges. | Revise RFP |
| 23 | Geotechnical Engineering | N/A | N/A | Is any subsurface data available at the site? If so, please provide the boring logs. | No. | No action needed |
| 24 | Other | 216 & 217 of pdf | Additive Scopes #1 and #2 | What is the purpose of additive scopes 1 and 2? If it is to maximize the width of the sidewalk, that should already be accomplished in the base bid price. | The purpose of the additives is to provide a means to avoid a cold joint and provide a uniform sidewalk surface if the project budget allows | No action needed |
| 25 | Other | 216 of pdf | Additive Scope #2, second paragraph | The specification requires that the sidewalk finish grade remain consistent with existing surface elevations along the entire length of the bridge. Please clarify since the overlay depth would necessarily raise the finished surface above existing grade elevations. | In order to maintain the finish grade, the top portion of the existing sidewalk would have to be removed. The intent of keeping the same grade is to avoid having to raise the outside rail even further. | No action needed |
| 26 | Other | N/A | Electronic Files | A pdf of a multi-use path alignment was provided in the Survey folder (Prop-Align). It shows the MUP alignment running approx 35' behind the existing sidewalk. It's not mentioned in the RFP. Are there any project requirements relative to this plan? | This file is intended to show the general location of the proposed MUP. City R.W. | Revise RFP |
| 27 | Other | N/A | N/A | The most recent bridge inspection report for Structure No. 730411, dated July 21, 2025, documents the presence of a vagrant encampment at End Bent 2. Please clarify whether the removal of this encampment prior to or during construction is the responsibility of the Design-Build Team, the Department, or another party. If removal is the responsibility of the Design-Build Team, please identify any applicable legal, coordination, or notice requirements - including engagement with local law enforcement or social services - that must be followed, and confirm whether associated costs are to be included in the lump sum price. | There is no plan to request anyone remove the encampment. The DBT will give the Department at least six weeks notice before working on the bridge over the encampment | Revise RFP |
| 28 | Other | N/A | N/A | Will the full set of plans for the adjacent Town Common West End Improvements project be provided to the Design-Build teams? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 29 | Other | N/A | N/A | There is a stream gauge on the east side of the bridge behind the sidewalk. If needed, whose responsibility will it be to temporarily remove the gauge (if needed) and re-attached it later to the bridge? | The gauge station has been relocated. A reference gauge remains that the USGS would like to keep in place for as long as they can. There will be a provision in the next draft that requires a two-week notice to allow time for the USGS to relocate the reference gauge. | Revise RFP |
| 30 | Other | N/A | N/A | When will NCDOT provide copies of the Categorical Exclusion and "Guidelines for Preparation of Traffic Control and Pavement Marking Plans for Design-Build Projects"? | Uploaded to Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 31 | Structures | 71 | 3rd bullet | Please verify the base design section on the bridge- understanding is that the final product will be maintaining two (2) lanes of travel with 11 foot lanes and a 8.5' minimum raised sidewalk (behind curb) as designated in the Greenway Scope of Work on page 67. | Greenway Scope will need to be revised; currently states 8'-5" MUP on bridge. Provide as wide a sidewalk/MUP on the bridge as possible | Revise RFP |
| 32 | Structures | 71 | 2nd bullet | If the base design has a raised sidewalk, do we still need to use the delineator system? Or is that for an option where the MUP is on the same elevation as the roadway? | Yes, still use the delineator system. Do not leave the sidewalk/MUP at the same elevation as the bridge - not enough room for positive separation. | No action needed |
| 33 | Roadway | 67 | 1st bullet | Will the DB teams receive all necessary utility information to aid in a decision for where the MUP is located? Will the team also receive all inlet elevations of all drainage along Greene Street to verify use of existing inlets? Will the team need to take into account the condition of the inlets when making decisions about replacement? | SUE data is all we have. If there is something structurally deficient will need to be replaced they don't need to be replaced. If Team don't touch the curb don't need to be replaced. | No action needed |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| 34 | General | 102 | Traffic Management Scope of Work | The TIA provided stated that Greene Street will obtain an acceptable level of service with one lane NB. Is this an option for the permanent configuration? | No - a permanent one-lane configuration is not an option. Will provide a provision that will give additional info and latitude on the bridge. | Revise RFP |
