

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

The following Matrix includes NHDOT’s response to questions and comments regarding the Interstate 93 Exit 4A 13065 Project RFP received as of **June 26, 2020**.

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
1	ITP 3.2.5 7 Form E / Contract Section 7.4, Appendix 7	<p>Regarding the key personnel submission due on June 8, 2020, the RFP appears to contain a conflict with regards to what roles are considered “key personnel” and must be submitted by this date. Can NHDOT clarify what is required to be submitted? For reference, Form E from the TIP lists the same key personnel as the RFQ, while Appendix 7 of the DB Contract appendices lists (3) additional key personnel roles.</p>	<p>Regarding the requirement in Section 1.4 of the ITP, and Section 3.2.5 of the Appendix to the ITP, to submit names of Key Personnel by June 8, 2020, Proposers are required to submit the names of Key Personnel as listed on Form E from the ITP. According to Section 3.2.5 of the ITP Exhibits, Form E shall be submitted as well as a statement signed by the proposers and the employer of each designated key person, committing to maintain such individual’s availability for and active involvement in the project.</p>
2	Technical Provisions Section 7.3	<p>Is it permissible to access the buildings to be demolished for the purposes of performing hazardous materials assessments? If so, please clarify the proper procedure for doing this.</p>	<p>Right-of-Way acquisition is ongoing for some of the properties to be acquired. For those properties not currently under the ownership of NHDOT, no access beyond the existing Right-of-Way will be permitted until NHDOT has ownership of the property and has completed relocation assistance. Once NHDOT has ownership of the property and relocation assistance is complete, access to the properties can be provided for the purpose of assessment of hazardous building materials.</p>

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
3	Technical Provisions Section 7.2.1.3.5	Section 7.2.1.3.5 states “In addition, the Design-Builder will be responsible for the design and construction of replacement water and sewer facilities in the Towns of Derry requiring adjustment/relocation necessary to accommodate the Project. The Design-Builder will evaluate and resolve all conflicts relating to the design. Multiple adjustments to the same water line resulting in the addition of 3 or more angle points will not be considered an equal service.” Is the D-B team allowed to discuss the requirements/intent of the Towns of Derry for what is needed for the replacement of water and sewer facilities?	Discussions with the Towns for the purpose of estimating the level of work and budget for these costs may not be considered exparte communications and would fall under the provisions for third party rules of contact. As such they are non-binding and potentially non confidential. NHDOT is in partnership with and will have full cooperation from the Towns for the work to be completed under the Design-Build procurement and contract management. Incidental Town costs will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Town of Derry will be assisting NHDOT on the inspection of municipal sewer and water construction as outlined in Volume II, Book 2 Technical Provisions, Section 7.2.1.3.5 Municipal Utility Facilities and Appurtenances. Design-Build Proposers will need to determine the cost for inspection of other components within the contract

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
4	Technical Provisions Section 7.4.2.2	<p>Within Section 7.4.2.2 – Pavement Design – there is a reference to the design ADLs. Is this intended to be a reference to the ADL's in Appendix I (labeled Appendix H in Table of Contents which is correct; Title Sheet should be revised from Appendix I to H) of the Engineering Report, and if so, are these ADL's intended to be used for pavement design? The list of ADL's is incomplete and does not provide information for the Exit 4A Ramps, the Connector Road, realigned North High Street, Franklin Street, NH 102, and other local roads. Is the Design Builder responsible for calculating the ADL's for the remaining roadways? If so, are the Build Year AADT's (apparently 2020) available for all roadways so that the missing ADL's can be calculated, and the available ones can be confirmed? Additionally, what data should be utilized for the heavy vehicle percentages for new roadways (i.e. Exit 4A Ramps, Connector Road) as there are no existing classification counts to utilize?</p>	<p>NHDOT will provide ADLs for the Exit 4A ramps, Connector Road, Folsom Road, Tsienneto Road, and NH 102. This information will be provided in the Reference Information Documents section. The Design-Builder is responsible for developing appropriate structural section for all other side road reconstruction, with Derry town road standards as a minimum.</p>

