

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Roadway	257	First bullet	Walnut: Will a pavement design be provided for Walnut Street, existing Ramp(s) and Loop(s). Can the department confirm the pavement design for the previous Piney Plains concept is intended to be applicable to all Walnut Street Ramps/Loops and any impacts to the Walnut corridor? In order to pave the gaps between the new ramp resurfacing tie ins, will the existing structure for Walnut over US 1 be required to be resurfaced and/or will additional deck rehab be required? All Locations: Can the department confirm the end resurfacing limits of these ramps and loops. i.e., will the resurfacing limits of these ramps end at the respective Y line's existing curb return, or should these tie to the existing Y line's EOT limit?	We can update the ramp designs in the RFP to incorporate other ramps.	Check RFP; possible change
2	Roadway	250	"US 1 Ramps" Description	What is the expectation for separating the traffic on the ramp and loop for Walnut? Can the department confirm any additional or desirable roadway separation between the Walnut Loop Ramp, beyond what is described in the NCDOT Roadway Design Manual's description for Loop Ramp Terminal Combination (RDP Page 9-27, Figure 9-11), i.e., will barrier separation or the use of curb and gutter, and or will wider shoulders be required?	Figure 9-11 is correct for monolithic island separation	No action needed
3	Roadway	251	Third Bullet	Will this Bullet remain applicable with the incorporation of the elongated loop and ramps as prescribed in the 3rd RFP?	Will remove bullet	Revise RFP
4	Roadway	256	Last Sub Bullet	Walnut: In order to pave the gaps between the new ramp resurfacing tie ins, will the existing structure for Walnut over US 1 be required to be resurfaced and/or will additional deck rehab be required?	No not unless the structure is impacted	No action needed
5	Roadway	250	First Bullet	The existing median of US1 is in excess of the maximum width inside EOT to inside EOT as described in the RFP. Can the department confirm that even with adjustments to the US 1 roadway alignments along the asphalt overlay and new pavement locations the DBTs will not be required to replace the existing concrete pavement to remain in place due to existing concete joint lines not aligning with proposed lane lines.	Possible change	Check RFP; possible change
6	Roadway	250	First Bullet	In areas where the existing median is wider than the allowable dimensions as noted for the median paved shoulder and the capped barrer, can the Department clarify the intended means to pave or cap the remaining area?	The Department wants to reduce the median through this area to at least the maximum allowable shoulder per the RFP.	No action needed
7	Roadway	250	First Bullet	Can the Department clarify the intended limits of the closed median? Per the I-5703 public meeting maps and provided preliminary desing files, the project limits end approximately 2000' east of the I-40 bridges. The median barrier on the U-2719 project does not begin until approximately 100' west of the Jones Franklin Road bridge. This creates an approximate 2000' gap between concrete barrier within the U-2719 project.	Yes median barrier will extend to barrier constructed on U-2719 project. Will clarify limits of median barrier in RFP.	Revise RFP
8	Roadway	250	First Bullet	Can the Department clarify the anchor/connection requirements between barrier for the backfilled and capped barrier sections? The adjacent U-2719 project required galvanized rods to connect parallel barrier in the median planter locations.	DB Team's responsibility	No action needed
9	Roadway	250		Can the Department clarify if barrier or guardrail will be required to provide separation between US 1 and the CD roads and/or I-40 and the CD roads.	No. The Department is not specifying the type of positive protection required between -21CDSB- and -Y1LT-. Your design will provide the basis of what is required.	No action needed
10	Roadway	255	Second Bullet	Will the Department be providing an updated or revised IAR based on the new Walnut Street interchange configuration?	DB Team's responsibility per the design.	No action needed
11	Structures	377	Paragraph 2	Is the added sacrificial thickness 1/4" (inch) and is that in addition to the 1/4" monolithic wearing surface provision of NCDOT SDM 6.2.2 and 6.6.2?	The sacrificial thickness is ¾" and is in addition to the minimum design thickness. The ¾" described in 6.2.2 and 6.6.2 is for composite design only and accounts for potential slab thickness lost over time.	Check RFP; possible change
12	Structures	377	Paragraph 4	Are teams required to maintain existing minimum vertical clearance even for bridges with existing MVC in excess of 17'-0" over I-40 and / or I-440 / US1 / US64, or is that for just the bridges that currently have less than the 17'-0" clearance?	No. maintain the lesser of existing and 17'. Paragraph edited.	Revise RFP
13	Structures	381	All Bullets	Regarding the unit prices for bridge rehab items, if current market prices indicate that these unit prices will not cover the actual cost of the work, should the design build team include this additional cost as incidental to our bid?	Not a renegotiting prices	No action needed
14	Structures	381	All Bullets	After award, does NCDOT plan to negotiate any of the bridge rehab unit prices based on current market conditions?	No	No action needed
15	Transportation Management	422	Table	Is the PPC overlay work on I-40 (bridge rehab) required to be completed within the lane closure time restrictions stated here?	Yes, no changes to RFP is anticipated for PPC overlay	No action needed
16	Hydraulics	314	1	The Design Frequency bullet says to use the 50-yr frequency as the design storm and to analyze the 100-yr storm. Please clarify if the 100-yr analysis will dictate the sizing of the pipes or if it is for analysis only.	Use 50yr for sizing of pipes. The 100yr analysis is for information only.	No action needed

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