| 35 | Other | 6 | Additive Scope Item 1. | Does the first additive scope option (remove and replace sidewalk) refer to leaving the MUP at the same elevation as the roadway or building back a raised sidewalk? Will this raised sidewalk be the 8.5 foot width or the maximum width with 11 foot lanes? | Do not leave the sidewalk/MUP at the same elevation as the bridge - not enough room for positive separation. Achieve the maximum MUP width as possible on the bridge | Revise RFP |
| 36 | Roadway | 68 | 9th bullet | Will the Dept. be providing a typical sections? Structure and roadway. | Provided Rdwy Typical. Uploaded to Materials Provided | Request for Material |
| 37 | General | 70 | 1st bullet | Will the Dept. be providing the CE document to the DB teams prior to the bid date? Will a final survey file be provided, both PDF and ORD? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 38 | Transportation Management | 103 | Design Parameters - Bullet 1. | From the provided SR 1531 (Greene St)_MUP_Concept drawing 3-6-26.pdf there does not seem to be any "two-lane" roadways. Is this requirement intended for the multi-lane one way facility, or the four-lane undivided facility, or both? | Look at making revision to clarify | Revise RFP |
| 39 | General | 61 | Review of Submittals | Concerning submittal guidelines, this section refers to using the Alternative Delivery Submittal Guidelines. Should we be using the Express Bridge Design Guidelines for submittals on this project? | Use the Alternative Delivery Unit Submittal Guidelines. | No action needed |
| 40 | Structures | 71 | General | Will the Dept. provide information on the existing bridge including as-built plans, and load rating? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 41 | Pavement Management | 69 | 1st and 2nd bullet | The RFQ specifies milling and replacing the pavement north of First St. to Bridge 730411 with S9.5B surface mix. It also requires a 1/2 lane width removal and repaving along N. Greene St. using an S9.5C surface mix. To optimize construction logistics, reduce equipment clean-out downtime, and ensure a seamless longitudinal joint transition, can a single mix design be utilized for both segments? Specifically, will the State approve utilizing S9.5B across both project areas, or conversely, evaluate if S9.5C meets the structural traffic demands of the N. Greene St. section? | Surface courses should be the same - use S9.5C. Per City discussion with Division change to S9.5B | Revise RFP |
| 42 | Project Special Provisions | 6 | 5 | Additive Scope Item #2. What is the minimum overlay requirement for sidewalk? Is this optional or required? | Overlay depth is according to the manufacturer's requirements | No action needed |
| 43 | Project Special Provisions | 6 | 6 | Additive Scope Item #3. Does this mean there is a different MUP location other than what the conceptual design provided? This different location requires more upfront design and pricing. Is this optional or required? | Providing a price for Alternate #3 is required. The location for the new location MUP can be approximately as shown in the concept drawing 50 foot | No action needed |
| 44 | Roadway | 67 | 6 | What permit and fees are anticipated? None anticipated for EC or environmental permitting - potentially CLOMR? | Likely no permits with small wetland work with nationwide permit. DBT to pay permit fees | No action needed |
| 45 | Roadway | 68 | 3 | What width utility strip is required? In an effort to minimize utility impacts and guardrail impacts above ground, can this utility strip be eliminated? | The existing utility strip width shall be maintained | Revise RFP |
| 46 | Roadway | 68 | 4 | Is installation of the guardrail needed for both the east and west sides of the roadway? Utility information was not provided for either bridge approach. Can this information be provided to help minimize potential conflicts with guardrail post installation? | Guardrail is required for both sides of the roadway. All available utility information is in the SUE file that was provided | No action needed |
| 47 | Roadway | 69 | 7 | Please confirm who is responsible for paying for ROW and easements needed for the project. Also, please confirm that these costs are not included in the bid. | The Department will pay the ROW and easement costs. The DBT is responsible for the acquisition process. | Revise RFP |
