

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
1	Other	27	1st (section 4) Analysis)	The RFP states "All intersection and interchange reconfigurations shall include corresponding electronic traffic analyses files...". The traffic analysis documents indicate that the analysis was completed in TransModeler Version 4.0. This version of TransModeler is outdated by several years, and is likely not available for download from Caliper. Which version and build of TransModeler should be used for ATC analysis.	The DBT will have to stay with the same version (4.0) of TransModeler since it was used to calibrated the model. Contact Caliper and they will provide the Version and Build used for this analysis. If any other version is used the DBT will be required to recalibrate the model. Best to stay with Version 4.
2	Project Special Provisions	46	Last line of Table	This section notes that all rail design should be completed using the Norfolk Southern Railway Public Project Manual. There are other references to Norfolk Southern throughout the document. With the new project limits, the rail work will be on Piedmont and Northern Railway lines. Are the standards for Norfolk Southern being used for consistency along the corridor or are there any other guidelines that need to be followed?	Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) standards being used for consistency and familiarity on all four I-5719 rail locations and especially because NCDOT Rail Division (owner and maintainer of the P&N rail corridor) doesn't have any standards of its own.
3	Project Special Provisions	47	1st Paragraph	Based on requirements for roadway safety referencing Norfolk Southern, is Norfolk Southern involved in reviews or training required for work within the revised project limits? The references would be expected to be revised to note NCDOT Rail Division requirements only.	NS is not involved. Applicable portions of Roadway Worker safety should be followed regardless.
4	Project Special Provisions	56	1st Paragraph	Based on the information provided, the railroad track is not being utilized for the majority of the rail corridor. Assuming the rail corridor is inactive at the time of construction, will the DB Team still be required to provide weekly construction schedule meeting all criteria noted on pg 49 Notes A and B?	This portion of the P&N rail corridor is inactive or made inactive and inaccessible for the project. Weekly meetings should be anticipated to ensure project construction elements are addressed in a timely manner.
5	Project Special Provisions	70	Cooperation Between Contractors	For the adjacent projects, are there any ICTs that could impact the work proposed for I-5719B/U-5800? Is there any additional construction schedule information that can be provided?	Are there any projects in particular that the DBT is concerned about?
6	Project Special Provisions	207	2nd	Sound Barrier Wall - Can pile spacing of greater than 15 feet be permitted since the new standard foundation tables include a pile spacing of 20 feet. Sometimes larger pile spacing are required if there is a conflict such as a utility easement or culvert.	No, 15-foot is the maximum panel spacing.
7	Project Special Provisions	223	PSRM	Does the Division have any concerns with the use of PSRM on the project, primarily for erosion control or as a permanent liner for drainage design?	PSRM can be used for preformed scour holes and cut/fill slopes if applicable, but preference for steep (4-5%) ditch treatment to be rip rap.
8	General	241	7th Bullet	Bullet states that roundabout design summary should be provided on how above roundabout criteria are met, but no criteria are listed above. Should bullet reference requirements in the Roadway Scope?	Yes - Will revise RFP to state Roadway SOW
9	Roadway	250	First Bullet	For the project limits of the 8 lane section, are the western ramp gore connections intended to be Y6RPB and Y6RPC at the NC 7 Exit 23, not Y7RPB and Y7RPC?	Yes - Will revise RFP to state Y6RPB and Y6RPC
10	Roadway	250	2nd to last bullet	Is the last sentence on tying the proposed 8 lane to existing 8 lane section intended to refer to the eastern end of the project only?	Correct, It ties the proposed 8-lane to the existing 8-lane.
11	Roadway	250	last bullet	In regards to the project limits and the proposed transition from existing section to proposed, has the Department considered the likely required noise walls NW16 & NW17 shown in the final TNR? We would assume that the Department would want the full proposed section that includes the proper noise wall offsets (lanes and shoulders) for the future project to tie to. The ramp also needs to be designed so that its taking the future build out into consideration or this will also be impacted. Can the Department clarify the transition requirements with the noise walls in mind?	The analysis of NW16 and NW17 will be included in the DNR for Section A. However, the DNR for the B section will still need to include the project limits plus 800 feet (for freeway improvement projects).
12	Roadway	251	1st Arrow	RFP states that Y6RPA should be designed as a single lane exit only for outside SB lane. For Y6RPA, designing as an exit only lane will require coming back to adjust the gore and mainline for the new decel lane with the next phase of the project. Is that the intent or does the department want the full width to be built out and striped for the interim period?	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxillary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
13	Roadway	251	1st Arrow	For Y6RPD, designing the entrance ramp as the outside NB lane will require adjustments to the gore and mainline to add the accel lane in the future. Is that the intent or does the Department want the full width to be build out and striped for the interim period?	Build full width for ultimate build out and paint stripe out to 6 lanes with temporary ramp ties.
14	Roadway	251	1st Bullet	Are the ramps noted intended to be Y6RPB and Y6RPC (NC 7 Exit 23)?	Yes - Will revise RFP to state Y6RPB and Y6RPC
15	Roadway	251	3rd Bullet	Is the Department intending to state that the intersection of Y7 and the mainline is preferred not to shift?	No. Should allow innovation.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
16	Roadway	251	3rd Bullet	The proposed intersection angle for Y7 and Y7B is approximately 48 degrees which exceeds the 75 degree maximum typically accepted by the design manual without written design waiver from Roadway Design Manual (section 8-9). Will this be provided and accepted?	No. Design-Build Team should look for desirable innovations.
17	Roadway	251	second arrow	The RFP asks to retain the alignment of Y6RPD. The proposed alignment doesn't include a spiral as it goes into the entry curve to I-85. Will this be approved as shown?	No. Spiral will be required at the high speed end (tie to I-85)
18	Roadway	252	5th Bullet	Is the intent to remove and replace the existing shoulders for all ramps up to the ramp terminal intersection? Also, normally if work is required on the ramp shoulder, resurfacing of the whole ramp would be required. The RFP also states on pg 262, 4th bullet, that resurfacing will be required for work more than pavement obliterations. Without adding an exclusion for the Beatty interchange ramps, a resurfacing grade would be required for all 4 ramps to add a wider paved shoulder. Is that the intention?	Yes, the existing paved shoulders are to be removed and replaced with 12-foot full depth paved shoulders at all ramps at Exit 27 and mill the and resurface the ramps to the terminal intersection.
19	Roadway	254	Last Bullet	Preliminary design files show 12-foot lanes for Y7E instead of 11-foot as noted in the RFP for Wimmer Circle. With this conflict, what lane widths should the team use?	The RFP will be revised to 12' lanes due to curvature with the requirement of autoturn of the facility to determine if the 12-foot lane width can be reduced.
20	Roadway	255	2nd Bullet	Preliminary design files show 12-foot lanes for Y7H instead of 11-foot as noted in the RFP for Wimmer Circle. With this conflict, what lane widths should the team use?	The RFP will be revised to 12' lanes due to curvature with the requirement of autoturn of the facility to determine if the 12-foot lane width can be reduced.
21	Roadway	255	6th Bullet	The RFP states that the design-build team shall design and construct eight-foot bike lanes in the north and south directions. The preliminary plans show a 5' lane with a 3' striped buffer between the ramp terminals. Is it the intent to have a full 8' bike lane with no buffer area? It should also be noted that the bike lane in the preliminary design goes away and restarts at Power Dr. however with only a 5' wide bike lane north of Power Dr. Does the Department want to make this a 8' wide bike lane consistent with the RFP language or will the provided preliminary design be the preferred width to tie to existing?	The DBT is to construct 5' bike lane with a 3' buffer from the C and D Ramps northward and connect to the existing bike lanes north of Tennant St.
22	Roadway	255	7th Bullet	The RFP notes that the Design-Build team is required to obtain written approval for alignment revisions of municipal streets. Can the Department provide a list of roadways that would require this? Is the Department aware of any impacted with the current design? The current language puts significant risk on the DB Team upon making any changes to the horizontal alignments included from the preliminary roadway plans. Can this language be revised to specific locations or localities with further provided details on the municipalities concerned provided to the DB Teams?	The RFP clearly states that "Excluding modifications included in the I-5719 Preliminary Roadway Plans provided by the Department, the Design Build Team shall coordinate with, and obtain written approval from the Engineer and any/all Municipalities for horizontal alignment revisions to municipal streets." I the DBT is planning to modify any street not shown on the Preliminary Plans they will need to determine which jurisdiction maintains it a gain the appropriate approvals.
23	Roadway	257	6th Arrow	Is there a preference for exit widths for 2-lane roundabouts?	No. Follow NCHRP 1043
24	Roadway	258	3rd Bullet	Preliminary Roadway plans show a circulating roadway width of 36-foot for the roundabout. Should the RFP minimum of 32-foot dictate?	Follow the RFP dimensions of 32-foot
25	Roadway	258	Last Bullet	The RFP stipulates the Woodlawn/Belmont Mt Holly/Wimmer roundabout should have single lane exits and entries for all legs with the exception of Belmont Mt Holly north bound south of the roundabout which should be dual lane entry. With a dual lane entry for Belmont Mt Holly south of the roundabout, and a single lane exist for Belmont Mt Holly north of the roundabout, is the intent for this roundabout to be a single lane roundabout, and the outside lane of the Belmont Mt Holly north bound entry to be a right bypass lane onto Wimmer Road?	No, the intent is for a dedicated left movement, i.e., the inner lane, to Woodlawn Street and a through / right movement, i.e., the outer lane, to Belmont Mt Holly Road and to Wimmer Circle. The Department will provide sketch of the desired configuration.
26	Roadway	263	1st 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?	Maintain all the existing vertical clearances.
27	Roadway	264	second bullet	The RFP denotes that no design exceptions will be required on ramps. Y6RPD proposes a 7% downgrade which is typically only good for approximately 30mph. The FHWA interstate controlling criteria does state the grade can be increased 2% in special cases. Will the Department consider this a design exception?	No. The 7% is acceptable per the notes and with the gore area at near 2% and the ramp profile assisting with acceleration it is acceptable.
28	Roadway	264	second bullet	Y6RPD is being shown with a 50 mph design speed which is good for the middle range speed (for a 65 mph mainline). Will the Department require the team meet the upper range per the norm or will this be acceptable?	No. Innovation desired to eliminate broken back curve and improve design speed at tie to I-85. Design speed near Y6 can be reduced and intersection skew potentially improved. Also important is if we are tying to future outside lane on I-85 per comments 12 and 13. The Design-Build Team shall not impact the Historic District.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
29	Roadway	265	1st Bullet	Should references to the proposed TNR review be revised to note the new project limits for I-5719B? The DB Team would only anticipate building or recommending noisewalls within the current project limits. When defining the limits of the noise walls, will resurfacing limits resulting from TMP operations dictate those limits, if so it could vary per teams approach?	Please clarify what they mean by "the proposed TNR review"? Per NCDOT Traffic Noise Manual, it is a requirement (and standard practice) to analyze a set distance beyond the project limits. For freeway improvement projects, the noise analysis must be completed for land uses at least 800 feet beyond the project limits to identify the impacts of the proposed improvements on the noise environment. Resurfacing limits adjacent to Section A may be excluded from the project limits for the purpose of the noise analysis.
30	Roadway	266	2nd paragraph	Sound barrier wall unit prices seem low based on current material prices. Can the unit price be increased to \$65 per SF regardless of on or off shoulder?	Based on further review, the Department will revise the RFP to reflect the following changes: Sound barrier on the shoulder - \$65/SF Sound barrier off the shoulder - \$60/SF Sound barrier on a bridge - \$70/SF
31	Roadway	268	Last Arrow	This arrow references August 2022 I-5719 / U5800 Public Meeting Map. Should this refer to the October 2023 public meeting maps?	Yes - The RFP will be revised to October 2023
32	Roadway	273	first bullet	RFP states Shoulder berm gutter to be installed in fill sections with guardrail and slopes greater than 4:1. Is this saying to install ONLY when guardrail is required for the fill height or anytime the slope is greater than 4:1 regardless of fill height?	No, this is DB standard language. The DBT shall install shoulder berm gutter with guardrail in fill sections with fill slopes steeper than 4:1 and shoulder berm gutter as needed elsewhere.
33	Roadway	N/A	N/A	Interchange Intersection skews at all Y6 ramps, Y7RPA,B,C are exceeding the acceptable values per NCDOT design manual 9-23. Will this be acceptable and approved in final design?	No. Innovation desired to improve designs.
34	Roadway	N/A	N/A	With the proposed 27-foot median, stopping sight distance along the inside of 2 curves along the mainline meets slightly less than design speed, but will meet posted speed. Will this be acceptable and approved in final design or would wider shoulders be required?	Based on Department computations, it is right at 65mph. (S=645; R=2869.5; HSO 18.106) which is 6' to middle of lane Plus 12.106 to face of barrier. It is stretch barrier but the allowance is 36" with the 27' median.
35	Roadway	N/A	N/A	The current preliminary roadway plans include guardrail on the outside of the Y6RPD ramp at the merge with I-85 at a standard offset. Based on the current plans, stopping sight distance would only meet 47 mph, not the required 55 mph. Alignment adjustments or a wider shoulder may require additional right of way. Would this be acceptable and approved in final design?	No. Innovation desired to improve designs. Note - the DBT can NOT encroach or impact the McAdenville Historic District without first receiving approval from the SHPO
36	Roadway	N/A	N/A	Cemetery Rd does not meet intersection sight distance requirements per the design speed. To fix this issue, the alignment may need to shift further away from the bridge which could cause additional right of way impacts. Would the current design be acceptable or preferred to shifting the alignment to meet ISD requirements?	Computation appears close. Evaluate the ISD and shift as needed to achieve ISD, while minimizing impacts.
37	Environmental Permits	275	2nd Paragraph	Is there an anticipated date when the updated surveys will be complete for the species noted and will receive concurrence from Fish and Wildlife? Delay could impact any early works packages. Does this statement only apply to specific areas of the project?	Plant surveys are up to date (DFHL and sunflower conducted 3/28/24 and 9/20/24, respectively). We are awaiting results from bat surveys conducted in 2024 in order to request concurrence. Tree cutting cannot occur in any area of the project until concurrence is received.
38	Environmental Permits	275	3rd Paragraph	If there a timeline on when concurrence is anticipated on the tree cutting moratorium?	Not at the moment. Though anticipated best guess is prior to June 2025 DB let.
39	Geotechnical Engineering	303	A. Structure Foundations	Are steel pile points/ cutting shoes required for piles driven to PWR or CR? Or is this as the DB team deems them required?	Up to team to determine if necessary to protect integrity of piles during driving.
40	Geotechnical Engineering	303	A. Structure Foundations, 7th bullet	If a satisfactorily stable 1.5:1 bridge end slope would be allowed with the use of a Geotextile for Embankment Stabilization?	No, use the height restrictions in the Geotech SOW
41	Geotechnical Engineering	304	B. Roadway Foundations, 2nd bullet	Does the use of Geotextile for Subgrade Stabilization for 200' long and ten-foot height measured vertically from the toe of the embankment consider the combined height of existing material and new fill for measurement of the embankment height?	Yes.
42	Geotechnical Engineering	308	6th	Can the required pile embedment length below the retaining wall foundation or leveling pad be reduced, if Pile Excavation is used?	No.