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
5	Technical Provisions Section 7.6.2.4	<p>Will the Connector Road be a state road or a local road? A local road would mean conforming to the Town of Londonderry Standards:</p> <p>A. The Londonderry Standards call out Stone Fill, Class C for a 2:1 fill slope (Exhibit R106) and there was no mention of that in the RFP documents. Can 1.5:1 slopes be used if stone is already required?</p> <p>B. The Londonderry Standards show 6' wide sidewalk with 1' panel and 6" curb reveal while Volume II – Book 2, Technical Provision 7.6.2.4.B has 5.5' with a 7" reveal (panel is then 1.5' per BTC Typical Sections). Engineering Report (p. 23) also has 5.5' sidewalks.</p>	<p>The Connector Road will have multiple jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities as agreed to under the NHDOT/Town of Derry and Londonderry Municipal Agreement. The project design requirements will need to meet the criteria for the BTC and as outlined in the Engineering Report. The use of 1.5H:1V slopes should be avoided except as noted in the BTC.</p>
6	Technical Provisions Section 7.4.2.2	<p>Please confirm the treatment for NH Route 28 Bypass from Sta. 320+35 – Sta. 333+31 as Volume II – Book 2, Technical Provision 7.4.2.2 states a 2" full width cold plane and 2" full width high strength wearing course, whereas the BTC profile and cross sections show just an overlay.</p>	<p>The requirements in the Technical Provisions, including those in Section 7.4.2.2 shall govern. The BTC profile and cross sections shall be taken as typical minimum requirements, with the more stringent specific requirements of the Technical Provisions governing.</p>
7	Technical Provisions Section 2.1.1	<p>Section 2.1.1. Other DOT's have file naming conventions for Design-Build. Through previous/current D-B projects has NHDOT seen or developed a naming convention for consistency on all D-B projects?</p>	<p>The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum to included expectations for file naming conventions.</p>

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
8	Technical Provisions Section 2.1.1.2	Section 2.1.1.2 reads "Design-Builder shall develop and implement an Electronic Document Management System (EDMS). Additionally, Design-Builder shall." Then 3 of the 4 items (A-D) listed pertain to NHDOT systems. Can you share more about your systems so we can ensure compatibility?	The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum.
9	Technical Provisions Section 2.1.1.2	Section 2.1.1.2.A. What data systems, standards and procedures does NHDOT employ for their Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)? We cannot know if our system is compatible without knowing what you use.	The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum.
10	Technical Provisions Section 2.1.1.2	Section 2.1.1.2.B. What data management system does NHDOT use? Will it be required for this project?	The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum.
11	Technical Provisions Section 2.1.1.2	Section 2.1.1.2.C. What meta data is required? Does it vary based on the type of file? What is the EDMS employed by NHDOT?	The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum.
12	Technical Provisions Section 3.7.3	Section 3.7.3 Other DOT's have file naming and folder structures for Design-Build. Through previous/current D-B projects, has NHDOT seen or developed a naming convention or folder structure for consistency on all D-B's?	The Department is currently evaluating post-award requirements for the Electronic Document Management System. Revisions are anticipated under a future Addendum.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
13	Technical Provisions Section 3.7.3	Section 3.7.3 Regarding daily logs. Does NHDOT have a preferred format? Or, what is minimally needed on the format for their acceptance?	NHDOT does not have a specific format for the daily logs. The Design-Builder shall develop these as part of their Quality Control program. Note B in Section 3.7.3 of the Technical Provisions states minimum required information to be provided in the daily reports, however it will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder to ensure sufficient information is provided to demonstrate an adequate inspection of work has been performed. Additional items of value to NHDOT include date, item name, description, test #, test type, location, results, tester name and company. All reports shall meet the requirements of 3.7 and 3.8
