

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Traffic Management	27	Bullet 4	Request for electronic traffic analysis files	Provided	Request for Material
2	Traffic Management	27	Bullet 4	What is the design year to consider for the purposes of the traffic analysis?	2047 - We had an updated traffic operations analysis completed in February 2026 using HCS & Synchro	Check RFP; possible change
3	Traffic Management	27	Bullet 4	Will VISSIM be accepted for the development of ATCs if prior models were also done in VISSIM?	HCS & Synchro are the appropriate software, keeping consistent with the most recent analysis	Check RFP; possible change
4	Roadway	206	First statement	Can the department confirm the files in the folder dated 2/7/2022 on the Sharepoint site are those referenced to be used as the Preliminary Roadway Plans for the I5701 area?	Yes. Will change date in roadway SOW to reflect this date	Revise RFP
5	Roadway	218	First bullet, Case No.2	Can department clarify the "approach roadway paved shoulder width"? Is this the typical section roadway paved shoulder or does this width include matching the widened shoulder for guardrail or barrier sections with a maximum of 12'?	Typical paved shoulder width	No action needed
6	Roadway	211 & 212	Last 3 bullets & 1st Bullet	Is it the department's intent to have all existing fence, woven wire and chain link fence be replaced within the project limits, regardless if it is damaged during construction.	Yes. RFP to be revised	Revise RFP
7	Roadway	212	Main Bullet 3	Does the minimum of 10' inside the right of way requirement for the construction of retaining walls include any anchors that may be required?	The 10' is for maintenance. Anchors can go into a permanent easement	Check RFP; possible change
8	Roadway	216	Bullet 3	The list of all work tasks required includes bridge attachments / modifications. Are Sound Barrier walls allowed on bridges? And will there be a maximum height for that use case?	Noise walls are allowed on bridges provided NCDOT SMU and D5 agree and an engineering review concludes that the bridge can support a wall. Noise walls on bridges are limited to 10 feet in height as measured from the bridge deck.	No action needed
9	Roadway	219	Last Bullet Case No.1	Does this requirement mean NCDOT would like the concrete face to be placed at the shoulder hinge point (i.e. 2' beyond typical paved shoulder for guardrail and barrier sections)?	Yes	No action needed
10	Geotechnical Engineering	251	3rd last Paragraph	is the boring depth still twice of the wall height for cut walls?	Yes, in soil or to refusal if achieved shallower	No action needed
11	Geotechnical Engineering	253	3rd last Paragraph	what's the minimum cut slope in weathered rock?	1.5H:1V	No action needed
12	Geotechnical Engineering	258	3rd Paragraph	for shallow weathered rock/rock conditions, can pile embedment be less than 10 ft?	No	No action needed
13	Geotechnical Engineering	259	4th Bullet	For clarity, does this mean that for all bridge abutments with MSE walls, the piles must be driven before the walls are constructed?	Yes	No action needed
14	Hydraulics	267	Stormwater Management - Bullet 1	Does the Department consider the use of preformed scour holes, dry detention basins, grassed swales, and filter strips considered adequate BMP features to provide practical water quality treatment?	This limited list of BMPs may not be adequate to meet the water quality treatment needs of the project.	No action needed
15	Hydraulics	268	Drainage Structures - Bullet 2	Will a general timeframe be given on when the structural integrity of existing pipes information will be available?	Pipe video collection is scheduled for completion late June. Retain/Line/Replace recommendations are likely to be available in July.	No action needed
16	Hydraulics	274	Drainage Structures - Last arrow bullet on page	For the pipe video inspections expected to be conducted by the Contractor, is this information expected to be submitted after the award of the project to supplement the Department's pipe structural condition assessment during the Technical Proposal Phase?	The submittals described under this section are intended to be performed only if the Department's investigations are incomplete.	No action needed
17	Hydraulics	275-276	FEMA Regulated Streams - Last arrow bullet on page	Is the awarded design build team responsible for additional surveys of potential impacted structures to be purchased in the floodplain if a CLOMR needs to be pursued?	The modeling, CLOMR, and identifying (both in plan and elevations) impacted structures is all on the TEAMS. It's the Department's desire to not impact any insurable structure.	No action needed
18	Pavement Management	297	Alternate 1	Will RCC shoulders be allowed with the concrete pavement option?	RCC shoulders options under evaluation for I-440 / US 1	Check RFP; possible change
19	Structures	325	Paragraph 3	What are the vertical clearance requirements for substructure elements over local and collector roads, and over I-40 and I-440 / US 64?	The vertical clearance is the same for all parts of the bridge, including substructure elements, as listed in the SOW.	No action needed
20	Structures	325	Paragraph 8	Clarify what is meant by appearance.	This will be deleted as a requirement for this project.	Revise RFP
21	Structures	326	Bullet 3	Based on the Roadway scope, page 219 last bullet, shoulder piers are allowed within the vehicle recovery area so long as single face concrete barrier is constructed and specified clearances are met. Clarify the intent in the structures scope of not allowing bridge piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder.	The intent (as described in 6.1.2 DM) is to use 1 span vs. 3 or 2 spans vs 4 on typical separations. It is not intended for bridges spanning more than the immediate facility below. This requirement may be deleted for this project.	Check RFP; possible change
22	Structures	326	3rd Bullet	Can we define "adjacent" to a roadway shoulder (specific distance)? The flyover structures will require bents adjacent to roadway shoulders in some capacity	See previous response.	Check RFP; possible change
23	Structures	326	8th Bullet	Can the requirement for the same girder depth for the entire structure be waived?	This will be deleted as a requirement for this project.	Revise RFP
24	Structures	326	Bullet 8	Can a mix of steel and concrete girder units be used on an individual bridge so long as the girder depth is the same?	Yes. Is there anything in the RFP that leads you think this is prevented?	No action needed
25	Structures	328	2nd paragraph	How will the unit prices for Bridge Rehab work be determined? What is the timeline for providing these prices?	Bid averages. Next RFP should have the prices	No action needed
26	Structures	328	Paragraph 4 Bullets 1-6	Provide unit prices for the following rehabilitation items not currently listed; Tighten Anchor Nut, Replace Diaphragms, Replace guardrail, Replace guardrail end terminal, repair guardrail end terminals, repair joint, repair deck spall, replace cover plates, repave approach slabs, and repair/replace fencing, posts, and fasteners.	Most of these are either directly or indirectly covered by already established pay items.	No action needed
27	Structures	329	General: Paragraph 2	Will the Rehabilitation of Existing Structures plans be subject to only a single structure per submittal?	What does the Team have in mind?	No action needed
28	Transportation Management	367	Last Paragraph	Work Zone Speed Limit Reduction Ordinance - Is this a permanent speed limit reduction through the work zone?	No, if any speed ordinance is requested by the DB team and approved, it will be variable and only apply when certain conditions exist (i.e. lane closures)	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
29	Transportation Management	371	First Bullet	There are several references to bridge demolition operations in this section. The preliminary maps don't identify any bridges to be removed. Has the department's preliminary design identified any structures requiring removal?	This is standard placeholder text in the event a team proposes a design that requires bridge demo.	No action needed
30	Transportation Management	371	Second Paragraph	Are rolling road blocks, not to exceed 30 min closure, allowable (in lieu of median crossovers)?	Stopping traffic on US-1, I-40, or I-440 will not be permitted. Rolling roadblocks, if used, will be required to follow NCDOT's permit process currently under development, which will require roadblocks to operate at minimum speeds of 15mph. Rolling road blocks are rolling. A 30 minute closure is not a rolling road block. P	No action needed
31	General	N/A	Provided Materials	Is there preliminary geotechnical data available for I-5703? Was not provided on the ADU website	Geotechnical information for I-5701 & -5703 was posted on 3/18/26. Contact ADU if information requested was not posted.	No action needed
32	Roadway	215/216	Provided Materials	The provided information for the I-5701_TNR identifies 312,374 SF of required Noise Wall and I-5703_TNR_Final Signed identifies 101,663 SF of required Noise Wall. This is significantly different than the 62,000 SF provided on pg 216 of the RFP. Therefore, we just want to verify the potential supplemental agreement for this contract already incorporates the need for approximately 352,037 SF of additional wall and approximately a \$21-22M Supplemental Fee that the Teams will not need to incorporate into their bids?	The quantities as stated by the DBT are a correct reflection of what is in the TNR for both projects. The quantities in the RFP appear to be incorrect. Will Revise RFP	Revise RFP
33	Transportation Management	351	First Section	Under the TMP Designer inspections section, is it the expectation of the Department that the designer will be providing inspections services into traffic control device conditions and proper placement? If so, how will coordination with the CEI firm take place and what are the responsibilities the CEI firm carries within their scope, as this may require additional insurance responsibilities to the DB Teams?	The TMP designer will be conducting drive-through field reviews to ensure the TMP design is installed and operating as intended. This does not take the place of CEI inspection. Language will be clarified to indicate within 72 hours of the phase shift instead of immediately.	Revise RFP
34	Right of Way	309	3rd Bullet	Will NCDOT be providing a list of existing billboards or has it been determined no billboards are anticipated to be impacted by the project?	There are no billboards on the project	No action needed
35	General	Public Hearing Maps		The provided Public Hearing Map for I-5703 identifies realignment/median improvements along I-40 East of the US 1/I-440 interchange bridge to provide a concrete barrier section here. Existing I-40 through this area already has barrier and necessary offsets to the barrier meeting AASHTO standards and therefore we assume this is just old topo and intended to be a retained section. However, to verify, is NCDOT asking the teams to realign this portion of the interstate and reconstruct the shoulders through this area?	Intent is to maintain existing median barrier in this area.	No action needed
36	General	Public Hearing Maps		The provided Public Hearing Map for I-5703 identifies realignment and total reconstruction of -21RA- to the tie with I-440 NB instead of tying into the existing ramp when possible. Is it the NCDOT's intent to reconstruct the entire ramp or are the teams allowed to tie to the existing ramp when capable?	Will depend on the design of DB Team. Design shall adhere to RFP requirements, specifically asphalt pavement removal requirements listed within the Pavement Management Scope of Work.	No action needed
