

**RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**  
**ROUTE 35 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT WIDENING**  
**VDOT PROJECT 0035-087-112**

**July 29, 2013**

---

- 1) Part 2, Section 1.5, 3rd Paragraph, last two sentences, "Utility betterments shall not be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal but shall be reimbursed to the Design-Builder through agreement with the requesting utility owner. Betterments must be requested by and/or approved by the affected utility owner and must meet Buy America requirements as described...."

If the betterments costs are covered by the utility owner, how would Buy America be relevant to their facility? And, how are we the design builder going to mandate that they follow a requirement of our contract and assume the costs that is associated?

*Betterment costs are paid by the utility owner and are not a Project cost. The utility will need to provide a certification that the materials used for project betterments meet the Buy America requirement.*

- 2) Part 2, Section 1.5, 1st Paragraph, states: "The Offeror's conceptual design included in their proposal shall be wholly contained within the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plan, with the exception of temporary construction, permanent drainage, and utility easements." Part 2, Section 2.12, 1st Paragraph, states: "The Offeror's conceptual design included in their proposal shall be wholly contained within the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans, with the exception of easements (other than for Stormwater management facilities).

Which one is correct?

*The Offeror's conceptual design included in their proposal shall be wholly contained within the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plan, with the exception of temporary construction, permanent drainage, and utility easements (other than permanent drainage easements for stormwater management facilities). RFP Addendum No.1 will reflect this change.*

- 3) Part 2, Section 1.5, 2nd Paragraph, states: "The Offeror's final design shall also be contained with the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plan, with the exception of easements." Part 2, Section 2.12, 1st Paragraph, states: "The Design-Builder's final shall also be contained with the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans, with the exception of easements (other than permanent drainage easement for SWM facilities).

Which one is correct?

*The Offeror's conceptual design included in their proposal shall be wholly contained within the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plan, with the exception of temporary construction, permanent drainage, and utility easements (other than permanent drainage easements for stormwater management facilities). RFP Addendum No.1 will reflect this change.*

- 4) Are there any Time-of-Year Restrictions for in-stream work on this project?

*There is the potential for TOYR on this project associated with anadromous fish and Bald Eagle nesting sites. Final determinations of the applicable TOYR will be concluded in the Design-Builder's coordination with the regulatory agencies during the permitting process for the project.*

- 5) Are there any restrictions other than blocking 50% of the stream on using causeways and or work-bridges to gain access to work items in the wetlands or in the stream?

*Restrictions related to work in the jurisdictional areas will be determined during the Design-Builder's permit coordination with the regulatory agencies.*

- 6) On the Table of Contents of the "Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis for Route 35 over the Nottoway River" dated August 7, 2012, it makes references to a "CD Containing HEC-RAS Files, LD-293 Forms". We would like to obtain a copy of the CD.

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.*

- 7) Please advise if the replacement bridge needs to make accommodations for any proposed or future utilities? If so, what is required?

*The proposed bridge does not need to make accommodations for private or public utilities. See Question and Answer No. 8. The Design Builder will need to make sure that they have all permits required for utility facility relocation.*

- 8) If existing overhead utilities on the north and south side (power, cable and telephone) need to be relocated, can they be supported/accommodated in the replacement bridge?

*Supporting/accommodating utility facilities in the replacement bridge design will be considered. A request for bridge attachment will need to be submitted for review and approval by the Department. Please refer to Section 7.6 of the VDOT Utilities Manual of Instruction (Tenth Edition, Date: 01/01/2011).*

- 9) We would like to request a copy of the current NBIS inspection report for the bridge.

*District Structure and Bridge will provide the inspection report to the successful Offeror after formal request and CII/SII forms are submitted for each person who is going to view the document.*

- 10) We would like to request a copy of the "Record" existing bridge construction plans referenced in the RFP Part 2–Technical Requirements Para. 2.1.2.

*Record Bridge Plans are available. Per Section 2.1.2 of RFP Part 2, the Record Bridge Plans are not deemed a component of the RFP. Offerors interested in obtaining the previously developed record plans should contact the Design-Build POC specified in Part 1, Section 2.5.*

- 11) Can the Letter of Submittal be organized in two volumes: one for 8 1/2x11 sheets and one for 11x17 sheets (drawings)?

