

RFP 22-09 Q&A Session

I-25/San Antonio Interchange Phase A/B Study
State CN: 1102060

The New Mexico Department of Transportation held a Question-and-Answer Sessions for: **RFP 22-09: I-25/San Antonio Interchange Phase A/B Study CN: 1102060 per the request of a multiple consulting firms.** The questions and answers are summarized and published on the New Mexico Department of Transportation website. This documentation will become a part of the Departments procurement file.

A full description of procedures for the Q&A session can be found in the NMDOT Consultant Services Handbook.

[https://www.dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Procurement/Consultant Handbook 2021.pdf](https://www.dot.state.nm.us/content/dam/nmdot/Procurement/Consultant_Handbook_2021.pdf)

Answers that were provided in the session are subject to change due to the final scope of work had not been finalized during the Q&A session. The final scope of work will be advertised with the RFP on September 3, 2021.

Technical Description of Project:

The 1102060 project area consists of the I-25/US-380 San Antonio interchange. The project lies on I-25 from MP 139 to 140 and on US 380 from MP 0 to 0.5.

I-25 is a divided four-lane facility through the project area. There are five bridges (BR# 6454, 6455, 6457, 6456 and 3168) in the area that may be impacted by the interchange improvements. Walnut Creek passes through BR# 3168, 6457 and 6456. US-380 is a two-lane minor arterial roadway that serves San Antonio as well as traffic traveling to and from eastern New Mexico beginning with Carrizozo. Existing interchange and improvement alternatives are to be analyzed in accordance with the latest NMDOT Location Study Procedures.

The Study (Phase A/B) will determine the preferred alternative for the I-25/US 380 interchange.

Questions:

1. What is the big driver (purpose and need) for the project?

The big driver is safety. Entrance ramp configuration.

2. What are the issues in the project? (Safety, geometry, drainage, structures, access control?)

**Michelle Lujan
Grisham**
Governor

Michael R. Sandoval
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Jennifer Sandoval
Commissioner, Vice-Chairman
District 1

Bruce Ellis
Commissioner
District 2

Hilma E. Chynoweth
Commissioner
District 3

Walter G. Adams
Commissioner, Chairman
District 4

Thomas C. Taylor
Commissioner
District 5

Charles Lundstrom
Commissioner, Secretary
District 6

Yes, safety current geometry. Drainage needs to be looked at closely with any interchange modification.

3. What are the limits of this project? Why were these limits chosen?

Approximate, may be extended depends on the alternative. Not set limit.

4. What challenges/issues do you expect in the development in this Phase A/B project?

Geometric improvement alternatives to address interchange deficiencies and drainage.

5. How do you see development of this project in the future phases? Do you expect this contract will extend into Phase I-C, I-D, and II?

At this time it is only phase A/B. May be an amendment in the future to add additional phases. Language will be in the RFP to add additional phases by future amendment or RFP.

6. Funding, where is it on the priority list for NMDOT?

No construction funding has been identified. Not a time frame either.

7. What are key project drivers for the Department?

- a. Alignment and profile
Ramp geometry and alignment
- b. Pavement conditions
Has not been identified. In good condition.
- c. Safety/Access/traffic issues
Safety because of the entrance ramp geometry.
- d. Structures or Drainage
Bridge structures are old, can be replaced if necessary. If improvements deem ok. Drainage is a key component. Flooding in San Antonio a few years ago.

8. What is the source/funding for the project?

There has not been any construction funding identified. The type of improvements need to be determined before funding is identified.

9. What are the study limits anticipated to be?

Mile posts in the description above, which includes the whole interchange. Portion of US 380 as needed, ramp extend further if needed. Be mindful about drainage. Drainage may extend further than portion on 380.

10. Will a Bridge-Type Study be part of the scope of work?

No, that will be in Phase ID.

11. Is it anticipated to add a west leg at the interchange?

The district is open to a full interchange reconfiguration. Any interchange geometric improvements should be included in the alternatives.

