

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
1	Environmental	276	Paragraph 3	Will the Department provide the Merger Packets for Concurrence Point 3 and 4A to help us verify baseline impact numbers and avoidance/minimization information?	See the NCDOT Connect Site for the Project (I-5719B_U-5800) Materials Provided/Merger Concurrence Forms	No action needed
2	Environmental	275	Paragraph 2	Previous response to questions pertaining to species surveys indicated that plant surveys are complete and bat surveys are forthcoming. Will NCDOT be requesting concurrence once those are received, and if so, is there a time limit for how long the concurrence will be valid? Is there risk of concurrence expiring prior to the start of construction?	NCDOT-ECAP will be requesting concurrence from the USFWS once the Bat Survey Memo has been received. There is no expiration date included in Concurrence Letters; however, surveys (for tricolored bat, Schweinitz's sunflower, and Dwarf-flowered heartleaf) will need to be kept up to date for the concurrence to remain valid. To be valid, surveys need to occur within 2 years prior to initiation of tree cutting/bridge demolition for each section of the project.	No action needed
3	Roadway	264	2nd Bullet	Curves at -L- NB 544+17.05 to 557+97.84 (required SSD= 655', provided SSD=643') and NB 410+45.01 to 417+05.56 (required SSD= 677', provided SSD=634') do not meet the required stopping sight distance when grade is considered. The longitudinal profile grades at both locations are below 3% currently. AAHSTO allows longitudinal profile grades to be disregarded when below 3%. Did the Department consider the grade when calculating the preliminary SSD? Can the Department confirm grades should not be included in the SSD calculation when below 3%?	It is near the 3% mark, so that would be appropriate. However, with the posted speed at 60mph, if the SSD meets that, no design exception is needed. (calculations above appear to be for 65mph design speed)	No action needed
4	Roadway	393	Paragraph 6	In response to the previously submitted Confidential Question #24, the RFP requires 14' shoulder along ramps where retaining wall are present. The DB Team would like to propose a shoulder width of 8' in sections with walls for ramps Y6RPA and Y6RPB.	No	No action needed
5	Roadway				Per request of the DBT Question #5 was rescinded	No action needed
6	Roadway	254	4th Bullett	Previously, question 119 was asked regarding the median width of -Y7A- being increased over the preliminary design from 16.5' to 23'. This will increase the right of way impacts to the adjoining parcels. Please confirm it is the Departments intent to have additional right of way impacts in this are exceeding what was shown in the preliminary plans.	Yes, the RFP governs over the Preliminary Plans. However, the DBT should minimize the amount of Right of Way to be acquired and avoid impacts to structures.	No action needed
7	Roadway	260	Last Bullet	The RFP states "The mainline grade point and crown point shall be located such that the inside two lanes in each direction of travel slope towards the median and the remaining lanes slope towards the outside." However, the NCDOT plans indicates the grade point is shifted at station 554+25.00 so that only one lane slopes towards the median, and the remaining 4 lanes slope towards the outside. Will the RFP be revised to clarify if this is acceptable.	Disregard the grade point shift shown in the Preliminary Plans. The DBT shall provide the grade point shift for both north and south bound lanes between Station 589+50± -L- to Station 591+50+ -L- from the existing to proposed roof top crown point as noted in the RFP	Revise RFP
8	Signing	Hearing Map 10		End TIP I-5719/End Lane Restriping is shown at the bridge. For SB I-85, the hearing map shows 5 lanes of travel coming into the project limits. However, existing condition has 4 lanes of travel for SB I-85. SB I-85 between approximately -L- Sta. 550+00 and the SB I-85 Weigh Station entrance ramp was restriped between 6/2018 and 5/2019. Will the bridge striping be revised to match the 5 lanes entering the project limits (with an EXIT ONLY lane for Exit 27) or will we have the existing 4 lanes (with a traditional deceleration lane for Exit 27)?	No, The bridge is to be restriped for four (4) southbound lanes with a parallel exit ramp for -Y8RPA-	No action needed
9	Roadway	393	Paragraph 6	The RFP states "The minimum horizontal setback from the closest edge of travel lane to the face of barrier in front of walls shall be 14'-0" for bridges over interstates, freeways, and arterials." However, the concept plans provided show and 18' full depth paved shoulder under the -Y6- bridge and there are not any proposed future lanes. Will the RFP be revised to clarify the exact shoulder width under structures over interstates, freeways, and arterials?	The RFP governs, provide a horizontal setback of 14'-0" from the edge of travel to the face of barrier.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
10	Hydraulics	317	Hydroplaning Section	In areas of the project that are strictly overlay (i.e. the mainline near NC 273), are the teams required to check for hydroplaning? If so, if mitigation is required, steepening superelevation is not really feasible and would require OGFC which is very costly for these long runs.	Yes, the DBTs are to check for hydroplaning. See Pavement Management SOW , UTBWC has been added as a pavement coarse.	No action needed
11	Roadway	255	Last Bullet	The RFP notes that Design-Build Team shall design and construct at-grade intersections with the lane configurations noted in the I-5719 Project Level Traffic Forecast Report. The lane configurations are actually shown in the Future Year Tech Memo FINAL_07-12-2024.	Page reference is 259, 1st bullet - Yes the reference should be I-5719_Traffic_Analysis_Future_Year_Tech_Memo_Final_07-12-2024 The Department will revise the RFP.	Revise RFP
12	General	70	Bullets 1-4	Projects I-5719E, I-5719FB, I-5719FD, and I-5719FC were added to the section "Cooperation Between Contractors". Can the Department provide any preliminary plans, schedule, or additional information about these projects to help the Teams accurately estimate any conflicts?	Anticipated completion dates are as follows: I-5719E - December 2026 I-5719FB - September 2030 I-5719FC - August 2030 I-5719FD - September 2033 The Department will post plans when available.	No action needed
13	Roadway	253	third bullet	The Roadway Scope of the RFP, pg. 250 third bullet notes that, <i>"Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, excluding the transitions required to tie to the existing median widths at the southern and northern project limits, the Design-Build Team shall design and construct a minimum 27-foot full depth paved median along the -L- Line. Excluding the transitions required to tie to the existing median barrier at the southern and northern project limits, the Design-Build Team shall design and construct Type T or single slope double-faced concrete median barrier."</i> The design-build team needs to know if it is the intent of the Department to eliminate the spread median section of I-85 -L- Sta. 474+00 to 515+00+/- . As the RFP is currently written it implies that median barrier protection should apply to the entire mainline.	The Department intent is to retain the spread median. The RFP will be revised.	Revise RFP
14	Roadway	254	First Bullet	Can the Department confirm parallel exit/entrances at Ramps A, B and D with an angular exit for ramp C? With the sketch we just want to make sure this is the intent.	No. All are parallel. Y6RPC connects to (future)Y5RPD as continuous aux lane. The stripping for the temporary Ramps B and C can be angular.	No action needed
15	Roadway	255	Fifth Bullet	Based on the answers to the first Q and A (question 18) and the updated 2nd industry draft to mill and resurface the ramps, the team is preparing resurfacing grades for the Beatty ramps up to the ramp terminal intersection. With these ramps, there are some existing vertical deficiencies that would need to be retained to avoid significant additional wedging through the gores and possibly additional overlay on the mainline. The following elements are within the gore area for the ramps and don't need upper range speed (55 mph) which is the preference noted in the RDM 9.4.1.1 Table 9-1: -Y8RPA- - existing super meets 40 mph and sage curve meets 46 mph; -Y8RPD- - existing super meets 50 mph; and Y8RPB - existing sag curve meets 50 mph. To limit additional right of way and wedging, can these elements be added to the RFP to indicate that they can be retained even though they don't meet the preferred design for ramps?	All Ramps at -Y8- are to be milled and filled 1.5 inches, i.e., mill and fill matches the existing profile(s) and does not require a resurfacing grade. Unrelated but the ramps should be restriped to drop the outside lane. For the super and vertical, The Department does not have an issue retaining the elements noted unless there has been a history of crashes at these locations.	No action needed
16	Roadway	255	5th Bullet	Adding 14-foot outside shoulders to -Y8RPD-, the existing expressway gutter along the entrance ramp (STA. XX+XX to XX+XX) would need to shift out to the 14-foot offset which would require impacts to the existing cut slopes. Using a max cut slope of 4:1 to the back of the clear zone also requires cutting into this slope which would require impacts to the fence of an existing metal fabrications building and possibly a billboard in quadrant D. Can the existing shoulder width be maintained or a steeper slope be used to avoid right of way impacts at this location?	Recommend allowing a steeper slope within the clear zone as long as you have six ft of 4:1 behind the expressway gutter low point (4' from outside of concrete gutter) before transitioning to 2:1. The slope must be free from obstacles within the clear zone, but the steep slope itself is not a hazard.	Revise RFP