17	Hydraulics	312	5	There is an existing 78" CSP that runs under I-40 / US-64 that drains the Crossroads Development. There is an additional 84" CSP that connects to the 78" CSP at a junction box just past the inlet. Preliminary hydraulic analysis shows the 78" CSP to be undersized. The 78" CSP was not accessed for a pipe video according to the Pipe Condition Assessment Report and therefore should be replaced according to the RFP. With the drainage area being greater than 50% impervious there will need to be several assumptions made in the hydrologic analysis to develop sizing for this crossing. Will the Department consider dictating the proposed size/conveyance for all teams? Due to the anticipated size and length of this crossing, this will be one of the higher risk items on the project.	The cross pipe does not necessarily need to be replaced simply because it was not included in the pipe condition assessment report. Other clauses of the RFP are invoked prior to the replacement clause on p. 312. For example see the fourth arrow on p. 319. NCDOT assigns the following flow rates for this crossing for use by all teams: 2 year = 340 cfs 5 year = 400 cfs 10 year = 430 cfs 25 year = 450 cfs 50 year = 460 cfs 100 year = 470 cfs 500 year = 500 cfs	Check RFP; possible change
18	Hydraulics	311	2	If the stormwater basin is impacted by the new ramp and loop for Walnut Street, will the impacts be handled in ROW negotiations or will the Team be required to bring the site back into compliance for storm water controls?	Impacts will be handled in ROW negotiations.	No action needed
19	Hydraulics	312	5	Please provide access to the GO! NC GIS Site for the following team members: Davin Morrison (davin.morrison@hdrinc.com); Grace Jacobson (grace.jacobson@hdrinc.com); James Rice (james.rice@hdrinc.com).	ADU has been managing access to this.	Request for Material
20	Hydraulics	312	5	There are discrepancies for the existing drainage between the provided survey CAD file, the pipe condition assessment report, and the archived plan sets provided. What does the department recommend to clarify these discrepancies?	Hydraulics Unit's recommendation is to consider the official record survey as the primary source, and the other sources as additional secondary information. Verification of existing drainage is the responsibility of the DB Team.	No action needed
1	Roadway	251&257	2nd bullet & 1st bullet	Please clarify the Department's intent for the design improvements required for All the Gorman Street, -RP6B-, and -RP6C- ramps. Is the Department's intent to add a uniform overlay and add the required shoulder? Please clarify whether the required work is limited to resurfacing and construction of the specified shoulder.	Yes	No action needed
2	Roadway	251& 256, 257	2nd bullet , 3rd from last & last bullet	Please clarify if the I-40 Westbound limits are to be in accordance with the limits of work on the public hearing map or if the I-40 Westbound lanes are to be resurfaced to match the I-40 Eastbound lanes as noted in the last bullet on page 256.	Yes. Westbound I-40 limits should match I-40 Eastbound lanes	No action needed
3	Roadway	250	1st bullet	The project limits on the preliminary plans and public hearing map do not extend to the limits of the median barrier constructed on the U-2719 project. Are the proposers to include extending the work along I-440 / US 1 / US 64 to the end of the median barrier constructed on the U-2719 project?	Yes median barrier will extend to barrier constructed on U-2719 project. Will clarify limits of median barrier in RFP.	Revise RFP
4	Roadway	341	Note 2 and 3	Note 2 includes the phrase "... may be used as part of future travel lanes or auxiliary lanes,...". Note 3 includes the phrase "... within these areas shall be removed and replaced with the Travel lane/Auxiliary Lane Concrete...". Can the narrow width US 1 Northbound outside concrete shoulder without rumble strips be repurposed and utilized as part of a future travel lane?	Note 2 states: "The existing full width outside concrete shoulders that do not contain rumble stripsmay be used as part of future travel lanes or auxiliary lanes". Note 3 states: "Any asphalt shoulders, or narrow width concrete shoulders, within these areas shall be removed and replaced with.....". The intent of these two notes is to clarify that the full width shoulders may be maintained in areas to become travel lanes, but the narrower shoulders, shall not. We can consider revisions to the language to clarify this if necessary.	Check RFP; possible change
5	Roadway	259	The DNR shall be developed in accordance with the NCDOT 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and the NCDOT 2022 Traffic Noise Manual.	Is it acceptable for the changes in noise barrier optimization considerations from the 2016 to the 2022 Traffic Noise Manual to result in a reduction in square feet of noise barrier and/or increases in noise levels for receivers behind the noise barrier?	It is acceptable if the optimization process changes the predicted build with barrier sound level for receptors behind the wall. The design-builder is reminded that the barrier optimization process should benefit as many impacted receptors as possible and achieve NRDG for as many impacted receptors as possible, while remaining cost reasonable. If this is achieved with a smaller barrier or with different with barrier noise levels from that in the TNR, that is fine.	No action needed
6	Roadway	259	The DNR shall be developed in accordance with the NCDOT 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and the NCDOT 2022 Traffic Noise Manual.	Is it acceptable for the DNR to use same traffic splits that were used in the TNR, or will design-builders be required to apply 50-50 traffic splits as recommended in the 2022 Traffic Noise Manual?	The DNR should use the traffic split that results in the loudest noise hour. In most cases, a 50-50 traffic split is acceptable. If the project traffic forecast indicates an extreme split (defined as 65% or greater in the Noise Manual), then we would ask the analyst to complete a comparison exercise to determine the loudest hour traffic volumes.	No action needed
7	Roadway	259	In accordance with the NCDOT 2022 Traffic Noise Manual, this means the DNR must evaluate noise impacts beyond the project limits: specifically, 800 feet for freeway improvement projects.	May the same extension of the project limits used in the TNR assessment be used for the DNR, or must the design-builder seek approval of the extension of project limits for use in the DNR?	The design-builder must analyze traffic impacts 800 feet beyond the proposed project improvements (and further if impacts extend even beyond this point) as designed by the design-build team. If the design-build team identifies a different project construction limit from that used in the TNR, then the Noise Study Area limits in the DNR will be different from Noise Study Area limits analyzed in the TNR.	No action needed

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
