

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
I-95 SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 3
VDOT PROJECT: 0095-111-278
CONTRACT ID: C00107715DB91

November 1, 2016 (Updated Responses dated December 2, 2016 are shown in red)

1. Will VDOT make available the as-built utility plans offered by utility companies at the utility project meeting on October 3, 2016?

VDOT Response: Available utility records provided to VDOT by the individual utility companies will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

2. Per Figure 10-74 of the AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, the proposed new two-lane exit for Ramp B shown in the RFP Conceptual Plans does not meet the 1,500-foot minimum auxiliary lane length. Will VDOT be securing a design exception from FHWA for this ramp?

VDOT Response: Figure 10-74 does not apply to the design for Ramp B. The Ramp B configuration provides for a ramp lane and an I-95 choice lane. Adequate deceleration has been provided; therefore, a design exception would not be required.

3. Please clarify requirement #2 for the work history form in Section 4.2.6. What is meant by “One (1) at grade interstate interchange construction/reconstruction project.”?

VDOT Response: The second requirement for the Lead Contractor Work History was modified in RFP Addendum No. 1 to clarify the requirement. It was modified to state “One (1) interstate construction/reconstruction project with demonstrated experience coordinating and monitoring maintenance of traffic (MOT).”

4. Please confirm that the projects shown for the designer on the work history form must have completed construction.

VDOT Response: The Offeror is to include three most relevant projects in demonstrating his qualifications to serve as lead designer, respectively. The projects included may be in progress or completed within the last 15 years. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

5. Has VDOT confirmed that no slope corrections are required to meet VDOT or AASHTO standards for pavement within the project limits?

VDOT Response: The preliminary field survey and utility data provided in the RFP is not represented to be complete for the purposes of design and construction of the Project. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to review and adjust slopes as needed.

6. Section 1.1 Part 2 of the RFP states that the project includes “The realignment of the I-95 North to Route 3 East ramp to improve ramp performance and safety by increasing the length of the merge area”. The ramp realignment is not shown in the RFP Conceptual Plans. Please confirm that the ramp realignment is not part of the project.

VDOT Response: The statement refers to the construction of Ramp A and the geometric requirements associated with a dual lane drop. The dual lane ramps (Ramp A) will require holding both lanes beyond the painted nose for 500 feet (RFP Conceptual Plan Sheet 7), then dropping the ramp lanes as shown (RFP Conceptual Plan Sheets 7-8).

7. Please confirm VDOT will be responsible for ITS integration at the TOC.

VDOT Response: VDOT will be responsible for ITS integration at the TOC; however, the Design-Builder will be responsible for providing sample devices for integration and testing at least ninety (90) days prior to installation. The Design-Builder will also be responsible to provide field technical support, observation, meta data, and configuration management that may be needed during the integration process. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

8. There is conflicting information in the RFP, will the ITS equipment be connected to T1 or fiber?

VDOT Response: All ITS devices shall be connected to the VDOT Resource Sharing fiber in accordance with Part 2, Section 2.8.3. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

9. Assuming connection to fiber, what size fiber are we tying into?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall use 12 count SM fiber to make field device connections to the VDOT access cable. The VDOT access cable is a 96 count SM fiber that ties the 12 count to the Summit Resource Sharing fiber. The Design-Builder’s design shall maintain this same configuration. VDOT will identify the fiber connections to the existing plant upon submission of the Design-Builder’s project network plan and device meta data. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

10. Will VDOT supply as-built plans for the ITS system within the project limits?

VDOT Response: The fiber plant As-built plans provided to VDOT by Summit IG will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2. As-built plans for other aspects of the ITS system, such as electrical or civil are not available.

11. What is the duration required for the UPS on ITS equipment?

VDOT Response: The UPS requirements are specified in the UPS Special Provision for ITS elements provided in the RFP Information Package. The special provision requires three (3) hours of continuous operations under full load.

12. What are the project limits for 100% video coverage? Please provide stationing.

VDOT Response: The project limits for 100% video coverage are the same as those identified on Plan Sheet 1 of the RFP Conceptual Plans which includes the Route 3 corridor.

13. Is intersection lighting required at the intersection of Route 3 and Carl D. Silver Parkway?

VDOT Response: Intersection lighting is not required at the intersection of Route 3 and Carl D. Silver Parkway. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 23.

14. What specific lighting criteria from RP-8-14 is required at the signalized intersections?

VDOT Response: RP-8-14 has multiple requirements for lighting. Offerors should refer to the section for intersection lighting.

15. Please confirm that VDOT will allow lighting and signals off the same SE-5 service?

VDOT Response: Signals and Intersection lighting can run off the same SE-5 electrical service. Offerors should refer to SPCN 238.02(H) 2 Circuit Breaker Box provided in the RFP Information Package.

16. Are there any empty /available conduits on the Route 3 bridges over I-95?

VDOT Response: There are two 6 inch diameter telephone conduits containing fiber optic and coaxial cables in the southernmost bay on Structure No. 1027; Route 3 eastbound over Route 95. Cox Cable installed these utility conduits in 2000. Cox Cable or their successors would appear to be responsible for use and maintenance of these lines. This structure also has a bridge conduit system with 2 inch conduit in the south parapet for future lighting and sign lighting.

17. Will VDOT supply the signal as-built plans for the Route 3/Carl D. Silver Parkway intersection?

VDOT Response: VDOT will provide the current signal As-built plan to Offerors in RFP RFP Addendum No. 2.

Structure No. 0880031; Route. 3 (Plank Road) at Carl D. Silver Parkway, Spotsylvania County (Group ID 880013A) is a simple span tapered tube spanning 83 feet. A private owner installed this signal bridge as part of land use permit construction at this intersection in 1996 using Union Metal Corporation pole designs that Robert A. Mantz, P. E. prepared and which are shown on Drawing No. 30449-B122, Sheet 1 of 3 through Sheet 3 of 3 dated

September 6, 1996. Copies of an inspection report dated November 14, 2011 and the working drawings will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

Structure No. 0880032; Route 3 (Plank Road) at Carl D. Silver Parkway, Spotsylvania County (Group ID 880013B) is a dual mast arm pole with a 70 foot mast arm and a 50 foot mast arm. A copy of an inspection report dated November 14, 2011 will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

Structure No. 0880033; Route 3 (Plank Road) at Carl D. Silver Parkway, Spotsylvania County (Group ID 880013C) is a mast arm pole with a single 50 foot mast arm on the northeast quadrant of this intersection. A copy of an inspection report dated November 14, 2011 will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

18. Will VDOT accept modifying an existing four bolt signal pole at Route 3/Carl D. Silver Parkway?

VDOT Response: VDOT will consider permitting the modification an existing four bolt signal pole at Route 3/Carl D. Silver Parkway. Equipment relocation on existing signal structures shall comply with Instructional and Informational Memorandum IIM-S&B-82/TED- 357 Traffic Structures. This will require the Design-Builder to provide computations indicating the capacity to demand ratio for all critical elements in the signal structure and showing that the structure has sufficient capacity to support the revised equipment loads.

