

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
1				<i>Answers provided in Q&amp;A #2</i>
2-5				<i>Answers provided in Q&amp;A #1</i>
6-8				<i>Answers provided in Q&amp;A #2</i>
9	ITP, 3.3.5, page 22 of 45	Third bullet from the bottom requires identification of the Design Quality Assurance Manager and the Construction Quality Assurance Manager in accordance with Section 2.28.2. There is no such section in the RFP. Please clarify.	3/14/07	In RFP Chapter 2, Technical Requirements there is a Section 2.28.2, page 2.28-8 that covers both the Design Quality Assurance (QA) Manger (Section 2.28.2.1) and Construction Quality Assurance (QA) Manger (Section 2.28.2.2).
10	ITP, 3.1.1, page 12 of 45	Please confirm that submittal time will be 4 PM Pacific DAYLIGHT Time.	3/14/07	The submittal time is 4:00 P.M. Pacific Time. The word "Standard" will be deleted in Addendum #3.
11	General	Is it possible to review proposals submitted for earlier I-405 Corridor projects?	3/14/07	Answer will be forth coming.
12	ITP, 3.1.2, page 14 of 45	Is it permissible to include resumes for project personnel other than those required by the RFP in Appendix B? If so, please suggest a preferred method of indicating their inclusion.	3/14/07	Yes. Addendum #3 will incorporate language into the ITP to allow the inclusion of additional resumes. As a precursor to Addendum #3, such language may be as follows: "Resumes will be included in a seperate appendix (Appendix D) and may be evaluated as part of the current Technical Evaluation Scoring as relevant to the Technical Proposal Sections. Resumes will be limited to 2 pages each per person and will be subject to the requirements of ITP Section 2.9."
14	N/A	It is our team's understanding that NHC has developed a HEC-RAS model for the City of Renton for the Springbrook Creek. Please provide information as to how our team can obtain a copy of this model.	3/15/07	Addendum #2 clarifies the information available from the City of Renton. WSDOT is currently in the process of copying the reports and electronic data to a disk. It is anticipated that this information will be available for pickup at the I-405 Project Office (Bellevue) by 3/22. An email will be sent to Proposers when the information is available.
15	Appendix M1, Sheet RWS1	To accommodate the final configuration of I-405, Sheet RWS1 shows that Walls 4111, 4130A, and 4130B will have future wall heights that are greater than those constructed for this project. Do MSE wall panels and reinforcing designed and constructed for the Phase 1 project need to be designed to accommodate the future configuration? If so, please provide these expected loadings.	3/15/07	Yes, these walls need to be designed to accommodate the future configurations. Additional wall data will be provided in a future addendum.

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
16	section 2.7.4.4.2	Please explain line 13 and 14 under RFP 2.7.4.4.2: "The pavement section for the SR 167 travel lane shall extend a minimum of two feet into the outside shoulder".	3/15/07	These two lines will be deleted in Addendum #3.
17	Appendix M1, Sheet RS2, PV17 to PV21	<p>Reference RS2, section D, note 5: "0.20' plan Bituminous pavement and overlay."</p> <p>Reference sheets PV17 to PV21. These alignment and paving plans do not depict any HMA overlay for the width of the SB lanes, only HMA widening pavement is shown on the West shoulder.</p> <p>Please clarify if SR167 from STA E167 11068+20.00 to STA E167 11127+99.06 requires a 0.2' plane and overlay?</p>	3/15/07	The 0.2' plane and overlay is not required on the travel lanes between E167 Sta. 11068+20.00 and E167 Sta. 11127+99.06 BK. The reference to note 5 in Detail D on Sheet RS2 will be deleted in Addendum #3.
18	sections 2.7.3.7.1 and 2.7.5.4.1	<p>Section 2.7.3.7.1 states: "The Project requires rehabilitating the PCCP panels, including the two feet extending into the shoulder, for what is currently the I-405 outside through lanes for NB and SB I-405.</p> <p>This work includes, but is not limited to, dowel bar retrofit and PCCP grinding – see Conceptual Plans, Appendix M1 for approximate limits of this work."</p> <p>Section 2.7.5.4.1 further states: "Dowel bar retrofit and diamond grind shall be in accordance with WSDOT Standard Specifications Section 5-01."</p> <p>The two references above talk about diamond grinding for PCCP rehabilitation but the conceptual plans do not portray any limits for diamond grinding. Please specify if there is any roadway section that requires PCCP grinding for PCCP rehabilitation.</p>	3/15/07	Yes, PCCP rehabilitation is required. The limits for rehabilitating the PCCP panels is indicated with the reference to note 10 in Roadway Section A on sheet RS1. Note 10 will be revised in Addendum #3 to clarify that "Rehabilitate the PCCP Panels" includes dowel bar retrofit and diamond grinding.

