

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 2nd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Pavement Management	298	1st paragraph	The note specifies that some areas of the existing shoulders are partial depth. The provided I-5338 typicals (sealed 8/21/2015) show full-depth shoulders (with pavement layers and thicknesses matching the adjacent travel lane) along all -L- typicals. The ramp typicals note partial depth in areas adjacent to guardrail. Can the Department clarify the locations where the existing shoulders are to be replaced?	Sheet 2-D in the I-5338/I-5311 signed typicals has a “Detail Showing Paved Shoulder in Relation to Guardrail-Mainline” (which shows a 2 ft. PDPS) and “Detail Showing Paved Shoulder in Relation to Guardrail - Ramps and Loops” (which shows variable width PDPS). Therefore, it is possible that some PDPS locations are present along L or the ramps within the project limits.	Request for Material
2	Pavement Management	298	1st paragraph	The note reference the "(FORTIFY)" plans. These plans are not in the provided materials on the project Connect site. Can the Department provide the full I-5338 plan set(s)?	The department has been unable to locate records containing as-built plans, or up to date design files. ADU is reaching out in an attempt to get more information and will provide it if available. RFC plans for Sections 1 and 2A have been provided	Request for Material
3	Signing	General		Within the project limits of I-40, due to the widening, are all existing overhead and ground-mounted signs to be replaced?	Yes, all guide signs should be replaced. All mileposts, route signs, regulatory and warning signs should be replaced. RFP to be revised to state all sign panels excluding Logo signs to be replaced	Check RFP; possible change
4	Signing	General		Can signs be retained or reused if the message is still applicable to the proposed patterns ?	No, if signs are touched replace with new signs, excluding logo signs and sponsorship signs. RFP to be revised to state all sign panels excluding Logo signs to be replaced	Check RFP; possible change
5	ITS	General		At what point in the project do the ITS features have to be installed / turned on?	Trunk line fiber must remain active through construction; devices may go in once final locations and power are available. CCTVs and DMS locations require a temporary portable device during construction until the final in in place and operational per the RFP.	No action needed
6	Geotechnical Engineering	259	II. D	Are precast gravity walls and/or modular block systems like Gravix explicitly acceptable for ramp and loops, or are there any restrictions specific to ramps/loops/interchange geometry? Are there any limitations (e.g., height, loading, or traffic barrier integration) that would preclude their use in ramp areas?	For these types of walls, Gravix, Twall, etc. which AASHTO loosely calls prefabricated modular walls, we are not planning on restricting their use in any certain types of locations or projects provided that the following requirements are adhered to: 1.A set height restriction of 30 ft maximum is required. The height includes the required wall embedment of at least18 inch. 2.If these walls are used for bridge abutments, coarse aggregate with the separation geotextile in accordance with the MSE prov would be required. 3.Based on the wall type and the backfill material used, a properly designed backfill drainage system is required that may include stone backfill drainage encased in a geotextile and/or geo-composite drain behind the wall facing. 4.The team should be made aware that temp shoring will be required in accordance with NCDOT policies for excavations (cut walls).	No action needed
7	Structures	330	Paragraph 10	Can the standard deck drain details for concrete girders be used? If not, will the department provide the detail for a vertical deck drain extending to bottom of girder for use with concrete girders?	Draft Deck drain d provided. Some modification may be needed to fit project constraints.	Request for Material
8	Structures	333	Bridge 910228	Can the department provide details for the preservation work item, repair/replace fencing, posts, and fasteners?	Bridge 910228 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
9	Structures	333	Bridge 910580	For the preservation work item, repave approach slabs, will the department allow for an asphalt overlay or is a concrete overlay required?	Bridge 910580 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
10	Structures	334	Bullet 1	Can the department provide steel girder repair details for adding plating to the web and bottom flange? Can the department provide details for the preferred method using a bolted beam plating repair to the existing bottom flange?	Bolted Beam Plating details can be provided	Request for Material
