

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 **July 30, 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> |
| 51 | ITP, Exhibit B | ITP, Exhibit B. Section 2 states that the proposal is to be limited to 50 pages. Section 4.1.4 requires that a baseline schedule "for all portions of the project" be submitted as part of the technical proposal. This document could be several pages. Does the baseline schedule count against the 50-page limit? | As noted in Section 2 of Exhibit B of the Instructions To Proposers, the schedule shall be provided in addition to the 50 page aggregate limit and will not count against the 50 page limit. |

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|------------------------------|---|---|
| 52 | ITP, Exhibit B | Section 4.1 of the ITP Exhibit B requires a “baseline schedule and narrative for all portions of the project...”. Section 4.1.4 further requires a “Preliminary Project Baseline Schedule and narrative for all portions of the project...” and must include at least the design and ordering of materials and ROW acquisitions. Please clarify the requirements of the schedule to be submitted as part of the technical proposal. Can the schedule and narrative for completion of full and partial acquisitions required separately under Section 4.2.2 be included within the comprehensive baseline schedule | Section 4.1 of Exhibit B of the Instructions To Proposers will be revised in a future Addendum to require the submission of a "Preliminary Project Baseline Schedule" consistent with other sections of Exhibit B. Proposers may provide one comprehensive Preliminary Project Baseline Schedule that includes the required information specified in Sections 4.1, 4.1.4 and 4.2.2. |
| 53 | Vol. 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | We request that a mutual waiver of consequential damages clause be included in the DB contract to provide liability protection for the design builder and NHDOT | NHDOT will not be adding a mutual waiver of consequential damages clause to the Contract. |
| 54 | Vol. 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | Section 8.1 of the DB contract discusses payment and performance bonds with penal sums increased by rider. Please confirm that the rider will be clear that bond value increases will not duplicate coverage. | There will be no duplication of coverage with the increase in the Performance Bond and Payment Bond amounts required upon the issuance by NHDOT of NTP2. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 55 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Sections 7.12.3.1 and Section 8.5 provide minimum lane width requirements for temporary traffic control. Section 7.12.3.1 prefers a minimum of 12' lane width while Section 8.5 requires a minimum lane width of 16' during the winter maintenance season. Please clarify the temporary lane width requirements vs the final product which will have 11' lanes. | Section 8.5 will be revised under a future Addendum to clarify the required lane arrangements during winter maintenance seasons. Outside of winter maintenance seasons, the requirements of Section 7 will prevail. Regarding the final conditions, cross sections are provided in the "Typical Sections" sheet of the BTC and show minimum lane and shoulders to be provided between the edges of roadway. |
| 56 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | There are several overhead sign structures proposed along I-93. Is the preferred treatment that these structures are set behind new guardrail with 10 feet offset from the face of rail consistent with other existing sign structures in the corridor? What clear zone should be used for design | The clear zone for I-93 is 34' and specified in the Project Engineering Report. The location of each overhead sign structure needs to be refined and verified with the Bureau of Traffic and Design to take into account the visual view distance needed to ensure effective communication for the high speed roadway. The need for protection will depend upon the placement location and the offset to the structure. If the structure is located within this clear zone area, it will require roadside safety hardware protection consistent with existing treatments along I-93. |
| 57 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Confirm locations of tie-in for milestone #2. If the road can be opened at the discretion of the Department than a connection to the existing road would be required | Requirements for Milestone #2, and NHDOT's intentions for opening this section to public access, will be addressed in a future addendum. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 58 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Section 12.1 of the Engineering report indicates that the proposed overhead sign at I-93 Sta 1658+00 may need to be adjusted to avoid impacts to the existing CCTV pole at Sta 1658+25. How far does the sign need to be offset in order to avoid impacts the operation of the CCTV? Moving the sign structure closer to the camera or relocating to a bridge mounted sign structure may be options. | The Design-Builder is responsible for final design of all OHSS to be in conformance with the contract documents. The designer shall locate the OHSS taking into account all site conditions for proposed locations. |
| 59 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Please confirm that ARM fund payments due NHDES for relocation of Trolley Car stream, contained in Technical Provisions section 6.5.7, is the responsibility of NHDOT and need not be carried in the design builder's bid. | NHDOT is responsible for ARM fund payment as required for the BTC under the NHDES Wetland Approval Letter Dated 05-05-2020. The final design of Trolley Car lane relocation shall be in accordance with Section 6.5.7 of the Technical Provisions and the April 2020 Trolley Car Stream Relocation Plan and narrative provided in the Reference Information Documents. |
| 60 | Supplemental Material Provided | The quantity of rock excavation based upon the geotechnical sampling could potentially be significantly higher than the Engineer's Estimate. The area of the Connector Road from Sta 1025+00 to 1036+00 has the potential to be the most ledge intensive area of the roadway, but has few borings to interpolate the elevation of the ledge. Would the Department consider doing additional rock probes? We would suggest 4 additional borings at 1027+00, 40' LT, 1030+00, 40' LT, 1033+00, 40' LT, and 1035+00, 40' LT | NHDOT intends to complete additional explorations in this area and provide the information prior to the last date for NHDOT addendum in Section 1.4 of the Instructions to Proposers. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 61 | Supplemental Material Provided | The 14633-D As-Built Cross Sections show muck in the area of the proposed ramps. Please confirm that this has not been removed as part of a previous contract | Muck excavation was performed to the limits shown of the 14633D plans. Design-Builder is responsible for any additional investigation and removal of muck on the project as needed. |
| 62 | Volume I | Volume 1, Exhibit B, Section 4.1 c – Should “substantial” be changed to “project” relative to completion? | The Instruction To Proposers will be revised under a future Addendum to clarify the use of the term Substantial Completion and Project Completion. |
| 63 | Volume I | Instructions to Proposers, Section 4.1.6 – What are the maximum dimensions (height and width) of a “scroll mat”? It appears the maximum width is 34”. | Refer to Section 4.1.6 of the Instructions to Proposers for requirements for dimensions of scroll mats. |
| 64 | Volume I | Can the Proposal be submitted in 11”x17” binders with the contents meeting the requirements of Volume 1 – Instructions to Proposers, Section 4.1.6.? | Section 4.1.6 will be revised under a future addendum to require the submission in 8-1/2”x 11” format three (3) ring binders. |
| 65 | Volume I | Can the Risk Matrix required per Volume 1 – Instructions to Proposers, Section 4.4.3 be prepared in 11”x17” format? Can the Risk Matrix be included in the Appendices or does it need to be included in the 50-page Section C – Technical Proposal? | Per Section 2 of Exhibit B of the Instructions to Proposers, matrices can be provided in an appendix and if provided in an appendix will not count against the 50-page aggregate limit. |
| 66 | Volume I | Is the Organizational Chart required per Volume 1 – Exhibit B, Section 4.4.1 (d) considered a graphic and can therefore be provided on 11”x17” format? | Yes, NHDOT will recognize the Organizational Chart as a graphic and therefor can be provided on 11x17 format. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 67 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 7.2.1.3.5 Municipal Utility Facilities and Appurtenances – According to the last sentence of paragraph 2, “Multiple adjustments to the same water line resulting in the addition of 3 or more angle points will not be considered an equal service.” According to that statement, we cannot use four (4) 45-degree bends to create a jog or a wide “u” shape to get around a water line utility conflict, but must instead relocate a longer section of the water line. Is that correct? | Correct, the intent of the wording in Section 7.2.1.3.5 would prohibit the use of four (4) 45-degree bends to create a jog or wide "U" shape in the same water line. |