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
17	Roadway	255	5th Bullet	Should the wider 12-foot paved shoulder for -Y8RPB- and -Y8RPD- run all the way to the back of the free flow right spurs? Additional right of way and utilities impacts may be needed to install the shoulders all the way to the back of the spurs. Please clarify if the intention is for the wider shoulders along the ramp only.	For Ramps B & D - ramps only	No action needed
18	Roadway	255	7th Bullet	To meet gore controls and avoid undercutting the existing ramps -Y8RPA- and -Y8RPD-, the mainline overlay of 1.5" is not sufficient. Based on laying out initial ramp grades, a mill and overlay of 3" along the mainline would be necessary through the gore of the -Y8RPA- and -Y8RPD- ramps. Can the mainline work be updated to include 1.5" milling with 3" overlay through the gores approximately Sta. 609+50?	I-85 (Sta. 594+00± -L- to Sta 627+38± -L-) and the Ramps A, B, C & D are to be mill and fill 1.5 inches - please clarify questions.	No action needed
19	Roadway	255	7th Bullet	Please explain what coordination will need to occur and the expectation for design and construction. At over 3000 ft. of roadway surface, this could be a considerable item (i.e. milling and filling for superelevation revisions, grade change, Park St. bridge clearance, pavement surface type revisions, etc.). If during coordination with the Department additional work is identified, our Team asks that this requirement be handled and paid for as extra work in accordance with Subarticle 104-8(A) of the Standard Specifications.	The Department and the DBT will follow the Standard Specifications.	No action needed
20	Roadway	255	Last Bullet	Can the Department clarify the reference to "semi-directional" ramps and where those may exist on this project?	General requirement - None are on this project unless proposed in an ATC	No action needed
21	Roadway	258	Second Bullet from bottom	The second RFP states the DBT shall construct 5 ft. sidewalk on north & south bound direction from -Y6- sta. 14+10+/- to 29+30 +/-. Station 29+30+/- is beyond the current roadway design construction limits and gets into the historic area and will include additional impacts. Does the Department want the Team to construct sidewalk to sta. 29+30+/-, or just to match the roadway work on north bound/tie to existing sidewalk on south bound to minimize impact to the HPB?	Follow the RFP, incursion into the HPB has been coordinated with SHPO.	No action needed
22	Roadway	259	First Bullet	Per "I-5719_Traffic_Analysis_Future_Year_Tech_Memo_Final_07-12-2024 ", it shows 200 ft. thru lane drop on NC 7 just beyond Power Dr for a 12 ft. lane drop. Using WS^2/60 this would require a 320 ft. taper to adhere to RDM Figure 8-11 (40 mph). Can the Department clarify if this will be allowed? This does further push the taper within the driveway locations just beyond Power St.	The DBT should provide the required length of taper.	No action needed
23	Roadway	259	First Bullet	The RFP notes that Design-Build Team shall design and construct at-grade intersections with the lane configurations noted in the I-5719 Project Level Traffic Forecast Report. The lane configurations are actually shown in the Future Year Tech Memo FINAL_07-12-2024.	Yes the reference should be I-5719_Traffic_Analysis_Future_Year_Tech_Memo_Final_07-12-2024 The Department will revise the RFP.	Revise RFP
24	Roadway	259	First Bullet	Per the turn lane requirements in this bullet it should be noted that there will be increased work limits and row impacts not currently shown in the current plans, most notably the following locations along -Y6- (McAdenville Rd.): 1) -Y6- eastbound left turn onto -PowerDr-, the traffic report requires 150 ft. of storage plus 165 ft. for the decel portion out of the taper = 315 ft. left turn bay which compares to the 77 ft. provided in the RFP design. 2) -Y6-westbound neither the 250 ft. left turn into the gas station or 350 ft. right turn storage onto power dr or decels are met in the RFP design and can't be unless significant changes are made 3) The left turns between the interchange terminals can't be met without moving the ramps out which could impact the historic properties 4) The -Y6- eastbound right turn onto -Y6RPD- requires a 175 ft. storage and decel which equals a 340 ft. right turn bay. Currently only approximately 94 ft.. This will further impact the historic property. We ask the Department to clarify these deviations in the RFP to be acceptable.	Do to the existing constraints the Department desires the DBT to innovate.	No action needed

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - REVISED 3/5/25
----------	--

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
25	Roadway	259	First Bullet	Per the turn lane requirements in this bullet it should be noted that there will be increased work limits and row impacts not currently shown in the teams design, most notably the following locations along -Y7- (Belmont Mount Holly Rd): 1) The back to back left turns between the interchange terminals cant be met without adding a lane to the bridge to increase storage 2) The right turn lane storage on -Y7B- onto Belmont Mount Holly Road using desirable decel would need to be increased from 345 ft. shown to 665 ft. which would require widening in front of the cemetery 3) Space between the main modified conflict intersection and uturn bulbs is approximately 724 ft. to 800 ft. To accomodate desirable deceleration, uturn bulbs would need to shift out an additional 400 ft. which would impact access and turn lane storage at adjacent intersections. 4) The -Y7B- right turn storage onto Belmont Mount Holly Road would need to be 780 ft. based on including desirable decel, but the spacing to the uturn bulb is 550 ft. To lengthen the right turn lane, it would need to be developed prior to the uturn bulb, or the bulb would need to shift out. Current plans show 290 ft. 5) Diagram shows a 325 ft. right turn lane to Central Ave from N. Main St. Currently, the plans just show tying to the existing cross section approximatelt 200 ft. from this intersection. To provide this turn lane, an additional lane along Main St. would need to be added right after the intersection with Wilkinson Blvd at -Y7C- Sta. 10+50 which would significantly increase impacts to adjacent businesses. We ask the Department to clarify these deviations in the RFP to be acceptable.	The Department will investigate and may revise the RFP.	Review again for Next RFP / Addendum
26	Roadway	259	4th Bullet	The preliminary plans show adding a through lane in the median at -Y7- Sta. 70+00. The existing through lane then drops as a right turn at the modified reduced conflict intersection which means that through traffic would have to change lanes. Is this intentional due to the amount of traffic continuing on Wllkinson Blvd. or should the DB team update to meet the RFP. Please either add an exclusion to the third bullet or confirm that the design needs to be updated.	The Preliminary Plans are not correct - comply with the requirement in the RFP.	No action needed
27	Roadway	262	3rd Bullet	The RFP notes that all intersections with restricted movements impacted by the Design-Build Team's design and/or construction methods, excluding resurfacing, shall provide five-inch keyed-in concrete monolithic channelization islands regardless of of the island dimensions. The preliminary design does not provide islands at 1) -Y6-/-Power Dr-, 2) -Y7-/-Y7B- (both sides of -Y7B-), 3)-Y7B-/-Y7D-. Will the Department require these to be added which will increase impacts?	Provide islands as needed at all intersections.	No action needed
28	Roadway	264	4th Bullet	The RFP states "The mainline grade point and crown point shall be located such that the inside two lanes in each direction of travel slope towards the median and the remaining lanes slope towards the outside." However, the NCDOT plans indicates the grade point is shifted at station 554+25.00 so that only one lane slopes towards the median, and the remaining 4 lanes slope towards the outside. Will the RFP be revised to clarify if this is acceptable.	Disregard the grade point shift shown in the Preliminary Plans. The DBT shall provide the grade point shift for both north and south bound lanes between Station 589+50+ -L- to Station 591+50+ -L- from the existing to proposed roof top crown point as noted in the RFP	Revise RFP
29	Roadway	264	5th Bullet	At the -Y6- McAdenville interchange, current control of access shown is significantly less than the 1000 ft. recommended in the RDM 9.3.7. The adjacent intersections and drives are approximately 350 ft. from the ramp terminals, but the RDM also calls for left turns to be prohibited with use of raised islands for an additional 650 ft. This would require significant extra work to provide median islands which would increase work within the historic district. Is the intent for this interchange to match the existing control of access limits even though the RDM requirements are not met?	Though the Department requires 1,000 foot on new interchange locations. At reconstruction of existing interchanges with development the Department expects the DBT to use all tools available to provide as much Control of Access as possible without acquisition of existing development.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
30	Roadway	265	Last Bullet	If work is required to add / repair shoulder berm gutter or expressway gutter within a mill and overlay area due to replacement of existing pipes, would a resurfacing grade be required? With a resurfacing grade, additional work on the side slopes may also end up being necessary. For example, there is a pipe that would require replacement at Sta. 627+50 which is adjacent to the Catawba River. If sliver fills or any fill is required in this area, it could possibly impact the buffer. Can an exception (steeper slope) be added to the resurfacing requirement where a pavement repair is completed solely due to replacement of pipes as required?	The DBT shall replace inkind.	No action needed
31	Roadway	266	2nd Bullet	With the Coats Access and Carolina Thread Trail under the existing I-85 bridge to be widened, are there any vertical clearance requirements or concerns at these crossings? Also, we need information regarding the trail location that is not currently shown in the final surveys file.	Provide a minimum of 15.5-foot vertical clearance at the Coats access and a minimum of 10-foot vertical clearance for the Carolina Tread Trail. There is not a defined location of the Carolina Tread Trail.	No action needed
32	Roadway	269	First Paragraph	Its noted that the teams are to construct the ultimate typical section of I-85 west of NC7 to accommodate the "future" construction of NW 16 and NW 17. It appears based off the latest sketches provided by the Department all of NW17 and the majority of NW16 will be within the I-5719B project limits. Since the majority of the walls are now in the I-5719B project limits, would the Department prefer to change the RFP to have construction of these walls included in this contract to avoid additional work on the shoulders of the ramps, drainage revisions because of barrier needed in front of the walls in the future if not installed now, etc. for the I-5719A project.	NW 16 and 17 will be constructed in the I-5719A Project.	No action needed
33	Roadway	272	Next to last bullet	There is a requirement to close gaps of guardrail when less than 300 ft. Along Hickory Grove Rd. (-Y14-) this condition exists between the existing bridge over the railroad and (-Y14- over I-85). Was this gap intentionally left for sight distance at Cemetery Dr or would this need to be revised and investigated?	This spot is not actually a gap since Cemetery Drive would break the guardrail anyway.	No action needed
34	Roadway	276	5th Bullet	Since guardrail is always required with SBG can the Department clarify the added languages intent?	No	No action needed
35	Roadway	276	5th Bullet	Does the requirement to add shoulder berm gutter to all fill sections apply to existing fills where current work includes only milling and overlaying?	Only if the guardrail is being replaced	No action needed
36	Other	278	1st Bullet under High End Bridge Aesthetic Betterments	Are turned back retaining walls required per this section or can parallel retaining walls be used as long as a brick veneer is included?	No - turned back retaining walls are not required, Yes - either turned back or parallel retaining walls may be used.	Revise RFP
37	Other	278-289		Will an aesthetic design guide be provided similar to the I-2513BD DB project?	No	No action needed
38	Hydraulics	317	Hydroplaning Section	In areas of the project that are strictly overlay (i.e. the mainline near NC 273), are the teams required to check for hydroplaning? If so, if mitigation is required, steepening superelevation is not really feasible and would require OGFC which is very costly for these long runs.	Duplicate question, see Question # 10 for response.	No action needed
39	Hydraulics	331, 332	8th Bullet, 5th Bullet	Since Norfolk Southern Railway Standards govern for the Piedmont Northern Railway for all disciplines, can this be specifically stated in the RFP?	Please clarify issue or confusion. Are there conflicts between the NCDOT and NS design requirements	No action needed
40	Hydraulics	338	First Bullet	Can polypropylene pipe be used under the paved shoulder? This is allowed on other projects by NCDOT.	Under current RFP, it cant be used under paved shoulders	No action needed
41	ITS	352	Last Paragraph	Requirements to maintin 3 existing Dynamic Trailblazer Signs have been added to the RFP. Are there existing plans detailing how these signs are communicating now? If so, can we get those plans?	Plans are still in the works but likely they will be installed with cell modems	Materials to be Provided

