

Part 2 – Technical Requirements – Request for Detailed Proposal (RFDP) – December 31, 2008. Clarifications to Offerors

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ROUTE 460 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS		CODES: A. ACCEPT COMMENT—WILL BE CORRECTED, ADDED, OR CLARIFIED. B. DESIGNER WILL EVALUATE. C. REJECT COMMENT. D. DEPARTMENT TO EVALUATE.			
UPC: 84272		Remarks by Offerors: Clarifications by VDOT			
DESCRIPTION: ROUTE 460 REQUEST FOR DETAILED PROPOSAL PART 2, TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS		REVIEW PHASE & TYPE: DRAFT, REV. 0		DATE: February 9, 2009	
Ref #	Provide Reference Section # and Description	Remark(s)	Originator	Code	Response
1	Section 1.2.1 General Requirements, Page 2	The requirements are unnecessary.		C	Response: The General Requirements section shall remain in the RFDP. Proposed Addendum: None
2	Section 1.2.3.2 Workers of the Concessionaire and Contractors, Page 3	Please provide more specific criteria to describe instances when the Department would direct the Concessionaire to remove an employee.		C	Response: This requirement is based upon a Division 1 VDOT Specification. No additional criteria or descriptions shall be provided. Proposed Addendum: None
3	Section 1.2.5.2 Submittals, Page 4	Requiring all correspondence between the listed parties is unnecessary oversight if it includes email communication.		A	Response: The requirement includes email correspondence to the listed entities Proposed Addendum: The Concessionaire shall issue to the Department and other appropriate parties, or make available through EDMS, hard copies and electronic copies of all correspondence, meeting minutes, and other external documents (including emails) reflecting or constituting any and all communications with:

4	1.2.5.12 – Submittals	Technical Requirements seem to indicate a traditional handling of submittals, i.e. submit package, wait three weeks for comments, revise, resubmit, and wait three weeks for approval. Would VDOT consider some co-location at the project site of designers and reviewers to expedite the review process through an “over the shoulder” process in which the reviewers would meet at least weekly with designers to pre-review work in progress?		A	<p>Response: The Department will work closely with the Concessionaire to facilitate submittal reviews. Those reviews will be additionally facilitated by the Concessionaire providing a certification that the submittal was prepared by professionals having the requisite qualifications, skills, and experiences and that the documents accurately depicts the Work to be undertake or performed; has reviewed the submittal for completeness and confirms the documents were prepared in accordance to, and otherwise complies with the Agreement, Technical Requirements, Applicable law and QMSP.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: Modify section 1.2.5 of the Technical Requirements to require a certification by the Concessionaire for each submittal provided to the Department.</p>
5	1.2.5.14 Submittals, VDOT review, Page 4 The Department shall provide its initial response within 21 days (which response shall not be binding on the Department), as well as an estimate for the time required to complete its review of the submittal. The Concessionaire and the Department shall coordinate their submittal and review schedules for such submittals, and any additional time required by the Department shall not be a basis of a Claim by the Concessionaire under the Agreement.	The RFP requires very detailed and updated programming of design submissions to VDOT, yet it does not specify any review time for a binding response from VDOT. In order for the Concessionaire to plan and commit to a project delivery schedule, it is essential that VDOT’s review time is clearly specified in the RFP and is binding in all circumstances.		C	<p>Response: RFDP Part 3 Sections 8.05 (c) and 10.05 address submittal review times and binding nature of responses</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
6	Section 1.4.1.2(e), page 16	Typo – “sates”		A	<p>Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 1.4.1.2 (e) ...dates...</p>
7	Section 1.4.4.1 Revisions to the Baseline Schedule, Page 20	Increase number of days to make a revision from seven days to ten days.		C	<p>Response: The Requirements of the Section will remain unchanged.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>

