

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

NO.	DOC SECTION	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE	DATE
1.	Book 2B 4.3.2.9	Where historic property identified, the Developer shall cease work immediately, protect and have an evaluation undertaken. Work cannot commence without approval from TxDOT. Please clarify allocation of risk associated with cost and time changes.	See change in Addendum #3. Exhibit 1 of the CDA will be revised to include Historic Property in the definition Relief Event.	1/25/08
2.	Book 2B 10.2 page 10-1 Salvaged Materials	Section 10.2 states, " <i>TxDOT reserves the right to require the Developer, at any time to salvage and deliver to a location designated by TxDOT within the TxDOT District in which the Project is located, any TxDOT-owned equipment and materials in an undamaged condition.</i> " Please provide a listing of the items anticipated per this verbiage. Does this requirement apply to pavement, concrete and/or other recycled materials?	See change in Addendum #3. Section 10.2 of Book 2A will be amended to eliminate this requirement.	1/25/08
3.	Book 2B 12.3.4.2.5 Section B and C Bridges	Section 12.3.4.2.5 states, " <i>runoff from bridge decks shall be carried off the bridges and into the adjacent roadway drainage systems...</i> " and " <i>open deck drains are not permissible for bridges passing over waterways or other roadways...</i> " Are open deck drains permissible on any bridges?	Unless expressly prohibited in Section 12.3.4.2.5 of Book 2B, open deck drains are permitted.	1/25/08
4.	Book 2B 14.1 Section B and C Bridges	Book 2B Section 14.1 states, " <i>Developer shall prepare a geometric design for the potential rail corridor...</i> " Book 2A Section 11.1.1(D) states, " <i>The Developer shall provide space to accommodate a potential Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) tunnel north of the IH 635 centerline between Midway Road and Preston Road...</i> " Please confirm that the DART tunnel described in Book 2A is the only potential rail corridor referenced in Book 2B. If there are other rail corridors that need to be accounted for in the design, please provide specific information as to the location and size of the corridor.	See changes in Addendum #3 to Section 14.1 of Book 2A. Section 14.1 of Book 2A will be amended to remove the requirements of Section 14.1 of Book 2B.	1/25/08
5.	Book 2B Section 19	The measurement record criteria and target values for several of the elements are extremely restrictive and will result in the addition of O&M costs to the financial proposal that we feel	Compliance with the Target is assessed by the Asset Condition Score in accordance with Section 19 of the Technical Provisions.	5/9/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	Attachment 19-1A	<p>are unnecessary to meet typical industry performance standards. Attached are detailed comments on the performance and measurement table.</p> <p>As a general comment we note that there are many undefined terms, and that the Performance Requirements column frequently does not coincide with the information regarding measurements. The performance requirements are often more stringent than the measurement information and sometimes include items that have no provision for measurement. If the performance requirements ultimately have precedence over the measurement information, the disparities between the two could result in additional measurements and corrected measurement methods that could result in standards harsher than those existing.</p>	<p>In respect of Targets, Noncompliance Points are assessed if: 1) the mean Asset Condition Score for any Element Category is less than 3.5; and/or 2) an Asset Condition Score is less than 3.</p> <p>Noncompliance Points in respect to Defects are only assessed if a Defect is not corrected within the specified response time.</p>	
6.	Book 2B Section 19.3.3	<p>The requirements in this paragraph will require the purchase of an elaborate MMIS with an initial cost of over \$500,000 plus annual software maintenance requirements in excess of \$50,000. This seems excessive for the needs of a corridor this small and the limited number of assets.</p> <p>A software system as specified in this section would typically be used on a large network of highways or a large geographical area like an entire county, city or state.</p> <p>We have provided suggested modifications to this section, that will meet the requirements for documentation, record keeping and TxDOT access.</p>	No change.	5/9/08
7.	Book 2B Section 19.5.6	<p>We note that in Addendum 1, TxDOT has excluded some of the elements from the requirement of the performance and measurement table. We agree with these exclusions and further suggest that 3.1, 3.2, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, and 19.1 and 19.2 be added to the exclusions in Book 2A, Section 19.5.6 paragraphs 1 and 2.</p>	<p>These items are not excluded from the Performance and Measurement Table; they are to be achieved over 60 months rather than 24 months. There will be no change to these requirements.</p>	5/9/08
8.	Reference Information Documents Study Reports/Drainage Reports/Final	<p>Preliminary drainage areas, trunk lines and profiles are presented in the exhibits.</p> <p>Is this info available in a MicroStation design file?</p>	<p>MicroStation design files of Preliminary Drainage Design will be provided in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3.</p>	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	DDRW-Exhibits. PDF Miscellaneous			
9.	Reference Information Documents Study Reports/Drainage Reports/Final DDRW-Exhibits. PDF Miscellaneous	Preliminary drainage areas, trunk lines and profiles are presented in the exhibits. What hydraulic software was used in the preliminary storm sewer design? GEOPAK Drainage? If so, is this available?	The preliminary storm sewer design was not produced in GEOPAK Drainage and is not available.	1/25/08
10.	Reference Information Documents NWP 14 (USACE Project No. 200500584) Letter from the USACE dated October 26, 2006	Confirmation from TxDOT that this is the only USACE permit that has been obtained for the project and no additional extensions have been filed to date. This letter states that it expired on March 18, 2007 unless TxDOT was under contract to commence work. Unless otherwise advised, the Proposer will be required to obtain a new USACE for the proposed project. Is this assumption correct?	USACE has confirmed with TxDOT that the permit is valid through March, 2009. Thereafter extensions will be required. Proposer will need to perform all necessary work in order for TxDOT to obtain an extension.	1/25/08
11.	Reference Information Documents Draft CE Re-evaluation (October 2006)	We request a copy of the Categorical Exclusion for reversible interim HOV lanes approved on January 10, 2006. This document was referred to in the October 2006 CE Re-Evaluation, but was not provided in the RID.	See the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3. All available environmental documents will be provided in the Reference Information Documents.	1/25/08
12.	Reference Information Documents Noise Analysis Electronic Data Files and Hard	We request copies of the original TNM electronic files for the noise analyses conducted in all of the approved EAs and a hard copy of the data results for the noise receiver modeling conducted as referenced in the EAs.	This is not available for all EA documents. Electronic files of noise analysis for IH 635 West re-evaluated EA will be provided in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3.	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	Copies of TNM modeling results			
