

[Back to Home](#)

2010-04 Cumberland Gap Tunnel

1/4/10

QUESTION #1: As mentioned during the Pre-proposal conference, the KYTC may allow additional pages in the submittal for Innovative Approaches for Engaging DBE Firms. Can the KYTC please clarify how many additional pages for this portion will be allowed as well as whether any additional pages will be allowed for the Organizational Chart?

RESPONSE:

2 pages are required for Page 3 (A-B) Project Team Organizational Chart

Include an organizational chart illustrating the project manager and all other project team members for this project. One paragraph of verbiage may also be included to further define the roles and interaction of the project team members. This should include relationships and lines of responsibility with sub-consultants as well.

8 pages are required for Page 7(A-H) Project Approach. DBE participation should addressed on Page 8.

Provide a narrative that describes what your project team sees as the major challenges for this project and propose solutions when appropriate. Describe how your firm or project team is the best qualified to perform the services required for this project for the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. At a **minimum** include discussion of your project team's intended approach to the problem, ability to meet the project schedule with current workload, project staffing, familiarity of project, and knowledge of Cabinet Procedures.

2 pages are required for Innovative Approach to DBE participation Page 8 (A-B)

This narrative should also include the qualification, expertise and role of significant sub-consultants and involvement of any special requirements (i.e. DBE firms). DBE certifications should also be included with the proposal and will not count as additional pages.

QUESTION #2: The Evaluation Criteria included with the RFQ package (p. 27) appears to include criteria based on information that was submitted with the original RFQ response (e.g., Corporate Experience and Related Projects, Proposed Project Staff, Technical Expertise and Capacity). Can the KYTC please clarify which of the Evaluation Criteria will be based on the original RFQ response and which criteria will be based on the subsequent 5-page submittal,

particularly since no duplication of information is allowed?

RESPONSE: The Evaluation Criteria may be scored using information from original RFQ response and the additional RFP information being submitted. Each Evaluation Criteria is not limited to one section of the response. Selection committee members may consider information submitted in any part of the RFQ or additional RFP for any of the Evaluation Criteria. All 6 of the stated Evaluation Criteria included with the RFQ package (p. 27) will be considered for the final selection.

If any significant changes have occurred from information submitted in the RFQ, these changes should be addressed in the Page 7 (A-H) section of the additional RFP submittal. No additional pages will be permitted to address any changes. Firms are not to re-submit any information previously submitted in the RFQ portion.

12/23/09

The following documents are available regarding the December 17th Pre-Proposal Meeting. Please note the change in date for submittal of information to January 13, 2010.

1. [Pre-Proposal Meeting Minutes_12-09.PDF](#)
2. [Pre-Proposal Meeting Written Questions.pdf](#)
3. [Asset Inventory List.pdf](#)
4. [Spare Parts A.pdf](#)
5. [Spare Parts B.pdf](#)
6. [Spare Parts C.pdf](#)
7. [PB Staffing Study.pdf](#)

12/23/09

QUESTION: We are a Performance Based Maintenance contractor proposing on the contract for the Cumberland Gap Tunnel. We understand that your office recently did an audit on that facility. We would like to make sure that we are addressing everything that needs to be addressed in our response to the proposal. That is the reason for our request. Thank you in advance for any help that you can give us.

RESPONSE: The Internal Audit has been posted at: [http://transportation.ky.gov/properform/Bull 2010-04/09023SPE Final Audit Report - Cumberland Gap Tunnel - 05-14-09.pdf](http://transportation.ky.gov/properform/Bull%202010-04/09023SPE%20Final%20Audit%20Report%20-%20Cumberland%20Gap%20Tunnel%20-%2005-14-09.pdf)

10/21/09

QUESTION: May we have a copy of the exiting vendor's contract for the management of the Cumberland Gap Tunnel.

