

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
1	Holmes Electric	Are there any structural issues with the buildings?	7/24/2008	WSDOT does not know of any structural issues with either of the buildings.
2	Holmes Electric	What will be the access between the two buildings?	7/24/2008	Please refer to Appendix R3, Section R3.1 and Exhibit "A".
3	Holmes Electric	What is the required end condition after the Project is complete?	7/24/2008	The end condition after the Project is complete is for the building to remain, in good condition, with the underground storage tanks (USTs) removed (refer to Section 2.8.5.3.10 of the final RFP for UST removal). WSDOT is open to alternative conditions and is willing to discuss these with the Proposers.
4	Holmes Electric	What is the use of the property after Stage 2?	7/24/2008	The site will eventually be used for future, unfunded I-405 improvements including a new off-ramp to Lind Avenue and a larger drainage detention facility (see Tukwila to Renton Improvement Project Environmental Assessment). Depending on how funding is allocated for the reconstruction of the I-405/ SR 167 interchange, the property may also be utilized in the same manner as Stage 2 if it is not required for construction of the next stage.
5	Holmes Electric	What part of the sites are available?	7/24/2008	Please refer to Appendix R3, Section R3.1 and Exhibit "A".
6	Holmes Electric	What type of wiring is in the building?	7/24/2008	The building has a T1 connection with Cat 3, fiber optic, and copper wiring (Note: Refer to Section 2.1.2.5.3.2 of the final RFP for WSDOT office/ workspace wiring requirements.)
7	Holmes Electric	Will tenant improvements be required to remain or removed?	7/24/2008	Please refer to Appendix R3, Section R3.6 (Fixtures, Improvements, and WSDOT's Personal Property).
8	Holmes Electric	Will the storage containers remain on site?	7/24/2008	The storage containers are not WSDOT property and will not remain on site.
9	Holmes Electric	Was there a hazardous materials investigation completed on the site?	7/24/2008	A hazardous materials investigation was completed on the site. The report is provided in the final RFP as Appendix E24.
10	Appendix G1 - Geotechnical Baseline Report	The project Geotechnical Baseline Report lists in Section 5.1.1 design earthquake parameters for the project. These parameters are based on a 10-percent probability of exceedance in 50 year (475-yr return period). Current AASHTO Specifications for LRFD Bridge Design requires use of a seismic event with 7 percent probability of exceedance in 75 years (approx. 1000 year return period). What are the numeric values of the Design Peak Bedrock Acceleration and the earthquake Moment Magnitude to be used by the proposers in their analyses?	7/25/2008	The AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Customary US Units, 4th Edition, 2007 with 2008 Interims, using the seismic event with 7 percent probability of exceedance in 75 years, should be used. The final RFP reflects the update to the Mandatory Standards in section 2.6 and 2.13 to include the AASHTO 2008 interims.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
11	Appendix G1 - Geotechnical Baseline Report	In the GBR, the log for test boring 515-1-06 lists 0% recovery for core runs from 21-26 ft, 26-31 ft, and 31-36 ft, with RQDs of 100, 95, and 80, respectively. What is the correct percent recovery of these core runs?	7/25/2008	21-26 ft: 100% recovery 26-31 ft: 95% recovery 31-36 ft: 80% recovery Images of these samples are included in the final RFP in Appendix G5.
12		What geotechnical information is available related to the power pole relocations and will it be provided by WSDOT?	7/25/2008	Geotechnical information provided from Puget Sound Energy is included in the final RFP as Appendix G6. Additional geotechnical information completed by GWC, Inc in regards to the parcel made available for the Property Exchange is also included in the final RFP in Appendix Q3.
