Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 4th Q&A

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Project Special Provisions	All		With the Digital Delivery Pilot Project will the department consider issuing survey upgraded to the OpenRoads platform requirement established in the RFP? Will the department be managing ex Terrain and survey updates through the project design and piloting process or are survey updates anticipated to be the responsibility of the DBTs?	Survey and existing terrain responsibility is established in the Roadway Scope of Work, NCDOT Information Supplied, and is not altered by the Digital Delivery Pilot. Supplemental survey updates remain the responsibility of the Design-Build Team.	Request for Material
2	Project Special Provisions	196	First Sentence	"…and delivery of digital information as the design reaches RFC status…" implies that piloting efforts will have already begun prior to RFC. Throughout this special provision it is noted that the DD deliverables will need to be provided within 30 calendar days of the approved RFC package(s). Can the department confirm no CREF, drainage model or other DD deliverable will be required prior to RFC, other than the commonly required DGN design files for review at the milestone submittals?	Confirmed. No CREF, drainage model, or other Digital Delivery deliverable is required prior to RFC (Sections VI(B) and VII(B)). The only pre-RFC obligation is model access under Section VIII(B), limited to model information already developed for the corresponding formal roadway or drainage submittal, and consistent with the Design-Build Team's existing milestone submittal practice.	No action needed
3	Project Special Provisions	199	VI.B First Sentence	Can the department confirm this includes RFC Revisions?	Yes. RFC revisions are included, but an updated CREF package is required only when an accepted design or construction revision materially changes previously submitted CREF information (Section III). Material changes are limited to changes in modeled information, such as alignment, profile, surface, breakline, or planimetric feature location. Sheet numbering changes, drafting edits, annotation or note changes, and minor field adjustments that do not affect modeled information do not require an update. When an update is required, only the affected files and limits of work are resubmitted, with or within 30 calendar days after the revised RFC Plans (Section VI(B))	No action needed
4	Project Special Provisions	200	Note Removed	Per the Construction Ready Electronic Files Deliverables Workflows, the subgrade is part of the CREF process. Can the department confirm no subgrade related items will be required with the piloting effort?	Confirmed. Proposed subgrade surface files are not a required CREF file type for this pilot. The required file types are limited to the four listed in Section VI(C). Where the CREF Workflows document differs, Section V provides that this Project Special Provision governs.	No action needed
5	Project Special Provisions	200	VII C Last Sentence	Will the department consider providing updated survey intended to be used for piloting early to be accommodated by the DBT and before any DD piloting requirements?	The Digital Delivery Pilot does not include issuance of updated survey by the Department.	Request for Material
6	Roadway	261	2nd bullet, sub bullets 1-3	This allows for a maximum width of 41' from inside EOT to inside EOT. With the extension of the median barrier along US1 to the limits of U2719, the existing width from EOT to EOT is in excess of this requirement. Can the department confirm the intent is to maintain the existing roadway layout or is the DBT expected to widen the travel way to the inside median to accommodate this requirement?	There is no roadway geometry reason that the inside shoulder width is limited for this median. The decision was made to limit the inside shoulder to prevent vehicles parking or passing in a widened shoulder. The limiting of the concrete cap width is more of a maintenance concern. From a roadway perspective, the median width could be larger than the 41' it is currently limited to, if needed, without violating our guidance.	Check RFP; possible change
7	Roadway	261	2nd bullet, 3rd paragraph (Note 2)	Can the Department please clarify the intended median barrier treatment to be applied around the overhead sign. Should the barrier continue along each shoulder, but the capped area be blocked out so that the existing foundation remains accessible and exposed?	There should be a continual barrier	Check RFP; possible change
8	Roadway	268	Bullet No. 4	Milling will impact existing signal loops for the exit ramps. Please clarify in the signals section that only recutting and replacement of the loops are required, and that upgrades and improvements to existing signals will not be required.	Replacing what is there.	Check RFP; possible change