*The Letter of Submittal and Attachments to the Letter of Submittal shall be bound in one (1) cohesive volume. 11"x17" attachments (Work History Forms and Drawings) must be folded to 8.5"x11".*

- 12) No HEC-RAS/FEMA HEC-2 model files were included in the RFP package, since the H&HA report references this information and no firms have been precluded from this solicitation, could a copy of the HEC RAS and HEC-2 analysis be provided?

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis. Questions regarding the preliminary HHA should be directed to VDOT, not the consultant.*

- 13) Potential Stormwater management locations are noted on sheet 7 and 7A, but no information could be found indicating the potential locations for the stormwater management facilities. If the final locations are for the DB team to determine, is survey information (including utilities, contour, right-of-way, etc) available for these locations to determine the feasibility of potential stormwater management sites?

*Potential stormwater management locations noted on Sheet 7 and 7A are provided for the Offeror's consideration. On Sheet 7, VDOT will provide available contour and utility files in RFP Addendum No. 1. On Sheet 7A, Microstation files with contours and utility designation are not available.*

- 14) Considering stormwater management facilities are proposed at an offsite location, were the off-site locations included in the environmental document evaluations? Are there any site constraints from an environmental perspective the DB team needs to consider (i.e. Historical or cultural resources, wetlands, T&E species, other environmental commitments related to the 6058-087-E04, C504 project)?

*Plan Sheets 7, 7A, with off-site locations are within the Right of Way of Route 58. Stormwater management sites were not identified during the environmental coordination process and have not been considered in any of the environmental coordination completed by the Department. Once sites have been determined by the Design-Builder, further coordination with the Environmental Section will be required in reference to CR, HM and the environmental document. The wetlands and T&E species coordination are the responsibility of the Design Builder to determine and coordinate with the appropriate agencies.*

- 15) RFP Part 2, Section 2.3.1 states "The replacement bridge shall utilize a structure section providing vertical clearance that does not increase the 100-year flood stage for the Nottoway River." RFP Attachment 2.2 indicates the design criteria to set the vertical clearance as the bridge low chord above 100YR WSE. RFP Part 2, Section 2.8.1, Hydraulic and Hydraulic Analysis: states the "proposed conveyance system shall be designed by the Design-Builder to meet all applicable hydraulic requirements including FEMA, FHWA, VDOT Drainage Manual (including errata sheet), HDAs, and IIMs". Following the design criteria outlined in the VDOT drainage manual would not require the low chord to be set above the 100-year WSE, but would require the project to adhere to the no rise criteria in Section 2.3.1. The existing bridge does not pass the 100-year WSE beneath the low chord. Please confirm that Attachment 2.2 supersedes the VDOT Drainage Manual and the proposed bridge low chord shall be set above the 100-year WSE.

*The existing Route 35 truss bridge does not meet current FHWA and VDOT standards with low chord above the 100YR WS. The replacement bridge follows the VDOT Drainage Manual and FHWA requirements with the low chord set above the 100 yr WSE.*

- 16) According to SB-300 the Nottoway River is navigable from the mouth to Route 634, the Nottoway River navigable through the Route 35 crossing. What is the required Coast Guard Clearance for the proposed bridge? Are there any other Coast Guard requirements or commitments for construction or final design required?

*The Project will not require a Coast Guard Bridge Permit. A copy of the letter from the Coast Guard to VDOT will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 17) The project footprint falls within a FEMA regulatory floodplain and floodway. Is there any required coordination of the Design-Build Team with FEMA or the Local Floodplain Manager(s) if the project changes the bridge footprint in the floodway, but adheres to the no-rise criteria outlined in the VDOT drainage manual?

*VDOT will review the Design-Builder's flood plain impacts with bridge plan submission and coordinate with FEMA or the local floodplain managers as required. The no-rise of 100 YR WS criteria minimizes coordination with other agencies.*

- 18) The proposed RFP bridge plan shows a different span arrangement than the current bridge situation. Will a no-rise criterion be required to be adhered to when construction activities will include both proposed and existing piers are in place during the middle of construction? Was this criteria evaluated with the RFP bridge situation?