13	Chapter 1 General Provisions Section 1-04.7 Differing Site Conditions	There is knowledge that the Thunder Hills Area (Renton formation) was coal mine site in the late 1800's and early 1900's. The GBR borings show tailings on the south end of RW 515-7, but the old mine entrance (hit during original I-405 work) was not shown other than at rough scale on the GIS-level mine mapping. The western edge of the underground workings are shown to be <500 ft from the walls, but the positional accuracy of the mine extents is unknown. In addition, WSDOT has performed ground penetrating surveys and multiple borings within the proximity of walls 515-6 and 515-7 which was inconclusive. With all of the material compiled to-date, if the design-builder encounters mine tailings that require special disposal or mine shafts or other mine works during construction, should the design-builder consider this encounter as a differing site condition OR should the design-builder assume the risk of mitigation of these events entirely?	7/25/2008	Encounters with the old mine during construction will be evaluated on a case by case basis as outlined in section 1-04.7 Differing Site Conditions . WSDOT has completed a reasonable investigation to try to locate the mine shaft, therefore an encounter with the mine shaft may be considered a Differing Site Condition. It may not be considered a Differing Site Condition when the provided geotechnical information indicates mine tailings at wall 7 and the DB encounters mine tailings while constructing wall 7.
14	Appendix M1 Plan DR5 Plan DR12	Detention Vault FC S2.2 shown on plan sheet DR5 calls out a 1.40 AC-FT volume. Detention vault FC S2.2 shown on the detail plan sheet DR12 calls out a 2.41 AC-FT volume. Which is correct? How were the capacity requirements developed? Is this based upon ultimate 2030 capacities or Renton Stage 2 capacities?	10/16/2008	The conceptual design for the Stage 2 project corresponds to an 1.40 ac-ft volume for FC S2.2. The notes on Appendix M1 sheets DR 12 and DR 13 are corrected in Addendum No. 1 to reflect the Stage 2 conceptual design volume. The Forward Compatible conceptual design has a capacity of 2.41 ac-ft. FC S2.2 shall at a minimum be designed to meet the Stage 2 requirements and be Forward Compatible in so much as it can accommodate the Forward Compatible design, i.e. it does not need to be constructed in Stage 2 to the size of the Forward Compatible project, but can be expanded to meet the Forward Compatible design in the future. See Section 2.14.4.7 of the RFP for general requirements on Forward Compatibility.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
15	Appendix H1 Preliminary Hydraulic Report	<p>Appendix H1 - Preliminary Hydraulic Report, Appendix A with the Preliminary Hydraulic Report: <u>Page 6 of 17, Table 3.1</u> lists TDA-S2 with new impervious area = 3.62 ac. <u>Page 10 of 17, Table 4.3</u> shows FC S2.2 requires 1.1 ac-ft detention volume. <u>Page 13 of 17</u>, explains that FC S2.2 is a detention vault 350' x 50' x 7' with a volume of 2.4 ac-ft for future implementation.</p> <p>However, in Appendix K of the Preliminary Hydraulic Report, page 7 of 14 FC S2.1 is a pond with detention volume of 0.86 ac-ft FC S2.2 is a vault with detention volume of 1.40 ac-ft</p> <p>Which appendix should the design-builder utilize for the design of the detention ponds?</p>	10/16/2008	<p>Appendix K of Appendix H1 - Preliminary Hydraulic Report, specifically discusses the Stage 2 Project.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 2.14.3.4 of the RFP for use of the Preliminary Hydraulic Report by the Design-Builder.</p>
16	Appendix M1 Plan AL4 Plans DR1, DR3 & DR4 Appendix R1, Sheets 3 of 9 and 9 of 9	<p>As shown on plan sheet AL4, retaining wall 515-3 appears to be outside of the Right-of-Way line.</p> <p>As shown on plan sheets DR1, DR3 and DR4, detention vault FC S2.1, modified ecology embankment RT S2.1.2 and RT S2.1.1 all appear to be outside of the WSDOT ROW.</p> <p>As shown on Appendix R1, sheets 3 of 9 and 8 of 9 shows the two parcels where the referenced retaining wall and drainage structures reside in a parcels owned by WSDOT. Will the design-builder have access to the referenced parcel? How should the design-builder acquire access to the parcel?</p>	10/16/2008	The Design-Builder will have access to the referenced parcel for constructing the wall and drainage features shown, subject to the existing encumbrances on the parcel.
