

I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #7 - May 3, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
1				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #2</i>
2-5				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #1</i>
6-8				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #2</i>
9-10				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
11				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
12				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
14				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
15				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
16-20				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
21				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
22-24				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
25				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
26-42				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
43				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
45-47				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #3</i>
48				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
49				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
50				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
51				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
52-53				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
54				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
55-58				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
59				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
60-68				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
69-71				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
72-73				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
74-76				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
77-78				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #6</i>
79				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
80-81				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
82				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #4</i>
83				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
84				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #6</i>
85-88				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
89-91				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #6</i>
92				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #5</i>
93-104				<i>Answers provided in Q&A #6</i>

I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening Question and Answer #7 - May 3, 2007

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
105	Q&A question # 74	Clarifying question: In response to Question No. 74 the I-405 Team stated "It is not anticipated that the bridge widening as shown on Sheet BR1 and BR2 in Appendix M1 will control the bridge rating." Did the I-405 Team consider the use of a 42" single slope barrier (recently added in Addendum No. 4) when they evaluated the bridge? If the team did not consider the use of a 42" single slope barrier in their analysis does it's inclusion into the project change the previously noted response to Question No. 74.	4/27/07	The I-405 Team did not evaluate the bridge with a 42" barrier, however it is not anticipated to change the widening feasibility. On the bridges in the project limits, the TL-4 loading may be used for the 42-inch barrier (including for the design of the bridge deck slab). For this loading, the 54 kip impact may be applied at a height of 34 inches on the 42 inch barrier.
106	Q&A question # 97	Clarifying question: Can the electronic bridge load rating files for Bridge No. 405/12 (I-405 Over N.N./U.P. RR) be made available for the design builders use to evaluate the bridge.	4/27/07	The electronic bridge load rating files are provided for information only. (This information will be emailed seperately.) The Design-Builders shall perform their own capacity calculations to verify the bridge rating.
107	Addendum 5	I-405 is realigned from MP 1.25 to MP 2.00. Addendum 5, Sheet DR7 does not identify any new I-405 median or edge of pavement drainage (i.e. catch basins or pipe system). No drainage system is identified in the electronic files for this area. Conceptual median and edge of pavement drainage is identified on other drawings (i.e. sheets DR6 & DR8). What is WSDOT's concept for the drainage in this area?	5/1/07	In addendum #5 the only change made to this sheet was the limited access line depiction. It is the Design-Builder's responsibility as part of their design to determine the required drainage system.
108	Q&A #6	The response to question #94 states that existing luminaire standards and fixtures can be utilized for the permanent illumination system, however Section 2.16.4.1, paragraph 3, states that no existing equipment will be reused. Please clarify the correct procedure.	5/1/07	Existing poles meeting the required design criteria can be used provided construction does not require them to be removed. If the poles need to be removed, then they can not be used elsewhere (except for temporary lighting).
109	Q&A #6	Clarification to questions 95 & 97: Has the Department performed crash testing on the barrier detail provided in Appendix T5? If so, did the barrier detail perform to the satisfaction of the Department? If not, is the design/builder required to conduct crash testing for the Department to accept the design?	5/1/07	No. No. N/A

**I-405, I-5 to SR 169 Stage 1 - Widening
Question and Answer #7 - May 3, 2007**

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date	Answer
110	Appendix M1, Sheet BR3 Appendix L1, Sheet W-1.4 and W2.0 2.13.3.3	<p>Reference 2.13.3.3: "Existing abutment walls shall be removed as shown in Appendices "L" and "M."</p> <p>Reference: Appendix M1, sheet BR3, Elevation view shows a dashed EXISTING full height East and West abutment walls of the Oakesdale Avenue bridge with a leader note: "Cut existing bridge abutment walls to match wall elevation beyond and behind."</p> <p>Appendix L, sheet W-1.4 and W-2.0 indicates a full height NEW abutment wall with an Ashlar wall texture and Medallions. W-1.4 and W-2.0 also have leader notes that state "existing wall to be removed" pointing to the EXISTING abutment walls and "existing barrier to remain" pointing to the barrier below the EXISTING abutment walls.</p> <p>Our interpretation of the referenced documents is that the Design builder must remove the EXISTING Oakesdale/Springbrook bridge abutment walls to the top of the barrier per drawing W1.4 of Appendix L1. Do you concur?</p>	5/1/07	Yes.