9	Roadway	270	Bullet No 2	This defines the limits of the noise analysis 800' beyond the roadway project limits. If noise walls are determined to be constructed 800' beyond the project limits, can the department confirm if the roadway construction limits will then need to be adjusted to the noise wall limits?	Roadway construction limits will not be extended to noise walls up to 800' beyond, to then have to go 800' more feet.	No action needed
10	Roadway	266	Bullet No 2	With the project being a similar design amongst all teams, will the Department specify whether hydroplaning improvements to cross slopes of the existing travel lanes are needed, as this is a significant cost and varies from the original scope/pavement design for this portion of I-40 as a mill/fill operation? This will put all teams on equal bidding levels for this area.	Hydroplaning section of RFP is being revised.	Revise RFP
11	Roadway	266	Bullet No 2	How does the Department want the Design Build Teams to handle hydroplaning on the existing concrete sections of US1?	Hydroplaning section of RFP is being revised.	Revise RFP
12	Pavement Management	362	3rd paragraph	Can the Department clarify which Y-lines are to be milled and overlayed? Walnut Street is anticipated due to the widening associated with the ramp/loop intersection. Is milling and overlay required for any Y-lines that do not intersect with the -L- or -Y1-? Is milling and overlay required on Y-lines where ramp work and paving is to be conducted?	The intent of this paragraph is not to create additional Y line resurfacing requirements, but rather, provide a pavement treatment for those that require resurfacing as required elsewhere in the RFP, but do not have a pavement treatment specified elsewhere. We will reword this paragraph to clarify the pavement treatments required are either: 1)already mentioned elsewhere in the pavement scope (i.e.: alignments already have individually mentioned pavement treatments), or 2) simple resurfacing as necessary/required per the roadway scope of work.	Revise RFP
13	Structures		Materials Provided	Can a PSP or reference to the standard specifications be provided to cover the following work items? Repair / Replace diaphragms Bridge Jacking Guardrail Repair / Replace Repair Scour and Undermining	Will provide the provisions and detail we have that are not covered in the standard drawings	Request for Material
14	Structures		Materials Provided	Please provide details and the PSP for welded beam repairs. Bolted beam repairs and beam cut out repairs were provided previously.	Will provide the provision	Request for Material

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 4th Q&A

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
15	Structures	395	Bridge Nos. 910582 910583	How should the cost of "Paint ends of girders" be accounted for?	Incidental to the lump sum price	No action needed
16	Structures	396	Bridge No. 910585	Are the web plating repairs listed intended to be bolted, welded, or cut out?	RFP specifiies bolted or welded	No action needed
17	Structures	397	BC Nos. 910587 910588	Are all box culvert repairs to be considered incidental? If not, provide pay items for the work listed.	Unit price provided for grout voids under culvert and repair culvert spalls and cracks	Revise RFP
18	Structures	397	First paragraph, 6th bullet	The unit price for replacement of joints was deleted. Foam joint seals and new joint sealer material are now required on the four I-40 structures across I-440/US1/US64. How should the cost of these joints be accounted for?	Incidental to the lump sum price. Bridge joint demolition will be paid where required, but excludes the removal of elastomeric concrete	Revise RFP
19	Structures		Materials Provided	Will the department provide concrete patching plans for the rehab bridges? Using the inspection reports we are not getting the same quantities as the provided bill of material.	No	No action needed
20	Structures		Rehabilitation of Existing Structures	Based on previous Q&A responses, load rating of existing structures is not required. How are the beam repair plates to be sized? Should teams assume the minimum?	Drawings provided as materiasl available give required plate sizes	Request for Material
21	Structures		Materials Provided	Will the department provide steel beam repair plans for the rehab bridges? Using the inspection reports we are not getting the same quantities as the provided bill of material.	No plans to be provided. Standard detail sheets provided as materials available	No action needed
22	Structures		Rehabilitation of Existing Structures	Will the department consider removing the remainder of the listed rehabilitation work for the specified bridges but still require that work to be performed and paid for as extra work?	No	No action needed