43	Geotechnical Engineering	311	5th	The RFP specifies PDA testing, can another dynamic pile test be performed instead to be consistent with the 2024 specifications?	Yes, this is old language and PDA should be considered interchangeable with DPT (Dynamic Pile Testing) in accordance with 2024 Std Spec.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
44	Hydraulics	317	3rd Bullet	Can the scuppers on the South Fork Catawba River bridge remain and or reinstall since they discharge directly to the river?	The existing drains located within the median that will not be modified and / or removed most likely can remain. The outside shoulder drains may be allowed at the Resource Agencies discretion. The Agencies have been agreeable in the past to retaining drains but the Department can't guarantee that until after the Concurrence 4B Meeting. How will the DBT handle the drainage and meet spread requirements if they can't retain the existing drains (wider bridge, by how much)?
45	Hydraulics	317	5th Bullet	Does NCDOT expect the use of open graded friction course to reduce the risk of hydroplaning? This is a more expensive alternative, and if it is not expected, it should be excluded in the RFP. Also, does NCDOT expect the surface layer of pavement to be variable in areas where hydroplaning is a risk or should a constant surface course be used for the entire project?	Open graded friction course isn't expected nor prohibited in the Hydraulic scope. It's up to the DBT to determine which mitigation measures they will use for any hydroplaning issues. If DBT opts to use OGFC then pavement sections should be consistent with logical termini and not patched in where needed.
46	Hydraulics	317	5th Bullet	Does NCDOT expect the teams to adjust the vertical grade due to hydroplaning risk? Given this is an existing location project, adjusting the grade is not as economically feasible (i.e. wedging, overpass/-Y-line grades, extended slope stakes to new parcel impacts, etc.)	Team may evaluate and determine best ways to mitigate for hydroplaning concerns
47	Hydraulics	318	1st Bullet	Given the requirements to meet 15A NCAC 04B .0109 and also the fact that: A) no additional ROW can be purchased; B) we are to minimize water quality impacts; C) seasonal high water table borings (which we usually don't have during procurement) dictate stormwater detention availability; can additional guidance be provided on methods NCDOT would like to employ?	when the design dictates that SCMs are needed, the PCSP can be used as a guide to select appropriate SCMs based on constraints; Guidance in the outlet analysis tool can be used to determine requirements to meet 04B rule.
48	Hydraulics	319	6th Bullet	The RFP states: "grass medians on I-85 shall be treated as an impervious surface." Should this be for the stretches that are only the 26' wide median? Is this for future widening? How should we handle the median at -L- 485+00-505+00?	The intent is to account for future widening. The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
49	Hydraulics	319	5th Bullet	Can guidance please be provided for how a 25% land use impervious percentage was determined? Given our GIS study and the urban nature of this project, we determined most drainage areas to be between 45% and 65%. We understand the upper USGS limit to use is 47.9%, however we do not feel comfortable only using 25%. Can additional guidance be provided so that all teams are designing to a higher impervious standard?	25% is a minimum, the Team should use higher values where appropriate. (We expect most values will be higher but there could be some larger areas that 25% may be appropriate so we don't want to increase the minimum)
50	Hydraulics	320	7th Bullet	Due to the widening and construction of the South Fork Catwaba River bridges, why is Section 15.6 not applicable? This seems to conflict with RFP pg. 327, 7th bullet.	Section 15.6 places risk for temporary encroachments on the Department, removal of that section is to place risk on the DB Team. The DB Teams requirements, which take the place of section 15.6 are shown on page 327, bullet 7 of the RFP.
51	Hydraulics	321	2nd Main Bullet	Can extensions on retained existing pipes have manholes without access as long as pipe inlet / exit is straight and above a certain size (i.e. 48" or larger)?	If the DBT is proposing a big junction box or pipe collar - the answer is Yes. Please clarify manholes without access? The Division is agreeable to omitting manhole access when pipes are 48", because entry will be provided at the pipe outlet.
52	Hydraulics	321	Last Bullet	Based on this bullet, a median drainage system where there is a wall on one side of the roadway would need to meet the walled section criteria. Is this the intention?	Yes
53	Hydraulics	322	4th Bullet	The use of polypropylene pipe on interstates conflicts with the NCDOT Pipe Material Selection Guide. Which guidance should we use: the RFP or the Selection Guide?	RFP controls
54	Hydraulics	326	4th Bullet	Will it be viewed negatively if an inlet with 840.39 is used in a roundabout? It is extremely difficult to meet design criteria without inlets in roundabouts. If no inlets are allowed, can other design criteria be relaxed (i.e. spread, bypass, etc.)?	Inlets aren't prohibited but designs which minimize or avoid them are preferable
55	ITS	330	2nd Paragraph	The RFP states: "The portable ITS devices shall be installed and integrated with the 'Statewide ITS Network' prior to beginning any activity that will impede the traffic on I-85". Does this mean that we would need to locate a portable device at an existing location that is not in an active work area or impacted by the current construction?	The Department still reviewing this question and will post a response prior to issuing the Second Industry Draft RFP.
56	ITS	333	Design Requirements: Communication 2nd Paragraph	The RFP states: "This coordination may include the use of temporary pole lines or temporary conduit runs to allow the installation of the Broadband fiber during the I-5719B / U-5800 construction." Will the DBT be responsible for the installation of the Temporary pole lines and conduit runs for the Broadband project to install the fiber? If temporary lines are used will the Broadband project retain responsibility for installation of the final underground fiber system?	The Department still reviewing this question and will post a response prior to issuing the Second Industry Draft RFP.
57	Pavement Management	352	5th Paragraph	Criteria is provided for shoulder drains for mainline asphalt alternatives. Can criteria be added for concrete alternatives? The DB Team would assume that continuous shoulder drains are needed, but want to confirm.	The RFP will be amended to include Concrete Shoulder Drain Criteria
58	Other	368	Design Requirements: NCDOT Rail Division (P&N)	Under design requirements NCDOT Rail Division (P&N) – page 368: does the Department want new 132 lb. rail, or will relay rail be acceptable? If relay rail is acceptable, has the Department decided if the existing rail can be fully or partially reused? If new rail is required, does the Department want Continuously Welded Rail (CWR) or will jointed rail be acceptable? If CWR is required, will the Department coordinate delivery with Norfolk Southern, or will that be the Design-Build Team's responsibility?	Yes - Minimum #132 RE Class 2 relay jointed rail (see attached grading chart) will be acceptable. Any joints in at-grade crossings should be welded to eliminate the joint in the rail seal material.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
59	Signing	383	3rd Paragraph	The RFP states: "The Design-Build Team shall design, fabricate and install ALL signs along I-85 Southbound for EXIT 27." Can the Department provide shop drawings for the existing Overhead Sign Structure located approximately 870' East of the Moores Chapel Rd bridge which holds "EXIT 27" panel and "NC 273 / Belmont / Mt Holly / 1 1/2 MILES" signs?	The Department will research the existing files for the requested Shop Drawings, if they are available the Department will post them to the Materials Available folder on the Connect site.
60	Structures	392	last bullet - bottom page	Bridge no. 350150 (excluding the pedestrian portion) shall be designed for E-60 live load, this does not conform to the current standard. Arema code requires rail road bridge to be designed to E-80 live load.	This portion of the P&N will only experience trolley service in the future, therefore E-60 has been specified instead of E-80.
61	Structures	392	10th bullet	Please confirm the two separate superstructures are intended to be supported by common substructure units.	Confirmed: two separate Super's, common Substructure
62	Structures	392	2nd to Last Bullet	Are the shoulder widths and clear railroad width in the provided typical section the required minimums for Bridge No. 350150 as well? The RFP currently only notes the bridge railing type as a specific requirement.	Required minimums for the bridge. Roadbed sections shall be as shown in the track / trail typical section of the concept plans. Information and Typical Section for Bridge #350150 (P&N Belmont) will be provided. The Department will evaluate if the RFP will require revision.
63	Structures	392	General	Since the design-build team is only constructing 3 lanes in each direction under the McAdenville bridge in the interim, please clarify in the RFP that it should or shouldn't span the future 4 lane section in each direction with appropriate shoulders.	The DBT is to construct the ultimate 8-lane section with paint stripe out to 6 lanes from the A and D ramps to the westward Project Limits. The Department will provide a sketch of the proposed work. The proposed McAdenville Road Bridge shall accommodate the ultimate I-85 8-lane Typical Section.
64	Structures	394	2nd to last paragraph	verify and confirm rehabilitation and repairs work unit prices	Unit prices have been established in the RFP for the rehabilitation / repair items
65	Signal Systems	397	1st Paragraph	This paragraph refers to work on the City of Gastonia Signal System, but no signals within that system will be impacted by this project. The only other reference to the City of Gastonia System is in the Signal Timing section. Is it the intention of the department that we will update the City of Gastonia Signal System Timings without doing any signal designs on the system?	Yes. There should be coordination with the City of Gastonia regarding any possible impact of the project on their system operation. There should be accommodation for the possibility of signal timing changes warranted as a result of other systemic timing changes throughout the duration of construction, including , but not limited to, any changes that come about as a result of possible traffic control phases or detour routes.
66	Signal Systems	400	New Signals Table	The title of this table is "NCDOT - New Signals to be Installed into existing CLS (6)", but some of these signals will be added to the NEW CLS along NC 7. Should this table be split into two tables to separate out the signals that go on the existing Belmont system and the new NC 7 system?	By the time of construction, the signals on NC 7 (D12-31_McAdenville) will already exist as a CLS as a result of ICM coordination efforts prior to this work. The fiber trunkline will be new (p.405), but the signals will already be part of a CLS with ICM timings installed. The signals to be included in the McAdenville system and the Belmont system are listed in the tables on pages 405 and 406+407, respectively.
67	Signal Systems	400	12-1946 and 12-1947	The proposed signals at Wilkinson Boulevard U-turn east of Main Street (12-1946) and Wilkinson Boulevard U-turn west of Main Street (12-1947) are assumed to be 'half-signals', two phase signals including the U-turn versus the opposing through movement. This design only includes stopping one direction of Wilkinson Boulevard. However, based on the public hearing maps, it appears that there are crosswalks across both directions of Wilkinson Boulevard. How are the crosswalks intended to get across the other half of the roadway that is unsignalized?	A Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon will be needed for the pedestrian crossing half signal.
68	Signal Systems	401	Existing Signals Table	The title of this table is "NCDOT - Existing Signals to be Modified and Added to Existing CLS (7)", but some of these signals will be added to the NEW CLS along NC 7. Should this table be split into two tables to separate out the signals that go on the existing Belmont system and the new NC 7 system?	By the time of construction, the signals on NC 7 (D12-31_McAdenville) will already exist as a CLS as a result of ICM coordination efforts prior to this work. The fiber trunkline will be new (p.405), but the signals will already be part of a CLS with ICM timings installed. The signals to be included in the McAdenville system and the Belmont system are listed in the tables on pages 405 and 406+407, respectively.
69	Signal Systems	401	Existing Signals Table	This table includes signal 12-1537 to be maintained and upgraded, but it has been removed in the preliminary plans that have been provided. Will this signal be maintained or removed?	This signal is existing and will need to be maintained while NC 7 (N. Main St.) is realigned.
70	Signal Systems	410	ICT #10	According to NCDOT's employee directory, the phone number for the Metrolina Regional ITS Engineer Jeffery D'Arruda is (980-287-0001). Is the listing of his phone number as (704-287-0001) in the ICT correct?	The new extension of 980 should be used for Jeff Jeffery D'Arruda's phone number.
71	Signal Systems	411	Section V: Signal System Timing Plans	The RFP states: "The Design-Build Team shall develop and implement all temporary and final coordinated signal system timing plans for the closed loop signal system along SR 1009 (Old NC 86) and the City of Gastonia Signal System along NC 86 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd )." SR 1009 (Old NC 86) is located in Orange County, is this meant to refer to the new system on NC 7? NC 86 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd) is also in Orange county, is this meant to refer to SR 2278 (DR. M.L.K., Jr. Way)? If this section should refer to SR 2278, should that Signal system timing work be included in the RFP for I-5719A instead of this one?	Timing plans shall be developed for the final condition for D12-31_McAdenville (NC 7) and D12-09_Belmont. Timing plans shall be developed as necessary for each system to accommodate temporary traffic patterns as warranted by changes in volumes/capacity and/or traffic control phasing changes. System timing plans have been confirmed to not be needed for the City of Gastonia Signal System

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
72	Transportation Management	429		Lane and Shoulder Closure Requirements - Maintain a minimum inside and outside paved shoulder width of four feet in each direction of I-85 unless temporary traffic barrier is placed on the paved shoulder. This requirement may be reduced to two feet paved shoulders under structures and one-foot paved shoulders along ramps. If temporary traffic barrier is placed on the shoulder, refer to the Traffic Control Devices and Temporary Traffic Barrier Systems subsections for shy distance and placement requirements. Is the offset to temporary guardrail 2'?	Yes
73	Transportation Management	430		Lane and Shoulder Requirements - The Design-Build Team shall not perform work involving heavy equipment within 15-feet of the edge of travelway when work is being performed behind a lane closure on the opposite side of the travelway. Is this in effect if the work involving heavy equipment is behind barrier?	No
74	Transportation Management	433		Temporary Pavement Markings, Markers, and Delineation – The table shows that “All other roads” require pavement markings. Some existing roads within the project limits do not currently have markings. e.g. -Y7E-, -Y7G-. These roads will likely not meet the ADT requirement per the MUTCD Section 3B.02. Can some of the roads be exempt from this requirement? Stop bars will be applied as required by the <i>Signing and Delineation Unit Manual</i> .	The project shall restripe up to the proposed paving limits. -Y7E-, -Y7G-, -Y7H- had a marked centerline and edge-line in the past.
75	Transportation Management	434		Temporary Pavement Markings, Markers, and Delineation – The Design-Build Team shall trace existing and / or proposed monolithic island locations with the proper color pavement marking prior to removal and / or installation. The Design-Build Team shall place drums to delineate existing and / or proposed monolithic islands after the removal and / or before installation. Is construction or removal of islands excluded from this requirement if work is performed away from traffic?	Yes, if the islands are not part of the active traffic configuration.
76	Utilities	450	Utility Owner List	Has the Department initiated utility relocation discussions with Kinder Morgan, Duke Transmsion and Distribution?	The Utilities Unit has initiated utility owner contact with these companies. We provided copy of plans and general prproject information, we did not discuss specifics regarding conflict analysis/relocations.
77	Utilities	450	General	Will the Department provide a utility contact list?	Yes, the List will be posted to the Materials Available on the Connect site.
78	Environmental Permits	-	I-5719 NRTR	Pg. 17 Section 5.5 of the NRTR: NC River Basin Buffer Rules, states that only the main stem of the Catawba River is covered by the Catawba River Buffer Rules and that the study area does not include this main stem of the Catawba River. The project limits ends at the Catawba River Bridge, will NCDOT update this information?	The NRTR will not be updated. It is still accurate to state that the mainstem Catawba is subject to buffer rules. So long as the project construction footprint is outside these buffers, then you don't need to worry about obtaining buffer certification.