11	Structures	331 / Rehabilitation of Existing Structures	Paragraph 1	Will the department provide the special provisions that were referenced for the rehabilitation work listed?	Existing preservation related special provisions are available on project's SharePoint site. Rehab provisions added to materials available website to be referenced in SOW	Revise RFP
12	Structures	331	Bridge 910290	For repair of bridge rail, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
13	Structures	331 332	Bridge 910290 Bridge 910253	For tighten anchor nut, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridges 910253 and 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
14	Structures	331	Bridge 910290	RFP states tighten anchor nut Span 2, far end of Beam 11. The inspection report says that anchor bolt is loose and needs to be replaced. Can the department clarify if this will be an anchor bolt replacement?	Bridge 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
15	Structures	331 332 332 332 333 333 333 333 333	Bridge 910290 Bridge 910558 Bridge 910253 Bridge 910582 Bridge 910584 Bridge 910228 Bridge 910580 Bridge 910649 BC 910303	For repair/replace GR and posts and repair GR end terminal, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	To remain incidental	No action needed
16	Structures	331	Bridge 910290	For replace end treatment, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 2nd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
17	Structures	331 332	Bridge 910290 Bridge 910558	For replace diaphragms, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	There is already a proposed pay item in the RFP. Any repair to diaphragm/cross frame components are anticipated to be replaced in-kind. Standard diaphragm/cross frame drawings for new construction can be used.	No action needed
18	Structures	331	Bridge 910290	For plate stiffeners, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
19	Structures	332	Bridge 910276	For repair slope protection, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Unit price still being discussed internally.	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
20	Structures	332 333	Bridge 910583 Bridge 910585	For repair joint, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Joint repair to be paid under joint repalcement	No action needed
21	Structures	333	Bridge 910228	For add plating, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910228 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
22	Structures	333	Bridge 910228	For repair/replace fencing, post, and fasteners, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910228 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
23	Structures	333	Bridge 910580	For repair deck spall, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910580 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
24	Structures	333	Bridge 910580	For repave approach slabs, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910580 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
25	Structures	333	Bridge 910580	For remove overhead sign frames, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	Bridge 910580 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
26	Structures	333	BC 910587	For "Repair scour at toe inlet wall. Fill any voids underneath culvert with grout. Rip Rap inlet.", can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	To remain incidental	No action needed
27	Structures	333	BC 910587	For "Repair toe wall exposure at outlet. Add CL II Rip Rap to prevent undermining.", can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	To remain incidental	No action needed
28	Structures	333 333	BC 910587 BC 910588	For remove drift, can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	To remain incidental	No action needed
29	Structures	333	BC 910587	For repair southwest wingwall (rotation, horizontal cracking at base), can a unit price for this pay item be provided? Or can the pay item that is intended to cover this work item be provided?	To remain incidental	No action needed
30	Structures	334	Paragraph 1	Should this paragraph be updated to include all pay items in the bulleted list similar to paragraph 2?	Yes, to be revised	Revise RFP
31	Structures	334	Paragraph 1	For work items not directly covered by already established pay items in the bulleted list are the teams expected to negotiate unit prices after award?	To remain incidental	No action needed
32	Structures	334	Bullet 1	Will the plating to bottom flange and web repairs pay item and unit price be used to cover plate stiffeners (Bridge 910290), and add plating (Bridge 910228)?	Bridges 910228 and 910290 rehab removed from SOW	Revise RFP
33	Structures	334	Bullet 2	The pay item for repairs to fix spalls on concrete slope protection is not identified as a required work item on any structure. Can the department clarify the structures where this repair is expected?	SMU will provide more details after assessment.	Check RFP; possible change
