

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



**SR 520 Evergreen Point Floating
Bridge & Landings Project
RFP Questions and Answers # 8
February 25, 2011**

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
142	1/27/2011	App	M1, V2	<p><u>Please clarify the following apparent conflicts in project requirements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDM 3.12 Limits height of Noise Walls on Bridges to 8'-0". Concept plans have minimum 10' up to 13'-0". • BDM 3.12 Limits height of Noise Walls on Retaining Walls to 14'-0". Concept Plans show walls up to 16'-0" • BDM 3.12 Requires a minimum thickness of 7". WSDOT Standard Plans are all 5" thicknesses. • BDM 3.12 Requires 2 Layers of Reinforcing with 1.5" clear each face. WSDOT Standard Plans have a mat of reinforcing in the center of the wall. <p><u>Also please verify where wall heights given on WN01 are measured from.</u></p>	Method of measurement of the noise wall heights will be clarified by future addendum. Standard Plan noise walls may be used on roadways. Noise walls on bridges shall follow the requirements of the BDM, except wall height limitation, which will be exempted in Section 2.13 by future addendum.	Y
143	1/27/2011	App	DM: 1420.05(9), 1420.05(7)(d)	<p>Per WSDOT DM Section 1420.05(9) Flyer Stop off-connections shall be designed as given in 1420.05(7). Section 1420.05(7)(d) state either the parallel (desirable) or the taper (with justification) design may be used. The conceptual plans show a taper design for both off-connections to the transit station.</p> <p><u>Has the justification been prepared and approved for this? Or does the design-builder need to prepare this justification and accept the risk if it's rejected and requires redesign as a parallel off-connection (which would require revising horizontal alignments)?</u></p>	The taper off connection documentation is included in the Design Approval Package under Design Parameters, Appendix O7. No further justification by the Design-Builder is required. A future addendum to Appendix O7 will be issued to provide the justification notes on the Design Parameters.	Y
144	1/27/2011	2	2.15.5.3.3	<p>2.15.5.3.3 Bridge Maintenance Facility Landscape and Aesthetics</p> <p>When developing landscape and shoreline restoration for the Bridge Maintenance Facility and surrounding landscape, the Design-Builder shall comply with the requirements of the WSDOT SR 520 Eastside Urban Design Criteria (Appendix L1), Section 2.8, Section 2.14 and the following requirements when developing designs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide pedestrian access path to two pedestrian overlooks near the Bridge Maintenance Facility at locations shown in the Bridge Maintenance Facility Architectural Concept (Appendix L10); • Pedestrian overlook access paths and overlook designs shall meet ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG); ... <p>Per Section 2.15.5.3.3, 4th and 5th bullets, the pedestrian access path and two pedestrian overlooks near the Bridge Maintenance Facility as shown in Appendix L10 must meet ADA Accessibility Guidelines. This pedestrian access path begins at the top of the Evergreen Point Lid and winds down past the drainage swale and ends near the Maintenance Facility. In order to meet ADA guidelines for maximum grade, fill and excavation is required</p>	Conceptual Plans for the pedestrian access path and associated technical requirements will be revised by future addendum. The Conceptual Plans in the SR 520 Medina to SR 202 RFP for the Evergreen Point Lid (sheet LG01 in Appendix M1) did not include grading or infrastructure for the proposed pedestrian access path.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
				on the south side of the Evergreen point lid wall. <u>Is the Evergreen Point Lid wall designed to accommodate the necessary re-grading for this path?</u>		
145	1/27/2011	2	2.15.5.3.4	2.15.5.3.4 Grading and Drainage Aesthetics The Design-Builder shall comply with the following guidelines when developing grading plans: • Slopes in planting areas shall not be steeper than 3:1, unless otherwise shown in the WSDOT SR 520 Eastside Urban Design Criteria (Appendix L1) or the Conceptual Plans (Appendix M1). The proposed grading shown on sheet LG01 of Appendix M1 around the swale and building is steeper than 3:1, and the existing slopes to remain are shown steeper than 2:1. The ADA compliant pedestrian access path (per RFP Section 2.15.5.3.3) winds through this area which will require retaining walls at the Right of Way, around the swale, and through the steep existing slope, and also modify Retaining Wall 4. <u>Since the contours are shown on sheet LG01 of Appendix M1 steeper than 3:1, will 2:1 slopes be allowed for grading in the pedestrian access path?</u>	Conceptual Plans for the pedestrian access path and associated technical requirements will be revised by future addendum.	Y