*The existing Route 35 truss bridge does not meet current FHWA and VDOT standard with low chord above the 100YR WS. The replacement bridge follows the VDOT Drainage Manual and FHWA requirements with the low chord set above the 100 yr WSE. Each bridge was included in the HEC-RAS modeling following the no-rise criterion.*

- 19) Are the HEC-RAS input files available for distribution?

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.*

- 20) It is not clear how many and what size sets of plans are required for submissions except for "Released for Construction" plans. Please clarify.

*Plan submittal requirements are provided in RFP Part 2, Section 2.16.5. VDOT shall receive two (2) full-size sets and ten (10) half-size sets of each submission, with the exception of the Released for Construction Plans noted in Section 2.16.8 FHWA shall receive two (2) half-size sets of each submission.*

- 21) Will VDOT permit drilling of soil borings from the existing bridge?

*Drilling from the existing bridge is allowed. However, drilling from the existing bridge will require coordination with several groups, including but not limited to: VDOT's Franklin Residency, Hampton Roads Structure and Bridge office, LCAMS, and Southampton County Board of Supervisors. The Design Builder is responsible for any and all permits associated with the drilling.*

*Structure and Bridge has the following restrictions for drilling from the existing bridge:*

- The drilling equipment shall not exceed the weight limit of the bridge*
- The drilling operation shall not damage any structural member (i.e. floor beams, stringers, girders, etc.)*
- Proper VA WAPM traffic control is utilized*
- Any lane closures are properly scheduled*
- Appropriate deck patching is put in the core holes*

*If the drilling equipment exceeds the posted weight limits, a more rigorous analysis may be performed by the Offeror to determine the safe capacity of the structure for the specific equipment that must be approved by and at no additional cost to the Department.*

- 22) There is a SFM manhole on the north side of the bridge approximate station 20+50. Will it have to be offset or relocated? Or plugged and removed? If it is live, can it be shut off for a new relocated alignment? Is there more survey information to indicate where the line goes?

*It is the Design/Builders responsibility to coordinate with the owner of the facility to determine if the facility will need to be offset, relocated, plugged, removed and if the facility is live and can be shut off. As for survey information, see Question and Answer No. 39.*

- 23) The ECS GDR indicates that four borings were previously drilled for a preliminary analysis. Please provide these boring logs (Original borings B-1 through B-4).

*The report titled "Minimum Pavement Design Recommendations for Design Build Project," dated September 11, 2012 will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. Boring logs B-1 through B-4 are included in this report.*

- 24) Will the samples from the ECS reports be made available for viewing by the DB teams? If so, where are they located?

*Jar samples obtained from the geotechnical exploration were submitted to the laboratory for testing. No extra samples were stored or are available.*

- 25) The cover letter to the ECS report indicates the data will be used for VDOT's "Preliminary Soil Survey". Please provide the survey if one was done.

*A "Soil Survey" was not performed for this Project. The information generated by ECS was used, in part, to develop minimum pavement recommendations. The majority of the new pavement will be constructed on new fill for this Project. The available support conditions of this fill material shall be established by the Design-Builder during final design.*

- 26) Can the geology be added to the ECS boring logs?

*Geology for selected borings will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 27) Several undisturbed samples (UD) were obtained of the very stiff clay encountered in the borings. Were any shear strength or consolidation tests performed on these samples. If so, please provide.

*Additional laboratory data will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 28) Were any shear strength or consolidation tests performed on the soft clay encountered at both ends of the site in the areas of the embankment widening/raising (i.e. soft clay samples from borings B-5, B-8, B-37, B3-8 and B-39)? If so, please provide.

*No shear strength or consolidation tests were performed on samples from these borings. Additional laboratory data will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 29) Are there any pavement reports available? If so, please provide.

*The report titled "Minimum Pavement Design Recommendations for Design Build Project," dated September 11, 2012 will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 30) Please provide the hydraulic model for the existing bridge and any As-Built drawings or survey information for the upstream adjacent Rail Road bridge.

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.*

- 31) Please provide the NEPA Categorical Exclusion document / form.

*The Categorical Exclusion document was included in the original RFP Information Package released on July 2, 2013. The document is titled "CE 81457.pdf."*

- 32) Please confirm that to meet RFP & VDOT standards the only jointed option is a fully continuous superstructure with Virginia abutment.