8	1.4.4.1 – Revisions to the Baseline Schedule	The CPM schedule for a project is one of the contractor's best tools for controlling risk on a project. It appears that VDOT desires to have control of the project schedule in which they can request "specific revisions in either logic, activity durations, WBS, manpower or cost" which the Concessionaire is required to make within 7 days with no further reference to "an item of non-conformance from the Department". Won't this result in a Contractor's Schedule and a VDOT Schedule for the project?		A	<p>Response: The Schedule is the Concessionaires. The Department shall retain the right to approve the Baseline Schedule and all updates to the schedule that involve Delays, Department Changes, Project Recovery Schedules or other events that have a material impact to the schedule.</p> <p>Additionally, the Department shall amend the Section 1.4.3.3 of the Technical Requirements that requires Department approval of the Monthly Progress Report. The Department will retain the right to review and comment on document inaccuracies that will require Concessionaire updating.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: Modify section 1.4 of the Technical Requirements as noted above.</p>
9	1.6.2.12 – Project Right of Way Part 3 – Section 8.08 – Acquisition of Project Right of Way and Utility Relocations	If the timely acquisition of the Project Right of Way is solely the Concessionaire's responsibility and expense, the requirement for VDOT to review and approve any Concessionaire proposed settlement above the most recent approved appraisal value will potentially slow the acquisition process. Would VDOT be willing to waive the last sentence of Part 2 – Section 1.6.2.12 to expedite Right of Way acquisition?		C	<p>Response: No, the Department is required to approve appraisals and settlements above the most recently approved appraisals.</p> <p>See response to Part 3, Section 8.08</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
10	Section 1.6.2.17, Page 26	Prefer that VDOT be responsible for all contacts with landowners.		C	<p>Response: The Concessionaire shall perform all contacts with landowners as provided in this Section.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
11	Section 1.13.2.3(h), Page 41	"Tolls" seems to be wrong word.		A	<p>Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 1.13.2.3 (h) -tools....</p>

12	3.2.2 Water Quality Permits, Page 50 The Concessionaire may, with the approval of the applicable Governmental Authority, consider payment of a fee or purchase of a wetland banking credit in lieu of the construction of compensation specific to the Project.	Could the proponents be provided a schedule of fees or banking credits applicable to the matter in question?		C	<p>Response: Proponents are able to obtain per credit cost information by contacting private wetland banks.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
13	3.2.3 – Hazardous Substances Part 3 – Section 16.01(f) – Management of Hazardous Substances	The Concessionaire cannot be the Generator of existing Hazardous Substances; will not accept Hazardous Material Risk.		C	<p>Response: The Offerors should review the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) definition of generator, co-generator, and review their position regarding generator status.</p> <p>Please also see response to Part 3, Section 16.01 (f)</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
14	3.2.4 Historic Properties, Page 52 The Concessionaire shall be responsible for completion of technical studies identified in the Programmatic Agreement (PA)	According to the RDFP and FEIS there are a number of properties lacking investigation due to denial of access from the owners. This poses a risk for the Concessionaire which is not possible to evaluate based on a PA. We request that either VDOT conduct the required studies and provide them to proposers or that a specific allowance is introduced in the concession contract to cover the costs of assessment and possible treatment of archeological sites in these properties.		C	<p>Response: VDOT will not perform additional study of the Project other than already performed and provided as a Project Reference. Based upon that information, the Offeror can develop estimates for the remaining cultural resource work, including costs for potential site evaluations and treatment of eligible properties.</p> <p>As provided in Part 3, Section 14.01 (k) (iii), this may qualify for Allocable Costs.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
15	3.2.9 Noise Mitigation, Page 55 The Concessionaire shall present all feasible and reasonable sound barriers as “barriers under consideration” on design plans at the design public hearing.	Reliance on public input for the public of a capital cost item may pose to the proposer greater uncertainty than desired. Will the locations be bound to the estimate included in the FEIS? We request clear warrants for design and estimating purposes.		C	<p>Response: The ROD does not specify which barriers are to be built only that noise mitigation is constructed where warranted, feasible and reasonable. VDOT will provide the Offeror’s with traffic data used in the initial noise analysis. The Offeror’s is responsible for updating traffic data as necessary for the final design noise analysis</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>

