

## RFQ QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## I-64 HAMPTON ROADS EXPRESS LANES (HREL) SEGMENT 1A

STATE PROJECT NO.: 0064-122-470

FEDERAL PROJECT NO.: NHPP-064-3(520)

CONTRACT ID NUMBER: C00117840DB112

**FEBRUARY 10, 2022****FEBRUARY 11, 2022**

1. Per RFQ Section 3.3.1.3, the Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) is required to be “from an independent firm that has no contractual relationship and no involvement in construction operations...”. Please clarify whether the QAM can be from the same firm providing engineering/design services on the project.

*VDOT Response: Yes, the QAM can be from the Lead Designer firm provided they comply with the requirements outlined in the Minimum Requirements for Quality Assurance and Quality Control on Design Build and P3 Projects.*

2. RFQ Section 3.3.1.3 requires the QAM to “be on the Project site full-time for the duration of construction activities.” Please confirm whether the QAM is required to be dedicated to this project full-time, or if they can be on-site supporting more than one segment of the HREL improvements simultaneously.

*VDOT Response: Yes, the QAM is required to be dedicated to and on-site for this project full time. They cannot serve on two HREL projects simultaneously.*

3. RFQ Section 2.1, Project Overview, 2nd Paragraph. Please clarify the I-64 EB and WB bridge rehabilitations/widenings to be included in the Segment 1A project, as there appears to be several discrepancies in what is shown in the RFQ versus the Conceptual Plans and Public Hearing Maps as well as what was presented during the pre-proposal meeting. Also, please clarify which structure the “I-64 Reversible Lanes bridge over I-564” is referring to. Additionally, please confirm that the “I-64 EB bridge over the Tidewater Drive WB ramp” will be rehabilitated as part of this project, as this was not shown on the maps displayed during the pre-proposal meeting.

What work, if any, is associated with the double 8’ x 8’ box culvert referred to in the RFQ?

*VDOT Response: This segment has been revised since the public hearing. Public hearing maps are not part of the procurement documents. The RFQ and the RFQ conceptual plans define the general scope of work.*

*The RFQ will be revised in an Addendum to clarify the scope of the project.*

*There is no anticipated work on the 8’ X 8’ culvert at this time. Any work on that culvert that may be required will be defined in the RFP.*

4. RFQ Page 14, 1st Paragraph. The first sentence of the paragraph states: “The individual serving as the Project Manager or the Design Manager may perform the role of the EIC, provided such individual has the qualifications and requirements described in this Section 3.2.2.2 (Entrusted Engineer in Charge).”

Please advise how doing this will affect the submittal of Key Personnel Forms, as the RFQ requires that one is provided for each of these roles. In addition, would the Department accept the inclusion of another member of the Design Team in lieu of the Design Manager, considering that this person meets all of the requirements as stated in Section 3.2.2.2 of the RFQ?

*VDOT Response: A resume shall be provided for each role that the individual will serve in. Note that the Entrusted Engineer in Charge shall be an employee of the Design-Builder (the legal entity who will execute the Contract with VDOT).*