37	Pavement Management	295	1st Paragraph	The RFP States the DB Team shall mill and fill the existing pavement with 1.5" of asphalt along with the 5/8" ultrathin bonded wearing course east of the I-440/US 1/US 64 bridge to the eastern project limits. However, in reviewing the pavement borings for this area, the average depths are 3" of S9.5A, 4" of I19.0C, and varying depths of 7-9" of B25.0C, with 10" of Aggregate Subgrade. These pavement depths do not meet the pavement design shown on PG 294 for any new pavement sections. Will NCDOT consider a different pavement option for new construction to prevent issues with varying subgrades and pavement depths or provide the teams with how best to address underdrain placement? Additionally, is NCDOT accepting of the existing pavement structure to be a lower SN than the proposed pavement on PG 294 and therefore allow for the Mill/Fill requirement on PG 295?	Awargo - This is really two separate questions: 1) We understand the variability of the existing pavement, which is common. Also, older pavement designs may have lower structural requirements than ones using updated traffic/pavement design methodologies. This means existing travel lanes may have lower structure than new designs for adjacent lanes. This was intentional. 2) Shoulder drains will be placed as normal in the proposed paved shoulders. They do not need to be in contact with the existing aggregate subgrade placed as part of Fortify. Differences in depth are not anticipated to cause problems from a pavement service life standpoint.	Check RFP; possible change
38	Project Special Provisions	6	First Paragraph	Page 5 specifies that the Final Completion Date shall not be later than 9/15/32. Is there "Not Later Than" Substantial Completion Date to be included in the Technical Proposal, or will it be left to the D-B teams to develop their proposed Substantial Completion date independently?	It will be left up to the D-B teams	No action needed
39	Project Special Provisions	174-177	Multiple	The Architectural Concrete Surface Treatment provisions refer to both Simulated Stone Masonry finish (i.e., 1.0 first paragraph, 1.0 last paragraph, 2.0 first paragraph, and 4.0 second paragraph) and Simulated Brick Finish (i.e., 1.0 second paragraph and 1.0 second paragraph). Please confirm which finished treatment will be required.	Will revise RFP to clarify.	Revise RFP
40	Project Special Provisions	174	Section 1.0, Second Paragraph	The provisions refer to use of the architectural concrete surface treatments for sound barriers and retaining walls along I-440 only. Please confirm if these provisions will also be applicable along I-40 and US 1/US 64 (e.g., basically the entire project).	Will revise RFP to clarify.	Revise RFP
41	Project Special Provisions	174, 176	Section 1.0, Second Paragraph, Section 3.0 Fifth Paragraph	The provisions refer to both a red palette color and a tan/brown color. Please confirm which color palette will be required.	Will revise RFP to clarify.	Revise RFP
42	Project Special Provisions	1, 16	Page 1: Second Paragraph; Page 16: Third Paragraph	The second paragraph on Page 1 states that the D-B team is responsible for any schedule delays of materials (e.g., steel). However, the third paragraph on Page 16 indicates that delays due to steel shortages may be justification for a contract time extension. Can the BABA requirement be revised to include this exception?	Not at this time. Contract extension only applies if the team opts into the steel price adjustment provision.	No action needed
43	Project Special Provisions	N/A	Multiple	The RFP specifies 2018 Standard Specifications for Road and Structures at three locations. Should this be 2024 instead of 2018?	2024 Standard Specs	Revise RFP

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
44	Traffic Management	27	Information Request	Any ATCs modifying interchanges/intersections require traffic analysis files to be included, and must follow appropriate Congestion Management standards. The traffic memo prepared for I-5703 (sealed 6/27/2021) notes that VISSIM was used to model the interchange, and Congestion Management only has standards for TransModeler (related to microsimulation software). What software should be used for ATC analysis? Also, the traffic memo for I-5703 references the Local Streets Analysis Technical Memorandum for Project I-5703 that was prepared for the surface streets near Walnut Street/Crossroads area and states that analysis used TransModeler. Will the Department provide these TransModeler files?	HCS & Synchro are the appropriate software, keeping consistent with the most recent analysis	No action needed
45	Project Special Provisions	140	First Paragraph	For the existing single arm light standard(s) to be relocated, can the Department verify the existing structure meets current standards? Will the Department be providing the D-B teams the necessary design parameters in which to design the new footing? How many light standards are anticipated to be relocated onto new footings?	The existing light standards to be relocated were installed under 2009 AASHTO Structural Standards 5th Edition, we are now using 2013 AASHTO Structural Standards 6th Edition. We have verified that the standard foundation design remains the same across both editions and it is my understanding that older designs from previous editions can be grandfathered in as long as it is for an existing pole that is to be reused. We would expect the design-build team to use the standard R1 or R2 foundation shown in the standard drawings. There are two light standards that are anticipated to be relocated onto new foundations at this time.	No action needed
46	General	198, 200	Multiple	The following RFP requirement is listed in both Section 2, Responsiveness to RFP - Natural Environmental Responsibility and Section 3: "Indicate the specific construction activities that will occur outside jurisdictional resources prior to obtaining the environmental permits and their anticipated start date." Please advise.	Deleted reference under Responsiveness to RFP	Revise RFP
47	General	195-196	Multiple	The first paragraph on Page 195 states the following concerning Volume 2: "Maximum 24-inch by 36-inch fold out sheets shall only be allowed to present interchange plans in the 11-inch by 17-inch plan sheets Printed on one side only Double-spaced." However, Page 196 only mentions that Electronic copies of the entirety of the proposal shall be delivered..." Please advise if hard copies of this proposal will be necessary, or if this is an electronic-only submission.	Electronic submission only. Deleted single side requirement.	Revise RFP
48	General	201	Bullets 5 and 14	The RFP requirement pertaining to "How hauling will be conducted..." is listed twice, with the second having expanded requirements. Please advise.	Will revise RFP to clarify.	Revise RFP
49	General	196	Second Paragraph and Timeline	Would the Department consider advancing the entirety of the procurement of this project to be completed ahead of Thanksgiving?	Not at this time.	No action needed
50	General	188, 491, 492	Multiple	The second sentence in the "Review of Submittals" section of page 188 indicates that a CPM schedule shall be submitted "...within 30 days of contract award." Division One towards the back of the RFP indicates that "...an Interim Schedule may be submitted within 14 days of contract execution" (Page 491) and that the Baseline Schedule "...(a) within 60 days of contract execution or (b) 90 days prior to the first construction activity, whichever is later." Is the CPM schedule referenced on Page 188 intended to be the same or different from the Interim and Baseline Schedules? If the same, can the requirements of Division One just be referenced? If different, what are the schedule requirements of the CPM schedule referenced on Page 188?	The reference in the General section is intended to include only major design milestones and required design submittals. This information can be provided on a CPM, bar chart or other scheduling tool and has to be submitted with the first design submittal or within 30 days.	No action needed
51	General	188-195	N/A	The top right header references Gaston County. Should this be Wake County?	Changed header Contract number, project number and County for this page range	Revise RFP
52	Roadway	212	Last Bullet	This section notes "...design and construct resurfacing grades for all roadways impacted by construction and all roadways shown to be resurfaced on the I-5701 and I-5703 Public Meeting Maps..." The statement of resurfacing grade indicates a grade be set where it is our understanding the pavement management scope only calls for uniform milling and filling as noted on page 295 2nd paragraph. Please clarify whether a grade is required.	Currently the grades on I-40 will be engineered, under discussion	Check RFP; possible change
53	Roadway	216	Second Paragraph	The sound barrier square footage (i.e., 55,000 and 7,000) appear to be significantly under the TNR square footage shown. Please clarify the discrepancy.	The quantities as stated by the DBT are a correct reflection of what is in the TNR for both projects. The quantities in the RFP appear to be incorrect. Will Revise RFP	Revise RFP
54	Roadway	216	Heading for bottom of page bullets	Please specify the absorptive facing material to be used on the project. The approved product list only lists for trial use.	If the PBA in the DNR indicates that absorptive treatment is recommended, then the Division determines the specific product to be used. The chosen product must be on the approved products list, but a status of "field trial use" is acceptable with D5 concurrence.	No action needed
55	Roadway	215	Last Bullet	The last bullet references that an evaluation must be done beyond the project limits and specifically 800 feet. NW 1 and 2 on I-5703 exceed this limit. Please clarify the construction of NW 1 and 2 is required if DNR determines them reasonable and feasible.	NW 1 and NW2 will need to be constructed if they are recommended in the DNR, even if they extend beyond the project limits. As stated in the NCDOT Traffic Noise Manual, the distance of 800 feet is to be used as a guide in the initial determination of study area limits. Certain conditions can necessitate that the study limits be extended further, as detailed in Section 7.7.2 of the NCDOT Traffic Noise Manual.	No action needed
56	Roadway	223	NCDOT Information Supplied	Will there be any municipal agreements and if so when would they be provided?	There are no municipal agreements at this time and none expected	No action needed
57	Roadway	209	N/A	What type of median should be constructed on Caitbo Avenue to replace the two left turn lanes that go to the on-ramp that is being removed?	Coordinating with Crossroads. Will revise RFP to include all work necessary to modify the signal. This signal is privately operated by Crossroads	Revise RFP

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
58	Roadway	209	Third Bullet	Should the new median on Walnut Street be planted to match the medians that the Town of Cary installed in 2016?	No	No action needed
59	Roadway	214	N/A	The RFP states no design exceptions are allowed for the freeway or ramps. However, in the preliminary plans information provided by NCDOT, there is a list of approved design exceptions for ramps within the project. Should the RFP be revised to state no additional design exceptions are allowed?	There are no approved design exceptions for either project.	No action needed
60	Roadway	213	N/A	How would the Load limit approval be implemented prior to the technical proposal?	DB Team would coordinate with NCDOT to determine any required agreement for maintenance or strengthening required to either remove postings or prevent a posting being added to a road	No action needed