16	Section 3.2.9.2, Barriers, Page 56	Request all these requirements are changed to “construct noise walls where required by the ROD.” Otherwise please provide the traffic data indicated sufficiently in advance of the proposal submission, so that the Offerors can evaluate and incorporate this presently uncertain capital cost into its proposal.		C	<p>Response: The ROD does not specify which barriers are to be built only that noise mitigation is constructed where warranted, feasible and reasonable. VDOT will provide the Offeror’s with traffic data used in the initial noise analysis. The Offeror’s is responsible for updating traffic data as necessary for the final design noise analysis</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
17	3.4.2.4 Minimum Pavement Requirements, Page 64 Any pavement reconstruction on arterials or local streets or other roadways adjacent to and crossing the Project that are affected by the construction activities of the Project shall match the existing pavement type and section, unless otherwise required by the Department and AASHTO design guides	Please provide these data in the data room.		C	<p>Response: Detailed existing pavement information for crossroads and related roadways is unavailable. The Concessionaire shall be responsible for determining the existing pavement information needed for developing its design. Reconstructed pavement shall be of the same type as the existing pavement and designed according to the pavement design standards referenced in RFDP Part 2 Attachment 1.5a</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
18	3.4.3.1 Geotechnical requirements, Page 65 The concessionaire shall submit to the Department for its review construction recommendations to address soil-structure interaction to accommodate the unique construction methods applied to this Project	We request clarification of the meaning of Unique construction methods applied to this project. Does it entail intellectual property/ proprietary methods? Or is this related to the nature of the project itself or uniqueness thereof as it relates to the current local construction practice?		C	<p>Response: “Unique construction methods” are those construction methods to be utilized by the Concessionaire that are specific to a particular site condition that differs from VDOT Standards and Specifications (Attachment 1.5a) and from current local construction practice.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
19	3.4.3.3 Geotechnical requirements, Page 66 The Concessionaire shall design foundations (bridges, retaining a) Total settlement to be the lesser of one inch over the life of the structure,	<p>We request that this design decision be left to the engineer of record based on final detailed design and sound engineering judgment.</p> <p>Project reference materials for I-295 & Rte 58 termini requested as above</p>			<p>Response: The Offeror shall develop its Detailed Proposal consistent with the geotechnical requirements as defined in the Technical Requirements. Additionally, the Project data room contains a link to information related to the I-295 and Route 58 Termini.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>

20	Section 3.4.3.5, page 67-68 Where applicable, the Concessionaire shall incorporate reliability assessments in conjunction with standard analysis methods. An acceptable method for evaluation of reliability is given by Duncan, J.M. (April 2000) Factors of Safety and Reliability in Geotechnical Engineering, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, Discussions and Closure August 2001.	Adequate performance of the project can be achieved without the need to use reliability analysis, which is not a commonly established method and practice in civil engineering. We request to change “where applicable” to “where considered appropriate by the concessionaire”, or to remove this requirement since VDOT and other applicable standards and good industry practice are established by the contract.		C	<p>Response: Reliability assessments shall be incorporated as stated in this section of the RFDP.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
21	3.4.4.1 Rights of use of material found on Project, Page 68 The Concessionaire shall replace with other acceptable material the excavation material removed and used that is needed for use in embankments, backfills, approaches, or otherwise	It is clear that the department will not allow excavation that is not within the grading limits. Therefore, we request clarification as to the intent of the requirement to replace with other acceptable material whatever material is removed for use in embankments, backfills, etc. Should we interpret it as though earthwork balancing is to come from borrow sources? Please clarify.		C	<p>Response: This refers to materials obtained from over excavated areas within the grading limits that will be required to be restored back to design grade by the Concessionaire using appropriate material for its design.</p> <p>Proposed addendum: None</p>
22	Section 3.5.1.2.1 Flood Frequency Criteria, page 71	Should design storm be 100 years for minor crossings?		C	<p>Response: No, the design storm for minor crossing is 50 yr. and should be no higher than 18” below the shoulder break. The check storm is 100 yr. and to the shoulder break. In the event of a 100 year storm, there should be no water on the pavement. The criteria as provided in the RFDP are correct and represent the minimum requirements for the Project.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
23	3.5.3.2 Hydrologic and Hydraulic (H&H) Analysis and Scour Analysis, Page 72 The scour analysis shall be performed in accordance with accepted design and analysis procedures outlined in FHWA publications HEC-18, HEC-20, and HEC-23.	We request to add “or other equivalent methods suitable for scour analysis in cohesive soils.”		C	<p>Response: The listed publications contain all the methods that are recognized by the FHWA and thus no other equivalent methods would be allowed.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>

