

RTE 29 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OVER LITTLE ROCKY RUN

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

August 15, 2012

1. Part 2 Section 2.4.5 states that a Phase I Hazardous Material Assessment shall be conducted by the Design Builder on parcel 002, 003, and 011.
 - a. As three studies have already been conducted, these sites appear to meet the ASTM standard as recognized environmental conditions requiring further studies. Is a Phase I Assessment necessary since it seems that the work already completed would indicate that further studies are appropriate at this time instead of a Phase I?

Response: A Phase I Hazardous Materials Assessment is not required on parcel 002, 003, and 011. This requirement has been revised in Addendum #1, Part 2, Section 2.4.5.

- b. If a Phase I is required, is it to be conducted in accordance with ASTM standards? (ASTM E1527 - 05 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process)

Response: A Phase I Hazardous Materials Assessment is not required on parcel 002, 003, and 011. This requirement has been revised in Addendum #1, Part 2, Section 2.4.5.

- c. Part 2, Section 2.4.5 seems to indicate that any other hazardous materials studies (Phase II and Phase III as necessary) will be addressed as per Part 4 Article 4 and should not be included in the Offerors lump sum bid. Please confirm this is the case.

Response: A Phase I Hazardous Materials Assessment is not required on parcel 002, 003, and 011. This requirement has been revised in Addendum #1, Part 2, Section 2.4.5.

- d. The levels of contamination noted in prior studies appear to require monitoring during construction with a Photoionization Detector (PID) which is used as a screening tool and measures volatile organic contaminants (VOC). Is that monitoring covered under Part 4 Article 4, or is the Offeror to include the costs associated with this monitoring in their lump sum bid?

Response: Any monitoring required based on the information found in the VDOT Hazardous Materials Summary Report shall be the responsibility of the Design-Builder and shall be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal.

- e. As construction within the noted areas of contamination and dewatering will likely be necessary, will any of the costs associated with required treatment of the dewatering materials be covered under Part 4 Article 4 or will the Offeror be responsible for including that cost in their proposal?

Response: Based on preliminary design, contaminated ground water should not be encountered during construction. If encountered, the treatment of dewatering materials will be addressed in accordance with Part 4, Article 4 and should not be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal.

2. Part 2 Section 2.4.2 states that the VA SHPO determined the project to have no adverse effect on eligible historic properties, however the EQ-103 included in the RFP information package noted the project will not affect cultural resources.

- a. Are there existing cultural resources in the project area that must be avoided or treated to maintain the “no adverse effect”?

Response: There are no cultural resources in the project area that must be avoided or treated to maintain the “no adverse effect.”

- b. Please provide the limits of the cultural resources study clearance to assure the design-builder that the areas outside of the proposed right-of-way for drainage, stormwater management basins, and/or utility relocations have been cleared by the SHPO.

Response: For this project, the area of potential effects (APE) for below-ground (archaeological) resources was defined as the limits of construction where ground disturbance may occur, corresponding with the construction footprint as shown on the RFP plans. The APE for above-ground (architectural) resources was defined as the view shed to and from the project area limited by vegetation and modern intrusions. VDOT coordinated the Project's effect with the VA SHPO in consideration of this APE, and in accordance with the RFP plans.

3. Part 2 Section 2.4.3 states that the design-builder is responsible to obtain the water quality permits and associated studies and fees, however Part 2 Section 2.7.3 notes the VSMP will be obtained through the VDOT LD-445 process. Please clarify who the permittee for the VSMP will be – the Offeror or VDOT – and who will be responsible for payment of the VSMP permit fee.

Response: In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.7.3, the Design-BUILDER will coordinate and submit the required VSMP permit coverage and application to the VDOT Project Manager. The VDOT Project Manager will review the submitted information and, if complete and acceptable, process a request for coverage under the VSMP Construction Permit. VDOT will be the permittee; however, the Design-BUILDER will be responsible for the VSMP permit fee.