8	Roadway	259	The Design-Build Team shall complete TNM model validation, including but not limited to the collection of additional noise measurement data, regardless of what was included in the TNR.	Will all new traffic noise measurements be required, or may the design-builder selectively include some additional noise measurements at their discretion where necessary, such as behind existing noise barriers that were not constructed when the TNR was prepared?	The design-builder will be expected to collect all new ambient noise measurements. The locations may vary from what was done in the TNR, based on guidance from the selected noise analyst and subject to approval by the TNAQ Group through the Noise Analysis Work Plan.	No action needed
9	Roadway	259	The DNR shall be developed in accordance with the NCDOT 2021 Traffic Noise Policy and the NCDOT 2022 Traffic Noise Manual.	Is an analysis of the four existing noise barriers required as per FHWA-HEP-12-051, and in consultation with NCDOT as recommended by the 2022 Traffic Noise Manual?	Analysis of existing noise barriers must follow the guidance in the 2022 Traffic Noise Manual, Appendix D.	No action needed
10	Roadway	250	1st Bullet	Does the 14' max inside shoulder along I-440 apply to the existing shoulders? At the beginning of the I-440 alignment, the existing shoulders are more than 14'.	We are not asking for any barrier wall to be removed to meet the shoulder requirement at the start of the project, which is US 1. A reasonable shoulder width transition is acceptable.	No action needed
11	Roadway	250	1st Bullet	Under existing bridges, do the RFP shoulders along I-440 apply (e.g., Walnut, I-440)? The minimum clear distance under the existing bridges does not appear to accommodate 5 lanes with RFP compliant shoulders.	Obtain maximum possible shoulder width. Ask for clarification on "does not appear to accommodate..."	No action needed
12	Roadway	250	1st Bullet	Is the median between -21CDSB- and -Y1LT- also required to have a capped median barrier? If so, what type and width would be required? Does the Department intend to retain the grass median between -21CDSB- and -Y1LT-?	No. The Department is not specifying the type of positive protection required between -21CDSB- and -Y1LT-. Your design will provide the basis of what is required.	No action needed
13	Roadway	248	3rd Bullet	The existing paved shoulder width in front of the existing concrete barrier / noise wall on I-40 westbound just east of Jones Franklin does not allow the required 14' paved shoulder to the face of barrier. The final survey file indicates this shoulder is between 10'-11'. Is the intent to demo and reconstruct the existing noise wall in this location (approximately -L- STA. 161+00 +/-)? Or will the existing shoulder width be allowed as an existing condition?	Sound wall will be allowed to stay if the paved shoulder exceeds 10'	Check RFP; possible change
14	Roadway	250	1st bullet/3rd sub bullet	Please clarify the department's reasoning and determination of the 10' maximum capped barrier width.		No action needed
15	Environmental Permits	269	Last paragraph	In light of the extended procurement, will the default June 2027 4B Meeting and August 2027 4C Meeting dates be revised in the Fourth Industry Draft?	4B moved to Septeber 2027, 4C to November 2027	Revise RFP
16	Hydraulics	Provided Materials	I-5701_Hydraulic Planning Report_04132020.pdf	The Department-provided report for the culvert located between Lake Wheeler Road and Trailwood Drive identifies an approximate 10-foot culvert width. Field observations indicate that the opening measured perpendicular to the culvert barrel may be approximately eight feet and that an approximately 18-inch sanitary sewer line passes through the opening. Please: (1) verify and provide the controlling culvert dimensions measured perpendicular to the barrel; (2) confirm the sewer-line size, location, and ownership; (3) revise the provided hydraulic information as necessary; and (4) confirm whether the sewer-line obstruction shall be deducted from the available hydraulic opening and/or reflected through an adjusted Manning's roughness coefficient.	1)Culvert has a span of 8ft. 2)Sewer line size is 18" diameter. The sewer line is located in the lower corner of the culvert barrel and runs along the length of the culvert. Hydraulics Unit defers to Utilities Unit for ownership information. 3)This answer shall serve as a revision to the provided hydraulic information. 4)Modifying the Mannings value of the culvert barrel is not an option because of the lack of available information with which to calibrate the revised Mannings value. The DBT shall elect to use one of three methods to represent the equivalent area of the sewer line blockage. See screenshots below for a visual representation. 1. Uniformly block the bottom of the barrel. 2. Insert a fully blocked round culvert into the RCBC barrel. 3. Modify the internal cross sections to block a portion of the barrel.	Check RFP; possible change
17	Hydraulics	312	3rd Bullet	In the ArcGIS layer named "NCDOT_I5701_I5703_stormwater_pipes", about half of the pipes are listed as "others" under the legend "CCTV Complete?" Will the recommendation for these pipes and culverts listed as "others" be provided?	No. Pipes listed as others were either determined to be either inaccessible by the pipe video collection crew or outside the project area.	No action needed
18	Hydraulics	308		Can the Department provide an updated final survey file that contains missing pipes within project limits and NCDOT Right-of-way/easements?	Hydraulics defers to Location and Survey.	No action needed
19	ITS	General		After reviewing as-built drawings provided by NCDOT, we still need ITS as-builts for the I-5338 - I-5311 project. Please provide these ITS as-builts.	We don't have As-Builts for I-5338 but we have the final design plans. We will send to ADU to disperse (please see attached). I-5311 we don't have any records for.	No action needed
20	ITS	General		The U-3101 C&D project ITS cover sheet indicates that two CCTV cameras were proposed at the US 1-64/I-440 interchange, however these cameras are not shown on the U-3101 C&D plan sheets. Please provide these sheets and confirm if these cameras exist and their locations at the interchange.	All existing and proposed CCTV locations are listed in the RFP.	No action needed
21	ITS	General		The I-5338 - I-5311 RFP states that there are existing cameras along I-40 that needed to be maintained/relocated for that project. Do these cameras still exist? If so, do they need to be maintained for this project and tied into the new fiber backbone?	All existing and proposed CCTV locations are listed in the RFP.	No action needed