**I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening  
Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007**

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
19	Appendix M1, Sheets PV21-PV23 and RS2	<p>Section 2.7.3.11 states: "Where any portion of an existing shoulder is to be used as a travel lane, the entire width of the shoulder shall be removed and replaced with full depth HMA pavement."</p> <p>Are the existing outside shoulder pavements (outside future GP Lane) from E167A 10975+65 +/- to E167A 10995+00 to be removed and replaced with full depth HMA pavement as required in RFP 2.7.3.11? The conceptual plans PV21 to PV23 and RS2 shows only overlay on a piece of the outside shoulder section. Is there supposed to be a jog at STA E167A 10975+65 +/- or should the whole outside shoulder be replaced with full depth HMA pavement?</p>	3/15/07	Yes, the existing outside shoulder pavement (outside the future GP lanes) from E167A Sta. 10975+65 +/- to E167A Sta. 10995+00 are to be removed and replaced with full depth HMA pavement. This will be clarified in Addendum #3.
20	Appendix M1 Section 2.7.3.8.1 and 2.7.3.8.2	<p>Reference Appendix M1, Sheet RS2, Roadway Section D (depicting SR167 sections), note 5, "0.20' plane bituminous pavement and overlay"</p> <p>Reference section 2.7.3.8.1, Plane and Overlay: "Within the limits depicted in the Conceptual Plans, existing pavement that is not to be reconstructed shall be resurfaced by planing to a minimum depth of 0.20 feet. and overlaying with a 0.20 feet minimum compacted depth of HMA."</p> <p>Reference section 2.7.3.8.2: Overlay: "Within the limits depicted in the Conceptual Plan, existing HMA pavement that is not to be reconstructed shall be resurfaced by overlaying with a 0.20 feet minimum compacted depth of HMA."</p> <p>Reference Appendix M1, Sheets PV17, PV18, PV19, PV20, PV21 between STA E167 11067+79.60 to STA E167 11127+99.06 there is no HMA overlay depicted, only outside shoulder reconstruction with HMA pavement.</p> <p>Please clarify the above references. Do you concur that between STA E167 11067+79.60 to STA E167 11127+99.06, no plane and overlay nor overlay is required?</p>	3/16/07	The 0.2' plane and overlay is not required on the travel lanes between E167 Sta. 11067+79.6 and E167 Sta. 11127+99.06 BK. The reference to note 5 in Detail D on Sheet RS2 will be deleted in Addendum #3.