4. Part 2 Section 2.4.3 states that the design-builder will be responsible for construction related permit conditions as well as post construction monitoring if required by the regulatory agencies. As some permit monitoring could extend several years in duration, please clarify if the design-builder will be responsible for post construction monitoring beyond the final completion date, and if so the anticipated duration that monitoring will be required.

Response: The Design-BUILDER will be responsible for any post construction monitoring, including post construction monitoring beyond the final completion date of the Project, required by the permitting agencies. The duration of monitoring is determined by the permitting agencies.

5. Part 2 Section 2.7.2 states that the Offeror shall provide a survey and inventory of all existing drainage structures (during the scope validation period) to be utilized on the project, and those determined to require replacement will be replaced by the Offeror? Please clarify whether the costs for replacement of existing culverts are to be included in the design-builders lump sum bid or if these costs will be discussed and agreed to post award as part of the scope validation process.

Response: This requirement has been revised in Addendum #1. For the purposes of developing the Price Proposal, the Offeror shall assume that the existing drainage pipes and culverts located within the project limits are unserviceable and are to be plugged and abandoned in accordance with VDOT Road and Bridge Standard PP-1, removed, or replaced with adequate structures

designed and constructed in support of the Design-Builder's final drainage design. The Offerors should note that none of the existing pipes and culverts within the project limits have been surveyed for structural and functional deficiencies. If after award the Design-Builder investigates the serviceability and functionality of the existing pipes and culverts, and as a result proposes use (or repair) of some or all, then it shall be done only with VDOT's approval. The Design-Builder shall assess the serviceability of the structure by performing a visual/video inspection of the existing pipes and culverts utilizing the assessment criteria for Post Installation Inspections presented in VDOT Supplemental Specification 30202. The Design-Builder will provide VDOT with an inspection report documenting the assessment as prescribed in the supplemental specification. Drainage pipes and box culverts deemed repairable shall be rehabilitated in accordance with VDOT's guidelines including, but not limited to those methods outlined in the latest version of IIM-LD-244 and Special Provision SU302000A - Pipe Culvert Replacement or Rehabilitation.

6. Part 2, Section 2.3.1 of the RFP requires the Offeror to "maintain pedestrian traffic on at least one side (of the bridge) at all times." However, the graphics showing the anticipated phasing of bridge construction provided as part of the RFP Information Package depict a temporary section of 4-11' lanes with no shoulders on Route 29 during the first phase of bridge construction. Please clarify whether the proposed bridge phasing needs to be revised, and if so whether a temporary bridge widening is required to provide ADA compliant pedestrian accommodations at all times as stated. Alternatively, please clarify the limits/locations where pedestrian accommodations are required – only at the Union Mill Intersection for example where there are existing pedestrian facilities.

Response: The requirement to maintain pedestrian traffic on at least one side of the bridge at all times has been removed from Part 2, Section 2.3.1 in Addendum #1.

7. Part 2, Section 2.2 states that the outside lane widths are 15 feet, and we understand that this additional pavement width is to accommodate on-road bicycle accommodations per Fairfax County's comprehensive bicycle plan. Since the additional pavement width of 3' is not adequate to meet VDOT's standards for an on-road bicycle facility, please clarify if a design waiver will be required for this typical section, and if so who is responsible for preparing the waiver. Also, please clarify what changes will be required if the waiver is not approved.

Response: A design waiver is not required. The 15 ft "Wide Outside Lane" indicated on the RFP plans and in Part 2, Section 2.2 of the RFP serves as an acceptable bicycle accommodation.

8. The lane closure hours identified in Part 2, Section 2.9.1.1 are different than those currently required by NOVA TE Memorandum dated April 27, 2012. Please clarify which lane closure hour restrictions are to be followed for this project.

Response: The allowable lane closure hour table identified in Part 2, Section 2.9.1.1 of the RFP has been revised in Addendum #1 to match those required by NOVA TE Memorandum dated April 27, 2012.