RESPONSE: A copy of the contract with Tunnel Management Inc. has been posted on the web at: <http://transportation.ky.gov/progperform/Bull 2010-04/CGT MO.pdf>

10/21/09

CLAIRFICATION: The RFQ was re-posted on 10-21-09 to reflect the following comments, which KYTC confirms and agrees with:

- 1) There are conflicting dates for submission of the RFQ on page 1.
- 2) On page 8 - **Facility Overview and Operation** - It states "The CGT was constructed using Federal-aid funds." Actually the funding was from Federal Lands. Further in this paragraph it states "the states of Kentucky and Tennessee agreed to build, operate ..." The tunnel was actually built by the Federal Highway Administration Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division.
- 3) On page 12 - **Intrusion Detection System** - This system was not included in the original construction and does not exist.
- 4) On page 12 - **Fire Protection System** - It states that the portal buildings are equipped with standpipes. Actually there are two 30,000 gallon cisterns located in the TN portal building. Note on page 9, Facility Overview and Operation, the last paragraph properly states the above.
- 5) On page 13 - **Traffic Surveillance Control System** - This states that the TSCS is interfaced with the SCADA. There is a new TSCS "Vanguard" system that is not interfaced with the SCADA.
- 6) On page 14 - **Emergency Response Responsibilities** - Under item 1 the last sentence prevents ER equipment and personnel from leaving the tunnel facility. A verbal agreement between the Lead State and the Park Service currently allows CGT personnel and equipment to aid the National Park in responding to fires and haz-mat spills within the park.
- 7) In that same section item 2 i - This item requires EMT certification in both KY and TN. Currently the EMT1s are trained and licensed in Kentucky by the National Register examination and respond within the park under the December 2005 General Agreement between the Lead State and the National Park.
- 8) On page 16 - **Reports** - The last sentence in item 3 states a weekly meeting is held. It is

currently held biweekly.

10/23/09

QUESTION: Could you post the proposal under which the project was previously bid?

RESPONSE: A Request for Bid that was put-out by the Division of Construction Procurement in the year 2000 for the Management and Operations of the Cumberland Gap Tunnel. The Bid Letting date was April 28, 2000. A copy has been posted on the web at: [http://transportation.ky.gov/progperform/Bull 2010-04/CGT RFB 2000.pdf](http://transportation.ky.gov/progperform/Bull%202010-04/CGT%20RFB%202000.pdf)

10/30/09

QUESTION: 1) Please verify that only 6 copies of the response are needed.

RESPONSE: One (1) original and six (6) copies will be required. This will include six (6) copies for the Selection Committee and one (1) original for the Division of Professional Services.

QUESTION: 2) Please clarify what the page count restrictions are for each section and/or the entire response. It's unclear since some of the information is no longer required (ex. Page 3, 6, and 7 information)

RESPONSE: There is currently no Prequalification for this type activity. Therefore in the initial Filing of Qualifications, a maximum of ten (10) pages will be allowed for Page 4(A-J): Relative Experience of Key Project Team Members for Resumes, and a maximum of twenty (20) pages will be allowed for Page 6(A-T): Relative Experience of Proposed Team wherein Firms provide information only for Projects of the same or similar nature as the Tunnel Activity, and/or that would have direct applicability to this type of Activity. The Selection Committee reserves the right to ask for additional information that may be necessary to determine a Firm's qualifications. All other limitations will be per Instructions for Response to Announcement: http://transportation.ky.gov/progperform/instructions_for_response_to_kentucky_transportation_cabinet_6-9-09.pdf will apply.

[2010-04 Madison / KY 627 / 7-8403.00](#)

10/16/09

QUESTION: Procurement Bulletin 10-04 for the Madison County project on KY 627 indicates that there are two available studies; US 27 Connector Scoping Study and the plans for the Simpson Ln/Colonel Rd relocation. However, it appears the links to the documents were not established in the Bulletin. Can both of those documents be made available?

RESPONSE: The link to the US 27 Connector Scoping Study has been added to the advertisement. [US 27 to I-75 Corridor Scoping Study](#)

The Simpson Lane/Colonel Road project plans are in draft form and not available for review at this time. Plans will be made available to the selected consultant.

10/19/09

QUESTION: In the current bulletin, the fee for the Madison/KY 627 interchange (Item 7-8403.00) shows \$1 million for Phase I and Environmental and \$500k for Phase II. But there are no environmental areas listed for pre-qualification and the bulletin says the environmental will be by the Department.

Please clarify if the consultant fee for Phase I is expected to be \$1 million, and if this is with or without the environmental services.

RESPONSE: The Department will provide any necessary Environmental Services. The advertisement was in error in showing Environmental next to the approximate fee. A correct version has been posted.

The entire \$1,000,000 approximate fee is for Phase I Preliminary Engineering. The \$1,000,000 does not include the associated costs for Environmental Services that will be provided by the department.