17	ITP page 24 line 11 Form D line 8 page 32 of ITP	<p>Page 24 of the ITP, line 11 changed the Substantial Completion date from June 30, 2011 to December 31, 2011. This change needs to be reflected in Form D (page 32 of the ITP, line 8). It still shows June 30, 2011 instead of December 31, 2011.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	10/16/2008	The correct date is December 31, 2011. See Addendum No. 1 for change to Page 32 of the ITP.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
18		Please provide as-builts for the following components of the Renton Stage 2 project currently not found in the provided as-builts: 1. Illumination 2. Signing 3. ITS 4. Talbot signals associated with the project	10/17/2008	The available plans from the I-405 office are at ABC imaging. Additional plans for the SC&DI plans have been added from the SR 405/ Tukwila to Factoric SC&DI Stage 1 Project. Proposers should obtain any additional plans from the WSDOT NW Region office and the City of Renton.
19	Appendix M1 Sheet UT2	On sheet UT2, the overhead power lines that run parallel to SR 515 North of the SR 515 / S. Renton Village Place Intersection are labeled as "UI 217*". In the utility CAD file this utility is located on the UI S11 level. Please clarify if this utility is UI 217 or UI S11 as well as if it is a Category 1 or 2.	10/17/2008	The referenced overhead power line that is designated as UI 217 on sheet UT2 is UI 217 - PSE's Talbot - Metro Renton 115 kV line. The UI S11, used in the utility CAD file, is an interim designation for UI 217 that was assigned at the time the field survey data was obtained. The power line at this location is classified as Category 2.
20	Appendix M1 Sheet UT2	On sheet UT2, the overhead power lines that run parallel to SR 515 North of the SR 515 / S. Renton Village Place Intersection are labeled as "UI 232". In the utility CAD file this utility is located on the UI S12 level. Please clarify if this utility is UI 232 or UI S12 as well as if it is a Category 1 or 2.	10/17/2008	The referenced overhead power line that is designated as UI 232 on sheet UT2 is UI 232 - PSE's Shuffleton - O'Brien 115 kV line. UI S12, used in the utility CAD file, is an interim designation for UI 232 that was assigned at the time the field survey data was obtained. The power line at this location is classified as Category 2.
21	Section 2.10 Utilities Appendices U2 and U6	Please clarify if the City of Renton UI 212 is a Category 1 or 2 utility. It is classified as a Prior Relocation in the RFP Section 2.10; Category 1,2 in Appendix U2; and Category 2 in Appendix U6.	10/17/2008	This water line classification (Category 1, Category 2 or prior relocation) depends upon the location of the facility within the project limits. Elements of the waterline located within I-405 limited access prior to the limits established for this project are classified as Category 1; elements of the water line located outside of I-405 limited access prior to the limits established for this project are classified as Category 2; and elements of the water line that have been moved recently are classified as a prior relocation.
22	Section 2.10 Utilities Appendix U6	Please clarify if the PSE UI 218 is a Category 1 or 2 utility. It is classified as a Category 2 in the RFP Section 2.10 and a Category 2 in Appendix U6.	10/17/2008	This power line is PSE's Talbot - Boeing Renton #2 115 kV line. The line is classified as Category 1 within I-405 limited access between approximately I-405 milepost 3.35 and 3.48; Category 2 outside of I-405 limited access between approximately I-405 milepost 3.20 and 3.35; and a prior relocation for those elements of the facility that have been relocated between approximately I-405 milepost 3.02 and 3.20. Please note that Appendix U6 includes this line in both the Category 1 and Category 2 memorandums of understanding.