13.	Reference Information Documents Loop 12/IH35E Wetland Delineation EA, dated February 2002	Need document to review. Please provide the complete Wetland Determination report including electronic data files of the delineated waters of the US, including wetlands as referenced in the document.	The Wetland Determination Report is not available electronically. However, the Wetland Delineations for the USACE permit will be provided in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3.	1/25/08
14.	Reference Information Documents Loop 12/IH35E EA, dated February 2002 Section 3.9, page 71 and Appendix K	Has the offsite mitigation for impacts to vegetation/wildlife been coordinated with official at any of the suggested mitigation locations? Please provide all coordination regarding the mitigation that has occurred after the issuance of the FONSI.	Offsite mitigation shall be in accordance with the USACE permit. No other coordination has taken place.	1/25/08
15.	Reference Information Documents EA Loop 12/IH 35E FONSI 12/11/2002 Page 83 & Appendix L	Page 83 of the EA mentions the Texas Historical Commission concurred with TxDOT Environmental Affairs Division that further archeological work is necessary for the proposed project. However, the THC letter in Appendix L says that further work is not necessary. Please clarify.	No further archeological work is required based on the Section 106 Coordination dated April 10, 2002 in Appendix L. THC concurred on May 6, 2002.	1/25/08
16.	Reference Information Documents IH 635 (Luna Road	Need document to review. Please provide the complete Wetland Determination report on	See response to question 13 above. The only coordination with the USACE was with regard to the	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	to US 75) EA/FONSI, dated April 2004 Section H, page 34	file at the District including electronic data files of the delineated waters of the US, including wetlands. Was this report verified by the USACE? Please provide documentation of any coordination.	NWP14.	
17.	Reference Information Documents IH 635 (Luna Road to US 75) EA/FONSI Section J, pages 39 and 40 Page.16-2	Need document to review. Please provide a copy of the Tree Mitigation Study performed that is on file with the TxDOT Dallas District office.	The Tree Mitigation Study is not available. Tree Mitigation commitments will be provided in Addendum #3.	1/25/08
18.	Reference Information Documents Re-evaluated Schematics – Dwgs 2/3 of 24	Please confirm that pavement overlay on existing IH 35E is not required.	It is not a requirement under the CDA Documents for the existing IH 35E to be overlaid. However, the Developer is required to restore existing infrastructure that the Work impacts. Book 2A will be modified to in Addendum #3 to clarify Developer requirements and obligations in the restoration of existing infrastructure.	1/25/08
19.	Reference Information Documents Right of Way CADD line work For IH 35E	Right of Way CADD line work for the RID Schematics show the right of way required for the ultimate master plan. Will TxDOT be acquiring the right of way for this at this time?	TxDOT will purchase the ROW for the ultimate configuration prior to NTP2.	1/25/08
20.	Reference Information Documents Right of Way CADD line work	Please provide existing and proposed right of way files (CADD) for IH 35E, north of IH 635	See Addendum #3. CADD files or PDF will be provided in the Reference Information Documents to the extent available.	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	For IH 35E			
21.	Reference Information Documents As-Built Plans	Please provide as-built plans of IH 35E within project limits.	These will be provided in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3.	1/25/08
22.	From Q&A Matrix RID #18	Q&A Matrix Book RID Response #18 states, "These will be provided in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3." As-builts of IH 35 were not provided in Addendum 3. Will as-builts be included in Addendum #4?	As-builts of IH 35E will be provided.	4/4/08
23.	Reference Information Documents Limited Phase I ESA and Expanded Phase I ESA	Given both the Limited Phase 1 and Expanded Phase 1 are both dated after the ASTM E 1527-05 standard was effective is TxDOT planning to perform Phase I ESA for according to these standards prior to ROW acquisition?	No further assessments are anticipated.	1/25/08
24.	Reference Information Documents Limited Phase I ESA and Expanded Phase I ESA	Please provide TCEQ Records as conducted for the Expanded Phase I for the following sites: Map Id 1, 2, 5, 6, 6, 9, 11, 13, 98, 109, 110, 134, 143, and 152.	To the extent these documents become available to TxDOT, the records will be included in the Reference Information Documents in Addendum #3.	1/25/08
25.	Reference Information Documents Limited Phase I ESA and Expanded Phase I ESA	Was the location of sites of potential environmental concern verified either during the Limited Phase I conducted in December 2006 or during the Expanded Phase I Re-evaluation conducted in March 2007? If it was, what kind of verification was conducted and for which sites?	The Reference Information Documents contain the extent of the information available.	1/25/08
26.	Reference	Was there further confirmation for Map ID 8 on whether the	See response to question 25 above.	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	Information Documents Limited Phase I ESA and Expanded Phase I ESA	permit for the construction of the landfill was granted?		
27.	Ultimate IH 35E Design Summary Report For IH 635 Managed Lanes Project - West Section Reference Schematic, 1.2.1	The Design Summary Reports states, <i>"The ultimate configuration along IH 35E between Loop 12 and IH 635 consists of eight main lanes; four to six frontage road lanes; two three-lane elevated direct connectors; two concurrent, managed lanes at grade; and one elevated, reversible, managed lane."</i> Please provide additional information concerning the ultimate configuration along IH 35E.	TxDOT anticipates modification to the IH 35E scope. See Addendum #3 for the revised scope to the IH 35E and a lane configuration diagram for IH 35E and the IH 35E/IH 635 interchange Sections.	1/25/08
28.	Ultimate IH 35E / IH 635 Design Summary Report For IH-635 Managed Lanes Project - West Section Reference Schematic, 1.2.1	The Design Summary Reports states, <i>"The ultimate configuration along IH 35E between Loop 12 and IH 635 consists of eight main lanes; four to six frontage road lanes; two three-lane elevated direct connectors; two concurrent, managed lanes at grade; and one elevated, reversible, managed lane."</i> Please provide details of the ultimate configuration at the connection between IH 35E and IH 635.	See response to question 27 above.	1/25/08
29.	Ultimate IH 35E Design Summary Report For IH-635 Managed Lanes Project - West Section Reference Schematic, 1.2.1 Reference file: ih35eultimate(2d).dgn	The Design Summary Reports states, <i>"The ultimate configuration along IH 35E between Loop 12 and IH 635 consists of eight main lanes; four to six frontage road lanes; two three-lane elevated direct connectors; two concurrent, managed lanes at grade; and one elevated, reversible, managed lane."</i> There appears to be inconsistencies between the ultimate configuration described in the Design Summary Report For IH-635 Managed Lanes and the reference file ih35eultimate(2d).dgn. Please provide clarification as to the required ultimate configuration along IH 35E.	See response to question 27 above.	1/25/08
30.	Ultimate IH 35E	When viewing the file is35eultimate(2d).dgn, file westschem(2d).dgn is an attached referenced file.	See response to question 27 above.	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