| 68 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.11 Responsibilities of NHDOT. This indicates that the DOT will cover closing costs on the acquisition property in addition to the purchase price. This typically includes title reports and updates, recording fees, transfer taxes, deed preparation, settlement fees, etc. Are there any acquisition closing cost(s) that the NHDOT will not be paying? | Additional clarification of the closing costs the Design-Builder will be responsible for will be provided in a future addendum. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 69 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 7.6.2.1 A. Notes that “The limits of slope work at the approach to the I-93 Southbound Off-Ramp and at the Southbound Off-Ramp shown on the BTC plans are intended to allow for construction of a future second lane for that ramp.” Design data for this future layout does not appear to have been provided with the electronic CADD files, other than the slope lines on the BTC plans. Can the pavement layout for the future second lane, cross sections, and InRoads template be provided; so, the layout can be reviewed and confirmed, and quantity takeoffs performed? | The Design-Builder will be responsible for providing the improvements as outlined in the BTC. The wetland permit includes the impacts directly associated with the future two lane ramp configuration. As part of the BTC, the slopes within the wetland areas reflects the impacts within the permit. To assist the teams as to understanding the future ramp layout, the conceptual two lane ramp PDF is posted to the project web site. No further design files will be provided. |
| 70 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 7.10.3.2 Permanent Pavement Markings, it notes that all lines on roadways maintained by the Towns of Londonderry and Derry shall be Thermoplastic. It also notes that line markings on I-93, NH 102, and NH 28 shall be paint (except as shown on the Standard Plans). Connector Road, Folsom Road, and Tsienneto are not specifically mentioned which leaves a grey area, as we do not have confirmation as to whether these roads will be State or Town maintained. Please advise. | Section 7.10.3.2 will be modified in a future addendum to provide additional information of pavement marking requirements. |
| 71 | General | Will infiltrating sidewalks be allowed as an alternative or as an additional BMP treatment option? | As per Section 7.6.2.4, Item B of the Technical Provisions, sidewalks off of bridges shall be constructed of HMA. The use of infiltrating sidewalks on the project will not be allowed. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|---|---|
| 72 | General | Per NHDOT 2015 Draft Drainage Manual, NRCC Rainfall Data is preferred to be used. The BTC appears to have utilized older Rainfall Data for the upgrade of the existing detention basins along I-93 (B1649 and B1670) causing an approximate 1" difference in rainfall depth for the 50-year storm event. What rainfall event should be utilized for these existing detention basins, the 14633D/I design storm event or the NRCC design storm event? | The Design-Builder shall utilize the same rainfall data used for the original basin designs for their Final Design. The Design-Builder shall provide a comparison as to the impacts due to an updated NRCC rainfall Data consistent with the NHDOT Drainage Manual. |
| 73 | General | Our D-B Team has evaluated the Connector Road over Interstate 93 bridge wingwall layout, grading and lengths depicted in the BTC/TS&L Plans. We are in general agreement with the layout and lengths for the northwest, southwest, and northeast quadrants of the bridge. However, we are unable to replicate the grading and subsequently the BTC/TS&L wall layout and length in the southeast quadrant. Our evaluation of the wingwall layout in this quadrant indicates a longer wall is needed to properly tie in the proposed BTC Connector Road and I-93 Northbound off ramp slopes with the existing grades. Would the Department provide additional information regarding the determination and confirmation of the BTC/TS&L Plan wingwall length as shown? | The wingwall length will be revised to approximately 50 feet in length in a revision to the TS&L Report for this structure under a future Addendum. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|---|
| 74 | General | <p>Would the Department please provide clarification regarding the Connector Road over Interstate 93 bridge future rail clearance envelope information regarding how it was developed and shown on the TS&L Plans. There appears to be a conflict between the detail and the text “* FUTURE RAIL ENVELOPE GRADE SET AS MIDPOINT ELEVATION BETWEEN INTERSTATE 93 SOUTHBOUND AND INTERSTATE 93 NORTHBOUND EDGES OF PAVEMENT.” This language implies the top of rail grade was set based on this criterion; however, the drawing depicts the “FUTURE RAIL ENVELOPE GRADE *” as being below the rail, ties, and ballast. Since I-93 survey is not available at this time, would Department please confirm the maximum structure depth needed to provide 16’-6” and 18’-0” minimum vertical clearance over the interstate and the future rail corridor, respectively?</p> | <p>Sheet No. 2 of the TS&L for the Connector Road bridge will be revised under a future addendum to clarify the overall dimensions to be used for the determination of the clearance envelop.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|---|--|
| 75 | General | <p>How will flow in Shields Brook be maintained during construction of Phase 1 of the BTC layout for the Connector Road Bridge over Shields Brook? The TS&L plan shows the east abutment in conflict with the inlet of the 72" culvert. The phase construction sections show traffic maintained on the existing roadway while Phase 1 of the bridge is constructed. Flow in Shields Brook cannot be maintained through the existing culvert during excavation and construction of the east abutment during Phase 1.</p> | <p>The Design-Builder is responsible for maintaining flow in Shield Brook during all stages of construction. The TS&L reports provides potential concepts from maintaining flow during construction, however determination of a water handling plan as part of the final design is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. NHDOT will review any methods proposed by the Design-Builder as part of their evaluation of the Technical Proposal.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|---|---|
| 76 | General | <p>The Connector Road over Shields Brook bridge TS&L/BTC profile shows bottom of footings at the streambed elevation or higher. Does the Department consider the Riprap, Class III as shown in the BTC adequate for scour protection? Although the footings are shown 5 feet below the small horizontal bench of riprap, they do not have 5 feet of cover for frost protection when measured from the riprap sloped section. Does the Department consider the bottom of footing elevations shown adequate for frost protection? If a tremie seal/sub footing is constructed to bedrock as the replacement for the unsuitable subsurface soil, scour or frost will not be an issue; however, the TS&L report indicates structural fill is an acceptable replacement material. Since, a concrete sub footing/tremie seal is more costly than structural fill, would the Department provide clarification regarding the TS&L/BTC foundation elevations and the preferred material to use below the footings?</p> | <p>The BTC and TS&L for the Connector Road over Shields Brook provides preliminary design concepts. Ensuring the foundation design as part of the final design is in conformance with the requirements of the Technical Provisions will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Department has provided limited geotech subsurface information to assist in consideration of the site conditions. The final design will need to take into account subsurface conditions for design of the foundation to include considerations for frost protection and scour protection. A scour analysis was not performed, however stone sizing (countermeasure) calculations were completed to determine the size of the stone in the channel. These calculations are located in the last Appendix of the Hydraulic Reports provided in the Reference Information Documents.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|---|---|
| 77 | General | <p>The Connector Road over Shields Brook bridge hydraulic analysis was based on a buried structure having a 28'-6" clear span. Would the Department clarify how it was determined a CLOMR is not required for the project, if the bridge is constructed as depicted in the BTC.</p> | <p>Government Document 44CFR 65 – Identification and Mapping of Special Hazard Areas, Section 65.12 "Revision of Flood Insurance Rate Maps to Reflect Base Flood Elevations caused by Proposed Encroachments", only requires a CLOMR if there is an encroachment that causes any increase in the base flood elevation of the floodway and/or 0.1 foot in the floodplain. The layout of the bridge carrying the Connector Road over Shields Brook depicted in the BTC does not place fill in, or alter, the floodway. Alterations to the floodway would trigger the need for a CLOMR instead of requiring only a LOMR.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|--|
| 78 | General | <p>Our D-B Team has evaluated the Connector Road over Shields Brook bridge wingwall layout, grading and lengths depicted in the BTC/TS&L Plans. We are in general agreement with the layout and lengths for the northwest and southwest quadrants of the bridge. However, there is a discrepancy between the TS&L Report and drawings proposed minimum finished grade in front of Abutment B. The text indicates this elevation is 275, while the BTC plan profile view elevation is drawn at approximately 277. Our evaluation of the wingwall layout in the northeast quadrant indicates a longer wall is needed to properly tie in the proposed grades when based on an elevation of 275. Would the Department provide additional information regarding the determination and confirmation of the BTC/TS&L Plan wingwall length as shown?</p> | <p>The elevation along the face of Abutment B for the bridge carrying the Connector Road over Shields Brook depicted in the BTC varies from 275 to 278 feet. At the centerline of the road, the elevation in the BTC is 277 feet as shown in the profile detail. The minimum elevation of 275 feet controlled the establishment of the bottom of footing elevation as discussed in the TS&L Report for this structure.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|---|---|