*That is correct. Per RFP Part 2, Section 2.3.1 the use of continuous span units and jointless bridge design technologies shall be used.*

33) Will VDOT allow 10' wide temporary traffic lanes during construction?

*Based on the Work Area Protection Manual, existing posted speed of 45 mph and a current ADT of 3400, a minimum temporary lane width of 11' is required on Route 35.*

34) Are there any limit requirements for minimum span lengths?

*There is not a limit on span lengths provided that all hydraulic, environmental and/or permit issues are satisfied.*

35) The begin and end construction call outs are set at 10+25 and 29+75 respectively. Why are Begin and End project termini set at Stations 12+10 and 27+50 respectively?

*Project Termini complies with Roadway Design Manual guidance provided on page 2D-25.*

36) Does the NEPA document cover the entire length of the construction improvements [10+25 to 29+75]?

*Yes, NEPA covers the entire length of the construction improvements.*

37) The dgn's indicate that a hydraulics/drainage file exists for the Route 35 project with the name h81457des.dgn, but was not included with the RFP information package. Can VDOT provide this file?

*Preliminary hydraulic/drainage files were not included in the RFP Information Package and will not be provided.*

38) Since VDOT will ultimately own and operate the lighting associated with these plans, will TERF charges by the utility companies be applicable?

*TERF charges are not applicable for the relocation of any existing facilities. As for lighting, VDOT will own and maintain the lighting with service provided by Dominion Virginia. Power. The cost to design and construct this service is applicable to TERF charges.*

39) There is a SFM Manhole located at station 20+50 right. Does VDOT know if the SFM runs North/South or East/West? Additionally, the plans do not indicate the owner of this facility.

*The Department does not have any information on the SFM. It is the Design/Builders responsibility to verify all utility owners within the project limits and coordinate with them. It is also the responsibility of the Design/Builder for all utility designation and utility locations (test holes).*

40) Current revisions to RDM were made in July 2013 but issued after this RFP, do these revisions apply for this project?

*The current revisions to the Road Design Manual (RDM), dated July 2013, will apply to this Project. This requirement will be included in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

41) The Department has determined there are adequate detours on state primary routes that can be used. However, an assessment of the WZTIA is still required.

- a. Will the concurrent construction contract at the Route 58 Courland Interchange impact the timeline for which this project may close the bridge and install a detour?

- b. Will the DB Team be responsible for additional analysis for concurrent construction projects which may influence this project's WZTIA where acceptable detour routes would become impaired by congestion due to multiple detours?

*The Route 58/Courtland Interchange is planned to be advertised during the summer of 2014 and will likely impact the Rte 35 timeline. Additional analysis on the influence to the project's WZTIA will be required by the Design-Builder.*

- 42) Debarment Forms - RFQ section 4.2.2 states "Execute and return the attached Certification Regarding Debarment Form(s) Primary Covered Transactions, set forth as Attachment 4.2.2(a) and Certification Regarding Debarment Form(s) Lower Tier Covered Transactions, set forth as Attachment 4.2.2(b) for the Offeror and any subconsultant, subcontractor, or any other person or entity on the Offeror's organizational chart."

Since the organizational chart is a Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittal, all firms that will be included on the Offeror's organizational chart may not be identified prior to submittal of the RFP. Would it be acceptable to submit debarment forms for the Lead Contractor, Lead Design, and Major Design Subconsultants only with the Letter of Submittal, and provide additional debarment forms with the Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittal?

*Offerors are to submit debarment forms for all firms included on the Offerors proposed team at the time of the Letter or Submittal.*

- 43) DPOR Licenses and SCC Registrations - RFQ section 4.2.5 states "All business entities on the Offeror's proposed team shall satisfy all commercial and professional registration requirements, including, but not limited to those requirements of the Virginia State Commission (SCC) and the Virginia Department of Professional and Occupational Regulations (DPOR). Full size copies of DPOR licenses and SCC registrations, or evidence indicating the same, should be included in the appendix of the Letter of Submittal."

