RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I-81 MM 48 NORTHBOUND ACCELERATION LANE EXTENSION

VDOT PROJECT: 0081-086-834 PE101, C501

CONTRACT ID: C00116161DB110

VERSION 3 - MARCH 25, 2021

update to Question #63 only (in track changes)

Geotechnical and Materials

1. Geotechnical Data Report and Part 2 – Addendum 1 - 2.6 Geotechnical Work. Are the rock core samples from the preliminary geotechnical investigation available for observation and visual inspection?

   *VDOT Response: Yes ,the cores will be made available, for visual inspection only, at the Bristol District Office (870 Bonham Road, Bristol, VA 24201) on **March 5, 2021 from 8am to noon**.. Appointments for 30 minute time slots are available on a first come first serve basis Please contact Coleman Hamilton 276-969-3315, coleman.hamilton@vdot.virginia.gov to make an appointment.*

2. The frequency of the borings provided in the Geotechnical Data Report (GDR) are spaced greater than 200 feet apart at several locations and there are no borings at the base of the proposed cut along the edge of the road. In order to meet the requirements of MOI Chapter 3, will the Design-Build team be required to drill additional borings, or will the information provided in the GDR be sufficient in allowing the Engineer to approve the slope design?

   VDOT Response: It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to perform a design-level geotechnical investigation to validate and augment the geotechnical information included in the RFP, including the GDR.. The geotechnical engineering investigation performed by the Design-Builder shall meet or exceed both Chapter 3 of the VDOT Material Division's Manual of Instructions (MOI); the current AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 6th Edition, 2012 and VDOT Modifications; and Section 700.05 (c) of the 2020 VDOT Road and Bridge Specifications.

3. Is Part 2, Section 2.1.2, Can we get the gINT file for the borings provided in the Geotechnical Data Report?

   VDOT Response: Yes, the gINT file will be provided in an upcoming Addendum.

4. Part 2, Section 2.6.4 requires that unsuitable materials at the subgrade be treated by removal and replacement, or other approved means. As there are no borings located within the proposed pavement area, will there be a basis provided for assuming an amount of unsuitable material that will need to be treated?

   VDOT Response: There will be no basis provided, all geotechnical data pertaining to the presence of unsuitable soils has been provided.

5. Is it a requirement to protect the roadway from falling rocks for slopes that are not modified by the project?

   VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall be responsible to protect all existing surfaces and return them to equivalent or better condition. Any surfaces damaged shall receive temporary repairs until permanent repairs can be completed.

6. The conceptual plans and Geotechnical Data Report indicate the use of a cut slope ratio of 1H:1V from station 116+00 to station 128+50 right and from station 135+00 to station 148+50 right. Soil was encountered in many borings to depths of up to 45.7 feet. Part 2 Section 2.6.3 states that the maximum slope ratio for cut and/or roadway embankment fill shall not be steeper than 2H:1V. It states that increases to the slope may be allowed based on approval of the Engineer. Will slope ratio steeper than 2H:1V be permitted by the Engineer in soil consistent with the conceptual design?

   VDOT Response: The maximum slope may be increased to greater than *2H:1V. However, the Design-Builder is responsible for preparing supportive analysis of slope design such that, sufficient reinforcement and appropriate safety factors are provided. The Design-Builder is responsible for verifying the stability of all slopes. VDOT will consider slope design configurations meeting the criteria for stability within the existing ROW. Slope design configurations may include the use of retaining walls, reinforced slopes, etc. if necessary.*

7. Part 2 Section 2.6.3 and the RFP Presentation indicates the maximum slope ratio for cuts is 2H:1V while the RFP drawings indicate 1H:1V slopes. Can the Design Builder assume a 1H:1V slope? If not, the slope may exceed the ROW limits.

   VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 6.

8. Part 2, Section 2.6.3, Can the slopes be designed with additional support elements; i.e. soil nails, rock anchors, wired mesh, etc.?

   VDOT Response: Yes, any approved VDOT method will be acceptable.