In the event the structure has insufficient capacity to support the revised equipment loads and must be replaced, the new structure shall comply with current standards and specifications. For an existing foundation with four anchor bolts, this usually results in replacement of the entire foundation so as to comply with the requirement in Section 700.02 of the VDOT Road and Bridge Specifications to provide a minimum of six anchor bolts.

19. The RFP Information Package has a Special Provision for UPS dated January 12, 2016. Section 2.8.2.1 of the RFP identified a Special Provision dated October 27, 2014. Please confirm the UPS specification required for this project.

VDOT Response: The Special Provision for Uninterruptible Power Supply dated January 12, 2016 shall apply. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

20. Please confirm the limits of the signal coordination required for the project.

VDOT Response: The limits of coordination will be the project limits. No coordination shall be required for signals located beyond the project limits. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

21. Part 1, Section 11.10 references Attachment 4.4.5. This attachment is labeled "4.4.6" on the form provided. Please verify the form may be submitted as provided.

VDOT Response: Offeror's shall provide a Schedule of Items on the Schedule of Items Form Attachment 4.4.5. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

22. Part 1, Section 4.4.3.1 requires SCC information to be provided on Attachment 4.4.3. There is no location on the form to provide this information. Is the SCC information required to be provided on this Attachment or will Attachment 4.2.5 fulfill the intent of the RFP?

VDOT Response: Offeror's shall provide the requested information on revised Attachment 4.4.3. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

23. The RFP does not mention a stipend for proposal preparation to be provided to the Offerors. Is there a stipend for this project? If not, please consider providing one as the level of pre-proposal effort required to provide a responsible/responsive offer on this project will be greater than usually incurred in a single phase procurement.

VDOT Response: A proposal payment will not be included in this procurement.

24. Does the Carl D. Silver / Route 3 intersection need to be milled / overlaid? If so, please define the limits.

VDOT Response: The intersection of Carl D. Silver Parkway and Route 3 does not require mill and overlay for condition or strengthening reasons; however, should the pavement markings or messaging need to be modified, requiring the elimination of the existing markings, mill and overlay would be required in lieu of eradication.

25. Please provide existing bridge plans for the Cowan Blvd. bridge and an inspection report of the box culvert.

VDOT Response: Cowan Boulevard Bridge Plans will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2. Culvert inspection reports will be made available to Offerors with the appropriate Critical Infrastructure Information/Sensitive Security Information (CII/SSI) documentation as described in Part 1 Section 11.8.8.

26. RFP Part 2 Section 2.2.1, the RFP states "A minimum of a two (2) foot wide flush median will be provided with the interstate tubular markings to separate the left turn lanes from the eastbound through lanes." This is also shown on the signing and marking plans, but it is not shown on the roadway plans or in the DGN file. Please clarify if this should be included.

VDOT Response: Signing and marking plans (RFP Conceptual Plan Sheet SI(5)) shows interstate tubular marking to separate the left turn lanes from the eastbound through lanes. The preliminary roadway plans provide for the additional width required for the flush median treatment.

27. Would VDOT allow the 2' raised median separating WB Route 3 and the slip ramp from SB I-95 to Carl D. Silver be redesigned to flush mount with tubular post (similar to Route 3 and I-95 Northbound On-Ramp (Ramp A) assuming the drainage was modified accordingly?

VDOT Response: VDOT will not allow the use of a flush mount with interstate tubular markings relative to the separation of westbound Route 3 and Slip Ramp from southbound I-95 to Carl D Silver Parkway. The RFP Conceptual Plans provide for a minimum 2 foot raised median with tubular posts and offset from the raised median.

28. RFP Part 2, 2.8.5 states all pavement markings to be removed shall done via mill and overlay including Carl D. Silver Parkway between Route 3 and Trade Street, yet RFP plan SI(3) indicates eradication of existing pavement markings in this location shall be done in a full rectangle around the message or symbol on Carl D. Silver Parkway. Please clarify which is required. If mill and overlay is required, please verify that the depth and mix type as stated in in Part 2, 2.6.1 shall apply.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 24. Milling and overlay will be required to restore the surface of the existing pavement in accordance Part 2, Section 2.6.1 where pavement markings are removed. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

29. Please specify the minimum lane widths to be maintained on Route 3 and I-95 throughout construction.

VDOT Response: For intermediate-term stationary and long-term stationary traffic control layouts, lane widths shall match existing conditions. For mobile, short duration, and short-term stationary, reduced lane widths shall be in accordance with section 6G.08 of the Virginia Work Area Protection Manual. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

30. If a traffic shift is required on NB I-95, will the adjacent lanes need to be milled and overlaid?

VDOT Response: Traffics shifts may require the mill and overlay of existing pavement to accommodate modifications to the pavement striping. An Offeror may propose other methods such as black out tape for VDOT's approval.

31. Are long term shoulder closures allowed along Ramp A and I-95 NB in order to build the required improvements or is temporary pavement required to shift traffic and maintain full outside shoulders? The existing allowable hours do not allow long term shoulder closures.

VDOT Response: Long term shoulder closures on I-95 northbound to construct the widened/lengthened Ramp A will be allowable in conformance with VAWAPM requirement which may include the use of positive barrier. It would depend on the closure, e.g., location, overall size, amount of time. Site specific MOT plans would need to be developed and reviewed. Additionally, a closure of this type would require additional approvals. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

32. When were the utility designations completed?

VDOT Response: The utility designations were completed March 1, 2016.

33. Does the waterline that crosses I-95 need to be encased within the entire limited access?

VDOT Response: Requirements pertaining to placement and/or encasement of utility facilities located within areas designated as limited access are subject to the policies, procedures, and requirements set forth in the latest versions of the VDOT Road & Bridge Standards, the VDOT Utility Manual of Instructions, the VDOT Land Use Permit Regulations, and in addition, are subject to approval from the VDOT Chief Engineer. Post award VDOT will consider a request from a Design-Builder for allowing existing utilities that are not in physical conflict with the proposed work to remain untouched in areas of limited access on a case by case basis pursuant to the regulations set forth in 24VAC30-151-310 Utility Installations within limited access highways.

34. Will VDOT require the existing 15” sanitary sewer to be encased from the existing manhole (station 136+80, 120’ RT) to the proposed limited access line? If so, will VDOT allow the existing manhole to remain in place or will VDOT require an entire new sanitary sewer crossing of I-95 completely encasing from LA line to LA line?

VDOT Response: Requirements pertaining to placement and/or encasement of utility facilities located within areas designated as limited access are subject to the policies, procedures, and requirements set forth in the latest versions of the VDOT Road & Bridge Standards, the VDOT Utility Manual of Instructions, the VDOT Land Use Permit Regulations, and in addition, are subject to approval from the VDOT Chief Engineer. Post award VDOT and the City of Fredericksburg will consider a request from a Design-Builder for alternatives to a new crossing, pursuant to the regulations set forth in 24VAC30-151-310 Utility Installations within limited access highways.