34	Structures	334	Bullet 3	The pay item for filling voids underneath slope protection with foam is not identified as a required work item on any structure. Can the department clarify the structures where this repair is expected?	SMU will provide more details after assessment.	Check RFP; possible change
35	Structures	334	Bullet 4	The pay item for adding rip rap to eroded slope protection is not identified as a required work item on any structure. Can the department clarify the structures where this repair is expected?	SMU will provide more details after assessment.	Check RFP; possible change
36	Structures	334	Bullet 5	Will the replacement of joints pay item and unit price be used to cover repair joint?	Yes	No action needed
37	Structures	334	Bullet 6	Will the replacement of bottom diaphragm members on beams pay item and unit price be used to cover replace diaphragms?	Will consider revision to clarify. Any repair to diaphragm/cross frame components are anticipated to be replaced in-kind. Standard diaphragm/cross frame drawings for new construction can be used.	Check RFP; possible change
38	Structures	334	Bullet 7	Will the anchor bolt replacements pay item and unit price be used to cover tighten anchor nut?	No. It should be incidental	No action needed
39	Structures	334		Will epoxy resin injection (ERI) be required for any of the rehabilitation bridges/culverts? If it is anticipated to be used, can the department provide a list of those structures and how will it be reimbursed?	To remain incidental	No action needed
40	Structures	335	Paragraph 3	Will the department accept for review a submittal of rehabilitation of existing structures plans covering multiple structures?	Due to the quantiy of sites, please keep plan sets separate.	Check RFP; possible change
41	Other	General		Can the Department provide the electronic "WET" file for the project?	WET file has been provided previously.	Request for Material
42	Structures	330	3rd	Please clarify if the 17'-0" minimum vertical clearance is required for existing bridges to be retained which have preservation measures required or roadway improvements underneath. As an example the additional lane for the southbound CD under Walnut Street bridge.	RFP revised to allow for exisitng clearance	Revise RFP
43	Hydraulics	271 & 276	271 - 2nd; 276 - 3rd	Page 271 directs teams to replace all metal pipes 48 inches or larger. Page 276 appears to allow the option to rehabilitate and supplement those pipes. Please clarify.	Pg 276 falls under the "Unless allowed oterhwise elsewhere in this RFP" on pg 271.	Check RFP; possible change
44	Hydraulics	276	2nd	Will any increase be allowed to the pre/post at culvert No. 910588 and in what frequency of storm?	No, we have insurable structures in the Floodway. Q100	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 2nd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
45	Transportation Management			For the “Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum 2047 Analysis” dated February 2026 (file name dated May 2026), can the Department provide all spreadsheets involved in the volume development process, rerouting, and origin-destination volume information for the 2047 Build analysis, including any analysis used to derive the volumes in the vicinity of the collector-distributor for US 1 southbound between the ramps for I-40, Crossroads Boulevard, and Walnut Street?	Will provide when available	Request for Material
46	Transportation Management			For the “Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum 2047 Analysis” dated February 2026 (file name dated May 2026), can the Department provide all spreadsheets used in the calculations for the volume/capacity ratios for the 2047 Build analysis; specifically, the information provided in Table 12 of the memo?”	Will provide when available	Request for Material
47	Pavement Management	305	Paragraph above Table 1	the RFP states “... shall remove and dispose of / recycle the pavement structure, in its entirety, to the top of the soil subgrade, including but not limited to the removal and disposal of existing aggregate base course and replaced with the designs listed in Table 1 and Table 2 below,” As this text references the removal to the “top of the soil subgrade,” and specifically references the removal of the aggregate base course it is unclear if the Department requires the removal of the 1984 stabilized subgrade noted in the 1984 typical sections. We request clarification if it is required to remove the stabilized subgrade and install a new stabilized subgrade or if the existing 1984 stabilized subgrade can be considered as meeting the last column in the table indicating stabilized subgrade.	The 1984 plans show item M, which is "Subgrade to be stabilized with 200 to 400 lbs. per sq. yd. stabilizer aggregate....as directed by the engineer....". It is the department's view that this is subgrade, and therefore, should not be treated any differently than non-stabilized subgrade for the purposes of the RFP. Additionally, since the locations were "as directed by the engineer", it's presence in any given location would be difficult to verify until the pavement has been removed, further supporting the assumption it should be treated the same as unstabilized subgrade for purposes of the RFP requirements.	No action needed