23	Section 2.10 Utilities Appendices U2 and U6	Please clarify if the Olympic Pipeline UI 240 is a Category 1 or 2 utility. It is classified as a Category 1 in Appendix U2; Category 2 on WSDOT property in 2.10; and Category 1 in Appendix U6.	10/17/2008	This pipe line is classified as Category 1 or Category 2 depending upon the location of the facility within the project limits. Please refer to RFP Section 2.10.1.1, page 2.10 - 4 for a description that clarifies the classification of this utility facility.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
24	Section 2.10 Utilities Appendices U2 and U6	Please clarify if the City of Renton UI 245 is a Category 1 or 2 utility. It is classified as a Category 1 in Appendix U2; Category 1,2 in RFP Section 2.10; and Category 1 in Appendix U6.	10/17/2008	This sewer line is classified as Category 1 or Category 2 depending upon the location of the facility within the project limits. Please refer to RFP Section 2.10.1.1, page 2.10 - 3 for a description that clarifies the classification of this utility facility.
25	Appendix U2	The following utilities were not classified as a Category 1 or Category 2 in Appendix U2: Qwest UI 500 and Comcast UI 601, 602, 604, 605 and 608. Please clarify which is Category 1 and which is Category 2.	10/17/2008	These utility facilities are located outside of existing I-405 limited access. The City of Renton has the exclusive right to grant franchises for utilities outside of limited access. For purposes of this RFP, the referenced Qwest facilities (UI 500, UI 604, UI 605, UI 608) are classified as Category 1 within WSDOT and City of Renton right of Way. Similarly, for purposes of this RFP, both referenced Comcast facilities (UI 601, UI 602) are classified as Category 1 utilities within City of Renton and WSDOT right of way.
26	Appendix U2	Qwest UI 202 is in Appendix U2, but it does not have a corresponding level in CAD. Please verify this location of this utility in the existing utility master CAD file.	10/17/2008	The UI 202 reference on the UT 1 plan sheet is included on "Level 23" - the standard level depicting Delineation, Pavement Marking, etc, ... because this facility is a concrete pad that may require removal.
27	Appendix M1 Sheet UT2	There is an OF line which crosses S. Renton Village Place at the intersection with SR 515. Currently this utility line is not identified with a UI, nor is it mentioned in the RFP. Please provide some information on this line, including the owner and the category designation.	10/17/2008	The overhead facilities crossing S. Renton Village Place at the intersection with SR 515 are a continuation of Comcast overhead facilities UI 601 and UI 602.
28	Appendix M1 Sheet UT2	There is a water line which crosses S. Renton Village Place at the intersection with SR 515. This water line is called out as City of Renton UI 238 on the sheet UT2 of Appendix M1. However, in CAD it is not included on the UI 238 but it is on the level "W-11-City of Renton" with the description: "(No U.I.) no information available". Please identify this utility and provide information including the category designation.	10/17/2008	There are two City of Renton water lines that connect at the intersection of S. Renton Village Place and SR 515 - a 24-inch water main (UI 238) running north-south in the SR 515 right of way for the entire length of SR 515 within the project limits and a 12-inch water main (UI 492) running west in the S. Renton Village Place right of way from the intersection with SR 515. Elements of UI 238 located within I-405 limited access prior to the limits established for this project are classified as Category 1. Other segments of UI 238 within the project limits and all of UI 592 within the project limits are classified as Category 2.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
29	Appendix U2	The following UI's are included in the CAD file but not the RFP: 211, 216, 242, 350, 425, 444, 446, 490, 494, 495, 498, 520, 521, 522, 524, 525, 526, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 555, 556, 557, 561, 568, 609, 614, S5, S8, S11, S12. In addition, the utilities located on the following CAD levels without a UI which are also not included in the RFP: "BF-11-1-WORLDCOM NETWORK", "SS-CITY OF RENTON", "OF-11-3-PSE", "OP-11-1-UNIDENTIFIED OWNER", "W-11-CITY OF RENTON", "BTV-11-1-UNKNOWN OWNER", "BF-11-5-COMCAST". Please include these in Appendix U2 and provide the appropriate information including the category designation.	10/17/2008	<p>The CAD level files contain interim UI reference designators that were reconciled during preparation of the plan set for the RFP. CAD file UI's reconciled with UI's used in RFP Appendix U2 and the UT plan sheets issued on October 6, 2008 are presented as CAD UI (Corresponding RFP UI) in the following list:</p> <p>211 (210), 216 (209), 242 (234), 350 (240), 425 (217), 446 (234), 520 (499), 526 (531), 609 (204A), 614 (PSE relocation - Removed From Right of Way), S5 (220), S8 (222), S11 (217) and S12 (232).