23	Transportation Management	416	2	ICT #13 is for Gorman St Ramp Closures. Did the Department intend to reference ICT #15 for Restriping instead of ICT #13 as originally intended in the second draft of the RFP	Yes, the exception is intended for the initial installation of WZ performance markings.	Revise RFP
24	Transportation Management	417	3	IMP Incident Management routes now requires 10 connected CMS for incident management routes. Is that in addition to or part of the 22 already required per page 424, last paragraph, solely for incident management		
25	Transportation Management	433	Bullet 2	Can we use regular surface course in lieu of ultra thin bond in temporary conditions then mill off and replace with ultra thin during final paving?	Ultrathin will need to be replaced due to hydroplaning/surface roughness concerns. This bullet point will be updated to require ultrathin replacement in locations where existing pavement has ultrathin.	Revise RFP
26	Transportation Management	361	Last Paragraph	The current RFP states that the pavement of all ramps/loops and WB I-40 CD within the I-40/I-440/US 1 interchange be removed and replaced with new pavement structure as required. However, the RFP does not specify an ICT for a long-term closure for Loop 'B' and the adjacent WB I-40 CD. Can the Department confirm that Loop 'B' and adjacent WB I-40 CD remain open with no long-term closure allowed during construction?	ICT will be added to allow 15-day closure contingent upon -21RAC- being open to traffic.	Revise RFP
27	Transportation Management	443	ICT #15	It appears that NCDOT Maintenance is currently restriping I-40. Do the ICT and associated LDs still apply as identified in the RFP?	ICT will likely be revised to only require US-1 to be restriped.	Check RFP; possible change
28	Hydraulics	326	Bullet 4	For the existing RCBC, BP-092-2017, located between Lake Wheeler Road and Trailwood Drive with upstream end near 35°45'13.3"N 78°40'56.8"W: With the drainage area being large with a moderate impervious area there will be several assumptions made in the hydrologic analysis to develop sizing for the potential supplemental conduit needed for this crossing. Will the Department consider dictating the proposed supplemental size/conveyance for all teams? Due to the anticipated size and length of the potential supplemental pipe crossing, this will be one of the higher risk items on the project.	No. The DBTs may submit an ATC in accordance with p. 324 of the RFP.	No action needed
29	Hydraulics	328	Bullet 6	For the existing 54" CSP at -L- Sta. 167+63: With the drainage area being large with a moderate impervious area there will be several assumptions made in the hydrologic analysis to develop sizing for the potential supplemental conduit needed for this crossing. Will the Department consider dictating the proposed supplemental size/conveyance for all teams? Due to the anticipated size and length of the potential supplemental pipe crossing, this will be one of the higher risk items on the project.	No. The DBTs may submit an ATC in accordance with p. 324 of the RFP.	No action needed
30	Hydraulics	324	2nd Bullet	Can Payment for structurally deficient pipes be paid for as extra work after coordination with the Department on structural mitigation determination	No	No action needed
31	Hydraulics	324	2nd Bullet	Is there a preferred method for structural rehabilitation	Yes. CIPP or Fold and Form as stated on p. 325, third arrow.	No action needed
32	Hydraulics	324	2nd Bullet	The RFP states that the department may reconsider replacement after the DBT conducts analysis of the pipes. Does this include pipes that are marked as being able to be retained in the pipe assessment.	No. Pipes called out as Retained in the RFP are intended to be retained.	No action needed
33	Hydraulics	324	2nd Bullet	Present pipe sizing as an ATC. Does this mean we can submit our analysis of the culverts before award. What does this submittal look like?	Yes. The submittal would likely contain information sufficient to secure DOT's agreement on the fate of a particular pipe or pipes for the purpose of refining the bid price of the project. The DBT may wish to present a camera inspection to seek DOT's agreement that a pipe slated for replacement under the provisions of the RFP is in sufficiently good condition to be retained, and/or lined, and/or supplemented. The DBT may wish to present hydraulic sizing calculations to seek DOT's agreement on the size of a supplemental pipe or pipes.	No action needed

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 4th Q&A

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
34	Hydraulics	331	2nd Bullet	For analyzing the y line cross pipes, it says that you don't have to analyze if you are adding no additional discharge. What is considered no additional discharge? There are multiple pipes under Lake Wheeler and Gorman that have drainage areas where there is additional pavement. Is it the intent to supplement or replace these pipes under this contract? Can the language be changed to no additional drainage area?	Additional discharge for the purposes of this project is an increase in cubic feet per second from the pre construction condition to the post construction condition, and may possibly be caused by an increase of impervious within a constant drainage area. Pipes within the project limits that do not qualify for this limited exemption would be subject to supplementation and/or replacement in accordance with the RFP language.	No action needed