14	Technical Provisions Section 6.2.1	Section 6.2.1 Does DOT know what outstanding permits there are that will need preparation support from the D-B team?	Section 6.2.1 of the Technical Provisions provides a non inclusive list of the project level permits NHDOT anticipates will be required based on the BTC. The Design-Builder will be required to acquire all permits required, including standard construction level permits, based on the final design developed by the Design-Builder. Of the permits listed in Table 6-1 of the Technical Provisions, NHDOT currently is aware that the ACOE Individual Section 404 Permit is outstanding and still undergoing legal review. The Corps has indicated that it anticipates issuing the permit by July 1, 2020.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
15	Technical Provisions Section 6.5.13.1	Section 6.5.13.1 How many stone wall locations still need coordination with homeowners to complete the Individual Stone Wall Rating Sheet?	<p>"Please refer to the document titled ""Stone Wall Summary Reconstruction Evaluation Needed"" provided by NHDOT in the Reference Information Documents.</p> <p>Based upon the document noted above, eighteen (18) stone walls meet the criteria for reconstruction and their feasibility of reconstruction must be evaluated by the DB Team in coordination with NHDOT. If reconstruction is feasible the DB Team will need to coordinate with the owners regarding acceptance of potential preservation easements on the reconstructed wall, or replaced within the ROW. Determinations of five walls are outstanding. If these five (5) walls have been identified as important by the owners, through coordination by the DB Team, the DB Team will need to assess the feasibility of reconstruction as above. Seven (7) walls do not qualify as important and should just be treated as part of the ROW negotiations, including discussions if the owners want possession of the stones, however the project will not reconstruct these seven (7) walls."</p>

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
16	Technical Provisions Section 6.5.12.1	Section 6.5.12.1 Can you characterize the expectations and extent of "Further coordination with the NHFGD by the Design-Builder is to occur prior to and during the construction process to ensure that there are no additional concerns with listed wildlife species"?	Please refer to the explanation provided in Addendum #1 of Volume II, Book 2, Technical Provision, Section 6.5.12.1
17	Technical Provisions Section 6.5.12.2	Section 6.5.12.2 DOT will complete the surveys for Nuttall's grass prior to construction, with the contractor possibly needing to relocate the grass if it will be impacted, will the D-B Team need to include a botanist to complete this work? Has there been any discussion with NHNHB staff about collaborating on this instead of using a botanist subconsultant?	NHDOT will coordinate with NHNHB to perform the survey when fruit is set. Evaluation will be by a qualified botanist within the August through October 2020 time frame. Refer to Addendum #1 of the RFP, Volume II, Book 2, Technical Provision, Section 6.5.12.2 and Reference Information Documents "Natural Heritage Bureau Memo" dated 04-02-2020.
18	Technical Provisions Section 6.5.12.3	Section 6.5.12.3 Has there been coordination with USFWS confirming the need for additional acoustic surveys for NLEB if tree removal cannot be completed by August 2021?	"Refer to Volume II, Book 2, Technical Provision, Section 6.5.12.3. It will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder to update the IPaC if construction clearing cannot be completed by August 2021.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
19	Technical Provisions Section 6.5.13.1	Section 6.5.13 Phase II and III archaeological surveys, if required, are they the responsibility of the D-B team? Will the results of the Phase IB archaeological survey be provided before the proposal deadline?	Phase II and III archeological investigations, if determined by NHDHR to be required, are the responsibility of the DB Team. Refer to Addendum #1 of the RFP, Volume II, Book 2, Technical Provision, Section 6.5.13. Phase IA investigations were completed on December 9, 2019 and NHDHR concurred with the End-of-Field Letter recommendations for the Phase IB investigations. Phase IB archeological investigations were completed on June 9, 2020. DOT will provide a summary, as Reference Information Documents, of the results and recommendations of the investigation after DOT and NHDHR have completed their reviews of this submittal.