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
42	Pavement Management	364	First Paragraph	The RFP notes that existing median and outside shoulders for I-85 should be removed, but adds a reference back to the Roadway Scope of Work. In the Roadway scope, the removal of shoulders is specifically noted for Sta. 591+50 to 594+00, and the shoulders should be retained from Sta. 594+00 to the end of the project with mill and overlay, but there is no note on the shoulders from the beginning of the project to Sta. 591+50. With the existing shoulder cores varying in quality with some not strong enough to bear traffic long term, the DB team believes the intention for the project is to remove all existing median and outside paved shoulders except for the section from Sta. 594+00 to the end of the project, but can a statement be added to clarify that shoulders should be removed unless otherwise noted in the Roadway scope of work.	It is the intent for the shoulders to be removed from the beginning of the project to Station 594+00. We will clarify the language.	Revise RFP
43	Pavement Management	364	I-85 Pavement Resurfacing / Uniform Overlay	The Roadway scope, pg. 255 7th bullet calls for mill and fill of 3" for Sta. 594+00 to 627+38. Is this section considered excluded from the uniform 3" overlay with UTBWC, as an area consisting solely of pavement marking obliterations or would the min 3" resurfacing criteria listed apply to this area as well? Please clarify in the RFP.	The DBT is to mill and fill 1.5-inch with UTBWC for Sta 594+00 to 627+38 for the purposes for pavement markings obliterations, see page 255 of the RFP.	No action needed
44	Pavement Management	367	6th Paragraph	In the TMP Scope of Work pg. 450, Second Bullet, it notes that pavement markings on I-85 shall be milled and filled or concealed with a uniform overlay to avoid conflicting pavement markings. The RFP in the Pavement Management Scope states that any overlay for pavement markings would then need to be milled off prior to placing any subsequent layer of the final pavement design. This could be very costly to the Department. As an example, if phasing was proposed to shift I-85 traffic to the outside for median construction and a layer of surface course was applied to the entire outside two lanes and shoulder, this layer would need to be removed prior to wedging up to final layer in the next phase of construction once traffic is shifted to the median, wasting a full layer of surface course that could be incorporated into the final pavement. The noted example is one case, but there may be multiple phases requiring this operation for the overall project. Is it the intent of the Department to require mill and overlay for each phase of construction along I-85?	As required by the Transportation Management Scope of Work found elsewhere in this RFP to conceal pavement markings, the Design-Build Team has the option to uniformly overlay areas of I-85, including all ramps and loops, with 1.5" S9.5C or S9.5D. If S9.5C is utilized, prior to placing any subsequent layer of the final pavement design, the Design-Build Team shall mill the aforementioned uniform overlay.	Revise RFP
45	Signing	400	3rd Paragraph	The RFP specifies that all signs for I-85 SB for Exit 27 will be designed fabricated and installed. For SB I-85, the hearing map shows 5 lanes of travel coming into the project limits. However, existing condition has 4 lanes of travel for SB I-85. SB I-85 between approximately -L- Sta. 550+00 and the SB I-85 Weigh Station entrance ramp was restriped between 6/2018 and 5/2019. Will the bridge striping be revised to match the 5 lanes entering the project limits (with an EXIT ONLY lane for Exit 27) or will we have the existing 4 lanes (with a traditional deceleration lane for Exit 27)?	The DBT will responsible for replacing the signage to match the proposed roadway design for Exit 27.	No action needed
46	Structures	410	6th Paragraph	The RFP states "The minimum horizontal setback from the closest edge of travel lane to the face of barrier in front of walls shall be 14 ft.-0 in. for bridges over interstates, freeways, and arterials." However, the concept plans provided show and 18' full depth paved shoulder under the -Y6- bridge and there are not any proposed future lanes. Will the RFP be revised to clarify the exact shoulder width under structures over interstates, freeways, and arterials?	The RFP governs, provide a horizontal setback of 14'-0" from the edge of travel to the face of barrier.	No action needed
47	Signal Systems	416	Last Paragraph	With the change to multi-zone microwave detection instead of induction loops, is there any interest in using Dynamic Red Extension on any of these signals?	Requests for DRE come from the Division and Regional Traffic Engineers, we have not received any for this project. Currently, DRE can only be designed with inductive loops.	No action needed
48	Signal Systems	418	Table for Existing signals to be modified	The RFP states that we are required to install mast arms at the intersection of NC 7 (Main Street) at Ford Drive / Dickson Drive (12-0166). This location is several hundred feet away from the end of the project limits. The most recent signal plan from this intersection is from 2019. Can the department provide the MicroStation file of the most recent design from 2019, as well as any possible survey in this area so we can ensure that the mast arm foundations do not conflict with any underground utilities?	This signal was added to the project scope for communications purposes, and it is not intended to have signal supports replaced with mast arms.	Revise RFP