35. At the Utility Meeting on 10/3/16, VDOT said they would distribute all utility as-builts received. Please provide these as soon as possible.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 1.

36. Please provide existing signal plans for the traffic signals at Route 3@ Carl D. Silver and Route 3@ Gateway Blvd/Ramseur St.

VDOT Response: VDOT will provide the current signal As-built plan to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

37. RFP Part 2, 2.8.2.1 states “The Design-Builder shall be responsible of retiming the corridor”. What are the limits of the corridor?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 20.

38. Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals states “Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) cabinets shall be installed on a VDOT Standard CF-3 Foundation at each signal and camera location.” Does this statement require that a camera be installed at each signalized

intersection, or must the ITS cabinet be provided only if the design builder elects to install a CCTV camera at a signalized intersection as part of meeting the video coverage requirements of *Section 2.8.3 Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras*?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall install an ITS camera at each intersection along with a CF-3 Foundation and cabinet.

39. *Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals* states “All VDOT Traffic Signal Controllers and communications subsystems shall be connected to VDOT Resource Share Fiber assets within the limits of construction for the project.” Please identify the third party fiber provider that should be utilized for the communications and please confirm whether all intersections listed under *Section 2.8.2 – Signals* must have their own hardwired fiber connection or whether a fiber connection at one signal combined with spread spectrum radio (SSR) or wireless Gigi Modems (also described within Section 2.8.2.1) can be used to provide the traffic signal communications subsystem to all intersections? Alternatively, if a hardwired fiber connection must be provided to each intersection can this be used to provide interconnection instead of SSR or wireless modem?

VDOT Response: VDOT will Coordinate/Facilitate the post award Resource Share fiber meeting between the Design-Builder and Summit IG and Sidrea/ LightTower. Modems are not approved for this project. Fiber may be installed in lieu of radio to radio interconnection.

40. *Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals* states “The design builder shall design and construct an intersection lighting system for all Signalized Intersections.” The section also states that “The lighting design shall consist of furnishing and installing LED luminaires on signal poles...”. Please clarify the following:

- Is it the Department’s intent to simply provide lighting bracket arms with luminaires on all mast arm poles?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall be responsible for furnishing and installing all lighting related equipment. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

- Is the installation of luminaires on existing traffic signal poles the intent at the Rt. 3 and Carl D. Silver Parkway intersection as this will require significant modification and/or replacement to the existing mast arm poles and signal bridge at this intersection?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 33.

- Is a photometric analysis required for the intersection lighting design?

VDOT Response: Yes, a photometric analysis will be required for lighting.

41. *Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals* states “Communication with all Traffic Signal systems from the CRO TOC shall be the responsibility of the Design-Builder within

the Project limits and shall be operational at all times during the construction of the Project including the use of temporary Traffic Signals.” Are there existing communication systems between existing traffic signals within the project limits? If so, please provide as-built plans or details of any existing systems that would need to remain operational during construction, including any connections to existing signals located outside of the project limits.

VDOT Response: There are no existing communications As-built plans.

42. Does the Department have shop drawings/ as-builts for the existing Central Park sign? If so, please provide.

VDOT Response: VDOT does not have As-built plans for the Central Park Sign.

43. Please provide original shop drawings for the overhead sign structures within the project limits.

VDOT Response: The overhead sign structures within the project limits are listed in Table 1 below. Most of these structures are shown on working drawings dated October 18, 1983 that Walpar Inc. prepared as part of Project 0095-088-109, C505. A copy of these working drawings and additional clarification will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 2.

Structure No. 880022; Route 3 West Exit Ramp from Route 95 southbound lane was installed by a private developer under a land use permit in 1994. VDOT has an inspection report dated September 20, 2011, but does not have access to working drawings at this time.

Table 1 – Overhead Sign Structures Impacted by Rte. 95 Safety Improvements at Rte. 3

Route	Str. No.	Location	Structure Type	Sheet Reference	Working Drawing
3(EBL)	880005	On Rte. 3 EBL, at Rte. 95 SBL Entrance Ramp	Overhead (Span)	si(03)	Walpar C7170
3(WBL)	880016	On Rte. 3 WBL, at Rte. 95 North Entrance Ramp	Overhead (Span)	si(05)	Walpar C7170
3(EBL)	880017	On Rte.3 EBL, at Rte. 95 North Entrance Ramp	Cantilever	si(04)	Walpar C7170
95(SBL)	880021	On Rte. 95 SBL, MP 130.5, at Rte.3 West Exit Ramp	Overhead (Span)	si(07)	Walpar C7170
95(SBL)	880022	On Rte.3 West Exit Ramp from Rte. 95 SBL	Overhead (Span)	si(04)	Private Development
3(WBL)	880024	On Rte. WBL, at Rte. 95 SBL Entrance Ramp	Cantilever	si(04)	Walpar C7170

44. Are ground mounted signs acceptable in lieu of overhead structures?

VDOT Response: The preliminary signing and marking plans (RFP Conceptual Plan Sheet SI(1-5)) depict the minimum requirements for overhead signage. All other required signage may be ground-mounted.

45. *Section 2.8.1 Signs* states that all overhead signs shall be evaluated for signing lighting needs per IIM-TE-380 whereas *Section 2.8.1.3 Design of Sign Panels and Locations* states that overhead signing shall be illuminated using luminaire retrieval system”. Confirm whether overhead sign lighting is a requirement for all overhead signs or if it shall be evaluated as indicated in the first statement.

VDOT Response: All overhead signage shall be evaluated for sign lighting needs in accordance with IIM-TE-380. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

46. The I-95 SB approach to the interchange does not have an existing 1/2 mile guide sign for the interchange whereas the NB direction does. Is installation of a 1/2 mile guide sign for the SB direction required?

VDOT Response: The installation of a 1/2 mile guide sign for the I-95 southbound approach is not required.

47. Please confirm all conceptual signing plans have been included with the RFP – for example, Sheet SI(5) includes a match line to Sheet SI(4B) that does not appear to be included. There are other match lines with station references only. Are there additional conceptual signing plans?

VDOT Response: The preliminary traffic engineering plans do not include plan sheet SI(4B). The matchline referencing that sheet number is an error. All conceptual signing plans have been included with the RFP. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

48. Please more clearly define the project limits as it relates to “100% video coverage of all lanes of the I-95 mainline and ramps throughout the Project limits” and “100% video coverage of interchanges and ramps throughout the Project limits”. Do the project limits only include sections of the I-95 mainline and ramps that are modified/constructed as part of this project as defined on the RFP cover page and *Part 2 Section 1.1 Project Description*? Also, please verify that providing 100% coverage as defined in the RFP of all ramps is desired as this can be difficult to achieve along loop ramps to remain considering the vegetation in the area if they are in fact included in the project limits.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 12.

