

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
35 Project Opportunity		(1) Will the HOT lanes accommodate commercial vehicles? (2) What I mean is will commercial vehicles be allowed to use the HOT lanes?	TxDOT has not yet determined to what extent commercial vehicles may be permitted to use the managed lanes. Proposer views will be solicited on this topic during industry review.
36 Project Opportunity		From a review of the RFQ of the IH-635 Managed Lanes Project, it appears that the 2 tunnel projects are included in the scope of work, presumably in Segment ABC. We specialize in tunnel construction, so we are interested in the tunnels. Can you Confirm design and construction of the 2 tunnels will be in the contract or otherwise clarify.	Tunneling is included within the scope of the Project. However, it may be possible for the Developer to deliver the Project and satisfy the technical requirements other than by constructing two mined tunnels. TxDOT anticipates that the RFDP will include the constraints identified in Exhibit C in some manner. The Developer will also have to adhere to the approved environmental documents for the project (which, among other things, requires tunnels and precludes developing the managed lanes on grade or elevated with respect to the general purpose lanes in the A segment). The RFDP may allow the Developer to seek certain limited changes to the approved environmental documents at its risk.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
37 Project Opportunity		I was wondering if you could tell me the logistics behind choosing where your access points are located. (1) Are there a set of guidelines that you follow that dictate where access points should be placed? (2) What dictates the distance between access points along the freeway?	The access locations for the managed lanes were spaced to provide opportunities for uninterrupted flow (non-stop) from major interchanges, to and from, the adjacent roadways. Geometric and right-of-way access criteria were adhered to. No specific optimization process was performed. Access justification reports are included in the Exhibit A documents.
38 Project Opportunity		The PDF files (389 page plan set) found in Disk 6 for Segment A contains an Option 1. This option seems to not reconstruct the short segment of the mainline 635, immediately shunting HOV traffic to the tunnel sections under the frontage roads. Which option does TxDOT prefer, or is it the contractor's choice.	Provided that the developer complies with the technical requirements which will be delineated in the RFDP, TxDOT anticipates that the Developer will have some flexibility given adherence to the new constraints identified in Exhibit C and the approved environmental documents. See also response to question No. 36.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
39 Project Description Section 2.1	TxDOT will include requirements regarding the limits and scope of the Project in the RFDP but anticipates that the Project will include Segment ABC and may include one or more of the following Segments: DE, F, G(1), G(2), H and/or I.	Does TxDOT expect all segments to be included in both the Development Plan and Financing Plan?	See response to Question No. 30.
40 Project Description Section 2.1	As part of this effort an attempt was made to minimize the overall impact to the most heavily traveled portion of the facility adjacent to the densest development as well. Project cost was not the overriding factor in develop-ing Segment ABC. A trade-off between disruption and an earlier start was deemed to offset higher capital costs. It is anticipated that a more flexible set of constraints applied to all of the project segments will result in a more cost effective and innovative solution.	(1) Does TxDOT expect this more flexible set of constraints to allow the developer to include options other than tunnel construction? (2) Also see question below regarding Exhibit C Page 1; Issue 1 – Managed Lanes.	See response to Question No. 36.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
41 Utility Investigation Section 2.5.2	Existing subsurface Project utility information is available to Proposers as a Project Document and is listed on Exhibit A. TxDOT is currently undertaking additional subsurface utility investigation (SUE) work and expects that such work will be completed by May 2005 and will be made available when completed.	Is this additional SUE work complete, and if so, is it available now?	See Addendum #1. Additional SUE work has been initiated from Greenville Avenue to the RR crossing near SH 78. TxDOT expects that such work will be completed by Dec 2005 and will be made available when completed.
42 Traffic and Revenue Forecast Section 2.6	An investment grade traffic and revenue study was initiated by TxDOT in July 2003 and is expected to be completed in August 2005 and will be made available when completed.	Please consider providing a draft copy of the investment grade traffic and revenue study with the RFQ documents. Review of this study data – even in draft form – is essential to the preliminary analysis that will take place to optimize the Conceptual Project Development Plan and the Conceptual Project Financing Plan.	The investment grade traffic and revenue study has been received and will be released after TxDOT has completed its review. See also response to Question No. 18.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
43 Managed Lanes Exhibit C Page 1	<p>Applied to Reference Schematic: Maintain, as shown in EA schematic the same alignment and arrangement for two managed lane tunnels with three lanes in each direction. The tunnels are a combination of U-wall transitions, Box and Mined sections.</p> <p>Anticipated to be applied: Provide a minimum of six managed lanes, three lanes in each direction between US 75 and IH-35E on IH-635.</p>	The “Applied to reference schematic” constraint specifically mentions tunnels yet the “Anticipated to be applied” does not. Is it TxDOT’s intention to let the developer to be creative on how the managed lanes are developed in Segment A?	See response to Question No. 36.
44 Bonding		"In RFQ § 4.2.2 (e), page 20, it states that TxDOT requires evidence from a surety or an insurance company indicating that the Proposer is capable of obtaining a Performance Bond and Payment Bond in an amount of at least \$250 million. This would lead one to believe the project is being competed as a	See Addendum #1.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
		conventional design-build project. However, our team delivering the Statement of Qualifications will be a developer/concessionaire, with a design-build entity as a subcontractor. Many concession companies do not perform construction directly and therefore do not have a conventional bonding capacity. Is it acceptable for the design and construction portions of our team to provide suitable evidence of bonding capacity?"	
45 Instructions for QS Submittal		In RFQ § 4.1, page 12, TxDOT states that Volume 1 shall have all pages sequentially numbered and not exceed 70 pages. §4.2.1.1 (a), page 12, indicates Form A and the letters from the equity partners in the Proposer are included in Volume 1. Including these items in the page count restriction places a greater burden to meet the page count on teams consisting of more member firms than on those of	See Addendum #2.