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
49	General	240	1st Paragraph	<p>First paragraph states "An electronic copy shall be submitted excluding the introductory letter..."</p> <p>Appears to be a typo with the wording that just needs to be corrected to state that the electronic copy is to be submitted and the introductory letter does not count towards the page count. Currently it reads that the introductory letter is to be excluded from the submittal.</p>	Yes, this was a typo	Revise RFP
50	Structures	N/A	N/A	The existing I-85 Bridge Over the S. Fork of the Catawba River has inspection platforms on each bent over the river (4 total). Is it the intent that these inspeciton platforms are extended onto the widened sections? If so, what are the requirements for these these platforms?	Catwalks are not required on the widening	No action needed
51	Structures	Br. 350143 Rehab Plans S-9	General Notes - Paragraph 3	<p>The RFP states for Bridge 350143, I-85 over South Fork Catawba River, it states that work shall be done in accordance with the Preservation Plan Sheets Provided.</p> <p>Page S-9 notes that all hold down plates are to be cleaned and repairs as needed, then the next paragraph states that contractor shall replace damaged hold-down plates and hardware at no cost to the Department.</p> <p>In order to appropriately price this scope of work, can the Department provide information on what repairs are expected for the expansion joint hold down plates/ hardware and if any are damaged to the point of requiring replacement. Alternatively we would suggest any replacements for damage not caused by the Contractor be paid as extra work.</p>	Joint repair requirements can be found in the 5-30-24 Routine Inspection Report. Additional damage to joints may have occurred since that date.	No action needed
52	Structures	Br. 350143 Rehab Plans S-2	Table	With regards to the Bridge 350143, I-85 over the South Fork Catawba River, rehab scope only, plan Sheet S-2 notes Approx. 127,000 lbs of Structural Steel Work. Can the Department clarify the scope intended by this Bill of Material Item? The only structural steel item we have possibly identified is the steel associated with the bearing replacements (sole plates and HSS for the rocker bearings); however, our assumption is that this would be incidental to the bearing replacement bill of material item.	127,000 lbs is the steel associated with the bearing work.	No action needed
53	Pavement Management	365	2nd Paragraph	<p>Paragraph 2 states "The Design-Build Team shall be responsible for all I-85 pavement repair costs associated with open-cut installation of drainage pipes 48 inches in diameter or smaller, including but not limited to repairs required outside the three-foot dimensions noted above."</p> <p>Trenchless installation will likely require removal of pavement in the median for bore pits. Recommend paragraph be revised to include pavement removed for trenchless installation as well if that is the Department's intent.</p> <p>Second, should this paragraph be revised to include pavement removed for placement of any size drainage pipes, not just 48 inches or smaller?</p>	Though the Department is referencing an open-cut method of construction the DBT shall include in their lump sum price bid all costs associated with their method of pipe installation.	No action needed
54	Pavement Management	365	5th Paragraph	<p>Paragraph 5 states "The I-85 full-depth pavement repairs that are... 2) outside the limits required solely to remove and / or to place pipe lines greater than 48 inches in diameter, as defined above..."</p> <p>Paragraph is in conflict with paragraph above it which references pipe lines smaller than 48 inches in diameter. Also question whether this should be changed to reference all pavement removed for the placement of pipe.</p>	The RFP is correctly written.	No action needed
55	Railroad Coordination	384	1st Paragraph	Paragraph mentions that the Department will provide Preliminary thru 60% Plans for the P&N Spur Corridor. If any of these plans are currently available, can the Department provide to the Design Build Teams?	The Department anticipates acceptance of Preliminary Plans by June 1, 2025, at which time they will be made available to the prospective DBTs.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
56	General			Based on the preliminary design, there is about 250' of additional survey that is needed along the beginning of Y7B. Is NCDOT acquiring additional survey for this or will this be the responsibility of the DB teams? If NCDOT, when are the additional surveys anticipated to be completed?	Additional surveys are anticipated to be completed and available to the DBTs by mid April 2025.	Materials to be Provided
57	General	246	2nd bullet	Please clarify the intent to specify the duration, in days, for ICT #7 through ICT #18, and ICT #20 through ICT #22. The ICTs are for failures and are in different durations (i.e. mins, hours, days).	The duration is stipulated per ICT.	No action needed
58	Roadway	253	3rd bullet	The RFP states that excluding the ties to the existing median barrier at the southern and northern project limits, the teams shall design and construct a 27' median with concrete barrier. Will the teams be allowed to transition to the grass median as shown in the preliminary design or is the intent to eliminate the existing grass median in this section?	Where the median is wider, the barriers should extend to the point the median reaches 70' in width. Alternatively, the barrier can end once the median reaches 36' and install guiderail in the median to the point where the median reaches 70'.	No action needed
59	Roadway	255	5th bullet	At what depth should the remaining pavement on the Exit 27 ramps be milled and resurfaced?	1.5 inches	Revise RFP
60	Roadway	255	7th bullet	Is it the Department's intent to retain the existing median shoulders and barrier through the mill and fill section of I-85?	Yes, if possible	No action needed
61	Roadway	266	3rd sub bullet	Will the DB teams be required to pave the gap along Main St (NC 7) between the end of construction on -Y6- and begin construction on -Y14-? Similarly between the Main St / Hickory Grove Rd / McAdenville Rd intersection to begin construction on -Y7B-?	No	No action needed
62	Roadway	268	3rd bullet	It is mentioned that NW 16 and NW17 will be reanalyzed and constructed as part of I-5719A. Is it intended that we start the DNR analysis for the I-5719B project from Main Street going east on I-85? Or would the Department want us to still evaluate noise impacts to the receptors to the west of Main Street all the way to 800 ft beyond our project limit and only provide impacts in the report but not evaluate mitigation and mention that mitigation will be part of the I-5719A project?	The DBT's DNR analysis is to extend 800-foot beyond the construction limits.	No action needed
63	Roadway	276	5th bullet	Will shoulder berm gutter be required on the high side of a superelevated curve that have guardrail and fill slopes steeper than 4:1?	No	Revise RFP
64	Structures	278	6th paragraph	The RFP states that the DB team shall provide square columns for all proposed interior bents. However, within the section detailing the aesthetic betterments required per structure, only the P&N railway bridge is listed to contain square or rectangular columns for interior bent and shoulder bents. Is the intent to have square or rectangular columns for all bridge interior bents or only for the P&N Railway bridge?	Though the Department prefers standard round columns, Discussions with the Local Governments is that square or rectangular columns will be constructed, see Aesthetics SOW .	Revise RFP
65	Structures	278	1st bullet	The RFP states that the DB team shall provide vertical abutments at all proposed bridges. For previous NC DB projects, the term "vertical abutment" has been defined to include cast-in-place abutments, soil nail walls, and mechanically stabilized earth walls. Is that definition correct for this project?	SMU agrees "vertical abutment" should be defined as in the past, but defers to others' response on Aesthetics	Revise RFP
66	Environmental Permits	290	6th paragraph	Will forestry practices (tree removal without grubbing) be allowed prior to obtaining 404/401/Buffer Permits and approved Erosion and Sediment Control plans?	Tree cutting/removal is not allowed until receipt of the USFWS Concurrence Letter. After receipt of Letter, tree-clearing can be conducted during the non-moratorium period (that will be provided in the USFWS Concurrence Letter), prior to receipt of 404/401 permits as long as tree-clearing does not occur in any jurisdictional areas and there aren't any discharges to jurisdictional features.	No action needed
67	Hydraulics		General	May we maintain drainage pipe connection into existing 8'x8' box culvert wall (STA 495+00) or must it be plugged?	Is there any part of the RFP that makes them think they can't retain that connection?	
68	Hydraulics	331/338	2nd bullet/ 8th bullet	Will these traffic bearing pre-cast drainage structures be required to have steel frame and grates if they are located outside the three criterion listed on page 331 2nd bullet?	No, the steel frame and grate is only required for locations listed on page 331.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
69	Hydraulics	331	5th bullet	Is the historic railroad line along NC-7 Main St required to meet Norfolk Southern standards? Presently the survey represents at least 1 - 15"RCP, 2 - 18" CMPs, 1 - 24"RCP, and 2 - 36" CMPs potentially impacted. NSR standards reference AREMA for drainage criteria such as 100yr design storms, 1.5 HW/D, and 36" minimum pipe sizes. Is this the Departments intent or may additional coordination be allowed for closed pipeline systems for roadway stormwater management (NSCE-8, Section 4)?	The Design-Build Team shall provide a minimum of 36-inch diameter for all pipes under track with a minimum cover 4.5 feet from the base of rail to the top of pipe. The Design-Build Team shall provide headwalls at inlets and outlets of all pipes that are greater than 60 inches in diameter. Pipe sizes for parallel closed pipe systems may have pipe diameters less than 36-inches.	Revise RFP
70	Hydraulics	333	4th sub bullet	There is a pond located on the border of the surveyed extents approximate STA 425+00 600' LT. Is this pond owned and maintained by NCDOT? If so, is there any information on its design and/or additional requirements the Design-Build teams should adhere to?	It is NOT owned by NCDOT. The Department don't have any info on the pond. Standard practice, for all ponds, and especially any SCMs, avoid increases; for any ponds downstream of our project be diligent about erosion control measures during construction	No action needed
71	Hydraulics	334	4th bullet	Do "smooth steel" pipes qualify for replacement as "replace all metal pipes"? (i.e. existing 60" SS at STA 383+00)	Our records indicate that this culvert is a 1 @ 60" CMP, and in June 2022 the Maintenance Unit installed a concrete spin cast liner on the culvert. The spin cast operation is an operation that is applied to lengthen the life span of the culvert, however we would still want to require the replacement of this CMP as part of the RFP.	No action needed
72	Hydraulics	334/339	4th bullet/ 1st bullet	Are the drainage systems under Dickson Rd giving access to the Selkirk Realty, LLC property considered private? Partially located under EB1 of South Fork bridge. All pipes in this location are smaller than 48", will they require replacement?	Yes Dickson Road Exd. within the C/A (under bridge) is a privately maintained road. The pipes will not be replaced as part of this project. If construction activities under the bridge and within the C/A damage any part of the roadway system including drainage pipes, curb and gutter, asphalt, it will be the responsibility of the contractor to restore in a good as or better condition at no additional cost to the Department.	No action needed
73	Hydraulics	336	2nd sub bullet	Will jack and bore pipes, aka smooth steel/welded steel, need to be upsized for maintenance as they are less likely to have failures or require sliplining future maintenance practices?	Yes, they have to be upsized for future maintenance	No action needed
74	Hydraulics	340	1st paragraph	Will this table only include existing crosspipes and box culverts that are 48" and larger? All drainage 42" and smaller is required to be removed per page 334 4th bullet.	Per current RFP, existing hydraulically deficient cross pipes and culverts being replaced would be on both tables	No action needed
75	ITS	345	4th bullet	Is there a Special Provision for Dynamic Trailblazer Signs?	Spec is still being developed. Will provide spec and device information as soon as it is available.	Revise RFP
76	ITS	351	5th paragraph	The second sentence requires the DB team to install new DMS assemblies on new pedestal structures at the locations specified. The third sentence states "The design build team shall confirm structure type with regional ITS Engineer and STOC". Do we need to confirm the structure type or should we be proposing pedestal structures?	Pedestal structures should be proposed unless there is insufficient shoulder	No action needed
77	Structures	410	6th paragraph	The RFP states that the minimum offset to the face of barrier in front of walls shall be 14' minimum. The offset for the abutment wall in the preliminary design is shown as 18'. Will this be the minimum offset at this location or will 14' be allowed?	The RFP governs, provide a horizontal setback of 14'-0" from the edge of travel to the face of barrier.	No action needed
78	Project Special Provisions	1	Paragraph 2	The RFP states that " the completion date thus proposed shall not be later than September 1 , 2030". Please clarify whether this date is the Substantial completion date or Final Acceptance date.	This is the Department's Project Completion Date, it is neither the substancial date or the Final Acceptance date.	No action needed
79	Project Special Provisions	1	Contract Time and Liquidated Damages Paragraph 3	Are insurance coverages required to be in place during observation periods after Final Completion? Who has risk of loss?	Yes	No action needed