24	3.6.1 Mainline Roadway Design Criteria, Page 75 c)The Project mainline shall be designed to facilitate expansion to the Ultimate Configuration	Use of the general word “facilitate” in a contractual setting can lead to problems of interpretation and contractual discussions. We request that the word “facilitate” is substituted by “allow”.		A	<p>Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 3.6.1 crevise from facilitate to “allow”....</p>
25	Section 3.6.3(g) Western Terminus, page 77 Perform an operational analysis to determine traffic impacts on the existing route 460/I-295\ interchange	Please define the type of operational analysis: deterministic/stochastic/macroscopic/microscopic simulation as well as the minimum performance variables and criteria.		C	<p>Response: The Requirements for Operational Analysis are provided in RFDP Part 2, Section 3.6.4 and should provided sufficient information related to these requirements.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
26	3.6.5 – Intermediate Interchanges	Requirement: “Whether or not provided, all intermediate interchanges must be designed and ROW acquired.” To what level of design completion must the intermediate interchanges be designed?		A	<p>Response: Intermediate interchanges shall be designed to conform to the department’s Right of Way Stage of plan development per the Department Standards and Specifications as provided in Part 2 Attachment 1.5a.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum:</p> <p>3.6.5.2 (i) The Concessionaire at a minimum shall prepare for the Department’s approval a design of each intermediate interchange conforming to the department’s Right of Way Stage of plan development showing Project Right of Way for, at a minimum, a diamond interchange configuration.</p>
27	3.6.6.1 – Secondary and Private Road Requirements	<p>Reference: Table A.1 - Comparison of Base Case and Core Requirements (Part 1, p. A-5).</p> <p>Question: Table A.1 indicates that NO intermediate interchanges are required as part of the Core Requirements. Part 2, Section 3.6.6.1 indicates that preliminary crossroad requirements are provided in the Preliminary Reference Design. What crossroads are required to be grade separated with Route 460 to meet Core Requirements?</p>		A	<p>Response: All existing crossings at interchange locations shall be grade-separated, which facilitates the project goal of constructing a facility capable of emergency evacuation.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: Add note to Table A.1 “As part of the Core Requirements, if the Offeror elects not to construct an intermediate interchange, a grade-separated structure shall be required to maintain connectivity of the existing transportation network.”</p>

