

## SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project



### SR 520 Evergreen Point Floating Bridge & Landings Project

RFP Questions and Answers # 19

May 13, 2011

Note: Revised answer to Qs #1, 50, 54, 71, 76, 156, 192, 211 and 228.

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). <del>If new information becomes available, these sections were will be updated in Addenda #19, #21 and #22 by addendum.</del>	<del>Y</del> N
50	1/18/2011	ITP & D-B Contract	1.3.5 and 4.2.3	ITP states that NTP2 will be on or before Sept 1, 2011. The D-B contract states NTP2 is on Sept 1, 2011 or the day after the ROD is executed, whichever is later. Please clarify.	<del>See Addenda #13 and #17. To be issued by future Addendum.</del>	Y
54	1/18/2011	Ch 2	2.12.4.2.7.1	Ref 2.12.4.2.7.1 states that hardware and parts shall be interchangeable with the PCP contract. Please provide the details of these parts from the PCP contract so that we may conform.	Shop drawings of the hardware and parts from the PCP contract <del>were will be made available in Addenda #11 and #22 as soon as they are available to WSDOT.</del> A placeholder is provided in Appendix M26 by <del>Addendum #5.</del>	Y
71	1/18/2011	2	2.8.4.5	We request the Draft Biological Assessment that has been prepared by WSDOT and submitted to the federal services for review be included as an Addendum to Appendix E of the RFP so its implications to the design, schedule, and costs can be determined.	Appendix E6 includes substantial information excerpted directly from the Draft Biological Assessment. Further, preliminary commitments of the Draft BA have been included in Appendix C1. <del>The Draft BA is not yet issued, and will not be available until spring 2011. One of the Biological Opinions was issued in Addendum #19. The BA will be posted in Addendum #22.</del>	N
76	1/24/2011	2	2.8 & 2.27	Please indicate when all permits are expected to be in place such that the mooring area in Gray's Harbor can be constructed.	Anticipated permits approval for the Pontoon Construction Project, including moorage, is in spring 2011. <del>See Addendum #14.</del>	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
156	2/14/2011	Add	ITP, 1.3.5 & 1.3.6 Section 4	<p>ITP – Procurement Schedule Contract Form – Contract Time</p> <p><u>Addendum No. 7</u> revised the Procurement Schedule with Contract Award now anticipated for July 25, 2011. Given that under section 1.3.5 of the ITP, WSDOT may defer issuance of NTP 1 for up to 30 Calendar Days after Contract execution; <u>does WSDOT intend to revise the September 1, 2011 date for NTP 2?</u></p> <p>The Design-Builder is required to achieve Substantial Completion within a “Time Bid” specified number of days from NTP 2, but not more than 1,186 days. Given a current anticipated NTP 2 date of September 1, 2011, adding 1,186 days equates to a Substantial Completion date of November 30, 2014, which conflicts with the Upset Determination date of December 31, 2014. <u>Please clarify.</u></p>	<p>WSDOT does not intend to revise September 1, 2011 for NTP 2 date at this time. <del>1429+186</del> Calendar Days will be the Contract requirement for Substantial Completion. Contract time specification <del>was will be</del> updated <u>in Addenda #13, #17 and #21 by future addendum.</u> Form C <del>was will be</del> revised <u>in Addendum #13 by future addendum.</u></p>	Y
192	3/7/2011	2	2.14.4.7	<p>2.14.4.7 Runoff Treatment and Flow Control</p> <p>Stormwater treatment Facility K has been conceptually designed to meet the runoff treatment requirements for portions of the on-land sections of the SR520 alignment west of the Evergreen Point Lid portal as well as the Bridge Maintenance Facility access roadway and parking lot. <u>Does this swale replace the function of “Stormwater Facility K” from the Eastside Transit and HOV Design-Build project?</u></p>	<p>FB&amp;L's Stormwater Facility K is independent and replaces the Eastside's Stormwater Facility K. Section 2.14.4.7 <del>was will be</del> updated <u>in Addendum #16</u> to clarify FB&amp;L's Design-Builder responsibility.</p>	Y
211	3/16/2011	App	S15	<p>Appendix S 15</p> <p>We understand that WSDOT modeled the bridge for longitudinal loading and that longitudinal wind load cases were included in the analysis. We do not see this load case mentioned in the report. <u>Please direct us to the location of longitudinal or quartering wind load cases.</u></p>	<p>Results for the Oblique Environmental Conditions will be incorporated into the <del>Final-Wind/Wave Report</del> <u>in Addendum #22 by future addendum</u> to Appendix S15.</p>	Y
228	4/4/2011	App	M25	<p>Appendix M25 Drawing CR5</p> <p>In Reference Appendix M25 drawing CR5 there is an single asterisk note which calls out that “9 Inches of Pontoon Hogging” is not being taken into account when fitting a maintenance barge under the elevated superstructure. <u>Please verify that the term “Hogging” as used in this context references the floating bridge movement due to wave action and does not reference “Camber” or “Construction Tolerances” and is unrelated to questions 226, 227 and 228.</u></p>	<p>This note is not in reference to the Maintenance Barge. This note is in reference to the 7'-6" min. height on the “Maintenance Window” in regards to the clearance between the Pontoon deck and the overhead superstructure clearance. The 9" is incorrectly referenced as Pontoon hogging; it should be referenced as “cumulative tolerances”. Cumulative tolerances are due to Pontoon, column, crossbeam, and superstructure fabrication, ballasting, shrinkage, creep, and differential grade effects. The 9" cumulative tolerance is to be added to 7'-6" minimum neat line dimension to ensure final Maintenance Window</p>	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