9. Section 3.7 of the Bridge Stage 1 Report states that deck drains will not be required for the proposed bridge structure. Please confirm that no scuppers are required for the proposed bridge, of if deck drainage is required, please provide direction as to whether these deck drains can outfall directly into Little Rocky Run.

Response: It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to confirm that scuppers are not required for the final structure. Direct Outfall to Little Rocky Run is acceptable as long as stabilized outfall protection is provided.

10. At the pre-proposal meeting on July 19th, VDOT stated that a Design Waiver addressing the use of voided precast, prestressed concrete slab elements with a 7 ½" composite concrete deck, continuous for live load on a Urban Principal Arterial is currently being reviewed by VDOT and that the Offeror shall assume that this design waiver has been approved for bidding purposes.

Section 2.3.3 of RFP Part 2 Technical Requirements states that "The proposed bridge shall use a superstructure type comprised of adjacent precast concrete slabs or adjacent box beams with a composite concrete deck or a cast-in-place concrete slabs. Cast-in-place voided slabs will not be allowed." The Structure and Bridge Manual Volume V – Part 2, File Number 12.08-1 states that precast prestressed concrete box beams shall not be used on bridges with a roadway functional classification of Urban Principal Arterial. Please confirm that the Offeror can assume that a Design Waiver for adjacent box beams with a composite deck on an Urban Principal Arterial is being prepared by VDOT and will also be approved for this project.

Response: A Design Waiver for Adjacent Box Beams with composite deck on an Urban Principal Arterial is being prepared by VDOT and will be provided to the Design-Builder after award of the Contract.

11. Concerning the potential to encounter hazardous materials on the project, is a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) required to be submitted to VDOT? Does the HASP need to be certified by a Professional Engineer? Is the Contractor required to have OSHA-certified workers in excavation areas where hazardous materials exist?

Response: In accordance with Part 4, Section 2.8.2 of the RFP, the "Design-Builder shall provide, for Department's review, comment and acceptance, a Health, Safety and Welfare (HS&W) plan..." Specifically regarding hazardous materials, the Design-Builder's HS&W plan shall include all applicable requirements of Section 411.09 of the 2007 VDOT Road and Bridge Specifications. This includes all applicable monitoring and certification requirements identified therein. The HS&W plan does not have to be certified by a Professional Engineer; however, the plan shall meet all applicable OSHA and VOSH standards. The Design-Builder is required to have OSHA-certified workers during all excavation activities, including the excavation of hazardous materials.

12. Does the existing 24" waterline need to be relocated per the limits in the Conflict Analysis dated February 21, 2012, or will the 24" be allowed to remain under the proposed eastbound travel lanes with a relocation only required at the proposed bridge structure?

Response: Offerors are responsible for coordinating utility requirements directly with the utility owner.

13. Please clarify the cathodic protection requirements for the 24" and 12" waterline relocation. Should costs associated with cathodic protection be included in the Offerors lump sum bid, or will this be paid for separately as a betterment by the utility owner?

Response: Cathodic protection is standard for the waterline relocation and shall be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal as part of the relocation cost for any pipes relocated for this project.

14. Since HDR is required to design the waterline relocation for Fairfax Water, please provide the HDR engineering cost (lump sum) which the design-builder will be required to include in their lump-sum bid for those design services.

Response: Offerors are responsible for coordinating utility requirements including costs directly with the utility owner.

15. Part 2, Section 2.3.1 states that substructure elements “shall be designed and detailed to span over the duct bank to the satisfaction of Verizon”. Will Verizon have a contract time from the date of submittal to provide this satisfaction on letterhead as discussed at the Utility Meeting?

Response: Verizon does not have an agreed upon review period to provide comments or satisfaction on letterhead after receiving copies of the proposed bridge plans from the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder should coordinate this effort with VDOT Utilities once the bridge plans are ready to be reviewed to expedite the process. It is noted that this review and approval process is similar to the one outlined for Governmental Approvals in accordance with Part 4, Section 3.5.2 of the RFP.