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - REVISED 3/5/25
----------	--

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
80	Roadway	4	I-5719 Pkg 2 Proposed Design Criteria	For alignments Y7B (east), Y7C and Y7D, design criteria table shows a K-value for crest and sag condition correspondent to a design speed of 50 mph when design speed for said alignments are 30, 40 and 40 mph respectively. Please confirm that the design values should follow the AASHTO tables 3-35 and 3-37.	The current posted speed limit on -Y7C- and -Y7D- is 35 MPH, i.e., the design speed is 40 MPH. The Department is investigating -Y7B- east.	Revise RFP
81	Project Special Provisions	45	Special Notice to Bidders Paragraph 1	Is the "Norfolk Southern, Standard Specifications for Materials and Construction" document available to review if any additional insurance requirements from the railroad?	See the Project Materials Provided folder in the Rail subfolder	No action needed
82	Project Special Provisions	52	Protection of Railroad Interest. Railroad Insurance (A) (1)	Considering potential use of Design-Build Team's commercial general liability corporate programs to satisfy this requirement. We request the Department to accept redacted copies of the policies.	Yes; however, it depend on what information is redacted. If redacted information is required the Department will work with the DBT on how to provide that information.	No action needed
83	Project Special Provisions	54	Protection of Railroad Interest. Railroad Insurance (C)	Considering that certificates of insurance, binders and other policy documents are now issued always in electronic format, we request the Department and the Company to amend the requirement of "original" and "duplicate copy", and accept a electronic format instead. In consequence, we request the Department and the Company to accept delivery of all required insurance documents via email and amend the remittance addresses listed in the Project Special Provisions, Railroad Insurance - Special Provisions for Protection of Railway Interest, section (C).	The Department will investigate	Check RFP; possible change
84	Project Special Provisions	54	Protection of Railroad Interest. Railroad Insurance (C)	Considering that insurers take 30 to 60 days to issue policies after coverage is bound, we request the Department and the Company to accept binders and certificates of insurance only, to grant access to the Company's corridor for the Design Build Team.	The Department will investigate	Check RFP; possible change
85	Project Special Provisions	55	Protection of Railroad Interest. Railroad Insurance (E)	Regarding commercial general liability, corporate programs are often used by Design Build Teams to satisfy the coverage requirements; therefore, we request the Department and the Company to require the commercial general liability limit to reinstate annually, rather than requiring reinstatement of limits based on loss reserves thresholds. In essence, we request deleting provision (E) and amending provision (A) (1) so that the commercial general liability required limit reinstate annually.	The Department will investigate	Check RFP; possible change
86	Project Special Provisions	56	Protection of Railroad Interest. Notice of Starting Work (C)	Considering that insurers take 30 to 60 days to issue policies after coverage is bound, and that, as per noted in this section, the Company typically takes 30 to 45 days to review, we request the Department and the Company to accept binders and certificates of insurance only, to grant a provisional or preliminary Notice to Starting Work.	The Department will investigate	No action needed
87	Project Special Provisions	68	Use of Unmanned Aircraft System Paragraph 4	We request the Department to specify that a minimum limit of \$5,000,000 per occurrence is required for the UAS specific general liability insurance.	No, follow UAS insurance requirements.	No action needed
88	ITS	241		Please confirm deliverables required to be submitted	Page number does on correspond to ITS please provide correct page and details regarding deliverables in question.	No action needed
89	Roadway	252	7th bullet	RFP states: From Station 594+00+ -L- to Station 627+38+ -L- the Design-Build Team shall mill and fill 1.5 inches of surface but Schematics "I5719_RDY_PLAN with Disclaimer" show a 3 inches mill and overlay. Please confirm 1.5 inches of mill and overlay shall be proposed.	The RFP governs, the DBT shall mill and fill 1.5-inch with UTBWC for Sta 594+00 to 627+38 for the purposes for pavement markings obliterations, see page 255 of the RFP.	No action needed
90	Lighting	252	last paragraph	Please confirm lighting requirements and scope in P&N barrier illumination. Which are the Lighting Special Provisions?	Not sure how page 252 applies to the question. Lighting requirements for the P&N barrier are shown on page 184 of the RFP. The lighting Special Provisions begin on page 175 of the RFP.	No action needed
91	Roadway	257	4th bullet	The provided preliminary design for -Y7A- provides a 16.5' median. Will it be acceptable to keep the 16.5' median instead of enlarging to 23' median to minimize right of way impacts to adjoin properties.	No, The RFP governs. Use the 23' median referenced in the RFP	No action needed

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - REVISED 3/5/25
----------	--

