

PARK PHASE OF THE VIRGINIA CAPITAL TRAIL

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Date: 01/16/14

Project: 0005-043-714, PE101, RW201, C501

Subject: RFP Questions and Answers

1. We ordered the RFP information package on 12-20-13 and did not receive the package until 01-03-14. Will VDOT extend the questions due date to allow time to review the RFP information package?

Response: The deadline for perspective Offeror's to submit questions was extended to January 14, 2014. Additionally we will extend the deadline for submitting Price Proposals to February 14, 2014. This schedule change will be included in the upcoming addendum.

2. Will VDOT allow access to the trail from the shoulder of I-295? Provided that the Design-Builder removes and re-installs the limited access fencing as necessary for the entrance.

Response: Access from I-295 will not be allowed.

3. Sheet 19 requires additional survey where the trailhead is located. From a field visit it appears this area could be a wetland. From review of the Preliminary wetland maps it appears this area was not evaluated. Can you confirm if wetland and stream's were identified or not in the area of the trailhead?

Response: In preliminary studies, the Department determined wetland locations and estimated project impacts. However, during final design plan development, the Design-Builder is responsible for determining the presence or absence of wetlands and the appropriate permitting. The trailhead was not included in the study area and was not evaluated by VDOT.

4. Sheet 10 at station 238+75 appears to cross Doran Rd. There is no road crossing shown. Will the trail need to be bifurcated at this road crossing?

Response: The RFP Conceptual Plans are preliminary in nature. The preliminary survey was limited and did not capture the edges of pavement of Doran Rd on plan view; however, the crossing is shown as "match existing" on the profile. The trail is to be bifurcated at that crossing (as at all roadway crossings) per the detail on plan sheet 2E of the RFP Conceptual Plans. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

5. Sheet 14 shows one 295 bridge that the trail is to be constructed under. Please confirm the trail is to be constructed under both bridges for 295.

Response: The RFP Conceptual Plans are preliminary in nature. The limited preliminary survey did not capture both bridges on plan view. The Trail is to be constructed under both bridges. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

6. Can we have the Virginia Capital Trail-Charles City Interpretive project (K09) plans and proposal set made available (Bid letting date 09/28/2011)? It would be helpful to have any and all special provisions or details that were included.

Response: Plans for the Herring Creek Trailhead can be obtained by submitting a written request to Carlos Garcia at the VDOT Richmond District Office.

7. The RFP plans do not show the existing Doran Road at all is there any improvements required to Doran Road where the trail intersects?

Response: There are no improvements to Doran Road other than what is necessary to provide for a safe trail crossing. Also, see response to Question No. 4.

8. The value engineering study report indicates reducing the bridge width from 14' to 12' with review to be approved by "Decision-Makers" and Chief Engineer. Is this something that we can allow for in our final design build proposal?

Response: The bridge widths as specified in the RFP Documents are the minimum allowable bridge widths.

9. Are we to incorporate any additional costs for composite bridge (superstructure) deck surface material as indicated in the value engineering study report in our design build proposal?

Response: No. Composite bridge deck materials are not be used.

10. How are we to deal with the existing springs (groundwater seepage) along Kinvan Road in our drainage design? Are we to allow for this groundwater to be relieved with the any proposed drainage?

Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for providing adequate and appropriate drainage in compliance with VDOT standards relative to its proposed design.

11. Will additional easements be required around the areas of the existing springs?

Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for providing adequate and appropriate drainage in compliance with VDOT standards relative to its proposed design.

12. The RFP documents special provisions division 7 traffic control has items *SS/SP 703_Traffic Signals*. Will there be any signal work associated with the Park Phase of the project either pedestrian or vehicular?

Response: There are no traffic signals on the Project, either permanent or temporary. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

13. Is access available to the entire alignment for the proposed bidders to complete a field review?

Response: Potential Offerors are encouraged to visit the Project site; however, field investigations such as drilling are not allowed.