| 79 | General | <p>The Connector Road over Shields Brook bridge TS&L/BTC plans depict an existing retaining wall in the southeast quadrant of the proposed bridge. The wall symbol appears to be drawn with the retained earth side towards the brook rather than towards the bank. Existing contours behind this wall appear to indicate a rather steep stone slope from the wall to the top of the slope. This condition was generally observed in available photographs. Our evaluation of the brook relocation, bridge and wingwall layout in this quadrant indicates this steep stone slope/retaining structure may need to be reconstructed and additional wetland impact area to properly tie in the proposed BTC brook realignment, wingwall and riprap slope with the existing grades. Would the Department provide confirmation the BTC can be constructed as is and within the limits shown? How should the D-B team proceed with developing a price proposal for this structure with some questions regarding the work relative to the site conditions and the proposed work?</p> | <p>It was anticipated that the existing wall within the limits of work would be removed. Conceptual level grading was established to match into the existing contours at the limit of work. The structural integrity of the existing slope beyond the wall at this location was not evaluated at the conceptual design level. The Design-Builder is responsible for providing a final design that conforms to the requirements of the Technical Provisions.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|--|
| 80 | General | <p>The Connector Road over Shields Brook bridge TS&L/BTC plans depict downstream "Limit of Work", riprap/slope and wetland impact limits which appear to result in an abrupt change in brook width to match existing. Since the hydraulic analysis and report information was based on a buried structure having a clear span 28'-6" clear span, was additional analysis performed to model the BTC? If so, would the Department provide any such hydraulic analyses and computer models? Stream geomorphology would be improved if a more gradual transition from the proposed opening within the bridge limits to the existing channel width is constructed. Would the Department provide confirmation the BTC layout is acceptable and the channel relocation can be constructed as is and within the limits shown?</p> | <p>The hydraulic model prepared to support the BTC assumed a 28'-6" span buried structure at a high skew. As such, the transition of the stream assuming a 28'-6" span was more gradual as compared to the larger span structure depicted in the BTC. The hydraulic model cross sections were hand edited to provide a gradual transition. NHDOT will not be providing any hydraulic analysis or computer models beyond what has already been provided in the Reference Information Documents. The Design-Builder is responsible for providing a final design that conforms to the requirements of the Technical Provisions.</p> |
| 81 | General | <p>Please confirm the Northbound Off-Ramp has no curbing and stormwater will flow off it and toward the ditch line between the Northbound Off-Ramp and I-93. In the 6/26/2020 response to questions document online it states, "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." Can you clarify if there is bituminous curbing under the guardrail along all the ramps (especially the Northbound Off-Ramp).</p> | <p>Determination of locations for bituminous curbing is the responsibility of the Design-Builder, including locations required to capture surface runoff to maximize surface treatment as noted by the stormwater management requirements.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|---|
| 82 | General | <p>There are several properties that are full takes and currently have water and/or sewer services. The buildings will be taken down as shown in the BTC, but the lots are obviously more valuable for re-sale if these utility services are maintained. Is it the intent of the Department to have water and sewer services continue to properties that the Department will own when the project is complete?</p> | <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> |
| 83 | General | <p>Based on the BTC, it does not appear the I-93 Northbound guardrail between the Northbound Off-Ramp nose and new Connector Road bridge is proposed to be removed. It is not required anymore and can be removed along with the bituminous curb below it. Should we include this in our bid?</p> | <p>The Design-Builder shall review the final design for I-93 NB and SB within the Project limits and determine the need for guardrail in the final condition. Existing guardrail on I-93 within the Project limits not necessary to meet NHDOT design criteria shall be removed once construction has resulted in the final conditions that no longer make the guardrail necessary.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|---|
| 84 | General | <p>The RFP documents indicate retaining walls shall be constructed to match the aesthetics of other retaining structures in the project area where possible and that recent sidewalk improvement projects along Tsienneto Road installed retaining walls using modular precast concrete blocks with split faced exposed surfaces having nominal block dimensions of approximately 16" wide by 8" high. The documents also indicate all walls shall be constructed with the same style modular block wall from the same manufacturer. Would the Department provide specific wall type, manufacturer, and dimensional information to the D-B teams; so, we are able to prepare our bids?</p> | <p>The flash drive provided at the time of the Draft RFP included a Folder titled "Record Plans from Derry". The block information (manufacture, wall type, and dimension) is included in the plan "Tsienneto_rd_sidwalk_ext_2013".</p> |
| 85 | ITP | <p>The response to submitted ATC's due date has been changed in Addendum 2. DB teams were supposed to receive responses yesterday (7/9/20), and the new response due date is August 5.</p> <p>Will NHDOT be providing any preliminary feedback or requests for additional information on submitted ATC's prior to August 5th?</p> | <p>NHDOT will be providing responses to all Formal ATC submissions based upon the date specified in Addendum #2.</p> |
| 86 | General | <p>Would the Department consider providing responses to the ATCs unaffected by the North High Street redesign earlier than August 5th? Previously there were 35 days between the ATC responses and the bid date, and now there will be 22 days. This leaves a lot of design and pricing work in a short window of time.</p> | <p>NHDOT will be providing responses to all Formal ATC submissions based upon the date specified in Addendum #2.</p> |

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|----------------------|--|--|
| 87 | General | Would the Department consider adjusting the stipend to account for the redesign efforts? A significant amount of the BTC design work has already been completed, with the exception of the ATCs. | NHDOT will not be adjusting the stipend available on this project. The Department has established the stipend value based on several factors, including the project size and complexity. |
| 88 | ITP, Exhibit B | Section 3.2.5 requires that the proposal include a completed Form “E” along with a statement signed by the employer of each of the key personnel and resumes and contact information. This same information was submitted by the June 8, 2020 due date shown in Section 1.4. Section 3.2.6 then requires that the proposal include a copy of the letter issued by NHDOT approving the key personnel. Is it necessary to include this duplicate information regarding key personnel, or is it acceptable to just submit the NHDOT letter approving the June 8th submission? If the same information is required with the proposal, is it acceptable to submit copies of the June 8th documents? | Proposers shall include with their Proposal a completed Form "E" along with the required information stated in Section 3.2.5 of the Instructions To Proposers, Exhibit B. Proposers shall also include a copy of the letter they received from NHDOT approving the key personnel required under Section 3.2.6 of the Instructions To Proposers, Exhibit B. Proposers may submit copies of the required Form "E" and supporting information as submitted previously, provided that by doing so, the Proposers is providing confirmation that all information on the documents is correct at the time the Proposal is submitted. |
| 89 | ITP, Exhibit B | ITP Exhibit D, Form H: Please advise what is to be filled in on the “Control” line on Form H. | Form "H" of Exhibit D of the Instructions To Proposers will be revised under a future addendum to remove reference to "Control". This is not required for this project. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 90 | ITP, Exhibit B | Would the Department consider extending the due date for the Technical/Price Proposals by one week to September 3? Alternatively, if this is not acceptable, could preliminary responses to the ATC submissions of June 29 be provided in advance of the revised Addendum No. 2 date of August 5th? This would provide adequate time for the proposers to incorporate the ATC's into their technical and price proposals and preliminary design plans. | Technical Proposals and Price Proposals are required to be submitted by the date and time listed in the Procurement Schedule listed in Section 1.4 of the Instructions To Proposers. NHDOT will be providing responses to all Formal ATC submissions based upon the date specified in Procurement Schedule in Section 1.4 of the Instructions to Proposers. |
| 91 | Vol 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | "Addendum No. 1 adjusted the language of 17.6.1 Interim Milestone #1. We are not able to find a design/layout for this relocation work in the bid documents. Please clarify the following points as they pertain to the completion of this Milestone, and the associated liquidated damages: | NHDOT is in the process of coordinating with Eversource's Transmission Department on development of a Preliminary Relocation Alignment. NHDOT will provide a Preliminary Relocation Alignment when available. NHDOT anticipates this will be available at the time the final addendum is issued. |
