

## ROUTE 29 BRIDGE OVER LITTLE ROCKY RUN

### RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

March 18, 2013, ~~Revised March 26, 2013~~ Revised March 28, 2013

1. The RFP for the original procurement of this project which was submitted in August 2012 had a Notice to Proceed date of November 15, 2012, and Substantial and Final Completion in May 2015-a total of 30 months for the project. The latest RFP has Notice to Proceed date of June 2013, Substantial Completion date of August 2015 and Final Completion date of October 2015-a total of 26 months to achieve substantial completion. Due to the need to acquire right-of-way and utility easements prior to relocating the significant utilities that are in conflict with the proposed bridge and the required bridge construction phasing, meeting the revised schedule along with all other project constraints may not be possible. Would VDOT consider revising the project schedule requirements to match the 30 month schedule per the original RFP?

*The initial contract time considered a Notice to Proceed (NTP) at the onset of winter and the holiday season, which will not be the case with anticipated Notice of Intent to Award in April 2013. The period of time allotted for construction allows for contract completion in fall of 2015 and commencing during favorable weather in 2013. Adjustment of the contract time allotted to this contract for 30 months would put the completion in mid-winter 2016 and is not an option.*

2. RFP Part 2 Article 2.6.1.1 indicates that the "pavement layers for widening shall be placed such that the top of the intermediate asphalt course matches grade and cross slope of the milled surface." This will leave only the 1.5" surface asphalt course to get to the finished grade of the widened section. However, the overlay section requires a minimum of 3.5" of asphalt over the milled pavement to include the 1.5" surface course, 2" intermediate course, and any variable depth base asphalt build-up. When widening the pavement next to an overlay section, can the design-builder construct the widened pavement such that the top of the base asphalt matches the grade and cross slope of any variable depth base asphalt overlay such that both the intermediate and surface courses on the overlay section and widened sections can be placed in uniform lifts across the joint.

*The pavement section shall be constructed per the RFP and GDR requirements; the top of the IM-19.0A in the widened area shall be level with the milled surface prior to any build-up.*

3. RFP Part 2, Article 2.11 indicates that Survey Plats will be required for right-of-way acquisition. As discussed during the pre-proposal meeting, VDOT is moving toward utilization of "RW series" plan sheets rather than plats for right-of-way acquisition. Will the RW series plans be a requirement of this project?

*Yes, the "RW series" plans will be used on this project rather than plats. This will be addressed in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

4. RFP Part 2, Article 2.11, Bullet 16 indicates that under certain circumstances the design-builder will be required to continue negotiations for a "minimum of 60 days" after the certificate is filed. After that time the case will be assigned to an attorney appointed by VDOT. It is our understanding that it is VDOT's policy to assign an attorney within 60 days after filing certificate. If that is correct, should the requirement be a "maximum of 60 days"? As currently written the Offeror would potentially need to carry contingency to cover additional negotiations that could last for years after a certificate is filed.

*The "minimum of 60 days" will be changed to "maximum of 60 days." in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

5. During the 1st procurement, VDOT held a utility meeting with the Offerors to discuss the utilities within the project limits, the known conflicts, specifics of the Verizon line that must remain in place, etc. The meeting was very beneficial to ensure that the Offeror's were aware of the utility relocation requirements for the project including the requirement to pay Fairfax Water to design the relocation of the 24" waterline. Will VDOT consider holding another Utility Meeting for this procurement as there may be additional Offeror's that were not involved in the 1st procurement? Additionally, having each Offeror approach each utility independently will result in increased time spent by the utilities and can result in variances in the information provided to each Offeror.

*VDOT will not hold another Utility Meeting. Utility requirements are provided in the RFP. Additionally, all Offerors should contact each utility company to discuss any questions they may have.*

6. 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?

*The Offeror should include costs associated with this monitoring in their lump sum bid.*

7. 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?

*The Offeror is not responsible for any Hazardous Environmental Conditions encountered at the site, therefore, the Offeror should not include cost of treating petroleum-contaminated water.*

8. 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.

*Part 2 Section 2.4.2 states that on September 30, 2009, the SHPO determined the project would have No Adverse Effect on eligible historic properties in the Area of Potential Effect. “No Adverse Effect” will be changed to “No Effect” in RFP Addendum No. 1. The EQ-103 is correct.*

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

*There are no historic properties in the project APE.*

- 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.