10/21/09

QUESTION: Given the complexity of this project and the range of impacts and other considerations that could be addressed in the project approach, would the Cabinet consider additional pages for the project approach to ensure that ample space is provided for addressing the multiple issues and considerations associated with this project.

RESPONSE: KYTC will allow 2 additional pages in the Page 7 Project Approach for a total of 5 pages (A-E) for the Madison KY 627 7-8403.00 response to announcement.

10/30/09

QUESTION: The Bulletin mentions under Available Studies that there are design plans for the relocation of Colonel Road and Simpson Lane east of the KY 627 / I-75 interchange. A) What is the distance from the existing intersection to the relocated intersection of these roads? B) What is the timing of the construction of the relocation of these roads (leading this project or incorporated into this project)?

RESPONSE: A) Based on Preliminary Design, the distance from the existing intersection to the relocated intersection is approximately 800' East.

B) KYTC has anticipated a Spring 2012 Letting for the Frontage Road Project if solid funding becomes available. No decision has been made on the Letting of the Frontage Roads. This issue will be discussed with the Selected Consultant as the Interchange plans are developed and issues with the Frontage Roads Utility Relocations are resolved.

Additionally, the Final Plans date of March 1, 2011 shown in the advertisement should be March 1, 2012. The advertisement has been updated to reflect this correction.

[Wolfe County / KY 91 / 10-8102.00](#)

10/21/09

QUESTION: I would like to make sure that environmental services are not required for this project. Under the “Special Instructions” it says that “The initial contract agreement will be for Phase I Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services only. This is contradicted by the lack of a prequalification requirement and the Environmental section.

RESPONSE: The Department will provided any necessary Environmental Services for the Wolfe Co. KY 91 10-8102.00 project. There was a typographical error in the Special Instructions of the advertisement.

QUESTION: 2010-04 Bulletin has projects in Mason County, KY 1448 Maple Leaf Road and Wolfe County, KY 191 that states Spans < 500 feet and Culvert design is required. I have been to both of these locations and can find no need for structures or culverts under 500 feet needed for either project. I did find the possible need to use tied back walls but those can be designed by geotechnical engineering staff which we have in house.

RESPONSE: If the need for a Structure of any type (Bridge, Culvert or Retaining Wall) for either project arise during the Phase I Preliminary Engineering the Selected consultant team may be asked to provide Structure Design services.

Any necessary Geotechnical Services will be provided by the Department for both projects.

Mason County / KY 1448 / 9-8303.00

QUESTION: 2010-04 Bulletin has projects in Mason County, KY 1448 Maple Leaf Road and Wolfe County, KY 191 that states Spans < 500 feet and Culvert design is required. I have been to both of these locations and can find no need for structures or culverts under 500 feet needed for either project. I did find the possible need to use tied back walls but those can be designed by geotechnical engineering staff which we have in house.

RESPONSE: If the need for a Structure of any type (Bridge, Culvert or Retaining Wall) for either project arise during the Phase I Preliminary Engineering the Selected consultant team may be asked to provide Structure Design services.

Any necessary Geotechnical Services will be provided by the Department for both projects.

2010-04 Perry / CR 1229 / 10-8502.00

10/16/09

QUESTION: The text of the procurement bulletin under geotechnical calls for the selected consultant to provide geotechnical services, but the prequalification requirements don't call for geotechnical prequalification. Just wanted to check on which is correct.

RESPONSE: The Department will provide any necessary Geotechnical Services. The advertisement was in error and a correct version has been posted.

2010-04 Statewide Ohio River Bridge Inspections

10/16/09

QUESTION: For the Statewide Ohio River Bridge Inspection, prequalification in Structure Design – Spans greater than 500 feet was identified. Is this correct? This prequalification has never been required on an inspection contract that did not explicitly include long span rehabilitation plans in the past.

RESPONSE: With several fracture critical inspections over the past few years, issues have been discovered with some bridges that require an immediate repair. In the past KYTC personnel have been able to prepare these plans. KYTC would like to have the ability to contract for repair plans under the same contract as the inspection is performed.

The requirement for Prequalification in Structure Design of Span over 500 feet is for the repair plans portion of the project only. Consultants responding to the advertisement may propose a sub-consultant team member to meet this prequalification requirement. Repair plans will not be a part of the original agreement but, if necessary, may be added by contract modification.

**The above Q & A section is dealing with the 2010-04 Project Listing
(Former name Bulletins)**