| 91A | Vol 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | 17.6.1.A: "Remove all trees within the project ROW and slope easements required to facilitate the relocation of the overhead transmission line..." Please clarify that the limits of this tree removal are only for the Eversource transmission area and that it does not include the entire project limits. Could the Department reference a station or monument to delineate this? | Refer to Section 17.6.1 of the Contract which specifies the limits of tree removal that must be completed as part of Milestone #1 is only what is required in support of the Eversource overhead transmission facility relocation. |

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 91B | Vol 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | 17.6.1.B: “Complete demolition of building on Parcel 16...” – the Technical Provisions, Section 7.3.4 list this parcel as one that NHDOT is responsible for acquiring. Given the 155-calendar day deadline for this milestone, please confirm that schedule relief from liquidated damages will be afforded the Design Builder if NHDOT has not taken possession of this parcel by NTP1. | The ROW acquisition for Parcel 16 has been completed and NHDOT has possession of this parcel. Relocation benefits will be initiated by the end of October 2020. The owners are actively in the process of moving from the parcel. |
| 91C | Vol 2, Book 1 - DB Contract | 17.6.1.C. D and E: Can the Department please provide a design/layout for this relocation so we can determine the level of effort required for this pathway, and any embankment required for the proposed poles? | NHDOT is in the process of coordinating with Eversource's Transmission Department on development of a Preliminary Relocation Alignment. NHDOT will provide a Preliminary Relocation Alignment when available. NHDOT anticipates this will be available at the time the final addendum is issued. |
| 92 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Section 7.3.2.11 of Volume II-Book 2: “Responsibilities of NHDOT” indicates that NHDOT will cover closing costs on the acquisition property in addition to the purchase price. This typically includes title reports and updates; recording fees; cost to secure releases; seller transfer taxes; deed prep; reimbursement of property taxes; costs to cure title problems; and settlement fees. Please confirm that these closing costs will be the responsibility of NHDOT. Are there any acquisition closing costs that NHDOT will not be paying | Additional clarification of the closing costs the Design-Builder will be responsible will be provided in a future addendum. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 93 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Please clarify how property taxes for parcel acquisitions will be compensated. We suggest that the DB's ROW agent submit the request to NHDOT, NHDOT requests funds and sends the check | The Design-Builder will submit a reimbursement form for taxes to NHDOT and then NHDOT will submit the form for reimbursement. |
| 94 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Will the DB's Right of Way agent be required to take a commission member or NHDOT staff on appointments? If so, will they be taking their own car to allow for social distancing? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions does not require NHDOT ROW staff to be present with the Design-Builder's agent for meetings with landowners. However, this does not preclude NHDOT ROW staff from attending such meetings for quality control checks. Determination of the frequency of such joint meetings will fall under the State ROW administrator to decide. If attending such meetings, NHDOT staff will provide their own vehicle access as may be needed. |
| 95 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Can an offer be emailed at the owner's request, assuming it will be followed up by a certified mailing. | Refer to Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions. Email is defined as one of three methods of direct contact recognized as part of a "good faith" efforts for contacts. Delivery by certified mail of the offer is still required. |
| 96 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Assuming the offer package is mailed in advance, can the DB's Right of Way agent video conference an owner to present the offer? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to include the use of "video conferencing" as a method of direct contact that would be considered part of a "good-faith" effort. Virtual meetings will be required to meet all documentation guidelines. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 97 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Please describe any additional requirements or modifications to the typical ROW acquisition process that NHDOT has put in place in response to the Covid-19 pandemic | The acquisition process shall be in conformance with any and all Governor's Executive Orders related to COVID-19. |
| 98 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Who is responsible for staking out the partial ROW takings if requested by the owner or appraiser? What is the turnaround time from request to stake out? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to indicate the Design-Builder will be responsible for staking out partial acquisitions if requested by the property owner as part of the acquisition activities. |
| 99 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Please confirm that NHDOT will request just compensation once approved. | Refer to Section 7.3.2.11 (D) of the Technical Provisions. |
| 100 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Per page 110 of Volume 2, Book 2, Section 7.3, checks under \$5,000 can be secured in 3 weeks and checks over \$5,000 will take 6 to 8 weeks. Is there a way to shorten the turnaround time for the funds? | The Design-Builder shall base their Project Schedule upon the timelines noted in Section 7.3.2.10 |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 101 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | <p>This is an aggressive ROW acquisition schedule under optimal conditions, and we are presently in the middle of a pandemic. This will lead to delays in meeting people and securing executed documents and recording deeds, inspecting properties, and other ROW-related tasks. In addition, NHDOT staff will be responsible for reviewing and approving a variety of ROW documents per Volume 2, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.4 matrix on pages 106 – 110 and their staff is limited, and could potentially be working remotely. Has there been any consideration in extending the project schedule to account for delays associated with the pandemic and limited DOT ROW staff that will assist with the review and approval process of appraisals, offer packages, condemnation packages, administrative settlements, closing packages, payment requests, ROW plan docs, and deeds?</p> | <p>NHDOT is committed to meeting appraisal review timeframes set forth in Section 7.3.2.4 of the Technical Provisions. As noted in Section 3 of the Technical Provisions, as part of the Design-Builder's Quality Management Plan and Quality Control process, all submittals are to undergo a quality control review prior to submission to ensure they are complete and free from grammar, spelling and math errors.</p> |
| 102 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | <p>Volume 2, Book 2, 7.3.2.11 item D: Can the acquisition cost and closing costs be paid directly to the property owner by NHDOT in order to save time? If this is possible could the DOT send a copy of the checks that are released to the DB for the ROW parcel files? This process has been used on past NHDOT projects involving property acquisition</p> | <p>Acquisitions checks will be sent directly to property owner by NHDOT and the Design-Builder will be notified of these correspondence. The Design-Builder will be responsible for closing costs as will be described in more detail in the final addendum.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 103 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | The ROW consultant has received a ROW Acquisition Status Report on the 12 parcels presently involved in the NHDOT's advanced acquisition program. The status report is lacking details on address, zoning, and FMV amounts. Can this information be made available to the ROW consultant for reference and research on anticipated acquisition costs? | NHDOT will provide an updated report on acquisition efforts at the time the final addendum is to be issued per the Procurement Schedule in Section 1.4 of the Instructions To Proposers. 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. |
| 104 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Are there any specific guidelines for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates? | NHDOT does not have formal guidelines available for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates. ROW acquisition cost estimates shall be prepared by the D-B and updated for each ROW coordination meeting described in Technical Provision Section 7.3.2.7. It is expected that these meetings will be held monthly while the ROW process is ongoing, or as requested by NHDOT. |