16. Concerning the existing Verizon manhole just west of the bridge, please provide the elevation of the bottom of the existing manhole, and please confirm that the existing Verizon manhole can be extended to the proposed pavement elevation without reconstruction due to the additional fill height. Alternatively, if this cannot be provided, please provide a specification for the maximum height of the manhole.

Response: Offerors are responsible for coordinating utility requirements directly with the utility owner.

17. On recent design-build projects, the QA inspector has been required to be on-site full-time. Please confirm that this requirement will also apply to this project.

Response: In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.13.2, “The QAM shall assign a Lead QA Inspector to the Project prior to the start of construction. This individual, who must be on the site for the duration of construction of the Project, shall be responsible to observe construction as it is being performed, to include all QC activities to ensure inspection and testing, and correction of any non-conformities of the Work are being performed in accordance with the Contract requirements. If needed, the Lead QA Inspector shall be supported by other QA inspectors under his/her direction to ensure all construction work and QC activities are being observed. The Lead QA Inspector shall report directly to the QAM.”

18. What is the level of coverage required for the QA Manager (full-time, 20 hours/week, etc.)?

Response: The Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) is required to perform all responsibilities indicated in the RFP. This includes, but is not limited to, all responsibilities of the QAM listed in the Minimum Requirements for Quality Assurance and Control Requirements on Design-Build and Public-Private Transportation Act Projects, dated January 2012.

19. There is a discrepancy in the Preliminary Structure Report, Plans, and Estimates document dated June 6, 2012 regarding foundation type. The list of design elements for Option 1 and Option 2 (on sheets 18 of 25 and 19 of 25) state that the abutments and wall piers are supported on pile foundations. The substructure section of the document (Sheet 19 of 25) recommends abutments founded on drilled shafts and wall piers founded on spread footings. In addition the bridge plans provided with the RFP Information Package show abutments founded on drilled shafts and wall piers founded on spread footings. Please confirm which type of foundation VDOT anticipates for this structure.

Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for making the final foundation determination and submitting a final geotechnical report that supports this determination.

20. Part 2, Section 2.8.1.1 states that the Design-Builder shall replace all existing ground mounted signs and install new signs within the project limits. This conflicts with Part 2, Section 2.8.1.2

which states the Design-Builder may relocate existing signs if they are applicable and in good condition. Please confirm that existing signs may be relocated per section 2.8.1.2.

Response: The Design-Builder shall replace all existing ground mounted signs and install new signing within the Project limits in accordance with Part 2, Section 2.8.1.1 of the RFP. Section 2.8.1.2 has been revised in Addendum #1 to eliminate the contradiction.

21. Part 2, Section 2.8.1.3 states “All signage and route marker assemblies installed as part of the Project along Route 29 shall be Standard Size.” Please confirm this is intended to be “Conventional Road Multi-Lane” size per MUTCD.

Response: Signs are to meet all requirements of the MUTCD and shall be Conventional Road Multi-Lane size.

22. Part 2, Section 2.9.1 states that a minimum of two 11 ft lanes of traffic in each direction shall be maintained at all times. Please confirm that temporary lane closures per hours specified Part 2, Section 2.9.1.1 are an allowed exception to this requirement.

Response: Approved temporary lane closures during allowable hours are an exception to the requirement to keep a minimum of two lanes of traffic open in each direction; however, it is noted that all lanes of traffic shall be a minimum of 11 feet wide during construction of the Project.

23. Will VDOT provide the Test Hole Certification Information for the project?

Response: The Test Hole Certification documents will be posted to the VDOT RFP website.

24. Part 2, Section 2.9.1 states that a minimum of two 11 ft lanes of traffic in each direction shall be maintained at all times. In order to maintain this four 11' lane section and complete proposed bridge construction, extensive temporary pavement will be required on bridge approaches during construction. Will VDOT allow narrower lanes during construction to minimize the temporary pavement required?