	Reference file: is35ultimate(2d).dgn Reference file: westschem(2d).dgn	There appears to be a disconnect between the two referenced CAD files, specifically around station 690+00. The CAD file shows NB IH 35 direct connectors to IH 635 coming off from both the NB IH 35 general purpose lanes and the managed lanes. This geometry does not appear feasible as the general purpose lanes are at grade while the managed lanes are elevated. This conflicting situation also occurs with the IH 635 direct connector to SB IH 35E. Please provide additional information concerning the ultimate tie-in between the IH 35E and IH 635.	The is35ultimate (2d).dgn file was a working file and does not represent the proposed ultimate configuration.	
31.	GeoPak Files	GeoPak alignment files were provided as part of the Reference Information Documents. Please provide any GeoPak criteria files produced as part of the schematic drawings.	No criteria files are available.	1/25/08
32.	IH 635 Managed Lanes Project Depressed Managed Lanes Preliminary Tunnel Fire Simulation, December 1, 2006 Introduction, Page 1	This fire study consisted of the following two simulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A 30 MW fire, simulating a truck or a bus fire, with a no-wind condition.• A 30MW fire simulated with a 10 miles per hour wind condition. The wind is assumed to blow in the most critical direction; across the surface roadways, from the side where the fire is located. Is the 30 MW fire the Design Fire? Is the cross-wind condition the most critical, and how was this determined?	Reference Information Documents are provided for information purposes only and are subject to Section 1.5 of the CDA. The fire study was conducted to provide a general understanding of the behavior of smoke and heat within the Depressed Managed Lanes during a fire incident. The Developer is responsible for determining the design fire condition and all associated parameters (including wind conditions, direction, etc.) in its design, as well as conducting the CFD analysis based on its schematic structural configuration.	1/25/08
33.	2.1 Tunnel Information Page 3	The typical section depicts a 56 foot opening above the Depressed Managed Lanes. The 56 foot opening dimension is not typical over the length of the proposed project. The opening width varies from 32 to 46 feet for 2.5 miles and from 28 to 46 feet for approximately 2 miles. This difference has significant implications for the normal emissions and emergency fire analyses and designs.	Section 2.2 of the fire study report states that this is the section that was modeled. See response to question 32 above.	1/25/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