9. Part 2, Section 1.2, The ground surface elevation as shown in boring 20BH-008 conflicts with the cross-sections and did not look correct. Can you confirm and provide the correct elevation?

   VDOT Response: The elevation has been corrected and will be included in a revised GDR in an upcoming Addendum.

10. Special Provision – Rock Blasting states "All rock slopes with a slope of 1V:1H or steeper shall be pre-split". A slope of 1:1 for presplitting is not easily achievable. Drill steel walking is going to be a large issue, also most drills are not designed to drill at such an angle. Normally the steepest angle used is ½:1 with ¼:1 and 1/8:1 being the most common. Additionally, the amount of cover material does not provide adequate protection for pre-splitting shots. Will VDOT reconsider this requirement?

    VDOT Response: The Special Provision for Rock Blasting does not require 1H:1V slope angle. The 1H:1V is criteria threshold, it is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the appropriate slope angle/treatment.

11. The Pre-Blast inspection information gives no radius from blast site as to where surveys apply. Is there a distance or formula available or can we assume the ISEE standards and VA SFPC will apply?

    VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall perform pre-blast inspections in all compass quadrants relative to each production blast. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the area and distance of impact to investigate based on their project blasting approach.

12. Geotechnical Data Report and Part 2 – Addendum 1 - 2.6 Geotechnical Work. Has VDOT conducted any rock structure field measurements as part of the preliminary geotechnical engineering investigation to provide information on rock mass discontinuity orientations (dip and dip direction) and strength characteristics to support slope stability analysis? If so, will VDOT provide the data?

    VDOT Response: All data relative to rock mass characteristics has been provided. The Geotechnical Data Report(GDR) provides rock quality designation (RQD), recovery and description of rock, based on VDOT's Manual of Instructions. Published geologic references provide further insight on the nature of the rock formation, including strike and dip. All Offerors have an opportunity to view the available rock samples and can evaluate the nature of discontinuity and bedding angles. All holes were drilled vertically. No additional data will be provided.

13. Geotechnical Data Report and Part 2 – Addendum 1 - 2.6 Geotechnical Work. The roadway concept cross section presented during the preproposal meeting shows cut slopes laid back to 1H:1V. Section 2.6.3 of the RFP states that cut slopes shall be no steeper than 2H:1V unless approved by the Engineer. Has VDOT performed slope stability analysis as part of the preliminary design to verify that 1:1 slopes are stable with respect to global stability? If so, will VDOT provide the results of the analysis?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 6.

14. Geotechnical Data Report, Drainage and Stormwater Management Report, Conceptual Plans, and Part 2 – Addendum 1 - 2.6 Geotechnical Work. Has VDOT performed rockfall hazard analysis as part of the preliminary design to verify that the rockfall catchment ditch shown on the concept cross section will be adequate to meet the VDOT MOI Section 305 rockfall criteria? If so, will VDOT provide the results of the analysis? If not, please confirm that the 10' width is acceptable for rockfall catchment to the Department.

    VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall be responsible for the final rockfall hazard analysis and determining the size requirements for rockfall catchment.

15. Geotechnical Data Report and Part 2 – Addendum 1 - 2.6 Geotechnical Work. Has any rock slope evaluation been performed using kinematic analysis techniques (i.e. stereo-nets)? If so, will VDOT provide the results of the analysis?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 14.

Roadway, Survey, Drainage

16. RFP Plans and Typical Sections show Prop. Mod. UD-4 (6" Pipe) from approximate Sta. 113+50 to 121+50, which appears to be lower than the typical road-side ditch shown. We believe that daylighting #1 stone to the ditch line would function better than the UD-4 (6" pipe). Please confirm if it is acceptable to daylight #1 stone to the ditch line, instead of placing the UD-4 (6" Pipe).

    VDOT Response: Daylighting #1 stone to the ditch line is an acceptable practice. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the appropriate method to address subgrade drainage in accordance with VDOT design criteria.