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
		smaller teams. We ask that TxDOT consider the opportunity to exclude Form A and the supporting letters from the page count to enable all teams to equally address the Project.	
46 Right-Of-Way		(1) It is our understanding that TxDOT is purchasing all necessary right of way for the project, and that the contractor will be required to provide any additional property that he needs for his overhead and management operations. Is this correct? (2) If so, will TxDOT have their purchased properties cleared prior to our NTP or will they lie abandoned until our operations require their demolition?	(1) TxDOT will undertake certain right of way acquisition activities prior to the RFDP proposal due date, but TxDOT anticipates that the Developer will have significant right of way acquisition obligations in connection with the Project. The parties' respective obligations with respect to right of way will be addressed in the RFDP. (2) Access to some of the Project right-of-way may be available prior to an NTP, but it is anticipated that some of the required right of way will not be acquired or available until after an NTP.
47 Right-Of-Way		(3) For the tunnel construction access shaft, a couple of parcels have been identified for possible use. Who will be responsible for purchasing these properties and if TxDOT is, is the purchase	(3) TxDOT has purchased approximately 5-6 acres of property on the NW corner at Welch Road (west), already. Other parcels of property available for tunnel construction access will be

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
		<p>process already underway and where are they, what size, etc.? (4) If they have not been purchased, will eminent domain be available to purchase these properties?</p>	<p>identified in the procurement documents. (4) Eminent domain was not used and would not typically be used to acquire a staging area. See also response to Question No. 46.</p>
<p>48 Exhibit A</p>		<p>Some information was to be released June 9, 2005 during the Pre-QS Workshop. However, such information (i.e. ROW data) cannot be found in the CD's provided as Exhibit A. In addition, after investigating the LBJ TX DOT web pages, we have been unsuccessful in finding such information. 1) What is the status of those reports? 2) If they are available, how can we obtain them?</p>	<p>Maps identifying the ROW currently being pursued for the project are available in the TxDOT Dallas District Office library. SUE information for the project is also available in the library. Contact Sue Rosebrock at 214-320-6289 for reproduction procedures. Status updates will be forthcoming in Draft RFDP, RFDP and Addenda as necessary.</p>
<p>49 Form D</p>		<p>After careful review of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) document and attached Exhibit A documents and Reference Schematics, as well as periodic investigations of the LBJ TxDOT web pages, we have been unable to identify the</p>	<p>The general limits for each letter segment correspond to the end limits shown on Exhibit B-2. This information is sufficient for the level of detail anticipated in preparing Form D.</p>

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number Topic Provision Section	Provision Text	Question	Response
		<p>station limits of the different segments involved in the project, as discussed in the RFQ. In order to address FORM D as requested, treating the different segments separately, we would need limits information.</p> <p>1) Is this information available?</p> <p>2) If so, how can we access it?</p>	
50 Design Summary Report		<p>The Design Summary Report (DSR) prepared by TxDOT discusses in Section 3.1.3 Option-1 road configurations. The Reference Schematics also include Option-1 information.</p> <p>1) The DSR indicated that Option-1 configurations are not preferred. What are the connotations of 'preferred'?</p> <p>2) Should Option-1 roadway plans and cross sections also be considered during the development of the proposal?</p>	<p>The DSR was prepared under the original constraints for the Project. Option - 1 did not comply with those constraints. The Developer may consider other options as permitted in the RFDP. See also response to Question No. 36.</p>

IH 635 Managed Lane Project

Question Number	Provision Text	Question	Response
Topic Provision Section 51 Toll Collection System		The RFQ indicates that Toll collection system requirements will be set forth in the RFDP. However, are there, at the present time, any requirements not yet included in the released procurement documentation, but already preferred by TxDOT?	No.