61	Roadway	207	Fourth Bullet	The RFP states that "...the outside I-40 westbound "Exit Only" lane onto I-440 / US 1 / US 64 at Exit 293 - RP1A- shall be designed as a single lane, parallel exit." I-5701 shows -RP1A as two lane parallel exit. Please clarify which is correct.	Revising RFP to state -21CDWB- is two lane exit and the existng lane shall remain "exit only"	Revise RFP
62	Roadway	208	Second Bullet	At the US 1/ US 64 / SR 1313 (Walnut Street) interchange (Exit 101), the Design-Build Team shall remove the existing lane and paved shoulders. Please clarify if this involves the removal of lanes in quadrant C.	Revising RFP to clarify ramps in quadrant C	Revise RFP
63	Roadway	208	First and Third Bullets	Bullets 1 and 3 appear to contradict each other; please clarify.	Revised to both state 14' outside and 12' inside	Revise RFP
64	Roadway	208	Fourth Bullet	The supplied I-5701 delivered design criteria has two columns in reference to ramps. One column "Interstate RThe flyover ramps have their own column in design criteria meeting (DS=50 mph, 8%). Please clarify if the emax 6% or 8% charts should be used for ramps and if any language is to be added clarifying Interstate Ramps and Ramps design. Note: the Flyover ramps have their own column in design criteria meeting that matches the RFP language.	I-5703 design criteria has Flyovers at 6% and 50DS with Ramps at 8% and 60DS. 8% for ramps leading up to bridges, 6% for flyovers(bridges)	No action needed
65	Roadway	221	First Bullet	Should the WB-62 be WB-62FL?	WB-62 is standard design vehicle	No action needed
66	Pavement Management	297	First Paragraph	Will the Department provide the As-Built plans for the 1962 project referenced for concrete removal?	Provided	Request for Material
67	Pavement Management	297	First Paragraph	Will the Department provide the As-Built plans for the 2006 project referenced for concrete retainage?	Provided	Request for Material
68	Pavement Management	296	Note 1	The RFP states that "...The required width of the outside travel lane widening shall be increased by 1.0' if asphalt shoulders are constructed." Is the intention of this note to apply to all areas of asphalt shoulder adjacent to concrete lanes? The note was not included for Alternate 2 on Page 298 of the RFP.	Yes, this will be corrected. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.	Revise RFP
69	Structures	326	Information Request	Will the Department provide the rehabilitation special provision referenced in the "Rehabilitation of Existing Structures" portion of the RFP?	Draft bridge preservation special provisions have been provided for information purposes	Request for Material
70	Structures	328	Information Request	Will the Department provide bridge preservation plans for the bridges listed in this section? If not will the DBT be responsible for submittal preservation plans?	NCDOT will not be providing preservation plans. Yes, the DB Team will be responsible for the plans	No action needed
71	Structures	326-328	Information Request	Will the Department provide the bridge inspection reports and As-Built for the bridges listed?	Provided	Request for Material
72	Structures	328	First Paragraph/Set of Bullets	For the list of work to do on Bridge 910580 (Cary Towne Boulevard), should removal of the old sign structures mounted to the north side of the bridge be included?	The Department is considering.	Check RFP; possible change
73	Structures	326	N/A	Given the nature of the long span bridges is the prohibition on modular joints to be applied to these bridges?	Yes, the prohibition applies: no modular joints.	No action needed
74	Structures	326	Third Bullet	The RFP states "...for new bridges, bridge piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder will not be allowed, excluding interior median piers." Please clarify how the Department defines "adjacent to a roadway shoulder," and whether a pier may be placed near the shoulder if separated by the required offset and protected by permanent barrier. (RFP, STRUCTURES SCOPE OF WORK, Project Details, pg 326: "Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, the following will not be allowed on this project...For new bridges, bridge piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder, excluding interior median piers")	The intent (as described in 6.1.2 DM) is to use 1 span vs. 3 or 2 spans vs 4 on typical separations. It is not intended for bridges spanning more than the immediate facility below. This requirement may be deleted for this project.	Check RFP; possible change
75	Structures	326	Middle of Page	For the existing bridges identified for rehabilitation, is the Design-Build Team responsible for confirming that the final rehabilitated condition achieves acceptable load rating and posting status? Or, is the intent limited to completing the listed rehabilitation items without requiring re-rating to eliminate existing posting concerns? (RFP, STRUCTURES SCOPE OF WORK, Rehabilitation of Existing Structures, pg 326 "The Design-Build Team shall rehabilitate bridges in accordance with the requirements noted below")	Firm shall not be required to analyze the bridges for load rating after the work requested.	No action needed
76	Structures	328	Information Request	Will the Department provide language to provide quantities to standardize the proposal expectations given the unknown variations that arise in rehabilitation work?	Language can be provided to determine quantities for common preservation activities. However, not all preservation activities will have guidance.	Check RFP; possible change
77	Geotechnical Engineering	254	Fourth Bullet from Bottom	Lowering ground water is not a straight forward solution. Our Design-Build Team requests a detail to be implemented rather than a requirement of lowering ground water. Is there a specific location where this is an issue on the project?	No.	No action needed
78	Geotechnical Engineering	258	First Paragraph	Is fall protection required along the side slopes for a bridge abutment?	No if OSHA allow	No action needed
79	Geotechnical Engineering	251	Second to Last Paragrph	Please clarify whether the prohibition on Triassic soils/rock applies to all embankment and structural fills, including processed or blended materials, or only to untreated borrow.	The Triassic prohibition applies to all embankment and structural fills, including processed or blended materials, as well as untreated borrow	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
80	Geotechnical Engineering	253-254	Last Bullet	What is the minimum monitoring period the Department will accept to demonstrate compliance for embankments adjacent to structures and MSE walls?	1 month	No action needed
81	Hydraulics	268	Information Request	When will the Department make the pipe inspection information available to teams?	Pipe video collection is scheduled for completion late June, they are being added to the materials available site as available. Retain/Line/Replace recommendations are likely to be available in July.	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
82	Hydraulics	272	Seventh Bullet	Please clarify how the independent contractor not affiliated with the contractor be implemented. Will the Department retain the video contractor?	DBT hire contractor. Revision to RFP is under consideration.	Check RFP; possible change
83	Hydraulics	267	N/A	When will Traffic Control Plans be available for hydro to complete Construction Hydroplaning Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan Report?	The Department will not be supplying MOT plans, this is the Teams responsibility as part of the design process	No action needed
84	Hydraulics	268	N/A	When will the Department provide recommendations for pipe repairs or replacement based on the pipe inspections?	Pipe video collection is scheduled for completion late June, they are being added to the materials available site as available. Retain/Line/Replace recommendations are likely to be available in July.	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
85	Hydraulics	268	Second Bullet	The RFP refers to pre/post requirements at railroads. There does not appear to be any rail facilities within the project limits. Should this bullet be deleted?	Yes.	Revise RFP
86	Hydraulics	273	N/A	Were any pipes replaced or supplemented during the I-40 Reconstruction project (Fortify)? Is it the Department's intent to require teams to re-evaluate cross pipes in the I-40 widening section of the project?	Cross pipes on Fortify were not supplemented or replaced. Many were lined; reducing cross sectional area. It is the Department's intent to require re-evaluation of cross pipes in the I-40 widening section of the project.	No action needed
87	Hydraulics	266	N/A	Which version of the hydroplaning risk tool should the team use?	NCDOT_HAT_2.0_BLANK 1.xlsm has been added to the I-5701 I-5703 Materials Provided Connect NCDOT site.	Request for Material
88	Hydraulics	274	Last Bullet	The last bullet notes that the Design-Build Team shall camera inspect any pipe to be retained. Is this in addition to the inspection listed on Page 268 that the Department is completing?	Yes. The submittals described under this section are intended to be performed only if the Department's investigations are incomplete.	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
89	Hydraulics	268	Fourth Bullet from Bottom	Will the Department provide the "Drainage Pipe Project Special Provision?"	See p. 66 of the RFP for the Drainage Pipe project special provision.	No action needed
90	Hydraulics	268	Third Bullet from the Bottom	Our Design-Build Team requests a timeframe for which the Department anticipates providing the information noted in the second bullet.	Pipe video collection is scheduled for completion late June. Retain/Line/Replace recommendations are likely to be available in July.	No action needed
91	Environmental Permits	224-225	Second Paragraph & Third Paragraph	Will the Department complete all necessary environmental surveys and approvals prior to 4B?	All surveys are currently up-to-date.	No action needed
92	Environmental Permits	General	Information Request	Will the Department provide the following files for the I-5703 project: NRTR; PJD package; TNR; Wet/Wex file; Study Area file; approved JDs, and ROW estimate/relocation report?	NRTR - Provided PJD package - Provided TNR - Provided Wet/Wex file - Provided Study Area file - Looking approved JDs - No JD, PJD is provided ROW estimate/relocation report - Looking	Request for Material
93	Environmental Permits	General	Information Request	Will the Department provide the following files for the I-5701 project: the WEX/WET file; the approved JD; the Study Area File ROW Estimate/Relocation Report; the Aquatic Species Survey Report (dated June 2025); the Memo to File - Impacts to Waters of the US and Neuse River Buffers from the I-5701 Preferred Alternative?	the WEX/WET file - Looking the approved JD - No JD for project provided PJD the Study Area File - Looking ROW Estimate/Relocation Report - Looking the Aquatic Species Survey Report (dated June 2025) - Provided the Memo to File - Impacts to Waters of the US and Neuse River Buffers from the I-5701 Preferred Alternative -	Request for Material
94	Utilities	General	Information Request	Will the Department provide water and sewer As-Builts for the Town of Cary, Apex and Raleigh?	We provided as-built information for Apex and Cary for some of their water and sewer facilities. There are not any as-builts provided by the City of Raleigh at this time.	Request for Material
95	Utilities	Green sheet	N/A	Please clarify if the betterments requested by the Town of Cary will be compensable through a Supplemental Agreement, or provide a list of betterments which are to be included.	There are no betterments. This commitment is considered fulfilled.	No action needed
