

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
1	12/20/2010	NA	General	Does WSDOT have an updated schedule for casting basin completion and completion of previous contract pontoons?	Section 2.33.3.1 provides an availability date for the Grays Harbor PCF (Pontoon Casting Facility). Section 2.27.4 provides an availability date for PFS (Pontoons furnished by the State). If new information becomes available, these sections will be updated by addendum.	N
2	12/20/2010	1 and 2	1-04.4(6) & 2.8	Throughout this section, there are references to project changes that will be managed per section 1-04.4(6) for allocation of cost and schedule implications. Section 1-04.4(6) does not appear to contain or address schedule implications. Please clarify.	To be addressed by future addendum	Y
3	12/20/2010	2	2.12.4.2.7.7 & 2.12.5.3.2	Lines 40-42: "Anchor connections to concrete walls and slabs shall use.....or drilled-in resin bonded anchors." However, section 2.12.5.3.2 indicates that these would not be allowed. Please clarify whether resin bonded anchors will be allowed.	See Addendum # 3	Y
4	12/20/2010	2	2.12.5.10.1	Line 18: "The PPDB interior walls shall be precast concrete construction." Please clarify if walls around the drainage wells considered exterior.	See Addendum # 3	Y
5	12/20/2010	2	2.12.4.2.3	The WWSn and WWDn loads are specified as acting on the "floating structure". This term is not defined in 2.12.1.1 NOMENCLATURE that does define "Floating Bridge" and "Elevated Structure". Please clarify.	See Addendum # 3	Y
6	12/20/2010	2	2.12.4.2.3.9	The term "WAVE" in the Section Title appears to be a misnomer and inconsistent with the "WSn" load specifications given in Section 2.12.4.2.3. for the Elevated Structure. Please clarify.	See Addendum # 3	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
7	12/20/2010	2	2.12.4.2.3.10	The terms "(WSn)" in the Section Title appears to be a misnomer and inconsistent with the load specifications given in Section 2.12.4.2.3. (Could be "(WWSn and WWDn)") Please clarify.	See Addendum # 3	Y
8	12/20/2010	2	2.12.4.2.9.1	Please clarify what is meant by "mock-up sections in the truss plans". Can WSDOT please define this scope	See Addendum # 3	Y
9	12/20/2010	2	2.13.4.10	Please verify that it is intend by reference omission that the Extreme I (EQ) Limit State is not a required design load combination.	See Addendum # 3	Y
10	12/20/2010	2	2.13.6.1.2	As currently written, the Structural Lead Engineer will be required to sign "Final" plans as well as RFC plans. Is this WSDOT's intent?	Confirmed. The Structural Lead Engineer shall sign final plans.	N
11	12/20/2010	2	2.7.3.3.1 & 2.7.5.3	Does WSDOT have data on how Next Generation Concrete Surfaces perform relative to IRI measurements?	There is no available test data	N
12	12/20/2010	2	2.24.1 & 2.5.1	States that approved ROW plans are in Appendix R2 which is a Contract Document. However, the electronic ROW files from which the project is designed are in Appendix A2 which is a Reference Document. This section also states that Dber shall verify and confirm the location and accuracy of the new ROW. This appears to assign the risk of any errors in the WSDOT-provided electronic ROW files to the Dber. Is this WSDOT's intent? If so would WSDOT please consider making the Electronic ROW files in Appendix A2 Contractual?.	Approved ROW plans are contract documents because they are legal documents while CADD/Electronic files are subject to errors, and therefore they are just for reference. The State will be issuing approved ROW plans in a future addendum. The Design Builder is advised to review/utilize the approved ROW plans.	Y
13	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix M1	A 32" Type F bridge traffic barrier is shown in section on some drawings (i.e. FB12), but shown as a Single Slope barrier elsewhere (i.e. FB14), and 34" tall elsewhere (EA2 & EA5). Please clarify this scope item.	Appendix M1 is a Reference Document. The design-builder will need to meet the requirements of Mandatory Standards in addition to the specific requirements of Chapter 2.	N
14	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix G7	Would WSDOT make the full scale proof anchor load tests from the I90 floating bridge referenced in Appendix G7 available for the SR 520 bid?	To be addressed by future addendum	Y
15	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix M23 and M11	Intermediate columns are shown at 30' on centers in App M23. M11 does not have details for these column connections. Please clarify if WSDOT has an updated set of M11 plans.	To be addressed by future addendum	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
16	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix M1	Please provide the dimensions of the vehicle to be operated on the dock (overall length & width, axle spacing, wheel spacing, tire size). Is this an H-10 truck or a small forklift?	Dimensional requirements for the Maintenance Dock are provided in Section 2.30.4.1.2. Also see Section 2.30.4.3.7.1 Live Load.	N
17	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix M, Vol 1	Index indicates sheets LS00 - LS04: Electronic files did not include LS04. Please clarify.	See Addendum # 3	Y
18	12/20/2010	Appendices	Appendix M, Vol 2	Electronic file contained WS01 - WS03 which did not include sheets WCB1-WCB16 as indicated in the index. Please clarify.	See Addendum # 3	Y
19	12/20/2010	2	2.12.5.4	Please verify that "pipe" and not round HSS is intended.	To be addressed by future addendum	Y
20	12/20/2010	2	2.12.5.4	Please verify that "tubing" and not round HSS is intended.	To be addressed by future addendum	Y
21	12/20/2010	2	2.12.5.17.1	Line 33, Please verify that "tubing" and not HSS is intended.	To be addressed by future addendum	Y
22	12/28/2010	2	2.30.4.2.1	2-30 BRIDGE MAINTENANCE FACILITY AND DOCK 2.30.4.2 Bridge maintenance Facility Building Program 2-30.4.2.1 General The Bridge Maintenance building shall be assigned and "Occupancy Category" of IV in accordance with IBC Chapter 16. The exterior walls of the Bridge maintenance Facility building shall be separated from the Bridge Maintenance Facility excavation permanent shoring walls by a minimum of three feet. <u>The above requirement for a three foot gap between the Bridge Maintenance building and the excavation</u>	Rationale for separation of the shoring walls from the building walls: • To minimize the risk of ground water intrusion into the maintenance facility building . • To provide for an easily accessible / maintainable gravity drain system for ground water intrusion.	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				<p>walls would appear to be unnecessary and would create an area that will collect trash and other undesirable items that will require maintenance. Under what circumstances can this be eliminated?</p>		
23	12/30/2010	2	2.11.4.11	<p>2.11.4.11 GEOMETRIC DESIGN COMPLIANCE At the extended length zero percent grade of the finished roadway surface on the floating bridge between mainline STA 152+95.00 and STA 198+55.00, the top of the south side barrier shall not be any higher than 21.00 feet from the water.</p> <p>ENGROSSED SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6392 Sec. 3. RCW 47.01.408 and 2008 c 270 s 2 are each amended to read as follows: (3) The state route number 520 bridge replacement and HOV project shall be designed to provide a total height from the water to the top of the bridge rail on the floating bridge portion of the project of no more than twenty feet if any portion of the project is funded by revenue generated from tolling the state route number 520 corridor.</p> <p>The RFP requirement that restricts bridge height to 21 feet is inconsistent with the provisions of State law, as provided in Section 3 of Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6392, which indicates a maximum height of 20 feet. Which maximum bridge height is correct?</p>	The approved Law included a line item veto of Section 3.	N