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
92	Roadway	255	7th bullet point	A question about the responsibilities of DB contractor in the area of the project between 594+00 to 627+38 regarding hydroplaning analysis was previously asked. RFP Draft 2 is adding that recommendations for mitigations will be coordinated with the Department, can NCDOT please confirm that DB contractor does not have responsibility to resolve any eventual hydroplaning issue on that area of the project?	THE DBT is responsible for performing hydroplane analysis for and recommendations for mitigation. THE DBT will coordinate with the Department as to which recommendation(s) will be constructed by the DBT.	No action needed
93	Roadway	259	B7	Please clarify whether the Y7C (NC HWY 7 N Main St) northbound through lane taper from existing is considered a lane change, and if so does the department find this acceptable	The Department does NOT find this acceptable.	No action needed
94	Roadway	259	B7	Storage length for Y7C northbound through movement storage bay is not included in the traffic capacity analysis, will it be provided?	Through lanes do not require storage.	No action needed
95	Roadway	259	B6	Is existing storage length for the right turn onto N. Central Ave. from Y7C SB required to be maintained?	The DBT is to work within existing constraints.	No action needed
96	Roadway	259	B1		Per request of the DBT Question #96 was rescinded	No action needed
97	Roadway	262	4th bullet, 3rd sub bullet	Throughout the RFP, the term "Unless note otherwise elsewhere in this RFP ..." is used. When this term is used for criteria that conflict with each other, which criteria takes precedent?	The "noted otherwise" takes precedent.	No action needed
98	Roadway	264	3rd bullet	Please provide any / all draft or approved design exceptions.	The Department will provide when the Design Exceptions are Approved.	Materials to be Provided
99	Roadway	265	1st bullet	The bullet states that the " Design-Build Team shall evaluate the entire I-5719 / U-5800 project and develop the Design Noise Report (DNR)". Please confirm that the DNR is only for this project (I-5719B / U-5800) and not the original I-5719 corridor.	The DNR will be for the I-5719B / U-5800 Project construction limits plus 800 feet on each end.	No action needed
100	Roadway	265	1st bullet	The bullet states that the " Design-Build Team shall evaluate the entire I-5719 / U-5800 project and develop the Design Noise Report (DNR)". What is NCDOT's intent for the D-B Team to evaluate the entire I-5719 project? Most of this segment is outside of the Scope of Work for I-5719B.	The DNR will be for the I-5719B / U-5800 Project construction limits plus 800 feet on each end.	No action needed
101	Roadway	268	Last Bullet	The RFP states, "NW 16 & NW 17 identified in the I-5719/U-5800 TNR will be reanalyzed and constructed as part of Section A of I-5719 (I-5719A)." The 12/27/24 RID release included a PDF clarifying the Begin Project limits which includes constructing the ultimate I-85 section west of NC-7 (McAdenville Rd). Please confirm analysis and construction of NW 16 & NW 17 will not need to be included in the I-5719B project.	The DNR will be for the I-5719B / U-5800 Project construction limits plus 800 feet on each end. However, NW 16 and NW 17 will be constructed in the I-5719A Project.	No action needed
102	Roadway	270	2nd bullet, 1st subbullet	Where is the depressed median width measured between? Edges of paved shoulder or some other typical section?	Edge of Travel Lane	No action needed
103	Roadway	270	2nd bullet, 1st subbullet	Based on this bullet, a five-inch keyed-in concrete monolithic island is to be constructed along the -L- line where the depressed median is less than eight feet. Please confirm this is NCDOT'S intent	Not on -L-; Yes on -Y-Lines	No action needed
104	Roadway	273	B2	Will the department consider changing the design speed for -Y7- to 40 MPH to more closely match the existing alignment and profile. The RFP requires a 55 MPH design speed based on the 50 mph posting.	The entire limits of -Y7- (City of Belmont, Town of Mt Holly and Gaston County) are posted at 35 MPH. The Design speed for -Y7- is 40 MPH	No action needed
105	Structures	278		On sheet 279, the RFP specifies that "Unless otherwise noted in this RFP, the DB Team shall provide vertical abutments at all proposed bridges". To maintain consistent aesthetics to all bridges within the project scope, is it permissible to construct a vertical abutment at the Railroad/Pedestrian bridge instead of a spill through bent?	The Department will accept a 2 span bridge, provided that the shoulder / end bent is cast in place (NO MSE construction) and that the depth of the proposed girders do NOT increase above those shown in the Typical Section. The uses of a 2 span structure, by the DBT, shall require the DBT to gain approval from SHPO and FHWA, and amend the MOA between NCDOT, SHPO and FHWA. This will be at the DBT's expense and risk.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
106	Environmental Permits	279	2nd paragraph	Please provide the impact tables/amount of mitigation agreed up in the I-5719 / U-5800 Concurrence Points 2A, 3 and 4A Concurrence Meetings.	Mitigation amounts have not yet been determined or agreed to. The amount of Mitigation to be requested from the DMS will include the amount of impacts to streams/wetlands based on: - Final impact values in the Permit Drawings for the initial section of the project to be permitted/let, and - Preliminary impacts for the subsequent sections (based on best available information).	No action needed
107	Environmental Permits	279	2nd paragraph	Please provide the I-5719 / U-5800 Concurrence Points 2A, 3 and 4A Concurrence Meeting Packages.	See the NCDOT Connect Site for I-5719: https://connect.ncdot.gov/site/Preconstruction/division/div12/I-5719/Project%20Development/Forms/AllItems.aspx	Materials to be Provided
108	Structures	280	P4	The RFP mentions that AASHTO M270 Grade 50 steel shall be utilized for all new bridges over the roadway. The existing girders at the I-85 south fork Catawba River bridges are all Grade A36 steel. The proposed beams on this bridge will be steel. Can the department confirm that we can use AASHTO M270 Grae 50 steel for this Bridge.	The DBT shall NOT use Grade A36 steel and painted or weathering for either the widening or the additional girders in Span C in the southbound lanes of Bridge 350143. The DBT shall NOT use Grade A36 steel and painted or weathering for any existing or proposed bridge.	No action needed
109	Environmental Permits	281	2nd paragraph	Will additional time/costs be granted to the DB Team if undocumented historic or archaeological reources are discovered during design and/or construction?	If a situation arises that warrants a significant delay, the Department will discuss any additional time. Any / all will be situation are on a case by case review.	No action needed
110	Geotechnical Engineering	303	2nd bullet	Please provide more detailed information related to the water depth measurement (e.g. time of year of measurement, normal water depth, high wather depth, etc)	The measurement is at time of construction.	No action needed
111	Hydraulics	316	6th bullet	The RFP states, "the hydraulic spread shall not encroach into the operation permanent travel lane and shall not encroach more than two feet into an operational temporary travel lane" Based on the typical section, the RFP is suggesting spread up to 12' is considered acceptable. The 2022 hydraulic guidelines state "in no case should total allowable spread exceed a 10' width or a 5" depth at the gutterline except through consultation.." Please confirm the RFP will govern.	They both govern. In cases where the shoulder is less than 10' spread can't encroach into a travel lane; where shoulders are more than 10', spread shouldn't exceed 10'; we'll clarify RFP to include maximum of 10'	Revise RFP
112	Hydraulics	316	6th bullet	In regards to spread, if 10 or 12 feet of spread are acceptable to NCDOT (refer to question above), what is considered acceptable bypass? The 2022 hydraulic guidelines do not specify a specific allowable flow "It is desirable that inlets be designed for 100% interception of runoff; however, minor bypass discharge to a downstream inlet is acceptable, provided it is accounted for in design computations."	The Department does not have a limit on bypass but it limits discharges running off the end of a gutter, or that will flow across a roadway, or similar situation to a maximum of 0.1 cfs	No action needed
113	Hydraulics	319	6th bullet	"Grass medians on I-85 shall be treated as paved surfaces for impervious surface calculations." Confirm this direction is applicable for the large bifurcated area between Station 482+00 - 510+00	This was revised in the Second Industry Draft RFP, see page 335 - second bullet, and a maximum of 13' adjacent to each side in the median should be treated as impervious.	No action needed
114	ITS	335	2nd paragraph	Please confirm if 100% CCTV coverage is required	The ITS scope does not require 100% CCTV coverage, see the CCTV Cameras section of the RFP.	No action needed
115	Lighting	342	1st paragraph	Can the Department please verify if lighting illumination on travel lanes and ramps includes shoulder pavement limits?	Minimum illumination levels are for the travel lanes. As a reminder, the Department will design the roadway lighting.	No action needed
116	Lighting	342	1st paragraph	Please confirm that the Design-Build teams will only be responsible for preparing a construction cost estimate for the proposal submittal based on the Preliminary Lighting Plans design by the NCDOT.	Confirmed.	No action needed
117	Lighting	342	1st paragraph	Please clarify who is responsible for modifying the Preliminary Lighting Plans to account for approved ATCs prepared by the Design-Build team.	The Department will modify the preliminary lighting plans based on the RFC roadway plans. Lighting plans will not be updated based on approved ATCs. Lighting should be priced as shown in preliminary lighting plans	No action needed
118	ITS	349	ist Paragraph	Have the existing fiber sections been established? What if more than two sections need to be relocated? Is the maximum of two cuts/splices for the new section of relocated fiber? What about possible butt-splices or drop cable splices within the new relocated fiber?	Purpose of this requirement is to minimize the number of whole cable splices through the proejct. If more than two sections of the trunk lines need to be relocated then sections should be combined into larger ones to minimize splicing.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
119	ITS	350	1st Paragraph/1st Bullett	Are there any existing terminations of the OMC fiber within the project limits?	There are not currently but could be before constructioun starts or during construction.	No action needed
120	ITS	350	1st Paragraph/2nd Bullett	Do you have identified existing fiber locations within the project limits?	We have plans for where the broadband project fiber through this area but it has not been installed yet.	Materials to be Provided
121	ITS	351	P2	Are all camera locations just one single camera or dual cameras on lowering devices?	Single cameras	No action needed
122	ITS	351	P2	Is 100% camera coverage required within the project limits?	Most coverage possible with the CCTV locations listed in the RFP.	No action needed
123	ITS	351	P5	What size are the new pedestal mounted CMS? Front-Access? Walk-in?	Full size, walk-in. Refer to DMS Project Special Provision.	No action needed
124	ITS	351	P6	What does the DTB signs consist of? Are they to be connected to the Statewide Fiber Network? Are the mentioned locations within the project limits?	Planned to be a DTB sign on a type 3 pedestal with a small comms cabinet and electrical service. Yes, DB team shall connect the DTBs to the NCDOT fiber network once any that have to be relocated due to construction are in their final locations. The US 29 / 74 at NC 273 are outside the project limits and the US 29 / 74 at NC 7 is inside the project limits	No action needed
125	ITS	353	P3 B2	1.25" conduits for NCDOT and OMC conduits. Are conduits to be micro-trenched? If so, are there developed standards on micro-trenching	No, standard trenching and directional drilling is to be used for conduit installation per NCDOT Standards.	No action needed
126	ITS	353	P3 B1	Can existing power service locations be utilized? Do you have the locations of existing power service locations?	Existing services can be utilized if they are not going to be impacted by construction, new feeder conductors would be needed and meter disconnects would need to be updated to new NEC standards if they do not currently meet them. We do not have locations for services or meters.	No action needed
127	Pavement Management	364	I-85 Pavement Resurfacing	NCDOT proposes resurfacing with 3" of S9.5D and 5/8" of UTBWC. By Resurfacing, is NCDOT okay with a (3"+5/8") mill and (3"+5/8") overlay, to have the final surface at the same level as the existing. If the intent of resurfacing was something else per NCDOT, then please clarify this by providing milling depth and total overlay thickness post milling?	The overlay of 3" + UTBWC is required for the entire project except as designated in the Roadway scope	Revise RFP
128	Railroad Coordination	366	P5	Will freight rail traffic be restored on this rail line, necessitating the following of NSR track alignment and profile criteria, or could commonly accepted transit criteria be applied for less robust track given the anticipated application of trolley service.	No, freight srevice will not be restored; however, maintenance and special limited passenger service will occur. Use NS track design alignment standards or maintain no worse than existing conditions.	No action needed
129	Railroad Coordination	368	P2	Will freight rail traffic be restored on this rail line, necessitating the following of NSR track alignment and profile criteria, or could commonly accepted transit criteria be applied for less robust track given the anticipated application of trolley service.	Duplicate question, see Question # 128 for response.	No action needed
130	Railroad Coordination	368	P2	Will existing track subgrade require renewal?	Yes	Revise RFP
131	Railroad Coordination	372	P1	If existing conditions support a undergrade rail bridge, with a crossing angle exceeding NSR maximum requirements of 60 degrees, can a new build also be constructed with a similar crossing angle? Impacts of economics and adjacent infrastructure is of concern if the rail bridge crossing angle were changed to NSR standards.	Maintain existing rail crossing angle.	No action needed
132	Railroad Coordination	413	VI	What are the expectation for the grade crossings for the rail line. Will signals and crossing gates be required. If so will they need to be linked to the nearby signals. (Signal Preemption.)	The DBT shall at a minimum install cross bucks. Grade crossing signals/gates to be evaluated for installation in the future if needed, see Traffic Signals and Signal Communication Scope of Work, Railroad Grade Crossings.	No action needed
133	Project Special Provisions	570	Section 107 Legal Relations and Responsibility to Public	We request the Department to amend the Commercial General Liability required limit to \$25,000,000 per occurrence and in the general aggregate.	No	No action needed
134	Project Special Provisions	1-59	2024 Standard Specifications for Roads	we request the department to include the following insurance coverage requirements: Employer's liability with limits of \$1M per Employee/Disease Employee/Disease policy	No change	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
135	Structures	278, 279		Is it acceptable to provide the brick veneer aesthetic requirements at vertical abutment walls with the use of formliners? This would be a similar procedure as what is permitted for the Stone Ashlar finish for the retaining wall panels and sound barriers as defined on Page 218 for Architectural Concrete Surface Treatment	No	No action needed
136	Structures	279 409	Last Bullet Last Bullet	On page 279, the minimum elements required for the Piedmont and Northern Railway Structure lists that interior bents and shoulder bents that shall be square or rectangular and closely match existing, and spill through bents shall be constructed. On page 409, the last bullet indicates that shoulder bents will be allowed for the replacement of this bridge. Please verify that the use of shoulder bents at the railroad/pedestrian bridge is optional, and a 2 span bridge is permitted. For a 2 span bridge design, verify that all aesthetic requirements will match the other bridges.	The Department will accept a 2 span bridge, provided that the shoulder / end bent is cast in place (NO MSE construction) and that the depth of the proposed girders do NOT increase above those shown in the Typical Section. The uses of a 2 span structure, by the DBT, shall require the DBT to gain approval from SHPO and FHWA, and amend the MOA between NCDOT, SHPO and FHWA. This will be at the DBT's expense and risk.	No action needed
137	Lighting	General		Please provide the AGI lighting files as well as electrical calculations so the DBT can verify lighting elements in order to properly price them.	The Department's policy is to provide Preliminary Lighting Plans which will have the quantities you are requesting.	No action needed
138	Structures	General/Geotechnical		What is the service level deflection limits allowed by NCDOT for Steel H-piles on the project.	Provide context; where are the H-piles being used?	No action needed
139	Roadway	Preliminary Plan		The taper length for -Y6RPA- is 285ft instead of the AASHTO Green Book requirement of 300ft. Please confirm if this taper length needs to be increased to 300ft.	Increase to 300 ft per guidance unless there is a justifiable reason not to.	No action needed
140	Signal Systems			Please provide RIDs with existing Traffic Signals information	Please provide clarification on what RID stands for.	All our signal plans can be found on our Signal Map: https://connect.ncdot.gov/site/tmsd/SignalPlans/Pages/default.aspx
141	Environmental Permits			It is indicated that the Design-Build Team shall design and construct maintenance access points, as necessary and / or as directed by the Engineer, during the design of the Noise Barriers. Can NCDOT provide further details about these access points (ie, typology, minimum dimensions...) as well as a specific criterion to define frequency?	These are coordinated during the design of the noise wall after the DNR is completed. Access points are determined on a case by case need.	No action needed
142	ITS			Please provide location of existing ITS communication Hubs	There are no ITS HUBS on or proposed for this project.	No action needed
143	ITS			Please provide RIDs with existing ITS information	Existing devices are listed in the RFP and there is no existing fiber west of NC 273 but the broadband project will be installing conduit and fiber through this area and the coordination with that project is called out in the RFP.	No action needed
144	ITS			Please provide location of existing electrical service points	We do not have these locations	No action needed
145	Right of Way			Will NCDOT permit advanced acquisition for priority parcels and relocation parcels anticipated to require an extended duration?	Yes, the DBT will have to submit documentation for review and approval prior to acquisition.	No action needed
146	Right of Way			The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) has established a structured process for the review and approval of settlements that exceed specified monetary thresholds. What is the expected turn around time for these approvals?	Turnaround is parcel dependent.	No action needed
147	Right of Way			The process for reviewing and approving settlement final reports within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) involves several key steps designed to ensure compliance with state regulations and proper handling of funds. What is the expected turn around time for these approvals?	Turnaround is parcel dependent.	No action needed
148	Right of Way			The process for review and approval of payments by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) involves several key steps to ensure that all transactions are properly vetted and authorized. What is the expected turn around time to process payments to property owners?	Turnaround is parcel dependent.	No action needed