| 48 | Roadway | 70 | 4 | When will CE be provided? It was not included on the Connect Site and is needed to adhere to all environmental commitments. | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 49 | Roadway | 70 | 3 | Can NCDOT confirm if more survey information is going to be provided to D-B teams? The survey provided is missing topography for new location alignment, missing topography for NE of bridge outside edge or pavement, new wetland and stream delineation, SUE files (provided PDF), and drainage structure inverts. In addition, the BO-2418 study area provided in CADD does not fully accommodate the proposed and alternate alignment provided. Is there a larger study area available as part of the forthcoming CE? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 50 | Structures | 71 | 3 | Please provide clarification on delineator system product installation location in shoulder. Is the installation location at the roadway edge, adjacent to the sidewalk, or on top of the sidewalk edge? Also, can you clarify the color (yellow or orange) and dimension (4"x22" or 8"x33") of the product? | The delineator system is to be installed on the bridge deck immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. White. 8"x33" | Revise RFP |
| 51 | Structures | 71 | 4 | Can you confirm if the existing sidewalk height (6" assumed) will need to be widened? | Do not understand - widen the height? | No action needed |
| 52 | Structures | 71 | 2 | Elaborate on modifying or supplementing existing bridge rail - is modification/supplementing preferred over a new bridge rail that meets height requirement? | A new 54" rail may add too much dead load to the bridge | No action needed |
| 53 | Hydraulics | 73 | 1 | Is a Technical Proposal needed? Express D-B projects do not typically require a Technical Proposal. Could you please confirm? If not required, please remove all references to a Technical Proposal in the RFP as it shows up in many places. | No, a technical proposal is not required. The RFP will be revised to remove that. | Revise RFP |
| 54 | Hydraulics | 74 | 4 | Please clarify the note about the D-B team not being responsible for analyzing existing cross pipes outside the corridor. Should this statement also include "drainage structures"? Such as - "Cross pipes on the west side of North Greene Street are not within greenway corridor and should not be analyzed as a part of this project." | Correct, this will be revised in the RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 55 | Hydraulics | 74 | 5 | On the east side of North Green Street within the greenway corridor, are the existing or proposed conditions at drainage structures that encroach beyond half of the travel lane considered hydraulically deficient? If so, would new drainage structures and pipe systems be required to get spread under half of the travel lane? | The intent is not to make the spread into the travel lanes worse. | No action needed |
| 56 | Hydraulics | 75 | 9 | In the event we are narrowing the shoulder width (not currently striped) on the west side of the bridge (low side) to accommodate 11' lanes, is it acceptable if the spread remains within the new shoulder width? | A two-foot shoulder must be maintained. The intent is not to make the current spread situation worse on the low side of the bridge. | No action needed |
| 57 | Hydraulics | 76 | 9 | Can NCDOT provide any available riverine models for the Tar River (effective and conditional) that will be needed for evaluating a no-rise in the project area? | The effective model is available for download at FRIS. | No action needed |
| 58 | Hydraulics | 76 | 1 | The existing west side of the bridge is low side and currently contains existing deck drains spaced evenly across the entire bridge. The D-B team is not adding more impervious to bridge and intends to retain the use the existing bridge deck drains. The floodplain under bridge north of the Tar River is approximately 640 LF so it would be very challenging to predict the location of a future greenway and prevent direct discharge on it. Can you please clarify this bullet and will it be acceptable to retain the existing deck drains as is? | Retain existing deck drains | Revise RFP |
| 59 | Erosion and Sedimentation Control | 94 | 5 | Can you confirm that NCDOT is providing CEI services? How many estimated monthly construction meetings will the D-B team project staff need to be included in the bid. | Yes, CEI will be handled by the division. The DBT should include the number of monthly meetings that are needed to get to the end of the project, based on their schedule | No action needed |
| 60 | Public Information | 100 | 8 | Please clarify the anticipated number and types of public meetings to be supported by the D-B Team. In addition to the required Beginning of Construction meeting, are additional public meetings, workshops or small group or stakeholder coordination meeting expected to be included in the base for budgeting purposes. | We do not anticipate the need for public meetings beyond at most one info-only meeting | Revise RFP |
| 61 | Public Information | 100 | 8 | Please clarify whether the D-B Team or NCDOT is responsible for comment collection, comment summaries, responses-to comments, documentation, and meeting summaries/minutes. | Design-Build Team | No action needed |