20	Technical Provisions Section 7.3.2.4	Section 7.3.2.4 Do we need to include an appraiser on our team to prepare appraisal reviews?	Appraiser reviews will be completed by the Department in accordance to RFP Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.4 (Schedule and Procedures). NHDOT is committed to meeting appraisal review timeframes set forth in Section 7.3.2.4 of the Technical Provisions. Under the Design-Builder's Quality Management Plan and Quality Control process, all appraisal report are to undergo a quality control review prior to submission to ensure they are complete and free from grammar, spelling and math errors.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
21	Technical Provisions Section 7.10.2.1	Section 7.10.2.1 Notes that "Overhead regulatory lane use signs shall be required in advance of all intersections with 5 or more approach lanes". The Engineering Report lists the location of proposed overhead signs which includes 8 total on I-93 NB, I-93 SB, and the Connector Road at 1010+00 and 1016+00. The EB approach to NH 28 on Folsom Road has 5 approach lanes in the BTC, yet an overhead sign in this location is not listed in the Engineering Report. Will an overhead sign structure be required for this location? Additionally, there are several locations where a thru approach lane becomes a dropped/mandatory turn lane on the downstream side of the intersection (i.e. NH 102 EB at Tsienneto & NH 102 WB at North Shore Road). Will an overhead or cantilevered sign structure be required in these locations to warn motorists of the downstream lane use?"	The Engineering Report addresses overhead signs at specific locations. At other locations, including in advance of intersections with 5 or more approach lanes, refer to Section 7.10.2.1 of the Technical Provisions. The Design-Builder shall investigate suitable arrangements. As noted in Section 7.10.2.1 span wires may be acceptable under certain conditions.
22		The BTC stormwater design appears to assume the ramps are curbed as the bmp calcs show capture of all the ramp pavement. This is inconsistent with the BTC typical section and cross sections which show no curbing along the ramps. Please clarify.	In areas without guardrail, the ramps were assumed not to be curbed. The stormwater is assumed to flow off the pavement and into a ditch, where it will be collected for treatment.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
23	Vol. 1: ITP, Section 3.2	"Section 3.2 of the Instructions to Proposers, in describing the agenda for the late June 1 on 1 meetings, indicates that the DB teams will be expected to describe their construction and design approaches, as well as approach to traffic maintenance. What level of detail would be expected for this discussion at this early stage of the procurement? "	The presentation shall provide sufficient detail to demonstrate the Proposers understanding of the requirements for maintaining traffic and access to properties, including accounting for profile grade changes, minimum roadway widths and minimum number of lanes.
24	Vol. 1: ITP, Section 4.4	Section 4.4.1 (i) of Exhibit B: Technical Proposal Instructions indicates that in the Project Management Plan section of the proposal, a preliminary safety plan meeting the requirements of the Technical Provisions is to be included with the proposal. A compliant safety plan would be a document of significant size. Please clarify expectations for this requirement	Under Section 4.4.1 (i), the intent is to provide a "preliminary safety plan meeting the requirements of RFP Volume II, Book 1 Section 4.0 (Safety). It is not the intent of submitting a final safety plan, but sufficient information to describe Design-Builder's policies, plans, training programs, Work Site controls, and Incident response plans to ensure the health and safety of personnel involved in the Project and the general public affected by the Project.
25	Vol. 1: ITP, Section 4.1.7	Section 4.1.7 of the ITP states that Escrowed Materials shall be delivered to the Escrow Agent as specified in Section 4.3.2. In section 4.2.2 and 4.3.2 it states that a copy of the executed Escrow Agreement shall be included in the Technical Proposal but the Section 1.4 Procurement Schedule states Escrow Proposal Documents are due on August 18th. The agreements get executed at the delivery of the escrow documents. Please clarify when the Escrow agreements are due.	Section 4.2.2 and Section 4.3.2 of Volume I, Instructions To Proposers will be revised under a future Addendum to indicate a copy of the executed Escrow Agreement shall be submitted no later than the date specified in Section 1.4 of Volume I, Instructions To Proposers.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
26	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 13.2.3	Reference Book 1 – Design-Build Contract, Section 13.2.3 where the Design-Builder shall not be entitled to an increase in the Contract Price for any NHDOT-directed Changes involving less than \$10,000. Changes could potentially be broken up into packages less than \$10,000. This clause could be abused to result in multiple, minor betterments throughout the contract with no relief to the DB. Are there any remedies in the contract to prevent this?	The intent of this language is to reduce or eliminate the time and cost involved in negotiation and preparation of minor Directed Changes in the Contract requirements. Any disagreement on the Department's interpretation of change orders meeting Section 13.2.3, the D-B contractor can file an official dispute based upon Section 13.13 for resolution.
27	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 19.8 and Appendix 10	Sections 10 and 19.8 of the DB Contract contain a conflict with regard to payment for fees and expenses of DRB members. Please clarify responsibility for payment for DRB invoices.	Section 19.8 of the Design-Build Contract is correct. Appendix 10 of the Design-Build Contract will be revised under a future addendum to specify that any fees from Dispute Resolution Board will be split equally between NHDOT and the Design-Builder.