| 105 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.12.2 of the Technical Provisions indicates in the summer of 2020 and prior to construction activities, NHDOT biologists, in coordination with NH NHB personnel, will search suitable habitat within the Project footprint for the state-endangered Nuttall's reed grass. Has the 2020 inspection been completed, and will NHDOT Biologists conduct the preconstruction inspection. | NHDOT is coordinating with NH NHB personnel to finalize an approved study area. Once approved, NHDOT will scope a consultant to perform a search of the state endangered Nuttall's reed grass. Once the inspection is completed, the results will be given to the DB for review. It is anticipated the study will be completed by August 31, 2020. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 106 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.12.1 of the Technical Provisions indicates that all State listed wildlife species encountered during pre-construction searches would be captured and released in appropriate habitat on site. Will the DB be required to obtain a Scientific Collection permit or other permit authorizing the capture of State listed species? | Handling of species under this Contract to move them away from the construction zone to a safe area will not require the Design-Builder to secure a permit. It is anticipated that these removals will require minimal handling and the species are not to be relocated away from the general area in which they were found. See also Section 6.5.12.1 of the Technical Provisions which states that contact to NHFGD will be required immediately for any encountered/captured species. |
| 107 | Vol. 2, Book 2 - Technical Provisions | Section 7.5.7.3 of the Technical Provisions defines the requirements for ROW Monumentation. Is there a total quantity of ROW monuments evenly distributed along the length of the project that would be adequate and significantly less costly than setting monuments along both sides of the ROW at every PC & PT? | The Design-Builder will be responsible for setting monumentation at all significant points along the ROW in conformance with Section 7.5.7.3 of the Technical Provisions. |
| 108 | Supplemental Material Provided | The Trolley Car Brook Stream Relocation design has been provided as part of the wetland permit. Can the Department provide either a set of PDF cross sections, a DGN file for the cross sections to develop earthwork quantities? The files provided have been reviewed, but do not seem to include this information. | The proposed thalweg grade is shown on the Trolley Car Lane Stream Profile, Sheet 6 of 6, in Attachment D Stream Restoration Grading Plan, of the April 2020 "Response to NHDES Requests for More Information". There are no cross section in this report. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 109 | Supplemental Material Provided | The BTC Plan 1 shows three signs located on the full sign structure: 2 WB and 1 EB. Will the Department expand on anticipated content of the EB sign? | The Design-Builder will be responsible for the final design of all traffic signs in accordance with project documents. |
| 110 | Supplemental Material Provided | Based upon the BTC Plan #1 is it the intent of the Department that the DB will be responsible for the construction of the sound wall and foundation from the tie in of the NB On Ramp to approximate I-93 NB Station 1717+50? Is it also accurate that there is an existing berm within this location so earthwork in support of the berm will be minimal? | The Design-Builder will be responsible for the final design and construction of the Northbound soundwall, including foundations. As part of I-93 expansion, NHDOT constructed portions of a soundwall berm to facilitate the soundwall placement. NHDOT does not guarantee that the berm constructed is complete or adequate for any soundwalls required under this Project. It will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder to verify the ability to use the previously constructed berm and/or modify the berm as needed. |
| 111 | Supplemental Material Provided | Based upon the BTC Plan #1 is it the intent of the Department that the DB will be responsible for the construction of the earthwork, excluding select materials and pavement, for the future two lane I-93 SB Off Ramp from I-93 SB Station 3714+25 to the SB Off Ramp Nose? Does the current permitting include the two culvert extensions and the resulting wetland impacts? | Refer to Vol. 2, Book 2 Technical Provisions, Section 7.6.2.1 (A). The Design-Builder shall construct to the limits of the BTC, including to the toe of slope shown, to allow for the future construction of a two lane off ramp. All environmental impacts for the BTC has been accounted for in project permits. Specific grading between that point and the edge of the one-lane ramp/I-93 roadway to be determined by design-builder during final design. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 112 | Supplemental Material Provided | On the I-93 shoulder the existing shoulder pavement is 4.5". Since the ramp design requires a thicker section does the Department agree that the shoulder pavement will need to be removed in order to meet the design requirements? With the requirement of a 2" mill and fill on this 4.5" shoulder, will the Department require a shoulder closure during the milling operation? | Should the pavement design require increasing the thickness of the existing I-93 shoulder, the shoulder pavement will need to be removed to meet the design requirements. We called for 2" mill and fill on the low speed lane not the shoulder. The design-builder is responsible for providing adequate traffic control in accordance with the MUTCD and NHDOT standards. |
| 113 | Supplemental Material Provided | Are there plans available for the Hood Pond Dam/Rail Trail Extension? | NHDOT is not in possession of any reference plans for this work. Proposers may inquire with the Town of Derry or other entities for any information available from other sources. |
| 114 | Supplemental Material Provided | The BTC contains grading adjacent to the I-93 Exit 4A NB On Ramp at Station 47+00, RT and 51+00, RT that appears to be expansion of stormwater treatment areas. Are there project commitments for stormwater improvements associated with Seasons Lane? If so where are these commitments defined? | This is part of the Trolley Car Stream relocation to provide additional flood storage. See the "NHDES Wetlands Permit RFMI Response #2, Dated 04-30-2020 available under the Reference Information Documents. This RFMI Response includes a grading plan. |
| 115 | Supplemental Material Provided | Please provide the as-built plans, including cross sections, for the 14633-I project (or whichever project constructed the earthwork north of the 14633-D contract). | As-built plans do not exist at this point. Construction plans can be found on the NHDOT Project Viewer as a completed (archive) project. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 116 | Supplemental Material Provided | In the ROW section of the Engineer's Report, (page 38), it cites a "Report to Special Committee" for other individual property owner concerns and commitments. Please provide this report. | The Report To Special Committee has been provided on the I-93 Exit 4A Project Website under the Section entitled "Report to Special Committee". |
| 117 | Supplemental Material Provided | At Tsienneto Road Station 1158+00, a new BMP is to be sited on Parcel 151, (see BTC Plan 2). The BMP will eliminate the existing leach field with negligible alternatives for relocation on the parcel. Is the intent that this property would become a total acquisition, a forced line constructed to Beaver Road, or a gravity line to NH Route 102? If it is to be a total acquisition, would NHDOT be responsible for securing rights to the parcel? | The existing onsite leach field will be impacted by construction of the BMP and construction of a new leach field may not be feasible. As such, alternative connections to the town's municipal system may be necessary. A forced main connection westerly along Tsienneto Road to existing sewer line down Beaver Road may be required as part of the final ROW settlement, and this work would be the responsibility of the property owner. This parcel is not intended to be a full acquisition. |
| 118 | Supplemental Material Provided | Does NHDOT have a specification for the decommissioning of leach fields? If so, please provide. | For the decommissioning of leach fields, the Design-Builder will be required to comply with the regulatory processes through NHDES. |
| 119 | Supplemental Material Provided | Does NHDOT have a specification for the decommissioning of monitoring wells? For the purpose of bidding should it be assumed that impacted monitoring wells will need to be replaced? | A Special Provision will be provided under Addendum #4 related to this work. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 120 | Supplemental Material Provided | Section 7.5.2 of the Technical provisions indicates that the DB is responsible for reviewing existing survey data and determining the requirements for updating or extending the existing survey and mapping data. We have not found any existing survey control points within the data provided. Can this information be made available to the DB at this time? | Within the I-93 corridor limits survey to be provided at NTP1 as per Section 7.5.1 A. For survey outside of the I-93 corridor, control points for survey work by Fuss & O'Neill anticipated to be provided with the final addendum. |
| 121 | Supplemental Material Provided | The NHDOT Right of Way manual indicates that the Limited Access Right-of-Way (LAROW) is in almost all cases fenced. In the case of this LAROW being within the future Woodmont Common development, is it the intent to fence this LAROW? Similarly, proposed BMP's will be accessible to the public. Will these BMPs require security fence with locked gates for maintenance access? | Locations of BMPs would be considered a public facility and require fencing under Section 7.3.4.4.1 of the Technical Provisions. In accordance with good industry practice, a lockable gate shall be provided to allow access by the owner. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 122 | Supplemental Material Provided | Sections 4.11 & 4.17.3 of the FEIS/ROD Vol I discuss potential time of year restrictions for construction, and bullet point 8 located on page 73 of the Standard Dredge and Fill Wetland Application states that Stream work will be timed to avoid impacts to breeding fish and wildlife, and high flows. Condition 27 of Wetland Permit NHDES File #2018-03134 does not address the timing of construction to avoid breeding fish and wildlife, rather it points out that cofferdams shall not be installed during periods of high flow, whether due to seasonal runoff or precipitation. Please confirm that there are not time of year restrictions in place that would restrict the installation of cofferdams. | The placement for temporary cofferdams will need to comply with restrictions on in water work as stipulated in the permit conditions. |