35	Hydraulics		Materials Provided	With I-5701 essentially being a similar design amongst all teams, will the Department consider updating the Preliminary Hydraulic Report with a Department preferred hydraulic sizing/mitigation at each crossing along I-40? The Hydraulic Crossings and the Structural Mitigation are a significant cost and carry a significant amount of risk. This will put all teams on equal bidding level and reduce risk and cost to the Department.	No. The DBTs may submit an ATC in accordance with p. 324 of the RFP.	No action needed
37	Lighting	351	New Lighting Systems - 2nd Paragraph	The Department's Preliminary Lighting Plans have been previously developed and roadway geometry and design criteria that have subsequently been revised by the Department in the RFP, including changes to the flyover ramp design criteria and the Piney Plains Road area and associated ramp connections. The Lighting Scope of Work states that the Department will compensate the Design-Build Team for additional lighting construction costs resulting from Department-directed design revisions and/or errors or omissions in the Preliminary Lighting Plans, while the Design-Build Team is responsible for additional costs resulting from revisions incorporated at its discretion. Please confirm that lighting revisions required solely to reconcile the Department's Preliminary Lighting Plans with the updated roadway criteria and design in drafts of the RFP will be considered Department-directed revisions and/or errors or omissions in the Preliminary Lighting Plans, and that the resulting additional lighting construction costs will be compensated by the Department. Please also confirm whether updated Preliminary Lighting Plans reflecting the Final RFP baseline will be issued before the Price Proposal due date. If updated plans will not be issued, please identify the lighting configuration and quantities that proposers shall use as the basis for their Price Proposals.	Yes, the Department will compensate the DBT for the lighting changes required as a result of Department directed design revisions. The Department will not compensate for additional lighting required for any ATCs implemented at the Team's discretion. The changes to the Roadway criteria in the RFP are considered Department directed design revisions. Updated preliminary lighting plans showing these revisions will be available in a few weeks.	No action needed
38	Project Special Provisions	199 / 202-205	Digital Delivery Pilot VI(B) + VII(B)	Section VI(B) permits CREF deliverables to be submitted up to 30 calendar days after the corresponding RFC Plans are accepted and states that CREF deliverables are not a condition of RFC acceptance or beginning construction. Section VII(B), however, requires the drainage network model and associated data to be submitted with the corresponding RFC plans. Please clarify.	The drainage network model is a separate pilot item from CREF (Section I(B); Section VIII(B)). The Department considers the drainage network model to be a source file for the RFC drainage plans. It is developed in the NCDOT OpenRoads Designer workspace as part of the Design-Build Team's drainage design (Section VII(C)), so delivering it is not intended to be a substantial additional effort. Because the drainage model is developed with the design, the Department expects drainage model information to be available through model review access at formal drainage design submittals before RFC, as described in Section VIII(B). Section VII(B) will be revised to align with Section VI(B): the formal drainage model deliverable may be submitted with, or no later than 30 calendar days after, the corresponding RFC Plans are accepted for construction, and is not a condition of RFC submittal, RFC acceptance, permit submittal, right-of-way acquisition, or beginning construction.	Revise RFP
39	Transportation Management	8 / 443	Other Liquidated Damages and Incentives / ICT #13 and #14	The Other Liquidated Damages and Incentives provision states that liquidated damages for ICT #13 and #14 are $2,000 per calendar day or any portion thereof. The Transportation Management Scope states that liquidated damages are $2,000 per hour or any portion thereof. The response to the Third Q&A confirmed that the Transportation Management Scope controls and that the Project Special Provision would be revised; however, the discrepancy remains in the Fourth Industry Draft. Please revise the RFP and confirm that the controlling liquidated-damages unit for ICT #13 and #14 is $2,000 per hour or any portion thereof.	ICT #13 and ICT #14 LDs are intended to be per hour because they are 56 consecutive hours. Page 8 will be updated.	Revise RFP