28	3.6.6.1 Secondary and Private Road Requirements, Page 81 The Department has identified preliminary crossroad requirements as provided in its Preliminary Reference Design and other Project Reference Documents.	Please provide crossroad requirements including functional classification, cross section elements, clear zone, provisions for turn lanes, etc. No requirements concerning Crossroads have been provided.		A	<p>Response: Crossroad requirements shall be developed by the Offeror as part of its project design. Current functional classifications of crossroads will be provided as available as a Project Reference in the Project Data Room.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
29	Section 3.6.6.3 Secondary and Private Road Conflicts, page 81 In the event the Project design causes a parcel or parcels to be land locked and without access to a public road, the Concessionaire shall either purchase the parcel or parcels or obtain the necessary right-of-way for and construct a service road providing the parcel or parcels with access.	We request VDOT's guidelines be made part of the Technical Requirements stating the extent and layout of frontage roads so that the proposer can analyze the possible landlocked properties and the capital or row cost associated with this. Otherwise, the Concessionaire bears the high risk of having a number of potential landlocked properties with some type of current special access arrangements that would then claim access to a public road they did not have before. There should also be criteria in the Technical Requirements determining the permeability of the US-460. i.e. how far can an affected user be forced to travel in parallel to the facility before there is a crossing. An additional concern that needs to be addressed is how changes in the existing parcel layout would be approached. Parcel owners frequently subdivide their parcels when the ROW acquisition process starts to gain leverage during the price negotiation.		C	<p>Response: VDOT will not provide the extent and design of frontage roads. The Offeror, within the context of its Project Design, is responsible for determining the extent and layout of frontage roads and ensuring that applicable property access requirements are met.</p> <p>VDOT will not provide specific criteria related to permeability of the Project other than what is included within the VDOT Design Manual or other applicable reference documents.</p> <p>The potential for property owners to subdivide property impacted by Right of Way acquisition can not be addressed by VDOT and is a Concessionaire risk.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
30	Section 3.7.1.10 Bridges and Structures General, Page 82 As part of the Concessionaire's design review requirements, the foundation recommendations shall be submitted to VDOT for review and approval prior to foundation construction.	<p>We request this review to be part of the normal Independent Engineer auditing of the project. Please change "to VDOT" to "to the independent engineer" Furthermore, clarification of the split in responsibilities between VDOT and IE would be beneficial.</p> <p>The use of the word "approval" seems to imply that VDOT will share responsibility for the final design of the foundations. This seems to contradict other clauses of the RFDP. Please clarify or revise "approval"</p>		A	<p>Response: Design review requirements are the responsibility of VDOT and not the Independent Engineer. The scope of work and responsibilities of the IE are contained in the IE Agreement.</p> <p>The Concessionaire has responsibility for the design of foundations. VDOT may provide comment and/or disapprove designs that are not consistent with requirements of the Agreement.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 3.7.1.10 last sentence....shall be submitted to the Department for review and <u>comment</u> prior to the submittal of....</p>

31	3.9.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation, Page 84	Will the Bicycle and Pedestrian plans extend beyond the proscribed limits of the project; New 460 mainline and connections to old 460? Is there any expectation that these plans/construction should extend beyond the defined roadway improvements; ie improvements to existing Rte 460?		A	<p>Response: The scope of bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on this Project is within its Right of Way limits. The Project design shall be coordinated with local and regional bicycle and pedestrian plans such that the Project and its crossroads are consistent with such plans.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 3.9.1.1 Second Paragraph – The bicycle and pedestrian plan shall be developed for implementation within the Project Right of Way and shall be consistent with the CTB’s Policy.....</p>
32	3.9.3.2 Capital Asset Facilities, Page 86 The overall design and construction shall comply with the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating	We request to clarify what ‘overall design LEED rating is being asked for, and for what type of facility...new, purchase or rent existing. office, maintenance, food/gas , etc		A	<p>Response: Capital Asset Facilities (non-highway) shall comply with Virginia Energy Conservation and Environment Standards, DEB Notice 120108. This is posted on the Project Data Room for Offeror reference. A specific LEED rating (gold, silver, etc) is not required for this project.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 3.9.3.2 The overall design and construction shall comply with Virginia Energy Conservation and Environmental Standards, DEB notice 120108 and all applicable building and fire codes.</p>
33	3.10 Context Sensitive Design, Landscape, Aesthetic Treatments, Page 88	Specific landscape requirements should be incorporated in the RFDP for the proposers to include in its capital cost. Alternatively VDOT may want to establish a contingency (allowance) for this purpose to be included by the proposers, given that this matter is subject to third party coordination during detailed design.		C	<p>Response: VDOT shall not provide specific landscaping requirements nor shall it establish a contingency fund for this purpose. The Offeror has the flexibility to provide for context sensitive design and landscaping within its Schematic Design based upon its ability to accommodate the results of third party coordination.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
34	Section 3.10.2.1 Aesthetic Treatments, page 88 Landscaping shall be designed to harmonize with the local environment as well as the developed themes of the local setting.	These requirements are undefined. Clear landscape requirements must be incorporated in the RFP for the proposer to include in its capital cost. Alternatively VDOT may establish a contingency for this purpose to be included by the Offerors.		C	<p>Response: VDOT shall not provide specific requirements for aesthetic treatments nor shall it establish a contingency fund for this purpose. The Offeror has the flexibility to provide for aesthetic treatments within its Schematic Design based upon its ability to accommodate the results of third party coordination.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>