5. Public Hearing Map, Page 1 of 9. Will the sound barrier wall and stormwater management basin (shown as “by others”) be included in the Segment 1A project scope?  
*VDOT Response: The RFQ and the RFQ conceptual plans will define the general scope of work.*
6. Categorical Exclusion, Page 3 of 6. The CE is written for the entire 9 mi. length of Segment 1, and indicates that jurisdictional features are present and will require water quality permits. Are any jurisdictional features present within the Segment 1A portion of the CE?  
*VDOT Response: Yes, there are jurisdictional features within the Segment 1A limits.*
7. What is VDOT’s anticipated timeframe for construction of the adjacent Segment 1B project?  
*VDOT Response: Final determination on the construction of Segment 1B has not been determined.*
8. Will permanent right-of-way acquisitions be included in the Segment 1A project? Are permanent or temporary easements anticipated?  
*VDOT Response: Yes, permanent right-of-way acquisitions will be required as part of this project. It is anticipated that easements will be required.*
9. Does the Navy/US Government own, or have any jurisdiction over, the I-64 right-of-way? Or is the I-64 right-of-way completely within the jurisdiction of VDOT? If the Navy/US Government has any jurisdictional entitlements, what coordination efforts will be required during design and construction? Will VDOT lead those coordination efforts?  
*VDOT Response: VDOT will be coordinating with the Navy and specific responsibilities will be identified in the RFP. The Design-Builder will be required to coordinate with the Navy during design and construction and Offerors may be required to coordinate on specific items in the RFP process.*
10. Will there be approach zone requirements/restrictions for the Naval runway? Will an FAA permit be required for overhead signs, lighting, cranes, or other construction items?  
*VDOT Response: VDOT will be coordinating on the preliminary airport clearance forms. This information will be provided with the RFP. Specific requirements will be identified in the RFP.*
11. Please clarify the ITS/traffic control devices responsibilities for the Design-Builder versus the toll collection contractor. Activities needing clarification include furnishing, installing, testing, and integration into VDOT’s Operations Center.  
*VDOT Response: The Design-Builder for Segment 1A will be required to construct some of the tolling civil infrastructure. This will be defined in the RFP.*

*VDOT has retained a tolling integrator who will be responsible for the integration of the toll system.*

12. Are there any existing agreements with the Forest Lawn Cemetery, City of Norfolk, or other entity that may require mitigations associated with the Segment 1A project?

*VDOT Response: There are none at this time.*

13. Are there any agreements or betterments that have been agreed to with the utility owners?

*VDOT Response: At this time there are no known agreements or betterments with the utility owners.*

14. Is VDOT aware of any hazardous materials in the groundwater coming from the Navy or other adjacent sites?

*VDOT Response: There is no known hazardous materials.*

15. Will this project be grandfathered under Part IIC of the VSMP regulations?

*VDOT Response: This project will not be grandfathered under Part IIC of the VSMP regulations unless otherwise noted in the RFP.*

16. Does the RFQ design plan meet the energy balance equation through on-site storage?

*VDOT Response: This will be further defined in the RFP.*

17. Does the RFQ design anticipate meeting the water quality requirements primarily through the purchase of off-site nutrient credits?

*VDOT Response: This will be further defined in the RFP.*

18. The RFQ Section 2.1 Project Overview, 2nd Paragraph notes “This section of interstate includes three mainline bridges to be widened and rehabilitated and one double 8’x8’ box culvert carrying drainage underneath I-64. These bridges are the I-64 Reversible Lanes bridge over I-564, the WB Little Creek Road bridge and the WB Granby Street bridge.” This conflicts with the RFQ Conceptual plans and project info meeting presentation. Therefore, please confirm the bridge structures scope of work for the project will be as follows:

- a. Widen and rehabilitate eastbound I-64 mainline bridges over Granby Street, I-564 WB, and East Little Creek Road;
- b. Widen and rehabilitate both the eastbound and westbound I-64 mainline bridges over Tidewater Drive;
- c. Rehabilitate the eastbound I-64 bridge over the ramp from northbound Tidewater Drive to westbound I-64 mainline

*VDOT Response: See the answer to question 3.*

19. Please confirm the Section 2.1 Reference double 8’x8’ box culvert is located between Tidewater Drive and the Tidewater Drive Interchange’s northbound ramps; RFQ Conceptual Plans I-64 Stations 1060 EB/Station 3052 WB.

*VDOT Response: The location described in the question is 8’ X 8’ culvert referenced in the RFQ. See answer to question 3.*

20. RFQ – 3.3.1, .2 Entrusted Engineer in Charge (EIC), Page 13. The RFQ states: “The individual serving as the Project Manager or the Design Manager may perform the role of the EIC...”  
Is the Construction Manager allowed to perform this role, as well, assuming they meet other qualifications?

*VDOT Response: No.*