Project: I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - **REVISED 3/5/25**

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
149	Right of Way			The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) follows a structured process for the review and approval of appraisals that exceed specified monetary thresholds. What is the expected turn around time to receive fully approved appraisals?	The appraisal process typically take 3-6 months.	No action needed
150	Right of Way			The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) has implemented a new appraisal process that is designed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of property appraisals. Does this process extend to design-build projects. It is essential to confirm whether this new appraisal process will be adhered to during the current design-build initiative and what can be expected for processing and turn around times.	Design-Build project delivery does not change the appraisal process.	No action needed
151	Right of Way			Has KH FORD HOLDINGS BELMONT LLC played a significant role in the design process by providing input on land use, ensuring that the project aligns with their interests? Furthermore, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) anticipates that KH FORD HOLDINGS BELMONT LLC will actively cooperate and engage in negotiations throughout the acquisition process to facilitate a smooth transition and address any concerns related to property acquisition.	There has been no direct coordination with the referenced property owner by the Division Right of Way Office.	No action needed
152	Right of Way			Has Belmont Land & Investment Co played a significant role in the design process by providing input on land use, ensuring that the project aligns with their interests? Furthermore, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) anticipates that Belmont Land & Investment Co will actively cooperate and engage in negotiations throughout the acquisition process to facilitate a smooth transition and address any concerns related to property acquisition.	There has been no direct coordination with the referenced property owner by the Division Right of Way Office.	No action needed
153	ITS			Is there any work required at HUBs for new devices? Please provide HUB locations.	Should not be any work at the HUB cabinets off of this projects limits.	No action needed
154	ITS			Are there any requirements for the fiber at the ends of the project limits?	Spliced one-to-one into the broadband fiber on either end of the project.	No action needed
155	ITS			Please provide RIDs with existing ITS information	Repeated question, see Question # 143 for response.	No action needed
156	Roadway	253	B1	Previously in the first round of questions #16 it was pointed out that the skew angle of the intersection was not compliant and optimizations were needed. Particularly for intersection between Y7 and Y7B, will the department reconsider a design exception to allow the skew angle to remain as in the preliminary design. If not would added treatments such as limiting right turns on red and realigning the right turns to be more perpendicular allow for a design exception?	The Department desires an improvement of the skew angle proposed in the Preliminary Plans. Angles less then 75 degrees shall be reviewed for accepted by the Department.	No action needed
157	Right of Way			Y7 crosses at Sta 43+00 over an existing creek. A culvert will be needed to keep continuity of the creek. NCDOT RIDs drawings show that embankment area as a construction easement. Please NCDOT confirm that the drainage structure does not need changes in ROW limits and that current construction easement suffices for its construction	The Department anticipates the drainage structure out side the Right of Way will be covered by a drainage easement.	No action needed
158	Roadway	260	Last Bullet	The RFP states "The mainline grade point and crown point shall be located such that the inside two lanes in each direction of travel slope towards the median and the remaining lanes slope towards the outside." However, the NCDOT plans indicates the grade point is shifted at station 554+25.00 so that only one lane slopes towards the median, and the remaining 4 lanes slope towards the outside. Will the RFP be revised to clarify if this is acceptable.	Duplicate question, see Question # 7 for response.	Check RFP; possible change