		<p>Was this the opening modeled in the CFD model?</p> <p>How are the reduced openings described above for the Depressed Managed Lanes accounted for in the report conclusions?</p> <p>Presentation materials that were part of the RFP package included architectural elements above the opening. How does this relate to the actual opening width?</p>	<p>TxDOT is unable to respond to this last question in 32 because there is no identification of the “presentation materials” or the architectural elements being referred to.</p>	
34.	<p>Re-Evaluated Design Schematic IH35 635 Managed Lanes Projects</p> <p>Design Summary Report West</p> <p>Section 12.18.16</p>	<p>The Design Summary Report West Section (sec 12.18.16) states that <i>“the ultimate configuration along IH35E between Loop 12 and IH 635 consist of eight mainlanes, four to six frontage road lanes...”</i></p> <p>Examination of the Re-Evaluated Design Schematic IH35 635 Managed lanes shows the IH35-NB to 635-EB hugging the ROW north of Crown Road thus restricting the possibility of an ultimate at grade frontage road.</p> <p>The two documents appear to be in conflict.</p> <p>Please confirm that it is TxDOT intention to terminate the ultimate IH35E Northbound Frontage road at Crown Road, or that TxDOT should acquire additional ROW for the future frontage road.</p>	<p>See response to question 27 above.</p>	1/25/08
35.	<p>From Q&A Matrix RID #31</p>	<p>Q&A Matrix RID #31 states, “The Design Summary Report West Section (sec 12.18.16) states that “the ultimate configuration along IH35E between Loop 12 and IH 635 consist of eight mainlanes, four to six frontage road lanes...” Examination of the Re-Evaluated Design Schematic IH 35 635 Managed lanes shows the IH 35E -NB to IH 635 -EB hugging the ROW north of Crown Road thus restricting the possibility of an ultimate at grade frontage road. The two documents appear to be in conflict. Please confirm that it is</p>	<p>The NB Frontage Road shall not terminate at Crown Road. The NB frontage road shall terminate at the EB Frontage Road in the IH 635/IH 35E Interchange. No additional right of way will be acquired. The Developer’s solution shall provide the schematic alignment and space for the NB Frontage Road north of Crown Road. The properties north of Crown Road are access controlled, therefore the NB Frontage Road is not required to be located adjacent to the right of way line within the IH 635/IH 35E Interchange.</p>	4/4/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