17. Part 1 Section 4.2.7.5(Page 12 of 36) states specifies the Conceptual Roadway Plans are to identify 5 design features in which #5 is Slope Treatment. What is meant by Slope Treatment?

    VDOT Response: Slope Treatment in Part 1, Section 4.2.7 is in reference to the proposed configuration of any cut/fill slopes needed to support the acceleration lane extension. Please see VDOT 2016 Road and Bridge Standards Section 700 - Geometric Design.

18. Part 2 Section 2.2 notes the Design-Builder is responsible for making necessary repairs to the Frontage Road if damaged. The frontage road currently appears to be in bad condition. Can VDOT provide details on the expected repairs?

    VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall provide a pre-construction assessment showing the existing frontage road conditions. Any damage to the frontage road caused by the Design-Builder's construction activities shall be repaired by the Design-Builder in kind prior to Final Acceptance.

19. RFP Plan Sheet 2A(1) – Typical Section notes that a Modified UD-4 is required where full depth pavement is placed. The Part 2 Technical Requirements, Section 2.6.2 states "standard UD-4 edgedrains will be required for all pavements on this project". Does VDOT require a modified UD-4 or a standard UD-4?

    VDOT Response: Both the UD-4 and modified UD-4 are acceptable and the Design-Builder shall select and utilize the correct one to meet the design criteria. The RFP Conceptual Plans are presented as a "Concept" to provide a general intent of the project. The Design-Builder shall analyze and provide an acceptable subgrade drainage solution that meets VDOT design criteria.

20. RFP Plan Sheet 2A(1) – Note 3 indicates that Aggr. Mat'l. No. 1 to be drained by French Drain every 500' (1,000' Max.), unless drained by Mod. UD-4. The Part 2 Technical Requirements, Section 2.6.2 states "standard UD-4 edgedrains will be required for all pavements on this project". Is it the intention of VDOT to allow Aggr. Mat'l. No. 1 to be used in place (as a substitute) of UD-4 edgedrains?

    VDOT Response: The term "French Drain" shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans Sheet 2(A)1, 2(A)2 and 2(A)3 is incorrectly identified and has been changed to "Aggregate Outfall". These plan sheets will be revised in an upcoming Addendum. Also, please see response to Question 16.

21. RFP Plan Sheet 6 – Indicates proposed guardrail tying into existing guardrail at the end of the project. The Part 2 Technical Requirements, Section 2.9.3 states "Existing sub-standard guardrail within the existing Project limits must be upgraded by the Design-Builder to meet current standards per Appendix I of the VDOT Road Design Manual. This may require the upgrade of guardrail to the nearest logical termination point beyond the current Project limits". Will VDOT please confirm

the limits of guardrail replacement are as shown on the RFP plans and confirm this is not a conflict with the requirements of the RFP and Appendix I of the VDOT Road Design Manual. If the intent is to replace the entire run of guardrail, can VDOT provide the special design detail for the FOA at the Bridge.

VDOT Response: The guardrail end treatment shown on RFP Conceptual Plan Sheet 6 will be revised in an upcoming Addendum. The guardrail replacement shall meet the requirements of Appendix I of the VDOT RDM. During the design phase of the project VDOT can provide a special design FOA (BR-GR) detail to the Design-Builder should one be required.

22. RFP Plan Sheet 3 & Cross Sections indicates proposed guardrail being replaced from approximately Sta. 106+75 Rt. to Sta. 111+75 Rt. without St'd. MC-4 (Asphalt Paving Under Guardrail). In the VDOT Road Design Manual – Appendix J, Page J-24, Asphalt Paving Under Guardrail states "Asphalt paving shall be used under guardrail to control the growth of vegetation on project which have asphalt concrete or hydraulic cement concrete paved shoulders unless otherwise directed by the District Maintenance Engineer". Is this section of guardrail required to have asphalt paving under the guardrail or is this requirement being waived by VDOT?

    VDOT Response: Asphalt paving shall be used under the guardrail.