48	Roadway	217	The DNR shall be developed in accordance with the NCDOT 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and the NCDOT 2022 Traffic Noise Manual.	Federal noise policy (23CFR 772.13(g)(i)) requires "For design-build projects, the preliminary technical noise study shall document all considered and proposed noise abatement measures for inclusion in the NEPA document. Final design of design-build noise abatement measures shall be based on the preliminary noise abatement design developed in the technical noise analysis. Noise abatement measures shall be considered, developed, and constructed in accordance with this standard and in conformance with the provisions of 40 CFR 1506.5(c) and 23 CFR 636.109." Since the TNR was developed using the NCDOT 2016 noise policy and the 2016 Traffic Noise Manual, how can the DNR comply with 23 CFR 772.13(g) (i) if it is required to be performed under a different policy and different traffic noise manual? Can NCDOT elaborate on this conflict? To resolve this conflict from federal policy and the potential for design-builders to interpret the 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and 2022 Traffic Noise Manual differently, would NCDOT consider allowing design builders to follow the design build requirements of the noise policy and traffic noise manual used to prepare the TNR, which include: a) no reduction to line of sight breaks identified in the TNR for any impacted and benefited receptor; b) no increase in abated noise level identified in the TNR at any impacted and benefited receptor; and c) creation of no impacts at receptors that were reported as not impacted in the TNR.	The DNR is subject to the 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and the 2022 Traffic Noise Manual because the I-5701 and I-5703 CE's were signed January 19, 2024. Per NCDOT 2021 Traffic Noise Policy, projects with a Date of Public Knowledge (the date the CE's were signed) on or after the effective date of the policy (November 29, 2021) shall comply with the criteria of the 2021 Policy. Per the RFP “The Design-Build Team shall reevaluate the entire I-5701 / I-5703 project and develop the Design Noise Report (DNR) based on the plans developed by the Design-Build Team, regardless of changes to the Department’s preliminary design” so the requested exceptions a through c will not be granted.	Check RFP; possible change
49	Roadway	217	The Department has provided an accepted I-5701 & I-5703 Traffic Noise Report (TNR) that is based on the Department’s preliminary design. The Design-Build Team shall reevaluate the entire I-5701 / I-5703 project and develop the Design Noise Report (DNR) based on the plans developed by the Design-Build Team, regardless of changes to the Department’s preliminary design.	The design year used in the TNRs is 2045. NCDOT has indicated that the design year for traffic analysis should be 2047, and an updated traffic operations analysis was completed Feb 2026. Should the DNR also use 2047 as the design year and use the updated Feb 2026 traffic analysis data?	The DNR analysis should be based on the design year of the project and should use the current approved traffic volume information available	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 2nd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
50	Roadway	219	The Design-Build Team shall design and construct all sound barrier walls a minimum of ten feet inside the right of way.	Will existing noise barriers at I-5703 that are within 10 feet of the ROW edge need to be moved so that they meet the offset requirement of 10 or more feet?	If this is in reference to the noise barrier and ROW behind the noise barrier, the answer is no unless the DBT is making changes in this area.	No action needed
51	Roadway	210	5th Bullet Point	21RDB is listed twice under Flyover Ramps and CD to CD Ramps. Which category should this ramp be classified as?	Will clarify RFP	Revise RFP
52	ITS			Please provide the I-40 ITS as-builts	Provided the plans we have for the I-40, I-440 and US 1 fiber. We may not have as-builts, and the design plans may be the only thing we have.	Request for Material
53	Utilities	386	1st paragraph	The RFP states to anticipate an executed URA in late 2026. What is the design basis for the URA? If a revision to the URA is needed, based on the DBT design, does the 24-30 month relocation timeframe cover the time for the URA revision.	The URA is being developed based on the two conflicts identified in the RFP. If significant design changes occur, a URA revision may be required. If the Team’s design causes additional impacts to Duke Energy Transmission facilities, the team shall make its best assumptions regarding any additional relocation time based on its coordination with Duke Energy Transmission.	No action needed