79	Hydraulics	320 & 324	2nd Bullet & 2nd/3rd Bullet	Pg. 324 references that >72" pipe diameter is allowable if trenchless construction methods are used. The following bullet also states that proposed cross structures requiring a hydraulically effective waterway opening of 30sf or more (excluding streambed burial area) shall be conveyed in a reinforced box culvert. Pg. 320 references that crosspipes shall be upsized 6" in diameter above that which would be required hydraulically and/or jurisdictionally required. Considering all of these requirements, would an 84" Trenchless installation WSP be allowable if the hydraulic opening is only a 72" (28.3sf area) and then upsized two pipe sizes (6" for maintenance + 1.0' for jursidictional waters)?	RFP will be revised to clarify 30sf requirement excludes burial and any required upsizing. Are there any areas where the DBT anticipate a new box culvert may be required based on current scope?
80	Signal Systems	370 & 413	(pg 370) Crossings: Permanent Crossing Signals (pg 413) VI. Railroad Crossings	The RFP states that the DBT is responsible for design and construction of the the required traffic control systems. RFP Page 370 Regard Permanent Crossing signals states DBT is responsible for signalization Planimetrics and request/coordinate with Railroad for "railroad-prepared design, engineering, materials list, and cost estimate of the highway / rail grade crossing signalization including required authorizations for construction and preliminary engineering." Is the DBT or Railroad preparing the final designs for Rail crossing signals?	The DBT shall provide Final design and Right of Way Plans for the required, see the last paragraph on page 369 of the RFP, highway-rail crossings needs.
81	Environmental Permits	N/A	N/A	Project Green Sheet Commitments in the NEPA Document. 5th commitment. Which structures have evidence of birds? MBTA compliance may require TOYR for those structures.	At this time it is likely that conservation measures required for bats will keep the project in compliance with MBTA.
82	Project Special Provisions	208	alternate wall section	A couple of references appear to refer to Asheville RFP, are they applicable to this project?	No - The RFP will be revised.
83	Project Special Provisions	215	palette color table	Color palette identical to Asheville project, is it applicable to this project?	No - The RFP will be revised.
84	Environmental Permits	-	I-5719 NRTR	Pg. 17 Section 5.5 of the NRTR: NC River Basin Buffer Rules, states that only the main stem of the Catawba River is covered by the Catawba River Buffer Rules and that the study area does not include this main stem of the Catawba River. The project limits ends at the Catawba River Bridge, will NCDOT update this information?	Duplicate question see Question #78 for response

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
85	Hydraulics	320 & 324	2nd Bullet & 2nd/3rd Bullet	Pg. 324 references that >72" pipe diameter is allowable if trenchless construction methods are used. The following bullet also states that proposed cross structures requiring a hydraulically effective waterway opening of 30sf or more (excluding streambed burial area) shall be conveyed in a reinforced box culvert. Pg. 320 references that crosspipes shall be upsized 6" in diameter above that which would be required hydraulically and/or jurisdictionally required. Considering all of these requirements, would an 84" Trenchless installation WSP be allowable if the hydraulic opening is only a 72" (28.3sf area) and then upsized two pipe sizes (6" for maintenance + 1.0' for jurisdictional waters)?	Duplicate question see Question #79 for response
86	Signal Systems	370 & 413	(pg 370) Crossings: Permanent Crossing Signals (pg 413) VI. Railroad Crossings	The RFP states that the DBT is responsible for design and construction of the the required traffic control systems. RFP Page 370 Regard Permanent Crossing signals states DBT is responsible for signalization Planimetrics and request/coordinate with Railroad for "railroad-prepared design, engineering, materials list, and cost estimate of the highway / rail grade crossing signalization including required authorizations for construction and preliminary engineering." Is the DBT or Railroad preparing the final designs for Rail crossing signals?	Duplicate question see Question #80 for response
87	Environmental Permits	N/A	N/A	Project Green Sheet Commitments in the NEPA Document. 5th commitment. Which structures have evidence of birds? MBTA compliance may require TOYR for those structures.	Duplicate question see Question #81 for response
88	Project Special Provisions	208	alternate wall section	A couple of references appear to refer to Asheville RFP, are they applicable to this project?	Duplicate question see Question #82 for response
89	Project Special Provisions	215	palette color table	Color palette identical to Asheville project, is it applicable to this project?	Duplicate question see Question #83 for response
90	Roadway	258	aesthetics references	There does not appear to be a Aesthetics Scope of work included in the Industry Draft RFP although it is referenced throughout p258, 259, 263, 343 and 393: "Reference the Aesthetics Scope of Work found elsewhere in this RFP".	The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP
91	Utilities	N/A		When is the utility meeting planned for?	There will be no utility meeting. Each team's Utility Coordinator shall coordinate with the utility companies at their own discretion.
92	Project Special Provisions	24	5	Can the ATC maximum be raised from six(6) to 12(12)?	The Department will consider raising the ATC maximum in next Draft RFP.
93	General	236	1	Would the Department consider changing from a hard copy Technical Proposal Submission to electronic only?	The Department is discussing if some hard copies are still needed. A decision will be made prior to the Final RFP being issued.
94	General	239	1	With respect to the Technical Proposal evaluation factors, can these be adjusted to reduce the points allocated to schedule from 25 down to 20 - a reduction of 5 points, and innovation be increased from 5 to 10 points - an increase of 5 points?	The Department will consider making the changes to the points in next RFP.
95	General	244	7	Would the Department consider an increase in Quality Credit Percentage from 25% to 30%?	The Quality credit will remain at 25%.
96	General	247	5	Would the Department consider an increase in the stipend from \$520,000 to \$750,000? The expected 3rd party costs are expected to be considerably more, and being contractor led design-build, the contractor will be out of pocket by a considerable sum.	The stipend will remain at \$520,000.
97	General	1	N/A	In several places, the RFP mentions the "Aesthetics Scope of Work found elsewhere" (specifically RDY SOW pgs. 258, 259, 263, and 270; Structures SOW and Lighting SOW), but there is no Aesthetics Scope in the RFP. Please provided a status update on this section.	The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP
98	Project Special Provisions	3	ICT 4	The last part of ICT 4 states, "3) the coordinated plan from the OMC contractor to perform their portion of the work. are \$10,000.00 per failure."  It appears this provision is missing the required timeframe language (i.e. "a minimum xx calendar days prior to a planned disruption... are \$10,000 per failure"). Please confirm and provide if still needed.	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
99	Project Special Provisions	3	ICT 4/ 12	ICT's 4 refers to NCDOT Communications and ICT 12 refers to NCDOT Fiber Optic Communications. These ICT's appear similar and may be duplicative in nature. Please confirm both ICT's and their related ICT's (i.e. ICT 13) are correct.	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
100	Project Special Provisions	8	1st Paragraph	Are the tree clearing moratorium dates of April 1 through October 15 firmly established between USFWS and NCDOT? The wording found in the Environmental Permits Scope of Work on Page 275 Paragraph 3 states that the tree clearing moratorium dates are subject to change based on USFWS concurrence.	The scope of work is accurate. The tree clearing moratorium dates are subject to change based on USFWS concurrence. At this time the April 1 - Oct 15 dates are the best available information.
101	Project Special Provisions	8	1st Paragraph	Does the tree clearing moratorium also apply to geotechnical exploration?	Tree cutting restrictions apply to all activities associated with the project.
102	Project Special Provisions	22	2nd Paragraph	Can the Department provide an update to the DB Teams on a potential meeting between each individual proposer and the affected utility owners?	There will be no utility meeting. Each team's Utility Coordinator shall coordinate with the utility companies at their own discretion.
103	Project Special Provisions	22	3rd Paragraph	Can the Department provide an update to the DB Teams on a potential meeting between each individual proposer and the NCDOT Rail Division?	ADU will coordinate meetings with shortlisted DBTs and the NCDOT Rail Division with adequate notice.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
104	Project Special Provisions	26	ATC Submittals	Should the email address for ATC's be changed to the "altdelivery@ncdot.gov" email address?	Yes - The RFP will be revised.
105	Project Special Provisions	46	Table	Since NCDOT is the Owner of the railroad, will NCDOT Rail Division and Structures Unit be the reviewers and approvers for all design submittals?	NCDOT Rail Division will be the primary reviewer of the design submittals. Structures Unit or other Division of Highways Unit will review for clearances and / or other concerns in regard to the bridge over I-85 and related items.
106	Project Special Provisions	45/46	45 - last paragraph 46 - RWIC box	Page 45 notes NSR as providing the Roadway Worker in Charge, while Page 46 notes the RWIC as being provided by the NCDOT Rail Division, please confirm who will be providing the RWIC.	NS will not be involved on the P&N Belmont Spur bridge. NCDOT Rail Division will provide a construction inspector but not necessarily a RWIC since the track is out-of-service. Other applicable Roadway Worker Safety criteria will still apply however. The RFP will be revised accordingly.
107	Project Special Provisions	62	Flagging Services 1st Paragraph	As the current tracks are inactive, does the Department anticipate requiring flagger services during construction of the P&N Railway? If Flagger services are required, can the Department provide the current daily rates for flagging services?	No flagging services are anticipated since the track is out-of-service, just construction oversight.
108	Project Special Provisions	70	Cooperation Between Contractors	Projects B-5857, U-6146, B-6051, I-6016, U-6143 are set to be let in the May & July 2025 letting; can the Department confirm if these dates are anticipated to hold? Request meeting with utility coordinators for these projects.	Projects B-5857, U-6146, B-6051, and U-6143 are still scheduled to be let in the May & July 2025. I-6016 is a CMGC Project with an anticipated construction award in June 2026. B-5857, U-6146, B-6051, and U-6143 are Design Bi Build Projects DBT will need to coordinate with NCDOT Utilities. To early to for coordination on I-6016.
109	Project Special Provisions	70	Cooperation Between Contractors	For projects B-5857, U-6146, B-6051, I-6016, U-6143. Can a meeting with the utility coordinators for these projects be scheduled?	See Question 108 for response.
110	Project Special Provisions	207	1st Paragraph	Do sound barrier wall posts have to be concrete, or are steel posts allowed as well?	The Department Policy calls for concrete posts but allows for steel if site conditions are adverse to the use of concrete.
111	Project Special Provisions	223	PSRM Section	In our experience, some Divisions of NCDOT do not prefer using Permanent Soil Reinforcement Mat (PSRM) due to maintenance concerns. For this project is there any concern if the team uses PSRM?	PSRM can be used for preformed scour holes and cut/fill slopes if applicable, but preference for steep (4-5%) ditch treatment to be rip rap.
112	General	236	Tech Proposal Requirements	Would the Department consider an "electronic only" technical proposal submission (i.e. no hard copies)?	The Department is discussing if some hard copies are still needed. A decision will be made prior to the Final RFP being issued.
113	Roadway	250	Bold Statement at Top	The top of the Roadway Scope of Work appears to reference both the 12/13/23 MicroStation Files and the Public Hearing Maps dated October 2023. Are the Public Hearing Maps based on the provided MicroStation Files? If not, which governs in case of a discrepancy?	The Public Meeting Maps are based on an earlier version of the Preliminary Design. If there is a discrepancy, inform the Department and the Department will determine which will govern.
114	Roadway	250	1st bullet	NC 7 (McAdenville Road/Main Street - Exit 23) is Y6, so should the RFP be revised to "western ramp (-Y6RPB- and -Y6RPC-) gore connections..." instead of Y7.	Yes - Will revise RFP to state Y6RPB and Y6RPC
115	Roadway	250	1st bullet	The preliminary plans at I-85/ -Y6- show Ramps B and C tying into the proposed outside lanes of the future I-5719A project. Please confirm the intent of these ramps for the I-571B project. Would the DBT need to design the western Y6 Ramps B and C for the future 8-lane configuration and stub out/stripe out to the existing mainline ties? This would also require an intermediate design for ramps that tie to the existing mainline configuration.	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxiliary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
116	Roadway	250	1st bullet	Roadway SOW shows the design speed as 65 MPH, however the hydroplaning analysis is required for 70-mph. Please confirm this is the intent, that the hydroplaning risk is analyzed at a higher speed than the road.	The RFP is correct, i.e., Design Speed is 65 MPH and Hydroplane Analysis is 70 MPH.
117	Roadway	251	1st main bullet	Should this be referring to -Y6RPB- and -Y6RPC- instead of -Y7RPB- and -Y7RPC- (Y7 that is referenced is Belmont Mt Holly)? This does not align with the current CAD files, these ramps tie to the future 8 lane section unless there is a different CAD file.	Yes - Will revise RFP to state Y6RPB and Y6RPC. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
118	Roadway	252	Second to last Bullet	This project does not appear to have any directional ramps. Please confirm that "directional ramp" refers to a "flyover" and not something else.	There are semi-directional ramps (flyovers) and high speed directional ramps (typically on system to system multi-level interchanges).
119	Roadway	254	4th Bullet	Section states that the DBT is to design and construct a Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) on Y7A "as shown in the Preliminary Plans" and then goes on to say a 23' median despite the Preliminary Plans showing a 16.5'. We believe the intent is to revise the prelim plans to use the 23' median, but want to confirm.	The RFP governs, i.e., 23' median.
120	Roadway	255	6th bullet	RFP requires the DBT to design and construct 8' bike lanes on Y6. Please confirm limits of these bike lanes at Tennant Street and terminating at Y6RPC and Y6RPD (inside interchange = prelim plan limits).	The DBT is to construct 5' bike lane with a 3' buffer from the C and D Ramps northward and connect to the existing bike lanes north of Tennant St.
121	Roadway	255	7th bullet	If a modification included in the preliminary plans is further modified by the Department does this require approval from the Engineer and municipalities? Alternatively, if an RFP requirement requires a change to the Preliminary Plans, will this require approval by the Engineer and municipalities?	No to both questions



Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
122	Roadway	255	Bullet 6	Notes that DB is to construct 8' bike lanes (5' lane, 3' buffer) across new Y6 structure, but does not reference the 5' sidewalks shown in the preliminary plans. Please confirm the intent is to have the 5' sidewalks on each side of the bridge in addition to the 8' bike lanes (5' lane, 3' buffer).	The DBT is to construct 5' sidewalks and the 8' bike lanes (5' lane, 3' buffer) on the proposed structure.
123	Roadway	256	4th bullet, 2nd sub-bullet	RFP states that the DBT is to submit a functional roundabout design prior to Preliminary and Final Plan Submittals for review and acceptance. We understand submitting for review and acceptance prior to Preliminary Plan submittals. If the roundabout design is accepted for Preliminary Plan submittals, do we need to resubmit prior to Final Plan submittal? Secondary review and acceptance prior to Final Plan submittal seems redundant. Please clarify and remove secondary review if not needed.	After preliminary submittals are reviewed and accepted, additional reviews prior to final submittals should only apply to changes made to the approved designs.
124	Roadway	260	Last Bullet	How should the DBT handle crown point transitions where tying to existing bridges and their crown points?	These are case by case transitions, based on the selected DBT's Preliminary Design the Department will provide guidance.
125	Roadway	260	1st bullet	The RFP provides specific design criteria (design speed and max super) for new service roads on pg. 260. However for any existing service roads that are modified as prescribed in this bullet, is it acceptable to meet the existing design speed or minimum radii of the existing service road being modified?	Coordination will be required for each location. Evaluation of existing geometry and crash history may be required to make decisions on matching existing designs.