					clearance after fabrication. The 9" in <a href="#">Appendix M25, sheet CR5 was removed in Addendum #21. Cumulative tolerance requirement will be clarified by future addendum to Appendix M23.</a>	
282	4/25/2011	2	2.12.5.10 .10	The specifications clearly define the requirements for crack repair at the pontoons. This section also says, "Epoxy injection of structural cracks shall be done prior to any post tensioning of the Pontoons". The auxiliary pontoons no longer have post tensioning. This has typically reduced or eliminated the amount of cracks in the pontoons . <u>Has the removal of this post tensioning component been considered in addressing the additional amount of crack repair that may be necessary and does this change the requirements for the non-structural crack repair?</u>	The removal of post-tensioning has been considered and crack repair requirements remain as currently specified in Section 2.12.	N
283	4/27/2011	2	2.12.5.16 .6	The referenced specification requires that clear areas be created for each anchor. This clearing includes removal of sunken boats. The conceptual plans show three sunken vessels that would require removal per specification; however, there is no further information on these vessels in the contract or reference documents.  <u>We request that WSDOT provide dive video and/or detailed information clearly identifying the scope and location of these sunken vessels, so we can determine the pricing for the related work.</u>	DVD will be provided to Proposers by WSDOT.	N
284	5/9/2011	2	2.30.4.5. 7	RFP; 2.30.4.5.7 Diesel Fuel System "The tank capacity shall be sized for 12-hour diesel generator operation plus 10% for sediment and 10% for testing for a total of 120% of 12-hour diesel generator operation." The RFP also dictates that the Maintenance Facility be classified as an Occupancy Category IV (IBC) building which carries an "Essential Facility" designation as noted below. According to the IBC and NFPA codes the Essential Facility designation, coupled with seismic considerations, mandate a fuel tank sized for 96-hour operation rather than the 12-hour figure stipulated in the RFP. Our findings are as follows: • RFP; 2.20.4.2.1 assigns BMF Occupancy Category IV in accordance with IBC Chapter 16. IBC table 1604.5 defines Category IV Occupancies as "Essential Facilities." IBC Section 1602.1 defines Essential Facilities as "Buildings and other Structures that are intended to remain operational in the event of extreme environmental loading from flood, wind, snow or earthquakes." • IBC Section 2802.1 "...stand by power systems required by this Code or the International Fire Code shall be installed in the accordance with this Code, NFPA 110 and 111..." NFPA 110 (2005 Edition) Paragraph 5.1.2 states "seismic design Category C, D, E or F as determined in accordance	The requirement for the standby generator fuel tank capacity was changed to 2,500 gallons in Addendum #20.  Additional supplies of diesel fuel will be fulfilled by other WSDOT means. The diesel generator can operate for extended periods up to 96 hours by both on-site and off-site storage by WSDOT.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				with ASCF 7, shall require a Level 1 EPSS (Emergency Power Supply System) Class X (minimum 96 hours.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BMF is classified as Design Category D per IBC Section 1613 or ASCE 7 Section 11.6.</li> </ul> Question: <u>Should the emergency generator fuel tank capacity be sized to conform to code as required by the Essential Facility designation?</u>		
285	5/9/2011	App	M1, Volume 1	The layout of the storm drainage system on DR09 does not accurately reflect the roadway alignment, profiles, and sections provided in Addendum 14 that will be constructed by the SR520 Eastside Transit and HOV Contractor. <u>Please provide plan and profiles for the conveyance systems (Storm Drain and Spill Collection) to be built by the SR520 Eastside Transit and HOV Contractor that will be affected by the construction of the Floating Bridge Project and/or revise drawing DR09.</u>	As the Eastside Transit and HOV drainage is being designed by others, additional information regarding the drainage interface requirements between the two projects will be released by future addendum if it becomes available before the end of the addenda period.  The spill collection system interface requirement was revised in Addendum #18.	Y
286	5/10/2011	Add	19/20	Revised bathymetry as per Addendums 19 and 20. WSDOT issued a revised bathymetry (completed April 2011) of the east and west slopes as part of Addendum 19, Appendix M27, Drawings NC01 and NC02, dated 22 April 2011. The survey data was provided as a PDF document only.  WSDOT subsequently issued a revised Anchor Location Plan drawing as part of Addendum 20, Appendix M23, Drawing A17 dated 29 April 2011, showing a revised bathymetry. However, the bathymetric data shown on Drawings NC01 and NC02 and on Drawing A17 do not appear to be in agreement, and there appears to be as much as 8' (+/-) of vertical difference at some locations.  <u>Can WSDOT confirm the appropriate bathymetry plans for the basis of the anchor design?</u>	Bathymetry data posted in Addendum #19, Appendix M27, was for the navigational channels to support the USCG Permit. See answer to Q #190, Q&A #17.  Bathymetry data posted in Addendum #20, Appendix M23, was to match the contours in the civil drawings. See answer to Q #230, Q&A #15.  Section 2.5.1.2 stated, "This information is for reference use only. Lake Washington bottom geometry within the Project limits shall be surveyed and mapped by the Design-Builder". Also, see Section 2.5.4.3 Lake Washington Mudline Survey.  The Design-Builder's survey shall be utilized for the basis of design.	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
