



KEY:
Closed: 
New: 

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014


Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
1	1-07.18(1).2	Addendum 1, Chapter 1, Item 4, 1-07.18(1.2) General Liability: Can the required limits be provided by any combination of primary and excess/umbrella limits?	5/2/2014	Yes, a combination of primary and excess is acceptable.
2	1-07.18(1).3	Addendum 1, Chapter 1, Item 5, sec 1-07.18 (1.3) Auto Liability: Can the required limits be provided by any combination of primary and excess/umbrella limits? If the Joint Venture does not own any automobiles can this requirement be satisfied by Hired/Non-Owned Auto coverage?	5/2/2014	(a) Yes, a combination of primary and excess is acceptable; (b) The specification is specific in that the bidder must provide coverage for the “ownership, maintenance, or use of all owned/leased, non owned and hired vehicles used in the performance of the work...” If the JV does not own any vehicles, then they do not have to provide coverage for them. If they only have non owned or hired vehicles, then that is the coverage that they must provide. This type of coverage is provided under the CA 0001 form.
3	2.11.3.1	Chapter 2, Section 2.11.3.1 Design Criteria: Design criteria classifies SR530 as a Rural Minor Arterial Route, Design Class P-1, with class 2 managed lanes. Class P1 is a divided Multilane Highway. SR530, as shown on Typical sections is a two lane highway, which is class a class P-3 to P-5 based on traffic volume. Please clarify?	5/2/2014	The correct classification is MDL-13. Section 2.11.3.1 will be updated in a future addendum.
4	ITP 3.3.5	ITP, sec. 3.3.5 Appendix A, Page 21, Line 24: Form L (utility certification): The ITP requires the contractor to fill out Form L. Page 31, Line 14 lists Form L. However, Form L is not in the ITP. Will WSDOT provide a copy of Form L?	5/2/2014	Yes. Form L will be provided in a future addendum.
5	ITP	ITP General: There in not any form where the Contractor is to acknowledge receipt of any addenda (similar to RFQ). Will WSDOT require the Contractor to provide this acknowledgement of receipt of addenda in the bid package?	5/2/2014	Yes. See Form A of the ITP; page A-2, lines 1-3.
6	1-04.7	If the design-builder encounters contaminated or hazardous water, soil, debris, fuel tanks, transformers with PCBs or other type of hazardous material; will the handling and disposal costs fall under the definition of Differing Site Conditions as described in Section 1-04.7?	5/16/2014	Section 2.8.5.7 and the GBR indicate the potential for hazardous materials. If conditions are substantially or materially different than what is outlined in the RFP, then handling and disposal costs would fall under Section 1-04.7 of the General Provisions.
7	1-07.18(1).4	It is recommended that WSDOT require an Environmental/Pollution Liability Insurance Policy from the design-builder. Please consider changing Section 1-07.18(1).4 Environmental Liability to require a project-specific policy and define the required deductibles.	5/16/2014	WSDOT does not plan to require an Environmental/Pollution Liability Insurance Policy.
8		Condition “d” of the Army Corps letter dated May 7, 2014 (NWS-2014-440) states: “The Corps concurs with the wetland, stream, and ditch delineations as marked by WSDOT and observed by the Corps on the interagency site visit on April 28, 2014. There appear to be additional waters of the U.S. in the project area that have not been delineated and that may be impacted by the proposed emergency work. If additional areas are not delineated by WSDOT staff, WSDOT staff with appropriate technical expertise shall confirm boundaries and acreage of all contractor-delineated waters of the U.S. that are identified to be impacted...” Can WSDOT provide some context regarding where these additional waters are that were observed and why they may be impacted, so we can better define our level of effort?	5/16/2014	WSDOT biologists have delineated wetlands within the WSDOT right-of-way. There may be wetlands adjacent to or nearby the WSDOT R/W or in temporary construction easements acquired for the project that have not been delineated. When WSDOT and the USACE were on site, staff from those agencies discussed the potential for the project to widen the footprint of driveways in order to meet the roadway elevation profile. There may be additional wetlands or streams within or along the driveways adjacent to the road. Additionally, WSDOT and USACE staff discussed the potential for mature forested wetlands to occur along C Post Road. There also may be additional wetlands and streams within the TCEs provided adjacent to new culvert installations. The description above is intended to provide the requested context and is not intended to be a complete disclosure of where other waters of the US may occur.

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014


KEY:
 Closed: 
 New: 

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
9		Ecology and the Corp provide wetland mitigation ratios guidance for different category wetlands base on the type of mitigation that is occurring, such as, re-establishment, creation, rehabilitation or enhancement. In order to figure out the Pilchuck mitigation bank use, we will need to understand what the bank use plan allows for credits. Based on the credit dispersal table in the 2013 Annual Monitoring Report for the Pilchuck site, it appears that the available credit is debited based on the re-establishment/creation ratios. Please confirm this assumption is correct.	5/16/2014	Yes, the assumption is correct. The Pilchuck 1 Mitigaiton Site (also known as Pilchuck Creek Mitigation site) is not a mitigation bank but does have future mitigation acreage available for WSDOT projects. The information regarding future mitigation acreage available is listed in the Pilchuck Site Schematic (Appendix E).