126	Roadway	262	4th bullet	This bullet is describing resurfacing grades for divided facilities and extending the resurfacing grades so they are the same for both directions of travel. This seems to contradict pg. 250 - 1st bullet which references the gores for Y6RPB and Y6RPC which would not be at the same mainline station. There is no mention of "unless otherwise noted in the RFP" for this requirement. Please provide clarification on the limits of mainline limits at the western ramps of Y6.	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxillary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
127	Roadway	262	Bullet 2	Section states that the DB shall provide milled rumble strips along the mainline outside and median paved shoulders, including ramp and loop terminals, and acceleration, deceleration and auxiliary lanes. Typically milled rumble strips are terminated at the back of gore for ramps & loops. Should limits be adjusted to match RSD 665.02?	The DBT shall follow Department standards
128	Roadway	265	1st Bullet	There is a section on sound barrier wall that may need to be installed within the Duke Transmission easement. Will Duke allow sound barrier wall to be installed underneath their transmission line, or should the sound barrier be evaluated to stop on either side of their easement?	This is a case by case determination based on coordination with the utility provider.
129	Roadway	265	1st Bullet	Can the Department better define the start/stop limits for the noise evaluation specific to this project? The TNR and previous analysis appears to be based on when the projects were combined, but since they are now split into 3 projects there will be overlapping areas of required analysis.	The DBT will need to analyze the noise impacts for all noise sensitive land uses adjacent to any proposed improvements. Additionally, per NCDOT Traffic Noise Manual, it is a requirement (and standard practice) to analyze a set distance beyond the project limits. For freeway improvement projects, the noise analysis must be completed for land uses at least 800 feet beyond the project limits to identify the impacts of the proposed improvements on the noise environment. Note that NW16 and NW17, identified in the TNR, are split by the Section A and B project limits. The analysis of NW16 and NW17 will be included in the DNR for Section A.
130	Roadway	272	5th Bullet	The bullet mentions the desirable Type A ditch on mainline and lists exclusions, will the same exception be allowed on Ramps?	Yes
131	Environmental Permits	275	1st Paragraph	The last sentence of Paragraph 1 references the need for a Neuse Riparian Buffer Authorization. Should this reference be for Catawba Riparian Buffers? Available environmental documents (CE and NRTR) do not identify any streams and/or waterbodies as subject to Catawba Buffer Rules within the project footprint. Does NCDOT anticipate that a Riparian Buffer Authorization will be required for the project?	Yes, Catawba, not Neuse. As the project footprint is currently outside the buffer zones for the mainstem Catawba and the portion of the SF Catawba that is buffered just south of the project, a buffer authorization is not anticipated to be required for this project unless the project area increases.
132	Environmental Permits	275	1st Paragraph	There doesn't appear to be any mention of the Main Stem of the Catawba River Buffer rules in the RFP. Per the NCDOT Environmental Sensitivity Map; the Main Stem rules also extend up the South Fork of the Catawba and encompass part of the project in this area along I-85. Please clarify if Main Stem Catawba Buffer rules apply to portions of this project.	Main Stem buffer rules do apply to the mainstem Catawba just east of the project terminus, as well as a portion of the SF Catawba River beginning south of the project footprint. So long as the construction footprint does not encroach on the buffers in these areas (it currently is outside), then buffer rules do not apply to the project.
133	Environmental Permits	275	2nd Paragraph	Per the CE document and recent review of IPaC, Northern Long-Eared bat (NLEB) is no longer listed as having the potential to occur within the project study area. Should considerations for NLEB be removed from future concurrence efforts?	Correct, NLEB is no longer listed in IPaC as potential within the project area. Reference to this species can be removed unless the range map changes. Tricolored bat is currently the only federally protected bat of consideration for this project.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
134	Environmental Permits	275	2nd Paragraph	Does the Department have a rough timeline / duration for when updated survey will be complete?	Plant surveys are up to date (DFHL and sunflower conducted 3/28/24 and 9/20/24, respectively). We are awaiting results from bat surveys conducted in 2024 in order to request concurrence.
135	Environmental Permits	275	3rd Paragraph	Currently, Tricolored bat (TCB) is listed by USFWS as "Proposed Endangered" but is not yet listed as Endangered. Are the tree clearing moratorium dates provided specific to NLEB, or are they also applicable to TCB per its current status?	Currently the same tree clearing dates are also applicable to TCB.
136	Environmental Permits	275	General Question	A portion of the project is shown to be in a Water Supply Critical Area and also inside the Hazardous Spill Basin Boundary. We may be discharging directly into or just upstream of a Jurisdictional Stream. The CE Planning Document doesn't mention the need for Hazardous Spill Basins. Will this project require hazardous spill basins in the above potential area?	Prefer not to install unless required by the permits.
137	Environmental Permits	275	N/A	Hazardous spill basins may be required for the project. Does the Department have any concerns with utilizing these? Past experience in some divisions is that they are not preferred due to maintenance requirements of sluice gates.	Prefer not to install unless required by the permits.
138	Geotechnical Engineering	301	General Question	Could the Department provide the gINT files that were used to create the inventory report to the teams?	Yes.
139	Geotechnical Engineering	303	5th bullet	Can the design scour elevation be geotechnically adjusted per the NCDOT Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Manual?	Yes, that is what is suggested in the 5th bullet section
140	Geotechnical Engineering	305	3rd bullet	Does the settlement criteria of 1-inch 15 years after final grading for roadway embankments include both primary consolidation and secondary compression settlement or just primary consolidation settlement?	Total settlement. Elastic settlement, primary and secondary consolidation.
141	Geotechnical Engineering	309	Second bullet	Does the cohesion value of 0 psf for retained materials apply for both the external and global stability analysis?	Yes.
142	Geotechnical Engineering	310	Second bullet	"Bridge embankment and roadway embankment settlement monitoring shall be required when the calculated settlement is greater than 2-inches." Does the 2-inch requirement apply to total settlement (elastic and consolidation settlement) or only long term settlement (consolidation) criteria stated on pages 304 and 305 in the Geotechnical Engineering Scope of Work?	Elastic settlement, primary and secondary consolidation.
143	Hydraulics	317	Bullet One	What is the latest version of the Hydroplaning Analysis Tool/Spreadsheet that the Teams will be expected to use for this analysis?	Follow current guidelines and links (Version 1.0 of the tool); If a new version is released we would not require a previously completed and approved analysis to be re-done using the new tool
144	Hydraulics	319	Bullet One	Section states that DB Team "shall replace all existing pipes within the existing/ proposed right of way of the mainline... within the project limits". Can the Department clarify the extents of the project limits, for instance are the project limits for the intent of this specification the "end grade" station on the mainline (STA 594+00) or the end of Mill and Overlay (STA 627+37)?	Yes, within the entire Project Limits (including the mill and overlay sections)
145	Hydraulics	319	Bullet One	Is there a distinction made between "existing/proposed right of way of mainline" and "project limits"? Is the intent that the existing/proposed ROW are the project limits?	Project limits often extend beyond physical construction limits, i.e. MOT. Construction limits entails all areas in which work, i.e., grading, paving, drainage, structures, pavement markings, signing, etc., occurs.
146	Hydraulics	321	Bullet Four	Can the Department help us define what is considered a wall to avoid confusion? Is it a certain type of wall, a certain height wall, could this include a single or double face barrier, etc?	Sealed system requirement apply to all retaining walls - walls that hold back material. Rephrase and resubmit the question.
147	Hydraulics	321	Bullet Five	This section as written is ambiguous and leads to broad application of the requirements, resulting in unnecessarily higher costs. For instance, if an interchange has walled ramps on both sides, is the intent that every pipe within that 400' plus wide section is considered within a walled zone? An illustration of the Department's intent would be helpful to all Teams.	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed. Would defining the area as the area consisting of "fill" alleviate confusion or make it worse? Please provide wording that the DBT thinks would clarify this bullet.
148	Hydraulics	322	Bullet 1 & 3	In Bullet 1, other than the areas defined (pipes in median and shoulders running parallel to the roadway) for the use of the Sealed DIP, it states to use WSP for all other Pipe. Please clarify the intent of "for all other pipes". Is this meant for pipes not running parallel?  We request the clarification because in bullet 3, it states for all other storm drainage pipe to use Sealed DIP. Is there a distinction made between "all other pipe" in 1 and 3; or are they a repeat, or a conflict?	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed. In VOC areas, use WSP for cross-drainage and under traffic, use DIP elsewhere. In other walled sections, use WSP for cross-drainage, under traffic, etc and use PP elsewhere.
149	Hydraulics	322	6th Bullet	Section states that storm drainage shall not pass through a retaining wall. Can this be modified to allow a storm drainage pipe to pass through a wall if it is designed for the condition?	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
150	Hydraulics	323	Bullet One	Section states no need to analyze an existing pipe if not lengthened and no additional discharge draining to it on the Y line, yet on Page 319 Bullet 1 says to replace all if less than 48". Which one controls?	Page 310 bullet 1 says "unless allowed otherwise elsewhere in this RFP" - Page 323 Bullet 1 controls
151	Hydraulics	324	Sub bullet Two	Excluding WSP installed by trenchless, the maximum pipe diameter is 72". However, sub bullet four states that any new structure requiring a hydraulic effective opening equal or greater than 30SF - has to be a Box Culvert. This appears to override Sub bullet two? Please clarify.	30sf is required hydraulic conveyance and doesn't include area required for burial or upsizing. RFP will be clarified to add upsizing exclusion.
152	Hydraulics	325	First Sub bullet	States cross drainage should only be conveyed by one line of pipe; yet; top of Page 324, states that deficient structures could be replaced with pipe/pipes. "Pipes" would imply more than 1 line of pipe; conflicting with Page 325 First Sub bullet. Please clarify.	"pipe(s)" on page 324 could refer to series of pipes; intent is not to have more than a single line per bullet on page 325
153	Railroad Coordination	363	General Question	Will provisions for an additional track, maintenance road, or trail on the P&N structure be required?	The proposed P&N Spur Structure is to accommodate the Spur Line and the proposed MUP, no additional track and / or maintenance road requirements.
154	Railroad Coordination	368	General Question	Since the project is on an inactive railroad, will the contractor have to comply with the following sections of Norfolk Southern's Special Provisions for Protection of Railway Interest: 3. INTERFERENCE WITH RAILROAD OPERATIONS – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 4. TRACK CLEARANCES – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 6. DAMAGES – NCDOT requirements should be applicable 7. RAILROAD PROTECTIVE SERVICES – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 8. HAUL ACROSS RAILROAD TRACKS – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 10. COOPERATION AND DELAYS – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 11. TRAINMAN'S WALKWAYS – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service 12. GUIDELINES FOR PERSONNEL ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY – Will the Contractor be allowed to make the track inaccessible as defined by the FRA to make this provision not applicable? 13. GUIDELINES FOR EQUIPMENT ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY – Not applicable due to the railroad being out of service. 14. INSURANCE – NCDOT's insurance requirements should apply	3. Agree 4. Agree 6. Agree 7. Agree 8. NCDOT Rail Div will need to review/approve any haul roads across tracks if in place. 10. NCDOT still needs to provide timely responses/reviews/approvals 11. Agree but still need to be mindful of providing a safe workspace 12. The track will be made inaccessible by NCDOT Rail Division and the operator of the active portion of the P&N. 13. Equipment also applies to work equipment on the track 14. Agree
155	Railroad Coordination	371	General Question	Norfolk Southern's Public Projects Manual Section H.2 - Underpass Grade Separation Design Criteria – 4. Design Loads, F. states "For design purposes, however, the supporting steel members shall be proportioned to carry the entire load without taking into account any stresses which may be induced in the concrete slab by composite action. Composite action may be taken into account when satisfying the deflection-length ratio requirements.." AREMA allows the use of composite action when sizing the supporting steel members. Can composite action be used when sizing the supporting steel members?	Use NS criteria, not AREMA.
156	Railroad Coordination	371	General Question	Norfolk Southern's Public Projects Manual Section H.2 - Underpass Grade Separation Design Criteria – 6. Superstructures for Ballast Deck Railway Bridges, B. Steel Superstructures, 2. "All web-to-flange welds shall be full penetration groove welds". AREMA allows these welds to be fillet welds. Can web-to-flange welds be fillet welds?	Use NS criteria, not AREMA.
157	Railroad Coordination	371/ 392	General Question/ Last Bullet	Norfolk Southern's Public Projects Manual indicates that structures must be designed for Cooper E80 or Cooper E90 (as directed), diesel impact / Alternative Live Load. On Page 392, there is a specific note for Bridge 350150 to design it for E-60; Please confirm this overrides the more conservative NS Public Projects Manual.	Yes, use E60 due to future limited rail traffic on the bridge.
158	Structures	392/ 394	2nd to last Bullet/ 2nd Bullet	Page 392 states that the new P&N Bridge shall be 2 separate superstructures. Page 394 states that for all new structures, the same girder depth must be used. Since the new P&N Bridge is two separate superstructures for the rail bridge and pedestrian bridge, may two separate superstructure types/ depths be utilized?	No - The Typical Section was approved in the MOA (FHWA, NCDOT and SHPO) shows same superstructure type/depth. Use same depth web for both as noted in the typical section. Elements of the pedestrian bridge however can be designed accordingly.
159	Transportation Management	444	ICT 29 thru 32	Please elaborate on ICT's #29-#32. It is not clear what the intentions are for these ICT's. Is there a description and date of availability paragraph(s) missing for these four ICT's? Similar to other ICT boxes.	ICTs 29-32 allow for long-term lane closures on the specified roads. Date of availability is the date the DBT elects to close a lane. The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
160	Utilities	450	Utility Owner List	Please provide Utility owner contacts for any NCDOT has already communicated with.	The Utilities Contact List will be posted to the Materials Available on the Connect site. The Utilities Unit has initiated utility owner contact with Kinder Morgan, Duke Transmssion and Distribution.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
161	Utilities	451	Colonial Pipeline Coordination	Can NCDOT provide a contact for the firm performing the engineering design for relocations for Colonial Pipeline? Can more information be provided on their planned relocations.	Please see the Utility Contacts List for Colonial Pipeline Point of Contact. Colonial Pipeline performed SUE work to verify locations and identify potential conflict areas. Please contact Colonial Pipeline for additional details. The DBT will need to confirm with Colonial Pipeline that their pipe under the P&N is encased or buried a sufficient depth to avoid encasement.
162	Utilities	451	Colonial Pipeline Coordination	Section states that NCDOT has initiated utility relocation coordination efforts with Colonial Pipeline. Is the expectation that the DB Team will takeover coordination efforts with Colonial Pipeline or will efforts stay with the Department? If the DB Team takes over, when is it expected that the transition of responsibilities will occur?	The Utilities Unit performed early utility coordination efforts with Colonial Pipeline ahead of Advertisement for this project. It is the responsibility of the selected Design Build Team to continue these efforts through the completion of the contract. The DBT will need to confirm with Colonial Pipeline that their pipe under the P&N is encased or buried a sufficient depth to avoid encasement.
163	Utilities	451	General Question	Has the Department initiated UPEA's for any other utilities, such as Products Pipeline or Dominion Energy?	No.
164	Utilities	455	Prior Rights	Has NCDOT received any prior right documents from any utilities, such as Dominion Energy, Products Pipeline, Colonial Pipeline, Duke Energy, AT&T, or Verizon?	The Utilities Unit has received prior rights information from Colonial Pipeline. Their pipeline has prior rights outside the existing public right-of-way and is encroaching within the existing public right-of-way.
165	Project Special Provisions	22	2nd & 3rd Paragraphs	Does the Department have an expected timeframe for scheduling the Team's individual meetings with the affected utility owners and/or railroad?	There will be no utility meeting. Each team's Utility Coordinator shall coordinate with the utility companies at their own discretion. ADU will coordinate meetings with shortlisted DBTs and the NCDOT Rail Division with adequate notice.