</p> <p>CAD file UI's that will be added to Appendix U2 and the UT plan sheets are:</p> <p>444, 498, 521, 522, 524, 525, 543, 545, 546, 548 and 556.</p> <p>CAD file UI's that are outside the project limits and have not been added to the RFP are:</p> <p>490, 494, 495, 544, 547, 557, 561 and 568.</p> <p>The CAD levels without UI's represent preliminary survey data and general information that was received during development of the RFP. This information has not been verified and is included in the CAD file for reference only.</p>
30	2.13.4.2.2	Design Criteria for Bridge Widening: Since you are requiring that the Design Builder widen the existing bridge, all the substructure elements will have additional DL and LL. Do you want the Design Builder to retrofit the existing bridge substructure to carry an HL93 loading that it was not originally designed for?	10/27/2008	WSDOT's preliminary investigation, that corresponds with the Conceptual Plan, shows that the substructure does not need to be modified for the HL 93 loading. The Design-Builder shall make the final determination, supported by their calculations, corresponding to the Design-Builder's design to final design. Modification for the abutments will need to be considered with the Design-Builder's design.
31	2.6.2.1	WSDOT's Geotechnical Design Manual requires that walls 10 ft or taller take liquefaction in consideration during design. Will this standard be required for fill walls supporting City of Renton streets which are located outside of the WSDOT Right of Way?	10/27/2008	Yes. See RFP Section 2.6.4.2.
32	2.7.3.5.1	The technical specification calls for Dowel Bar Retrofitting of the outside panels along mainline. Grinding of these panels will create a grade difference or "lip" between the outside panel and first inside panel. How would you like the Design Builder to deal with the lip caused by unground pavement meeting ground pavement?	10/27/2008	The methodology developed by the Design-Builder shall ensure that no lip is remaining between the ground panel and the remaining adjacent panel after completion of the Dowel Bar Retrofit.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
33	2.18.4.5	The technical specification states that the two existing four inch conduits can be used north of 1227+75 if they meet "all other design requirements." For the purpose of bidding, is WSDOT willing to warrant that the condition of the existing conduits is acceptable for use?	10/27/2008	WSDOT will not warrant that the condition of the existing conduits is acceptable. Junction boxes in this section shall need to be relocated out of the new traveled way - see Addendum #2.
34	Drawing AL3	Noisewall 515-15 marks the boundary of WSDOT ROW and will have a steep slope immediately on its north side. How would WSDOT like to preserve maintenance access to the Noisewall as conceived?	10/27/2008	Maintenance access will be worked out during the design development phase of the Project with the Design-Builder. Specific maintenance easements were not obtained from the adjacent properties at the back of the wall.
35	2.1.1.5	Per the referenced section, Wall 515-10 is required to be Forward Compatible. In the ultimate configuration, Benson Rd and the SB off ramp have less than 1.5 ft between them. What future considerations (straps for ultimate height, cantilever loading) must be considered in the design of this wall?	10/27/2008	The Design-Builder shall design the wall so that it is Forward Compatible. If the wall is not constructed to its full Forward Compatible height, it shall be designed so that additional height can be constructed in the future. The design of the Stage 2 wall shall take into account the ultimate height, loading, etc in the design. For example, an MSE wall would not need to be constructed to its ultimate height, but the straps would need to be long enough for the ultimate height, loading, etc.
36	Chapter 2 Technical Requirements 2.18.4.5	Per the Technical Requirements of the RFP section 2.18.4.5 it states "The Design- Builder may use existing two 4-inch conduits (one with four innerducts and the other with three innerducts) north of this cable vault in the southbound median provided it meets all other design requirements". Do these two 4-inch conduits meet all other design requirements? Please indicate if the existing raceway system is re-useable without exceptions or if it needs to be replaced? If the existing raceway system is re-useable, please indicate locations of all existing pull boxes and cable vaults and which ones meet all design requirements?	11/11/08	See answer to Question #33.