28	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 21.2	"Reference Book 1 – Design-Build Contract, Section 21.2, regarding Subcontractor Pricing Documents. When receiving bid time pricing from subcontractors, General Contractors do not typically receive subcontractor pricing with the level of detail that is required of the DB Entity. Please clarify expectations for the level of detail of subcontractor pricing.	Section 21.2 of Volume II, Book 1, the Design-Build Contract, lists the required information to be provided for principal design Subcontractor and each Major Subcontractor. The Contract Appendices provides a definition of what constitutes a Major Subcontractor. The required information shall be provided for the principal design Subcontractor and each Major subcontractor as required by the Contract.

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
29	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 3.2.2	Reference Book 1 – Design-Build Contract, Section 3.2.2, regarding review time periods. Will NHDOT participate in “over the shoulder” reviews during the design process to expedite design approvals?	Refer to Section 3.7.4.3 and Section 5.5.4 of the Technical Provisions. NHDOT will participate in the over the shoulder review meetings. It is the intent of NHDOT to be good partners and to collaborate with the Design-Builder through working meetings to develop an understanding on general design concepts such as geometrics, aesthetics, drainage, traffic control, and structures. Working meetings can include "over the shoulder" reviews.
30	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 3.8	Section 3.8 of the DB Contract discusses coordination with the towns of Derry and Londonderry. Will contact with the towns be conducted through NHDOT, or directly with each town?	The Town of Derry and the Town of Londonderry will be part of the NHDOT project team providing direct input as needed. NHDOT will maintain administrative and oversight control, however the majority of the project is within the municipalities’ maintenance regions and as such their input will not be discounted. The Towns of Londonderry and Derry has vested its quality control with NHDOT personnel through the Inter-municipal Agreement. Town personnel will be visiting jobsites in an advisory capacity. The Towns of Londonderry and Derry expect unfettered access to jobsites within their right-of-way. Any concerns or directives will be funneled through NHDOT inspection or administrative personnel for resolution.

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
31	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Sections 12.1.6.5 and 12.1.6.6	"Design-Build Contract, Section 12.1.6.6, and Section 12.1.6.5 where the Design-Builder will be responsible for up to \$100,000 for Contaminated Materials in excavation. Beyond that we also will be responsible for 50% of any additional cost. So, in a scenario where we encounter a total estimated cost of contaminated excavation of \$600,000, would the design builder be responsible for the first \$100,000 and an additional \$250,000 while the remaining \$250,000 would be reimbursed from the Contaminated Material Allowance? This same question would apply to the Contaminated Materials with Building Demolition. "	Interpretation of Section 12.1.6.5 and Section 12.1.6.6 is correct. Further guidance will be provided in a future Addendum.
32	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Sections 12.1.6.5 and 12.1.6.6	Refer to the Design-Build Contract, Section 12.1.6.6, Section 12.1.6.5, and Book 2 – Technical Provisions, Section 6.6, as well as the ITP Bid Form regarding Contaminated Materials. Please provide the value for each allowance as the values shown are different.	Section 6.6 of the Technical Provisions will be revised in a future addendum. The values in Section 6.6 will be revised to agree with those stated in Technical Provisions Section 12.1.6.5 and 12.1.6.6, as well as the Bid Form provided in the Appendices to the Instructions To Proposers.
33	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 21.1	Section 21.1 of the Design Build Contract discusses escrowed proposal documents being held in "...a locked, fireproof cabinet supplied by the Design Builder...". Has this section been superseded by Section 4 of the Instructions to Proposers? "	Section 21.1 of the Contract will be revised to remove reference to the option to supplying a locked, fire cabinet. The use of an escrow agent will be required.

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
34	Vol. 2: Book 1 - DB Contract, Section 11.6	Section 11.6 of the Design Build Contract states that the Towns of Derry and Londonderry will have the “direct right” to enforce warranties and pursue any remedies available at law against the Design Builder. In the absence of any contractual relationship between the Design Builder and the towns, please clarify how these direct rights are to be exercised. Will requests for warranty repairs be channeled through NHDOT?	Upon completion of the Project, applicable warranties will be transferred from NHDOT to the respective Towns at the time of transfer of the roadway facility ownership.