35	Section 4.1 General Information, page 95 “Generally, the proposed ETTM plan...”	For clarity purposes, we kindly suggest that the terminology of the list of items in this section is made coherent with subsequent sections. In particular: - Variable and fixed message signs system. Subsequent sections do not mention fixed signs, please clarify. - Traffic counters at entrance/exit lanes. Is this item somehow related with section 4.14? Please clarify.	A	<p>Response: The following proposed addendum will clarify requirements.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: Generally, the proposed ETTM plan for the corridor should provide the following minimum Assets, and as further described in this section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ETTM Facilities • ETTM System and Equipment including an Open Road Tolling (ORT) toll system with optional separated credit card/cash payment facilities • Fiber-optic backbone and network nodes • Dynamic Message Signs • Traffic Management System • CCTV camera systems for surveillance • Automated Incident Detection • Traffic Monitoring Sensors including counters at entrance/exit lanes <p>Modify 4.2.3 as follows: “ETTM equipment shall be installed to facilitate electronic collection.....“</p> <p>Add “4.14.4 Traffic counters shall be installed on all facility entrance and exit lanes that provide, as a minimum, vehicle counts in 15 minute increments.”</p> <p>Perhaps add to 3.11: “of traffic generated by the Project. Signs shall include toll related signage necessary to inform customers of the tolled facility, provide information on the toll rates and direct vehicles to the appropriate payment lanes. The Concessionaire shall provide plans”</p>
36	Section 4.2.4, page 96	Which is the preferred model, if any, for the interoperability of US 460 with the IAG/ E-ZPass group? Is VDOT expecting for the Concessionaire to join the IAG as a full member or, on the contrary, is VDOT willing for the Concessionaire to process ETC transactions through its Customer Service Center?	D	<p>Response: The Concessionaire must comply with IAG requirements for membership and standards for interoperability.</p> <p>Either way, by executing the ETC agreement, the Concessionaire can process their ETC transactions through VDOT’s customer service center.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
37	Section 4.2.5 “A Violation Enforcement System...”, page 96	Will the Concessionaire be allowed to access the required information to process violations on its own in case we choose not to utilize VDOT’s Customer Service Center?	C	<p>Response: The Concessionaire will be allowed to enter into its own agreements with the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles and other state Department’s of Motor Vehicles to access information on their own.</p>

					Proposed Addendum: None
38	Section 4.2.6., page 96 “The Agreement provides the Concessionaire the option to enter into an Electronic Toll Collection Service Agreement and/or a Violation Processing Services Agreement with the Department for enforcement of toll collection and enforcement of penalties for toll violations.”	May the Concessionaire elect to become an independent member of the IAG group, handling its own accounts, issuing its own transponders and directly interfacing with the rest of CSCs of IAG for lists and transaction files exchange?		C	Response: The Concessionaire must comply with IAG requirements for membership, account servicing, interfacing with CSCs for file exchange, and issuance of transponders Proposed Addendum: None.
39	Section 4.2.7, page 96	What is the nature of the enforcement the police will be providing at the "enforcement areas"? Will the Concessionaire get any information beneficial for its operation from the enforcement provided by the police in such areas?		C	Response: The Concessionaire shall communicate with the Virginia State Police and develop and define the nature of required enforcement. Proposed Addendum: None.
40	Section 4.4.1(g), page 98	Can you please specify the “relevant requirements for enforcement evidence”?		A	Response: The following proposed addendum will clarify requirements. Proposed Addendum: Modify (g) as follows: The Security Plan shall be a document (or part of another document) prepared by the Concessionaire which sets out how the security of the ETTM System, including the sub systems, communication links, roadside equipment and ETTM Facility shall meet the relevant requirements identified in Section 5.5.7.2 and that data are held securely, are only accessible to authorized personnel, and are protected from tampering. Modify 5.5.7.2: Add to end of (a): “procedures. An audit trail shall be maintained that tracks changes by individual user with this audit trail subject to the same data integrity requirements as other system data;”