96	Utilities	376	Second Paragraph	New language: Stating that all existing utilities shall relocate based on 4 conditions. 1. If this is regardless if it is direct conflict with project? 2. How do you know if a utility is structurally inadequate to be able to price this? 3. If all W/S pipe material is on this list, does the utility owner know this is a requirement and will agree to pay their share in the utility construction agreement?	1. Utilities are not allowed to remain in place if running parallel within the C/A as indicated in bullet A, which is in accordance with the Utility Accommodation Manual. 2. We are not aware of any structurally inadequate utility facilities at this time. If any are found during the project, they will need to be relocated and handled through a Supplemental Agreement. We will modify the RFP to clarify. 3. This requirement is in alignment with Paragraph 4.1.4.7 of the UAM. The cost of water and sewer relocations shall be included in the DBT lump sum price of the bid regardless of cost responsibility. The cost responsibility is handled through the UCA and is ultimately handled between NCDOT and the utility owner.	Revise RFP
97	Utilities	General	Information Request	Will the Department provide the Utility Risk Assessment and Inventory Report for I-5703?	Provided	Request for Material
98	Signing	315	Information Request	Will the Department provide a list of projects that DBT is required to coordinate with?	Yes, reference COOPERATION BETWEEN CONTRACTORS PSP	No action needed
99	Signal Systems	332, 334	Multiple	The RFP states on page 332 that all final signals shall use metal poles with arched mast arms. However, on page 334, the RFP states to use metal poles with span wire for 05-1294. Please advise.	The official RTE Signal Recommendation is for metal strain poles. Cary had originally indicated that they would do a betterment agreement for metal poles with mastsarms, but have since retracted that interest. The final signal design for 05-1294 should use galvanized metal strain poles with span wire.	Revise RFP
100	Signal Systems	336	End of First Paragraph	The first paragraph ends with an extra "The;" please advise if there is missing content at the end of this paragraph.	Typo removed	Revise RFP
101	Erosion and Sedimentation Control	234	N/A	Will Roadside Environmental Unit (REU) allow coir fiber wattle breaks in lieu of special sediment control fence as silt fence breaks?	Teams should plan to use special sediment control fence as silt fence breaks. Requests to use coir fiber wattle breaks during construction may be made to the Roadside Environmental Field Operations Engineer for review and approval.	No action needed
102	Erosion and Sedimentation Control	233	N/A	Will REU allow basins length to width ratio outside the minimum and maximum range of 2:1 through 6:1?	Basin designs outside this range may be allowed as dictated by project constraints and will be reviewed and approved on a case-by-case basis.	No action needed

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build
----------	------------------------------

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
103	ITS	284	First Paragraph/Bullet	The RFP says to replace the DMS on US 1 SB at MM 100, with a note to remove the overhead structure that spans over the southbound lane. The structure also has a sign for Cary Parkway. Can the structure and Cary Parkway sign remain, or does it require a new pedestal mounted sign for Cary Parkway?	Looking into what should be done with the structure and static sign. May make a change to the ITS language to reflect this.	Revise RFP
104	ITS	282	First Paragraph	The RFP states that "...After any necessary relocation of existing NCDOT fiber-optic cable, once the conduit is in the final location, the design-build team shall replace the full length of the existing fiber-optic cables from the project limits to the new HUB cabinet..." Please clarify the intent to replace the entire length of fiber from the project limits to the new HUB cabinet for the final configuration. This implies that all existing and relocated fiber cable should be replaced for the final ITS configuration.	It is to reduce the number of cable-to-cable splices on the fiber. If there are multiple relocations/cuts/repairs through the construction that require multiple cable-to-cable splices then when the final conduit layout is in we want a clean cable installed to remove these unnecessary splices.	No action needed
105	ITS	283, 288	283: Third Paragraph; 288: First Bullet	The RFP states that "...all cameras shall be mounted on 70' metal poles with lowering devices." However, the "Wood Poles" portion of Page 288 contradicts this and states to use "...60-foot CCTV Class 3 wood poles as defined in the ITS Project Special Provision." Please clarify the CCTV pole type to be used.	Revised RFP	Revise RFP
106	Division One	491	Paragraph (3)(c)(i)	For the Interim Schedule, the paragraph specifies the "...Design-Build Team shall limit activities to a maximum duration of 22 workdays." Please indicate if this is intended to be for "construction" activities. Additionally, please consider the allowance for longer duration activities associated with right of way acquisition, Utility Relocations by others, and Procurement of Material activities, as the normal duration for these activities takes substantially longer to complete.	The 22-workday maximum applies to non-design activities included in the Interim CPM Schedule, except where the provision expressly allows larger work components. For the Interim CPM Schedule, the Design-Build Team may show broad future work components, such as "Construction of the Project," as a single activity with the overall anticipated construction duration, provided the Interim CPM Schedule otherwise meets the requirements of this Article. Detailed construction activities are expected to be developed in the Baseline CPM Schedule.	No action needed
107	Division One	491	Paragraph (3)(c)(ii)	Please clarify that the 90-day maximum specified for design activity durations is in Calendar Days, if that is the intent.	Yes. The 90-day maximum duration for design activities is measured in calendar days. Where the provision intends workdays, it specifically uses the term "workdays."	No action needed
108	Division One	494	Paras. (6)(c)(i) and (6)(c)(ii)	Similar comments for the Baseline Schedule requirements as shown above for the Interim Schedule.	For the Baseline CPM Schedule, non-design activities are limited to a maximum duration of 22 workdays. Design activities are limited to the required design submittal duration or a maximum of 90 calendar days, whichever is shorter.	No action needed
109	Division One	494	Paragraph (6)(f)	The last sentence states that "Weather shall not be accounted for in activity durations." However, the prior sentence seems to indicate that normal adverse weather days shall be included. Please advise. Please consider increasing the 7 CD requirement to submit the Schedule Updates after the Data Date.	Weather is accounted for in the Activity Calendars, not within individual activity durations. Activity durations should reflect the planned time required to perform the work, while weather assumptions are addressed through the calendars assigned to those activities	No action needed
110	Division One	497	Section (E), First Paragraph	Past experience has shown the schedule updates, narratives, pay applications, steel/fuel adjustment sheets, stored materials sheets and justifications can take much longer for complete document submissions. Additionally, days are lost if the Data Date is the first day of the month and holidays such as July 4 and Labor Day are included. Can the Department consider somewhere in the range of 10 to 12 CD instead?	The requirement will remain as currently written. The 7-calendar-day timeframe for submitting Schedule Updates after the Data Date was discussed through the CPM Workgroup and determined to be acceptable	No action needed
111	Division One	501	Section (F), Last Paragraph	Same question as above.	Will leave as currently shown.	No action needed
112	Division One	504	Section (B)(2), First Paragraph	Please confirm whether the 100 days of normal adverse weather days (to be inputted into the CPM schedule) is intended to 100 WD or 100 CD (71 WD). The formula on the following page seems to include CD in the 100-day computation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 100 days referenced in the provision are Workdays impacted by the combined effects of normal adverse weather and unfavorable conditions resulting from weather.</li> <li>The revised language no longer requires the Design-Build Team to preload a specific number of weather impact days into the CPM Schedule or Activity Calendars. Instead, the Design-Build Team must develop Activity Calendars using reasonable industry-standard assumptions appropriate for the project location, season, and type of work being performed.</li> <li>For purposes of evaluating weather-related requests for time extensions, the Department will use 100 Workdays per year as the anticipated amount of Normal Adverse Weather Impacts. For partial years, the anticipated impacts will be prorated based on the duration of the applicable Contract Time or Intermediate Contract Time.</li> </ul>	Revise RFP
113	Roadway	207		Please confirm the use of the 06 superelevation table for both directional and semi-directional ramps.	6% max super is for the Flyovers (2 bridges)	No action needed
114	Roadway	207		Per the RFP, directional ramps will be designed for 60 mph and semi-directional ramps for 50 mph design. This criteria doesn't match the Preliminary Plan design. Please confirm.	Acknowledged.	Check RFP; possible change
115	Roadway			A design exception document for Alt 2 is included in the RFP Provided Material. Are we allowed to use those design parameters without submitting an ATC?	There are no design exceptions approved for I-5701 or I-5703	No action needed
116	Roadway	211	Last bullets	Is it the department's desire to install all new control access fence, or install fence where it is currently missing and replace damaged fence?	All new C/A fence	Revise RFP
117	Roadway	212	1st bullet	When will the IAR be provided? (RFP pg 212)	Should be available soon	Request for Material
118	Roadway	207	2nd bullet	I-5701/I-5703 tie point discrepancy (-RP1A- & -RP1D-). I-40 widening transition starts @ -I- Sta. 135+00 (RFP pg 207) which is before the Jones Franklin Road crossing. How many lanes of I-40 are intended to go under the Jones Franklin crossing?	I-40 EB - 5 lanes, 4 through and one "exit only" I-40 WB 5 lanes, 3 through and 2 "exit only"/ramp lanes	No action needed
119	Environmental Permits			Please provide the number of mitigation credits available for this project.	Mitigation credits for the projects are as follows: I-5701= 1290lf warm stream; 0.307 ac riparian wetland I-5703= 1386lf warm stream; 0.718 ac riparian wetland Buffer mitigation to be requested from NCDMS	No action needed
120	Environmental Permits	224	2nd paragraph	What is the anticipated date of concurrence for Section 7 compliance?	Concurrence for Section 7 will be requested once design has been determined for areas that could potentially impact protected species.	No action needed
121	Geotechnical Engineering	250		Is FWD data available for the alignments?	FWD was not performed for this project.	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