| 123 | Supplemental Material Provided | Note 1 on the Trolley Car Lane Stream Relocation plans dated April 2020 state that final stream diversion/erosion control plans shall be prepared by a Professional Engineer. Do these plans need to be reviewed/approved by NHDOT and/or NHDES? | The final diversion and erosion control plans will be required to be stamped by a Professional Engineer and submitted for review by NHDOT, and by NHDES for conformance with the April 2020 Trolley Car Lane Stream Relocation plan. The final design shall meet or exceed the parameters in the April 2020 Trolley Car Steam Relocation Plan and narrative. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 124 | Supplemental Material Provided | Has a Request for Project Review (RPR) form been previously submitted to NHDHR for the proposed project? If so, does it need to be updated? If not, does one need to be submitted? | A Request for Project Review (RPR) is not required. The project has been reviewed with FHWA and NHDHR throughout the NEPA process with a final determination made of an Adverse Effect to cultural resources. The mitigation measures stipulated in the MOA are to be adhered to by the Design-Builder. |
| 125 | Supplemental Material Provided | With regard to the Engineers Report, page 36, please provide the overhead sign structure detail for the existing sign at 3696+50 so that it can be verified that it is appropriate for reuse and if any modifications will be needed prior to reuse. | NHDOT will provide this information in the RID. |
| 126 | Supplemental Material Provided | As part of the additional documentation provided on the website, there was a summary labeled "Derry-Londonderry, 13065 Exit 4A-Stone Walls Feasibility of Reconstruction Needed". The potential walls for reconstruction either require additional coordination with property owners or a check of the feasibility of reconstruction. It would appear that for either of these conclusions there should be coordination needed that is not practical during the proposal phase. Would the Department consider providing a baseline length of wall to be reconstructed so that the scope of this work can be accurately estimated | The Design-Builder is responsible for conformance with the Technical Provisions, including Section 6.5.13.1 and Section 7.3.4.4. The existing stone walls are identified by stationing on the Stonewall Evaluation Forms. This information is available to the Design-Builder for use in estimating lengths. The type of wall that could be reconstructed is also identified in the forms, with photographs of the existing wall attached that further show what the reconstructed stone wall would need to be replicated. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 127 | Supplemental Material Provided | <p>Adjacent to the project area there are asbestos cement water pipe on Manchester Avenue, Claremont Avenue, Laconia Avenue, Crystal Avenue and Energy Lane. There is also an asbestos sewer line on Pinkerton Street. Direct impact to these lines is not anticipated, but this type of pipe tends to become brittle with age. What is the age of these pipes and is there any maintenance data on their current condition? Removal or repair of these pipes are considered hazardous. If these pipes fracture due to normal construction vibration will the required specialized equipment and safety plan count toward the hazardous material contingency or should that risk be carried in the utility costs?</p> | <p>Any impacts to existing municipal asbestos cement water and asbestos sewer will need to be addressed with the utility owner in accordance with Utility Manual. Should removal of municipal asbestos services be required under the project, the cost for disposal will be addressed in an allowance to be added to the Contract under the final addendum.</p> |
| 128 | Supplemental Material Provided | <p>Reviewing the ITS plans for the Contract D project, they do not appear to show the location of the fiber bank that was tied into. Is there additional ITS infrastructure north of Pillsbury Road? If plans are not available, can the Department provide guidance on an appropriate splice point?</p> | <p>Refer to Reference Information Document "ITS Existing Infrastructure Plan 14633D RAP 7" for 14633D ITS information.</p> |
| 129 | ROW General | <p>Can an offer be emailed at the owner's request? (assume it will be follow up by a certified mailing).</p> | <p>Refer to Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions. Email is defined as one of three methods of direct contact recognized as part of a "good faith" efforts for contacts. Delivery by certified mail of the offer is still required.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 130 | ROW General | Will video conferencing be allowed to present an offer to an owner if the offer package was pre-mailed? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to include the use of "video conferencing" as a method of direct contact that would be considered part of a "good-faith" effort. Virtual meetings will be required to meet all documentation guidelines. |
| 131 | ROW General | Who is responsible for staking out the property if requested by the owner or appraiser? What is the turnaround time for request to stake out? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to indicate the Design-Builder will be responsible for staking out partial acquisitions if requested by the property owner as part of the acquisition activities. |
| 132 | ROW General | How are property taxes being handled? Suggest submit to NHDOT, NHDOT request funds, NHDOT sends check. | The Design-Builder will submit a reimbursement form for taxes to NHDOT and then NHDOT will submit the form for reimbursement. |
| 133 | Vol 2, Book 2, Section 7.3, page 110 | Please confirm that NHDOT will request just compensation once approved (as before). Vol 2, Book 2, Section 7.3 page 110 notes that checks under \$5,000 can be secured in 3 weeks and over \$5,000 can be secured in 6-8 weeks. Can this time frame be expedited? | Refer to Section 7.3.2.11 (F) of the Technical Provisions. The Design-Builder shall base their Project Schedule upon the timelines noted in Section 7.3.2.10 |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 134 | Vol 2, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.11.A | NHDOT will be responsible for closing costs including title policies for each property purchased. What other typical seller closing costs are covered by NHDOT? (Such as: Recording Fees, cost to secure releases, settlement charges, title reports, title updates, seller transfer taxes, reimbursement of property taxes, cost to cure title problems, etc.) | Additional clarification of the cost the Design-Builder will be responsible will be provided in the final addendum. |
| 135 | Vol 2, Book 2, Section 7.3.2.11.D | Can the acquisition cost and closing costs be paid directly to the property owners by NHDOT in order to save time? If this is possible can NHDOT send a copy of the checks that are released to the DB for the ROW parcel files? This is how it has been handled in the past, and given the tight timeframe for the project is a prudent approach. | Acquisitions checks will be sent directly to property owner by NHDOT and the Design-Builder will be notified of these correspondence. The Design-Builder will be responsible for closing costs as will be described in more detail in the final addendum. |
| 136 | ROW General | The ROW consultant has received a ROW Acquisition Status Report on the 12 parcels presently involved in the NHDOT's advanced acquisition program. The status report is lacking details on address, zoning, and FMV amounts. Can this information be made available so that we can do research on acquisition costs? | NHDOT will provide an update report on acquisition efforts at the time the final addendum is to be issued per the Procurement Schedule in Section 1.4 of the Instructions To Proposers. 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 |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 137 | ROW General | Are there guidelines for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates? | NHDOT does not have formal guidelines available for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates. ROW acquisition cost estimates shall be prepared by the D-B and updated for each ROW coordination meeting described in Technical Provision Section 7.3.2.7. It is expected that these meetings will be held monthly while the ROW process is ongoing, or as requested by NHDOT. |
| 138 | Volume I - Instructions to Proposers | Form N-1 Line 26 dated May 19, 2020 reads "Total Project Mgmt. and Administrative Costs (Lines 9-25)". Believe this should read "Total Project Mgmt. and Administrative Costs (Lines 8-25)". Please confirm Line 26 should be the total of Lines 8-25, not 9-25. | Form N-1 will be revised under the final addendum for clarification. |
| 139 | Volume II – Book 1 – Design Build Contract | Section 4.3.3 - Payment Schedule states that the Project Schedule shall provide for payment to be made solely on the basis of progress by Design-Builder for the Project. Request clarification on how progress is expected to be reported each cycle and what information and documents are required backup for approval and payment. Also are these documents expected to be continuously updated for change orders and cost with each submittal for payment? | NHDOT will be working with the Design-Builder to establish a payment plan using Form N-1 and the approved Project Schedule. The Design-Builder's approved Form N-1 form along with the Project Schedule will be entered into IPD for payment. The Design-Builder will request payment based upon a percent complete for the items in Form N-1 in accordance with Vol. 1 Book 1 Contracts, section 4.3.3. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|--|---|---|