Further definition of "all business entities on the Offeror's proposed team" would assist in determining which firms DPOR licenses and SCC registrations should be included in the submittal. Should this information be provided for any business entity that will be shown on the organizational chart, any DBE firms identified, and any subcontractor identified prior to the proposal submission? With the submission of the organizational chart included in the Post Notice of Intent to Award Submittal, all firms on the team may not be identified prior to submission of the Proposal.

*Offerors are to submit SCC and DPOR information for all firms included on the Offerors proposed team at the time of the Letter or Submittal.*

- 44) One of the requirements for this project is for the Design-Builder to provide the duration of the Bridge Closure Days (BCD), the Interim Milestone. Part 1 Section 4.1.10 asks, in part, for the Interim Milestone date. By requiring a date to be submitted with the bid, the Department is imposing a constraint in addition to the BCD. The date of the start of the BCD is driven by many unknowns at bid time. Will the Department remove this requirement to submit a date along with the bid?

*Submission of an Interim Milestone date (Part 1, Section 4.1.10) and the number of Bridge Closure Days (Part 1, Section 4.3.1) are both a requirement of the RFP. Failure to submit this information may deem the Offeror's proposal non-responsive.*

- 45) Does the hydrographic survey need to be completed?

*VDOT surveyed cross sections of the river channel and flood plain for the consultant to complete the HHA analysis. Those cross sections are included with the bridge situation plan which is in the RFP package. The Design-Builder needs to determine the need for additional hydrographic survey cross sections for their modeling*

- 46) Part 1, Section 11.6 – Please confirm that the number of on-the-job trainees required for the project is ten (10) individuals.

*The Hampton Roads Civil Rights Division has reviewed the number of on-the-job trainees and has set the requirement as two (2) individuals. This change will be reflected in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 47) Part 2, Section 1.5 – Stations and offsets are not depicted for proposed ROW. Are limits of proposed ROW to be defined by line work in the Microstation drawing?

*VDOT will provide the unofficial station/ offsets for the ROW limits provided in the RFP Conceptual Plans. This update to the plans will be provided with RFP Addendum No. 1. However, the Design Builder's Surveyor is required to provide this information while developing the right of way acquisition plans.*

- 48) Part 2, Section 1.5 – Have any utility owners requested any betterments to their facilities?

*No, VDOT has not received any requests from the utility owners for betterments.*

- 49) Part 2, Section 2.1.2 – Can the Department provide copies of the existing bridge plans as described in the last paragraph?

*Record Bridge Plans are available. Per Section 2.1.2 of RFP Part 2, the Record Bridge Plans are not deemed a component of the RFP. Offerors interested in obtaining the previously developed record plans should contact the Design-Build POC specified in Part 1, Section 2.5.*

- 50) Part 2, Section 2.3.3 – Are all types of open rails allowed including Kansas Corral, Illinois Steel Railing, and BR27 Series Steel Railing? Can the Department confirm that the Cast-In-Place Concrete Parapet (F-shape) is not allowed?

*All types of open parapets or rails that meet the requirements in Vol. V, Part II: Chapter 25 and the current details of Vol. V, Part III are allowed. F-shape parapets are NOT allowed on this project.*

- 51) Part 2, Section 2.3.3 – Can the Department confirm that storm water on the deck can be directed to fall directly into the river by the use of deck drains?

*VDOT confirms that deck drainage directly to the Nottoway River or floodplain without a collection system is acceptable.*

- 52) Part 2, Section 2.3.3 – Can the Department confirm that the proposed bridge will not need to accommodate any future utilities?

*The proposed bridge does not need to make accommodations for private or public utilities. See Question and Answer No. 8. The Design Builder will need to make sure that they have all permits required for utility facility relocation.*

- 53) Part 2, Section 2.4 – Can the Department provide copies of any technical environmental studies that have been performed such as archaeological or historic structures surveys, wetland and stream delineations, and threatened and endangered species studies?

*All of the work VDOT undertook to conclude NEPA, as well as, preliminary assessments of permitting requirements and T&E, has been included in the RFP Information Package.*

- 54) Part 2, Section 2.4.2 – Can the Department state whether there any known Time of Year Restrictions for work associated with the project?