166	General	236		Is the Department still considering allowing electronic submittals of the technical proposals?	The Department is discussing if some hard copies are still needed. A decision will be made prior to the Final RFP being issued.
167	Roadway	250	1st Bullet	The RFP notes the begin project limits should be the McAdenville / Main St western ramp (Y7RPB and Y7RPC) gore connections. Should the alignment names of the ramp ties be changed to Y6RPB and Y6RPC?	Yes. Y6RPB and Y6RPC
168	Roadway	251	4th Bullet	Should these ramp alignment names be Y6RPB and Y6RPC? (See question #3)	Yes. Y6RPB and Y6RPC
169	Roadway	251	6th Bullet	Could the Department better define what would be considered a "significant shift" of the alignments?	Greater than 25' either up or down station will be considered a significant shift.
170	Roadway	255	8th Bullet	This bullet refers to the utilization of the I-5719 Project Level Traffic Forecast Report for all lane configurations. Should it reference the I-5719_Traffic_Analysis_Future_Year_Tech_Memo_FINAL_07-12-2024 instead?	Yes the reference should be I-5719_Traffic_Analysis_Future_Year_Tech_Memo_Final_07-12-2024 The Department will revise the RFP.
171	Roadway	263	1st Bullet	Should this read "Carolina Thread Trail"?	Yes. Carolina Thread Trail
172	Environmental Permits	275	1st Paragraph	This paragraph references the Neuse River Basin but should this be the Catawba Buffers?	Yes. Catawba.
173	Environmental Permits	281	2nd Paragraph	This paragraph details the process for if the DB Team discovers any undocumented historic or archaeological resources while conducting the authorized work. It notes that if necessary, the DB Team shall engage the services of a NCDOT prequalified historic architecture and / or archaeology consultant to conduct further historic architecture and / or archaeology evaluation and / or mitigation. Is this meant to be at the DB Team's expense or is this paid for by the Department as extra work?	Additional historic architecture and / or archaeology consultant services will be at the DBT's expense.
174	Geotechnical Engineering	General		Can electronic gINT file and boring location gtm file be provided?	Yes.
175	Geotechnical Engineering	304	6th Bullet	What is the minimum allowable cut slope in weathered rock?	2:1
176	Geotechnical Engineering	308	Last Bullet	For shallow weathered rock/rock conditions, can the embedment be less than 10 ft?	No.
177	Geotechnical Engineering	310	2nd Bullet	Please clarify the start time of settlement monitoring. Would it be after reaching the roadway embankment finish grade, or prior to placing the first lift?	"Install settlement plates at least one foot below original grade and begin monitoring prior to placing first lift of the embankment."
178	Hydraulics	316	3rd Bullet	What is the minimum offset from median barrier rail preferred for proposed trunklines?	At a minimum, enough offset to achieve proper compaction during backfill of trunklines and not interfere with foundations.
179	Hydraulics	316	4th Bullet	Is there Department preference for or against preformed scour holes and/or energy dissipator basins as outlet protection mitigation methods? If so, can this be specified in the RFP?	Preference would be for a design that doesn't require either. When required, DBT should select appropriate measures and be able to justify the selection to the Department and permitting agencies
180	Hydraulics	317	3rd Bullet	To mitigate spread concerns during construction, will the Department allow temporary deck drains over waterways?	As long as the permitting agencies are ok with it. We have been allowed to do this in the past just while under construction.
181	Hydraulics	319	6th Bullet	Will this condition (grassed median count as impervious surface) apply to STA 480+00 to 511+00, representing roughly 5.4 acres of grassed median that would count as pavement? Does the condition apply to sizing pipes and pre versus post analysis?	The intent is to make sure storm drainage systems can accommodate future widening. Anticipate revising RFP to limit area that has to be treated as impervious to 13' each side. Pre/post should only account for impacts of the project being constructed.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
182	Hydraulics	320 & 325	14th Bullet & 1st Bullet	Bullet on 320 suggests supplemental pipes may be utilized, while Bullet on 325 states multiple lines cannot serve the same watershed. Can clarification be provided on when supplemental pipes may be used?	Has Team identified any existing box culverts that are undersized? The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
183	Hydraulics	326	General	South Fork Catawba River is a Redelineated Study Zone AE without a model posted to the FRIS website. Will the Department request the model from FEMA to provide to the Pursuit Teams?	we will request FEMA models within the project area
184	Lighting	342	Last Paragraph	This paragraph notes that the Piedmont and Northern Railway Spur Line Bridge foot lighting system shall utilize step light luminaires that are integral to the interior barrier and to reference the Lighting Special Provisions for additional details. It doesn't appear the Lighting Special Provisions contain any additional information on these step lights. Please clarify.	The Lighting SPs will be updated to include the information about the foot lighting system. This was inadvertently removed when the project was segmented.
185	Pavement Management	347	1st Bullet	Please clarify the maximum thickness of wedging that will be allowed for maintenance of traffic before full-depth pavement replacement will be required?	The RFP will be changed to the following: The DB Team may elect to reconstruct the pavement in lieu of resurfacing or the DB may elect to resurface with any remaining elevation made up with wedging.
186	Railroad Coordination	366		Train Data: Given that the existing track is out-of-service, is there any requirement to maintain the track connection within the project limits? If not, are there any time restrictions for track removal? Specifically, may the rail bridge be removed without temporary accommodation?	Track (at the limits identified) and bridge can be removed without any time restrictions. Existing grade crossings will need to be maintained until such time as new track is in place or replaced with minimum outage.
187	Structures	392	4th Paragraph, 1st Bullet	It is noted that for bridge 350150 on P&N east of Belmont Mt Holly Road over I-85, the bridge railing shall be as shown in the provided typical section "I5719B_SMU_PGD_350150", and the deck shall be concrete. Is that the limit of what is required to "match" the provided PGD?	The Department will verify the Typical posted, all components of the Typical Section are apart of the MOA (FHWA, NCDOT, SHPO) and shall be complied with by the DBT.
188	Structures	393	10th Paragraph	An "Aesthetics Scope of Work" is referenced here and elsewhere in the document but this scope is not included in the provided RFP. When can the Team's expect for this to be provided?	The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP
189	Transportation Management	416	1st & 4th Paragraphs	Please clarify what Incident Management Plan effort should be provided with the Technical Proposal, prior to award.	IMPs are developed after the project has been awarded in conjunction with NCDOT.
190	Transportation Management	416	1st & 4th Paragraphs	Please specify when and to what degree will current Incident Management Plans be made available to the Design-Build Team for the project Incident Management Plan development.	NCDOT will provide existing IMP information after the project is awarded. Existing IMPs can be expanded on by the contractor based on the construction impacts.
191	Transportation Management	421	3rd Paragraph	Please clarify the need for Basic Level of Pedestrian Accommodation during construction for NC 273 between US 29/74 and I-85, where no existing or proposed pedestrian facilities are present.	Previous aerial images show worn paths on either side of bridge at the interchange. See temporary pedestrian accommodation guidelines. Basic level could be served by Pedestrian Transport service.
192	Transportation Management	421	3rd Paragraph	Please clarify the need for Basic Level of Pedestrian Accommodation during construction for SR 2093 North of I-85, where no existing pedestrian facilities are present.	Existing sidewalk on south side of bridge. See temporary pedestrian accommodation guidelines. Basic level could be served by Pedestrian Transport service.
193	Transportation Management	421	3rd Paragraph	Please clarify the need for Basic Level of Pedestrian Accommodation during construction within the interchange of NC 7 and I-85, where no existing pedestrian facilities are present.	Agree, level of pedestrian accommodation is on par with Absence of need. The Department will revise the RFP.
194	Transportation Management	429	6th Paragraph	Coordination with adjacent projects and "a minimum of 3 miles between lane closures" may greatly restrict the available work area for this 4.1 mile project. Many interstate projects have been successfully completed with a restriction of 2 miles between lane closures. Would the Department consider modification of the current restriction?	Please note, 3 miles has been used on recent projects including I-95 in Robeson Co (C204596). The purpose of the language change from 2 miles was to clarify that the 3 miles is measured from the end of one closure to the beginning of the taper of the next lane closure.
195	Transportation Management	431	5th Paragraph	Please clarify if the Department approval of Road Closures will be determined after Award, prior to inclusion within the TMP, or necessary prior to inclusion within the Technical Proposal.	If road closures fall outside of the time restrictions and ICTS, approval notification would be after award. If the team wants approval for a road closure that falls outside of the time restrictions and ICTS before the Technical Proposal, they should submit proposed road closures as an ATC.
196	Transportation Management	444	1st Paragraph	Please clarify if the lane closures listed with ICT # 29-32 may be repeated or if they are further restricted by Holiday or Season? Example: Will a lane along US 29/74 be permitted to be closed under ICT 30 at different times, perhaps in different locations; or one location and direction, may the outside lane be closed and later the inside lane be closed?	ICTs 29-32 allow for long-term lane closures on the specified roads. Date of availability is the date the DBT elects to close a lane. The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
197	Transportation Management	445	1st Paragraph	Given that the NC 7 bridge over I-85 will need to be stage constructed, as shown in the preliminary plans, please clarify the number of lanes to be provided for each construction stage and whether the closure ICT may be repeated between construction stages.	Please provide additional information or justification for need of utilizing the ICT multiple times.  Unless capacity analysis is provided and approved for phases during construction. The same number of lanes should be provided as in the existing conditions.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
198	Transportation Management	445	4th Paragraph	Given that US 29/74 is used for traffic exiting the McAdenville Christmas Lights Celebration, will ICT # 35 or 36 apply to US 29/74?	Yes, will amend the RFP
199	Transportation Management	446	2nd Bullet	Please clarify the level of detail required to show Median Access Areas within the Technical Proposal.	The TMP in the technical proposal should show the access and egress locations. PCB at access and egress locations should be shown on plan sheets as they would be installed (see Typical Median Access Detail).
200	Utilities	General		Will there be a FERC permit required with any work at the South Fork Catawba River crossing?	It is not the intent for any of the work to require a FERC permit. If bidders believe any of their work will trigger a FERC permit, please contact the Department.
201	Utilities	General		Should we anticipate any additional files or SUE data other than what has already been shared?	Not at this time.
202	Utilities	General		Is there any additional preliminary data regarding septic systems and/or private utilities that can be shared?	This would be the Design Build Team's responsibility as part of ROW work. There were no advanced parcel acquisitions for this project.
203	Utilities	449	2(A)	On Sheet 7 of the plans, there is a proposed CA line through what appears to be an existing Sewer Pump Station. Please confirm this Pump Station needs to be relocated outside of the new CA line.	Preliminary Plan Sheet 7 is outside of the project limits of I-5719B. Please note I-5719B generally starts on Preliminary Plan Sheet 10 of the roadway plans.
204	Utilities	449	2(B)	For the existing bridges to be widened with a water or sewer force main attached to the structure, please confirm the requirement of 3.5.1.1 justification process does or does not have to be conducted ?	In general, attachment of new/relocated water or sewer mains to structures will only be considered if trenchless installation is determined not to be feasible. Requirements of Section 3.5.1.1 do apply to any new/relocated utilities proposed for attachment to structures.
205	Utilities	449	2(B)	For the existing bridges to be relocated with a water or sewer force main attached, please confirm the requirement of 3.5.1.1 justification process does or does not have to be conducted ?	In general, attachment of new/relocated water or sewer mains to structures will only be considered if trenchless installation is determined not to be feasible. Requirements of Section 3.5.1.1 do apply to any new/relocated utilities proposed for attachment to structures.
206	Utilities	449	2(C)	The plans indicate there are three skewed water main crossings of Line "L" and seven skewed sewer main crossings. Please confirm these lines, if determined to be structurally inadequate, do not need to be relocated to be as perpendicular to Line "L" as required by the UAM.	Existing mains that cross the -L- line and are not in conflict with the work may be retained. If any mains that cross the -L- line need to be relocated, the newly laid mains shall be as perpendicular as feasible and be installed within encasement pipe within the limits of C/A as required by the UAM.
207	Utilities	449	2(C)	The plans indicate there are potentially seven water main crossings of Line "L" and one sewer force main crossings at bridges. Please confirm the location of these existing lines as being attached to the existing bridge or below the roadway.	There does not appear to be any water main or sewer force main crossings in the vicinity of bridges within I-5719B project limits. There are several crossings near bridges within the I-5719A project limits. This should be verified via coordination with the appropriate Utility Owners.
208	Project Special Provisions	8	p1	Construction Moratorium: Can trees be cut between october 15 and april 1 and the grubbing take place at a later date when prior to having a 404/401 permit.	Yes. The bat tree clearing moratorium refers to tree cutting. Removal of felled trees/grubbing can occur outside of that window. This can occur prior to the 404/401 permit provided these activities do not impact (even temporarily) water resources.
209	Project Special Provisions	24		Can confidential questions be submitted to NCDOT outside of the industry review meetings?	Yes
210	Project Special Provisions	99	DMS	What is the current version of the DMS Control Software being used?	Currently, DMS is controlled through Daktronics Vanguard software but transitioning to Arcadis inSight ATMS software in 2025.
211	Structures	208	Paragraph 5	In the Sound Barrier Wall section, there is a reference to the Montford Historic District and the Burton Street history mural. This seems to be a holdover from the I-2513B/D RFP - please clarify.	Correct - The RFP will be revised
212	General	229	Review of submittals	Can NCDOT indicate the submittal process indicating each stage the DOT expects the DB contractor to deliver the design submittals per discipline?	The general submittal process is: Preliminary Plans, Final Plans and Release for Construction Plans. This will vary from discipline to discipline. The schedule for submission of any / all submittals is at the discretion of the DBT.
213	General	229	Review of submittals	What submittal type (e.g. design submittals, shop drawings, other) is the 15 working day review period for temporary structures, OH sign assemblies, MSE Walls, and temporary shoring referring to?	All submittal type for temporary structures, overhead sign assemblies MSE walls, FEMA compliance documents, curved steel girder working drawings and temporary shoring will be on a 15 working day review timeframe.
214	General	230	1st paragraph	Is the "Alternative Delivery Submittal Guidelines" that the RFP references the same as the "Design-Build Submittal Guidelines 2009" on NCDOT's Alternative Delivery Resources website?	Yes
215	General	230	Review of submittals	RFP indicates that no work shall be performed prior to the Department's review and acceptance of the design submittals. Would NCDOT entertain the option to start construction at risk before the corresponding RFC design submittals are accepted?	The Department may entertain this on a case-by-case basis if it is determined to be a critical path item.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
216	General	231	1	Can NCDOT change the date for the current version of the design standards to follow from " Technical Proposal submittal date or the Best and Final Offer submittal date, whichever is later." to Final RFP issuance date? Proposers will be unable to modify their design if a significant change is made to a design standard or policy between completion of proposal design and submittal of Technical Proposal.	The Department will keep Technical Proposal submittal date or the Best and Final Offer submittal date, whichever is later.