35	Vol. 2: Book 2- Technical Provisions, Section 7.3.2.4	Volume II, Book II, Technical Provisions, Section 7.3.2.4, implies that NHDOT will prepare the review appraisal report in-house. In light of current DOT staffing levels and remote working conditions, should the DB Entity include in its scope the hiring of an appraiser to complete the review appraisal reports for submission?	Appraiser reviews will be completed by the Department in accordance to RFP Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.4 (Schedule and Procedures). NHDOT is committed to meeting appraisal review timeframes set forth in Section 7.3.2.4 of the Technical Provisions. Under the Design-Builder's Quality Management Plan and Quality Control process, all appraisal report are to undergo a quality control review prior to submission to ensure they are complete and free from grammar, spelling and math errors.
36	Vol. 2: Book 2- Technical Provisions	Please advise of the status of the total parcel takings by NHDOT.	NHDOT will provide an update report on acquisition efforts as of June 18, 2020. Due to the confidential nature of the information in the update report, NHDOT will provide this information directly to each Proposer's Authorized Representative by email.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
37	Vol. 2: Book 2- Technical Provisions, Section 2.4.1.2	Volume II, Book II, Technical Provisions, Section 2.4.1.2.1: "Baseline Schedule" states the following: "Design-Builder shall be responsible for updating scheduling software to maintain compatibility with current NHDOT-supported scheduling software, which is currently Microsoft Project". Please confirm that the use of Primavera P6 is acceptable for preparing the baseline schedule.	All schedule submittals shall be provided in Microsoft Project format.
38	Vol. 2: Book 2- Technical Provisions, Section 7.12.1	Please note Technical Provisions, Section 7.12.1 regarding Traffic Control utilizing flaggers and or uniformed police officers. We understand that the technical provisions provide some clarity on where uniformed officers with vehicle shall be used, but these costs are typically covered under an allowance in conventional NHDOT design-bid-build projects. Would the Department consider adding the typically used Item 618.61 Uniformed Officers with Vehicle as an Allowance item for this project?	Flaggers and Uniformed officers use shall be in accordance with Section 7.12.1 of Volume 2, Book 2, Technical Provisions, and be included in the Lump sum bid price.
39	Vol. 2: Book 2- Technical Provisions, Section 7.9.2.3	Technical Provisions, Section 7.9.2.3 regarding plantings in the grass median of the Connector Road states that costs associated with this will be paid under a third-party agreement between the Design-Builder, Town of Londonderry, and the Developer. Should the cost for this landscaping be included in the cost proposal?	Section 7.9.2.3 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future Addendum to clarify that the cost of any design, furnishing, installation and maintenance of landscaping in the Connector Road would need to be included in a third party agreement between the parties specified.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
40	Supplemental Material Provided	From the Tsienneto Road, Tributary E TSL report, Maintenance of Traffic "Phased construction will be utilized to construct the replacement structure. Three phases will be required to complete the work. During phase 1 and phase 2 construction, eastbound traffic will be detoured via Bypass 28 and Route 102 and westbound traffic will be maintained on Tsienneto Road over the bridge utilizing phased construction. See the traffic control memo (attached) for the traffic analyses." Can you clarify what was included in the referenced "traffic control memo"? Reviewing the material supplied, nothing was found to fit the context as referenced.	NHDOT has provided the traffic control memo referenced in the Reference Information Documents section on the project website.
41	Supplemental Material Provided	Please provide a plan view for the future two-lane SB Off Ramp (DGN or Dimensioned PDF).	NHDOT will provide a plan view of the future SB Off Ramp in the Reference Information Documents section of the project website.