22	Pavement Management	348	4th bullet	Please clarify if references to multiuse paths are no longer applicable for this project.	Will clarify	Revise RFP

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
23	Pavement Management	340	I-440 / US 1 / US 64 REQUIREMENTS	What shoulder pavement design is allowed for -Y1RT- and -Y1LT- if the project limits are extended to the previous U-2719 limits?	The answer depends on the station range in question. Can the team provide specific areas that may have been missed in the language in the current RFP? If the team is asking about sections of new asphalt travel lanes placed under U-2719 (with adjacent partial depth asphalt shoulders), then no shoulder options are used. New full depth shoulders are required (same as new travel lanes). The language of this section can be modified to clarify this.	Check RFP; possible change
24	Public Information	358	3rd Paragraph	Please confirm that the PI Technician Identification is a post award decision between the Department and the Design Build Team.	If the DB team would like to use their own qualified individual, they should include those costs in the contract. If the DB team does not have a qualified individual on staff, then a qualified candidate from outside of the firm will be selected and compensated under a separate contract.	No action needed
25	Signing	General		If the median barrier along I-440 / US 1 / US 64 is to be extended to the median barrier limits constructed on the U-2719 project, are the signs and lighting elements constructed on U-2719 also to be replaced?	One overhead sign structure will be impacted; is only one year old. Prefer to not replace but adjust barrier to maintain sign structure. If cannot, replace structure and re-erect existing sign. Will discuss internally.	Check RFP; possible change
26	Structures	378	2nd paragraph	Please clarify if the deck drain detail is applicable for prestressed concrete girder bridges. For example, the stated requirement applies to steel girders.	Yes, it applies to prestressed girders. I don't see anything in the 2nd paragraph that limits the requirement to steel.	No action needed
27	Structures	377	2nd paragraph	The Structures Scope states that all new I-40 interchange bridge decks shall include an added sacrificial 1/4' thickness to account for the diamond grinding. Please confirm that the intended sacrificial thickness is 1/4 inch (1/4"), rather than 1/4 foot (3").	Yes, ¼" minimum sacrificial thickness, not 3".	Check RFP; possible change
28	Signal Systems	384 / 387	5th paragraph / 2nd on list	On page 384, the RFP states that if any new signal supports are required, they shall be mast arms as an overall requirement for signal modifications. However, on page 387 which lists specific requirements for the signal at Crossroads Boulevard and Caitboo Avenue, the Work Requirements states that wood poles are permissible for any required new poles. We assume that the mast arm requirement is intended for the signal 05-0270 at Walnut Street / US 1 NB ramps (which currently has mast arms but some of them may need to be replaced depending on the design footprint) but wanted to clarify that it is not a requirement if a pole at Crossroads / Caitboo needs to be replaced.	Correct. An assumption is based that all existing poles at Crossroads and Caitboo can be retained since there is no widening occurring. If	No action needed
29	Transportation Management	8/426	3rd paragraph	The Project Special Provision states that liquidated damages for ICT #13 and #14 are \$2,000 per calendar day. The Transportation Management Scope of Work states that liquidated damages for ICT #13 and #14 are \$2,000 per hour. Please identify the controlling unit for assessment of liquidated damages.	The TM Scope of Work is correct, Page 8 to be revised	Revise RFP
30	Transportation Management	426	7th paragraph	In light of the extended procurement, will the June 1, 2027, ICT #15 date be revised in the Fourth Industry Draft?	ICT #15 will be revised to account for the extended procurement, likely Oct 1, 2027	Revise RFP
31	Project Special Provisions	195	Item (B)	We request clarification that review, comment resolution, and updates of the CREF Deliverables are not linked to the review, approval/acceptance of RFC documents and will not affect progression of design plan, permit, or release for construction approval.	Confirmed. The provision will be revised to clarify that CREF deliverables are pilot deliverables and are not a gate on design plan review, RFC acceptance, permitting, right-of-way acquisition, or construction. CREF deliverables may be submitted with, or no later than 30 calendar days after, the corresponding RFC Plans are accepted for construction for the same limits of work. Department review of CREF deliverables is for pilot evaluation and coordination and does not replace the signed and sealed plans or other governing contract documents. Corrections to CREF deliverables will be limited to affected required digital deliverables when necessary for pilot use, such as a missing required file, incorrect format, coordinate system or units, corrupted file, or material inconsistency with the corresponding RFC Plans that prevents use of the CREF package for the pilot.	Check RFP; possible change
1	Project Special Provisions	pg. 175	1st and 3rd Paragraphs - Sound Barrier Wall/ Working Drawings and Architectural Concrete Surface Treatment:	The first paragraph states along US 1 / US 64 the Design-Build Team shall match the material, surface treatment and color of the existing steel pile exposed aggregate noise walls along US 1 / US 64. The third paragraph states along I-40 the architectural concrete surface treatment shall match the appearance to resemble an ashlar stone pattern on both sides of pre-cast concrete panels used for sound barrier walls. The TNR recommended reconstructing part of the existing exposed aggregate sound barrier wall as part of NW3 along westbound I-40 near Jones Franklin Road. Which surface treatment should be used if part of this existing wall is reconstructed?	There are two walls at this location(on shoulder and off shoulder). Assuming the break between the walls is maintained the new wall shall match the I-40 architectural concrete surface treatment. If the walls physically touch, we do not want two different patterns touching the same vertical pile	No action needed
2	Project Special Provisions	180-182, 216-229,377		Do the project special provisions regarding the diamond grinding and application of concrete penetrant sealer thickness that apply to bridge decks also apply to bridge approach slabs? If so, which ones?		?