| 140 | Volume II – Book 1 – Design Build Contract | "It is not clear what is expected of the DB team as it relates to meeting all requirements of Section 17.6.1 Interim Milestone #1: In preparation of overhead transmission powerline relocation work. There is a deadline for the clearing of the trees, but it seems there is earthwork that will be required, as well as wetlands to be dealt with, ROW, etc. There also does not appear to be a breakout on Form N-1 for the costs associated with the powerline relocation. | Refer to Section 17.6.1 of the Contract which specifies the limits of work that must be completed as part of Milestone #1 is only what is required in support of the Eversource overhead transmission facility relocation. The Design-Builder should include their costs for this work within the items listed on Form N-1. |
| 141 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | (Addendum #3) Section 2.1.1.2 Electronic Document Management System (EDMS). NHDOT will develop and implement an EDMS. What EDMS is NHDOT going to implement? | Section 2.1.1.2 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to indicate that NHDOT will be providing an EDMS based on Microsoft SharePoint. |
| 142 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.2 Noise states that the FEIS/ROD has committed to noise barriers. | <i>(Responses to subparts of this questions provided below)</i> |
| 142 (a) | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | a. Will the Design Builder have to solicit the views of benefited receptors behind each noise barrier as part of the reasonableness determination? | The Design-Builder will not be required to solicit views of benefited receptors behind each noise barrier. The D-B team will need to show that their design profile meets or exceeds the noise reductions from the FEIS/ROD commitments. |
| 142 (b) | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | b. If required to do so, what method of soliciting viewpoints is acceptable? Would the Department find the direct mailing of a survey form, with supporting information about the proposed barrier design, and under a cover letter, acceptable? | The Design-Builder will not be required to solicit views of benefited receptors behind each noise barrier. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|---|--|--|
| 143 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.2 Noise states that a final design noise analysis is required. | <i>(Responses to subparts of this questions provided below)</i> |
| 143 (a) | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | a. Will the Department supply the applicable Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 files from the FEIS? | The information provided previously on a flash drive is in Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5. It is recommended that TNM 2.5 be utilized by the Design-Builder for the final design assessment despite availability of TNM 3.0 as there may be differences between the two models and it would be best to compare the BTC and Design-Builder's final designs without concern for differences between the models. |
| 143 (b) | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | b. Is a noise measurement program to validate the noise model required as part of the final design noise analysis? | A noise measurement program is not required if the Traffic Noise Models provided by NHDOT are utilized. The provided models are considered valid and thus only require final design modifications which could not be validated. Section 6.5.2 of the TP will be revised by a future addendum to required version 2.5 |
| 144 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.2 Noise states that the FEIS/ROD has committed to noise barriers including two discontinuous noise barriers in the Trolley Lane neighborhood and one barrier in the Seasons Lane neighborhood. The FEIS found that each of these barriers exceeded the Department's effectiveness criterion of 1,500 square feet per benefited receptor. | <i>(Responses to subparts of this questions provided below)</i> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|---|--|--|
| 144 (a) | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | "a. We understand the final design noise analysis will evaluate the three noise barriers with respect to the final roadway design. If the final design noise analysis finds that a noise barrier exceeds the Department's 1,500 square feet per benefited receptor effectiveness criterion, is the Design Builder committed to constructing the noise barrier? | The Department is committed within the FEIS to construct sound barriers along I-93. To achieve this commitment, the Design-Build shall construct the barriers as shown in the BTC. The intent of the final design barrier analysis is to ensure any final design modifications have not affected the anticipated benefits shown in the FEIS. |
| 145 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 6.5.2 Noise states that the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model shall be used. The FHWA released TNM Version 3.0 for use on projects on a voluntary basis in February 2020. However, FHWA also states that TNM version 2.5 may still be used. Should the final design noise analysis use TNM version 2.5 for all noise calculations and noise barrier design, to maintain consistency with the prior noise studies performed for this project? | Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 shall be used. Section 6.5.2 of the TP will be revised by a future addendum to required use of Version 2.5. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 146 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | <p>Section 7.4.2.2 Pavement Design notes that “It is assumed that the majority of roadways will require full depth reconstruction to meet the design ADLs, with the possible exception of: Side Roads that were recently reconstructed: NH Route 28 (Manchester Road/Crystal Avenue)” (Page 130). According to the 14192 NH Route 28 Improvement plans (October 2011), a step box widening consisting of 4.5 inches of pavement and 24” of crushed gravel was constructed (presumably to match the existing roadway structural section). As the frost protection base course material depth for this Tier 5 – Local Road is 24 inches (Section 7.4.2.2.1 Extra Sand for Frost Protection), with the BTC profile, a potential increase in pavement thickness would cause this roadway to not meet the required depth without full reconstruction. Would an exception for the frost protection depth or a minor profile increase (1” to 2”) be allowed in this location to avoid undercutting and require full width and depth reconstruction for this section of roadway?</p> | <p>NHDOT may entertain an exception under Section 7.4.2.2 for locations of side roads that were recently reconstructed and minor roads not meeting the frost protection depths specified in the Technical Provisions.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 147 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | Section 7.6.5 Construction notes that “Depending on ADL and the roadway design, high strength pavement may be needed for the binder course of pavement.” (Page 147). It is not clear how NHDOT intends to determine where high strength binder course pavement will be required. Request additional direction on this requirement (i.e. specific locations anticipated, roadways with an ADL greater than a certain amount, to what depth, etc.) so that the anticipated quantity required can be determined and provided. | Section 7.6.5 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to remove reference to high strength pavement for the binder course. |

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|---|---|
| 148 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | <p>Section 7.4.2.1 states, “The Design-Builder shall determine the specific locations, frequency, and scope of all subsurface geotechnical investigations, testing, research, and analysis the Design-Builder considers necessary to support the design of a safe and reliable roadway, pavement, foundation, structure, and other facilities for the Project.” And also states; “Roadways - A minimum of one test boring per 200 feet shall be performed at uninvestigated portions each roadway”.</p> <p>Considering that the RFP requires a box construction of 24 to 36 inches of base product (plus pavement thickness), we question the need and the value of obtaining borings along the existing roadways post-contract award, but pre-construction. The roadway will have already been priced and designed prior to explorations. Is there a satisfactory observational method during construction where the subgrade conditions can be verified by the geotechnical engineer during construction with recommendations altered, if necessary, in lieu of doing pre-construction borings?</p> | <p>For construction on an existing alignment, a visual inspection of subgrade will be adequate. It will be the responsibility of Design-Builder’s geotechnical personnel to address any subgrade deficiencies encountered. Sections of roadway to be constructed on a new alignment will require borings completed in accordance with Section 7.4.2.1. Section 7.4.2.1 will be modified in the Final Addendum to reflect this change.</p> |