23. PFI Drainage Report indicates for outfalls #2, 3, 4, and 5 that downstream channel adequacy should be evaluated for capacity to satisfy the 1% rule to avoid implementing on-site stormwater detention. The report also refers to an existing inlet that "may exist". The RFP Survey files do not provide enough downstream area for adequacy to be proven. Can additional survey information be provided so that outfall adequacy can be proven and included in our price proposal?

    VDOT Response: No additional survey will be provided, regarding outfalls #2, 3, 4, and 5. Requirements for these outfalls will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

24. RFP Part 2 Section 2.9.4 states that all new lane markings, edge lines, and center lines shall be supplemented with snow-plowable raised pavement markers. However, since the contract was advertised after January 1, 2020 should this be changed to plastic inlaid markers "INLAID PAVEMENT MARKER"?

    VDOT Response: Yes, Inlaid Pavement Markers shall be used in lieu of Snow plowable raised pavement markers. This will be modified in an upcoming Addendum.

25. Part 2 Section 2.9.4 – RFP specifies SRPMs. Should the project use plastic inlaid markers (PIM) per the latest PM-8 standard?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 24.

Traffic Engineering, TMP, ITS, Signage

26. For the signage within the project limits, quantity estimate seems to indicate that all the signs were being replaced with new signs. Can we reuse the sign panels within the project limits rather than replace with new sign panels? Can we reuse the solar powered blinking chevron sign panels, which appear to be installed recently, rather than replace with new sign panels?

VDOT Response: The reuse of sign panels for this project will not be permitted. The solar powered flashing chevrons will be removed prior to Notice to Proceed for this project and re-installed upon completion of the project by VDOT forces. This will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

27. As part of the RFP Traffic Documents, I-81 Incident Detour Plan Between Exit 47 & Exit 50 is missing Sheet 2 of 2. Can you please provide Sheet 2 of 2?

    VDOT Response: Yes, this sheet will be provided in an upcoming Addendum

28. Part 2, Section 1.3, The list of Anticipated Design Services includes traffic counts and analysis, but these services are not described in any additional detail in this document. Where are traffic counts required and what type of analysis are required?

    VDOT Response: Traffic counts and analysis will not be required for this project. This will be modified in an upcoming Addendum.

29. Part 2, Section 1.2, The list of Anticipated Scope of Work includes Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) components including Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras, Dynamic Message Signs (DMS), and Fiber Optic Communications (COMM) Infrastructure. These services are not described in any additional detail in this document except for the ITS Structures. What ITS, CCTV, DMS, and COMM services are anticipated for this project?

    VDOT Response: There will be no ITS services required for this project. This will be modified in an upcoming Addendum.

30. Part 2 Section 2.9.1 Signs – "Design Builder shall be responsible for modifications to existing signs and sign structure and furnishing and installing all new temporary and permanent signs…" Can the existing solar-powered flashing chevrons be removed at the start of construction and reinstalled at the completion of construction?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 26.

31. Part 2 Section 2.10. 3 – Notes Temporary closures up to 20 minutes can be approved by the Engineer. What are the times the Design Builder can expect closures – Monday through Friday? 7:00AM to 7:00PM? Please note that blasting cannot be performed at night.

    VDOT Response: Part 2 Section 2.10.3 table details that no lane closures will be allowed during the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, including temporary closures for 20 minutes. Temporary lane closures will be allowed for blasting operations between the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM at the approval of the Engineer. Lane closure restrictions will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

32. Part 2 Section 2.9.1.3 – Existing sign structures along the corridor appear to be STP-1. RFP currently requires SSP-VA or SSP-VIA. Is the use of VDOT standard STP-1 or STP-2 structures permissible?

    VDOT Response: No, the use of STP-1 or STP-2 will not be permitted.

33. Part 2 Section 2.10.3 – Lane Closure Restrictions Table. Please clarify the lane closure restrictions table. Does this mean that lanes cannot be closed between 7 AM and 7 PM or that they can only be closed during this time period?

VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 31.

