

Q #	Date Received	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
1	09/14/2009	ITP 3.3.1/ pg 18	This section states that no price information of any kind may be included in the Technical Proposal. It goes on to say that complete copies of all approved ATCs incorporated into the Proposal are to be included in the Appendix. Some ATCs may include monetary information as a part of the benefit discussion. Please confirm that this type of information is not considered "price information" and is allowable in the Technical Proposal.	The information requested in the ITP, with respect to earning of Technical Credits is limited 'value' not cost or price. We expect that the Design-Builder can establish a dollar 'value' of the proposed element of work.	N
2	09/14/2009	ITP 3.3.3 / pg 19 3.3.4 / pg 20 3.3.5 / pg 21 3.3.6 / pg 21 3.3.7 / pg 22	Each of these sections contain the requirement to provide an estimated value of the increased benefit or reduced risks to WSDOT anticipated through the implementation of that particular plan complete with simple calculations. Please provide additional clarification to this requirement.	Same as # 1 above.	N
3	09/14/2009	ITP 3.3.6 / pg 21	The second bullet describes a benefit termed "Optimized forward compatibility". Please clarify what is meant by this term.	Pontoons constructed in this project will be used for 4-lane, 6-lane, and future 6-lane plus HCT bridge configuration described in Section 2.14.3.2.1 of the Technical Requirements.	N
4	09/14/2009	GP 1-04.4(1) / pg 35	This section describes payments for "minor changes," and the last paragraph says that WSDOT has entered an amount for "Minor Change" in the Proposal to become a part of the total Price Proposal. Please explain how this works in conjunction with Form B Price Proposal.	The last sentence of this paragraph was deleted in addendum 3, as it does not apply to this project.	Y

Q #	Date Received	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
5	09/14/2009	GP 1-04.7 / pg 47	<p>This section states that the responsibility for the first \$10,000,000 worth of Differing Site Conditions shall rest solely with the Design-Builder. This is an extraordinarily high cap and could result in large contingencies in the Proposals. If this happens, WSDOT pays the cost regardless of whether the issue actually occurs or not. These types of risk are better left with the Owner. Under that scenario, the Owner only experiences the costs if the event actually occurs. Please consider shifting the differing site condition risk to the Owner as is typical in the industry.</p>	<p>Establishing a threshold dollar amount for Differing Site Conditions accomplishes the following: 1) It provides a level of cost certainty for the owner, 2) It provides a level playing field by limiting the liability of the Design-Builder, and 3) Encourages the Design-Builder to develop strategies to limit risks associated with Differing Site Conditions.</p> <p>Providing a threshold dollar amount for Differing Site Conditions has been used successfully on all WSDOT design-build projects to date. The \$10,000,000 threshold for this project is consistent with another WSDOT design-build project of this size and complexity (Tacoma Narrows Bridge).</p>	N
6	09/14/2009	GP 1-08.3(5) / pg 149	<p>Addendum 1 removed references to mobilization payments. Please clarify that the intent now is to include individual mobilization-related activities in the price loaded schedule and that payment will be made through those activities as they are completed.</p>	<p>The intent is to allow for individual mobilization-related activities to be included in the price loaded schedule.</p>	N
7	09/14/2009	GP 1-08.9(1) / pg 159	<p>This section states that WSDOT shall be entitled to recover their actual direct costs incurred as the result of a delay to Completion beyond 120 calendar days after Project Physical Completion. This type of open ended risk is difficult if not impossible for Proposers to assess and evaluate as a contingency. Please consider an amount of liquidated damages per day for this time period.</p>	<p>This is standard language in all WSDOT contracts, including DBB. Direct costs are actual expenditure related to the project and are open for independent audit.</p>	N

Q #	Date Received	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Addendum (Y/N)
8	09/14/2009	TR 2.15.3.8 / pg 184	This section states that tug boats will come to the mooring location and attach towing lines to the Construction Segments. Once the mooring lines are in place and secure, the Design-Builder's mooring lines shall be removed. Please clarify who provides the tug boats, towing lines, mooring lines and labor to do this work.	After segment acceptance, WSDOT representative from the upcoming project will.	N
9	09/14/2009	Appendix C1 Commitments List / pg 3	Index Number ESA-3; Unique ID #1702 -- This item states that the window for in-water work "may be" June 15 to February 28. It also mentions that a more appropriate window may be November 1 to April 1, depending on whether the National Marine Fisheries Service determines it is protective of Green Sturgeon. Elsewhere, the RFP only refers to the June 15 to February 28 window. When will the Proposer receive confirmation of which work window will be preferred, so that we can plan the work accordingly?	November 1 to April 1 window is no longer valid.	Y
10	09/15/2009	n/a	Has there been a Value Engineering study done for this project? If so, is it available to the public?	Yes. The VE Study Report can be downloaded from the Ad/Award website at:  <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/biz/contaa/DESIGNBUILDCONTRACTS/SR520BRIDGEREPLACEMENT/">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/biz/contaa/DESIGNBUILDCONTRACTS/SR520BRIDGEREPLACEMENT/</a>	N