VARINA PHASE OF THE VIRGINIA CAPITAL TRAIL PROJECT

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Date: 10-31-12

Project:	**0005-043-714, P101, R201, C501**
Subject:	RFP Questions and Answers

1. The plans for The Varina Phase indicate utility owners information can be found on sheet 3. Sheet 3 was not included. Can you send me the information on all utility owners involved in this project or sheet 3?

   Plan Sheet 3 was intentionally omitted from the conceptual plans included in the RFP Information Package. Information regarding utility owners is provided in Part 2, Section 2.11 of Addendum #1.

2. Can underground utilities be left in place and paved over?

   In accordance with Part 2 Section 2.11 of Addendum #1, "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for the relocation of all utilities required for the construction of the Project and shall be responsible for the coordination of construction activities with all utility owners that may be affected. … The resolution of any conflicts between utilities and the construction of the Project shall be the responsibility of the Design-Builder. … The Design-Builder shall make all reasonable efforts to design the Project to avoid conflicts with utilities, minimize impacts where conflicts cannot be avoided."

3. I spoke with a representative from Dominion Virginia Power and he told me that he provided estimates to VDOT for relocating some of their utilities. Will VDOT be providing these estimates to bidders? The Dominion rep would not release these estimates to me without the permission of VDOT.

   In accordance with Part 2 Section 2.11 of Addendum #1, "The Offeror shall contact each utility owner prior to submitting bids to determine the scope of each utility owner's relocation." VDOT has contacted Dominion Virginia Power to give them authorization to discuss the project with prospective Offerors.

4. Does VDOT intend to issue work orders for Phase II Environmental Site Assessment investigations of contamination along the route if the need arises?

   In accordance with Part 2 Section 2.2.6 of Addendum #1, "During the Scope Validation Period, the Design-Builder will be responsible for performing any additional studies to characterize the identified potential contamination source(s) as well as any other sources and to evaluate impacts to Project construction. The Design-Builder shall include in the price proposal all costs associated in complying with the above hazardous materials studies."

5. What loadings should we use for the bridge designs? Should the bridge over Route 895 be designed to a different load capacity?

   In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.5 of Addendum #1, "For the structure over I-895, the maintenance vehicle loading shall be included. For the timber structures, the maintenance vehicle load does not need to be considered except to accommodate the Contractor's method of construction."

6. It is unclear in the RFP what the scope of work is for pavement markings. It is assumed that any PM disturbed by or conflicts with the proposed trail will need to be replaced/corrected. The RFP isn't clear as to whether all pavement markings on Route 5 is also being requested.

   Only pavement markings that are disturbed by the trail or that are in conflict with the trail need to be included with this project.

7. The clear zone within the project limits is to be free from hazards/fixed objects. Is the intent of this statement to review all locations along Route 5 within the project limits and determine if GR is required regardless of the project's impacts? There are numerous trees, steep slopes, and other hazards that would be currently considered hazards that seemingly would not pose any new risk. Or is it the intent of the RFP only to address the hazards to the trail side of the project?

   The intent of this statement is for the Design-Builder not to introduce new hazards to Route 5 traffic as a result of the proposed trail project. If new hazards are introduced, then guardrail needs associated with the hazard shall be addressed. Existing hazards that are not changed or introduced (as part of the trail construction) do not need to be addressed.

8. Deviations to the proposed footprint are permissible in the RFP, but subject to VDOT approval and as noted in Part 1 Sections 2.8 & 2.9 and Part 2 Section 2. If changes are found to be unacceptable by VDOT, what modifications to the contract price will be allowed?

   If the changes are determined to be unacceptable by VDOT, no changes to the footprint will be permissible.

   If the changes are determined to be acceptable by VDOT, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any time and/or cost impacts associated with the proposed design changes. VDOT reserves the right to issue an addendum to reflect changes to the RFP requirements.

9. Section 2.4.1 milestone indicates questions due by 10/15/12 @ 4:00 and the special provision for 2010 division 1 amendments to the standard specifications general provisions for design –build contracts part V section 102.04(c) indicates 19 days prior to bid. Will the RFI date be extended to the 9th of November?

   In accordance with Part 1, Section 2.7.2 "questions or requests for clarification will be submitted to VDOT's POC within the time specified in Part 1, Section 2.4.1 of this RFP." Part 1, Section 2.4.1 establishes the deadline to submit RFP questions to VDOT as 4:00PM on 10/15/12. The deadline for submitting RFP questions will not be extended.