3	Project Special Provisions	193		Does a minor drainage revision constitute a modification and submittal to the model due to field modification.	Not necessarily. A minor drainage revision or field modification does not automatically require an updated drainage model submittal. An update is required only when an accepted design or construction revision materially changes required modeled drainage information or required drainage attribute data previously submitted for the affected limits of work. Examples include material changes to drainage feature location, configuration, size, material, invert elevation, rim elevation, connectivity, or other required modeled features or attributes. Minor field adjustments, field modifications, or construction revisions that do not affect required modeled information or attribute data do not require an updated drainage model submittal. Where an update is required, it is limited to the affected files and limits of work. The Department may approve another submittal schedule when appropriate.	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
4	Project Special Provisions	195-205		Is it NCDOT's intent for every submittal through the life of the design process (pre-RFC and post-RFC) to include models and corresponding model files? Does this include designs not using models but using information from disciplines that did use models? The following statements seem somewhat contradictory and hard to follow: 191, 5th para: <i>Submit updated digital deliverables only when required by Sections VI(B) or VII(B), and limit updates to the affected files and affected limits of work.</i> 195, 4th paragraph: <i>CREF deliverables are not required before the design information has reached the corresponding RFC stage. Before RFC, the Design-Build Team shall provide model access, model views, reference files, or native design model files only as required by Section VIII of this Project Special Provision.</i> 198, 4th para: <i>Submit the applicable drainage network model and associated attribute data with the corresponding RFC drainage plans or roadway plans that include the permanent drainage features represented in the model.</i> 201, 4th para: <i>At each formal design submittal where roadway, drainage, or other model-based design information is included, provide access to applicable model views, reference files, or native design model files already developed to support the corresponding design submittal.</i>	No. It is not NCDOT's intent for every design submittal throughout the project to include models and corresponding model files. CREF packages are required only as described in Section VI(B), with, or no later than 30 calendar days after, the corresponding RFC Plans are accepted for construction. Drainage model deliverables are required only as described in Section VII(B), with the corresponding RFC drainage plans or roadway plans that include the permanent drainage features represented in the model. Pre-RFC model access under Section VIII(B) is separate and is for supplemental model review only. At formal roadway or drainage design submittals before RFC, the Design-Build Team is required to provide access only to applicable model views, reference files, or native design model files already developed to support that submittal. The Design-Build Team is not required to create, update, or submit model files solely to support permit submittals, right-of-way acquisition, or other non-RFC project milestones unless required elsewhere in the RFP. For disciplines or submittals that are not model-based, no model is required by this provision. Other model information may be made available for pilot evaluation when already developed, but doing so does not make that information a required digital deliverable under Sections VI or VII or change its contractual status.	Revise RFP
5	Project Special Provisions	201	Design Model Review Integration	What is the timeline for the Department to provide comments from the RFC model review? If access is provided to pre-RFC model files will they be subject to review, comment and the potential for a revise and resubmit? On past projects, anything submitted is subject to review and comment by the GEC. If more content to review is provided this will lead to more comments in earlier stages for design work that is not complete but shows in the model resulting in delays to the project. Can submittal of model files be limited to the RFC submittal?	Model review is supplemental and does not create a separate model review comment cycle, approval action, or revise-and-resubmit process. Comments resulting from model review, if any, will be provided through the Department's standard design review comment process and within the review period applicable to the corresponding formal design submittal. Pre-RFC model access under Section VIII(B) is limited to applicable roadway or drainage model views, reference files, or native design model files already developed to support the corresponding formal design submittal. Incomplete or in-progress model information will not, by itself, be considered a deficiency or require model resubmittal when consistent with the level of design development represented by that submittal and not otherwise inconsistent with the RFP or other governing contract documents. Model access will not be limited entirely to RFC because Design Model Review Integration is one of the pilot items being evaluated. However, the pre-RFC requirement is limited to access to already-developed applicable roadway or drainage model information. It does not require the Design-Build Team to prepare a separate model, update or clean up model files, or submit a formal CREF or drainage model deliverable before RFC solely for model review.	Check RFP; possible change
6	Project Special Provisions	209	Grouting Host Pipe	This section notes that grouting to fill voids in the soil around the host pipe is not included in the scope of pipe lining described by this special provision and will be paid for as found elsewhere in this RFP. Can a unit price of \$500 be added per CY of grout? (Host Pipe Before Lining (pg. 215).	Division is fine with a unit price of \$500/CY as a unit price.	Check RFP; possible change
7	Project Special Provisions	214	Post Installation Inspection	Can the warranty bond be used in lieu of the construction bond? The construction bond will have a significantly higher cost.		Check RFP; possible change
8	Project Special Provisions	214	Post Installation Inspection	Typical pipe repair warranties last 1 to 2 years. Can the current 5-year reinspection be reduced to 2 years? This change aligns the reinspection timeline with our standard contract period, or allows it to occur shortly after project completion. Since the project will be under NCDOT Maintenance during the period and Pg 244 says all warranty inspection will be by NCDOT, who will be responsible for access to the pipe for inspection as these areas may have grown up and the pipe maybe plugged with debris?	Department looking into this	Check RFP; possible change
9	General	236	1st Paragraph	The first paragraph still has a reference to Mr. Ron Davenport.	Will revise	Revise RFP
10	General	240-241 & 351	Last Bullet	The last bullet on page 240 notes the pavement Alternate chosen for I-440 / US 1 / US 64 will not be a part of the Technical Proposal evaluation and the selection thereof will not impact the Technical Scores; although an alternate pavement design, as approved as an ATC, may be considered in the evaluation. This statement currently conflicts with page 351's verbiage noting ATCs that provide an alternate I-5701 / I-5703 pavement design will not be considered.	Will clarify	Revise RFP
11	General	242	Schedule and Milestone, last bullet	Based on the revisions to the Contract Time Liquidated Damages section of the PSP, will the Department also require the Construction Completion Date be included in the Design-Built Team's schedule?	Will clarify	Revise RFP
12	Roadway	250	1st Arrow	Does the 10 foot maximum capped barrier width include the width of the single faced barrier? Is the maximum width of the closed median 38 feet or 41 feet?	Yes - Maximum 38 ft	No action needed
13	Roadway	251 / 256	2nd Bullet / Last Arrow	Adding 12' FDPS to the ramps at Gorman Street interchange and at Lake Wheeler will require paving the entire ramp up to the -Y- line. Does this mean that Gorman Street, Lake Wheeler Road, or Walnut St. need to be resurfaced between the ramps up to the existing bridge?	No. Ramps only	No action needed
14	Roadway	251	2nd Bullet	What are the limits of the widen shoulder as it approaches the existing intersection on Gorman St ramps. Adjusting the existing transitions may impact existing signal equipment	Expectation would be to stop approximately 100 ft short of the ramp intersection with Gorman St (clarify)	Revise RFP