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014

KEY:
 Closed: 
 New: 


Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response																		
10		<p>5. Snohomish County provides the buffer mitigation ratios as follows:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>(3) Buffer standards and requirements - mitigation ratios. To mitigate impacts to functions and values of buffers, the ratios in Table 3 shall be required unless using the provisions of innovative development in SCC 30.62A.350. The ratios are based upon the existing type of vegetative cover and are expressed in terms of the number of acres needed to recover the lost functions and values of one acre of buffer area. For impacts to buffers that permanently remove existing vegetation, functions and values shall be assumed to be replaced by creating or enhancing new buffers at the following ratios:</p> <p align="center">Table 3 -Buffer Mitigation Ratios</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Existing Riparian habitat vegetation type</th> <th>Creation</th> <th>Enhancement¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mature forest</td> <td align="center">6:1</td> <td align="center">12:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-mature forest</td> <td align="center">3:1</td> <td align="center">6:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shrub</td> <td align="center">2:1</td> <td align="center">4:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-woody vegetation</td> <td align="center">1.5:1</td> <td align="center">3:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No vegetated cover</td> <td align="center">1:1</td> <td align="center">2:1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ enhancement of the existing buffer is allowed in lieu of creation for up to one acre of buffer loss</p> <p><small>(Added Amended Ord. 05-061, Aug. 1, 2007, Eff date Oct. 1, 2007; Amended by Amended Ord. 10-026, June 9, 2010, Eff date Sept. 30, 2010)</small></p> </div> <p>Will this project need to meet these buffer mitigation ratios? Can buffers be mitigated at Pilchuck? If so, what is the cost formula for them?</p>	Existing Riparian habitat vegetation type	Creation	Enhancement ¹	Mature forest	6:1	12:1	Non-mature forest	3:1	6:1	Shrub	2:1	4:1	Non-woody vegetation	1.5:1	3:1	No vegetated cover	1:1	2:1	5/16/2014	<p>If the project triggers the need to obtain Snohomish County permits (i.e., Shoreline Substantial Development Permit), then the project will need to meet the Snohomish County buffer mitigation ratio requirements.</p> <p>Yes, buffers can be mitigated at Pilchuck. See Addendum 7.</p>
Existing Riparian habitat vegetation type	Creation	Enhancement ¹																				
Mature forest	6:1	12:1																				
Non-mature forest	3:1	6:1																				
Shrub	2:1	4:1																				
Non-woody vegetation	1.5:1	3:1																				
No vegetated cover	1:1	2:1																				
11		Will stream buffers need to be mitigated if they are impacted?	5/16/2014	Yes																		
12		Should we assume that buffers (wetland and stream) stop at the edge of the road prism or do we need to include the square footage of the buffer that lies within the road prism for mitigation purposes?	5/16/2014	It is safe to assume that wetland buffers stop at the edge of the road prism. In our experience with streams, however, Snohomish County regulates stream buffers up to Zone 1 of the roadway. Zone 1 is defined in the WSDOT Roadside Policy Manual.																		
13		If buffers are mitigated on site will the long term monitoring requirement be the same as for the landscape restoration requirements or will it potentially be longer?	5/16/2014	The monitoring for on site buffer mitigation will be the same as for the roadside restoration requirements.																		
14		Wetland 12 is listed as palustrine forested wetland but may be non-mature forests. Category 1 wetlands that are forested have a higher mitigation ratio than Cat 1 wetlands based on function score. For mitigation purposes, what should we assume the mitigation ratio to be?	5/16/2014	Both Wetland 2 and Wetland 12 are rated as mature forested wetlands per the DOE rating form but only Wetland 12 is mature forested per the COE definition. Snohomish County asks for a 4:1 ratio for Category I wetlands and Ecology asks for 6:1 for Category I mature forested wetland impacts, so assume the highest ratio.																		
15		Wetland 12 has a dual rating of both Cat 1 and 2. Can we assume that within the ROW the wetland rating is a category 2? If not, what mitigation ratio should we assume?	5/16/2014	A portion of Wetland 12 is Category I mature forested (both DOE and COE definitions) east of Stream 6. Yes, a portion of it is the Category I mature forested within WSDOT right of way which requires the higher ratio.																		
16		Can we get the results of the hazardous materials testing for the soil and water that is being handled by the debris removal Contractor or others?	5/16/2014	No. Information is incomplete with no locations defined.																		