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
21	Appendix M1 Appendix P8	<p>Reference: Appendix M1, sheet T2, General Note 8: "IMPACT AREA: THE AREA BETWEEN THE EXISTING ROADWAY AND THE IMPACT AREA LINE OR AN AREA ENCLOSED BY AN IMPACT AREA LINE. THE DESIGN-BUILDER MAY ADJUST THE CUT/FILL LINE OUTWARD TO THE IMPACT AREA LINE."</p> <p>Reference: Appendix P8_2 (JARPA Application Package) and Appendix P8_3 (JARPA Attachment 1, Project Drawings, Sheets 3-27). These figures portray a "Limits of Work" line that appears to be the same as the "Impact Area Line" of Appendix M1. It appears that temporary and permanent resource impacts are tallied within the Limits of Work (Impact Area Line). Please clarify the relationship of the Limits of Work and Impact Area Lines to permitted wetland/water/buffer impacts. Does the Impact Area Line define the limit of assumed permanent wetland/water/buffer impacts only, or does it encompass both the temporary wetland/water/buffer impacts and permanent wetland/water/buffer impacts together? In other words, will modification of cut/fill (per General Note 8 of sheet T2) within the Impact Area Line trigger the need to modify regulatory permits, including the project wetland fill permit,</p>	3/17/07	See the Design Build Contract Chapter 2.11.4.9. Permits have been obtained for work within the impact area line. The design builder may adjust the cut/fill line as noted, provided that the total disturbed acreage requirements are met, and provided that the sensitive area impacts identified in the Project Permits are not exceeded. The sensitive area impacts identified in the Project Permits are tabulated in the JARPHA drawings. An electronic file depicting the permitted sensitive area impacts will be provided.
22	Appendix M1, Chapter 2 sections 2.6 & 2.13	<p>The current plan is to widen the existing Bridge No. 405/12 by one foot on each side. Due to the occurrence of loose, liquefiable soils, the existing bridge does not appear to meet the current WSDOT liquefaction criteria. Based on WSDOT Geotechnical Design Manual Section 6.1.2.2.1, WSDOT's policy related to bridge widening states that:</p> <p>"For the case where an existing bridge is to be widened and liquefiable soil is present, the foundations for the widening portion of the bridge and the bridge approaches should be designed to remain stable during the design seismic event such that the bridge collapse does not occur. In addition, if the existing bridge foundation is not stable to the extent practical, measures should be taken to prevent collapse of the existing bridge during the design event."</p>	3/16/07	See the WSDOT Bridge Design Manual Section 5.5.2 .B. 2. Liquefaction mitigation of the existing bridge foundations and the bridge approaches will not be required, provided the widening will not require new foundations,

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
23		<p>Section 6.1.2.2.1 goes on to state: The combination of "to the extent practical" and "consideration should be given to " provide WSDOT upper management the flexibility to defer full mitigation of the existing bridge in such situations until such time funding is available.</p> <p>Based on the limited bridge widening, the fact that the widening will not require new foundations and the likely high cost of upgrading the bridge, we assume that no liquefaction mitigation is required. Is this a correct assumption?</p>		See WSDOT Bridge Design Manual 5.5.2.B.2. Liquefaction mitigation of the existing bridge foundations and the bridge approaches will not be required, provided the widening will not require new foundations,
24	Chapter 2, section 2.13.3.2	Existing WSDOT Bridge No. 405/12. Is the Design Builder required to perform a seismic evaluation of the existing substructure and include the possibility of seismic retrofit of the existing bridge in the base scope of work?	3/16/07	See WSDOT Bridge Design Manual 5.5.2.B.2. Provided the widening will not require new foundations, seismic retrofit of the existing bridge foundations and the bridge approaches will not be required.
25	Chapter 2, section 2.13.1.1 and appendix 05B, section 4.2.1	Appendix 05B section 4.2.1 (starting at line 181) states "The I-405 bridge over ... Oaksdale Avenue will be constructed to accommodate the future Oaksdale Avenue roadway width of 79'. Chapter 2 section 2.13.11 states "Future total widened width of Oaksdale is 79', measured from the existing face of the west curb lane of Oaksdale Avenue." Question: Is it correct to assume the roadway width of 79' is measured from face of curb to face of curb?	3/16/07	Answer will be forthcoming.
26	Appendix M1 Sheet DR1	Most of the width for 48,229 sf WQ & FC catchment area exceeds the 75' maximum runoff width allowed in the HRM. Please confirm that WSDOT/Ecology will allow the design with an approximate 100' width.	3/16/07	WSDOT contacted Ecology and got concurrence that this is acceptable as long as the following conditions are met. The Design Builder shall confirm that hydroplaning on the roadway will not be an issue. The Design Builder shall provide an additional no-vegetation zone width (of 6-feet at 6:1 max) and shall assure that the runoff is evenly distributed over the ecology embankment media.