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
15	Roadway	258-259	Beginning with 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?		?
16	Hydraulics	General Hydro / pg. 254 Roadway	4th Bullet Roadway	- NCDOT has indicated that the I-5701 section of I-40 is to utilize a mill and fill operation. In tangent sections of this part of the project as shown on the I-5338 plans (-L1- 28+00-32+00, 100+50-102+00, 174+00-234+00), the superelevation is one lane to the median at 0.02 and all other lanes / shoulder to the outside at 0.02. - HEC-22, page 4-5 states: <i>"On multi-lane highways where three (3) lanes or more are sloped in the same direction, it is desirable to counter the resulting increase in flow depth by increasing the cross slope of the outermost lanes. The two (2) lanes adjacent to the crown line should be pitched at the normal slope, and successive lane pairs, or portions thereof outward, should be increased by about 0.5 to 1%. The maximum pavement cross slope should be limited to 4% (Table 4-2)."</i> - Roadway page 254 states lane superelevation should be steepened as required to minimize hydroplaning potential. - Given there are no hydroplaning issues using the pavement surface that NCDOT directs in this section of the project, can the DB Team retain the existing superelevations regardless of the HEC-22 requirements?	Mill and fill as well as lack of hydroplaning accident history do not eliminate the hydroplaning requirements in the RFP. Hydroplaning risk is greater on new pavement due to the lack of surface texture, so hydroplaning incidents have the potential to occur on new pavement where there were previously none. The Roadway hydroplaning section on p. 254 refers to the Hydraulics hydroplaning section beginning on 310. The DBT shall follow the hydroplaning analysis requirements of the RFP.	No action needed
17	Environmental Permits	269	Last Paragraph	Can NCDOT update the 4B and 4C meeting dates based on the new schedule?	4B moved to Septeber 2027, 4C to November 2027	Revise RFP
18	Hydraulics	312, 319	2nd & 3rd Bullet	Why has the department differentiated between pipes that are less than 48" and all metal pipes 48" or greater for replacement? If a pipe is listed as Retain/Repair in the Pipe Evaluation Memo, is an RCP greater than 48", but is hydraulically deficient, can it be retained as long as it is supplemented and / or repaired? Page 319, third bullet only references supplementing CROSS DRAINAGE that is hydraulically deficient.	1)The department differentiates between pipe sizes because smaller pipes are less costly to replace, and metal pipes of all sizes are more likely to be deteriorated and in need of replacement. The clause this question refers to is (generally speaking) a fallback clause to be invoked for pipes that are not otherwise addressed by other provisions that govern pipes on the project. 2)Yes. An RCP pipe greater than 48" that is hydraulically deficient, listed as repair/retain in the memo, may be repaired/retained as long as it is supplemented and repaired if called for. 3)The question referencing p. 319 seems to be asking which pipes are and are not valid for supplementing (aka hydraulic mitigation). A broad answer without considering every possible scenario, is that pipes generally perpendicular to the travel lanes may be supplemented, including storm sewer outfalls and median cross drains. Designs that result in dual (or more) pipes immediately adjacent to one another that are generally parallel to the travel lanes are not acceptable.	No action needed
19	Hydraulics	312	3rd bullet - 4th Arrow	What is the departments expectations for the pipe runs that were found as 'inaccessible" within the structural integrity assessment provided? Pipes listed as incomplete are noted to remove but this verbiage is not specified in the RFP. There are currently 9 cross pipes ranging from 24" to 78" that were noted as inaccessible - can these pipes be retained and supplemented according to the remainder of the RFP?	These pipes will be governed by the fourth arrow on p. 319. If they remain inaccessible to the design build team, then they will be governed by the second bullet on p. 312.	No action needed
20	Hydraulics	312	3rd bullet - 4th Arrow	There are pipes currently missing from the FS file that are shown either within ArcGIS and/or the I-5338 FS file or I-5338 drainage design files. These cross pipes will need to be addressed within the I-5701/I-5703 projects design and were also not included within the structural integrity assessment. We currently count 4 cross pipes ranging from 24" to 36" in size that this applies to, shall these pipes be handled like the other "inaccessible" ones on the job? See previous question.	These pipes will be governed by the fourth arrow on p. 319. If they remain inaccessible to the design build team, then they will be governed by the second bullet on p. 312.	No action needed
21	Hydraulics	317	Second from the last bullet	The RFP notes, the Design-Build Team shall provide the Department with a pre / post analysis at the inlet of Culvert No. 910588 on Walnut Creek under I-440 near Jones Franklin Road. If this submittal results in additional work, will this work be considered supplemental to the contract?	Yes	No action needed
22	ITS	328,333	CCTV Cameras' Par. 1	p. 328 states 'The Design-Build Team shall install new CCTVs with all new equipment on new 70-foot metal poles with lowering devices at locations that provide optimum viewing of the primary route and any arterial routes.' p. 333, 'Wood Poles' section, bullet 1 states 'Use 60-foot Class 3 wood poles as defined in the ITS Project Special Provision for CCTV installations where required by this RFP.' Can NCDOT please specify which type of poles should be used for CCTV Assemblies?	Please use poles described in the CCTV section of the RFP.	No action needed
23	Lighting	337	2nd paragraph	How does the Department define the "Design revisions incorporated at the Design-Build Team's discretion"?	Wording will be clarified in next RFP.	Revise RFP