122	Hydraulics	268	4th paragraph	Please clarify removal and replacement of metal pipes and the allowable pipe material to be used per the Drainage Pipe special provisions, as some allowable material is metal.	Metal pipe is allowable for installation on this project per the Pipe Material Selection Guide unless modified by the RFP. If a pipe is under 48" and hyd / struct deficient, it gets replaced; unless it's explicitly called out as lined or retained in the Department's pipe condition assessment. If a pipe is 48" or greater and metal, it will get replaced regardless of hyd / struct sufficiency; unless it's explicitly called out as lined or retained in the Department's pipe condition assessment. Pipes listed as lined / retained in the Department's condition assessment (with reference to the above statements) have been assessed for structural integrity only. The DB Teams will need to assess hydraulic sufficiency to determine whether hydraulic mitigation is necessary.	No action needed
123	Hydraulics			Will the department provide future build-out land use projections for consistency between teams?	The Department's approach to this is located on p. 269 of the RFP.	No action needed
124	ITS	284	3rd paragraph	There is a double star note under the list of DMS signs. Which sign is it referring to?	Revised RFP	Revise RFP
125	Signing			Are dgn files available for the Department provided signing plans?	Yes. Provided for U-2719	Request for Material
126	Structures	325		Will NCDOT provide conceptual bridge plans for the three known bridge sites?	No.	No action needed
127	Structures	326	Rehab Bridges	Should the rehab quantities be limited to the list of repairs specifically identified in the RFP? What if NCDOT determines that other repairs are needed after award?	For purposes of bidding, the teams shall bid based on the information presented. If further repairs are determined to be necessary by NCDOT staff, that will be considered to be extra work.	No action needed
128	Structures	326	Rehab Bridges	For rehab bridges needing plating on the bottom flange, is this replace in kind or to improve the rating, or is this a cover plate?	If plating is needed due to section loss, than the preferred repair would be to a bolted beam plating repair to the existing bottom flange.	No action needed
129	Structures	328	Rehab Bridges	Would NCDOT consider Unit Price payment for all repair items to minimize quantity growth risk? Will NCDOT provide quantities for the list of repairs?	NCDOT can provide guidance on how to estimate repair quantities but will not provide repair quantities.	No action needed
131	Transportation Management	354		The RFP states the location of incident management ITS devices has been provided by the Department. It doesn't appear to be included in the RFP material.	Will either provide the IM plans or	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
132	Utilities	377, 378		Is there any existing utility mapping that was acquired during the SUE phase that NCDOT could provide?	There is no additional utility mapping beyond what has been provided to date.	No action needed
133	Utilities	379	1st paragraph	The RFP states the department has initiated utility relocation coordination with Town of Apex regarding a sewer force main. Please clarify if this line is currently being relocated, or if potential relocation will be the responsibility of the design build team.	This is an existing force main, if this force main or metering station conflict with the project, the DBT is responsible for its design, permitting and relocation, refer to General Section, 2nd bullet point, page 375.	No action needed
134	PROJECT SPECIAL PROVISIONS	88	DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGNS (DMS), CONSTRUCTION METHODS	RFP states "The "as built" plans will show: the DMS, controller, and service pole locations; DMS enclosure and controller cabinet wiring layouts; Wiring Diagrams, Parts list; coordinates of the DMS and devices; and wire and conduit routing." Can these "as built" plans be incorporated into the Plans of Record identified later in the ITS Scope of Work (page 289), or are they meant to be submitted separately?	As-builts are separate and are different than Plans of Record.	No action needed
135	PROJECT SPECIAL PROVISIONS	88	DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGNS (DMS), CONSTRUCTION METHODS	RFP states "The Regional ITS engineer or Division Traffic Engineer will establish the actual location of each DMS assembly." ITS Scope of Work instructs the DB team to "Determine the exact location of each DMS, obtain the Engineer's written approval of the locations, and install the DMS." Please confirm "actual location" versus "exact location." Does "actual location" refer to the general milemarker locations identified in the RFP?	Meant to be synonymous	Check RFP; possible change
136	PROJECT SPECIAL PROVISIONS	93	CONDUIT FOR JETTING FIBER, DESCRIPTION	RFP states "Grouped Microcell Conduits that are comprised of individual microducts manufactured into a multi-cell conduit configuration as required by the plans "Grouped Microcell Conduits that are comprised of individual microducts manufactured into a multi-cell conduit configuration as required by the plans." ITS scope of work states "Micro-duct conduit is not approved for use on this project." Please confirm whether Micro-duct and/or Microcell conduits are approved for use on this project.	Revision to RFP is under consideration.	Check RFP; possible change
137	PROJECT SPECIAL PROVISIONS	97	CONDUIT FOR JETTING FIBER, CONSTRUCTION METHODS	In terms of conduit depth minimums, if it can be demonstrated that rock would be encountered, are reductions in depth minimums allowed, assuming approval by the Engineer.	No	No action needed
138	ITS	278	ITS, GENERAL	Can the Department provide as-built information for the existing ITS infrastructure in the project area?	Coordinating with ITS to provide plans. Will post when available	Request for Material
139	ITS	278	ITS, GENERAL	"Metal and Wood Poles" are listed as a major item of work; however, RFP states CCTV cameras are to be installed on metal poles. Is there an anticipated need for the use of wood poles aside from wood pedestals for electrical services? Are wood poles expected to be used for any temporary purposes?	RFP Revised	Revise RFP
140	ITS	279	ITS, PROJECT OPERATION REQUIREMENTS	RFP states "The Design-Build Team shall provide a portable device that is integrated with the "Statewide ITS Network" at all existing permanent ITS device locations that will be offline longer than 24 hours when being modified or replaced until a final permanent ITS device is installed and integrated with the "Statewide ITS Network."  Is the Department going to require temporary ITS plans showing the proposed use of portable devices? Alternatively, will the Department expect for the use of portable ITS devices to be addressed through the work zone traffic control plans?	Not necessarily a full temporary ITS plan set but an overview of where portable ITS devices will be located in place of permanent ones or for incident management use would be useful. Portable DMS or Connected CMS are separate from the WZTC CMS and stated in the Traffic Management SOW. We will clarify this requirement in the RFP.	Revise RFP
141	ITS	282	ITS, DESIGN REQUIREMENTS, COMMUNICATIONS	RFP states DB team "shall install a 288-fiber "Device Line" and a 96-fiber "trunk line" in the new conduits" (pg. 281). On page 282, RFP describes labeling conventions for "relocated fiber cables," including 96, 144, and 288-fiber cables. Please confirm whether the 96 and 288-fiber cables are proposed as new and the 144-fiber cable an existing cable to be relocated. See Question No. 5, request for as-built information for existing ITS infrastructure.	I believe this is correct, but we will verify existing cable counts and make changes in the next RFP if needed.	Check RFP; possible change

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
142	ITS	282	ITS, DESIGN REQUIREMENTS, COMMUNICATIONS	RFP provides information on Field Ethernet Edge Switch requirements; however, there are not requirements listed for the Ethernet Edge Switch at the proposed Hub location. Please confirm whether procurement, programming, and/or installation of the Hub Ethernet Edge Switch is a responsibility of the DB team.	HUB switch will be installed and programmed by NCDOT/NCDIT. DB team will be required to coordinate the installation of this HUB switch once the hub cabinet is ready. Revision added in <b>NCDOT ITS Fiber Hub Cabinet</b> section of Scope.	Revise RFP
143	ITS	284	ITS, DESIGN REQUIREMENTS, DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGNS	Under bulleted list of proposed DMS locations/connections to existing DMS, there are two starred statements. The second statement marked by two stars/asterisks states "The Design-Build Team shall remove the existing DMS assembly, including the DMS cabinet, and install the new DMS assembly and cabinet on the existing structure." None of the bulleted DMS locations are marked with two stars/asterisks. What location does replacing the DMS assembly on the existing structure apply to?	RFP Revised	Revise RFP
144	Signal Systems	332	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, TRAFFIC SIGNALS	RFP states that "all final signal installations shall utilize galvanized metal poles with arched (monocurve) mast arms." On page 334, Work Requirements for the proposed installation at SR 1423 (Piney Plains Road) at SR 1349 (Dillard Drive) and US 1 NB/US 64 EB Ramps state that the DB team "shall install new galvanized metal poles with span wire at this location." Please confirm pole type for the final signal installation at this location.	The official RTE Signal Recommendation is for metal strain poles. Cary had originally indicated that they would do a betterment agreement for metal poles with mastarms, but have since retracted that interest. The final signal design for 05-1294 should use galvanized metal strain poles with span wire.	Revise RFP
145	Signal Systems	332	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, TRAFFIC SIGNALS	RFP states that the Design-Build Team must develop "signal system timings" and that "all signal timing plans shall be reviewed and accepted by the TSMO Unit". The Town of Cary does not permit timing plan development or implementation on signals in their signal system by anyone other than Town of Cary staff. Have they changed their policy for this project or will this requirement be waived?	We recommend the DBT initiate signal timings based on traffic data such as vehicular counts and other probe data as available. Cary staff requests collaboration throughout the process as timings should be downloaded to field locations via Cary's signal system by Cary staff members.	No action needed
146	Signal Systems	333	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, TRAFFIC SIGNALS	RFP states that "the traffic signal detection for the final traffic patterns shall be inductive loop detection." NCDOT Division and municipal staff are increasingly requesting multi-zone microwave detection and other non-intrusive detection for final configurations in addition to temporary configurations. Can the choice of final detection be left to the discretion of the design team and municipal staff?	Cary staff does request during the review period to have the opportunity to review and provide comment on the type and manufacturer of equipment that is being used in accordance with DOT QPL.  Division needs to confirm what will be allowed.	No action needed