49. Please provide or highlight the location of the installation plans for the closed circuits television (CCTV) cameras installed adjacent to the lanes of I-95 that are noted as included in the RFP in *Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals*.

VDOT Response: A CCTV location plan will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

50. *Section 2.8.3 Closed Circuits Television (CCTV) Cameras* states “The design shall include all required supporting hardware and software necessary for full integration to the specified tie-

in location of the network as defined by the CRO RTOM or his designee.” Please provide more detail of the “specified tie-in location of the network” for proper design and bidding.

VDOT Response: The tie-in location referenced is the Richmond TOC, the Northern Virginia TOC, or both depending on the location of each camera. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

51. The *Special Provision for Managed Field Ethernet Switch* states that “The Contractor is not expected to utilize the optical ports on the Field Switch at this time.” and the RFP also includes a *Special Provision for Field Router* that states that “The field router shall be required to provide intelligent network communications routing management and bridging between Ethernet and DS-1/T-1.” Please confirm that use of Managed Field Ethernet Switches is acceptable and that providing Field Routers is not necessary.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder is expected to utilize the optical ports to deliver the fiber service. VDOT will give consideration to a Design-Builder’s request for the use of field routers. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

52. Previous projects along the 95 corridor have included provisions in the RFP to address payment for the noise barrier on a per unit basis based upon the results of the final noise analysis. Will VDOT consider adding similar provisions to this procurement? If so, please specify the quantity of noise barrier for which the Offerors are to base their proposal price upon.

VDOT Response: Noise walls, as shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans and/or preliminary Noise Analysis, are to be used to develop the Offeror’s Proposal. Offerors should refer to Part 2, Section 2.4.8 regarding increases and decreases in noise wall requirements as it pertains to compensation to the Offeror and the Department.

53. Does visibility and ITS to the billboard at Fall Hill Avenue need to be maintained?

VDOT Response: No, visibility nor ITS needs to be maintained to the billboard at Fall Hill Avenue.

54. RFP Part 2 Section 2.7.1 states “For the purpose of developing the Price Proposal, the Offeror shall assume that existing storm sewer systems located within the Project limits, as defined in Part 2, Section 1.1 and which are a functional element of the proposed drainage design, are structurally deficient” We suggest changing the wording of the RFP to follow recent proposals, so that when a pipe is determined to be structurally deficient, a change order is provided by VDOT.

VDOT Response: This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

55. Has a Preliminary or Approved Jurisdictional Determination been issued by the USACE for the ROW limits or cut/fill limits of proposed project area?

VDOT Response: No, a Preliminary or Approved Jurisdictional Determination has not been issued by the USACE for the ROW limits or cut/fill limits of the proposed project area.

56. Has VDOT conducted or received coordination for state listed Green Floater (*Lasmigona subviridis*) from VDGIF or DCR – DNH? This state listed species has been confirmed within the vicinity of the project area.

VDOT Response: No, VDOT has not conducted or received coordination for the state listed Green Floater (Lasmigona subviridis) from VDGIF or DCR – DNH. The green floater shows up within the project vicinity because it has been documented in the Rappahannock River. Based on the database results, critical habitats for the Dwarf Wedgemussel, Harperella, and Small Whorled Pogonia were not identified within study area. Additionally, the Green Floater and referenced Bald Eagle nest were not identified within the footprint of the Build Alternative.

57. Is information available for wetlands and streams along Ramp A and along the east side of I-95 at the Box Culvert? If so, please provide.

VDOT Response: No wetland or stream information is available for this area.

58. Part 2, Section 2.2 states that noise barriers are to be positioned to accommodate a future northbound 2-lane CD road. Please provide the typical section for this CD road, including shoulder widths, so the noise barrier can be located appropriately (confirmation is necessary for the paved shoulder widths identified on Attachment 2.2 – will increases in shoulder widths be required where barrier or guardrail is required adjacent to the paved shoulders?). Please confirm that if the noise barrier is located immediately adjacent to the future CD road, it needs to accommodate barrier protection (MB-7D and backfill) adjacent to the barrier.

VDOT Response: Part 2 Attachment 2.2 provides the geometric criteria for the I-95 northbound CD Roadway. RFP Conceptual Plan sheet 2Q provides the ultimate northbound CD Roadway typical section to assist in conceptualization of the shoulder, lane width, and MB-7A/sound wall requirements. Horizontal and vertical cross sections have also been included in the RFP Conceptual Plans to aid Offeror's in the grading and placement of noise walls.

59. Is the design-builder responsible for any grading of the future CD road so that the noise barrier is positioned in the correct vertical location as compared to the future CD road?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder will be responsible for the grading of the future CD road associated with fill condition and the transition to existing cut. The noise wall located within existing cut must be located to allow for the construction of a future retaining wall associated with the northbound CD Roadway. The Design-Builder will be responsible for positioning the noise walls in the correct vertical location compared to the future CD road.

60. Section 2.4.8 states that the design-builder is responsible for development of the Final Design Noise Analysis, and the usual statements related to increases or decreases in noise barrier

area are also included. However, a base-bid noise barrier area is not provided as the basis for any future increase or decrease in barrier area. Can a noise barrier area be provided that the design-builder shall include as the basis of their price proposal for the noise barrier?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 52.

61. Please provide the TNM noise model files used to develop the preliminary noise analysis.

VDOT Response: This information will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

62. Please confirm that shoulder closure times identified in tables on Part 2 pages 62 thru 65 are related to short-term and mobile operations, and are not applicable to long-term closures which are allowed by page 59 of Section 2.9.1 and page 60 of Section 2.9.3. We recognize that long-term shoulder closures will be required to construct the proposed full depth pavement immediately adjacent to existing thru lanes.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 31.

63. Please clarify if traffic signals controllers and controller cabinets will be provided to the design-builder at no cost, or if the design-builder will be required to purchase this equipment.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder will be responsible for the purchase and installation of traffic signal controllers and cabinets. Refer to the second paragraph in Part 2, Section 2.8.2 of the RFP.

64. The Anticipated Scope of Work (Section 1.2 of Part 2) lists Dynamic Message Signs (DMS), yet no scope definition is found in the RFP documents. Please clarify the DMS scope.

VDOT Response: Dynamic Message Signs will not be a part of the scope of work for this project. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

65. Page 57 of Part 2 notes that mill & overlay of Carl D. Silver Parkway is required where existing pavement markings do not conform to final pavement markings. Yet for the pavement marking changes required per Sheet “si(3)” of the RFP Conceptual Plans, Sheet 3 does not specify mill and overlay on Carl D. Silver Parkway. Please clarify the required mill & overlay limits on Carl D. Silver Parkway.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 28.

66. Section 2.8.1.3 of Part 2 states that all advance guide signs shall be mounted overhead. Please confirm that this applies only to major guide signing depicted on the RFP plans, and not to small supplemental advance guide signs such as “next signal” signs.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 44.

