

RFP 22-05 Q&A Session Agenda

Phase IA/B Passing Lanes US 60 MP 325-381 (Clovis to Ft. Sumner)
State CN: 2104660

The New Mexico Department of Transportation held a Question-and-Answer Session for: **22-05: Phase IA/B Passing Lanes- US 60 MP 325-381 (Clovis to Ft. Sumner) CN: 2104660 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

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 July 9, 2021.

Technical Description of Project:

US 60/84 from mile marker 325 to mile marker 381 is a two-lane roadway which serves the agricultural and freight industries. The general typical section is two (2) 12-foot travel lanes in either direction with two (2) – 9-12' shoulders on either side. The roadway at the project limits on either end transitions from a 2 lane section into a 4 lane urban section through the town of Ft. Sumner, back into a 2 lane section and alternates as it proceeds through the communities of Taiban, Tolar, St Vrain, and Melrose. There is either no compliant ADA or no existing form of ADA in these towns, and there are various skewed intersections which are unlit, and have no auxiliary lanes and There are various drainage crossing structures throughout the project limits. at N Roosevelt road AV. There are no passing lanes in the corridor.

The existing pavement shows signs of deterioration and block cracking. From mile marker 363 to mile marker 375, the pavement exhibits a rolling/washboard pattern believed to be responsible for near accidents caused by vehicles bouncing off the roadway. This rolling is believed to be due to too much oil in the existing pavement surfacing and is causing

**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

standing water and potholes after rainstorms. Regarding flooding, there is curb and gutter in the community of Melrose that prevents any water from exiting the roadway due to the flat nature of the corridor in this area, resulting in vehicular hydroplaning.

It is the intent of the NMDOT to negotiate a fixed price for Phase 1A/B Services (combined).

Questions:

1. What is the purpose of this project? What is the main driver for the study?

The absence of passing lanes and conversational reports of head on fatalities are driving this project.

2. What are the issues along the corridor? (Safety, geometry, access control, etc.?)

A combination of all three. Since this corridor serves the freight industry, drivers following slower moving commercial traffic tend to get impatient, and since this corridor isn't entirely flat on a planar perspective, and there are rolling hills, drivers tend to pass at risk to themselves and oncoming traffic.

3. What's the goal of this project?

The goal of this project is to determine needs based on existing conditions whether or not passing lanes are warranted.

4. The project description lists MP 325 as the BOP and MP 381 as the EOP. Why were these limits selected?

The limits were selected to include Ft. Sumner in the needs analysis. Almost all intersections in Ft. Sumner are skewed

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

It depends on the consultant, however none are anticipated for this project.

6. Do you expect improvements for the urban areas of Ft. Sumner, Taiban and Melrose (ADA, drainage, etc.)?

Improvements in Ft. Sumner will most probably be done as a separate project depending on funding, however improvements such as ADA are anticipated in Taiban and Melrose.

- 7. 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? Will the corridor be one project or broken into pieces?**

The development on this corridor will be dependent on the needs analysis. In other words we anticipate this corridor to be broken into smaller projects in the 10-15 million dollar range with the critical ones being recommended as built first.

- 8. What are the primary reasons that this project is being advanced? Is it primarily safety or are there other reasons?**

Drainage issues, Patrols said Melrose, west bound of Brazier asphalt, rich in oil content. Creates a really soft overlay. Rutting and shoving is creating a washboard effect. Puddling waters causing hydroplaning. Some fatal head on collisions. Wal Mart will no longer send trucks due to goods and trailers are being damaged by the washboard pavement.

- 9. The mileposts in the RFP schedule description include two-lane and four-lane sections. Will the assessment include the four-lane sections?**

Yes, the assessment will include the four lane and how they will interact. Alternatives will most probably be broken into sections of independent utility, and will most probably include super two, enhanced two and full four lane reconstruction. ADA or intersections need to be improved, no lighting at intersections.

- 10. The project limits pass through portions of two municipalities and one small village. Will improvements in these areas also be part of the project?**

We don't know if the Department will want to fund the entire corridor. We may not have the funding. Quite a bit of right of way impacts will be necessary to realign every skewed intersection in Ft. Sumner. FDR near AFB, completed 3 or 4 years ago. Project will terminate at where FDR left off.

- 11. In addition to a full safety analysis, will the study also evaluate typical section, pavement and resurfacing needs, and drainage needs? Will the project include evaluation of the railroad overpass?**

Railroad overpass, do not anticipate to accommodate a passing lane. Alternative that super two and an enhanced two. It will have to fit into the preferred alternative.

