

ROUTE 460 CONNECTOR PHASE I

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Date: 03/19/09

Project:	Route 460 Connector – Phase I
Subject:	RFP Questions and Answers-2009

- 1) In the DVD provided for the project, specifically Attachment 1 for Part 2, the last bullet on page 17 ends in mid sentence. The top of page 18 is blank. Please provide the missing portion of this bullet.

Attachment 1 will be corrected and included in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

- 2) Can the length of the turn lane and taper from Rte. 460 EBL to Rte. 80 be reduced from what is shown on the 30% design drawings as long as it meets VDOT design standards?

Yes, the turn lane may be shorter than what is shown on the preliminary plans as long as the turn lane design meets VDOT design standards.

- 3) Surface and mineral rights are to be procured for VDOT as part of the scope of work for this project. If any merchantable coal is encountered within the excavation limits of the project, will the Contractor be permitted to sell the coal? Will VDOT require that the Contractor pay them a royalty for any coal that is sold?

All mineral rights negotiated for will be sterilized once purchased and will not be mined by VDOT or anyone else.

- 4) Will the testing of low permeability concrete (permeability testing) be performed by VDOT in accordance with the Special Provisions?

Testing of low permeability concrete is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Special Provision for Low Permeability Concretes for Design-Build Projects will be included in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

Since this project is a lump sum price, will the Contractor be subject to the provisions of a reduction of concrete price if permeability requirements are not met? How will such a reduction be applied?

Remedies for the correction of nonconforming Work is described in Part 4, Section 2.10 of the RFP and in Section 105.09 of VDOT's Minimum Requirements for Quality Assurance & quality Control on Design Build & Public-Private Transportation Act Projects (August 2008).

- 5) It is our understanding that our technical and price proposals for this project are to include the design of the environmental mitigation features, but that VDOT will a) reimburse or pay directly costs for credit purchase or purchase of property and b) pay for all cost of constructing the offsite the mitigation work as part of a work order. Is this understanding correct?

Yes, this is correct, See Part 2, Section 2.4.3 of the RFP.

- 6) Is VDOT or its contractors permitted to begin work in streams prior to Corps/DEQ approval of the mitigation plan?

VDOT and its contractors must comply with all permit special provisions issued by the ACOE and VDEQ. The agencies require that a conceptual mitigation plan be submitted and approved in order to issue appropriate environmental permits. Typically, the permits would in turn indicate that VDOT and its contractors are not authorized to work in jurisdictional areas until the final mitigation plan is submitted to and approved by the regulatory agencies.

- 7) The guides for mitigation and water quality permits included in the RFP cover only wetlands. They do not include streams. Our understanding of current regulations is that any permits issued for this project will need to address stream impacts, and, if appropriate, stream mitigation in accordance with the Corps/DEQ Unified Stream Methodology, 2007. Is this understanding correct?

Yes. However, the application of the Unified Stream Methodology is intended to be a method to rapidly assess what the stream compensation requirements would be for permitted impacts and the amount of "credits" obtainable through implementation of various stream compensation practices. This method is not intended to take the place of project specific review and discussion with the ACOE/VDEQ, which may result in adjustments to the compensation requirements or credits obtained through application of this process.

- 8) If we stay within the 30% ROW (i.e. no alteration to the SERP scope) are we therefore permitted to rely on the current SERP/FONSI, particularly the "protected species" conclusion?

Yes, as long as the Offeror stays within the project footprint, as depicted on the preliminary design plans, and complies with the commitments of the EA/FONSI, 4(f) de minimus finding, EQ-103, EQ-200 and the technical requirements of Part 2, Section 2.4 of the RFP.

If a situation occurs that requires the SERP/FONSI to be redone, will the cost of any delays or additional work be paid for under a work order as an addition to the scope of this project?

If VDOT accepts an Offeror-proposed change that requires the Offeror to complete additional environmental studies, that work will be compensated. The Offeror is responsible for any associated schedule delays. See Part 2, Section 2.4.1 of the RFP.

- 9) Will VDOT require that all mitigation work be located in the state of Virginia?

VDOT has no regulatory authority related to Section 404 and 401 Clean Water Act (CWA) permitting and associated compensatory mitigation requirements. The ACOE and VDEQ reviews and approves any compensatory mitigation plans in association with the CWA permitting process.

- 10) The following files were included as part of the first RFP Information package but are not included in this one. Can you please either provide updated files or confirm that these files have not changed from the first time?

- a. s64144.dgn
- b. h64144dr.dgn
- c. scr64144.dgn

d. su64144.dgn

These drawings will be provided in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

11) Can we get the preliminary boring logs in a gInt format?

Yes, the boring log gInt files will be provided in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

12) Can we look at the rock cores from previous subsurface explorations?

Yes, the cores are stored at VDOT's Bristol District. Access shall be coordinated through VDOT's POC (Jeffrey A. Roby).

13) Will VDOT provide minutes of the Pre-Proposal meeting and a copy of the sign-in sheet to the Proposers?

Yes, the sign-sheet has been distributed and the Pre-Proposal meeting minutes are posted on VDOT's website- <http://www.virginiadot.org/business/request-for-proposals.asp>

14) VDOT stated at the Pre-proposal meeting that one of the technical proposals of the previous solicitation showed an alternate for a side road. VDOT stated that it would not pursue this alternate in the current solicitation. A question was asked if this was an alternate for the Route 80 Connector. VDOT answered yes. A previous technical proposal showed a one span bridge for Route 80 over Hunts Creek. The alignment of Route 768 was changed to show an "at grade" intersection with Route 80. Please clarify VDOT's statements regarding the alternate alignment shown in the previous proposal. Are the Proposers required to include "a multi-span bridge over Route 768 and Hunts Creek" as stated in Part 1 Section 2.1 of the RFP? Will an "at grade" intersection with Route 768 and Route 80 be allowed?