12. What is the level of effort that is anticipating. Will this be a full Phase A/B/C study with multiple alternatives?

Yes, study locations procedures. Full A/B.

Not environmental at this time.

13. Schedule, do you anticipate this being a high priority?

The district point of view is to get this done in one project, instead of phasing. Not an emergency at this time.

14. IACR, will that be a part of A/B or preliminary design.

Preliminary design

15. RFP schedule State funded. Can it be federally funded?

This RFP is state funded, but federal guidelines should be followed because the interchange is on the NHS and construction will likely be federally funded.

16. What is driving the need for this project? Is it infrastructure condition, safety, traffic, or some other need?

Safety, specifically entrance ramp configuration. Poor sight distance, not acceleration lanes, short merging distance. Bridges are old and would consider replacement.

17. If there is a better configuration will be open to consider it.

Yes, a new interchange configuration may be an alternative.

18. Do you have crash data for it or is the experience is that you are having issues on this bridge?

There have been crashes where the entrance ramps merge onto I-25. NMDOT can provide available crash data.

19. What major challenges for the project has the NMDOT identified?

Major challenges include addressing entrance ramp configuration, inadequate sight distance, short merging distance and lack of acceleration lanes. Drainage is another concern that needs to be addressed as storm water runoff drained down US-380 into San Antonio a few years ago.

20. What is the scope of work anticipated for this project? Will it be limited to a Phase A/B study or will it include environmental and preliminary design? If the later, will Phase II services be allowed by amendment?

Scope is limited to phase A/B only. Other phases may be through an amendment.

21. When phases are just A/B many times the cultural influences are included in phase B. You may want to include in the scope the limit of environmental effort.

Will add more detail regarding the environmental expectations in the scope of work.

22. Has any funding been programmed for the project? If so, for what, and what year?

Construction funding has not been programmed. We need the study to determine the type of interchange improvements necessary before programming funding.

23. Will you seek federal or state funding?

The type of funding is unknown at this time.

24. From a need's standpoint, is the push from the community, is this a political project, or is this defined from just NMDOT.

This project is defined from just the NMDOT as a safety concern with the entrance ramps.

25. Will the the change in access and federal process start once we have environmental? Are you going to mention it?

The Phase A/B study will not include the IACR. The IACR will be completed parallel with the environmental phase C.

26. From a schedule standpoint is there a timeframe?

This is not a rush project. At this time there is no set schedule. Please include a schedule to complete the Phase A/B study in your proposal.

27. Is this a Remedial (Low Budget- right now fix) or a Future 25-40 year Improvements?

District is looking at a future year. Future Project to fully address interchange deficiencies. Construction funding has not been fully identified.

28. Depending upon the answer to Q1, we can go into two routes of questions below.

Remedial Improvements

What are the issues that you want to fix?

a) On-ramp taper is not to standard so...

i. Would you allow for changing the curvature (reduce the approach design speed) and bring the ramp in further back?

Yes, the study should consider all ramps, realignments,, widening bridges as well as other deficiencies.

ii. Would you allow for widening the bridge over the wash/creek?

Yes, widening the bridge over the wash/creek may be considered if it addresses deficiencies.

b) Any other improvements? Drainage, pavement, sight distance, accidents, or maintenance issues that we need to look at?

All of the above and also other issues beyond that. Also look into acceleration lanes, drainage issues and anything else you may find in your research.

29. Would you guys be open to realignment because it's on that curve, it's a really odd thing at an interchange so would you be open to realignment?

Yes, realigning curvature and close the gap in between bridges.

Future 25-40 Improvements

If there is a developer going in or if NMDOT wants a Future look at this interchange:

- a) Does NMDOT have Traffic Accident reports?

Yes, NMDOT can provide the available crash data.