34. Part 2 Section 2.10.3 – Lane Closure Restrictions Table. Please clarify the lane closure restrictions table with respect to the 20 Minute Duration column. It appears the Note would allow 20-minute closures during periods of time when construction may not be permitted. For example, Saturday.

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 31.

Environmental, Noise

35. Special Provision for Tree Removal Time of Year Restriction for Roosting Bat Habitat restricts removal of trees greater than or equal to 3 inches from April 15 to September 15. With an NTP of June 21, 2021 and final completion date of July 25, 2022 or October 26, 2022, it does not leave much time to perform most of the required work. Construction of median shoulder widening, pavement markings to shift the traffic towards the median, and installation of portable concrete barrier should be one of the first items addressed before cold weather prevents proper asphalt paving and prevents the required preformed markings from adhering properly. Since the project was determined as Not Likely to Adversely Affect listed species, will the authorized District staff issue a waiver on tree cutting moratorium for this project?

    VDOT Response: The will be no waiver of the time of year restriction for tree cutting. The median shoulder will be in place via Project No.: 0081-961-642, N501; UPC 116732. Also, please see responses to Questions 53 and 55.

36. The Tree Removal Special Provision does not allow clearing of trees greater than 3" diameter between April 15 and Sept. 15. The NTP is 6/21/21 while the scope validation is for 60 days following. How can the Design Builder perform additional geology exploration prior to September 15 with the current timber landscape? If Design Builder waits until September 15 to perform additional geology exploration, the scope validation period has expired.

    VDOT Response: The Scope Validation Period for geotechnical investigations impacted by the Tree Removal Special Provision will be extended to October 29, 2021. Any other Scope Issues the Design-Builder intends to seek relief for will be subject to the Scope Validation Period which expires 60 days after Notice to Proceed. This will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

37. Will the successful D/B Team be provided the original design noise report as a reference?

    VDOT Response: The preliminary noise study was included in the environmental documentation included in the RFP information package. Please see pdf titled "UPC-116161 Environmental Documentation for DB "page 45/84" .

Utilities

38. Part 2 Section 2.3.10, Does VDOT own or is aware of any fiber optic / communication cabling within the existing Right-of-Way within the project limits?

VDOT Response: Based on the Point Broadband As-built plans, VDOT has no knowledge of existing Fiber Optic lines within the project limits. However, there are Lumen/Century Link facilities along Route 11 and aerial facilities along Rifton Drive.

Contractual

39. VDOT allows the contractor rock excavation experience to come from a subcontractor. Will VDOT allow the designer rock (cut) excavation experience to come from a subconsultant?

    VDOT Response: Yes, this was addressed in Addendum #1 to the RFP.

40. Currently the designer project experience for maintenance of traffic and traffic control must come from an interstate project. Can this requirement be expanded to come from either interstate or a limited-access primary?

    VDOT Response: This was addressed in Addendum #1 to the RFP. For the Lead designer, one (1) project on an interstate or a limited access primary highway that includes maintenance of traffic as well as traffic control for traffic volumes exceeding 10,000 vehicles a day.

41. Can one project be utilized multiple times to meet the project requirements?

    VDOT Response: No. The projects shall be separate and distinct projects. This was addressed in Addendum #1 to the RFP.

42. Could you please provide access to the .tin/3D files for the above referenced project? We were unable to locate them in the RFP Information Package and believe they are necessary to prepare our bid.

    VDOT Response: Yes, the tin/3D files were provided Addendum #1 to the RFP.

43. The scope validation duration for this project is set at sixty (60) days. Given the lack of available geotechnical information, especially in the pavement section, can this duration be extended to one-hundred and twenty (120) days? This would account for the time needed to line up the drillers, conduct the explorations, conduct the lab analysis and evaluate the findings.

    VDOT Response: The Scope Validation Period will remain at sixty (60) days.

44. Based on the unpredictable nature of karst bedrock and the potential for sinkholes and pinnacled bedrock due to the local geology, will the Design-Build team be compensated during construction if karst features are encountered beyond what was identified in the GDR?