| 62 | Public Information | 100 | 12 | Can you confirm the D-B Team is responsible for monthly drone footage? Or is this handled by the NCDOT CEI firm overseeing construction? | Not applicable to this project, will be removed from the RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 63 | Transportation Management | 112 | 7 | Since North Greene Street is 4-lane, 2-way traffic pattern (2 lanes in 1 direction south of split), is ICT #1 and LDs really applicable for the outer northbound lane? Depending on construction phasing, work may not be finished for lane openings by Friday. TIA traffic analysis indicated one lane of traffic would be acceptable, especially during construction. | Revise in final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 64 | Utilities | 114 | 2 | Are the design and construction of water and sewer relocations not included in the bid? | They should be included in the bid | Revise RFP |
| 65 | Other | (PDF Page) 214 | | Can you please update the proposal estimate report to not indicate project end is Mumford Road? Consider River Park North. | Yes | Revise RFP |
| 66 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 1 & 3rd Paragraph | Is a 54" tall 2-Bar Metal Rail required for this project? If not, what is the criteria to modify or supplement the existing bridge rail to get to 54" tall? Modifying the existing 3 bar rail is non-standard and will affect the crash rating. | No. The DB team is not being limited on how to achieve the 54". | No action needed |
| 67 | Structures | 72 | 1st paragraph | Can the shortlisted teams get a copy of NCDOT SMU's review of the bridge that added sidewalk width up to 9'? What modifications to the barrier rail were assumed in this analysis? | Uploaded to materials available site. The analysis requested was for additional sidewalk only, no rail modifications. | Request for Material |
| 68 | Transportation Management | 111 | Last Paragraph | The lane closure allowance and restriction appears to allow 2-3 months of short durations and other shorter periods for installation of temporary barrier and complete work. The work required on the bridge is anticipated to require a continuous 6-9 months timeframe to modify/replace rail and sidewalk. Additional optional work could extend this required period. Can the lane closure requirements be modified to allow the long term closures needed for constructability? Or would a road closure be allowed of N. Greene St. with a two-way pattern on Pitts Street to detour traffic? | Modify to allow a long term closure. | Revise RFP |
| 69 | Transportation Management | 104 | Last Paragraph | Can you please provide the level of accommodation required per the 'NCDOT Guidelines for the level of Pedestrian Accommodation in Work Zones' for this project and any pedestrian volumes? | Pedestrian accommodations should be provided consistent with ADA requirements, NCDOT Roadway Design Manual, adopted multimodal plans, and the project's Complete Streets context. Complete Streets Review Assessment will provide more context specific guidelines. | No action needed |
| 70 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 8 | The RFP states the lane widths on North Green Street can be reduced to 11 feet. Is this for the entirety of the project limits or in certain areas? | The entirety of the project | Revise RFP |
| 71 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 8 | Are the utilities referenced limited to water and sewer or do the referenced utilities include all utilities (i.e. gas, communication, cable, power etc.) | Water and Sewer responsibility of the Design-Build Team, dry utilities not included. | Revise RFP |
| 72 | Roadway | 68 | Bullet 3 | The RFP states "Guardrail shall be installed to protect both approaches to Bridge No. 730411." Due to the location of the S. Tar River Greenway there is not room to install guardrail. If the roadway approach is not changing why does guardrail needed? | Bridge was built in 2003. New design criteria warrants protection. IMD supports maintaining a safe and accessible connection between the proposed greenway/shared-use path and the bridge approaches. Any roadside safety treatments, including guardrail, should be evaluated in coordination with the appropriate roadway and safety disciplines to ensure they accommodate the proposed multimodal facilities while meeting applicable safety requirements. | Revise RFP |
| 73 | Hydraulics | 74 | Bullet 1 | Is a temporary barrier subject to this requirement? What review time frame will be needed by the local floodplain administrator. | Yes, as it is a man-made obstruction located within the floodway and may remain in place for over a year, even if it is considered temporary. unless it's less than 1 year | No action needed |
| 74 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 2 | Is the intent to install the pexco grade curb system on top of the raised MUP or at top of deck level? Is there any required offset? Installation of the flexible posts next to the sidewalk has the potential for the posts hitting the sidewalk. | Top of deck. Immediately adjacent to the sidewalk | No action needed |