147	Signal Systems	336	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, SIGNAL COMMUNICATION PLANS	RFP states "The Department upon request, will supply the Design-Build Team with copies of any available documentation pertaining to the existing signal system, with regards to these intersections." Can this information be provided at this stage?	The Department will provide a full set pdfs of the 2008 Cary Signal System where you will add one signal at SR 1423 (Piney Plains Road) at SR 1349 (Dillard Drive) and US 1 NB/US 64 EB Ramps (05-1294 (NEW)) and will remove one signal at SR 1313 (Walnut Street) at US 1 NB-64 EB Ramps (05-0270). The Town of Cary can provide any upgrades to the full set of Cary Signal System plans that we have. The plans were done in AutoCadd (dwg files) and we don't have plans in ORD or V8. The Department will attach the 2008 plans in pdf format. The enclosed Signal Communications Plan package represents the latest documents on file with the TSMO Unit. Field conditions may have changed from the original installation. The Design Firm is responsible for field inspections and coordinating with Division/City personnel to determine the current field conditions. TOC - Designer should also include Cary staff since the signal system has changed since inception and staff have additional information NCDOT may not be familiar with. Public Facing GIS map for NCDOT signal plans  <a href="https://www.arcgis.com/home/Item.html?id=cd1fe92936ec44f8a3dbc002be2f68a3">https://www.arcgis.com/home/Item.html?id=cd1fe92936ec44f8a3dbc002be2f68a3</a>	Request for Material
148	Signal Systems	336	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, SIGNAL COMMUNICATION PLANS	RFP states that the DB team "shall replace one existing CCTV cameras on a metal signal poles at a location that provides optimum viewing." Please confirm that the intent is for a new CCTV camera to be installed on a metal signal pole at the new signal installation proposed at SR 1423 (Piney Plains Road) at SR 1349 (Dillard Drive) and US 1 NB/US 64 EB Ramps.	RFP revision is under consideration	Check RFP; possible change
149	Signal Systems	337	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, SIGNAL COMMUNICATION PLANS	RFP states DB team "shall install new fiber optic interconnect centers, fiber optic pigtails, and fiber optic jumpers in each new and existing traffic signal and camera cabinet." Please confirm that no work is proposed at existing signal cabinets and/or signal system CCTV camera cabinets aside from the proposed traffic signal and CCTV camera removal at SR 1313 (Walnut Street) or US 1 NB-64 EB Ramps (SIN 05-0270).  RFP suggests installation of new CCTV camera cabinets may be required. See Question 15 on installation of CCTV camera at new signal installation. If the CCTV camera is proposed at the new signal installation, would it be acceptable to connect the proposed camera to the Town of Cary Signal System via a Power Over Ethernet (PoE) cable connection to the proposed signal cabinet? I.e., please confirm whether a separate CCTV camera cabinet will be required.	ToC - Providing CCTV cameras via POE to the proposed cabinet is fine. We don't typically require a separate cabinet. Please collaborate with Cary staff on type and location of CCTV used.	No action needed
150	Signal Systems	342-343	TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, SIGNAL SYSTEM TIMING PLANS	The Town of Cary does not permit timing plan development or implementation on signals in their signal system by anyone other than Town of Cary staff. Have they changed their policy for this project or will this requirement be waived?	We recommend the DBT initiate signal timings based on traffic data such as vehicular counts and other probe data as available. Cary staff requests collaboration throughout the process as timings should be downloaded to field locations via Cary's signal system by Cary staff members.	No action needed
151	Other			Most RFP discipline sections require using the most up to date guidelines / manuals available to the Team. Would NCDOT consider providing a list of the most current guidelines / manuals instead of the blanket statement to use the most recent? Sometimes guidelines / manuals are revised and engineering firms are not notified. Also, if guidelines / manuals are revised during procurement, this potentially could require significant redesign in a very short amount of time.	No longer considering at this time. Page 190 - General Section - 2nd Paragraph under <i>General Scope</i> states, "Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, all documents referenced herein shall be the edition / version, including all interim revisions, effective on the Technical Proposal submittal date or the Best and Final Offer submittal date, whichever is later."	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
152	Project Special Provisions	152	1st Paragraph	Please consider allowing Median Access within the interchange at I-440/US 1/US 64 for Flyover Bent construction in area between CD lanes since there will not be any ramp exits or entrances?	RFP revised to expand use of median access	Revise RFP
153	Project Special Provisions	174	ACST / 1, 2 and 3	Architectural Conc. Surface Treatment - First Paragraph describes "simulated stone masonry" form liners and the Second Paragraph describes "standard brick pattern". There are three different types of noise walls within the footprint of this project. Is there an overall preference of style or is it optional depending on the prior project location. An option is given to use a simulated stone pattern if approved. Will this be approved if it is similar to the current desired sound wall pattern?	Will revise RFP to clarify.	Revise RFP
154	Project Special Provisions	178	Last Paragraph	Does a hard copy of the schedule need to be submitted?	No	No action needed
155	Roadway	207	2nd Bullet / 4th Arrow	The RFP states that the -RPB4- entrance ramp at the Gorman Street interchange shall become the outside I-40 westbound "Exit Only" lane onto I-440 / US 1 / US 64 at Exit 293. The exit ramp for the WB collector distributor (-RP1A-) shall be designed as a single lane, parallel exit. The D-B Teams will convert the "Existing Exit" lane to a through lane. Both the preliminary design and the hearing map show a 3-2-split with a 2 lane exit and 3 through lanes. Should the exit ramp be designed as a 3-2 split to match the hearing map? Should the exit ramp be designed as a single lane parallel exit and we have 4 through lanes on I-40 going WB?	3-2 split. RFP to revised	Revise RFP
156	Roadway	207	Last Bullet, 1st arrow	What is the median shoulder width for -Y1- (US 64 / US 1)?	Variable, checking to see if we can provide more detail	Check RFP; possible change
157	Roadway	208	2nd Bullet	At the US 1 / US 64 / Walnut Street interchange (Exit 101), the D-B Team shall remove the existing lane and paved shoulders. Does this statement refer to the NB exit ramp at the Walnut Street interchange? Does this include the loop as well ?	The entrance and exit ramps for US NB shall be removed in their entirety	No action needed
158	Roadway	208	4th Bullet	Will the Department clarify if directional ramps should be designed to meet a 60 mph design speed using the 0.08 maximum superelevation chart? Should the last sentence of this Bullet that references bridge rail offsets for a directional ramp be referencing a semi-directional ramp instead?	Acknowledged.	Check RFP; possible change
159	Roadway	208	5th Bullet	Does this statement mean that all existing loops (to remain in-place) must have a minimum 230' radius?	Yes as written, looking into changing	Revise RFP
160	Roadway	208	6th Bullet	Will the Department clarify the reason for restricting the maximum allowable cut and fill slopes to 3:1, while allowing the use of 2:1 cut and fill slopes in areas where there may be ROW impacts? Since the I-5703 project has constraints in all quadrants, why not allow 2:1 slopes project wide? Please refer to the Geotechnical Scope of Work on page 253.	Departments wants slopes to be 3:1 where they can be without increasing ROW.	No action needed
161	Roadway	208	1st & 3rd Bullet	Bullet 1 - all ramps shall have 14-foot outside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulders and 12-foot inside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulders. Bullet 3 - All ramps shall have 12-foot outside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulder and ten-foot inside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulder. Can the Department clarify which Bullet is correct?	14-foot outside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulders and 12-foot inside shoulders, four-foot of which shall be full depth paved shoulders	Revise RFP
162	Traffic Management	209	5th Bullet	The traffic Ops Tech Memo uses 2035 ADT for the Build Alternatives. Is NCDOT okay with using 2035 traffic? The I-5703 ROW Consultation states that the traffic forecast and the IAR will be updated to 2047 traffic and the IAR update will be completed by September 2026. When will the 2047 Build Traffic be provided to the Teams?	The updated traffic ops memo uses 2047 traffic - the IAJR has also been updated to 2047 and is currently under review by FHWA. Any change in design as a result of ATCs that affects interstate access will likely require the IAJR be updated for FHWA. Files provided	Request for Material
163	Roadway	212 / 294 / 295	last Bullet on 212	This Bullet states that we are to design and construct a resurfacing grade for all roadways impacted by construction. Does this conflict with the Pavement Design instructions on pages 294 and 295 that state we are to mill and fill the existing lanes on I-40?	Currently the grades on I-40 will be engineered, under discussion	Check RFP; possible change
164	Roadway	213	Last Bullet	Please reconsider requirement to evaluate haul roads to project prior to bid since the department will make there on determination after award. A better solution would be to pay the contractor for any roads that need to be upgraded since the department will get the benefit of the strengthened roads in the future.	The Department does not know which roads a DB Team might use as haul roads, as these decisions vary by Team and strategy. The extent of evaluation is determined by the DB Team to better define their bid and risk. Decisions made after award (p. 388) will be specific to haul roads of choice by the selected DB Team. Posting of roads and any required strengthening of roads is not specific to only construction projects, but applies to daily use of a road by all vehicles. In this application, the need for upgrades would be directly tied to construction of the project.	No action needed
165	Roadway	214	2nd Bullet	The statement that refers to the exclusion of design exceptions. Does this mean a design exception is not needed for the existing horizontal stopping sight distance along the median paved shoulder of I-40? Does it mean that a design exception is not needed for locations where bridge piers, concrete barrier, or overhead sign assemblies reduce the median shoulder width to less than 10 feet? Does it mean that if we are required to complete a design exception request for the existing median width of 22' on I-40, that it will be approved? Does this need to be noted in the Proposal by all the D-B Teams?	There are no approved Design Exceptions for the project. The bullet is stating design exceptions for the mainline will not be allowed unless they fall into one of the listed categories. Designs in the preliminary design that did not require a design exception will not require a design exception post award	No action needed
166	Roadway	214	2nd Bullet	Please confirm the Department will prepare NEPA Construction Consultations if no changes from the preliminary design are proposed.	CE was just renewed with ROW /Constrution consultation. Any plan change may result in a construction consultation	No action needed
167	Roadway	214	2nd Bullet	Please confirm that work within City of Raleigh Storm Drainage easement on the Lake Johnson Park will not the trigger the need for 4(f) and 6(f) efforts, which could result in significant expenditures and delays.	Working on answer	Check RFP; possible change
168	Roadway	218	2nd Bullet	Does the first arrow negate the 2nd arrow exclusion of concrete? Would consideration be given at specific locations for wasting of other materials (i.e. earth materials)?	First bullet states no wasting material. Second bullet should be related to necessary fill sections.	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