					Modify 5.5.7.2: Add item: “(d) Transaction and image data used for violation shall be securely encrypted on-site in digital form as close the source as possible to prevent tampering. Any additional data security requirements associated with ability to pursue toll payments and/or violations via video images that are prescribed by law at the time of writing of the security plan shall also be incorporated.”
41	Section 4.5.5, Page 98	We would like to understand in more detail which kind of information we need to exchange with VDOT per this clause.		C	<p>Response: The information to be exchanged is that required to process ETC transactions and will include: transmission of transaction data (e.g. date, sequence number, amount, tag information, vehicle class information), and receipt of tag status information (e.g. valid, invalid, low balance, lost/stolen, non-revenue) and possibly transaction posting status (e.g. posted, not posted, rejected.) If violations processing services are to be utilized, the information transmission will also include evidence packages which contain data such as images, transactions and equipment status information.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None.</p>
42	Section 4.9, page 100	The Concessionaire is required to provide real-time traffic information, it is not specified how this information has to be transmitted, web page, VMS Radio etc.		C	<p>Response: At such time as the Concessionaire is ready to develop this system/information, it should coordinate with VDOT to determine the current technology and systems requirements associated with this action</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
43	Section 4.17.6, page 104	The new communications conduit bank for the Project shall consist of 2 four-inch diameter PVC conduits. One shall be for use by the Concessionaire.” Can VDOT please remove the concessionaire’s maintenance responsibility for conduit they will not be allowed to use?		A	<p>Response: VDOT shall be responsible for maintaining the conduit dedicated for its use. The Concessionaire shall cooperate and coordinate with VDOT as needed for the maintenance of this conduit. Should the conduit need to be moved/relocated the cost of this move shall be assumed by the party initiating the movement.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: 4.17.6 - Add to end of this section... One conduit shall be for Department use. The Department shall be responsible for the maintenance of this</p>

					conduit and shall coordinate with the Concessionaire as needed during this maintenance. The Concessionaire shall cooperate with the Department in the Department's maintenance activities. The Department shall not be responsible for any impacts to the Concessionaire's conduit or functions.
44	Section 4.19, page 105	As part of the ETTM, the Project Traffic Management System (TMS) shall interface to the Department's Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS). Can we get the system details for the ATMS?		C	<p>Response: At such time as the Concessionaire is ready to develop this system/information, it should coordinate with VDOT to determine the current technology and systems requirements associated with this action.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>
45	Attachment 5.6, Performance baseline tables, Structures. Page 18-19 Asset condition criteria for bridge deck which shall conform to localized roughness criteria for pavement	Does this requirement exclude approach slabs and joints? Is the straight edge method not acceptable?		A	<p>Response: These requirement/criteria include approach slabs and joints. The straight edge method is acceptable. These criteria tie construction methods and foundation design (settlement) together.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: Attachment 5.6, Page 18, under Bridge Asset Group – Deck Add - (includes Approach Slabs and Joints)</p>
46	Attachment 5.6 To the Technical Requirements Performance Requirements Baseline Tables. "Traffic Management System Incident information transfer time to VDOT., page 22	Incident information is to be transferred to the VDOT within 5 minutes of detection. What is the nature of this transfer?		C	<p>Response: At such time as the Concessionaire is ready to develop this system/information, it should coordinate with VDOT to determine the current technology and transmission requirements associated with this action.</p> <p>Proposed Addendum: None</p>