Alternates to the Route 80 connector alignments and bridge over Hunts Creek are permissible with the following restrictions:

- a. The profile grade may not exceed 6%.*
- b. An at-grade intersection will not be permitted.*
- c. Alternate configurations for the Route 80 bridge may be considered. However, a one span bridge, which results in an excessive amount of fill at the abutments, will not be permitted.*

15) The previous RFP preliminary drawings show a rockfall ditch for Route 460 and Route 80 in the typical sections. The current typical sections do not show a rockfall ditch. Sheet 17 of the minimum geotechnical requirements requires a "Rockfall Containment Ditch" for rock cut slopes. Please clarify the requirements for the project related to the rockfall containment ditch.

Rockfall protection is required. The slope configuration shown on the typical section is for illustrative purposes only. The rockfall containment ditch shall be designed and constructed as per the RFP and VDOT standards and specifications.

16) The typical sections shown on the preliminary drawings in the RFP do not appear to show the correct clear zone from the edge of pavement to the cut slope for Route 80 and Route 460 based

on the design speed. Please clarify the design requirements for clear zone.

The slope configuration shown on the typical section is for illustrative purposes only. The clear zone shall be designed and constructed as per the RFP and VDOT standards and specifications.

- 17) From our understanding of RFP, Attachment 1, Minimum Geotechnical Requirements, Section for Minimal Geotechnical Requirements for Rock Cut Slopes, page 17 paragraph 2, the rockfall containment ditch can be designed to the “Oregon Ditch” (Pierson et al. 2001) or “Ritchie Ditch” (Ritchie, 1963) criteria. From page 17 paragraph 4, it states that “the proposed cut slope and containment ditch shall prevent rock fall from reaching the roadway shoulder. Based on our review and understanding of the documents mentioned above, the design guidelines do not include 100 percent retention of rockfall. Will it generally be accepted to design rock fall catchments to the 99 percent retention as set forth in the above mentioned documents?”

Yes, it is acceptable to design rock fall catchments to 99 percent retention.

- 18) VDOT stated at the Pre-Proposal meeting that the interim milestone for the grading work on the Kentucky side of the project was 07/31/11, not 07/31/10 as stated in Part 2 of the RFP. This is included just as a reminder.

The correct milestone date for work at the Virginia/Kentucky border is 07/31/11.

- 19) Sheet 6 of the preliminary plans shows the end of pavement for Route 460 as station 89+00 and says begin grading at station 89+00. Profile sheet 6E shows the 6 percent profile for Route 460 extending to Station 91+68.99. Is the Proposer required to grade the project to finished subgrade for the full typical section to station 91+68.99?

Yes, the end of pavement is at station 89+00. VDOT will require that the typical section to finish subgrade be extended a minimum of 200' beyond station 89+00. It is then the Design-Builders responsibility to design the rest of the cut and slopes at the project terminus. The terminus slopes must be designed per the requirements of the RFP and the slopes should stay within the Right Of Way limits shown on the preliminary plans. The slopes should facilitate development of the next section of the 460 Connector (Phase II).

A clarification on the terminus slopes will be included in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

- 20) The electronic file cross sections included in the RFP for Route 460 show VDOT’s typical section plotted on the 2:1 profile from Station 91+68.99 to the end of grading at Station 94+75. This does not seem to be correct. Should the typical section be based on a projection of the 6 percent grade from station 91+68.99 to Station 94+75? Should the grading from station 91+68.99 to station 94+75 extend to the future finished slopes as shown in the attached sample sections?

See response to question 19.

- 21) The preliminary plans shown plane and overlay on Route 80 from Station 39+45 to Station 56+00. Neither the typical sections nor Part 2 paragraph 2.6.1 state the depth of milling or give any details on the overlay. Please clarify the requirements for this pavement.

The pavement in this section will be milled two (2) inches and replaced with 220lbs/sy of SM-12.5A. A clarification will be included in an Addendum to be issued the week of March 23rd.

- 22) Part 2, paragraph 2.3 of the RFP states “The Offeror shall note the curve in the Route 80 overlay and widening at the connection to Route 609 will require excavation on the inside of the curve to obtain the required sight (sight?) distance for the 50 mph design speed. This work must stay inside the existing right of way.” The preliminary plans only show plan and overlay at this location. This requirement appears to be more applicable to the previous RFP. Has the widening been eliminated at this location? Is the excavation for sight distance required?

Yes, the widening has been eliminated. However, excavation may still be required to satisfy sight distance requirements for 50 MPH. When a vehicle traveling east on Route 80 turns left onto Route 609, the required sight distance may be accomplished by excavation of the embankment of the inside of the existing curve. It is the Design-Builders responsibility to ensure that sight distance requirements are satisfied.

- 23) Are resumes limited to the six Key Personnel listed in Part 1, Section 4.2.2? Can additional resumes be submitted?

No, only the resumes for the six Key Personnel should be submitted with the Technical Proposal.

- 24) Part 2, paragraph 2.8.1 says “The project shall include all required modifications to existing signs and all required new signs.” Is there any additional information about what is required for the permanent signs on Route 460?

Please refer to the RFP Part 5, Section 104.05 (a) and Part 2, Section 2.1.1 Standards and Reference Documents.