169	Environmental Permits	227	Last Paragraph	Seven months for the DB Team to accurately and adequately complete all designs necessary for the permit application, and develop the permit application is a very short timeframe. Will consideration be given to extend this to nine months.	Under consideration	Check RFP; possible change
170	Environmental Permits	228	1st Paragraph	Please confirm that compensatory mitigation for riparian buffer impacts will be provided by the Department.	Riparian buffer mitigation will be requested from NCDMS once the impact numbers are known.	No action needed
171	Geotechnical Engineering	253	4th Bullet	RFP states long term settlement of bridge embankments should be kept to 0.5 inches or less after 15 years of reaching final grade. Based on our local knowledge and experience, up to 1 inch of long term settlement has generally been acceptable. What calls for a stricter requirement for long term settlement on this project?	Current Bumps observed at existing bridge approaches	No action needed
172	Geotechnical Engineering	254	2nd solid Bullet	Please clarify if Geotextile for Subgrade Stabilization is required for cut sections?	Yes	No action needed
173	Hydraulics	266	9th Bullet	If there is minimal change to a roadway (i.e. mill and overlay), is mitigation still required? This could potentially require changing the grade, grade point, super-elevation, etc.	Yes, if the Teams 'changes something' other than mill and overlay, then The Teams will be required analysis and provide mitigation. All Teams need to take the "as good or better" approach. If the Teams negatively impacts something existing, that's not "as good or better", that's worse.	No action needed
174	Hydraulics	266	9th Bullet	If there is no work required on the existing roadway other than work on the shoulders / slopes such as utility work, signing, drainage tie-ins, etc., is mitigation still required?	Yes, if the Teams 'changes something' other than mill and overlay, then The Teams will be required analysis and provide mitigation. All Teams need to take the "as good or better" approach. If the Teams negatively impacts something existing, that's not "as good or better", that's worse.	No action needed
175	Hydraulics	273	3rd and 4th Bullets	It is difficult to ensure absolutely no increase in discharge on a project. For RBCBs (i.e. Walnut Creek), an increase in discharge could be inconsequential. Will NCDOT entertain the potential for an increase as long as there is no appreciable or measurable increase to the water surface elevation? Otherwise, as it is currently written, a new RBCB could be required.	Yes, if a Team 'changes something' other than mill and overlay, then The Team will be required to analyze and provide mitigation. All Teams need to take the "as good or better" approach. If the Teams negatively impact something existing, that will not be considered "as good or better". If the teams can provide/prove a no-rise, no-impact that's what the Department needs	No action needed
176	ITS	279	ICT# 9	Please consider adjusting to allow for when knowledge of damage occurs.	Under consideration	Check RFP; possible change
177	ITS	279	Project Operation Requirements	"The NCDOT fiber network shall remain operational through the duration of construction." ICT #13 and #14 note devices can be connected via fiber or cellular modem. Please confirm, can existing and temporary devices be connected via cellular modems during construction?	Devices can use temporary cellular communication in place of drop cables if necessary, but the fiber trunk lines still need to remain operational for connections off the project.	No action needed
178	ITS	281/282	Design Requirements	RFP page 281, references installing 288 fiber device line and 96 fiber trunk line. Page 282 Discusses 288 & 144 fiber device lines. Is the 144 device line an existing line and can proposed devices be added to the existing line?	The 288 and 96 are new, there are also existing and new 144 fiber cables as well. We will review clarify fiber counts/requirements for this project.	Check RFP; possible change
179	ITS	283	CCTV Cameras	Please Clarify Collocated Camera Installation. Is the CCTV to be installed on the sign structure or a separate pole in the vicinity? Can a combined cabinet be used, what are the power requirements? There are 2 DMS's at Mile Marker 100 is there a requirement for which DMS the Camera is to be collocated with?	CCTV should be located where it will have the best view of the roadway, so co-locating may not necessarily be the best option. We will review this language and revise if needed.	Check RFP; possible change
180	ITS	283	CCTV Cameras	Are 3 separate camera installations required or can they be collocated with other devices such as another CCTV?	Cameras should be located at locations to give the most viewing coverage of the whole interchange. It is doubtful that collocated CCTVs will achieve this goal.	No action needed
181	ITS	284	Dynamic Message Sign	The "****" Note does not appear to be used. Can you please clarify if this note is applicable to a location on this project?	RFP Revised	Revise RFP
182	Pavement Management	295	I-440 / US 1 / US 64 Requirements	Will the Department clarify the area of existing concrete lanes to remain in place for -Y21RC- from station 39+28 to 63+10? Is this area on the existing US 1 collector-distributor lanes?	Yes. This is a very complex area. Supplementary information will be provided and stationing will be added to the RFP	Revise RFP
183	Pavement Management	301	2nd Paragraph from the bottom	The RFP states that the D-B Teams shall resurface the existing pavement of all -Y- lines (excluding US 1 / US 64 / I-440). Base on the hearing maps provided by the Department, our Team anticipates resurfacing the 4 ramps at the Gorman Street interchange and 1 ramp at the Lake Wheeler Road interchange for the I-5701 project. Please clarify if other areas of this project will need resurfacing and the limits of the resurfacing.	Yes. The ramp at Lake Wheeler is the EB off-ramp	No action needed
184	Pavement Management	301	2nd Paragraph from the bottom	The RFP states that the D-B Teams shall resurface the existing pavement of all -Y- lines (excluding US 1 / US 64 / I-440). Base on the hearing maps provided by the Department, our Team anticipates resurfacing Walnut Street with 1 ramp and 1 loop, Buck Jones Road, Piney Plains Road, Dillard Drive, and Crossroads Blvd for the I-5703 project. Please clarify if other areas of this project will need resurfacing and the limits of the resurfacing.	Yes, with the exception of Buck Jones Road	No action needed
185	Pavement Management	301	Last Paragraph	The RFP has 4 alternate pavement designs for MUP's that are not located on berms adjacent to the curb & gutter. What pavement design do we use for MUP's that are located on berms adjacent to the curb & gutter?	These should be the same. We will change the RFP to reflect these designs are for all MUPs	Revise RFP
186	Signing	314	4th Bullet	East I-440 / North US-1 Exit 1 to I-40 / East US-64 has an option lane. MUTCD 2E.40 Paragraph 2 states "The Overhead Arrow-per-Lane guide sign at the exit or split shall be located at or in the immediate vicinity of the point where the exiting lanes begin to diverge from the through lanes..." The Walnut St bridge may limit sign visibility if sign is located at this location. Will the Arrow-per-Lane sign be allowed to be located in advance of the Walnut St bridge? If so, will an additional overhead sign assembly be required past the Walnut St bridge?	>Not as the exit directional, but yes, one APL before as an advanced guide sign to establish lane assignment is helpful. >Yes, one APL at the exit divergence point per MUTCD.	No action needed
187	Signing	315	Paragraph 8	Will overhead signs be required on ramps/loops beyond the construction limits of the mainline (Walnut Street Loop B, Jones Franklin RPC)?	Not as written, looking at for benefit.	Check RFP; possible change

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
188	Signing	315	8th Paragraph	South US-1 / West US-64 Exit 99 to Cary Parkway has an option lane. While the theoretical gore is outside the limits of I-5701/I-5703, the advanced guide sign/s will fall within the project limits. Will Arrow-Per-Lane overhead sign assembly be required at the theoretical gore?	Meaton - Depends on if team will be touching the Cary Pkwy 1 mile cantilever sign structure. If yes, will need to address all Exit 99 overhead guide signs in southbound sequence.	No action needed
189	Structures	325	8th Paragraph	Can a bridge have an abutment or MSE wall on one end and an end slope on the other? If one end bent has a retaining wall, does the other one have to have a retaining wall? Can one have turn-back wall and the other be parallel to the roadway?	The requirement for each end of the bridge to have the same appearance may be deleted on this project	Revise RFP
190	Structures	325	9th Line	Will a deck drain detail be provided for prestressed concrete girders that extends below the bottom flange of the beam?	It will be provided when available	Request for Material
191	Structures	326	1st Paragraph	Is the expectation to have a full rehab plan set for each structure listed in the "Rehab of Existing Structure" section?	Yes. What does the Team have in mind?	No action needed
192	Structures	326	Rehabilitation	"Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in the RFP, the DBT shall perform all rehabilitation work for the entire bridge." Thereafter 15 Bridges are identified with various repair locations. Does this mean that these are the only anticipated repairs that will be subject to the unit prices listed to compensate for 108-4(A)? Will repairs described that are not a part of the unit price list be extra work at negotiated prices such as guardrail or missing cover plates? If additional locations are identified beyond the listed locations will they be compensated by negotiations since the price of each location can vary greatly due to access, traffic, time restrictions, beam jacking, painting of steel beams near joints, etc?	For purposes of bidding, the teams shall bid based on the information presented. If further repairs are determined to be necessary by NCDOT staff, that will be considered to be extra work.	Revise RFP
193	Structures	326	10th Bullet	Please clarify the offset distance required for a sound barrier from the front face of the retaining wall.	As per Appendix E of the NCDOT Traffic Noise Manual: "A MINIMUM OF 6-FOOT HORIZONTAL CLEARANCE shall be provided between the exposed face of the retaining wall and the closest face of the noise wall. However, as little as 1-Foot may be used depending on retaining wall type provided the retaining wall can be designed for it."	No action needed
194	Structures	326-328	Rehabilitation of Existing Structures Section	Upon award, will the DB Team be required to perform a detailed inspection to confirm the limits of all structure repairs and develop pertinent details for the steel plating repairs described in the Rehabilitation of Existing Structures section?	It is recommended that the DBT perform a detailed inspection at steel beam repair locations to develop appropriate repair details, dimensions and quantities.	No action needed
195	Structures	326-328	Rehabilitation of Existing Structures Section	The RFP indicates prior to performing the proposed repairs, approval is required from the Engineer in writing. Is there a submittal requirement to initiate the approval process? If so, what is required for the submittal?	Contact Project Manager (typically Division) for approval submittal requirements.	No action needed