54	Utilities			There was an information request for the Duke transmission line profiles. Will the department provide this information?	Duke transmission line information has been posted. In addition, the Utilities Unit is coordinating with L&S to obtain elevation data for the transmission crossing over I 40. These efforts do not relieve the teams of their responsibility to conduct their own due diligence and to coordinate directly with Duke Energy in developing their bids.	Request for Material
55	Project Special Provisions	174	2nd paragraph under Architectural Concrete Surface Treatment	Is there a color preference for the sound barrier and retaining walls along I-40? Assuming it will be Red Palette Color #30166, but not completely clear.	I-40 walls will have no color added. Will clarify in RFP that they shall not be stained	Revise RFP
56	General	193	1st sentence	The RFP was revised to state designs shall be in Bentley Open Roads Designer (ORD). Will the Department provide survey data in ORD format?	Looking to see if this can be provided	Request for Material
57	General	193	1st sentence	Can the Teams utilize Microstation throughout the procurement phase and then transition to ORD after award as a meaningful amount of design has already taken place?	Yes	No action needed
58	Roadway	212 & 294-295	Last Bullet (p. 212), I-40 Pavement Resurfacing/Uniform Overlay (pp. 294-295)	I-40 travel lanes west of the existing bridges over I-440 / US 1 / US-64: On pages 294-295, the RFP notes milling and replacing the existing UTBWC where elsewhere in the RFP (pg. 212), the Teams are required to resurface this area based on referencing the roadways to be resurfaced on the NCDOT provided public meeting maps. If the Teams are to resurface this area, can the Department provide a pavement design and minimum resurfacing depth for this area of I-40?	Will revise to match requiremnts in pavement management scope: For I-40 travel lanes from the western project limits to the western limits of the existing bridge over US-1/I-440 (approximate station 109+50), the Design-Build Team shall mill off and replace the existing UTBWC (5/8” milling & replacement) only in areas as required to revise pavement markings.	Revise RFP
59	Roadway	217	1st Bullet	The 2nd Draft RFP notes design exceptions are to be provided by the Department. Are said designs exceptions the same as those noted in the <i>I-5703_Design Exception Package_Alt2.pdf</i> provided back in March of 2026?	Next RFP will revert back to no design exceptions. As the package was explored they were ultimately deemed design decisions	Revise RFP
60	Roadway	217	3rd Bullet	The I-5701 & I-5703 TNRs included 2018 base year and 2045 design year traffic based on traffic forecasts completed in 2018. Will the Design Noise Report (DNR) use the 2018 existing and 2047 year traffic from the recently updated I-5703 2047 TOTM Addendum_Draft_05222026 and I-5701 Capacity Operation Technical Memorandum or use the 2045 design year in the TNRs?	The DNR analysis should be based on the design year of the project and should use the current approved traffic volume information available	Check RFP; possible change
61	Hydraulics	270-271	Stormwater Management Section	There are two stormwater management ponds in the gore areas of the I-40 / I-440 B quadrant. There is no mention of these ponds in the RFP. Is the Team responsible for replacing these ponds (and if so, can criteria be provided for what is expected) or should we just adhere to the RFP Stormwater Management section?	The DBT has to adhere to the NCDOT’s NPDES Permit and the permit has some language that requires NCDOT to replace a retrofitted that has to be removed with another BMP or SCM	No action needed
62	ITS	292	Generator Hookup	Please Clarify, does the secondary hub cabinet require external generator hookup? it is not powered or have cooling per the RFP page 288 NCDOT ITS Fiber Hub Cabinet section	No, secondary cabinet does not require power or a generator hookup.	No action needed
63	Pavement Management	298	Note 1	The RFP states that "Some areas with widened shoulder, as indicated in the (Fortify) plans, consist of partial depth asphalt shoulders. The D-B Team shall remove these partial depth shoulders and replace with the design listed above in areas that are to become travel lanes or a proposed 12' shoulder." NCDOT has provided sealed typicals for the Fortify plans, but has not provided the plans or CADD files that show the Fortify design within our project area. Will NCDOT provide the Fortify Plans in pdf format or CADD files or both, particularly the profiles?	The department has been unable to locate records containing as-built plans, or up to date design files. ADU is reaching out in an attempt to get more information and will provide it if available.	Request for Material