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
27	Appendix M1 Sheet DR4	Please confirm that no water quality treatment is required for TDA G1, 8,033 sf area.	3/16/07	The conceptual level stormwater systems included in this RFP illustrate one conceptual level stormwater solution for this project. The Design Builder shall provide a complete storm water system which meets all of Project requirements including, but not limited to, the requirements of the mandatory Standards and all of the Permit requirements. The Design Builder shall confirm that the Design Builder's proposed system meets the project requirements. The final design shall follow the water quality requirements per the HRM unless greater water quality treatment commitments are noted. The conceptual design illustrates one solution which provides treatment through RT G1.2 to address water quality treatment of discharges from the east bank of the Green River.
28	Appendix M1 Sheet DR4	The Hydraulics Report does not discuss the detention tank (48" diam. x 60LF). Please provide the design criteria and rational for this detention facility.	3/16/07	The conceptual level stormwater systems included in this RFP illustrate one conceptual level stormwater solution for this project. The Design Builder shall provide a complete storm water system which meets all of Project requirements including, but not limited to, the requirements of the mandatory Standards and all of the Permit requirements. The Design Builder shall confirm that the proposed system meets the project requirements. The final design shall follow the water quality requirements per the HRM unless greater water quality treatment commitments are noted. This flow control structure was included in the conceptual design stromwater system to protect the downstream conveyance systems located to the north of the SR 181 interchange with I-405. The design of the stormwater detention tank shall be in accordance with WSDOT standards including the HRM criteria.

**I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening  
Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007**

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
29	Appendix M1 Sheet DR6	Please confirm that no detention is required for the 180,382 sf water quality catchment area draining to Springbrook Creek.	3/16/07	The conceptual level stormwater systems included in this RFP illustrate one conceptual level stormwater solution for this project. The Design Builder shall provide a complete storm water system which meets all of Project requirements including, but not limited to, the requirements of the mandatory Standards and all of the Permit requirements. The Design Builder shall confirm that the proposed system meets the project requirements. In the conceptual design, flow control for the S1 TDA basin is provided by FC S1.1. The conceptual design proposes to mitigate flow increases to the west bank of Springbrook by decreasing flows to the east bank.
30	Appendix M1 Sheet DR6	Please provide the design criteria and methodology for design of the pilot BMP, "Modified Ecology Embankment."	3/16/07	Please see Specification Section 2.14.4.9.
31	Appendix M1 Sheet DR6	Is the DB Contractor responsible for long term monitoring to validate the pilot Modified Ecology Embankment BMP and or additional mitigation if it does not perform as anticipated?	3/16/07	The contractor is required to monitor the flow dispersal system to ensure that flows are evenly distributed over the ecology embankment media during the two year contractor warranty period.
32	Appendix M1 Sheet DR8	For cross culvert C30, is it the DB Contractor's decision to either clean or replace this culvert after video inspection or will WSDOT make this decision?	3/16/07	The video inspection for this culvert has been provided. It will be the DB contractor's decision whether to repair or replace the pipe.
33	Chapter 2 section 2.10, Appendix 05A & 05B	Please provide a copy of the City Ordinance for the construction easement allowing work on the 60" water lines in the City controlled properties.	3/16/07	The City of Seattle ordinance is pending and will be provided prior to the start of the slip-lining of the waterline.
34	Chapter 2 section 2.10	Section 7-11.3(9)A of the City of Seattle Standard Specifications requires SPU Water Operations to make all connections to all existing water mains. On this project, will cutting and capping of the 60" water line ends and final connection of the 54" carrier pipe to the 60" water line be accomplished by SPU forces or by the DB Contractor? If completed by SPU, does the DB Contractor scope of work include compensating SPU for this work?	3/16/07	The cutting and capping of the 60-inch waterline and the final connection of the 54-inch carrier pipe to the 60-inch waterline is to be accomplished by the Design-Builder.