42	Supplemental Material Provided	The BTC does not get into detail for the ramp connections to the Interstate mainline. Due to the 5% shoulders in the Interstate mainline normally crowned sections and different shoulder treatments in the mainline superelevated sections, should more direction be provided for the project limits so that all bidders are utilizing a similar scope of work?	Design-Builder is to design the ramp connections and associated traffic control to tie into the existing mainline. Section 7.10.3.3.1 of the Technical Provisions states the final paved surfaces must be free of damage. This would include any damage to the existing I-93 roadway.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
43	Supplemental Material Provided	I-93 NB Pavement based upon the 14633-D plans is made up of two 1-1/2" layers of wearing course, one layer of 2-1/2" binder course, and two 2" layers of binder course. Given the lack of base material in pavement of this thickness should the NB final treatment include a mill and overlay?	The Department does not anticipate reconstruction of I-93 NB unless damaged by the Design-Builder. Section 7.10.3.3.1 of the Technical Provisions states the final paved surfaces must be free of damage. This would include any damage to the existing I-93 roadway.
44	Supplemental Material Provided	Traffic Management impacts to the Interstate to tie in the ramps and construct the bridge median pier are approximately SB Station 3654+50 to 3700+00 and NB Station 1657+50 to 1704+50 based upon BTC Plan 1. What would the Department require for the final treatment for the mainline (i.e. cold plane at limits, 1-1/2" overlay, and restripe)?	Section 7.6.5 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to require that any damage caused by the Design-Builder to any lane of I-93 NB or SB will require a full 2" mill and overlay of each lane damaged, for a minimum length of 1000 feet. In addition, Section 7.6.5 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to require mill and overlay of the low speed lane of I-93 NB & SB for the limits beginning at the start of the off-ramp deceleration lane to the end of the on-ramp acceleration lane.
45	Supplemental Material Provided	I-93 SB Pavement based upon the 14633-D plans is made up of 5-1/2" Base course, 2-1/2" Binder Course, and a 1-1/2" Wearing course, but the shoulder is paved with only the 4" nominal wearing and binder courses. As a minimum we would recommend the pavement design proposed for the ramps within the gore area, but does the Department wish to dictate something different for its Interstate gore and shoulder designs?	The Design-Builder is required to design ramp connections and associated traffic control to tie into the existing mainline. Section 7.10.3.3.1 of the Technical Provisions states that the final paved surfaces must be free of damage. This would include any damage to the existing I-93 roadway.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
46	Supplemental Material Provided	Can the Department confirm that wood guard rail posts will be required within the Derry section of the project? Please also confirm that within LAROW/CAROW steel posts will be used.	The final design shall utilize NHDOT specifications for steel guardrail posts for all locations on the Project.
47	Supplemental Material Provided	Can the Department confirm that typical placement of underdrain on curbed roads will be directly below the edge of pavement/curb?	The final design shall follow NHDOT specifications regarding location of underdrains for all locations on the Project.
48	Supplemental Material Provided	Can the Department provide the superelevation calculations produced for I-93 NB (Station 1653+00 to 1718+00) and I-93 SB (3654+00 to 3715+00)?	NHDOT will provide any available superelevation calculations for the roadway locations requested. These will be provided in the Reference Information Documents section.
49	Engineering Report, Appendix H	<p>"Revised Base Technical Concept (5/19/2020), Engineering Report, Appendix H provides Average Daily Load (ADL) values for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N High Street / Folsom Rd near Franklin • Tsienneto Rd East of Pinkerton • Tsienneto Rd East of 28 Bypass • NH 28 at Derry / Londonderry TL (values for existing and based on I-93 regional model). <p>Will NHDOT please provide the ADL values for the I-93 ramps and the connector roadway?"</p>	NHDOT will provide ADL values for the I-93 Ramps and the Connector Roadway. These will be provided in the Reference Information Documents section. The Design-Builder is responsible for developing appropriate structural section for all other side road reconstruction, with Derry town road standards as a minimum.

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
50	Technical Provisions	A question came up today regarding some properties that NHDOT will end up owning at the conclusion of our project. If there are properties that currently have water and sewer services, and the structures on such properties will be removed by our project, will we need to make provisions for the property that's left after our work to have services available? I would think the answer would be yes, as the lots are obviously more valuable with services, assuming the Department will want to sell them once we are complete and out.	<p>Any developable properties remaining at the completion of the project shall have access to water and sewer services so that NHDOT may market them for sale at the conclusion of the project.</p> <p>Parcels 71 & 72 shall have at least one connection between them. Parcels 66, 67 & 68 shall have at least one connection between them.</p>