40	Roadway	270	2nd bullet	The I-5703 Traffic Noise Report (TNR) notes NW2 on pdf page 77 of 310 on the I-40 Eastbound side and on pdf page 30 of 310 NW2 is noted as likely. NW2 extends greater than 800 feet from the limits western limits of the I-40 work as shown in the preliminary plans provided by the Department. A portion of NW2 is shown in the shoulder of I-40 eastbound at the I-40 over Walnut Creek culvert. Please confirm through RFP revision NW2 will extend the limits of the project's roadway work (construction of wider shoulders, resurfacing, guardrail etc) to the end of the NW2 as constructed on the shoulder along with its corresponding guardrail attachment.	Roadway construction limits will not be extended to noise walls up to 800' beyond, to then have to go 800' more feet.	Check RFP; possible change
41	Roadway	268	3rd arrow bullet	The I-5703 Traffic Noise Report (TNR) notes NW2 on pdf page 77 of 310 on the I-40 Eastbound side and on pdf page 30 of 310 NW2 is noted as likely. NW2 extends greater than 800 feet from the limits western limits of the I-40 work as shown in the preliminary plans provided by the Department. NW1 is not proposed along the shoulder of the I-40 Westbound lanes. Please confirm the limits of resurfacing on I-40 westbound are to be resurfaced to the same length of the I-40 eastbound work and the existing shoulder does or does not need to be widened solely for the purpose of matching resurfacing for each side of the median.	Roadway construction limits will not be extended to noise walls up to 800' beyond, to then have to go 800' more feet.	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 4th Q&A

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
42	Hydraulics	325	4th bullet	The fourth bullet states that pipes noted in the assessment as incomplete, other and or inaccessible shall be replaced. The pipes in the median of I-40 as shown in median under the barrier for the I5338 were noted as incessible. The Department provided files note these as RCP in short sections across the barrier width. Given the relative age of this project and the scope of work necessary to replace these pipes (barrier removal, traffic staging, etc.) we request the department clarify the RFP that replacement is not required as it relates to the pipe networks constructed under the Fortify I-5338 project and that inspection of these pipes would be evaluated post award through the extra work provisions of the standard specifications.	In discussion	Check RFP; possible change
43	Hydraulics	334-335	Last Bullet on Page 334	The RFP ties 60% ROW, 100% drainage, and acceptance of the ROW plans to moving forward with the 4C meeting. Additionally, ROW approval is tied to approval of permanent utility easements. This, combined with the 7-week lead time of the 100% hydraulic submittal to NCDOT prior to the 4 C meeting, does not align with the two month window between 4B and 4C in the RFP. Additionally, on page 283 of the RFP (last paragraph), the environmental permits scope of work states that teams should expect up to 7 months to accurately and adequately complete all design necessary for the permit application. Please advise if the verbaige pertaining to the " ... 7 month period" requires updating to match the current RFP requirements.	looking into a change	Check RFP; possible change
45	Other	Provided Materials	I-5701 / I-5703 Draft Operational Risk Assessment	The referenced document provides the Preliminary Incident Management Routes and associated risks. Within the document, several mitigation measures are also suggested. What are NCDOT's expectations for the DB Teams and these mitigation efforts? Examples include signal upgrades, a towing contract, additional CCTV cameras, etc.	Since there is no formal ICM Plan for this project there is not an additional list of off-project cameras, signal timing changes, or dynamic trailblazer signs related to the ICM Plans like there have been for some recent past projects. There will be a tow contract as stated in the RFP. Division 5 will manage the tow contract; DB team will have coordination with D5 and the tow companies as part of their incident management plan.	No action needed