| 75 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 3 | Is the intent of the RFP for the DB Team to cast new concrete sidewalk up against the existing concrete sidewalk with an exposed cold joint? Does the existing sidewalk require a clean vertical sawcut in before the team casts new concrete sidewalk against it? | Base bid is widening sidewalk against the existing sidewalk. Will clarify that a clean vertical cut is required. | Revise RFP |
| 76 | Structures | 71 | Bullet 3 | The existing sidewalk has spalls and delamination but the RFP does not mention rehabilitation. Are these areas supposed to be left in place? Is any rehabilitation of the existing structure required? Will any rehabilitation of the bridge beyond the sidewalk widening and barrier rail modification be extra work? | IMD Response - Any retained pedestrian facility should provide a continuous ADA-accessible route and safely connect to the proposed greenway/MUP. No spalling or delamination was identified - no repairs are anticipated | No action needed |
| 77 | Structures | 72 | 1st paragraph | The RFP specifies the design build team is responsible for rating the bridge for the proposed work. Is the design build team responsible for producing a new LRFR sheet for the bridge? | Yes | No action needed |
| 78 | Right of Way | 75 | Bullet 6 | This bullet states the Design Build Team will be required to "acquire" the right of way. Will the design build team be responsible for the cost to purchase the land or just the coordination? Can more detail on cost responsibility be added to the Right of Way Scope? | NCDOT will pay ROW and easement costs. DBT is responsible for acquisition | Revise RFP |
| 79 | Other | 217 (pdf) | 3rd Paragraph | Can the limits of debris removal be better defined including depth and width or can this be paid for as extra work? Can the new location greenway be added to the geoenvironmental report? | Limits of debris to be removed is that which is inside the ROW/easement needed for the DBT's design. Geoenvironmental reviewer did not find any history that required a review | No action needed |
| 80 | Hydraulics | 74 | Bullet 3 | What are considered the limits of the Greenway Corridor? | See Greenway Scope of work Pg 73 bullet 2, also see materials provided for conceptual layout, this gives you the general limits. | Revise RFP |
| 81 | Hydraulics | 76 | First Bullet | Have all the anticipated future greenway corridors etc. that may pertain to this specification been provided to the shortlisted firms? | No. Coordination with local adopted plans should be considered where applicable. | No action needed |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| | | | | | No, as the NCDOT is not the owner/operator/maintainer of the Greenway Facility, the local floodplain administrator is the correct path for this review. The package will be prepared with the "same information", but it will go through the local floodplain administrator and they will decide if they review it or if it goes to FEMA for review. It will not be submitted through the NCDOT's SFC Process with any of the NCDOT's logos/paperwork. | |
| 82 | Hydraulics | 76 | Last Bullet | Can the study be carried out through the SFC process instead of through the local floodplain administrator? | | No action needed |
| 83 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 2 | Can the Department provide clarification on the new location greenway typical section? Including greenway width and shoulder width. | Typical sections will be posted for new location. Not berm width. | Request for Material |
| 84 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 2 | Can the Department provide a design speed for the new location greenway? | 20 mph | Revise RFP |
| 85 | Roadway | 67 | Bullet 2 | Can the Department provide clarity on where the new location greenway should be constructed? The provided information shows more than one design. | The MUP on the O'Neal property should be north of the existing power line and easement Beyond that, it is up to the DBT. | Revise RFP |
| 86 | Roadway | 69 | Last Paragraph | Please clarify Signing Scope of Work. Is the DB Team responsible for updating the existing roadway signing the current MUTCD. Does the existing 45 MPH sign need to be relocated to match the speed limit ordinance? Are trail/guide signs desired along the MUP? Are trail stops the preferred treatment at driveway crossings? | Roadway signing, except for the speed limit sign mentioned, is not required. Trail signs are desired. City will handle outside of this project | Revise RFP |
| 87 | Roadway | 69 | Last Paragraph | Please clarify Pavement Marking Scope of Work. What pavement marking and marker material is required for the greenway and on Green St or -Y- Lines? | Upgrading the markings not part of the scope - pavement marking will be on the final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 88 | Roadway | 70 | Last bullet | When will the CE for the project be provided? | Uploaded to the Materials Available Site. | Request for Material |
| 89 | Roadway | 69 | Bullet 1 | Please clarify/confirm is the one-half lane width to be removed based on the existing lane or is the intent to remove up to the center of the proposed 11' lane? | The intent is to go to the center of what will be the middle of the lane in its final configuration | Revise RFP |