67. Section 2.8.1 of Part 2 states that the design-builder is to evaluate the need for overhead sign lighting, but Section 2.8.1.3 states that overhead signing shall be illuminated with luminaire retrieval systems. Please clarify if sign lighting is required only where warranted per the VDOT IIM-TE-380 process, or if it is required for all overhead signs.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 45.

68. Section 2.8.2.1 of Part 2 regarding traffic signals (page 47) states that the design-builder is “responsible of retiming the corridor”. Please clarify if the design-builder is responsible for re-timing only Route 3 within the project limits, or if “the corridor” extends beyond the project limits. If the re-timing is to extend beyond the project limits, please specify the begin and end locations.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 20.

69. Section 2.8.2.1 of Part 2 regarding traffic signals (page 53) states that intersection lighting is required at signalized intersections. Please clarify if this scope is intended to require 1 luminaire arm mounted on each pole (MP-3 standard), or if the design-builder is required to complete a photometric analysis and required to meet IES RP-8-14 illuminance levels. If minimum illuminance levels are to be met, it is anticipated that additional stand-alone light poles will be required to meet these levels.

VDOT Response: The Offeror’s design shall be in accordance with the Traffic Engineering Design Manual and IES RP-8-14. Additional light poles will not be permitted for intersection lighting. The Design-Builder will conduct a photometric analysis to determine the needs for type, placement, height, wattage of luminaire needs per intersection. See the response to question No. 40.

70. Page 54 of Part 2 of the RFP states that VDOT’s installation plans for CCTV cameras to be installed along I-95 have been included in the information package, yet these plans cannot be found. Please provide these plans or clarify where they have been included in the RFP package.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 49.

71. Section 2.8.3 of Part 2 states that 100% camera coverage is required. Please confirm that 100% coverage includes under bridges, behind signs, etc., as 100% visibility requires significantly more cameras than necessary for 95% visibility.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 12.

72. Please clarify if CCTV cameras are also required to be installed integral with each traffic signal.

VDOT Response: Yes, CCTV cameras will be required at each intersection. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

73. Section 2.9.3 of Part 2 (page 60) states that long term detours will not be permitted. Please also confirm that no long term lane closures are permitted.

VDOT Response: Long term lane closures are not permitted. Lane closures are only permitted in accordance with section 2.9.3 of the RFP.

74. Section 2.9.6 of Part 2 stipulates where PCMS signs are required, which does not include Route 3. Yet, Section 2.9.3 (page 66) states that PCMS are required in advance of lane and shoulder closures, which are also anticipated along Route 3. Please clarify if the PCMS requirement on page 66 only applies to I-95, or if it applies to all roadways.

VDOT Response: PCMS signs are required for all lane closures and shifts on I-95, and as required by Virginia’s Work Area Protection Manual for all other roadways. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

75. The RFP requires guide signing to be installed per MUTCD and VDOT standards, yet the signing shown on the RFP conceptual plans is missing required overhead signing. An example is along southbound I-95 where two sets of arrow-per-lane signs for the option lane exit are required per Section 2E.20 of the MUTCD for major interchanges. Please clarify if the design-builder is to include these additional signs, which are likely about 60’ wide each and require span sign structures across I-95. An example of this required signing along NB I-95 at Exit 158 is pictured below, which has the same geometric configuration as proposed with this project.



VDOT Response: Additional arrow-per-lane signs are not required. The RFP Conceptual Plans represent the minimum signage required for the Project.

76. Are there any preliminary drainage calculations available to support the RFP Conceptual Plans?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for the final drainage and stormwater management designs for the project. Any drainage and stormwater management calculations prepared for the project are preliminary and will not be provided.

77. Are there any preliminary stormwater management calculations available to support the 3 large proposed RFP conceptual BMP's?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 76.

78. The Cultural Resources clearance provided is limited to just the Route 3 interchange improvements and does not extend to the full limits of this project. Please verify the limits of the area cleared regarding Section 106, and clarify if it includes the full right-of-way limits in the project area?

VDOT Response: The proposed area of construction falls within the previously surveyed and disturbed footprint of southbound I-95. The Section 106 process has been concluded for this location and been reviewed by the FHWA in their subsequent approvals of the draft and final environmental documents for Rappahannock River Crossing and the I-95 HOT Lanes South projects.

79. For the Noise Study what is the Date of Knowledge to be used for analysis?

VDOT Response: The date of public knowledge is the date the environmental document was approved (FONSI). The FONSI is dated November 17, 2015.

80. The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC provided does not appear to encompass the entire project reach and is limited to only the Route 3 interchange. Please confirm that the project has been cleared in regards to federal species. Also, please clarify if there are any time of year restrictions associated with the VDOT "may affect determination" for the Northern Long Eared Bat.

VDOT Response: The IPaC was done based on the design information that was provided at that time. Any additional design changes were not covered, although we don't anticipate the conclusions would be any different based on the current design. The project was coordinated with FWS based on 2.5 acres of clearing. There was no response from FWS within the 30 day comment period. There should not be any time of year restrictions for the NLEB as long as there are no documented roost trees or hibernacula within the vicinity of the project area. Currently there are no documented roost trees or hibernacula.

81. The required re-construction of existing I-95 outside shoulders, including the 1' saw cut into the existing rightmost I-95 thru lane, and the requirement to have a 2' shoulder adjacent to temporary barrier, necessitates temporarily shifting I-95 traffic onto the existing median shoulder. Please provide existing pavement thicknesses for the median shoulder to allow the design-builder to evaluate what type of temporary pavement strengthening is required to accommodate traffic on the I-95 median shoulder.

VDOT Response: No core data has been collected; however, based on As-built plans the existing median shoulder is considered adequate for short term temporary support of shifted traffic. Should the Offeror intend to shift traffic for extended periods of time it is recommended that the Offeror pursue securing additional data. Furthermore, unless the

Offeror has alternative methods, the usage of mill and overlay to remove the rumble strip will be required. The As-built pavement sections will be made available to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2. However it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to determine the adequate strength of the shoulder for supporting shifted traffic. All cost and time impacts related to the use of the shoulder for traffic sifts shall be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal.

82. The "107715 Route 3 at Carl D Silver Pkwy and I-95 SB Off-Ramp Intersections Analysis Memo -2020 PM Peak Conditions" document included in the RFP Information Package reports a queue length along Ramp B at the Route 3 signal of 1,269 feet. This queue will block the Ramp B Spur, which doesn't appear to have been addressed in this analysis document, and may back up ramp traffic onto mainline SB I-95. Backups onto mainline I-95 are particularly concerning, given that the 2nd exit lane is a shared I-95 thru lane. Please clarify if the design-builder is responsible for additional analysis or design modifications to prevent queuing onto mainline I-95.

VDOT Response: The 95% queue is 1,269 feet while the storage space is more than 1,700 feet (from SB stop bar at the triple right signal to gore on I-95 mainline). Backing up to SB I-95 mainline is not anticipated. The impact of queue blocking Ramp B Spur is already considered in the simulation model and the 1,269 feet queue reflects the impact.