37		There is a foundation near the City of Renton City Hall building and located near BRS STA 41+25, left that is not recorded in any of the RFP documents. Please provide information regarding this foundation and the provisions/restrictions (if any) that must be followed during construction.	11/11/08	WSDOT is developing the appropriate documentation for this recently discovered foundation. Additional information will be forthcoming.
38	2.13.3.2	According to Section 2.13.3.2 the joint seals and concrete headers shall be replaced across the full width of Bridge No. 405/16 (Southbound I-405 over SR 515). Section 2.22 does not provide adequate full closure time to perform this work across the full width of the bridge in one step. Please clarify what the intent is for replacing the joint seals and concrete headers, and also clarify what is meant by full width, is it full width of Southbound Bridge or is it full width of Southbound and Northbound Bridge.	11/17/08	The joints and concrete headers shall be replace for the full width across just the Southbound structure. WSDOT feels the work described in the RFP can be performed within the closures allowed in Section 2.22.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
39		Will the I-405 Renton Stage 2 project be designed using a 1000 year return period design seismic event and does this criteria apply to retaining walls?	11/17/08	Yes.
40		Will the requirements of the new, October 2008 WSDOT GDM Chapter 6 apply to the I-405 Renton Stage 2 project?	11/17/08	Yes. Addendum #3 will update the draft GDM revisions provided in Addendum #1 to the final GDM.
41		Satisfying WSDOT GDM requirements for slope stability for seismic conditions on the sloping ground and potentially sloping bedrock surface on the north/west side of the SB I-405 lanes through the project area may be difficult and expensive if the new, October 2008 WSDOT GDM Chapter 6 criteria for a 1000 year return period design seismic event is applied for the proposed walls. Would designing these walls for a 475 year return period design seismic event be acceptable; the 475 year return period design seismic event is the criteria established in the WSDOT December 2006 GDM.	11/17/08	No.
42		The size of the detention pond for FC2.1 shows a capacity of 0.86 Ac-ft. It appears as if this does not include the requirement of including the surface area of the pond in your tributary areas. In addition the 0.86 Ac-ft assumes only 0.5 feet of freeboard above the riser adding the extra 0.5 ft (minimum) above the riser will also increase the size of the detention pond. Adding these two requirements will represent an increase in pond size. It appears that this proposed pond will be replaced when the ultimate widening occurs. Please confirm our understanding so we can evaluate options for enlarging the pond.	11/17/08	1. The Conceptual Plans are provided as reference only. The Design-Builder's design shall meet the requirements of the contractual language of the RFP, including the Mandatory Standards. 2. Correct, FC S2.1 was not a Forward Compatible feature in the conceptual design.
43		It appears that there could be areas on Benson Road where there are back to back MSE walls that exceed the 30 foot high maximum as specified in the Geotechnical Design manual. Would WSDOT consider higher back to back MSE walls if sufficient analysis was performed demonstrating this height would be acceptable?	11/24/08	Yes.
44	ITP section 3.3.9.1	The ITP 3.3.9.1 states "A resume for the ECM, not to exceed two pages, shall be included in Section 8A of the Proposal." All other resumes are included in Appendices. Will the resume count towards the 8 page limit? Can the resume be included in an appendix?	11/17/08	Addendum #3 will modify the ITP to allow 10 pages. The resume will count toward the 10 page limit. Additional resumes can always be provide in Appendix B (Resumes) of the proposal.