*The project limits are a 0.25 mile long stretch of Route 29 and begin at 0.09 mile west of Mill Road to 0.14 mile east of Newgate Blvd. Due to the limited nature of proposed ground disturbance the DHR has concurred that because the undertaking will occur entirely within the previously disturbed roadway corridor, no further work is warranted.*

9. 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.

*VDOT will be the permittee for the VSMP permit as per the latest version of IIM-242. VDOT will be responsible for payment of the VSMP permit fee.*

10. Part 2 Section 2.4.3 states that the Offeror 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 Offeror will be responsible for post construction monitoring beyond the final completion date, and if so the anticipated duration that monitoring will be required.

*No, the Offeror is not responsible for permit related monitoring beyond project completion. There are two types of construction monitoring that could potentially be tied to water quality permits. 1) Monitoring and reporting of authorized impacts to jurisdictional waters of the US (e.g., streams and wetlands) during construction is typically a requirement of the Department of Environmental Quality permits for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd months of construction and then every 6 months thereafter until the project is complete. 2) Monitoring of compensatory mitigation established within the project limits (onsite mitigation). Typically, this requires annual monitoring and reporting for a period 2-5 years post construction. If the project will be completed prior to fulfilling the required monitoring period then the Offeror shall notify VDOT Environmental staff and the permit transferred from the Offeror to VDOT.*

11. 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, or if deck drainage is required; please provide direction as to whether these deck drains can outfall directly into Little Rocky Run.

*The Offeror shall follow the guidance provided in the most current version of VDOT's Manual of Structure and Bridge Division, Vol. V, Part 2, Chapter 22. At this time, there are no specific restrictions to direct discharge of deck drainage into Little Rocky Run.*

12. 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.”

- a. 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.

*Yes, a bridge load rating shall be performed on the existing conditions per the providers proposed sequencing for review by the Department.*

- b. 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?

*The structure shall initially be rated using LRFR as outlined in IIM-S&B-86. The determination of the use of other methods will be based on that analysis and at the discretion of the District Bridge Engineer or designee as outlined in IIM-S&B-86.*

- 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.

*Yes, posting shall be in place prior to structure modification if required.*

13. 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.

*The costs for HDR design cost, and Fairfax Water inspection fees should be included in the Offeror's lump sum bid. Offerors should contact Fairfax Water for estimated costs.*

14. Per section 2.7.3 Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan states that post construction Stormwater Management (SWM) Plan shall be prepared and implemented by the Design-Builder in compliance with applicable requirements of the standards and reference documents listed in Section 2.1. The documents listed refer to VDOT Instructional & Information Memoranda (I&IM), all

Division. The current I&IM for post SWM is VDOT IIM-LD-195.7 which allows performance based and technology based criteria. There is no mention of the Stormwater Program Advisory SWPA 12-01. We understand that the preliminary SWM calculations were completed using performance based criteria. Is the Design-Builder to follow the current I&IM 195.7 and address SWM by performance based or technology based criteria?

*Yes, the Offeror shall follow IIM-195.7.*

15. Part 2, Section 2.2 states “unless otherwise approved by VDOT, no change to or deviation from the listed criteria shall be allowed” with respect to the Minimum Roadway Design Criteria Table provided in Attachment 2.2. That table requires a left turn lane taper length of 200’ for the left turn to Centreville Farms Road. However, recent direction from VDOT has required turn lane tapers to comply with the Road Design Manual, Appendix A, page A-6 formulas for “Lane/Transitions, Merging Tapers, and Speed Change Lengths.” Based on this requirement, the turn lane taper length (L) would need to be 600’ (W=12’, S=50mph) or a design waiver would be required. Please clarify if the taper should be increased to 600’ to avoid a design waiver.

*The left turn lane taper should meet the criteria set forth in Figure 3-1 on page F-48 of Appendix F of the Road Design Manual. This should not require a Design Waiver.*

16. Attachment 2.2 indicates the superelevation standard to be used is TC-5.01U, however recent requirements are for all designs to follow TC-5.11U. Please clarify if the current TC-5.11U superelevation standard should be followed.