83. Can VDOT provide the MicroStation files for the boring location plan?

VDOT Response: Microstation files for the boring location plan are not available. Adobe formatted files are provided within the GDR.

84. Can VDOT provide gINT files for the boring logs?

VDOT Response: The gINT files are available and they will be provided to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

85. Will soil samples and pavement cores be available to the design-builder to perform lab testing?

VDOT Response: Soils samples will be available to the Design-Builder for lab testing after the award of the contract. Pavement cores were not retained by the Department after they were measured and photographed and are no longer available for testing. The Design-Builder is responsible to confirm that tests performed on our archive samples are valid, recognizing that moisture content, strength and plasticity can be influenced by storage.

86. Section 2.6 of RFP (Part 2) recommends to use AASHTO LRFD 6th Edition 2012. Can we use AASHTO LRFD 7th Edition, 2014 for design since this is the latest edition?

VDOT Response: AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 7th Edition, 2014 are effective for all projects with an advertisement date after June 14, 2016. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

87. Should VDOT 2016 Road and Bridge Specifications be used instead of VDOT 2007 Road and Bridge Specifications as recommended in Section 2.6 of RFP (Part 2)?

VDOT Response: The VDOT 2016 Road and Bridge Specifications will not be implemented on this project. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

88. Section 2.6 of RFP (Part 2) recommends performing laboratory tests accordance with pertinent ASTM or AASHTO standards. Shouldn't the tests be performed in accordance with VTM standards as applicable?

VDOT Response: Yes the tests should be performed in accordance with the VTM standards. The VTM standards are referenced in Part 2, Section 2.1.1. The VTM standards elaborate on ASTM and AASHTO standards. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

89. Can VDOT confirm that the design-builder will be responsible for 100% of the costs of utility relocations as the project is within the City of Fredericksburg limits?

VDOT Response: Cost responsibility associated with the relocation or removal of utility facilities for projects within the Interstate System within cities or towns are referenced in the latest version of the VDOT Utility Manual of Instructions Section 2.8 (Statutory Rights) and defined by the Code of Virginia Section 33.2-307 (Relocation or removal of utility facilities within projects on Interstate System).

90. Section 2.9.4 Lane Rental Charges. The "Lane Rental Table" (page 67 of 85) for Ramp A and B Closure show rental charges beginning at 4:30am. Per Section 2.9.3 Lane and Road Closure Restriction, the allowable work times for each Ramp vary based on day of the week and time of the year. Are we to assume that the rental rate schedules for each ramp are correct, but the start of the rental times will be delayed to the contract lane closure allowable times per the document tables?

VDOT Response: The allowable lane/ramp closures table and lane rental table will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2. The lane rental times will not vary throughout the year.

91. At Route 3 Station 51+50, the proposed overhead sign structure in the conceptual plans appears to be a butterfly structure. Is it acceptable to use a cantilever structure so that the I-95 North/Washington/Left Arrow sign can be centered over the left turn/shared left through lanes?

VDOT Response: The signing and marking plans (RFP Conceptual Plan Sheet SI(1-5)) depict the minimum requirements for overhead signage. The Design-Builder will need to determine the best type of sign structure to display the proposed overhead messages in the signing plans.

92. On Carl D. Silver Parkway, the conceptual signing plans show a proposed overhead structure that appears to be a signal mast arm judging by the symbology. Should this be a standard

overhead cantilever sign structure with luminaires? According to standard D15-1 of the 2012 Supplement to the FHWA Standard Highway Signs manual, the four proposed signs are each 4' to 4.5' wide and 8' tall, for a total of 136 SF.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 91.

93. There are four existing ground mounted service signs (gas, food, lodging, and attractions) on the I-95 South to Route 3 off-ramp that are being impacted. The panels appear to be in good condition. Is it acceptable to relocate the service signs to new ground mount posts and foundations, or should the panels be replaced as well?

VDOT Response: The applicable requirement is addressed in the last paragraph of Part 2, Section 2.8.1.

94. The RFP language indicates that DMS are included in the ITS design, however, there is no indication in the RFP plans of any existing or proposed DMS within the project area that would be part of the ITS design. Is there any existing or proposed DMS that should be included in the design?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 64.

95. Can VDOT provide ITS as-builts in the project area?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 10.

96. The RFP plans do not show the proposed new signal pole locations and sign pole locations. The probable locations for these items would necessitate the use of guardrail or barrier missing from the RFP plans. Was it VDOT's intent to leave these items off of the plans and are we responsible for including these items in the project cost?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for determining the need for guardrail or barrier as required due to their signal pole and sign pole locations. The associated costs for guardrail or barrier required shall be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal.

97. **General:** Please provide the Synchro files associated with the IMR.

VDOT Response: The Synchro files associated with the IMR will be provided to Offerors in RFP Addendum No. 2.

98. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.1.1 Standards and Reference Documents:** A special provision for Retroreflective Backplates is provided in the RFP package. Please confirm that the Design-Build is required to provide retroreflective backplates for all proposed signal heads on the project?

VDOT Response: Retroreflective Backplates will be required for all proposed signal heads. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

99. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8 Traffic Control Devices:** Are there any special security clearance requirements for handling the communications infrastructure (i.e. signals, ITS/CCTV, etc.)?

VDOT Response: Yes there are security requirements for handling the communication infrastructure. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

100. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.1 Signs:** Please confirm that the last paragraph in this section indicates that if sign lighting is required based the evaluations provided per TE-380, and lighting is required then the sign lighting shall be designed and constructed in accordance with VDOT Traffic Engineering Design Manual, the VDOT 2008 Road and Bridge Standards, the VDOT 2007 Road and Bridge Specifications, Section 705, and the MUTCD.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 45.

101. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2 Signals:** Please confirm that all proposed signal poles shall be placed out of the clear zone or protected by guardrail.

VDOT Response: Offeror's are to refer to the 2005 Road Design Manual for clearzone requirements and lateral offsets.

102. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals:** Please explain the intended scope of the review for the retiming of the corridor. We understand that VDOT performed an IMR and would expect the intended timings from the IMR to be put in place with minor adjustments. Please clarify if the Design-Builder is expected to perform additional analyses and review to “better” the conditions from the IMR report or simply transfer the analyzed data/timings from the IMR for implementation in the field.

VDOT Response: VDOT is in the process of retiming Route 3 between Carl D. Silver Parkway and Andora Drive (Route 626). The Design-Builder will be responsible to tie the most current Synchro files of Route 3 to the new traffic signals. Using the IMR timings with minor adjustments will be fine.

103. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals:** Regarding the volumes for the intersections to be submitted in Synchro for the corridor retiming, is it acceptable to use the IMR future year volumes or is the Design-Builder required to obtain new volumes?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall use the IMR future year volumes. However, the Synchro files referencing the future condition need to be actualized. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

104. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals:** Please provide the limits of the intended signal retiming. Which signals along the corridor are to be included as part of the signal retiming effort?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 37.

105. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals:** The next to last bullet in this section indicates that the existing CCTV plans for I-95 were included in the RFP Information Package. Please confirm that the plans were included and in what folder.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 70.

106. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.2.1 Requirements for Traffic Signals:** The RFP clearly identifies that GPS preemption shall be considered at all intersections. Please confirm that if GPS preemption cannot be used for whatever reason, that another preemption method shall be implemented.

VDOT Response: If GPS preemption cannot be installed for some reason, the Design-Builder shall bring this to the attention of the VDOT Project Manager. Once the issue has been verified by VDOT's traffic engineering staff, VDOT can submit a request to utilize Infrared Red preemption.

107. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.3 Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras:** The location of the one, new CCTV camera appears to be on an overhead sign structure per the RFP plans; however, the RFP indicates requirements for stand-alone poles, please clarify or provide additional information related to a sign structure mounted system.

VDOT Response: A combination of structure mounted cameras as well as pole mounted cameras may be needed to address the 100% coverage requirement through the project limits.

108. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.3 Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras:** Please provide any tolerances, minimums, or maximums associated with the expected mounting heights for the CCTV cameras, or are the heights for the Design-Builder to determine so long as coverage is provided?

VDOT Response: Standard camera pole heights up to 50 feet are common. Taller poles will require a lowering device. This will be largely driven by the coverage requirements and within reason there is some flexibility to the mounting heights based on the field conditions and the design.

109. **RFP Part 2, Section 2.2.3 Route 3 and I-95 Southbound Off-Ramp (Ramp B):** The RFP states that "The slip ramp shall be separated by a two (2) foot wide median and will require the use of interstate tubular markers". Please confirm whether the two (2) foot wide median is required to be raised.

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 27.

110. The Design Criteria Table reflected in Attachment 2.2 of Part 2 of the RFP states that the minimum lane widths on Route 3 are, "11 ft min. and 12' within interchange areas.". Given the current roadway geometry shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans 12-foot

lanes are not currently being accommodated along Route 3 within the project limits. Will 11-foot minimum lane widths be allowed along Route 3 throughout the project? If not, please specify the limits of the “interchange area” where existing Route 3 will need to be further widened to accommodate 12-foot minimum lane widths.

VDOT Response: The westbound Route 3 mainline lane widths of 11 feet apply to the west of the I-95 Bridge. The eastbound Route 3 mainline lane widths of 12 feet apply to the east of the I-95 Bridge. This will be clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

111. From Route 3 BL Station 28+00 to 39+00, the existing 16" waterline is inside of VDOT's limited access R/W, under the grass ditch line.

A) In areas where it is not in conflict, will the 16" waterline be allowed to remain in limited access under the proposed "slip ramp" asphalt, or will it be required to be relocated?

B) In areas where it is in conflict, can the relocated waterline remain under the "slip ramp" inside of limited access?

C) If the waterline must be relocated outside of limited access, has the VDOT determined any viable routes outside of limited access?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 33.

112. We have reviewed all of the environmental documents provided with the RFP and none of them mention the existing Permanent Preservation Easement located on the east side of northbound I-95 at approximately station 137 noted in the Property Boundary file provided in the RFP. There does not appear to be any information regarding this easement, the proposed impact to the easement, nor was it identified in the RFP documentation.

A) Is the Design-Builder responsible for coordination with the easement holder to impact this easement?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for any/all acquisitions with respect to this parcel.

B) Will the NEPA document need to be revised to address the impacts to the easement, and if so, will the D-B teams be responsible for the documentation and coordination?

VDOT Response: No, the NEPA document would not need to be revised to address impacts to the easement.

C) Will compensatory mitigation be required to vacate the portion of the easement required for the proposed project? If so, please provide the D-B the mitigation quantity required for the vacation of the easement, and what form of mitigation will be required?

VDOT Response: The Offerors need to fully understand the implications of the easements by having their Land Acquisition and Legal team review the easement deeds and develop their plan to achieve the project objectives. It is unknown if the easement holders will require mitigation for any unavoidable real property acquisition.

113. VDOT's TE-380 guidelines indicates lighting would be required for O/H signage proposed on Carl Silver Parkway as the unencumbered sight distance is less than 800 ft.; however, VDOT's RFP plans indicate this structure to be a mast arm style structure. Is the Contractor expected to install a full span O/H structure which can support an lumi-track system?

VDOT Response: The overhead sign structure has been removed from the RFP Conceptual Plans. This is clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

114. VDOT's Question & Answers vs. Addendum 2 indicated different actions for the signal at Route 3 / Carl Silver Parkway. To clarify, please confirm that VDOT's term "rebuild" means that VDOT wants the contractor to completely remove the existing signal (including signal bridge) and rebuild the entire signal with all new components?

VDOT Response: A new signal structure will be required to signalize the Thru-Right and the Right Turn lanes going into Carl D. Silver Parkway. All existing signal equipment and components at the intersection of Route and Carl D. Silver Parkway shall remain. This is clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

115. Please confirm that VA Logos Inc. (or other VDOT Contractor) is responsible for the maintenance of the blue sign panels for attractions/gas/restaurants along the ramps within the project limits etc.

VDOT Response: VDOT's Integrated Directional Signing Program (IDSP) is responsible for the routine maintenance of the motorist service signs; however, it is not responsible for project-related impacts. In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.8.1, "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for modifications to existing signs and sign structures, and furnishing and installing all required new temporary and permanent signs and structures...Temporary relocation of signs may be necessary as part of this Project and it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to perform all the required sign relocations. All existing signs shall remain in service and be legible and visible to the travelling public until such time that the sign is either replaced or the message is no longer applicable."

116. Please confirm that the CCTV/TOC Camera shown on Sheet Si(4) is proposed to be on a cantilever arm?

VDOT Response: The CCTV camera can be installed on a pole, gooseneck, cantilever arm or another approved mount to optimize coverage area while limiting blind spots as determined by Design-Builder's Design Engineer.

117. In quadrants of intersections that may not have a signal pole, is the Contractor permitted to install a light pole to ensure the intersection is lighted or shall the Contractor only be permitted to install luminaire arms on combination poles with the signals.

VDOT Response: A standalone lighting pole will be permitted as long as the requirements for intersection lighting are achieved. This is clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

118. As a follow-up to the previous question (Question 112) regarding the existing permanent preservation easements on Parcels 001 & 002 near Station 137+00, preliminary field reconnaissance and aerial photography indicate two stream channels totaling approximately 500 feet and a few small wetland pockets occur proximal to the planned drainage system conveyances that extend into the easements. Is VDOT willing to establish a preservation easement for the undisturbed stream channel and contiguous buffers within the proposed additional right-of-way/limited access line as compensation for impacting the existing preservation easement? Also, if there are additional costs for vacating the preservation easements that are not specifically a mitigation/compensation requirement of any Section 401 or 404 permit that will be required to impact the jurisdictional features within the easement, will VDOT pay those costs as part of the right-of-way acquisition cost?