		<p>TxDOT intention to terminate the ultimate IH 35E Northbound Frontage road at Crown Road, or that TxDOT should acquire additional ROW for the future frontage road.</p> <p>Q&A Matrix RID Response states, "TxDOT anticipates modification to the IH 35E scope. See Addendum #3 for the revised scope to the IH 35E and a lane configuration diagram for IH 35E and the IH 35E/IH 635 interchange Sections."</p> <p>A ROW file was provided in Addendum #3 for the future IH 35E ROW north of IH 635. However, the question was in respect to IH 35E ROW south of IH 635. Please provide the amended ROW file for IH 35E, south of IH 635.</p>		
36.	Miscellaneous	Are there any mandatory Design software requirements for this project?	Design software shall be in accordance with the CDA Documents.	1/25/08
37.	TxDOT's March 3, 2008 letter, under Scope Change Items Technical Provisions	<p>In TxDOT's letter dated March 3, 2008 under the heading "Scope Change Items," TxDOT indicated that the Technical Provisions would be revised in Addendum # 3 so that "the selected Developer will be required to incorporate . . . aesthetic enhancements . . . to the value of \$10M."</p> <p>The Technical Provisions were revised for content, but the \$10 million "aesthetics allowance" was not included in Addendum # 2 nor has it been added in the following two Addenda.</p> <p>Please confirm that the Proposal will include a separate \$10 million allowance for aesthetic enhancements.</p>	<p>The following change will be made in TP 15 of Addendum #6.</p> <p>"The cost of providing the aesthetic and landscaping Elements shall not be associated with standard construction cost and shall not be less than ten (10) million dollars. The aesthetic and landscaping Elements shall be detailed in the Aesthetic and Landscaping Plan."</p>	5/9/08
38.	Missing RID Documents Addendum 3, RID Table of Contents – SCHEMATICS FOLDER	<p>Table of Contents included "03.19.08 Re-Evaluated Design Schematic (PDF) Folder (Added to RID March 19, 2008)]"</p> <p>Only MicroStation files were provided. Please provide .PDF files as identified in the Table of Contents.</p>	PDF files of the Approved Re-Evaluated Design Schematic will be provided in Addendum 6.	4/4/08
39.	Addendum 3, RID Schematic Drawing No. 5	<p>At-grade profile for alignment RPN35HH.</p> <p>The profile for the Harry Hines entrance ramp (RPN35HH) looks incorrect. Please confirm that a bridge over Valley View is required.</p>	The correct profile for RPN35HH will be provided in Addendum 6.	4/4/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