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - REVISED 3/5/25
----------	--

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
159	Signing	Hearing Map 10		End TIP I-5719/End Lane Restriping is shown at the bridge. For SB I-85, the hearing map shows 5 lanes of travel coming into the project limits. However, existing condition has 4 lanes of travel for SB I-85. SB I-85 between approximately -L- Sta. 550+00 and the SB I-85 Weigh Station entrance ramp was restriped between 6/2018 and 5/2019. Will the bridge striping be revised to match the 5 lanes entering the project limits (with an EXIT ONLY lane for Exit 27) or will we have the existing 4 lanes (with a traditional deceleration lane for Exit 27)?	Duplicate question, see Question # 8 for response.	No action needed
160	Roadway	393	Paragraph 6	The RFP states "The minimum horizontal setback from the closest edge of travel lane to the face of barrier in front of walls shall be 14'-0" for bridges over interstates, freeways, and arterials." However, the concept plans provided show and 18' full depth paved shoulder under the -Y6- bridge and there are not any proposed future lanes. Will the RFP be revised to clarify the exact shoulder width under structures over interstates, freeways, and arterials?	Duplicate question, see Question # 9 for response.	No action needed
161	Hydraulics	317	Hydroplaning Section	In areas of the project that are strictly overlay (i.e. the mainline near NC 273), are the teams required to check for hydroplaning? If so, if mitigation is required, steepening superelevation is not really feasible and would require OGFC which is very costly for these long runs.	Duplicate question, see Question # 10 for response.	No action needed
162	Roadway	250	third bullet	The Roadway Scope of the RFP, pg. 250 third bullet notes that, "Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, excluding the transitions required to tie to the existing median widths at the southern and northern project limits, the Design-Build Team shall design and construct a minimum 27-foot full depth paved median along the -L- Line. Excluding the transitions required to tie to the existing median barrier at the southern and northern project limits, the Design-Build Team shall design and construct Type T or single slope double-faced concrete median barrier." The design-build team needs to know if it is the intent of the Department to eliminate the spread median section of I-85 -L- Sta. 474+00 to 515+00+/- . As the RFP is currently written it implies that the 27' median should apply to the entire mainline.	Duplicate question, see Question # 13 for response.	Revise RFP
163	Roadway	259	Second Bullet	The RFP notes that all intersections with restricted movements impacted by the Design-Build Team's design and/or construction methods, excluding resurfacing, the Design-Build Team's design shall provide five-inch keyed-in concrete monolithic channelization islands regardless of of the island dimensions. The preliminary design isnt providing these islands at 1) -Y6-/-Power Dr-, 2) -Y7-/-Y7B- (both sides of -Y7B-), 3)-Y7B-/-Y7D-. Will the Department require these to be added which will increase some impacts?	Duplicate question, see Question # 27 for response.	No action needed
164	Roadway	255	Last Bullet	The RFP notes that Design-Build Team shall design and construct at-grade intersections with the lane configurations noted in the I-5719 Project Level Traffic Forecast Report. The lane configurations are actually shown in the Future Year Tech Memo FINAL_07-12-2024.	Duplicate question, see Question # 11 for response.	Revise RFP
165	Roadway	255	Last Bullet	Per the turn lane requirements in this bullet it should be noted that there will be increased work limits and row impacts not currently shown in the teams design, most notably the following locations along Y6 (McAdenville Rd.): 1) -Y6- eastbound left turn onto-PowerDr-, the traffic report requires 150' of storage plus 165' for the decel portion out of the taper = 315' left turn bay which compares to the 77' provided in the RFP design. 2) -Y6-westbound neither the 250' left turn into the gas station or 350' right turn storage onto power dr or decels are met in the RFP design and cant be unless significant changes are made 3) The left turns between the interchange terminals cant be met without moving the ramps out which could impact the historic properties 4) The -Y6- eastbound right turn onto Y6RPD requires a 175' storage and decel which equals a 340' right turn bay. Currently only approximately 94'. This will further impact the historic property. We ask the Department to clarify these deviations in the RFP to be acceptable.	Duplicate question, see Question # 24 for response.	No action needed

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800 - Second Q& A - REVISED 3/5/25
----------	--

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response	Changes to RFP or Other Actions
166	Roadway	252	2nd Bullet	Per the turn lane requirements in this bullet it should be noted that there will be increased work limits and row impacts not currently shown in the teams design, most notably the following locations along Y7 (Belmont Mount Holly Rd): 1) The back to back left turns between the interchange terminals cant be met without adding a lane to the bridge to increase storage 2) The right turn lane storage on Y7B onto Belmont Mount Holly Road using desirable decel would need to be increased from 345-foot shown to 665-foot which would require widening in front of the cemetery 3) Space between main modified conflict intersection and uturn bulbs is approximately 724-800-foot. To accomodate desirable decel, uturn bulbs would need to shift out an additional 400-foot which would impact access and turn lane storage at adjacent intersections. 4) The -Y7B- right turn storage onto Belmont Mount Holly Road would need to be 780-foot based on including desirable decel, but the spacing to the uturn bulb is 550-foot. To lengthen the right turn lane, it would need to be developed prior to the uturn bulb, or the bulb would need to shift out further. Current plans show 290-foot. 5) Dlagram shows a 325' right turn lane to Central Ave from N. Main St. Currently, the plans just show tying to the existing cross section approximatelt 200-foot from this intersection. To provide this turn lane, an additional lane along Main St. would need to be added right after the intersection with Wilkinson Blvd at -Y7C- Sta. 10+50 which would significantly increase impacts to adjacent businesses. We ask the Department to clarify these deviations in the RFP to be acceptable.	Duplicate question, see Question # 25 for response.	Check RFP; possible change
167	Roadway	252	2nd Bullet	Based on the answers to the first Q and A (question 18), the team is preparing resurfacing grades for the Beatty ramps up to the ramp terminal intersection. With these ramps, there are some deficiencies that would need to be retained to avoid signifciant additional wedging through the gores and possibly additional overlay on the mainline. The following elements are within the gore area for the ramps and don't need upper range speed (55 mph) which is the preference noted in the RDM 9.4.1.1 Table 9-1: Y8RPA - existing super meets 40 mph and sage curve meets 46 mph; Y8RPD - existing super meets 50 mph; and Y8RPB - existing sag curve meets 50 mph. To limit additional right of way and wedging, can these elements bve added to the RFP to indicate that they can be retained even though they don't meet the preferred design for ramps?	Duplicate question, see Question # 15 for response.	No action needed
168	Roadway	252	2nd Bullet	To meet gore controls and avoid undercutting the existing ramps Y8RPA and Y8RPD, a mainline overlay of 3" would be necessary through the gore of the Y8RPA and Y8RPD ramps. Can the overlay be updated to include 3" through the gores rather than the 1.5"?	I-85 (Sta. 594+00± -L- to Sta 627+38± -L-) and the Ramps A, B, C & D are to be mill and fill 1.5 inches - please clarify questions.	No action needed
169	Roadway	256	3rd Bullet	The preliminary plans show adding a through lane in the median at -Y7- Sta. 70+00. The existing through lane then drops as a right turn at the modified reduced conflict intersection which means that through traffic would have to change lanes. Is this intentional due to the amount of traffic continuing on Wlikinson Blvd. or should the DB team update to meet the RFP. Please either add an exclusion to the third bullet or confirm that the design needs to be updated.	Duplicate question, see Question # 26 for response.	No action needed
170	NS Standards for Industry Tracks	28		Since the historic rail line is considered a "non-main track". Will the Department clarify the required pipe material to be used in this area since HDPE pipe is technically allowed per Page 28 of the NS Standards for Industry Tracks?	HDPE pipe will not be allowed, provide either concrete or steel pipe	Check RFP; possible change
171				The recently provided Transmodeler memo (Transmodeler 4 Memo 1-2025) references two macros that were developed by the project team to assist in the development of results. It appears these macros were intended to be provided with the memo. Can the two macro files (NCTransModelerHelp-erMacros_Output_MultiHour.rsc and NCTransModelerHelperMacros_Output_1Hour.rsc) be provided to the teams as they do not appear in the Traffic folder?	The referenced macro files have been to the Project Materials Available folder on the NCDOT Connect site	Materials to be Provided