217	General	232	last paragraph	Please strike " shall be performed in a manner satisfactory to the State and" from the first sentence of the last paragraph. "Satisfactory to the State" is an arbitrary term.	No - Standard NCDOT Design-Build Language
218	General	232	last paragraph	Please strike the last sentence of the last paragraph "The decision of the Engineer / State / Department shall control in all questions regarding location, type of design, dimension of design, and similar questions."	No - Standard NCDOT Design-Build Language
219	General	233	3rd paragraph	Is the intention of the sentence "Individual offices of the Design-Build Team not identified in the SOQ or the Technical Proposal submitted shall not perform any work without written consent by the Engineer." to require each D-B Team firm (contractor, subconsultant, subcontractor) to list the expected branch office that might perform work on the project?	Yes
220	General	236		Can proposers submit 34"x84" roll plots instead of 11"x17" plan sheets for the proposal? The Preliminary Roadway Plans provided by NCDOT are 34"x84" in size.	11" x 17" plan sheets are preferred.
221	General	236		Alternatively, could NCDOT accept together with 11x17 drawings, a set of roll plots (24x36 inches or longer) of the entire corridor with: (1) a project overview and (2) TMPC (traffic management) concept design?	Department will consider. May add to RFP.
222	General	237	2nd paragraph	Are the proposal design CAD files to be included as part of the Technical Proposal - Electronic Copy?	No
223	General	241	16th bullet point	Can NCDOT provide the aesthetic requirements for the project?	The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP
224	General	246	2nd paragraph	What is the Engineer's Estimate for this project?	It is only for internal use of NCDOT, i.e., not available to the shortlisted DBTs.
225	Roadway	250	2nd bullet	For the shoulders along the "acceleration, deceleration and auxiliary lanes, and ramps / loops to the back of the gore" is the 12-foot width mentioned the total width of the outside shoulder or the useable shoulder width? If it's the useable shoulder width, then what is the required total width?	The bullet notes a 14' outside shoulder, 12' full depth paved shoulder. Where guardrail is required, it will be placed at 14' and 3 additional feet will be added to the shoulder for a total of 17'.
226	Roadway	250	3rd bullet	A 27' full depth median is indicated. However, 26' is indicated in the typical section which would correspond to 12' lanes and 2' median barrier. Confirm which is correct?	27' is required. The extra foot should allow for the 2' median barrier to be widened as need where it is stretched for overhead sign foundations and minimizes / avoids encroaching on the 12' shoulders.
227	Roadway	251	3rd bullet	Between the Y6RPB tie-in and the Y6RPA back of gore, are the SB I-85 lanes to be resurfaced? Between the Y6RPC tie-in and the Y6RPBD back of gore, are the NB I-85 lanes to be resurfaced?	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxiliary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
228	Roadway	251	4th bullet	Could the Department please clarify if the required acceleration/deceleration lengths mentioned refer to the lengths shown in the preliminary plans or if the department intends for the contractor to determine those lengths per the RDM and 2018 Greenbook?	First bullet note indicates to provide the required acceleration/deceleration lengths. If proposed lengths are less than what is shown in the preliminary plans, coordination with NCDOT for confirmation will be required.
229	Roadway	251	B3	Is the requirement for a diamond configuration with a ramp in loop D at exit 26 only for the final condition?	Yes, unless the DBT chooses to submit an ATC for different interchange design and that ATC is approved.
230	Roadway	251	B4 Sub 1	Aux lanes between exit 26 and exit 27 are called out. The hearing map indicates resurfacing over the existing shoulder. Will all of the existing shoulder pavement structure need replacement?	Yes - The DBT shall remove the existing shoulder pavement and replace it with full depth pavement.
231	Roadway	251	last bullet	The RFP states that a retaining wall shall be required from Sta 546+60 - 551+50 to avoid impacts to the adjacent property. Please clarify that the wall can be eliminated if other design measures are taken to avoid property impacts. Potentially eliminating this wall does not appear to require an ATC based on page 254, 2nd bullet since this location along I-85 is in a cut section.	No ATC is required if the proposed design does not impact the property.
232	Roadway	251	Last Paragraph	"3) all existing and proposed slopes shall be 2:1 or flatter, requiring the Design-Built Team to flatten all existing slopes steeper than 2:1" Please allow using rockplated steeper than 2:1 slopes. Rockplated slopes may provide significant cost/environmental savings	The RFP will remain as written, no change.
233	Roadway	251		Since the proposed gore areas for the -Y6- ramps will be different than what's shown in the Preliminary Roadway Plans, is the intent to have the tie-ins to -Y6- (NC 7) match the ultimate configuration shown in the Preliminary Roadway Plans?	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxiliary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
234	Roadway	252	3rd & 4th bullet	The 3rd and 4th bullets contradict each other regarding the width of the outside full depth shoulders. Bullet 3 indicates 4-foot full depth paved outside shoulders and Bullet 4 indicates 12-foot full depth paved outside shoulders	3rd bullet indicates "unless noted elsewhere..."; 4th bullet is elsewhere.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
235	Roadway	252	3rd bullet	On ramp outside shoulders that require guardrail, can the 10-foot section of the shoulder remain unpaved? Criteria states that only 4-foot of the outside 14-foot shoulder shall be paved	The bullet notes a 14' outside shoulder, 12' full depth paved shoulder. Where guardrail is required, it will be placed at 14' and 3 additional feet will be added to the shoulder for a total of 17'.
236	Roadway	252	4th bullet point	In page 252, outside shoulder for ramps at the interchanges with NC7 and SR 2093, RFP prescribes 12' of full depth outside shoulder, but the bullet point above calls for 14' outside shoulder for all ramps in general in the project, therefore, for these two interchanges, can NCDOT clarify if the ramps need to have 12' or 14' of outside shoulder?	14' is the total outside shoulders width (of which either 4' or 12' will paved).
237	Roadway	252	5th bullet	Please define the limits of ramp outside shoulder reconstruction of the NC-273 (Beatty Dr) interchange.	Remove and replace the existing shoulders for all ramps up to the ramp terminal intersection
238	Roadway	252	7th bullet	If the existing median shoulders are less than 10-foot wide at eh Mill and Overlay areas, does the Proposer have to reconstruct the median shoulders?	No.
239	Roadway	252	7th bullet point	Can NCDOT confirm that from Station 594+00 to 627+38 I85 ML, the scope of works is only mill and overlay and that no widening is prescribed to get the required 12' lanes and 10' median shoulder?	That is correct - No widening
240	Roadway	252	7th bullet point	For the aforementioned station ranges between 594+00 to 627+38, can NCDOT confirm that DB contractor responsibility is to mill and overlay with 1.5 inches and that existing horizontal and vertical roadway geometry will not need to be modified. Also in this section do we need to mitigate hydroplaning issues?	Yes, Evaluate Hydroplaning
241	Roadway	252	8th bullet	The scope of work currently states that directional ramps shall meet a 65mph design speed. Please confirm this design speed encompasses the full length of the ramp. Also, please provide ramp design speed criteria for semidirectional ramps.	Semi-directional 50 mph, directional 65 mph
242	Roadway	252	B4	The two -Y- line ramps require 12' of full depth outside shoulder. Confirm 14' shoulder not required.	No. The bullet notes "All ramps". A 14' outside shoulderis required (12' full depth paved shoulder plus 2') . Where guardrail is required, it will be placed at 14' and 3 additional feet will be added to the shoulder for a total of 17'.
243	Roadway	253	B1	Does DDI language still apply?	Only if the DBT chooses to submit an ATC for a DDI design.
244	Roadway	255	6th bullet	The scope of work along NC-7 (McAdenville Rd) currently states only constructing an 8-ft bike lane in each direction. Please confirm no other scope is required along this route (e.g., turn-lanes).	The DBT is to construct 5' bike lane with a 3' buffer from the C and D Ramps northward and connect to the existing bike lanes north of Tennant St. The DBT is to construct 5' sidewalks along the southbound lanes from -Y6- Station 14+13.00 across the bridge to 29+10.00± tie to the existing sidewalk and northbound on the bridge, see Plan Sheet 10 of the Preliminary Plans
245	Roadway	255	6th bullet	What are the eastern limits of the bike lanes on -Y6- NC 7?	The DBT is to construct 5' bike lane with a 3' buffer from the C and D Ramps northward and connect to the existing bike lanes north of Tennant St.
246	Roadway	255	7th bullet	If the Proposer stays within the limits outlined in the Preliminary Plans, but the design varies from what is shown, is coordination and written approval from the Municipalities still required?	Yes
247	Roadway	255	7th bullet	Is this for ownership only or does it apply to streets with which maintenance agreements are in place? Can the department provide a list of municipal owned and/or maintained streets within the project limits?	It applies to both. Check the NCDOT webpage at the following address: <a href="https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/Asset-Management/Pages/Posted-Roads.aspx">https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/Asset-Management/Pages/Posted-Roads.aspx</a>
248	Roadway	256	2nd bullet	The RFP states, "The Design-Build Team will not be required to design or construct ramps or bridges to accommodate future loops or future auxiliary lanes." Page 383 states that the overhead sign structure for I-85 SB at NC-7 (ramp -Y6RPA-) shall be designed to handle any future signs. The RFP requires that exit ramp -Y6RPA- will develop as an "EXIT ONLY" where the outside 4th SB lane drops at the gore. In the future project to the west, this exit ramp will be developed as a 5th lane parallel exit whereas the outside 4th lane continues as a through lane. Due to the lane requirement differences between the current and future projects, the location of the overhead sign structure column would be different. Please clarify if the location of the required overhead sign at this exit ramp shall accommodate both the current & future lane configurations along I-85 SB.	Construct the ultimate pavement width (8 lanes with shoulders) to the B and C ramps with a portion of the auxillary lanes to Exit 22 but paint strip out to 6 lanes. The DBT will construct the proposed B and C ramps with temporary ramp ties (the Department will provide a sketch to denote limits of work).
249	Roadway	256	3rd bullet	The scope of work currently states the design & construction of -Y- lines shall be such that the through movement is not required to change lanes through the project limits. Please confirm this does not apply to temporary traffic shift tapers where lane continuity is maintained through the shifting taper.	Yes. This applies only to final design.
250	Roadway	258	B4	Service road studies are indicated for all landlocked parcels. Will this be resolved prior to bidding?	Standard NCDOT verbiage, If the DBT's design landlocks a parcel(s) the DBT shall preform a Service Road Study.
251	Roadway	260	1st bullet point	The width of travel lanes of existing service roads are subject to certain conditions per RFP (page 260) being one of them to be wider than existing. Since the width of existing travel lane can vary depending on location, could NCDOT establish a homogeneous constant width for the travel lanes of these service roads?	No, homogeneous is not applicable. Service roads have the three criteria for width. Curve widening, based on autoturn, may be required where there is moderate to heavy trucks usage.



Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
252	Roadway	260	7th bullet	The scope of work states, "The normal crown cross-slope for the outermost lane(s) in each direction are to be steepened as required to minimize hydroplaning potential, not to exceed 0.03." Please specify an offset from the crown point at which this lane cross-slope criteria is applicable. This increased cross-slope typically applies to lanes that are more than 2-lanes (i.e., 24') from the crown point per the Greenbook.	Generally, the Greenbook applies; however, this will depend on the Hydroplane Analysis.
253	Roadway	260	B7	Assuming the existing grade/crown is currently between lane 1 and 2 or in center of lane 2. Will the location of the crown point be allowed to remain where it is currently to minimize the amount of wedging?	No, NCDOT wants consistent typical as stated in RFP
254	Roadway	260	B7	In the section where there is an auxiliary lanes between exits 26 & 27 will both lanes be on a 0.03 super?	The cross slope of the auxiliary lanes will depend on Hydroplan analysis.
255	Roadway	261	3rd bullet	Please provide the Interchange Access Report (IAR) at your earliest convenience along with any associated traffic analysis files such as VISSIM, Synchro, etc.	IAR is currently being reviewed by FHWA, NCDOT will post as soon as FHWA approves
256	Roadway	262	6th bullet	If the DB Team reduces the project tie -in limits will the resurfacing limits reduce or are the limits in the PHM final?	Resurfacing limits will not change
257	Structures	262	Bullet 1	The RFP (page 262) mentions that all retaining walls shall be constructed within 10 ft inside the ROW. Does the 10 ft include MSE wall anchors, Tie backs for soldier pile walls ,etc.?	The anchors can extend into the 10' buffer, but shall not extend beyond ROW.
258	Roadway	263	last bullet	Are there any existing load limit restrictions in place within the project limits? Permanent or temporary via other NCDOT projects or private developer projects.	Check the NCDOT webpage at the following address: <a href="https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/Asset-Management/Pages/Posted-Roads.aspx">https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/Asset-Management/Pages/Posted-Roads.aspx</a>
259	Roadway	264	1st bullet	Please define what exactly constitutes a "proposed design revision" as part of the Technical Proposal submittal requirement.	Any revision / modification from the Preliminary Plans not required by the RFP
260	Roadway	265	1st bullet	NW 16 and NW 17 begin within I-5719A but end within the Y6RPB and Y6RPC ramps; will these noise walls need to be included in this project or the I-5719A project?	NCDOT TNAQ: The analysis of NW16 and NW17 will be included in the DNR for Section A. However, standard practice for noise studies is to include 800 feet beyond the project limits (for freeway improvement projects) and the I-5719B DNR will need to follow this guidance.
261	Structures	270	First Bullet	The RFP (Page 270) mentions the requirement of adding a single face concrete barrier in front for sound barrier & retaining walls, Does the department require us to evaluate these walls for vehicular collision loads.	No. Not if NCDOT Standard Sound Walls are used.
262	Roadway	280	last bullet	The provided roadway plans have two 8 lane typical sections, with grade points in different locations. The RFP states that the grade point shall be in the middle of the 4 lanes in each direction. Is there any reason why the grade point will need to be one lane in from the median?	This was based on discussions with Hydraulics to help minimize hydroplaning issues.
263	Geotechnical Engineering	304	1st bullet	The RFP states, "Retaining walls or taller headwalls/end walls shall not be used to reduce the length of proposed box culverts." Please consider relaxing this requirement in order to reduce environmental impacts to the associated stream and/or wetland.	No.
264	Hydraulics	315	2/1	There are existing pipes/culverts that potentially are already in conflict with this requirement. If HW/D criteria are satisfied, will DB team be required to upsize these crossings to meet the freeboard criteria, or will existing level of service be satisfactory? Are there specific crossings the department is ok with retaining?	If the DBT can provide a list of locations with their calcs, we can review. Otherwise, pipes that don't meet freeboard requirements are considered hydraulically deficient and must be replaced.
265	Hydraulics	315		The RFP states, "Slotted concrete barrier will be allowed separating vehicular travel lanes from non-vehicular areas, such as multi-use paths and sidewalks." Please clarify if slotted concrete barriers can be used along the outside of proposed bridges.	Slotted drains are NOT to be used on outside edges of bridges.
266	Hydraulics	316	3rd bullet	"Existing and proposed longitudinal pipe (trunkline) shall not be located beneath the proposed roadway travel lanes or beneath proposed barrier rails" clarify barrier rails. Is this targeting median barriers? Does this include guardrails? If this includes guardrails along the outer shoulders, this will require use to only utilize transverse pipes throughout these areas. Many divisions prefer to limit transverse pipes when possible. If this is a subsurface constructibility concern, would DOT allow the designers to use 2GI-As with 18" or smaller pipes to provide a small offset from the pipe run vs the barrier rail?	issue is access for maintenance without having to tear up barriers or travel lanes. Standard drainage boxes in shoulder berm gutter in front of guardrail is acceptable. Structures with a 24" or larger pipe in the narrow side of the box will require a type A box.