196	Structures	326-328	Rehabilitation of Existing Structures Section	For the structural steel repairs, to what extent shall the repairs extend? Is there a limit of section remaining for the structural steel that will dictate the termination of the repair?	SMU can provide steel beam plating details that show the repair extents.	Request for Material
197	Structures	326-328	Rehabilitation of Existing Structures Section	The RFP indicates traffic control, surveys, and portable lighting are incidental to the unit price of the repairs. Please clarify how the following additional activities will be paid for: detailed inspection (if required), engineering and plan development (if required), shop drawings for fabrication as required, access equipment (i.e., bucket trucks, manlifts, etc.), and as-built documentation.	Inspections, access equipment, engineering and plan development would be covered in the "design fee". The cost of shop drawings should be incorporated into the unit cost of steel beam repairs.	No action needed
198	Structures	326-328	Rehabilitation of Existing Structures Section	Please provide the recent inspection reports that were used to identify the repair locations.	provided	Request for Material
199	Signal Systems	332	5th Paragraph	"All final signal installations shall utilize galvanized metal poles with arched(monocurve) mast arms." Elsewhere in the RFP and the signal recommendation letter the proposed signal is to utilize metal strain poles. please clarify.	The official RTE Signal Recommendation is for metal strain poles. Cary had originally indicated that they would do a betterment agreement for metal poles with mastarms, but have since retracted that interest. The final signal design for 05-1294 should use galvanized metal strain poles with span wire.	Revise RFP
200	Signal Systems	332	Traffic Signals	There is an existing Signal at the On/Off Ramp and Cross-roads Blvd. With the closure/removal of the on-ramp, the operation of this signal would be impacted. What is the DBT responsibility in regard to this location?	Coordinating with Crossroads. Will revise RFP to include all work necessary to modify the signal. This signal is privately operated by Crossroads	Revise RFP
201	Signal Systems	336	Signal System CCTV Camera	The RFP Require removal of the CCTV at SIN 05-0270. It then notes to replace on existing CCTV on a metal signal pole. Please clarify, is the one being replaced a separate location from 05-0270.	This is confirmed.	No action needed
202	Signal Systems	336	Signal System CCTV Camera	The Location of the replaced CCTV states at a location that provides optimum viewing. Please Clarify, What is the intended view for the replaced CCTV? Is it located at the new signal and intended to view the new interchange?	Yes. Option 1: The CCTV must be within 300'+ of the Signal cabinet, but if feasible to place the CCTV in a separate quadrant, and still maintain this criteria in order to have a more optimal view of the new interchange that would be preferable; however, the criteria must be met. To have an optimal CCTV view of the interchange there will need to be coordination with the Town and the Department with this consideration when determining the location of the Signal Cabinet. Option 2: If we determine that pole height is critical for optimal viewing over the new interchange we may need to place the CCTV and CCTV cabinet on an separate CCTV pole with it's own switch and in that case placement of the CCTV within 300'+ of the signal cabinet is no longer required.	No action needed
203	Transportation Management	351	TMP Designer Inspections	Is the traffic control designer restricted to the EOR or can another representative be designated?	The report will need to be completed by the EOR, but the EOR may have a designee collect video footage of the project site for their review.	No action needed
204	Transportation Management	351	TMP Designer Inspections	Please clarify intent of the term "Immediately" as shifts often occur low volume hours. Consider allowing some reasonable time for the designer to get in the field.	The TMP designer will be conducting drive-through field reviews to ensure the TMP design is installed and operating as intended. This does not take the place of CEI inspection. Language will be clarified to indicate within 72 hours of the phase shift instead of immediately.	Revise RFP
205	Utilities	376	2/D Paragraph	Is the DB Team responsible for relocating unsuitable pipe within the project limits even if our designs are not impacting these pipes?	Yes, that is the intent of paragraph 2, bullet D. DBT's should review the FS file and coordinate with the Utility Owners to identify any existing unsuitable pipes.	No action needed
206	Utilities	381	6th Paragraph	Is the Utility Engineer suppose to submit just a ut_ucput.dgn with each submittal?	The Utility engineer shall submit the design file (ut_ucput.dgn) along with associated reference files. Layout/Plan sheets do not need to be provided.	No action needed

Project: I-5701 / I-5703 Design-Build

Changed Responses are Highlighted Yellow

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
207	Roadway	216	1st full paragraph	The RFP stipulates if the DNR and balloting process require more than 55,000 square feet of sound barrier wall on shoulder, and/or 7,000 square feet off the shoulder, the amount over will be paid for as extra work. The I-5701 TNR Table 8 (p.22) lists 312,374 square feet (SF) of "likely" barriers and the I-5703 TNR Table 8 (p.25) indicates 101,663 SF of "likely" barriers. 26,519 SF of barrier is duplicated in both reports, resulting in a total of 387,518 SF. The RFP SF and the TNR "likely wall" SF are significantly different. Can you please provide clarification to why there is such a significant difference and/or should the RFP SF be adjusted to align more with the TNR?	The quantities as stated by the DBT are a correct reflection of what is in the TNR for both projects. The quantities in the RFP appear to be incorrect. Will Revise RFP	Revise RFP
208	Geotechnical Engineering	250	General	We request the .gint files.	Provided	Request for Material
209	Roadway	206	General	We request the tin file providing the construction from U-2719 on I-440 US 1	Provided	Request for Material
210	Roadway	215	General	The noise zip file when downloaded comes up invalid file with a file size of 3kb	Not sure was able to download and open each zip file	Request for Material
211	Utilities		General	We request the profile of the transmission line asbuilt or survey of transmission lines crossing I-40 just east of I-440/US 1/US 64.	Will be Provided when available	Request for Material
212	Transportation Management		General	What is the Department's intention for the US 1/US 64 CD and Loop entrances/exits requirements related to the full depth replacement of the concrete pavement? ICT with Closure&Temporary Detour? Nightly restrictions?	Added ICTs for Loops C and D	Check RFP; possible change
213	Pavement Management	295	I-440/US 1/US 64 Requirements	The asphalt shoulder on US 1/64 southbound at the project limits has an outside asphalt shoulder constructed in 2023 as part of U-2719. The RFP based on Note 3 can be read to require replacement of this recently constructed shoulder and replaced with dowled concrete pavement. If this is to be removed to the project limits then there will be a short section of asphalt shoulder south of the project. If removal is required please clarify if it applies to the project limit or the full southern end of the asphalt shoulder.	The existing asphalt shoulder is partial depth and is not capable of being used as a travel lane. The intent of note 3, unless otherwise noted elsewhere in the RFP, is to only require its removal in areas where the travel lanes will be shifting onto the existing shoulder. The intention is not to remove the entirety of the asphalt shoulder for the project (only in areas where it will become part of the proposed travel lane OR in other areas noted elsewhere in the RFP). We can reword this section to make this more clear, if necessary.	Check RFP; possible change
214	Pavement Management	301	top paragraph	Please clarify the intent of the statement requiring removal of "... all ramps, loops, and collector distributor ... shall be removed and replaced in their entirety."	The intent is to remove the ramps, loops, and CD's down to the existing subgrade, unless otherwise specified, and replace with the designs in table 1. As worded, we understand that this note may be confusing.	Check RFP; possible change
215	Roadway		General	We request the 1980-- asbuilt plans for the construction of I-40 across US 1 / US 64	Looking to provide	Request for Material
216	Geotechnical Engineering			Are there any other conditions on the project where 2:1 fill slopes will be allowed other than minimizing right of way impacts, such as minimizing environmental impacts, utility impacts, etc?	May Revise RFP	Check RFP; possible change
217	Geotechnical Engineering			Answers to questions 79 and 80 appear to address structure rehab, not the geotech questions asked. Please confirm the answers.	Confirmed	Check RFP; possible change
218	Structures			There are 3 culvert inspection reports provided that recommends rehab work. Is this work part of the RFP requirements?	May revise RFP	Check RFP; possible change
219	Structures			Would the department consider providing line items in bid form with quantities for the design build team to provide unit prices similar to the I-5719B project?	I-5719B had a standalone bridge rehab project that was incorporated onto the RFP. Rehab on this project does not have the same level of detail to give quantities at this time	No action needed
220	Hydraulics			There are a couple of structure sized hydraulic crossings that do not meet the HW/D requirement for the 100-yr storm. These crossings were identified in the Hydraulic Planning Report for I-5701, and the recommendation is to retain the structures due to significant freeboard for the 100-yr storm. Would the department consider relaxing the HW/D requirement for certain crossings where the HW/D is close to the RFP requirement and design storm freeboard below the roadway shoulder is significant?	RFP being revised to a 50-year design storm. Team will be required to analyze 100 year	Revise RFP
221	Hydraulics			A Maximum Contributing Pavement Width Table was mentioned in a recent presentation on version 2.0 of the Hydroplaning Assessment Tool. Will the department provide this table for all teams to reference during hydroplaning assessment?	The table is a draft only. Will provide once finalized or given the OK to provide draft as information only	Request for Material
222			Information Request	I-5703 gINT files	Provided	Request for Material
223			Information Request	I-5338/I-5311 (Fortify) Subsurface inventory reports and gINT files	Provided	Request for Material
224			Information Request	U-2719 gINT files	Provided	Request for Material
225			Information Request	I-4744 gINT files	Provided	Request for Material
226			Information Request	Updated DTM and TIN files that match the latest FS File	Provided	Request for Material
227			Information Request	ITS/Fiber plans from adjacent projects.	Will be Provided when available	Request for Material
228			Information Request	Lighting plans	Will be Provided when available	Request for Material
229			Information Request	Existing signing plans (including structure line drawings) for past adjacent projects (I-5338/I-5311, any others) for reuse of existing overhead structures	<a href="#">Public Facing GIS map for NCDOT signal plans</a>	Request for Material
230			Information Request	I-5338/I-5311 (Fortify) Signing plans (dgnns and pdfs)	<a href="https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=cd1fe92936ec44f8a3dbc002be2f68a3">https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=cd1fe92936ec44f8a3dbc002be2f68a3</a> Will be Provided when available	Request for Material