    VDOT Response: Any compensation related to subsurface geotechnical conditions is subject to the scope validation process is described in Part 4, Section 2. The purpose of the scope validation clause is to give the Design-Builder an opportunity to notify VDOT of issues that are discovered during the post-award review period that materially differ from what the Department provided in the RFP Documents during the procurement process.

45. Is RFP Part 1 Section 2.3.1.10 shows a final completion date of 07/25/22 while RFP Part 1 Section 4.4.4 Proposal Schedule shows a Final Completion Date of October 26, 2022. Please clarify which date is the correct date.

    VDOT Response: The Final Completion Date is July 25, 2022. This will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

46. Part 1 Sections 2.3.1 & 4.4.4, Which is the completion date per contract, July 25, 2022 or October 26, 2022?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 46.

47. The Presentation states a Final Completion Date (Slide 57) of July 25, 2022 while Part 1 Section 4.4.4.1 (pg. 15 of 36) shows a Final Completion Date of October 26, 2022. Which is correct?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 46.

48. Does the laboratory performing the Quality Assurance (QA) testing for the QAM need to be separate laboratory than the laboratory performing the Quality Control testing for the contractor?

    VDOT Response: Yes, two (2) independent, AMRL certified testing laboratories will be required, one for QA testing and one for QC testing..

49. Please confirm if the QC inspector can be from the same firm as the lead designer?

    VDOT Response: Yes, QC inspector can be from the same firm as the lead designer. In addition the Design-Builder shall ensure a clear separation and independence of a contractual relationship of any kind with the Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) programs for construction activities.

50. Part 2 Section 2.17.5 Plan Submittals, Are there set review times/turnaround for design submittal?

    VDOT Response: Please see Part 4 (General Conditions of Contract), Article 3 for review times.

51. Part 1 Section 4.4.2 and Part 2 Section 2.14.1, What is the time commitment expectation for the QAM? Full-time or part-time?

    VDOT Response: For this project the QAM is not required to be on site full time.

52. Part 1 Section 4.1.9 and Section 11.5, Are DBE firms utilized on the consultants portion of the Team counted as a part of overall DBE requirement?

    VDOT Response: DBE Program compliance procedures for the Design Phase and Construction Phase of the project shall be in accordance with the Part 5 Exhibit (Special Provision for Section 107.15 for Design-Build Projects).

53. Part 2 Section 1.7, What is the construction completion date for the Interstate Widening Project MM 47 NB Left Shoulder; Proj. No. 0087-961-642; N501; UPC 116732?

VDOT Response: The Interstate Widening Project MM 47 NB Left Shoulder; Proj. No. 0087-961-642; N501; UPC 116732 is anticipated to be completed by late April or early May 2021.

54. Part 2 – Addendum 1 – 1.7 Coordination with Active Construction Projects. Left shoulder widening per UPC 116732. What is the scheduled completion date for UPC 116732?

    VDOT Response: Please see response to Question 53.

55. Part 2 Section 1.7, Can a copy of the construction drawings for the Interstate Widening Project MM 47 NB Left Shoulder; Proj .No. 0087-961-642; N501; UPC 116732 be made available?

    VDOT Response: Yes, plans related to Interstate Widening Project MM 47 NB Left Shoulder; Proj. No. 0087-961-642; N501; UPC 116732 will be provided in an upcoming Addendum.

56. Part 2, Section 2.11, How many informational meetings are anticipated?

    VDOT Response: It will be the Design-Builder's responsibility to hold informal meetings with affected stakeholders as necessary and as directed by VDOT. The number of meetings will depend on the Design-Builder's approach to complete the design and construction of the project as it related to stakeholder coordination.

57. Part 2, Section 2.11, What intervals are anticipated for the submission to the VDOT Project Manager written information about the project suitable for posting by VDOT of its Website?

    VDOT Response: It will be the Design-Builder's responsibility to coordinate website postings based on the Design-Builder's approach to complete the design and construction of the project.