46	Project Special Provisions	pg. 179	2nd Paragraph - Sound Barrier Wall/ Working Drawings and Architectural Concrete Surface Treatment:	The second paragraph states along I-40 the Design-Build Team shall use the same source of form liner and have no color stains for all sound barrier wall panels and retaining walls. The architectural concrete surface treatment shall match the appearance (stone size, stone shape, stone texture, pattern and relief) of natural stone to resemble an ashlar stone pattern on both sides of pre-cast concrete panels used for sound barrier walls and exposed faces of retaining walls to match. The current noise walls along I-40 are exposed aggregate which will not match the requested ashlar stone pattern required. Is this the Departments intent as the TNR proposes modifying a portion of the existing I-40 noise wall.	If the new wall extends or physically touches the exsiting aggregate wall then it shall be built to match the wall it touches. All sound walls that do not physically touch an existing sound wall alon I-40 shall be unstained ashlar stone pattern	No action needed
47	ITS	General		Can NCDOT provide the final design ITS plans for I-5338?	Posted to materials available	Request for Material
48	Hydraulics	324	2nd Bullet	Can additional information be provided for the CPM schedule submitted with the proposal? Is the intention to only list the pipes not in the I-5701 - I-5703 Pipe Evaluation Memo_Final_Aug20206.pdf? Should these be shown individually in the construction schedule? No other individual crossings / pipes are shown the construction schedule unless they are major crossings. If this refers to the drainage summary as a "schedule", this is not submitted in the proposal either. Please provide clarification.	The DBT will formulate the construction schedule with the assumption that certain pipes will be replaced, as determined by the RFP language. The intent of this RFP language is to ensure time for pipe replacement is appropriately included in the schedule. It is not the intent to individually list every pipe in the schedule.	Check RFP; possible change
49	Pavement Management	356	2nd Paragraph (Note 2)	The 4th Draft RFP added the word "only." Does this mean the tied concrete is the only allowed replacement? Or does the note apply only when we use the tied concrete shoulder option so we could keep the asphalt otherwise?	Yes. Only tied concrete shoulders are allowed for this area due to the geometry and thickness of the existing travel lane.	No action needed
50	Pavement Management	362	Table 2	The RFP provided pavement designs for Quadrants B, C, and D at the Walnut St. interchange, should this be quadrants A, B, and C, as the ramp on Quadrant D is required to be removed?	The intent is to be any ramps used in the interchange. Will revise to make it more clear.	Revise RFP
51	Pavement Management	268, 362	2nd Arrow (p. 268) 3rd Paragraph (p. 362)	The RFP requires the DB Teams to uniformly mill and overlay the existing pavement on all -Y- lines including those shown on the public hearing map. Does this include streets such as Walnut St., and Buck Jones Rd, and should Dillard Dr. and Piney Planes Rd. be excluded as they are shown as mill and fill overlay in the public hearing map.	The intent of this paragraph is not to create additional Y line resurfacing requirements, but rather, provide a pavement treatment for those that require resurfacing as required elsewhere in the RFP, but do not have a pavement treatment specified elsewhere. We will reword this paragraph to clarify the pavement treatments required are either: 1)already mentioned elsewhere in the pavement scope (i.e.: alignments already have individually mentioned pavement treatments), or 2) simple resurfacing as necessary/required per the roadway scope of work.	Revise RFP
52	Pavement Management	366	1st Bullet	Concrete Slab and spalls replacement: This work will be performed at the very start of the project with an ICT and LD's. Can this work be performed by using the NCDOT Standard drawings and not require an approved traffic control plan? Can the Department provide an estimated quantity as well?	Yes, assuming it's nightly lane closures and you only need RSDs. The RFP still applies to this work. if proposing to place PCB for the work or need to detour ramps, then we'd need to see some type of early work plans. We can provide quantities used for estimating. Quantities are for reference only	Request for Material

Project:	I-5701 / I-5703 - 4th Q&A

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
53	Signing	381	P. 2, Bullet 4	RFP has been revised so that Signing Plans shall be prepared in accordance with MUTCD 11th Edition (including latest revisions). MUTCD Version 11 with Revision 1 Table 2E-4, Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes for Freeway Guide Signs According to Interchange Classification, added an asterisk in the overhead column with note: "Where a larger size is shown for the interchange classification of the interchange, that larger size is used for overhead-mounted guide signs for that interchange." We interpret, using NCDOT's Functional Classification Map as well as MUTCD's Section 2E.11, Interchange Classification, that the interchange of I-440 / US 1 / US 64 at I-40 / US 64 is a "Major, Category a" interchange, that the interchange of I-40 at Gorman St is an "Intermediate" interchange, that the interchange of I-40 at Lake Wheeler Rd is an "Intermediate" interchange, that the interchange of I-440 / US 1 / US 64 at Walnut St is an "Intermediate" interchange, that the interchange of I-440 / US 1 / US 64 at Jones Franklin Rd is an "Intermediate" interchange, and that the interchange of I-40 at Cary Towne Blvd is an "Intermediate" interchange. Can NCDOT verify that these are the correct interchange classifications? Can NCDOT also verify that the larger and desirable sizes shown in MUTCD Table 2E-4, 'Major' columns will be required for all guide signs associated with the US 1 / US 64 / I-440 at I-40 / US 64 interchange?	