12. Will the contract be limited to Phase A/B or will other project development phases be included, depending on outcome?

Should the district wish to advance this project beyond Phase I A/B, it will be done via amendment. RFP is only for Phase I A/B due to the length and the preferred alternative is not yet known.

13. Have any funds already been programmed for this corridor?

Yes. For design but not construction. District is hoping to gain from the study to lobby for further funding.

14. Has the NMDOT determined a schedule?

RFP schedule is the only schedule to be done. Not in STIP because there is no construction funding.

15. What are the major concerns for this corridor? In other words, why did the District feel they needed a corridor study?

Discussing with the district, previous project basically wants to see passing lanes in this area. Accident reports, fatal accidents-head on. Pavement in bad shape. Pavement is rolling, causing a washboard effect with is causing standing water and pot holes. Intersections that are at a skew. Out of date ADA. I don't know if the district wants to fix-include in the study.

16. Funding is state, but the route is federal, will the project follow the federal design process?

State Funding- lobby for federal Follow the Location Study Procedures.

17. What is your ultimate goal for this corridor?

Do we need passing lanes. Does this justify passing lanes

18. What is the predominant type of traffic that your see through this corridor? Combination and vehicular four wheel traffic.

POV Wal-Mart is no longer sending freight through this road, due to damage of freight.

19. Is the intent to seek alternative routes, roadway geometry changes, or simple reconstruction or rehab?

Result of the study, define alternatives. Every alternative will see intersection improvements. Some type of pavement rehabilitation.

20. What areas have flooding concerns throughout the corridor?

The one on Melrose is the predominant area of concern. Due to the presence of curb and gutters and the flat nature of the road, water doesn't have an exit off of the road.

21. Would you want a master drainage plan, how would you want to deal with that?

Removal of curb and cutter, additional cutouts for drainage. Reconstruct the roadway and force the water into the location we want it to drain too. We'd want a drainage report

22. What problems do the maintenance patrols have knowledge of?

Potholes. Oil bleeding through. Hard tar like substance on top of the asphalt is evident of excess oil. The excess oil is causing the shoving.

23. What is the condition of the bridge over the railroad tracks?

Have not received the bridge inspection report. Don't see any improvements to the bridge itself. Strategically passing lanes around the bridge so as not to affect it.

24. Accident rate concerns throughout the corridor

Conversation reports of Head on, fatal accident reports will be shared as an addendum

25. In reference to the five lane section through Fort Sumner – is the Department considering access control/combining driveways?

Yes, perfect thing to do. Preferred thing to do.

26. The terrain is flat through Fort Sumner, does the city have a master drainage plan?

No, the city doesn't have a master drainage plan that PDE knows of. Has reached out to the town of Fort Sumner, but has not heard anything back.

27. Does NMDOT want to realign roadways intersecting with US 60 such as at Richards St. in Ft Sumner, most streets on the North are coming in at a skew (are you keeping the skew)?

Huge undertaking, buying ROW and effecting businesses. Doesn't imagine District doing anything in the town of Ft. Sumner.

28. Also, in Fort Sumner, Sharp St & W Gonzales and Ave G & S 14th St are offset do you desire realigning?

Might want to suggest in the study.

29. Does the section at 4th Street/US 60 have drainage or subbase issues?

There might be spotty allegator cracking.

30. 7th and Ave D are both skewed within a short intersection with US 60, same with 9th /10th and Ave E – comments?

I do not know if the district will want to do everything with this project. Strategically design 10 mile segments within the corridor. Up to the District and the village of Ft Sumner to fund a project.

31. Sidewalks are intermittent in Fort Sumner, there will be an ADA component correct?

Yes, with the study. Depending on the cost.

32. Do you anticipate ADA upgrades through Melrose?

Yes, because it is in the middle of the project limits.

33. Do you have flooding concerns through Melrose?

In interviewing the patrol supervisor, there is flooding in Melrose due to water not being able to sheet flow off of the roadway due to curb and gutter not allowing it. A suggested solution is perhaps further defining the crown and forcing the water to drainage cutouts in the side walk.

34. Project appears to end west of Clovis in the vicinity of airbase housing. Are there any concerns in working with the AFB?

No concerns. Communication with the AFB during construction, but in the study phase. no

35. Continuing the FDR practice in this corridor?

Yes, something we can look at. Depending on the underline soils. For FDR, the subbase must be in good condition that is conducive to compaction. In Clovis, for example we FDR was not an option due to the nature of the sub base.