## I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
35	Appendix U8	Paragraph 2.04B, Technical Specifications, Appendix U8 requires that the 102" long tapered joint transition section from 60" to 54" have permanent thrust restraint installed. Does this thrust restrain need to be inside a vault or can it be direct burial with cast-in-place thrust restraint blocks?	3/16/07	The thrust restraint does not need to be within a vault. It can be direct burial with cast-in-place thrust restraint blocks.
36	Appendix U8	Paragraph 3.21A, Technical Specifications, Appendix U8 requires that the annular space between the 54" carrier pipe and the 60" casing be filled with high strength grout the full length of the slipline. This will prevent any future removal of the 60" water main. Please confirm that this is correct.	3/16/07	The requirement to fill the annular space between the 54-inch carrier pipe and the 60-inch casing with high strength grout the full length of the slip-line is confirmed.
37	Appendix U8	Will a Romac Isolating Union be allowed for the connection of the existing 60" water transmission line main and the 60" steel pipe transition piece?	3/16/07	The connections are to be designed by the Design-Builder and approved by SPU. If you use a Romac isolating Union, you will need to provide the drawings and calculations to support it's use.
38		Please provide SPU as-built drawings for the 60" water transmission main shown on Sheets UT2 and UT3. Drawings provided with the recent As-Built sets did not include this area.	3/16/07	The as-builts for the SPU 60-inch water transmission main are attached.
39	Chapter 2 section 2.8, Appendix C1 & P	Is WSDOT planning to implement the wetland buffer mitigation ratio requirements for the City of Renton?	3/16/07	No.
40	Appendix P8	What is the status of the JARPA submittals?	3/16/07	The JARPA submittals are complete.
41	Appendix P1	What is the status of the 404 permit?	3/16/07	The 404 permit and updated commitments database has been published in Addendum #2
42	Chapter 2 section 2.8, Appendix C1 & P	What is the status of the Springbrook Creek Mitigation Banking Instrument?	3/16/07	The Springbrook Creek Wetland and Habitat Mitigation Bank Mitigation Bank Instrucment was finalized on August 8, 2006 and approved.
43	Chapter 2 section 2.8, Appendix C1 & P	Have the parcels where storm water treatment areas are indicated on the drawings been determined free of environmental contaminants, or will remediation be required? If so, whose responsibility will it be? Specific areas include parcel #'s 1-19539, 1-19566, 1-19567, 1-19564, 1-19936.	3/16/07	Answer will be forth comming.
44	Appendix M1	The project drawings DR6 show the 100 year floodplain elevation at Elev. 19.5. The Hydraulics Report Table 5 calls out the floodplain elevation in this area at Elev. 14.3. Which is correct?	3/16/07	There are several datums in use in this vicinity. The floodplain elevation shown on DR6 is in the project datum. Additional information on the datum conversion is on sheet BR3.

**I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening  
Question and Answer #3 - March 20, 2007**

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
45	TR 2.7.3.6 Appendix O6	The area of HMA pavement shown in the Conceptual Plans ("PV" sheets) conflicts with the area of HMA pavement provided in the Conceptual Quantities (Appendix O6). Please confirm that the required pavement area is shown correctly in the Conceptual Plans.	3/16/07	The Conceptual quantities only show an order of magnitude. The pavement requirements are as indicated in the RFP. Final quantities will be based on the selected Design-Builder's design.
46	2.7.3.8.2 Appendix O6	The area of HMA overlay shown in the Conceptual Plans ("PV" sheets) conflicts with the area of HMA Overlay provided in the Conceptual Quantities (Appendix O6). Please confirm that the required overlay area is shown correctly in the Conceptual Plans.	3/16/07	The Conceptual quantities only show an order of magnitude. The pavement requirements are as indicated in the RFP. Final quantities will be based on the selected Design-Builder's design.
47	Chapter 2 section 2.1.1.8	line 20 states "March 7 to April 3, 2007 - Toll system commission Testing." Question, should this be 2008?	3/16/07	Yes, this should be 2008. This change will be incorporated in Addendum #3.