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
45	Appendix M1 Sheets AL1 and AL2	<p>Reference: Appendix Q1 Design Decision Barrier located at STA 1203+50 to 1210+00, E405 line</p> <p>In the Appendix Q1 Design decision for where I-405 shoulder cross slopes differ from the adjacent lanes, it states "SB I-405 median shoulder will be reconstructed south of SR 515. The HOV lane is being restriped to include <u>the existing median shoulder which will be reconstructed to eliminate the crown located at the existing fog line</u>. The existing superelevation of the southbound lanes will be extended to include the shoulder cross slope."</p> <p>The existing barrier is type 2 and will need to be replaced as a result of the superelevation change. Is it permissible to replace the existing barrier with type 2 barrier rather than the HP required by the design decision?</p>	11/17/08	<p>The final determination of the reconstruction will be determined by the Design-Builder. The intent of the design decision to document that there is an area where the existing shoulder cross slope differences from the existing lanes, and where lanes are restriped onto that existing shoulder the cross slope will need to be adjusted to have a consistent slope across the traveled way. The extent and method will be determined by the Design-Builder depending on the final design.</p> <p>Type 2 barrier is not reasonable for this application because of the likely difference in roadway elevation in addition to that replaced median barrier shall meet the requirements of section 2.11.4.4.</p>
46	WQ Drainage	What is the required water quality treatment standard to be applied to the I-405/ I-5 to SR169 Renton Stage 2 project? Is there a certain amount of impervious surface area (existing + proposed) to be treated? If so, please quantify. Or is the project expected to meet a certain performance based standard such as no net increase of pollutant loading? If so, please define the performance goal.	11/17/08	<p>The RFP will be updated in Addendum #3 to simplify the calculation for the amount of stormwater treatment required for the Stage 2 Project. The Design-Builder shall treat a minimum area of pollutant generating impervious surface (PGIS) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the Springbrook Creek basin, the greater area of 179% of the effective new PGIS or the effective new PGIS plus 3.60 acres. - For the Cedar River basin, the greater area of 148% of the effective new PGIS or the effective new PGIS plus 0.74 acres.
47	Drawing PM5	The reconstruction of Benson Road matches into existing Benson near the match line on sheet PM5. The bike lanes do not match into any existing bike lanes or shoulders, and the center left turn pocket into City Hall is not shown. How is it intended that Benson tie into existing? Adding the taper for the left turn pocket pushes Wall 515-9 outside of the impact line.	11/18/08	The bike lanes should extend as far north as practicable, while staying within the right-of-way, and matching into the existing roadway section, including the left turn pocket. The final details of signing, striping, etc of the match into the existing section, including the ending of the bike lanes, will be worked out during the design development phase of the Project with the Design-Builder.
48	Drawing PM4	The new sidewalk on the west side of Talbot goes outside of existing right of way at the Seattle City Light Tower. Is this acceptable to have the sidewalk, fill slope and retaining wall outside of right of way?	11/18/08	See answer to Question #16. This also applies to the sidewalk.
49	Drawing PM4 & UT4	Just south of the Seattle City Light Tower is an existing power vault, inside the right of way. The conceptual plan shows widening Talbot here, and filling over this vault. Is this vault being relocated? It is not identified on sheet UT4.	11/18/08	<p>Puget Sound Energy has a underground power line running on the west side of Talbot Road (UI 207).</p> <p>The final design of Talbot Road, and associated utility conflicts or avoidances, are the responsibility of the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder shall work with the Utility owners to design and construct any required protection, adjustment or relocation as required in the RFP.</p>

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
50	Inroads files	There was no finished ground DTM for Talbot Road or Wall 515-2. Does WSDOT have a finished ground DTM for Talbot?	11/18/08	Provided in Addendum #2.
51	Inroads files	The existing ground DTM does not go quite far enough north to include the full widening of the 169-SB405 on ramp. Is there an existing ground DTM for this area?	11/18/08	Provided in Addendum #2.