Q: We had a Q & A Session on US/60 and crash data was going to be provided, do we need to ask you for it or do we need to request it through IPRA? During the Q & A session it was indicated that it would be provided but we never received it and we don't know where to get it so we went ahead and requested it for us.

A: So you can request it through IPRA but typically it will not be provided until the information is advertised on our website. Christina will double check to see if it was posted.

- b) Based on the Traffic Report, how many Alternative TI concepts would you like in order to provide the appropriate level of service in the Design Year (usually 25-40 years from now)?

Refer to the NMDOT location study procedures for the horizon year and other traffic condition requirements.

- c) Drainage Report. What is the expected LOE-Drainage reports or Technical memos?

Preliminary drainage study report as identified in the NMDOT Location Study Procedures.

- d) Geotech. What is the expected LOE for this Phase A/B?

Geotech scoping report for alternatives as identified in the NMDOT Location Study Procedures.

- e) Did the district put this in the program or why is it in the program?

It is the program because the District identified the safety concerns of the current interchange geometry.

- f) What about public involvement?

Yes at least one public meeting in San Antonio.

g) Environmental overview type of report or preliminary?

It would be a preliminary analysis. A description of the environmental effort expected will be provided in the Phase A/B scope of work.

h) Will ask the District if there is traffic data available?

There might be 2019 data available for the main lines.

i) Is there to be a separate analysis for the creek? Is that something to be done now or differed to the final design?

It should be included in the preliminary drainage report.

j) Has the district maintenance presented any concerns or issues with the bridges at the creek that you can share with us?

I believe there is a project underway to address erosion at the creek bridge. I will provide more information about this project in the scope of work. Another issue is the flooding of US-380 and San Antonio that occurred a few years ago that needs to be addressed in this study.

30. What was the driving factor to include this project on the procurement schedule?

This was placed on the procurement schedule because the design region does not have the resources to prepare the Phase A/B study for this interchange.

31. Was there an urgent need to fix these bridges?

The bridges are old and may need replacement, but safety was the driving factor. *The department has identified entrance ramp deficiencies such as poor sight distance, no acceleration lane and short merging distance. Drainage is also a major concern especially because of major flooding in San Antonio a few years ago. The study should also investigate other issues that need to be addressed beyond what has been mentioned.*

32. Will you provide bridge spec reports?

Yes, NMDOT will provide available bridge inspection reports.

33. Is the goal to maintain the existing configuration and improve it vs a new interchange configuration?

Goal is to analyze the existing interchange configuration and prepare improvement alternatives to address deficiencies. An alternative may be a new interchange to include redesign of existing bridges.

34. Will the project limits primarily stay within the existing interchange on I-25?

Yes, also consider a portion of US 380 for potential ramp realignment.

35. Are we going to get into the community or not?

Walnut creek goes into San Antonio and my need to go into it for Drainage study.

36. Do you plan on reconstructing mainline I-25 or is the preference to leave the alignment alone due to cost?

Reconstruction of I-25 mainline alignment may be considered as well as closing the gap between the bridges if it helps address deficiencies. No budget has been established.

Will there be additional survey needs?

(WSP is currently doing the Walnut Creek drainage analysis)David Trujillo had given us the task. Lidar data and drainage data merging. May need a better analysis and more study.

Survey only what is needed for study phase A/B.

37. Are there any utility issues? Are we going to need an SUE firm?

Not aware of a utility conflict at this time.

38. How much environmental effort is needed during the phase? Is a scoping level or a higher level anticipated?

A preliminary analysis as per NMDOT study location process.

39. Is this a fast-track project? (Any urgent needs?)

No

40. Is the intent to take this project through final design?

No, right now only phase A/B.

41. Are there any construction funding expectations? (Federal funding anticipated)

Construction funding has not been identified. We need the study to determine what type of improvements are needed.

42. Will NMDOT share as-built plans and any previous reports?

Yes, NMDOT will share available as-builts, bridge inspection reports, and crash data.

43. Will this be built all at once?

The preference would be to be build all at once.