Design Build Team’s RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 149 | Volume II – Book 2 – Technical Provisions | <p>Section 2.4.1.2.1 Paragraph 5 – Baseline Schedule states the following “With the exception of activities relating to Environmental Approvals by Governmental Entities, each activity depicting Design-Builder’s operations shall have duration of not more than 20 Days, and not less than one Day, except as otherwise approved by NHDOT. All activities shown in the schedule, with the exception of the first and last activities, shall have a minimum of one predecessor and a minimum of one successor activity. This clause regarding activities with durations no greater than 20 days seems to be applicable for each activity in the schedule. This is NOT a common practice. This requirement is a standard practice for construction activities ONLY. Otherwise, all DOT review activities will not meet this requirement. In addition, the fabrication of long lead items such as structural steel takes no less than 40 days. Therefore, request to waive this clause of 20 workdays for design, procurement, submittal and fabrication activities.</p> | <p>As noted in Section 2.4.1.2.1 of the Technical Provisions, NHDOT can provide exceptions for certain activities in the Baseline Schedule for which the maximum duration of 20 days is not appropriate.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| 150 | Electronic Files Received | <p>The Proposed Stormwater Water Treatment Memorandum dated July 31, 2018 with revisions dated July 10, 2020 indicates there are two potential access locations for proposed BMP 1052: either from the bike path at 607+00 or an access driveway which is graded from the Connector Road at approximately 1053+00 and that it will need to be confirmed that maintenance equipment can fit through the bike path structure. Is it the Department's and/or the Town of Derry's intent to utilize this structure for maintenance equipment access to proposed BMP 1052? If so, what equipment is expected to be used and has it been confirmed the rail trail underpass BTC dimensions accommodate all required vehicles?</p> | <p>The structure carrying the Connector Road over the rail trail shall be constructed to meet the minimum clearances depicted in BTC.</p> |
| 151 | Electronic Files Received | <p>The BTC/TSL Report indicates the semi-integral spread footing will be founded on bedrock but does not provide a top of footing elevation. Since the ditch lines constructed in these areas as part I93 widening project are in close proximity to the abutments, can the Department's BTC intent for placing the footing relative to the ditches and backslopes, as well as the top of footing elevations, be provided to the D-B teams so that we are able to develop our foundation design?</p> | <p>Per Section 7.4.2.1 of the Technical Provisions, the Design-Builders shall provide recommendations related to the substructure types and foundations. Geotechnical recommendations are not included in the Reference Information. The Design-Builder is responsible for determining the necessary top of footing elevations with their Geotechnical Engineer based upon the existing information provided to develop foundation recommendations and layout.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|
| 152 | General | Questions regarding COVID and providing Right of Way services: This is an aggressive ROW schedule in the best of times, and we are presently in the middle of a pandemic, which will lead to delays in meeting people and securing executed documents and recording deeds, inspecting properties, etc. | <i>(Responses to subparts of this questions provided below)</i> |
| 152 (a) | General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are we required to take a commission member or NHDOT staff on appointments? - - Will they be taking their own car to allow for social distancing? | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions does not require NHDOT ROW staff to be present with the Design-Builder's agent for meetings with landowners. However, this does not preclude NHDOT ROW staff from attending such meetings for quality control checks. Determination of the frequency of such joint meetings will fall under the State ROW administrator to decide. If attending such meetings, NHDOT staff will provide their own vehicle access as may be needed. |
| 152 (b) | General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can an offer be emailed at the owner's request? Assume it will be followed up by a certified mailing. | Refer to Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions. Email is defined as one of three methods of direct contact recognized as part of a "good faith" efforts for contacts. Delivery by certified mail of the offer is still required. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|----------|----------------------|---|--|
| 152 (c) | General | - Can you video conference an owner to present the offer? (Offer package would be pre-mailed.) | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to include the use of "video conferencing" as a method of direct contact that would be considered part of a "good-faith" effort. Virtual meetings will be required to meet all documentation guidelines. |
| 152 (d) | General | - What additional requirements are imposed because of the Covid-19? | The acquisition process shall be in conformance with any and all Governor's Executive Orders related to COVID-19. |
| 152 (e) | General | " - Who is responsible for staking out the property, if requested by the owner or appraiser? - - What is the turnaround time from request to stake out?" | Section 7.3.4 of the Technical Provisions will be revised under a future addendum to indicate the Design-Builder will be responsible for staking out partial acquisitions if requested by the property owner as part of the acquisition activities. |
| 152 (f) | General | - How are we handling property taxes? Suggest submitting to NHDOT; NHDOT request funds; and NHDOT sends check. | The Design-Builder will submit a reimbursement form for taxes to NHDOT and then NHDOT will submit the form for reimbursement. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|--|--|--|
| 152 (g) | General | <p>" - Confirm NHDOT will request just compensation once approved. (As before)</p> <p>- - Per Page 110 of the Volume II Book 2 Section 7.3, checks under \$5,000 can be secured in three (3) weeks and over \$5,000 6-8 weeks.</p> <p>- - Is there a way to shorten the turnaround time for the funds?"</p> | <p>Refer to Section 7.3.2.11 (F) of the Technical Provisions. The Design-Builder shall base their Project Schedule upon the timelines noted in Section 7.3.2.10</p> |
| 152 (h) | General | <p>- In addition, the DOT staff will be responsible for reviewing and approving a variety of ROW documents per Volume II Book 2, Section 7.3.2.4 matrix on pages 106 – 110 and their staff is limited. Has there been any consideration in extending the project schedule to account for delays associated with the pandemic and limited DOT ROW staff that will assist with the review and approval process of appraisals, offer packages, condemnation packages, administrative settlements, closing packages, payment requests, ROW plan docs, deeds, etc.?</p> | <p>NHDOT is committed to meeting appraisal review timeframes set forth in Section 7.3.2.4 of the Technical Provisions. As noted in Section 3 of the Technical Provisions, as part of the Design-Builder's Quality Management Plan and Quality Control process, all submittals are to undergo a quality control review prior to submission to ensure they are complete and free from grammar, spelling and math errors.</p> |
| 152 (i) | General/ Volume II Book 2, Section 7.3.2.11 Item A | <p>- Per Volume II Book 2, Section 7.3.2.11 Item A, NHDOT will be responsible for closing costs including title policies for each property purchased. What other typical seller closing costs are covered by NHDOT (i.e. recording fees, cost to secure releases, settlement charges, title reports, title updates, seller transfer taxes, reimbursement of property taxes, cost to cure title problems, etc.)?</p> | <p>Additional clarification of the cost the Design-Builder will be responsible will be provided in a future addendum.</p> |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|---|--|---|
| 152 (j) | General/ - Volume II Book 2, 7.3.2.11 Item D. | - Volume II Book 2, 7.3.2.11 Item D. Can the acquisition cost and closing costs be paid directly to the property owner by the NHDOT to save time? If this is possible, could the NHDOT send a copy of the checks that are released to the DB for the ROW parcel files? This was how it was handled on the last project; and since time is of the essence, it seems to be a reasonable request. | Acquisitions checks will be sent directly to property owner by NHDOT and the Design-Builder will be notified of these correspondence. The Design-Builder will be responsible for closing costs as will be described in more detail in a future addendum. |
| 152 (k) | General | - The ROW consultant has received a ROW Acquisition Status Report on the 12 parcels presently involved in the NHDOT's advanced acquisition program. The status report is lacking details on address, zoning, and FMV amounts. Can this information be made available to the ROW consultant; so, we can do some research on acquisition costs? | NHDOT will provide an update report on acquisition efforts at the time the final addendum is to be issued per the Procurement Schedule in Section 1.4 of the Instructions To Proposers. 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. |
| 152 (l) | General | - Are there guidelines for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates? | NHDOT does not have formal guidelines available for providing ROW acquisition cost estimates. ROW acquisition cost estimates shall be prepared by the D-B and updated for each ROW coordination meeting described in Technical Provision Section 7.3.2.7. It is expected that these meetings will be held monthly while the ROW process is ongoing, or as requested by NHDOT. |

Design Build Team's RFP Clarification Request

| No. | Doc/Section/Page No. | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|---------|----------------------|---|--|
| 152 (m) | General | - Will the Department consider including appraisal review services to the design-build team's requested services on this project to speed up submittal reviews and approvals? | 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. |
| | | | |