   The special provision will be updated in Addendum #1. The CABB system will not be utilized on this project.

10. Will VDOT supply the caps for the RM-2 installs?

    Per the RW-2 standard detail in the VDOT Road and Bridge Standards, the RM-2 caps will be furnished by VDOT.

11. Is there any preliminary information available for pavement markings and permanent sign types and locations along the trail and or additional roadway signs along route 5?

    In accordance with Part 2 Section 2.8.2 of Addendum #1, "An existing sign inventory shall be completed prior to site demolition in accordance with the VDOT Traffic Engineering Design Manual."

12. RFP Section 2.5.2 indicates that except the bridge over I-895 all other bridge shall be timber structures. Some of these brides have longer spans from 33' to 62' in lengths. For these longer spans it will be difficult to satisfy deflection requirements with the use of timber (glulam) beams. Does VDOT allow design builder to consider the use of steel beams instead of glulam beams. This will also require the use of deeper deck members since steel will be spaced more than 24" center to center.

    In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.5.2 of Addendum #1, "With the exception of the bridge over Route 895, the bridges proposed in the preliminary plans shall be timber structures."

13. Are there any areas where historical marker turn offs are to be provided? There is an area at section #1 188+50 that has an existing sign. What is required at these locations?

    Historical marker turn offs are not to be provided with this Project.

14. Typical section sheet 2 unsuitable material reference to geotechnical report. The geotechnical report only identifies unsuitable as CH, MH, OH and OL materials encountered. There is not enough time in preparation of our proposal to identify all areas of possible unsuitable material in the field is there any information available to further identify possible undercut areas?

    Unsuitable materials are identified in Part 5 of the RFP. Unsuitable materials were encountered within the project limits at the boring locations included in the Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report. The Offerors are responsible for interpreting the data in the Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report for the purpose of preparing their bid.

15. What type of finish on the guardrail, weathering or standard steel beam?

    All guardrail on this project shall be galvanized.

16. Who's responsible for locating and relocating domestic water services from existing meter boxes to residence (private) water services?

    In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.11 of Addendum #1, "The Design-Builder shall be responsible for the relocation of all utilities required for the construction of the Project and shall be responsible for the coordination of construction activities with all utility owners that may be affected."

17. What are the contractor's responsibilities for replacing/restoration of existing private property that will now be inside the new proposed right of way areas? Are we to replace outside the new right of way to like conditions? Example brick columns, planters, lights and masonry wall at lot #13 sheet #8.

    Anything that cannot be picked up and moved is considered a site improvement. The appraiser will value site improvements as part of the appraisal and that value will be included in the offer to purchase. It is up to the landowner to use the monies allotted for these items to replace them if they so desire. The contractor is not responsible for their replacement.

18. The proposed trail in section #2 sheet #10 crosses the existing parking lot at the 7-11. Are we to remove and replace the existing pavement here to the proposed trail design section or will the existing parking lot remain?

    The intent of the RFP design is for the existing pavement to remain in place. The profile at the bottom of Sheet 10 shows "match existing pavement".

19. Where the trail crosses all existing right of way roadway surfaces are we to allow for the divided median crossing typical detail at these locations (sheet 2E)? Sheet #10 only indicates one out of two crossings installing this section.

In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.12.2 of Addendum #1, "When the trail intersects with a roadway, the trail shall be divided (bifurcated) in accordance with the design indicated in the preliminary design plans included in the RFP Information Package. To accomplish this, the median areas created by the division shall be paved with concrete pavers as indicated on the plan details for the preliminary design plans that are included in the RFP Information Package and in accordance with the Special Provisions for Unit Pavers."

20. The RFP specifies all entrances shall be paved from the Route 5 edge of pavement to a minimum of five (5) beyond the outside edge of Trail pavement and the RFP plans specify 3' beyond the back edge of the trail. Which is correct?

    In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.3 of Addendum #1, "All entrances shall be paved from the Route 5 edge of pavement to a minimum of five (5) feet beyond the outside edge of Trail pavement to reduce the risk of raveling."

21. The RFP scope for the Rt 895 Bridge requires a minimum of 3 girders in cross section, which implies that the department desires a 'redundant' structure. Would VDOT accept a pre-fabricated truss (that is internally redundant) as an alternative superstructure type?

    In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.5.1.3 of Addendum #1, "The superstructure shall have a minimum of three (3) girders supporting a composite concrete deck. Girders may be prestressed concrete or structural steel. All structural steel, including bearings, shall be ASTM A709 Grade 50W and shall be unpainted."