267	Structures	317	1/1	Can a closed drainage system be used for the R/R bridge? The typical section provided shows a closed drainage system.	NS requires drainage system per NSRR Specs and PPM. The Hydraulic Scope of Work in the RFP will be revised to allow for Closed System on RR bridges.
268	Hydraulics	317	Hydroplaning Analysis	It is noted that: The Design-Build Team shall provide mitigation that minimizes hydroplaning risk for all new and existing roadways within the construction limits, as necessary. Please, provide details about clear actions, thresholds or limits to be used when minimizing hydroplanning risk for DB Contractor to evaluate mitigations and properly budget them.	Follow guidance in drainage guidelines and hydroplaning tool; Any areas identified using the tool as hydroplaning risks should be corrected (change in grades, typicals, pavement type, etc)
269	Hydraulics	319	1/1	If there are existing drainage pipes that we investigate to be in good condition and are hydraulically adequate, are we still required to replace them?	Per current RFP, all metal pipes should be replaced and all other pipes that are less than 48" diameter
270	Hydraulics	319	1/5	Does this future build out condition apply to both rational and USGS regression analysis? If both, would we assume any increase in C coefficient of 0.9 be applied to grassed areas to bump the drainage area composition to 25%?	Unless updated, 0.45 would be the min composite c value for use in the rational equation (based on 25% impervious)

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
271	Hydraulics	319	1st bullet	Could the Department please clarify if the requirement of replacing the existing pipes applies to the mill and overlay area if the pipes are in good condition and hydraulically adequate?	Right now it applies. RFP will be updated if that changes.
272	Hydraulics	319	Existing drainage	Please, provide as-built plans, survey, and any other valuable information for Contractors to identify and evaluate the size, material, condition, and status of the existing drainage elements (box culverts, pipes and structures)	We'll check to see if we have any additional info on drainage structures or pipes that could be helpful.
273	Hydraulics	325	1st bullet	The RFP states, "Cross drainage shall be conveyed with a single drainage structure (pipe or box culvert) or single drainage structures in series. More than one line of pipe and/or three (3) box culvert barrels serving the same watershed shall not be allowed." Please consider relaxing this requirement so that unnecessary vertical adjustment of roadway profiles can be avoided by using multiple smaller pipes instead of a larger single pipe.	Currently requiring a single pipe. RFP will be updated if request is considered.
274	Hydraulics	326	FEMA Regulated Streams	Please provide the latest H&H reports for the major crossings, including Hydrological and Hydraulic models, coordination with FEMA, latest FEMA models to be used and pre-preliminary models that can affect the construction in the future	The Department will try to obtain these and provide to the DBTs via the Materials Available folder on the Connect site.
275	ITS	336	2 bullet	Existing DMS I-85 NB MM 28 is outside of the project limits. Please confirm that this DMS is to be replaced.	Yes replace DMS I-85 NB MM 28
276	Structures	342	8	What lighting system is required for the pedestrian bridge? "The Design-Build Team shall design, provide, and install a lighting system in the interior barrier between the railway and greenway to aid visibility of pedestrians using the greenway during nighttime hours. The lighting system shall utilize step light luminaires that are integral to the interior barrier. Refer to the Lighting Special Provisions for additional details." Is the lighting only in one barrier on the R/R bridge? Are details provided in the "I-5719B Preliminary Lighting plans"?	The proposed pedestrian lighting is to be located in the eastern exterior parapet. See the Aesthetics Scope of Work (SOW). The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP.
277	Lighting	342	P1	Confirm the lighting design for the P&N bridge is the responsibility of the DB team.	Yes. Roadway / interchange lighting will be designed by the Department. Lighting for the P&N bridge is the responsibility of the DB team.
278	Structures	343	1	What sort of pedestrian lighting is required for the P&N Railway bridge? "Pedestrian lighting for the Piedmont and Northern Railway Bridge shall be owned and operated by the City of Belmont". "The Design-Build Team shall establish a separate electrical service in the City's name for the pedestrian lighting system." Will these details be provided in the "I-5719B Preliminary Lighting plans"?	See the Aesthetics Scope of Work (SOW). The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP.
279	Structures	343	2	Will NCDOT provide details for the conduit system for future lighting on all Y-line bridges? What are the locations of the light supports for attaching poles?	The Department will develop and distribute the conduit plans for the future lighting to the DBT after the RFC Structures Plans are accepted.
280	Lighting	343	2nd paragraph	Please clarify if conduit will be allowed to be placed within the median barrier in roadway & bridge sections.	Conduit may be placed at the bottom of the median barrier in roadway sections. Defer to Structures regarding conduit in a median barrier on a bridge. I don't believe there are any applications that require conduit in a median barrier on the bridge other than the P&N spur.
281	Pavement Management	347	I-85 Pavement Resurfacing / Uniform Overlay	Please confirm and explain the requirement of why the I-85 travel lane needs resurfacing of 3" of S9.5D. And how and why its different to the requirement from 2nd Bullet point in page 348 of this subsection.	The 2nd Bullet on page 348 is for removal of temporary pavement makings.
282	Pavement Management	347	Potential I-85 Travel Lane & Shoulder Reconstruction	The 2 bullet points reference the "thickness of the mainline pavement design chosen" when determining the criteria for I-85 travel lane reconstruction. Please clarify if this thickness represents the total overall asphalt build-up thicknesses outlined in the RFP or only an individual asphalt layer.	The RFP will be changed to the following: The DB Team may elect to reconstruct the pavement in lieu of resurfacing or the DB may elect to resurface with any remaining elevation made up with wedging.
283	Pavement Management	347	Potential I-85 Travel Lane and Shoulder Reconstruction (2nd Bullet)	RFP defines the conditions at which point the I-85 travel lanes get mandated for reconstruction instead of resurfacing and/or wedging. This condition is dependent on the position of the new crown to that of the existing, as well as final pavement depths/thickness. Since there is a relevant construction work associated with technical uncertainties, can NCDOT provide stations where resurfacing and where full reconstruction of I-85 lanes are required as per the Baseline design done?	The RFP will be changed to the following: The DB Team may elect to reconstruct the pavement in lieu of resurfacing or the DB may elect to resurface with any remaining elevation made up with wedging.
284	Pavement Management	348	I-85 Full Depth Pavement Repair	In this subsection, a pavement design is recommended for full depth repair/patching where drainage structures need replacement. This pavement design is found to be thicker than the designs provided in the New construction alternatives presented before in page 344. It would be helpful if NCDOT provides the pavement design analysis or reasoning which determined this thicker pavement for full depth patch/repair.	The increase in pavement depth are a result of the absence of subgrade stabilization.
285	Pavement Management	348	I-85 Full Depth Pavement Repair	Does the Department have any estimated quantities for full depth pavement repair?	No
286	Pavement Management	348	Other Requirements	In regards to concrete pavement, the RFP states, "For concrete alternates, unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, all longitudinal joints shall be located on a lane line or lane midpoint." Please clarify if longitudinal joints can be located elsewhere within the lane as long as they are not within the proposed wheel path.	Only on lane lines or center of travel lane. If in a transition area, the maximum length outside of those 2 criteria is 840 ft (56 - 15ft slabs).

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
287	Pavement Management	350	Other Requirements	For existing Y lines and ramps, the RFP indicates that, all existing Y - Lines and ramps need to be resurfaced. Can NCDOT depict each of these roadways? Can NCDOT also indicate the station ranges for this resurface? – This will make the limits of reconstruction for the Y-lines in Table 1 clearly depicted and differentiated as well.	Refer to the Preliminary Plans and the Public Meeting Maps.
288	Pavement Management	351	Other Requirements	The RFP states on page 351, 2nd paragraph that, "Longitudinal joints of all surface course layers shall not be located in the final traffic pattern wheel path." Please clarify if there is a specific distance the joint can be located from the wheel path.	Lane line or centerline
289	Pavement Management	352	Other Requirements	Confirm all shoulder drain outlets must be in drainage structures. Is this in conflict with standard drawing 816.02?	The median shoulder drains shall outlet drainage structure. Outlet shoulder drains can either outlet to drainage structures or concrete pads as shown in Standard Drawing 816.02.
290	Signing	383	p6	Will the at grade rail crossing at approximately -Y7- Station 40+50 requiring crossing arms and full signal crossing sign?	The DBT shall provide Final design and Right of Way Plans for the required, see the last paragraph on page 369 of the RFP, highway-rail crossings needs.
291	Structures	392	4/1	Can another superstructure type be used for the pedestrian bridge other than what is shown on the provided typical section "I5719B_SMU_PGD_350150" (such as truss bridge)?	No, the Typical Section was approved in the MOA (FHWA, NCDOT and SHPO) shows same superstructure type/depth. Use same depth web for both as noted in the typical section.
292	Structures	392		Does the R/R bridge need to follow CSX or Norfolk Southern design guidelines? Are there any specific requirements from Piedmont Northern RR? Can the DOT confirm, for each crossing, who owns the Railroad ROW, and provide existing trackage and operation rights agreements?	Use the Norfolk Southern (NS) design guidelines. NCDOT Rail Division (owner and maintainer of the P&N) does not have any separate design guidelines except as noted with the E60 loading.
293	Structures	392		Where is the water discharged from the R/R bridge?	Down into the I-85 drainage system or as topography dictates, but not onto private property.
294	Structures	392		What are the fence requirements for the pedestrian bridge if an alternate superstructure type is used?	Alternate superstructure is not allowed, reference the MOA (FHWA, NCDOT and SHPO) for superstructure typical. Fencing will be discuss in the Aesthetics Scope of Work.
295	Structures	392		Can MSE walls be used for the R/R bridge?	Not allowed on NSRR structures as per NSR Public Projects Manual. Since NCDOT Rail Division is using the NSR design guidelines / requirements MSE wall will not be allow on the P&N Spur Line Bridge. Other wall types, i.e., drilled shafts with sheeting on back side may be acceptable. DBT should submit specific wall type(s) being considered to NCDOT for review and concurrence prior to finalizing their design.
296	Structures	393	11/9	Can bridge piers adjacent to the roadway shoulder be used for the R/R bridge?	No
297	Structures	393	4	Please provide the "I-5719B Preliminary Lighting plans" as they are not included in the RIDs?	The Department anticipates posting the Preliminary Lighting Plans shortly.
298	Structures	393	4th Bullet	The RFP forbids using precast reinforced box culverts for full culvert replacements. Can the design-build team get clarification on the reasoning behind that and why NCDOT prefers CIP culverts.	When loaded, there is a potential for differential settlement of earth foundation, which can lead to joint separation and dirt migration. <b>CIP Culverts only</b>
299	Structures	393	Bridge Piers	Please confirm that the prohibition to have bridge piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder only applies to intermediate piers and not to bridge abutment walls, including but not limited to MSE walls. Also, the NCDOT Roadway Design Manual discourages, but does not prohibit the use of bridge piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder within the clear zone. NCDOT SMU Manual 6.1.2 prohibits piers adjacent to a roadway shoulder, however the context indicates that the intent is a general guidance for typical separated highways. SMU Manual 2.3.4 has guidance for pier protection within the clear zone. Please confirm whether the intent is to prohibit piers adjacent to a shoulder even if it will require longer spans, deeper superstructure and more affection to the profile of reconstructed -Y- lines.	Yes, the intent is to avoid bridge piers, unless they can not be avoided, in or adjacent to the roadway shoulders due to clear zone and to reduce the number of spans and joints in the structure. Alternitives in design of the structure, i.e., girder type and spacing, may be submitted for consideration to minimize the depth of the superstructure and design of the -Y-Line profile.
300	Structures	393	Paragraph 5	The RFP requires the bridge barrier rails for the I085 widening to be the most current version of CBR1. Does this apply to the outside barriers only? Or do we need to upgrade the median barrier to the latest standards?	CBR1 is for use on exterior rail of bridges; defer to Roadway Std Drawings for Median Barrier details
301	Structures	394	1st paragraph	The RFP states that multiple girder depths on an individual bridge are not allowed for new bridges. Does this mean that a consistent girder depth is required on all spans of a multi-span bridge?	Yes, use a consistant girder depth
302	Structures	394	b 2	Can multiple girder depths be used on the R/R bridge if a 4 span structure is utilized?	No, use a consistant girder depth
303	Structures	394	Bridge 350034	Please confirm that rehabilitation scope for Bridge 350034 is completely defined by the bullet points included on this page and if the concrete repairs shall be according to NCDOT SMU Standard Bridge Repair sheets, when applicable. Will a similar PSP set such as the one provided for Bridge 350143 be shared with Proposers?	Only the work listed in the Structures Scope of Work is required on 350034. SMU can provide examples of any required PSP but DBT is responsible
304	Structures	394	Bullet 1	The RFP forbids using multiple girder depths in new bridges only. For bridge #350143, Can we clarify , if permitted by vertical clearance and design compliance, can deeper girders be used adjacent to the existing girders to increase span lengths and reduce substructure elements.	No

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
305	Structures	394	Bullet 2	The RFP forbids using multiple girder depths in new bridges only. For bridge #350143, Can we clarify , if permitted by vertical clearance and design compliance, can deeper girders be used adjacent to the existing girders to increase span lengths and reduce substructure elements.	Duplicate question see Question #304 for response
306	Structures	394	Rehab of Existing Structures	For bridge No. 350034 on NC 273 over I-85, NCDOT is calling for a 1.25" LMC overlay. Does the Department want 1.25" to be removed from the existing deck surface prior to placing the overlay? Is there chloride data that directs how much to remove from the existing? Is hydro-demolition required for a certain portion of the removal?	The DBT is to "properly prepare concrete deck" and defer to PSP's for Preservation. Please provide additional questions.
307	Structures	394	Rehab of Existing Structures	For bridge #350034, our understanding is that the CEI team will delineate the items paid for as extra work (spall repairs, crack injection, anchor bolt replacements, Class II and III repairs, etc.) during construction. Please confirm the contractor's engineer will not be required to survey the bridge for these repair items.	Unit prices have been established in the RFP for the repair items listed in the question. The DBT will be required to survey the bridge and submit repair items / recommendations for review and approval by the Engineer. All work must be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineer.
308	Structures	394	Sound Barrier Walls	Please clarify the intent of prohibiting the construction of sound barrier walls on top of retaining walls. Removal of this prohibition will reduce the required ROW at all locations where retaining walls and sound walls are to be constructed at the same location.	It is against Department policy to construct sound walls on top of retaining wall structures. Follow guidance in the Geotechnical Engineering Unit policy for wall offset.
309	Signal Systems	398	2nd paragraph	The RFP states, "Where construction activities necessitate a detour, the Design-Build team shall evaluate the effects of that detour on all traffic signals along the detour route. The Design-Build Team shall make operational changes as necessary and as directed by the Engineer." Please clarify if what acceptable criteria should be met when analyzing the effects on the signals.	TBD
310	Signal Systems	399	last paragraph	The RFP states, "The traffic signal detection for the final traffic patterns shall be inductive loop detection..." Please consider allowing video detection to be used within the project limits.	Detection type falls on the Division. Recently, they have expressed interest in using Multi-Zone Microwave Detection for temporary traffic signals, and then maintaining that same detection during the final pattern in lieu of inductive loops.