VDOT Response: VDOT is not willing to establish a preservation easement within the right of way. Any Additional costs associated with vacating the preservation easements beyond what is the Section 401 or 404 permitting responsibility of the Offeror would be considered part of the right of way acquisition cost.

119. RFP Part 2, Section 2.4.8 Noise Mitigation: The RFP notes that the “noise walls, as shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans and/or the Preliminary Noise Analysis shall be utilized for Proposal preparation purposes”. Given that all or part of the proposed noise wall will be below ground for more than 1500’ of the length of the wall, is the Design-Builder required to include in their cost the cost of retaining panels and the cost of excavation to build the wall?

VDOT Response: The RFP Conceptual Plans (Plan Sheet 2P) include typical sections that depict grading between stations 133+30 to 144+25. Fill and cut slopes were provided to show the anticipated grading and right of way limits. If the Design-Builder determines that it would be more economical for it to utilize retaining walls, then the Offeror’s Price Proposal should include the costs for the retaining wall and associated excavation. This is clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

The typical section covering 144+25 to 160+50 provides for a noise barrier wall at the top of an existing cut. The noise barrier shall be located to accommodate a future retaining wall associated with the construction of a CD Road.

120. Can you confirm that the City of Fredericksburg will require that any waterlines under the roadway within the interchange footprint will require encasement pipe?

VDOT Response: Where new waterlines are installed under the roadway they will be required to meet the City of Fredericksburg Construction Specifications and Standards for Water and Sewerage Facilities and the VDOT 2007 Road and Bridge Specifications. VDOT will allow the existing 16" waterline as identified from the Route 3 baseline Station 28+00 to 39+00 to remain in-place and undisturbed within the existing/proposed limited access right of way provided the existing facility will not be affected by any proposed roadway construction activity and the City of Fredericksburg concurs. An exception to this occurs at Ramp B from station 40+00 to 41+00 where the waterline should be encased under the new lanes entering Route 3. Minor adjustments to the existing waterline facility will be considered within existing/proposed limited access right of way on a case by case basis where minimal conflicts with proposed roadway improvements are unavoidable, again with concurrence from the City of Fredericksburg. Should the proposed roadway improvements within the defined area dictate that the majority of the existing waterline facility will require relocation/adjustment, it may be necessary to place the relocated facility within the outer 10' limits of the existing/proposed limited access right of way and/or within a yet to be identified private utility easement.

121. The answer to Question #75 regarding arrow-per-lane signs along southbound I-95 does not provide the necessary direction for bidding. The response states that "VDOT agrees that arrow-per-lane signs should be used..." Please confirm this was intended to instead read "VDOT agrees that arrow-per-lane signs shall be used...". Per Section 2E.20 of the MUTCD (line 02) Overhead Arrow-per-Lane or Diagrammatic guide sign designs shall be used for this condition. As described in the originally submitted question, neither the expensive required Arrow-per-Lane nor Diagrammatic guide signs are detailed in the RFP conceptual plans, which conflicts with the requirement to provide MUTCD compliant signing. In addition to confirming that this signing is a shall condition, please confirm that the signs shown on Sheet si(7) of the RFP Conceptual plans are not compliant with the current MUTCD, and are not to be used for bidding purposes.

VDOT Response: As the right-most exit lane off I-95 south bound is an added deceleration lane (rather than a drop lane), Arrow-per-lane and diagrammatic guide signs are not required on the mainline of I-95. While the overhead sign plans provided are only conceptual in nature showing the minimum overhead signing requirements, VDOT anticipates that the Design-Builder will use Figure 2E-12 of the MUTCD for signing a Two-Lane Intermediate Interchange Exit with Option and Auxiliary lanes for this specific sign. As such, the structure would need to be located at the theoretical gore and the yellow and black "EXIT ONLY" panel will not be required; however, these changes from the RFP Conceptual Plans will not significantly change the cost or size of the sign structure. The Route 3 East, Fredericksburg, ¼ Mile sign will be required on the same structure, as shown on the RFP conceptual signing plans.

122. Please confirm that it is the intent of Section 2.8.3 to provide 100% camera coverage of the entire project limits (including I-95, Ramps, and Route 3), instead of just relocating/adding cameras at the traffic signals. This adds numerous stand-alone cameras to achieve 100% coverage, which are not depicted on the RFP conceptual plans.

VDOT Response: The intent of Part 2, Section 2.8.3 is for the Design-Builder to provide 100% camera coverage of all lanes of I-95, Route 3, and the I-95 ramps located within the project limits. Camera relocations as shown on Plan Sheet Si(4) can be used to supplement/augment the Design-Builder's design to achieve 100% coverage.

123. Please confirm the minimum height for new CCTV camera poles.

VDOT Response: Standard pole heights shall be 40 feet, 45 feet, 60 feet, and 80 feet. A CCTV camera lowering device is required on poles of 60 and 80 feet in height. This is clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

124. The answer to Question #13 states that intersection lighting is not required at the Carl D. Silver Parkway intersection, yet Section 2.8.2.1 of Part 2 of the RFP (page 53) was revised to require lighting at this intersection. Please clarify this conflict.

VDOT Response: Intersection lighting is NOT required at the Carl D. Silver Parkway Intersection. The response to Question No. 13 is revised in this update to the Questions and Answers.

125. Section 2.8.2 of Part 2 of the RFP (page 47) changed the requirement for the Carl D. Silver Parkway signal from "Modify Existing Signal" to "Rebuild signal". Please clarify the definition of "rebuild". Does this require replacement of all existing poles, conduits, junction boxes, and foundations, even if the equipment is not impacted by the roadway improvements?

VDOT Response: See response to question No. 114.

126. As a follow-up to question #33, please confirm if the 16" City of Fredericksburg waterline, from Route 3 BL station 28+00 to 39+00, will be required to be removed from limited access, or if it will be allowed to remain in limited access. During coordination with the City of Fredericksburg, the City stated they would not approve any waterline design that relocated their line out of VDOT right-of-way in this area. The Regional Utility Coordinator Rick Miller gave direction that the waterline would not be allowed to remain in a location that future maintenance or access would disrupt the operation of the VDOT facility. Please clarify VDOT's intent for the waterline in this area and provide the proposed waterline alignment outside of limited access.

VDOT Response: VDOT will allow the existing 16" waterline as identified from the Route 3 baseline Station 28+00 to 39+00 to remain in-place and undisturbed within existing/proposed limited access right of way provided the existing facility will not be affected by any proposed roadway construction activity and the City of Fredericksburg concurs. Minor adjustments to the existing waterline facility will be considered within existing/proposed limited access right of way on a case by case basis where minimal conflicts with proposed roadway improvements are unavoidable, again with concurrence from the City of Fredericksburg. Should the proposed roadway improvements within the defined area dictate that the majority of the existing waterline facility will require relocation/adjustment, it may be necessary to place the relocated facility within the outer 10' limits of the existing/proposed limited access right of way and/or within a yet to be identified private utility easement.