14. Will the DOT provide the existing construction plans for the I-295 bridges over Four Mile Creek for reference as part of the RFP documents?

Response: Construction Plans for the I-295 bridges over Four Mile Creek can be obtained by submitting the completed Critical Infrastructure Information (CII)/Sensitivity Security Information (SSI) form to Carlos Garcia at the VDOT Richmond District Office.

15. Conceptual bridge plans 295-69_002 and 295-71_002 did not print correctly on the pdf's. Will these be re-issued in an addendum?

Response: Revised copies of RFP Conceptual Bridge Plan sheets 295-69_002 and 295-71_002 will be provided in an upcoming addendum.

16. Will VDOT procure the Right of Way, temporary and permanent easements required on the Commonwealth of Virginia property?

Response: Properties owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Transportation will not require the need for the right of way, temporary and permanent easements to be acquired, appraised, or negotiated. Properties owned by other agencies of the Commonwealth of Virginia will need to be appraised and negotiated for.

17. Can you clarify the pavement marking and permanent sign panel requirements as outlined in previous trail sections? Will post mounted sign panels be required at the trail/bridge transition areas and trail/road crossing locations?

Response: In accordance with Part 2, Section 2.9, Signing and Pavement Marking Plans are required from the Design-Builder for approval by VDOT and shall be included as planned work packages. Markings and signing shall be provided at road crossings for safety purposes. The trail is to be signed and marked in a similar fashion as the previous trail sections for consistency purposes. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

18. Is there to be any landscape plantings along the section 1-3 trail sections shoulder/slope areas?

Response: No. The only planting plan is for the Trailhead area.

19. What are the requirements for permanent pavement markings? Are we to mark the trail/bridge transition areas and trail/road crossing locations?

Response: See the response to question No. 17.

20. RFP plan sheet #2 Kinvan Road section indicates "Refer to Geotechnical Engineering Report" for minimum mill and overlay design. The GDR section 7.0 Pavements does not provide this information. What is the responsibility of the design builder for depth of mill & thickness of overlay on Kinvan Road?

Response: The mill and overlay requirements for Kinvan Road will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

21. What are the requirements of access using existing Dominion Power utility easements for construction of the project? Who would be the contact and are we allowed discussing with them?

Response: It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to coordinate with utility owners. Refer to Part 2, Section 2.13 of the RFP. For access the Design-Builder will need to enter into an encroachment agreement with the utility company. The contact for Dominion Power is Rick McDonald who can be reached at (804) 775-5236. Yes, the Design-Builder may discuss the project with the utility company.

22. What are the requirements for work in the Colonial Pipeline easement? There is no information available for this utility owner in the RFP documents. Who would be the contact and are we allowed discussing with them?

Response: It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to coordinate with utility owners. Refer to Part 2, Section 2.13 of the RFP. For access the Design-Builder will need to enter into an encroachment agreement with the utility company. The contact for Colonial Pipeline is Timothy Gross who can be reached at (804) 672-3077. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum. Yes, the Design-Builder may discuss the project with the utility company.

23. Is the intent as shown on RFP plan sheet #7 to remove the existing roadway drainage culvert and structure and upgrade the storm sewer with new piping and structure at station 504+00?

Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for determining if the existing roadway drainage system is adequate or needs to be upgraded and/or improved. Sufficient permanent

drainage easement was shown in the RFP Conceptual Plans to accommodate any improvements that may be necessary.

24. Will bicycle lane pavement markings (VDOT PM-6) be required along the new Kinvan Road shoulders?

Response: Shared lane markings are to be installed, as described in Section 9C.07 of the 2009 MUTCD. In addition to the shared lane markings, signage alerting motorists along Kinvan Road of the trail crossing shall be provided. The Design-Builder shall follow Section 9B.18 of the 2011 Virginia Supplement to the 2009 MUTCD. Some signs to consider for installation include, but are not limited to, W11-15/W11-15P assembly, W11-1, and W11-2. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

25. Access to phase 2 is going to be an issue without disturbing wetlands. Will Henrico County allow access through Dorey Park or along the existing sewer easement? Who would be the contact at the county and are we allowed discussing with them?

