

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

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
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
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 barrier, 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
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 frequncy 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
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
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 clariy 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
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 ¼" and is in addition to the minimum design thickness. The ¼" 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
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

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

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
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 beremoved 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
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?	Would allow a design exception for this location	Check RFP; possible change
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?	ECAP has no issue with moving the dates for the 4B and 4C meetings to reflect the extended procurement	Revise RFP
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
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
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 pole	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

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

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
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?	This is a contracting question. Hydraulics defers to ADU/Division. The special provision normally pays by the cubic yard of grout. Per the 2025 bid averages, host pipe grouting cost \$854 / cubic yard, with a total quantity of 110 cubic yards.	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
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
17	Environmental Permits	269	Last Paragraph	Can NCDOT update the 4B and 4C meeting dates based on the new schedule?	The dates can slide to correspond with the new schedule. As for the actual dates of these meetings, they are typically set by Hydraulics and usually occur on confirmed Merger Team dates.	Revise RFP
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
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
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
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, released December 2023 and subsequent revisions.	Check RFP; possible change
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?	Depending on nature of work and how it is performed. Signals cannot operate pre-timed or without detection; Yes	Check RFP; possible change
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

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

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
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
	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?	Will be revised	Revise RFP
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