| 90 | Project Special Provisions | 6 | 4th | The RFP states that notice to proceed with additive scope items may take up to 90 days after contract award, while design begins immediately upon NTP. This delay creates scheduling challenges, particularly since no additional time will be granted for design adjustments. Can the Department consider reducing the decision window? | Will make every effort to provide the response as soon as possible | No action needed |
| 91 | Environmental Permits | 96 | First Paragraph | The Environmental Permits Scope of Work states that the DB Team will prepare designs and documents necessary for the Department to obtain environmental permits. Page 217 of the PDF (New Location Multi-Use Path - Additive Scope Option) notes that the bidder will obtain the permit for this option. Can you confirm that the Department will obtain all permits with designs and documents necessary to obtain the permit supplied by the DB Team? | The DBT shall prepare designs and documents for the permits as well as pay fees - clarify in additive in the RFP | Revise RFP |
| 92 | Transportation Management | 112 | Last Paragraph | Can multi-vehicle hauling restrictions be removed as hauling vehicles can enter and exit through lane closures which are allowed during peak hours? | Multi-vehicle hauling restrictions will be removed in the final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 93 | Roadway | 69 | Bullet 2 | Does NCDOT only want to overlay from first street to the bridge or should teams resurface from the bridge to the end of the project limits? | First Street to the bridge - up to paved limits | Revise RFP |
| 94 | Hydraulics | 74 | Bullet 5 | The bullet states to use Geopak Drainage or Open Roads Drainage and Utilities. In the General section on page 63, paragraph 2. The RFP states "All designs shall be in Bentley Open Roads Designer (ORD)." Please clarify what software is allowed. | ORD, will revise the RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 95 | Roadway | 70 | Last Bullet | Will the Department provide a Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work? | No, Reference Section 848 from the Standard Specifications. | No action needed |
| 96 | Environmental Permits | 97 | Last Bullet | The RFP mentions a 60-day agency review time for "complete" packages. Is the NCDOT package review time 10-days in addition to the agency review time? | The ten days is in addition to the agency review, will revise the RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 97 | Project Special Provisions | 57/58 | Last Paragraph | Does the Department anticipate the need for horizontal drains? | No, the Department does not anticipate horizontal drains. | No action needed |
| 98 | Project Special Provisions | 57 | Paragraph 1 | The RFP states, "Provide geotextile for subgrade stabilization in accordance with the Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work found elsewhere in this RFP." Does the Department intend to include a Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work? | No, Reference Section 848 from the Standard Specifications. Remove the reference the geotechnical engineering scope of work. | Revise RFP |
| 99 | Environmental Permits | 96 | Bullet 5 | There is no technical proposal to indicate construction activities that will occur outside jurisdictional areas prior to obtaining environmental permits. Multiple other references to the Technical Proposal on pages 2, 79, 83, 87, 102, 105, 108, 111, 118, 218 of the PDF. | Revised to remove Technical Proposal in the Final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 100 | Hydraulics | 74 | 4th bullet | Throughout the project limits, the Design-Build team shall analyze all drainage structures that are located within the existing/proposed right of way or easement for hydraulic and structural deficiencies. "The Design-Build Team shall provide the appropriate hydraulic mitigation for 1) all hydraulically deficient drainage structures..." What is being defined as hydraulically deficient? Is the City or Department aware of any current hydraulic or structural deficiencies on the project? If the curb line is not moved, will the Design-Build team be responsible for addressing any spread issues at no additional cost to the Department or the City of Greenville? | If the Design-Build Team's design and construction do not impact an existing drainage structure, no analysis or improvements are required. | No action needed |
| 101 | Hydraulics | 76 | FEMA Regulated Streams | Effective model found on NC FRIS is older than the Greene St bridge update and Pitt St bridge. Does NCDOT or NC FMP have a preliminary model that contains Pitt St bridge and updated Greene St bridge? If so, can the updated model be provided? | The effective model is available for download at FRIS. | No action needed |