311	Signal Systems	400	1	The RFP lists 6 new signals, 7 signal modifications, and 2 signal removals, while the Synopsis, the scope work is to install 4 new signals and 11 signal modifications. Can the Department provide more clarifications on the differences?	The RFP is correct, however there will be an additional new signal for the pedestrian hybrid beacon half signal next to 12-1947.
312	Signal Systems	400	1	Can the Department clarify for traffic signal/control requirement at intersection of Y7D (Old Main Street) and Y7B (Calwell Road)? Inv 12-1930 is listed as a new signal at the new alignment of Y7 at Y7B, but the original location (Old Main at Caldwell) is shown under signal control in the preliminary design plans.	The existing signal (12-1537) will need to be maintained during construction while the new realigned location (12-1930) is being built.
313	Signal Systems	401	Signal Table	Signal Inventory Numbers 12-0163 & 12-1537 do not list any work requirements. Please confirm no signal work is required at these 2 locations.	These two signals are in the table of signals to be modified, the work requirements on the right apply to all signals listed in this table.
314	Signal Systems	411	1	For pedestrian crossing at signaled intersections, will lead pedestrian phase (LPI) considered a standard requirement for this project? What is the capacity analysis requirement for LPI implementations (at locations such as US 29/74 at NC 7)?	LPI shall be implemented at every signalized pedestrian crossing unless there is no vehicle conflict or the programming would be overly complex.
315	Transportation Management	421	P2	SOW for transportation management, minimum level of pedestrian accommodation is required at US 29/74 at NC 273, which is not affected by construction of this project. On the other hand, US 29/74 at NC 7 is not listed. Can the Department clarify?	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
316	Transportation Management	422	Maintenance of access	NCDOT defines in page 422 the minimum clear width during construction, but, we have not seen the minimum vertical clearance during construction, can NCDOT indicate it?	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
317	Transportation Management	428	3rd paragraph	Please clarify what constitutes an on-site detour.	On-site detour includes bypassing work area on a temp alignment where a road closure isn't desirable, and off-site detour is not possible. Normally, these are used on two lane roadways.
318	Transportation Management	429	2nd paragraph	The RFP states specifies that the wheel path of all design vehicles listed in Table 2-4a Design of Vehicle Dimensions of the Greenbook shall not be located within one-foot of a temporary or permanent pavement joint line. However, the RFP specifies that a WB-62 shall be used as the design vehicle. Please revise this section to specify which design vehicle wheel path should be used.	No revision will be made.
319	Transportation Management	429	Lane and Shoulder Requirements	Lane closures are limited to 1 mile on two-lane, two way facilities and 2 miles on multi-lane facilities. Due to the length of the project please remove the 2 mile limit on multi-lane facilities for lane closure.	This is what was used for I-95 in Robeson Co (C204596)
320	Transportation Management	439	P1	No mention of the McAdenville Christmas Light event that typical significantly impacts traffic along I-85 and NC 7 during the month of December in the evenings. It is however mentioned on Page 445	In addition to the "holiday, holiday weekend, special events, or any other time when traffic is unusually heavy. At a minimum" as note on page 439 and 440 of the RFP for the entire Project limits the DBT shall also comply with ICT #'s 35 and 36 as listed on page 445 of the RFP.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
321	Utilities	453	Review of submittals	It is Noted: The Design-Build Team shall provide the Agreement Package for water and/or sewer designs prior to the Utility Construction Agreement (UCA) being signed by the utility owner. The UCA will be submitted as part of the agreement package from the NCDOT to utility owner. Historically, the utility owner submits the UCR to the NCDOT prior to development of design package requesting the NCDOT to design and include in the roadway contract. If the UCR is to be submitted with the final agreement package, will the NCDOT have prior written commitment from utility owner requesting this work be made part of the highway contract or will the design-build team meet with utility owner for approval to design?	Please note, the Utility Relocation Agreement is the UCA and the Utility Construction Request form is the UCR. The UCA Form itself will be prepared by NCDOT. The plans, special provisions and cost estimate shall be provided by Design Build Team, referred to as the Agreement Package on pg 453 of the SOW. The Utilities Unit will provide the Utility Construction Request (UCR) Form to the water and sewer utilities within the project limits to obtain written commitment from the utility owners.
322	Utilities	453	Review of submittals	It is Noted: The Design-Build Team shall provide the Agreement Package for the NCDOT to submit the Use & Occupancy Agreement (U&O). In the language of the U&O, it states to the owner; "As discussed with you previously, the design for the relocation will be handled by our engineer and construction will be included in the highway contract." If a utility owner has 100% non-participating relocation cost and all cost will be borne by the NCDOT, will the NCDOT get prior written commitment from utility owner or will this be managed by the design-build team?	The Utilities Unit will provide the Utility Construction Request (UCR) Form to the water and sewer utilities within the project limits to obtain written commitment from the utility owners.
323	Utilities	457	Other	What is the average NCDOT review turnaround time for a utility relocation agreement or encroachment package on design-build projects?	Utility submittals have standard NCDOT review period of 10 business days. Note, Utility Owners have a 30 day review period for any submittals that require their review.
324	Standard Specifications	461	p1	Please confirm who is responsible for snow and ice removal?	NCDOT will be responsible for snow and ice removal operations.
325	Structures	250/392	Last Paragraph	The Roadway SOW ( page 250) mentions that the Design-Build Team shall design and construct minimum 14-foot outside shoulders (twelve-foot useable shoulder width plus two feet). However, for Bridge #350143 (page 392), the proposed widening is to accommodate a 12 ft shoulder only. Is the additional 2 ft of shoulder excluded for the bridge widening by considering it to be part of the barrier? Please clarify?	The 12' bridge shoulder is to match the 12' paved roadway shoulder.
326	Structures	393/308	Last Bullet	The RFP (Page 393) mentions that no integral end bents are allowed behind MSE abutment walls. Page 308 however lists integral abutments and points to FHWA GEC 11 which is a MSE wall related spec. Please clarify?	NCDOT <u>does not</u> currently allow Integral End Bents with MSE Walls. Note the more restrictive requirements will apply.
327	Structures	393/310	Last Bullet	The RFP (Page 393) mentions that no shallow foundations are allowed. Is this applicable to only endbents? The Geotech SOW, (Page 310) mentions the use of key-in spread footings, please clarify the range of applicability of shallow foundations	Only for End Bents behind MSE Walls.
328	Roadway	Design Criteria		There are two sets of Roadway Design Criteria provided as part of the RIDs. Does the Design Criteria dated 01-14-2022 take precedence over the Design Criteria dated 7-17-2018?	Neither - The Department will post the Design Criteria that corresponds to the Preliminary Plans to the Materials Available folder on the Connect site
329	Roadway	General		Please provide the roadway classification for each road in the RFP and not the RIDs as RIDs are not contractual	Check the NCDOT webpage at the following address: <a href="https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/State-Mapping/Pages/default.aspx">https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/State-Mapping/Pages/default.aspx</a>
330	Roadway	General		The roadway profiles provided in the RFP are "smooth profiles" along I-85 mainline which do not necessarily represent a widening scope of work. This design approach can result in unnecessary asphalt levelling wedges in order to achieve the "smooth profile" configuration. Please confirm that spline curves reflecting edge of pavement widening are an acceptable design approach.	No,
331	Roadway	General		The roadway scope of work in the RFP specifies that the design shall accommodate a WB-62 design vehicle; however, the Design Criteria in the RIDs contains a footnote that says, "WB-67 Design Vehicle at all locations." Please specify which design vehicle is to be used throughout the project design.	WB-62
332	Structures	General		Are bearing replacements required on bridge #350034? Replacing the bearings would make the rehabilitation consistent with bridge #350143.	No
333	Structures	General		Is epoxy coating the tops of all caps at expansion joints required on bridge #350034? Epoxy coating the tops of the caps would make the rehabilitation consistent with bridge #350143.	Yes
334	Structures	General		Will the bridge 350143 rehabilitation plans be PE sealed by KCA at some point in the project, or will the contractor's engineer have to take over responsible charge, verify all data, and PE seal the plans and special provisions?	Plans provided will NOT be sealed by KCA.
335	Structures	General		The RFP requires a PPC overlay on the widened deck for bridge 350143, but this is not shown on the rehab plans. Will this be added to the rehab plans with pay items, or will the contractor's engineer have to provide plans and take responsible charge for this work? Is there a specific thickness of PPC overlay desired by NCDOT?	DBT is responsible. Thickness will be provided per manufacturer of PPC

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
336	Structures	General		For bridge #350143, are steel beams required in order to maintain superstructure stiffness continuity within each span since the existing beams are steel? If concrete beams are allowed, does the department require a specific calculation methodology to validate the design since there will be steel and concrete beams (with variable beam stiffness) within the same span?	Steel beams required on spans with steel beams for widening
337	Structures	General		For bridge #350143, can the crown points remain at the existing locations? Is it required to utilize a variable thickness PPC overlay to move the crown point to the edge of a travel lane? Do the crown requirements noted on page 260 of the RFP in the Roadway scope of work apply to this bridge, or can there be an exception for the bridge?	Crown points to be located as shown in the Roadway plans; however, these are case by case transitions, based on the selected DBT's Preliminary Design the Department will provide guidance.
338	Structures	General		The RFP refers to the Aesthetics Scope of Work (pages 258, 259, 263, 343, and 393), but there is no specific scope of work or special provision section on aesthetics. Please clarify.	The Department will include the Aesthetics SOW in the Second Industry Draft RFP
339	Structures	General		The RFP has guidelines for architectural surface treatment for concrete, however there are no guidelines for structural steel. Please clarify?	Typically, steel beams do not require surface treatment; however, refer to the Aesthetics Scope of Work which will be included in the 2nd Industry Draft RFP
340	Roadway	Typical Sections	Typical Section 21	Typical Section 21 for -Y14- (Hickory Grove Road) shows a shoulder hinge point of 13ft (8ft shoulder + 5ft from guardrail face) when guardrail is used. However, Standard 862.01 (sheet 6) shows the hinge point 3ft from the face of guardrail and not 5ft as indicated in the typical section. Which criteria should be used?	Y14 is an arterial, which will require shoulder widening 2' in front of the guardrail plus 3' widening for the guardrail. (RDM)
341	Other		Design-Build Submittal Guidelines	The Design-Build Submittal Guidelines reference both hard copies and electronic copies for the plan submittals. Can the plan submittals only be electronic?	The Department is discussing if some hard copies are still needed. A decision will be made prior to the Final RFP being issued.
342	Pavement Markings			Will we be required to submit a pavement marking plan set for the pursuit phase?	No.
343	Transportation Management			What is the traffic analysis scope requirement for ATC? Specifically, for ATC at one at grade intersection, can capacity analysis be prepared for the subject location and its immediate area while skipping freeway and other intersections that shouldn't be affected?	This can be considered on a case by case basis.
344	Transportation Management			Will the modeling and analysis of railroad crossing during the event of trolley operations be required for ATC concerning Y7 (Belmont Mount Holly Road) between the R7RPA/R7RPB and Y7E (Wimmer Circle #2), or at the US 29/74 (Y7A) intersection?	No, the trolleys/crossings were not included in the TransModeler or Synchro/SimTraffic modeling.
345	Project Special Provisions	24		Are there deadlines for submitting Confidential Questions either during the industry review of the draft RFP or after the issuance of the Final RFP?	No
346	General	232	2nd Paragraph under "DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PERFORMED BY DESIGN-BUILD TEAM"	For designers' professional liability policies to provide coverage, an insurable negligence-based standard of care must be used. To eliminate any room for argument that coverage will apply to design services and also to ensure compliance with North Carolina Statute NCGS 22B-1 (Certain indemnity and defend agreements invalid), please make the adjustments (which bifurcate design work and all other work) indicated in the bracketed language of the following paragraph.  "Unless noted otherwise elsewhere in this RFP, the Design-Build Team shall acknowledge that project documents furnished by the Department are preliminary and provided solely to assist the Design-Build Team in the development of the project design. The Design-Build Team shall be fully and totally responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all work performed under this contract and shall save the State harmless and shall be fully liable for any additional costs and all claims against the State which [DELETE] may arise due to [DELETE] [are proximately caused by (1) the negligent acts, negligent errors, and negligent omissions of the Design-Build Team in performing the design work required by this contract and (2)] errors, omissions and negligence of the Design-Build Team in performing [all other] work required by this contract."	Department still reviewing language.
347	Erosion and Sedimentation Control	298	1st full paragraph	Please add "reasonable" before "any associated engineering costs or actions taken by the Department"	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.
348	Railroad Coordination	60	G, 2nd Paragraph	To ensure compliance with North Carolina Statute NCGS 22B-1 (Certain indemnity and defend agreements invalid), please replace "arising out of or incident to" with the phrase "that are proximately caused by"	Department still reviewing language.
349	General	Proposal Form, Page 2, PDF Page 3	2nd Full Paragraph	Proposers should not be required to indemnify the Department for errors in the preliminary project designs. This could create an insurability issue and may not comply with North Carolina Statute NCGS 22B-1 (Certain indemnity and defend agreements invalid). Rather, we believe it is customary for proposers to agree they will not rely on such materials. Please replace the phrasing requiring proposers to "indemnify and hold the Department harmless" with language limiting proposers' right to rely.	Department still reviewing language.

Project:	I-5719B / U-5800
----------	------------------

No.	Document Section	Page	Paragraph/Bullet	Comment/Question	NCDOT Response
350	General	General	Other	We have been unable to locate provisions in the RFP requiring Professional Liability insurance (as required by Section 16, on Page 16 of the Design-Build Manual). Could the Department please provide these requirements so that proposers can review and potentially make recommendations?	The Department still reviewing this question and will post a response prior to issuing the Second Industry Draft RFP.
351	General	General	Other	Given the recent storm damage experienced throughout North Carolina, will the Department consider including Builder's Risk insurance requirements?	Not at this time.
352	Geotechnical Engineering	Proposal Form, Page 2, PDF Page 3	5th Full Paragraph	To reduce contingency and enhance the efficiency and competitiveness of bids, please revise the RFP to expressly include compensation and relief for differing site conditions, in line with what FAR No. 52.236-2 provides for type 1 and type 2 differing site conditions.	Department still reviewing language.
353	ITS	330	2nd to Last Paragraph	<p>Please include a definition of "Broadband Fiber Compensation Event." The language included in the referenced paragraph does not actually define the event, and as drafted, the provision would make proposers responsible for any damage to such infrastructure regardless of the cause, not just Design-Build Team acts.</p> <p>[A Broadband Fiber Compensation Event (BFCE) is defined as any damage to existing communication infrastructure that actually disrupts the service provided by such infrastructure that is caused by the the negligent acts of the Design-Build Team or its subcontractors.] The Design-Build Team shall report damage to existing communication infrastructure[, including but not limited to BFCEs,] to the Engineer, Regional ITS Engineer, OMC Contractor and the STOC within one hour of the damage occurring. The OMC Contractor shall repair all damage to the communications infrastructure. The Design-Build Team shall be responsible for all costs associated with [DELETE&gt;these&lt;DELETE] repairs [required as a result of a BFCE] as well as any costs associated with a Broadband Fiber Compensation Event (BFCE) caused by an unplanned cut or damage up to the limits defined below. Communications infrastructure includes but is not limited to, Fiber-optic cable, underground conduit, micro-duct conduit, junction boxes, tracer wire, electrical service conductors, grounding arrays, equipment cabinets and electrical services.</p>	The Department will review this section of the RFP to determine if revisions are needed.