Response: All lanes of traffic shall be a minimum of 11' feet wide during construction of the Project. It is also noted that in accordance with Part 2, Section 2.9.1 of the RFP, a minimum width of one foot shall be provided between the traffic lane and the Traffic Barrier service or Group II Channelizing devices.

25. Section 2.3.6 of RFP Part 2 Technical Requirements states that a Load and Resistance Factor Rating (LRFR) is required “when an existing structure is modified and is intended to carry traffic in a temporary configuration. Load rating shall include changed conditions and loadings, including temporary barrier services.” and for “any partial configuration of the existing structure.”
- Please confirm that a LRFR analysis and report shall be submitted to VDOT by the Offeror and approved by VDOT prior to any modification to the existing structure including i) shifting of traffic lanes, ii) adding temporary barrier, and iii) removing a portion of the existing structure.

Response: Confirmed. A LRFR analysis and report shall be submitted to VDOT by the Design-Builder and approved by VDOT prior to any modification to the existing structure.

- If the LRFR analysis indicates that the structure in the changed configuration results in a lower rating capacity (does not rate), will VDOT allow the use of other evaluation methods (LFR/AS/Engineering Judgment) as described in IIM-S&B-86 Sheet 8 of 27 or will the structure need to be posted?

Response: If changed conditions on the existing bridge result in lower LRFR rating capacity, alternate rating methods as described in IIM-S&B-86 may be used. Posting of this bridge is not allowed.

- c. If the structure needs to be posted, please confirm that the posting of the structure shall be completed prior to any modification to the existing structure including i) shifting of traffic lanes, ii) adding temporary barrier, and iii) removing a portion of the existing structure.

Response: Posting of structure for reduced load carrying capacity will not be allowed. In the event a load rating analysis suggests posting, the Design-Builder shall, instead, retrofit/modify the structure to the extent that posting will not be necessary. Details of the retrofit/modification along with an updated load rating report shall be coordinated and submitted to the Department for review and approval prior to construction being initiated.

- 26. Section 4.2.6 of Part 1 of the RFP has similar requirements for both the contractor and the lead designer. The first requirement states: "At least two (2) major bridge structures construction (or design) projects with a minimum construction value of \$5,000,000 for the bridge work." Does the value of each bridge have to equal or exceed \$5,000,000 or is that the aggregate of the two bridges combined or does the value of the bridge work for the project on which it was built have to equal or exceed \$5,000,000?

Response: Offerors are required to include two (2) separate projects on each the Lead Contractor Work History Form and the Lead Designer Work History Form that each have a minimum construction value of \$5,000,000 for the bridge work. If one (1) project included the construction or design of multiple bridges, then the aggregate total construction value of all bridges may count towards the \$5,000,000 minimum construction value requirement for that one (1) project.

- 27. Please provide the utility test hole certification/data sheets for the Verizon duct bank (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 44, 45, 52, 64, 65, 66, 77 and 78).

Response: The Test Hole Certification documents will be posted to the VDOT RFP website.

- 28. Has any utility, other than Fairfax Water, provided a preliminary conflict evaluation, relocation plan or cost estimate?

Response: Offerors are responsible for coordinating utility requirements including costs directly with the utility owner.

- 29. The hydraulic analysis assumes a ground elevation of 303.0 under the bridge. Part 2 Section 2.12 of the RFP states the Verizon duct bank is not to be disturbed during construction. If the elevation of the existing Verizon duct bank reduces the opening under the bridge, does the bridge design need to be adjusted to compensate for the reduced waterway opening?

Response: The Design-Builder shall provide a final design that meets the hydraulic opening requirements and does not impact the existing Verizon duct bank.

- 30. Does the project budget (\$8.7M) include the utility-related works?

Response: The estimated contract value includes all utility relocations required for the Project.