*There is a potential TOYR for anadromous fish 2/15-6/30 and for Bald Eagle nesting 5/1-7/31. During final coordination with the regulatory agencies for permits, TOYR will be determined.*

- 55) Part 2, Section 2.4.3 – The RFP states that “A search (June 27, 2012) in the VDOT GIS Integrator indicated that there are T&E species located in the Project area. The Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Resources Clearance report listing these species is included in the RFP Information Package.” The Categorical Exclusion dated 06/27/2012 indicates that there are no federal threatened or endangered species. Can the Department confirm the presence of T&E species in the Project area? Also, can the Department confirm whether the referenced Clearance report was included in the RFP Information Package?

*The Fish, Plant, and Wildlife Resources Clearance report was not included in the RFP Information Package and will be included in RFP Addendum No. 1. The report indicates the species that were identified in the project area and will have to be considered during the permitting process for the project. The Design-Builder will have to re-verify the T&E species data during permitting as T&E species data changes frequently.*

- 56) Part 2, Section 2.4.5 – The RFP states that VDOT performed an Asbestos Inspection on Bridge #1006 and did not identify any positive Asbestos Containing Material (ACM). However, the Special Provision for Asbestos Removal and NESHAP-Related Demolition Requirements for Structures on Design-Build Projects lists ACM identified for Bridge 1802 and 1800. Can the Department provide a copy of the asbestos inspection results for the existing Route 35 bridge?

*A copy of the Asbestos Inspection Report for Bridge 1006 will be included in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 57) Part 2, Section 2.4.5 - The RFP states that abatement and/or removal of hazardous material(s) discovered to exist within the Project limits will be paid for, if and when necessary, under a Work Order in accordance with Article 9 of Part 4 (General Conditions of Contract). Since the RFP states that the bridge has been identified as a Type B structure (structures that have coatings that may generate hazardous wastes), should costs for abatement/removal/disposal be included as a known condition or excluded until testing and management options are confirmed? Can the Department clarify what costs should be included in the Price Proposal for hazardous materials.

*The Design-Builder should follow Section 411 of the VDOT Road and Bridge Specifications.*

- 58) Part 2, Section 2.5 – The RFP states that “The Design-Builder shall depict the monuments on the final plats in accordance with the Department’s Survey Manual.” For this project, will individual plats be required or RW plan sheets as currently described in the Department’s Survey Manual?

*The Design Builder should meet current requirements to provide RW Acquisition Plan Sheets as described in the Department’s Survey Manual and CADD Manual.*

- 59) Part 2, Section 2.7 – The RFP states that the geotechnical engineering investigation shall meet or exceed AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 5th Edition and 2010 Interim Specifications. In Part 2, Section 2.1.1 and Section 2.3.1, the RFP refers to AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 6th Edition. Can the Department confirm the required edition of the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications to use for geotechnical engineering investigations?

*The geotechnical engineering investigation performed by the Design-Builder shall meet or exceed Chapter 3 of the VDOT Materials Division Manual of Instructions (MOI) and the current AASHTO LRFD 6<sup>th</sup> Edition with current VDOT modifications. This language will be included in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 60) Part 2, Section 2.8.4 – For the offsite locations for post construction stormwater management facilities, is the intent to locate the facilities within existing VDOT right-of-way with no right-of-way costs associated with this work?

*Yes, it is the intent of VDOT to locate stormwater management facilities within VDOT right of way.*

- 61) Part 2, Section 2.8.4 - For the offsite locations for post construction stormwater management facilities, can the Department provide existing information related to topography and utilities including any existing survey and subsurface utility files?

*On Sheet 7, VDOT will provide available contour and utility files in RFP Addendum No. 1. On Sheet 7A, Microstation files with contours and utility designation are not available.*

- 62) Part 2, Section 2.8.5 – The RFP refers to cleaning out existing drainage facilities with the project area. Part 2, Section 2.8.2 refers to plugging, removing, or replacing existing drainage facilities. Can the Department clarify the intent of these two sections?

*Per RFP Part 2 Section 2.8.2 the Design-Builder can propose use (or repair) of some or all existing drainage facilities pending VDOT approval. The amount of cleaning, plugging or removal/replacement of existing drainage facilities shall be determined by the Design-Builder. VDOT is not aware of any drainage improvements at the site since the survey was conducted.*

- 63) Microstation files – The Microstation files provided in the RFP documents contain design files that reference the following drawings - h81457des.dgn, d81457xsewgeot.dgn, and d81457xsunsuitable.dgn. The referenced drawings were not included with the Microstation files provided. Can the Department provide copies of these referenced drawings?