58. Scoping Document indicates a High-Speed Friction Latex Coating is shown in the Preliminary Project Detail Cost Estimate. Will this be required in final design and if so, where is it necessary?

    VDOT Response: The Preliminary Detail Cost Estimate was inadvertently included with the Scoping Document and shall not be considered as part of the design-build contract for this project. A revised Scoping Document will be included in an upcoming Addendum. High-Speed Friction Latex Coating is not required for this project.

59. Part 2 Technical Requirements, Section 2.10.3 states "Offeror's Technical and Price Proposals shall be developed to meet the required lane, shoulder, or road closure restrictions specified in this section. Any deviations from these allowable lane closures may render an Offeror's Proposal non-responsive. Part 1, Section 4.2.7 (Attachments to the Letter of Proposal) MOT Conceptual Plans are not listed as a requirement. Is it VDOT's intention to require MOT Conceptual Plans with the Price Proposal? Please verify that a Technical Proposal is not required.

    VDOT Response: Each Offeror will submit a "Letter of Submittal", "Attachments to the Letter of Submittal" and a "Price Proposal" for this project. The submittal requirements shall be in accordance with Part 1, Section 4. MOT Conceptual Plans are not required as part of the Letter of Submittal. A "Technical Proposal" is not required. This will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.

60. Part 1, Section 6.2 Format_6.2.2 (pages 17 & 18), page size and font requirements are stated. Is there a page requirement/limitation for the Letter of Submittal?

    VDOT Response: No, there is no page limitation for the Letter of Submittal.

61. Part 1, Section 6.2 Format_6.2.2 (pages 17) states that page number references should be included in the lower right-hand corner on each page of Volume I and Volume II of the Letter of Submittal. Is it required to number all forms including Work History, Resumes, Appendices, schedule, etc.

    VDOT Response: Yes, page number references should be included in the lower right hand corner on each page of Volume I and Volume II of the Letter of Submittal.

62. Part 1, Section 6.2 Format_6.2.2 (page 17) states that the LOS should be "Separated by numbered tabs with sections corresponding to the order set forth in Part 1, Section 4.0, except for that required by Part 1, Section 4.3. Is there a preference on how the tabs should be numbered? For example "Tab 4.1 - Letter of Submittal" or "Tab 1 - Section 4.1 Letter of Submittal"

    VDOT Response: No, there is no preference.

63. The reference to deliverables within three (3) calendar days of Notice of Intent to Award appears in several places within the RFP. Notice of Intent to Award Date is Thursday 04/08/21.

    Overview (page 2) of RFP - VDOT will use a single-phase selection process on the Project. In accordance with the requirements of this RFP, interested Offerors will submit a Proposal consisting of a Letter of Submittal, Attachments to the Letter of Submittal, and Price Proposal consistent with Part 1, Section 4.0. Additionally, the Offeror who submits the lowest Proposal Price will develop and deliver the Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittals consistent with Part 1, Section 4.4 within three (3) business days of Notice of Intent to Award.

    Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittals (page 13) - Within three (3) calendar days of Notice of Intent to Award, the Successful Offeror shall deliver to VDOT documents required by this Section for its review and approval. VDOT may seek clarifications on any such documents. If VDOT disapproves any such submittal, VDOT may, in its sole discretion, disqualify the Successful Offeror.

    Part 1, 6.2 Format, 6.2.4 (page 18) - Within three (3) calendar days of Notice of Intent to Award, the Successful Offeror shall deliver a sealed parcel containing one (1) paper copy of the Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittals, excluding the Escrow Proposal Documents, and one (1) CD-ROM or DVD ROM containing the entire Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittals, excluding the Escrow Proposal Documents in a single cohesive Adobe PDF file.

    Please confirm the actual date that these documents are to be submitted.

    VDOT Response: The ~~current~~ scheduled Notice of Intent to Award date has been changed to ~~is~~ April ~~8~~20, 2021. For this project The Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittals shall be due within three (3) business days on April ~~13~~23, 2021. This change was included in Addendum No. 4~~will be clarified in an upcoming Addendum.~~