146	1/27/2011	2	2.15.5.3.1	2.15.5.3.1 Vegetation Protection The Design-Builder shall preserve and protect existing trees as identified in the roadside planting and irrigation Conceptual Plans (Appendix M1). Sheet LS02 of Appendix M1 shows tree protection fencing at the edge of the swale grading. However, the ADA compliant pedestrian access path (per RFP Section 2.15.5.3.3) winds through this area, which will require re-grading into the area outlined by tree protection fence. In order to meet ADA guidelines, the pedestrian access path cannot follow the contours that have been shown on various plan sheets in Appendix M1, and the tree protection fence on sheet LS02 has been located per that grading. The grading of this area will be significantly different in order to fit in the ADA pedestrian path and overlooks. The pedestrian path shown in Appendix L10 appears to cross into the tree protection fenced area. <u>Will retaining walls along the entire length of pedestrian access path be required so there is no grading into the tree protection area, and all trees shown on LS02 are saved?</u>	Conceptual Plans for the pedestrian access path and associated technical requirements will be revised by future addendum. Tree protection requirements will be reviewed and may be revised in that addendum.	Y
147	2/14/2011	App	M1, V1, DR11	Appendix M1, Volume 1, Drawing DR11 indicates a new Storm Sewer on the extreme right edge of the page that does not appear to be connected to anything. <u>Please clarify whether this is intended to be part of the Floating Bridge Contractor's scope or if it is intended to be constructed by the Eastside Contractor.</u>	The referenced storm sewer pipe does not exist. Drawing DR11 will be revised to eliminate the referenced line in Addendum # 10.	Y
148	2/14/2011	App	M1, V1, DR11	Appendix M1, Volume 1, Drawing DR 11 shows five (5) catch basins connected to a catch basin in the Maintenance Road. <u>Please provide a drainage profile(s) to connect the five catch basins to the catch basin shown on drawing DP16. It should be noted, as indicated the last run will have to either go under or pass through two retaining walls (Numbers 1 and 3).</u>	The conceptual design for these five catch basins does not include profile design. WSDOT does not plan to develop a drainage profile. Per Section 2.14.1, the Design-Builder shall conduct all Work necessary to	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP	Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
					design, document, and construct stormwater conveyance and management facilities.	
149	2/14/2011	2 & App	2.8.4.6.2.1, E6 & E8	<p>2.8.4.6.2.1 In-Water Work Windows</p> <p>WSDOT has developed a Conceptual Schedule for In-Water Work (Appendix E8) and has used this schedule in early coordination efforts with the resource agencies. This conceptual schedule includes in-water work windows including exemptions to the standard windows that have been discussed with the resource agencies and will be included in the application for the Hydraulic Project Approval.</p> <p>The RFP Chapter 2 references Appendix E-8 for In-Water Work Windows, there is also an In-Water Construction Window table outlined in Appendix E-6, both of which are reference documents. The Gravity or Shaft Anchor Installation – East End windows outlined in Appendix E-8 do not match the windows in Appendix E-6, September 1 to May 15 vs. July 16 to June 15 respectively. <u>Are the windows in Appendix E-8 the correct windows?</u></p> <p>The Appendix E-8 table also references a subset (a) for work windows in relation to existing bridge, north or south.</p> <p><u>Which work windows take precedence - the Standard Work windows as referenced in the subset or the work windows outlined in the table as defined by work location and type?</u></p>	<p>Appendix E8 was revised in Addendum # 9. Per Section 2.8.4.6.2.1, Appendix E8 contains the in-water work windows that are a permit commitment and may only be changed through a permit modification as described in Section 2.8. Exhibit 2.1, page 2-38, of Appendix E6 was revised in Addendum # 9 to match Appendix E8.</p>	Y