| 102 | Roadway | 67 | ADA compliance | Will there be a need for handrail? Do we need to follow a handrail standard? AASHTO? | If a handrail is required, the Design-Build Team shall use the applicable handrail detail from the Department's Standard Specifications and Standard Drawings. | No action needed |
| 103 | Roadway | 68 | Utility Strip | The RFP mentions that we need to keep an utility strip if currently in place. Can that be relaxed? Specifically looking at section just north of the bridge where there is a steep slope off the right side. | Revise in the final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 104 | Roadway | 67 | | Do we need to replace trees that will be removed for the new MUP? | No | No action needed |
| 105 | Hydraulics | 74 | | From RFP: "There appears to be a buried drainage structure at the northwest corner of Pitt County parcel 4220, just north of the driveway. Investigate, design and construct the appropriate remedy for this location to accommodate the greenway/multi-use path." Is there any information for this drainage structure? | Investigated no buried drainage on this parcel. Revised in Final RFP. | Revise RFP |
| 106 | Roadway | | | Can the MUP go behind the sidewalk? And if so, do we need to keep the existing sidewalk? | The MUP can go behind the sidewalk on city parcels, the existing sidewalk shall be retained. | No action needed |
| 107 | Roadway | 69 | 1st bullet | Do we mill and overlay to the final lane width for half of lane to be paved? Will we need to mill and overlay the entire roadway between the end of the bridge south to the Tar River Greenway crosswalk? | Yes. The Design-Build Team shall mill and overlay the half lane to match the final proposed lane width from the bridge north to First Street. South of the bridge, the Design-Build Team shall mill and overlay the roadway from the bridge to Green Street. | Revise RFP |
| 108 | Geoenvironmental | | | For the third bid alternative, will the DB teams be responsible for removal of any potential contaminated material? | Contaminated materials encountered during construction shall be handled in accordance with the Department's standard procedures. The Design-Build Team shall immediately notify the Department upon encountering any known or suspected contaminated materials. | Revise RFP |
| 109 | Other | | | Are including ROW services in the base bid or will it be a separate line item? | Base Bid | No action needed |
| 110 | Other | Pg 217 of pdf | 2nd Paragraph | The paragraph notes that the new location greenway should be north of the existing utility pole line. During the one-on-one meeting it was noted that there is an easement for this pole line and that teams should place the alignment outside of the utility easement. Can the Department confirm if there is an easement for this pole line? There is not an easement in the survey files provided by the Department. If there is an easement can it be added to the survey files for the project? | The easement document has not yet been located. Until it is available, the Design-Build Team shall treat this area as having a 30-foot-wide easement centered on the existing pole line for design purposes. | No action needed |
| 111 | Other | NA | NA | There are existing streetlights along the east side of N. Green St. Are those lights owned by the Department of Greenville Utilities? If lights are owned by the Department will the Department provide lighting plans for the project? If the lights are owned by Greenville Utilities, will they relocate the lights with utility coordination provided by the Design-Build Team? | The Department does not own the street lights along Greene Street. Greenville Utilities will make the decision as to whether the existing street lights will be relocated. | No action needed |
| 112 | Roadway | 70 | 1st Bullet | Can the Department provide the Natural Resources Technical Report completed as part of the Categorical Exclusion? The wetland boundaries shown in the survey files provided by the Department appear incomplete based on preliminary site visits. | Posted to Materials Available site. | Request for Material |
| 113 | General | 62 | 3rd Paragraph | Are teams limited to constructing the multi-use path/sidewalk to only the east side of Greene Street? | Yes | No action needed |
| 114 | Other | Pg 217 of pdf | 2nd Paragraph | During the one-on-one meeting the Department noted that additional survey will be provided for the new location greenway. When will this survey be provided? The area is heavily wooded and LIDAR and aerial photos do not provide detailed data in the area. There is a very limited time before teams need design to be completed so that quantities and pricing can be completed prior to submittal of price proposals. | Posted to Materials Available site. | Request for Material |
| 115 | | | | What is the anticipated completion timeline for the Town Common project work directly south of Bridge No. 730411, specifically the removal of the pergola entrance structure to the park? | The pergola has already been removed. The completion date for the Town Common Project has not yet been determined. | No action needed |