

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Does the City have an existing Pavement Management System that they wish the successful respondent to load the condition data into and to use for performance of analyses, or is it intended that the consultant would recommend an appropriate program?
 - **Consultant recommend program**
2. Has an approximate budget been allocated to this project? If yes, is the City willing to share that information?
 - **We have an proposed budget for this project of \$175,000.**
3. What is the proposed term of the contract?
 - **The amount of time to collect the information one time and present the information in the desired format to the City.**
4. Has the City established a desired or proposed schedule for work completion?
 - **Yes. We anticipate the consultant would start gathering data mid Oct/early November. We estimate 3 months to collect data, process it and present it to the City.**
5. One of the requirements of the stated scope of work is development of a prediction model that will predict pavement conditions based on funding limits, present and estimated future traffic. This is to include truck traffic and anticipated truck traffic. This specific requirement raises a few questions.
 - a. Are all of the pavements in the City of the same type? (Asphalt, Concrete, AC overlay of PCC, etc.). Attachment A, Item 1.1.1 references distress types for both AC and PCC pavements, leading to the assumption that multiple pavement types exist. We ask because performance models would typically be developed by pavement type due to significantly different performance expectations, and if there are multiple pavement types in the City we would anticipate the requirement for multiple pavement models.
 - **Pavements are not the same type.**
 - b. Is the intent that the performance model(s) would be used in a specific program, or as a stand-alone program?
 - **Undetermined**
 - c. Does the City have something specific in mind in regards to this expectation? TxDOT has attempted this through application of an 18-kip ESAL coefficient, but it is rarely used, if at all due to lack of work history information.

- **Whatever is standard business practice among municipalities similar in size to San Angelo.**

6. In regards to the requirement for collection of distress data, in one location there is a reference to definitions per the LTPP Distress ID Manual, and in another there is a requirement for budget needs to achieve a PCI of 95 or higher. The LTPP distress definitions are not consistent with those as defined for the determination of PCI per ASTM D6433, and as such this represents an inconsistency in the stated performance metrics for the project. Will the City require distress measurements in accordance with the LTPP Distress ID manual, PCI determination in accordance with the provisions of ASTM D6433, or both?

- **Both**

7. One of the requirements for Pavement Data collection is Curb and Gutter/sidewalk/ADA access (condition and location). Again, this requirement prompts a couple of questions.

a. Does condition and location apply to ADA access only, or to all three items?

- **All three items**

Where ADA access is concerned, is it intended that this would be a subjective assessment as one might obtain from ROW images, or is it the City's desire to quantify condition through measurements of items like faulting, ramp slope, dimensions, etc.? These would imply dramatically different data collection approaches.

- **Subjective assessment**