24	Pavement Management	342	Note 2	The RFP states that we are to remove the -Y1- southbound asphalt paved shoulder (constructed under U-2719) between stations 46+86 to 71+66 and replace with the tied concrete shoulder option. Can we use any of the three options?	No, only the tied concrete shoulder option shall be used. We will consider if additional wording would make this more clear	Check RFP; possible change
25	Pavement Management	257/347	Table 2	Can a pavement design for the Ramp B and Loop B at the Walnut Street interchange, Walnut Street, and Buck Jones Rd. be provided? Shouldn't the pavement designs for Dillard Drive and Piney Plains be removed from the RFP?	Yes, the ramp designs can be provided.	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
26	Public Information	358	3rd Paragraph	If the Design-Build Team uses their own qualified individual in lieu of using someone from NCDOT to fill the PI Technician, would they be compensated for their work by the Department?	If the DB team would like to use their own qualified individual, they should include those costs in the contract. If the DB team does not have a qualified individual on staff, then a qualified candidate from outside of the firm will be selected and compensated under a separate contract.	No action needed
27	Signing	366	Bullet 4	RFP states that signing plans should be prepared in accordance with “FHWA Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) 11th Edition”. FHWA has formally issued a ‘Version 11 with Revision 1’ dated December 2025. Can NCDOT confirm whether the signing plans should be prepared in accordance with ‘MUTCD version 11’ or ‘MUTCD version 11 with revision 1’?	Use MUTCD version 11 with Revision 1. Can adjust RFP to say “MUTCD Version 11 with latest revisions”.	Check RFP; possible change
28	Signing	368	Paragraph 2	Excluding Logo signs, the Design-Build Team shall replace all existing sign panels within 500 feet of the construction limits.' Can NCDOT please more clearly define 'construction limits'? Does this mean that all signs on Y-lines that cross the project limits but are not impacted need all signs replaced within the slope stakes plus 500' in each direction (Jones Franklin Rd over I-40, Avent Ferry Road over I-40, Lake Dam Rd over I-40, Trailwood Drive over I-40...)? Additionally, does this mean that advanced guide signs past the 500' offset from construction limits should be retained?	Do not replace signs on -Y- lines that do not interchange with I-40. Yes, if existing signs are past the 500 ft offset from construction limits, they should not be touched but retained. RFP can be modified if needed.	Revise RFP
29	Signing	368	Paragraph 3	Should references to the 'Dillard Drive exit' be revised to 'Walnut St exit'?	The Exit 101 from US-1 NB/US-64 EB does directly tie into Dillard Drive, so that is correct. If changes need to be made to messaging it should be “TO Walnut Street”. RFP can be modified if needed.	Revise RFP
30	Structures	377	Paragraph 2	Is the sacrificial thickness to account for diamond grinding 1/4 inch instead of the 1/4' written in the RFP?	Yes, ¼” minimum sacrificial thickness, not ¼’.	Revise RFP
31	Structures	377	Paragraph 2	Should the added 1/4" of sacrificial thickness be applied to approach slabs of all new I-40 interchange bridges?	Yes, ¼” minimum sacrificial thickness, not ¼’.	Check RFP; possible change
32	Structures	377	Paragraph 2	Should bridge decks and approach slabs include a total of 1/2" sacrificial depth to account for diamond grinding and monolithic wearing surface as defined in SMU section 6.2.2?	Minimum sacrificial depth of ¼”	Check RFP; possible change
33	Structures	380	Bullet 12	Is the rip rap required at the inlet of box culvert 910587 class II rip rap?	Yes, update RFP if needed.	Revise RFP
34	Structures	380	Bullet 12	Can a unit price be provided for the grout to be used to repair scour under box culvert 910587?	Division is okay adding a unit price.	Check RFP; possible change
35	Structures	380	Bullets 15,17	Can a unit price be provided for the crack sealing in box culvert 910587 and 910588?	Division is okay adding a unit price.	Check RFP; possible change
36	Structures	380	Last Paragraph	Are the repairs to the box culverts also to be paid for as extra work in the same manner as the repair items listed in the final paragraph on page 380?		Check RFP; possible change
37	Structures	380	Last Paragraph	Is the word "shall" missing before the word "be" in the existing text: "... and PPC overlay be paid for as extra work..."?	Yes...add "shall"	Revise RFP
38	Structures	381	Bullet 6	What is the difference between the rehab items of "replace joint" and "replace joint sealer material"? Does the unit price of \$117.85 per linear foot apply to both items?		Check RFP; possible change
39	Structures	381	Bullet 6	What is the preferred joint type to replace existing joints with?		Check RFP; possible change
40	Structures	381	Bullet 9	Can a unit cost for surface prep be added?	No	No action needed
41	Signal Systems	385	6th bullet	RFP states that signals shall be prepared in accordance with 'FHWA Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)'. Can NCDOT please specify which version?	11th edition is current version at time of TP and bid award. The revisions were technical revisions that should have minimal, if any, impacts to bid or specifications.	No action needed
42	Signal Systems	386-387	Charts	For construction limits, work now impacts signal detection loops for signals 05-1660 SR 1571 (Gorman Street at I-40/US 64 EB Ramps, 05-1729 SR 1571 (Gorman Street) at I-40/US 64 WB Ramps, and 05-1575 SR 1009 (Lake Wheeler Road) at I-40/US 64 EB Ramps. Will these signals require temp and final designs? If these signals will require designs, will they need to be brought up to current MUTCD and NCDOT Signal Design Manual Standards?	Signals should not operate pre-timed or on Recall for extended periods, however the nature of this work seems consistent with milling and resurfacing projects where loops are impacted. While we would like signals to be upgraded to current standards if they are not, that may be beyond the true scope of this project if ramps are just being surfaced, not widened. If additional lanes are being added to ramps, then plans are needed. If ramps are just being resurfaced with no additional lanes or widening, then no additional plans are needed and loops may be replaced using the attached standard which is also used in resurfacing contracts.	No action needed