*Preliminary hydraulic/drainage files were not included in the RFP Information Package and will not be provided. Drawing d81457xsewgeot.dgn was a conceptual design and will not be provided.*

- 64) Plan Sheet 8(3) – Can the Department provide a copy of the referenced City of Franklin Standard luminaire and light pole?

*The Department will provide this information in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 65) Cross Section Sheets – The cross sections depict an area below the proposed pavement and above the existing pavement delineated by approximately 1:1 sloped lines running from edge of existing pavement at the proposed pavement elevation down to existing grade. See cross section at Sta. 14+25 and Sta. 23+75 for examples. Can the Department clarify what the area outlined indicates?

*Section 2.7.1 of RFP Part 2 recommends scarifying the existing pavement and placing 6-inches of stone as a stabilization friction course. The balance of height between the old and new grades could be made up of new fill material as required to meet final grade. The 1:1 sloped area will be removed from the RFP Conceptual Plans. This change will be reflected in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 66) Special Provisions – Information contained in the RFP documents indicates that the approximate Right-of-Way required for the project will be 5 acres (2.88 acres of right-of-way, 0.10 of permanent easements, and 2.06 acres of temporary easements). The RFP documents include a Special Provision for Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) for Design-Build Projects. The Special Provision does not indicate which parcels require a Phase I or II ESA. Can the Department clarify which parcels require ESA's?

*The subject Special Provision will be removed from the RFP. There is no requirement for this Project to conduct either a Phase I or Phase II ESA.*

- 67) Part 2, Section 1.4 - Please confirm the Design-Builder is responsible to pay for any stream and/or wetland compensation.

*Yes, all costs for compensatory mitigation associated with the project are the sole responsibility of the Design-Builder.*

- 68) Please clarify the DBE subcontracting requirements. Part 1, Section 4.4.4 indicates the requirement for DBE participation of 12%. Part 1, Section 11.5.4 states that SWaM participation is required. Please clarify if the DBE requirement can be achieved 100% by SWaM Businesses, or if there is a portion that will be DBE and portion that will be SWaM of the overall 12% goal.

*Offeror's are encouraged to utilize SWaM vendors to meet the goal in Executive Order Number 33. Although some DBE's are SWaM vendors, Section 11.5.4 is independent of the DBE goal requirement. The DBE contract goal for the Project is twelve percent (12%).*

- 69) Given the Design-Build nature of the project, please consider allowing submission of the C-111, C-49 and C-112 forms post bid, or some modification of the forms to better facilitate a bid time submission. It is often impossible to accurately populate these DBE forms for a Design-Build project prior to finalization of the design. Determination of subcontractor needs is not fully understood until the project scope is finalized.

*Submission of Forms C-111 and C-112 (and C-49 if applicable) with the Price Proposal is a requirement. Offerors that submit Price Proposals that fail to include the required DBE forms in accordance with RFP Part 1, Section 4.3 will be deemed non-responsive.*

- 70) Please provide a copy of the HEC-RAS hydraulic model that was developed for this project.

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.*

- 71) During the pre-proposal meeting, it was indicated by the utility companies in attendance that they were looking at the Project for the first time, and were not knowledgeable to the project requirements for utility relocations. Given the low level of preparedness of the utility companies, it will be improbable that the Design-Builder will be able to obtain adequate information from the utility companies to accurately price the utility relocations. The letting of this project does not allow for enough time for utility coordination meetings and easement and prior rights research. Please consider establishing an allowance for the utility relocation costs, or allowing for more time for proposal preparation.

*It is the Design-Builder's responsibility to conduct utility coordination meetings, easement determination and prior rights. The project budget has an allowance for utility relocation costs. Proposal submission dates will be adjusted based on the release date of Addendum No. 1.*

- 72) Part 2, Section 2.3.3 states that all hardware components for the deck drainage system shall be galvanized steel. Please clarify if the pipe is considered "hardware" and therefore must be galvanized, or if other pipe material is acceptable.