40.	RID Final AJR, Exhibit 2	On Exhibit 2 of the Final AJR, the ramp from the WB Frontage Road to the WB General Purpose lanes west of Rosser is a single lane with an ADT of 54.9K. This translates to 3300 vehicles per hour. This is significantly more than the maximum possible capacity of a single lane. Is a revision coming out to correct this and any other similar inconsistencies?	No correction is included in the Approved IAJ. Please refer to page 24 of the original IAJ dated August 22, 2003 (RID). Suggested modifications should be included in the Proposer's solution. At a minimum, the Developer shall provide the ramp capacity in the re-evaluated schematic as approved by TxDOT and FHWA.	4/4/08
41.	RID Reference file LBJwpzr2.dgn	Eastbound & Westbound Bypass Frontage Road profiles are crossed out. A note stating "Do not show by pass ramps for this submittal 07-06" is noted on the profile. Please provide corrected profiles.	The re-evaluated schematic states that the ramps were designed by others. The CADD file are crossed out because the ramps were designed by others and not included on the re-evaluated schematic. The ramp profiles are shown in the RID folder "Prelim Plans for IH 635 FR Hillcrest Rd to Merit Dr." under the Current Projects and As-built Documents Section.	4/4/08
42.	RID (Addendum #3) II. Studies and Reports / Re-evaluated Design Schematics / Miscellaneous Design Files / Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram	See Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram. Please clarify the hierarchy of documents with respect to the previously issued schematics and the Interim Line Configuration and the Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram.	Clarification of the Interim and Ultimate facilities will be provided in Addendum 5. The Developer will be responsible for providing the Interim Configuration and will not be required to provide the design of the Ultimate Configuration.	4/4/08
43.	RID (Addendum #3) II. Studies and Reports / Re-evaluated Design Schematics / Miscellaneous Design Files / Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram	See Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram. In Section A and B the West to South and North to East managed lane direct connectors are shown as a three lane facility in the RID schematics. In both the Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram a two lane facility is utilized. Please confirm the configuration of both direct connectors.	The Addendum 4 RID shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Interim Configuration as a 2-lane facility.• The Ultimate Configuration as a 3-lane facility. Clarification of the Interim and Ultimate facilities will be provided in Addendum 5. TxDOT will provide the location of the Ultimate Configuration's facilities including ultimate roadway location, bent location restrictions, required alignments of the interim configuration within the IH 635/IH 35E Interchange section, etc. The Developer will be responsible for providing the Interim Configuration and will not be required to provide the design of the Ultimate Configuration.	4/4/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

44.	RID Document (Addendum #3) II. Studies and Reports / Re-evaluated Design Schematics / Miscellaneous Design Files / Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram	<p>See Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram.</p> <p>Please provide assumed vertical profile for the new direct connectors shown in the Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram.</p> <p>Of specific concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The west to south general purpose direct connector and its tie in at the east, specifically the available right of way2. The tie in at the south and its ability to tie in abruptly to the at grade general-purpose southbound lanes.	<p>See response to RID (Addendum #3) II question.</p> <p>The Developer will be responsible for providing the Interim Configuration and will not be required to provide the design of the Ultimate Configuration.</p>	4/4/08
45.	RID Document (Addendum #3) II. Studies and Reports / Re-evaluated Design Schematics / Miscellaneous Design Files / Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram	<p>See Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram.</p> <p>The Northbound frontage road shown in the Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram is shown as a 5 to 3 to 2 lane facility. To adequately place the interim piers, additional information is needed.</p>	<p>See response to RID (Addendum #3) II question.</p> <p>The Developer will be responsible for providing the Interim Configuration and will not be required to provide the design of the Ultimate Configuration.</p>	4/4/08
46.	RID Document (Addendum #3) II. Studies and Reports / Re-evaluated Design Schematics / Miscellaneous Design Files / Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram	<p>See Interim and Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram.</p> <p>At the Loop 12 / IH 35E split, the Ultimate Line Configuration Diagram shows ramps extending out from the interim elevated direct connectors. Is it TxDOT intent that stub-outs be provided in the interim design in order to accommodate ultimate configuration.</p>	<p>Stub-outs will be required to accommodate the Ultimate Configuration.</p>	4/4/08
47.	RID	<p>We have not received Attachments 05-3A "Municipal Maintenance Agreement (City of Dallas)" and 05-4A "Dallas Area rapid Transit (DART) Memorandum of Agreement ".</p>	<p>The traffic signal, municipal maintenance agreements and DART MOU identified in TP 5 will be deleted or moved to the RID for Addendum #6. The Developer's responsibilities will be identified in the technical provisions.</p>	5/7/08

DRAFT

IH-635

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS MATRIX re BOOK 2B AND REFERENCE INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

		These are third party agreements that we will have to take into account in our evaluation. Will TxDOT make these documents available to proposers?		
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--