Response: Issues related to Henrico County property should be coordinated with E. Todd Eure at (804) 501-4617.

26. Will right of monuments be required along the permanent maintenance easement through Henrico County and VDOT property?

Response: At this time, it is not anticipated that right of monuments will be required. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to determine the need for monuments as part of the final design. Should the Final Design conclude that right of way monuments are warranted and subsequently approved by VDOT, costs for the monuments and their installation will be paid for, if and when necessary, under a Work Order in accordance with [Article 9 of Part 4 \(General Conditions of Contract\)](#).

27. Can the preliminary trail cross sections be provided to the bidders?

Response: The cross sections will not be provided.

28. Does VDOT anticipate a CLOMR will be required from FEMA since the trail will be constructed within the regulatory floodway?

Response: A CLOMR is not anticipated and the RFP Conceptual Plans do not show any proposed embankment/fill in a regulatory floodway. The Design-Builder is responsible for developing a bridge and trail design that does not impact the 100-year flood elevation of FEMA detailed studied streams.

29. The preliminary drainage design and HH&A report states that the bridge piles were assumed at over 30' below the streambed elevation and that any alternative pile design would

require scour evaluation. Did this statement only apply to bridges B603 and B604, or to all bridges? Please clarify.

Response: This statement only applies to bridges spanning waterways and/or defined channels (B603, B604, and B608). The Design-Builder is responsible for determining when a scour evaluation is necessary once the final bridge designs are complete.

30. Will the HECRAS model that was performed as part of the preliminary design be made available to the design team?

Response: The HEC-RAS model will be provided in an upcoming addendum.

31. The HH&A report states that several of the bridges have negligible impact on the flood elevations and that detailed hydraulic analysis was not necessary. Please confirm that a detailed HH&A analysis of these bridges is not required during design.

Response: The Design-Builder is responsible for developing the final bridge design and determining if an H&HA is required for each individual bridge.

32. The RFP package contained the swl.dgn file, however there were no wetlands shown along the alignment of the proposed trail (only wetlands at the Route 5 and I-295 interchange). Is there a dgn file that contains the existing wetlands that were delineated during the initial field investigations?

Response: No. The delineations were for preliminary information only. The Design-Builder will be responsible for identifying, delineating and mapping the wetlands.

33. Since the trailhead improvements are on Henrico County property, do we have to go through a site plan submittal/approval process with Henrico County? The RFP and the plan sheets just say it has to be submitted to VDOT for the landscape arch approval, but nowhere does it say that it DOES NOT have to go to Henrico County.

Response: Plan submittals requirements are defined in Part 2, Section 2.15.5 of the RFP. The Design-Builder shall submit all Right of Way and/or Construction plans to VDOT, FHWA, and Henrico County simultaneously, for review and approval.

34. For the paved entrances along Kinvan Road, does the asphalt need to go to the limits as denoted on Sheet No. 7 or only to 5' beyond the paved shoulder/trail on each side of Kinvan Road?

Response: The asphalt shall extend to five (5) feet beyond the limits of the paved shoulder/trail for all entrances. The remainder of the entrance, at a minimum, shall be replaced in kind with a material similar to that of the existing entrance.

35. Does bridge B601 over the "Extant Earthworks" need to be 16' wide as shown on the plans or 14' wide like the other bridges?

Response: The sixteen (16) foot width is necessary to maintain adequate sight distance across bridge B601 with the RFP Conceptual Plan alignment, due to the sharpness of the curve.

36. For Bridge B601, a horizontal curve is indicated within the main span. Can a series of tangent/deflected spans be utilized to simulate the curve?

Response: The RFP Conceptual Plans depict one solution for designing the alignment and the bridge. The Design-Builder is responsible for developing the final design. A series of tangent/deflected spans may be utilized if in compliance with the Standard and Reference Documents listed in Part 2, Section 2.1.1.