*Current pipe details are located in Manual of Structure and Bridge, Vol. V, Part 2; Chapter 22 shows only steel pipes and shall be hot dipped galvanized after fabrication.*

- 73) The existing slopes are lined with rip-rap. The cross sections in the preliminary plans indicate a requirement for 2" of topsoil. Will rip-rap protection be required on the final slopes?

*Final shape and configuration of slopes is the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The two inches of topsoil shown on the plans is a typical thickness used by VDOT to promote stabilization of the slope by vegetation.*

- 74) Due to the Design-Build nature of this project, and the aggressive proposal schedule, please consider allowing for an additional submission of questions at a later date.

*VDOT's response to Offeror's questions contained herein will be incorporated into RFP Addendum No. 1, when applicable. The proposal schedule will be adjusted accordingly based on the release date of Addendum No. 1. A second round of questions and answers will not be entertained at this time.*

- 75) Can VDOT please provide redline changes to the recently revised 2013 Parts 3, 4 & 5 of the Design-Build Standard Template Documents? This will aid the Offeror in determining the extent of the revisions.

*Redline changes to the recently revised 2013 RFP Parts 3, 4 and 5 template documents will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1.*

- 76) Has a formal wetland delineation been conducted and approved by the USACE?

*No, wetland delineation has not been conducted on the site. The Wetland delineation is the responsibility of the Design Builder*

- 77) Have initial consultations with regulatory agencies been initiated, specifically USFWS, VDGIF, and VDCR Natural Heritage?

*No, consultation with the regulatory agencies has not been initiated. Coordination with regulatory agencies is the responsibility of the Design Builder.*

- 78) Can we drop bridge deck drainage directly into the Nottoway River or floodplain without a collection system?

*VDOT confirms that deck drainage directly to the Nottoway River or floodplain without a collection system is acceptable.*

- 79) Is the HEC-RAS model used for the preliminary Hydraulic report made available to the proposing teams prior to bid and, if so, how can it be obtained?

*HEC-RAS files will be provided in RFP Addendum No. 1. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to complete the final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.*

- 80) Are abutments to be designed to total scour depth or contraction scour depth + countermeasure armoring?

*The Design-Builder shall submit to VDOT a final hydrologic and hydraulic analysis to include scour analysis and mitigation design of the final proposed bridge configuration in accordance with AASHTO and HEC-18 requirements.*

- 81) Where should the letter of submittal checklist and price proposal checklists be placed within the proposal?

*The Letter of Submittal Checklist and the Price Proposal Checklist should be included in the front of each respective document. RFP Addendum No. 1 will provide further direction regarding the placement of these documents within the Offeror's proposals.*

- 82) There are (2) potential BMP locations shown on sheets (7) and (7a), can you provide more details on their proposed locations and scope of work?

*Potential locations for BMP's located with VDOT right of way have been provided on sheets 7 and 7A. The final location and selection of BMP type is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.*

- 83) Will the BMP locations be within the existing VDOT R/w or located on private land and will be part of the R/W acquisition?

*Potential locations for BMP's within VDOT right of way is provided on sheets 7 and 7A and will not require acquisition. BMP's located on private property will require R/W acquisition as part of the Design-Builder's scope of work.*

- 84) Are there any in-stream work restrictions within the environmental commitments?

*All in-stream work restrictions will be coordinated with the agencies and determined during the permitting process. This is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.*

- 85) For utility requiring relocation, does the contractor need to purchase new easements for the utility owner?

*Yes, new easements shall be purchased if existing utilities need to be relocated and cannot be relocated within the right of way limits shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans. If the utility has a prior right (record easement,) the Design-Builder will be responsible to acquire an easement in the name of the utility. If the utility does not have a prior right, the Design-Builder will be responsible for acquiring a VDOT utility easement.*

- 86) The sign in sheets from the Pre-Proposal Meeting have no contact info on them. Can the sheets be revised to include email and phone numbers...mainly so we can do utility contacts?

*The contact information for the utility representatives listed on Pre-Proposal Meeting sign-in sheet is provided below:*

*Dominion Virginia Power – Steve Heroux – 757-857-2991  
Verizon – Joe Gibson – 804-772-7312  
MBC – Chris Coleman – 434-540-1306  
Charter Communications – Kimberly Mann – 757-466-9607*