64	ITS	361	3rd Full Paragraph	The RFP noted the preliminary locations for incident management ITS devices has been provided by the Department. Will these still be provided?	Yes, we are working on this information now and will give it to the alternate delivery unit to provide to the teams as soon as we can.	Request for Material
65	Transportation Management	379	ICT #11 for Refreshing Pavement Markings	Are temporary marking plans and review/approval process required for this operation?	No	No action needed
66	Transportation Management	379	ICT #11 for Refreshing Pavement Markings	Are temporary markers or reflector replacement required for this operation?	No	No action needed
67	Other	N/A	N/A	IAJR Volume Figures - The revised traffic volumes provided still includes some inconsistencies. Please see attachment.	Looking at inconsistencies, and will provided updates wehen available	Request for Material

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 2nd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
70	Geotechnical Engineering			Request additional geotech information for Walnut Creek area and slope failure information.	Could not find any information regarding the slope failure in Walnut Creek area yet. Will try to see if division 5 maintenance has any records on this. A "location pin for the failed slope area" will help locate	Request for Material
71	Roadway			US 1/US 64 was constructed as metric. Can the travel lanes remain metric and only new widening as English – or does the DB team need to construct the extra width to restripe existing as English?	The travel lanes shall be as the RFP dictates in English. The Department can work with the team during the design and construction process to best fit the existing lanes in with the English dimensions	No action needed
72	Other			Will NCDOT confirm that traffic analysis comparisons should be based on the 2047 TOTM Addendum dated 6/30/2026?	Yes, the 2047 TOTM dated 6/30/26 should be used.	No action needed
73	Other			If the answer is yes to the above question, will NCDOT provide the HCS model files used for the analysis provided in the 2047 TOTM Addendum dated June 30,2026? It is very difficult to mimic the analysis from scratch and we desire to accurately compare any ATCs for the interchange to the performance of the RFP design.	The HCS & Synchro files, as well as a spreadsheet for v/cs for CDs uploaded to materiasl available	Request for Material
74	Pavement Management	298	3rd Paragraph	Will NCDOT clarify the intent of this paragraph is to only mill the existing pavement to remain in place 1.5" and fill with 1.5" of S9.5D and the 5/8" Ultra-Thin Bonded Wearing Course? The mention of "minimum" depth in this statement alludes to the need for establishing a new wedge grade through the corridor that may impact existing drainage and shoulder cross slopes requiring significant work along the existing median shoulder.	The intent is for the existing full depth lanes on I-40 to have a uniform mill and overlay. Resurfacing grades are not required.	Revise RFP
75	General			Due to the additional scope and need for significant fieldwork (existing structure and pavement evaluations) to determine conditions, will the Department consider increasing the stipend?	No.	No action needed
76	Hydraulics			Will the Department allow retaining the existing drainage/ditch lines along I-40 or will the Teams be required to modify all existing slopes to meet standard interstate typical sections? Retaining existing ditch lines will eliminate many of the sliver cuts and the erosion control needed to stabilize slopes.	Follow the Roadway Typical	No action needed
77	General	64	1st Paragraph	With the widening along I-40 impacting existing slopes and the potential to retain existing drainage and ditch lines (above question), will NCDOT require the Teams to clear and grub to meet clear-zone requirements even though we are using Method III clearing which most likely was used on the prior project to establish clearing limits along the I-40 corridor?	Follow the Roadway Typical	No action needed
78	General			Due to the complexities of the scope for all structural rehabilitation items and the want for all Teams to be bidding fairly on this contract, will NCDOT consider removing the entire structural rehabilitation scope from this project and implementing the scope post award as a Supplemental Agreement to this contract? This scope alone could dictate significant swings in bid costs for the project and be very difficult for all Teams to estimate incidentals due to the limited ability and time to field verify elements during this proposal phase.	Rehab scope has been revised.	Revise RFP
79	Transportation Management	378	Table	Will NCDOT consider closures (15-day) similar to Ramp -21RA- for widening improvements/ties for all ramps along I-40 for Project No. I-5701? (i.e. ramps at Gorman Street and Lake Wheeler Road)	RFP revised to allow closures at Gorman and Lake Wheeler Roads	Revise RFP