52	Drawing AL5	The permanent impact line for Wall 515-9 is only 5 feet away from the edge of Benson pavement. The physical face of wall is typically 1-foot away from the edge of pavement for MSE walls to allow for a concrete barrier outside the shoulder. This wall is also on a slope, so a 4-foot wide bench for maintenance is required to be cut into the slope. The wall and maintenance bench are considered permanent impacts, so there is no extra room inside the permanent impact line to modify the horizontal alignment of Benson. Additionally, the temporary impact line appears to go inside the permanent impact line around station BRS 37+00, and at station BRS 41+00 there is less than 5 feet to the permanent impact line and it appears there is no temporary impact line. Is Benson designed to a level that no modifications will be necessary that will force it outside the permanent impact line? What components were included in developing the template for the permanent impact line?	11/24/08	<p>Benson Road is laid out to a conceptual level only. As indicated in your questions, this conceptual layout of Benson Road was configured with the impact line 5 feet away from the edge of Benson Road pavement using the same assumption you stated--physical face of wall typically 1-foot away. Subtracting 1-foot wall thickness from available five-feet leaves 4 foot for bench.</p> <p>Please, note that no permanent facilities shall be built beyond the Permanent Impact Area Line within Environmentally Sensitive Areas as described in RFP Section 2.1.1.8. However, there is some flexibility in working outside the Impact Area when outside Environmentally Sensitive Areas.</p>
53	Drawing RS2	The roadway section for ETBS shows the existing bridge column on the left side of Talbot, and the new sidewalk to be constructed outside of that column. The existing ground line is shown below the new sidewalk, which is not the case at the column locations. The existing ground is concrete slope protection sloped up. Is it the intent that a retaining wall be located at the back of sidewalk?	11/18/08	The Design-Builder shall determine the final location of the sidewalk and the necessity/ location of any retaining wall to meet the requirements of the RFP, including the mandatory standards.
54	TS 2.10.1 and General to Utilities	In cases where DB will perform Relocation work at Utility Owner's expense, many local governments and regulated utilities are restricted from paying for work that is not competitively awarded. Will WSDOT enter into Cooperative Government Agreements with these entities to provide payment vehicle, or should DBer plan on potential lengthy delays associated with competitive bidding processes?	11/18/08	<p>The Design-Builder shall coordinate with the respective Utility owners to determine any competitive bidding process requirement and possible sole source contract cost limits. The RFP requires the Design-Builder to develop and execute the necessary utility relocation agreements with the Utility owner. Section 1.07-17 and 2.10 of the RFP identify responsibilities for delays in utility relocations.</p> <p>WSDOT has mitigated this risk by entering into Utility Agreements with the City of Renton for two known utility conflicts and including those conflicts as separate bid items in the Proposal. The RFP also requires allowing the City of Renton a minimum of 5 months for relocation of Renton Category 1 utilities, subject to additional environmental permits.</p>

**I-405/ I-5 to SR 169 Stage 2 - Widening and SR 515 Interchange Project
Question and Answer #5 - December 9, 2008**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
55	Drainage Drawings	Several conveyances are depicted on the conceptual drainage plans, but several other significant conveyances appear to be missing. Apparent missing conveyances include the SB 405 - TBS line, TBS - NB 405 line, E405 (LT) Line from 1216+75 to S2.2.2, BRS Line south of new bridge, East side of Talbot Road from Puget to S2.1.1, and Benson Road North of Bridge to FC S2.2. Are these omissions from the conceptual plan, or are the conceptals to be taken as merely as a preliminary template with significant conveyances to be conceived by the Design Builder?	11/18/08	The drainage design reflected in the Appendix M and H1 are merely conceptual plans to be taken as a preliminary template. The Design-Builder will be responsible for developing the final drainage design in accordance with the RFP requirements, including Chapter 2, the Project permits, the mandatory standards, agreements with the City of Renton, etc.
56		The RFP indicates HMA pavement widening along I-405. Sheet RS1 indicates that the existing I-405 is 12 inches of PCCP. The interface of these two pavement sections may be located in a HOV or Auxiliary Lane, is this acceptable?	12/1/08	Yes. The pavement markings included in the Conceptual Plans (RFP Appendix M1) took into consideration the interface between PCCP and HMA pavements and the interface between PCCP panels.
57	As-builts	For the purpose of dowel bar retrofit estimation, has WSDOT confirmed the concrete panel standard which was used on mainline within the project limits? It appears to be a skew pattern with panels ranging between 9' and 14' similar to the 1990 standard where visible.	12/1/08	No, WSDOT has not confirmed the concrete panel standard used on the project, and is leaving this confirmation to the Proposers.