43	Signal Systems	386	6th Paragraph	"At the option of the town of Cary, the signal may be designed to include a GPS activated Emergency Vehicle Preemption System." Will the Coordination with the Town, the additional design, and additional equipment for the potential Emergency Preemption be considered supplemental work and materials?	Town should provide materials for GPS EVP System, but signal plan(s) will need to be designed to reflect operation of EVP as needed as part of design. Signal 05-0270 already has EVP in design, so minor changes should be needed based on operation of GPS vs. current system.	No action needed
44	Transportation Management	400	IMP Incident Management Routes	Paragraph notes the Department will provide preliminary incident management routes with portable incident management ITS device locations. Can the department provide this information?	From STOC – Map will be provided for IMP Devices prior to next draft	Revise RFP
45	Transportation Management	403	Ped Accommodation Chart	Should Level of Pedestrian Accommodation be included for Lake Wheeler Road given the latest construction limits for the Lake Wheeler Road Ramps?	Yes, will be provided in next draft	Revise RFP
46	Transportation Management	425	5th paragraph	Should ICT’s in the last sentence be 3 to 7 instead of 1 to 4?	Yes, will be provided in next draft	Revise RFP
47	Transportation Management	426	1st Paragraph	Should ITC’s referenced in the second sentence be 13 and 14 instead of 11 and 12?	Yes, will be provided in next draft	Revise RFP
48	Transportation Management	426	7th paragraph	Should the date be extend based on the new bid date?	ICT #15 will be revised to account for the extended procurement, likely Oct 1, 2027	Revise RFP
49	Utilities	434	1st Bullet	Should the discussion about the Dillard Dr. transmission tower conflict be removed?	The RFP will be revised to reflect the change in that area. The discussion regarding the Dillard Dr. transmission tower conflict should be updated accordingly.	Revise RFP

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 3rd Q&A
----------	---------------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
	Structures	378	Last Paragraph	Page 378 states “Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, the Design-Build Team shall perform all rehabilitation work for the entire bridge. Rehabilitation work not listed below will be paid for as extra work in accordance with Subarticle 104-8(A) of the 2024 NCDOT Standard Specifications for Roads and Structures (Standard Specifications) at the unit prices noted below.” Should the “at the unit prices below” be removed from this statement so it doesn’t conflict with the last paragraph on pg. 380? Can the Department add verbiage to the RFP that notes that any rehabilitation work not listed in the inspection reports would be considered extra work.		Check RFP; possible change
	Structures	381		The bid average unit prices appear to only cover the one item when in fact several items are required to complete the scope as defined on pages 378-380. I have listed a few examples with the 2025 Central Let Bid Averages below for reference. RFP pg. 381: “• All replacement of joints will be paid for at the unit price of \$117.85 per linear foot.” Bridge 910582 requires Expansion Joint Seals for Preservation @ \$199.83 LF, Pourable Silicone Joint Sealant @ \$75.30 LF, Bridge Joint Demolition @ \$109.45 SF, & Elastomeric Concrete for Preservation @ \$699.27 CF Bridge 910583 & 910585 are similar. RFP pg. 381: “ All PPC overlay will be paid for at the unit price of \$2,990 per cubic yard” Bridge 910582 requires Polymer Concrete @ \$3,056.43 CY, Scarifying of Bridge Deck @ \$36.96 SY, Shot Blasting of Bridge Deck @ \$10.85 SY, Placing & Finishing of Polymer Concrete Overlay @ \$47.59 SY, & Concrete Deck Repair for Polymer Concrete Overlay @ \$422.16 SY Bridges 910583, 910584, & 910585 are similar. Can the additional unit prices be added to the RFP?	Bridge 910582 - Replacement joints will be foam joint seals(\$117.85 per linear foot). Header work is not anticipated. PC overlay material is sufficient to repair minor defects along headers as part of the overlay work	Check RFP; possible change
1	Roadway	250	Second paragraph	Are there any changes to the tie-in limits along I-440/US 1/US 64 since the introduction of the concrete capped median requirements?	Revised RFP to tie to U-2719 barrier	Revise RFP
2	Roadway	250	Second paragraph	There is an area along I-440/US 1/US 64 that will require a shift in travel lanes in order to not violate the maximum median shoulder width and maximum capped barrier width. Will the department consider increasing the maximum shoulder width or cap width?		Check RFP; possible change
3	Roadway			Please provide design criteria for Loop 3LD.	Same as other loops	No action needed
4	Roadway	257	1st paragraph	Is it the department's intent to resurface the remaining existing ramps at Walnut Street, Gorman Street, and Lake Wheeler Road up to the Y line terminals, or just to the alignment tie-in limits?	Y line terminals	No action needed
5	Structures	378-381		Please clarify whether the rehabilitation work identified in the "Rehabilitation of Existing Structures section including associated inspections, repair design/detailing, and construction support, is to be included in the Design-Build lump sum proposal. If not, pleasee clarify how proposers should account for rehabilitation items that are identified in the bridge- and culvert-specific scope, including those not included in the unit-price schedule.	It should be included in the LS proposal	Check RFP; possible change