287	5/12/2011	2	2.6.3.7, 2.14.4.6	<p>Specification section 2.6.3.7 GROUNDWATER MONITORING AND WELL DECOMMISSIONING states, 'Collection of groundwater information from existing observation wells and vibrating wire piezometers is the responsibility of the Design-Builder from NTP 1 to completion of the geotechnical design. When the Design-Builder determines that the geotechnical design is complete and the observation wells can be abandoned, the Design-Builder shall decommission the observation wells before any excavation Work occurs...'</p> <p>Specification section 2.14.4.6 INFILTRATION states, '... After NTP 1, the Design-Builder shall continue recording the existing piezometers' water elevations as needed for design purposes. If the Design-Builder is required to remove any existing monitoring wells during construction, the Design-Builder will replace the removed well in kind and continue to monitor the new well until Physical Completion. The Design-Builder shall coordinate the new well location with WSDOT, provide all permits and install new monitoring equipment...'</p> <p>These specifications conflict. Please clarify the Design-Builder's responsibilities as they pertain to either decommissioning or removal and replacement of the existing wells?</p>	The Design-Builder's responsibility for existing well decommissioning or replacement was clarified in Addendum #22.	Y
288	5/12/2011	2	2.11.4.4, 2.12.4.2, 9.12 2.13.4.22	<p>2.11.4.4 ROADSIDE BARRIER SELECTION states, 'Traffic barriers shall be cast-in-place concrete. Traffic barriers may be pre-cast for temporary use or where the roadway will be matched to adjacent construction projects.'</p> <p>2.12.4.2.9.12 Traffic Barrier and Pedestrian Barrier states, 'The traffic barriers and pedestrian barrier shall be fixed-form cast-in-place concrete barriers in accordance with Sections 6-02.3(11)A and 6-10.3(2) of the WSDOT Standard Specifications (Appendix D18). Slip-form barriers will not be allowed.'</p> <p>2.13.4.22 BRIDGE AND RETAINING WALL BARRIERS AND RAILINGS states, 'The Design-Builder shall not use precast concrete barriers for permanent applications on bridges or bridge approach slabs. Permanent barriers shall be cast-in-place reinforced concrete. Concrete barriers shall not be slip-formed.'</p> <p>Please clarify whether matching the adjacent Eastside HOV and Transit Project with precast or slip-form permanent barriers will be allowed on land based construction east of the new bridge abutment (Pier 3).</p>	<p>The requirements of Section 2.13 apply to traffic barriers on bridges or retaining walls only.</p> <p>The requirements of Section 2.12 apply to traffic barriers on the floating bridge only.</p> <p>Requirements for traffic barriers in other locations are as stated in Section 2.11.</p> <p>Alternative Technical Concepts will be evaluated on a case by case basis.</p>	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
289	5/12/2011	App	M3	<p>In Addendum 19, Appendix M3, WCB drawings, various items are called out as 'Included in Contract'. Please identify the applicable 'Contract' for these items as either 'Included in FBL Contract' or 'Included in WCB Contract'. Specific items to be clarified include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• installation of the single slope dual-faced center median barrier for the new bridge alignment between Pier 25 and Pier 30,</li> <li>• installation of the single slope south barrier for the new bridge alignment between Pier 25 and Pier 30,</li> <li>• installation of the temporary barrier and debris screen for the north side of the existing bridge,</li> <li>• demo of the north barrier on the existing bridge,</li> <li>• reinforcement and concrete work associated with the closure pour,</li> <li>• removal of the temporary barrier and debris screen for the north side of the existing bridge,</li> <li>• traffic control at the WCB associated with switch of traffic onto the new bridge,</li> <li>• removal of asphalt overlay on existing bridge from Pier 25 to Pier 30,</li> <li>• HMA overlay on new and existing bridge from Pier 25 to Pier 36, and</li> <li>• final striping from Pier 36 to the west.</li> </ul>	<p>The items in Appendix M3 designated as "Included in Contract" refer to items in the FB&amp;L Contract.</p> <p>Specific items asked about that are in the WCB Contract include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• installation of the temporary barrier and debris screen for the north side of the existing bridge (per sheet WCB13),</li> <li>• demo of the north barrier on the existing bridge (per sheet WCB13),</li> <li>• reinforcement, and</li> <li>• concrete work associated with the closure pour (per sheet WCB11).</li> </ul> <p>A legend will be added to the Appendix M3 sheets in Addendum #22 that indicates the shaded zones of work are to be "Constructed by Others", which will mean by the WCB Contract.</p>	Y