*The most current superelevation standard TC-5.11U should be followed. This will be addressed in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

17. Attachment 2.2 indicates the storage and full width decel length for the left turn to Centreville Farms Road is to be 410’. VDOT NOVA District has been requiring the full width length to at least be as long as the deceleration length required from the design speed to a stop condition, or 435’ for a 50mph facility. Please clarify if the turn lane length will need to be lengthened to 435’ to avoid development and approval of a design waiver, as has recently been required on numerous projects.

*The turn lane length should be lengthened to 435 ft to comply with current VDOT NOVA District requirements. This will be addressed in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

18. The septic field on Parcel 008 will be impacted by widening of Route 29 and will require replacement or connection to public sewer service. There is no public sewer service available without acquisition of easements on adjacent properties. The shortest distance to public sewer is to the north, on the other side of Little Rocky Run, but this connection would be beyond the limits of environmental studies already completed. Please clarify if the design-builder will be responsible for all costs associated with connection to the public sewer, including additional cultural and environmental studies and public coordination.

*The Design-Builder shall be responsible for all costs associated with the replacement or connection to public sewer service, including but not limited to environmental studies.*

19. As part of the previous RFP for this project, VDOT indicated they would be obtaining approval of a design waiver for Adjacent Box Beams with composite deck on an Urban Principal Arterial. Please confirm this waiver approval is still being processed or has been obtained such that this type of construction will be acceptable for use on this project.

*A Design Waiver has been approved for the use of voided concrete slabs and can be downloaded from VDOT's Design-Build Request for Proposals website using the following link:*

<http://www.virginiadot.org/business/request-for-proposals.asp>

*The design waiver will be amended to allow the use of adjacent box beams. The overall structural depth will be limited to allow a maximum of a nominal 27" deep box beam with a nominal composite deck thickness of 7.5" per the requirements of the VDOT Structural and Bridge Design Manual Vol. V, Part 2, Chapter 12, File 12.06-1. The Design Build team is responsible for the final bridge configuration meeting all the specified required final design hydraulic performance.*

*The limitation of a 27" beam depth is for hydraulic reasons, namely, to prevent any increase in the level of the upstream 100-Year Floodplain beyond the Right-of-Way. Given the bridge span length and pier configurations as shown in the RFP, lowering the low chord elevation more than the 27" depth will result in an increase in the existing 100-Year Floodplain elevations. This is not consistent with the policies in the VDOT Drainage Manual for this case where a FEMA Floodplain has been delineated on the effective FIRM. While this is a Zone A FEMA Floodplain without detailed elevations depicted, its boundaries were based on a formal hydrologic/hydraulic study conducted in the past. Furthermore, the existing floodplain impacts several properties and buildings which would be adversely affected by further increases. Increases in the roadway profile are not acceptable due to excessive access impacts with several properties adjacent to the bridge site. For these reasons it is concluded that the beam depth shall not exceed the 27" limitation.*

20. RFP Part 2, Section 2.13.2, states: "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...". Please confirm that this statement is meant to require that the Lead QA inspector is required to be on site at all times (full-time) during construction.

*It is the Department's intention to have the QA Inspector(s) on site full-time, and as necessary to meet the requirements of Part 2, Section 2.13.2 for the duration of the construction of the project.*

21. The RFP does not state the level of involvement for the Quality Assurance Manager. Please confirm whether it is the expectation of the Department that the Quality Assurance Manager should be on site full-time or part-time for the duration of the construction. If part-time, please indicate the expectation of what part-time means (1 day per week, 2 days per week...).

*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. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the number of hours and amount of time the QAM is required on the construction site to satisfy the requirements of the RFP.*

22. While it appears the RFP requires the Lead QA inspector be on site full time during construction, there is no mention of the expectation for the level of staffing for the QC inspection staff. Please provide direction regarding whether or not the Department expects there to be full time QC inspection for the project.

*It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to determine the number of hours, amount of time on site, and the level of staffing for QC staff in order to satisfy the requirements of the RFP.*

23. Reference files are missing from the following DGN files included in the RFP Information Package:

- b77322001.dgn, missing reference file 01\_Front Sheet\_DB.dgn
- b77322002.dgn, missing reference file 02\_Transverse Section\_DB.dgn
- b77322003.dgn, missing reference file 03\_Substructure\_DB.dgn

*The subject DGN files will be updated to include the missing reference files and will be posted on VDOT's Design Build Request for Proposals website along with RFP Addendum No. 1.*