Yes, the Department would similarly classify the listed interchanges as the Team interpreted by Section 2E.11 of the MUTCD. The Department would classify the US 1 / US 64 / I-440 at I-40 / US 64 interchange as Major Category A needing larger sizes for shields and fonts on overheads due to the interchanging of two interstates: Interstate 40 and Interstate 440. It is the Department's practice for consistency to use larger shield and font sizes for other overhead guide signs that may share the same sign structures with interstate-to-interstate connections.	No action needed
54	Structures	396	Bridge No. 9100584	The RFP now requires the complete removal of the existing LMC overlay on the bridge deck and approach slabs, and applying PC overlay. Will traffic be allowed on the bridge deck after the existing LMC overlay has been removed but prior to applying the PC overlay?	Yes, if fine milled or diamond grinded AND the condition of the deck is deemed acceptable by the Team and Department at that time.	Check RFP; possible change
55	Transportation Management	443	7th Paragraph	The date for completion of installing the Work Zone Performance Markings has been revised to Oct. 1, 2027. Can this date be extended to match up with the concrete repairs and repaving, so pavement markings don't have to be put down twice?	No, the date will remain as Oct 1.	No action needed
56	Utilities	455	1st Paragraph	Can the department include the Utility Construction Agreement Package that is submitted with the RFC Utility Plans which are for review and approval, be part of the RFC submittal review period. We suggest a review period of 45 days to allow for both the Plans and the Utility Construction Agreement be fully executed.		
58	Signing	383	5	Can the Department please clarify in the RFP the exact signing lmits along Gorman Street where new signing is desired.	The Department would prefer to replace signing on the Gorman Street deceleration ramps at least up to the Stop/Yield lines at the ramp termini intersections. This is an attempt to bring guide signs up to current MUTCD standards, as well as to refresh signing for wrong way movements on these ramps. Signs on the -Y- line of Gorman Street are exempt.	Check RFP; possible change
59	Hydraulics	326	4th bullet, 1st sub-bullet	RFP states RCBC to be retained and not lined as per the definitions associated with the Department's structural integrity assessment. Based on the Pipe Condition Evaluation titled: "I-5701 – I-5703 Pipe Evaluation Memo_Final_Aug20206," the RCBC was not included in the study. Is there an additional study that the D-B Team is not aware of?	The additional study was a simple field visit to observe the condition of the pipes. There is no associated report or videos.	No action needed
60	Hydraulics	326	4th bullet, 1st sub-bullet	Can the RCBC be retained without supplemental pipe?	Not necessarily. This will need to be determined by the DBT.	No action needed
61	Hydraulics	326 & 327	6	RFP states that the existing pipes at five locations shall be retained and repaired as per the definitions associated with the Department's structural integrity assessment. Based on the Pipe Condition Evaluation titled: "I-5701 – I-5703 Pipe Evaluation Memo_Final_Aug20206," all five of these pipes are shown as "Inaccessible." Is there an additional study that the D-B Team is not aware of?	The Retain and Repair status in the 6th bullet referenced by this question supersedes the Inaccessible designation within the pipe evaluation memo. The additional study was a simple field visit to observe the condition of the pipes.	No action needed
62	Hydraulics	326 & 327	6	Can these pipes be retained without supplemental pipes?	Most likely not, but this will need to be determined by the DBT. The pipes do not contain any sediment deposits, and some have downstream scour holes; which are indicative of being undersized.	No action needed
63	Hydraulics	326 & 327	6	What criteria did the Department use to determine that the 5 cross pipes listed in bullet 6 can be retained and repaired	A field visit and visual inspection revealed that the pipes are in need of lining due to failing existing cementitious liners, joint separation, and / or corroded inverts. No evidence of pipe collapse or other failure that would prevent the free flow of water was observed from the ends of the pipes during the field visit.	No action needed