KEY:
Closed: 
New: 

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014


Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
17		Will WSDOT be writing a wetland and stream delineation report for the wetlands they delineated? If not, will they develop the functional assessment of the wetlands they delineated?	5/16/2014	WSDOT will provide a Wetland Assessment Report within seven calendar days of issuing the Notice to Proceed. The Wetland Assessment Report will include a functional assessment of wetlands delineated. WSDOT will not be providing a Stream Assessment Report.
18	2.8	The 2010 Construction Stormwater General Permit (http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/permitdocs/cswgppermit120110.pdf) cites the 25 NTU stormwater discharge benchmark value and includes the following turbidity thresholds when stormwater exceeds 250 NTU, “ 1) No more than 5 NTU over background turbidity, if background is less than 50 NTU, or no more than 10% over background turbidity if background is 50 NTU or greater.” According to the 2005 Washington State Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, “turbidity shall not exceed 5 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) over background turbidity when the background turbidity is 50 NTU or less, or have more than a 10 percent increase in turbidity when the background turbidity is more than 50 NTU.” Reference: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/0510030.pdf The existing conditions of the site have a background turbidity that is greater than 250 NTU. Is it WSDOT’s intent for the design-builder to meet the turbidity thresholds based on the site’s background turbidity?	5/16/2014	No. WSDOT's intent is for the Design-Builder to comply with the conditions of the Construction Stormwater General permit and ensure that discharges do not cause or contribute to a violation of state water quality standards (WAC 173-201A).
19		Can you clarify that common borrow from the knoll cannot be used as structural fill for the alignment west of the knoll?	5/17/2014	Correct. Per Section 2.7.3.1.3, Gravel Borrow or Select Borrow shall be used where fill is needed to achieve the new subgrade elevation.
20		WSDOT has shifted the east end of the SR 530 proposed alignment to the south by addendum which results in the proposed roadway alignment being located outside (south) of the Contract #2 debris removal contract work. Will the Design Builder be required to follow the SR 530 Slide Action plan for removal/grading of the slide debris materials if utilizing WSDOT’s proposed SR 530 roadway alignment?	5/19/2014	Yes. Per 2.8.6.4, if the Design-Builder encounters recently deposited landslide debris, the Design-Builder shall follow the most current Snohomish County SR 530 Slide Action Plan. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for all cost and time impacts associated with following Appendix A of the SR530 Slide Action Plan, including providing primary, secondary and tertiary spotters.
21	2.6	Is the Design Builder responsible for drainage performance (2.6.6.4) and the stability performance (2.6.7.2) of slopes constructed by Contract #2 – debris removal contract?	5/19/2014	Yes.
22	2.8	Does WSDOT anticipate the water quality requirements of the NPDES permit to be relaxed given the current site conditions?	5/19/2014	WSDOT's intent is for the Design-Builder to comply with the conditions of the Construction Stormwater General permit and ensure that discharges do not cause or contribute to a violation of state water quality standards (WAC 173-201A).
23	2.22	Is the Vehicle Protection- temporary guardrail/barrier requirement (2.22.4.4.1) applicable to reduced speed one-lane piloted traffic control (i.e. use of the Seattle City Light road)?	5/19/2014	It is not applicable to the reduced speed one-lane piloted traffic control on the Seattle City Light Road.

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014

KEY:
Closed: 
New: 

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
24		Addendum #1 increased the Section 1-07.18(1).2 Commercial General Liability coverage to \$10,000,000. It is also WSDOT's intention to increase the Section 1-07.18(1).10 Owners and Contractors Protective (OCP) Liability Insurance requirements as well?	5/19/2014	No.
25	2.8	Chapter 2, Section 2.8.6.4: Excavation in Landslide Debris (Addendum 2) states: "If the Design-Builder encounters recently deposited landslide debris, the Design-Builder shall follow the most current Snohomish County SR 530 Slide Action Plan. The Design-Builder shall be responsible for all cost and time impacts associated with following Appendix A of the SR530 Slide Action Plan, including providing primary, secondary and tertiary spotters." Does this include borings associated with the field exploration program?	5/19/2014	Yes.
26	2.8	WSDOT has indicated the landslide debris could be impacted from chemical and biological hazards. Does WSDOT have a minimum requirement for worker training (such as 40 hours HAZWOPER) and/or minimum protective equipment and decontamination procedures that need to be followed?	5/19/2014	See the Sections 1-04, 1-05, and 1-07 of the General Provisions for specifications on worker safety.
27		RFP Chapter 1, Page 108, Line 40: Requires General Liability coverage for acts, errors, and omissions in the rendering or failure to render professional services under the Contract Documents or in the performance of the Work. This is professional liability coverage and is not readily available in the commercial insurance market under a General Liability policy. We've received multiple declinations in attempting to secure the coverage for this project. Please advise: 1) Specific policy wording which will meet this requirement? 2) Will ISO Form CG 22 79 satisfy this requirement? 3) If a subcontractor is not performing professional services are they required to provide this coverage?	5/19/2014	(a) a General Liability policy will provide this coverage, so long as the policy is not endorsed with any exclusions concerning professional acts, errors and omissions. As such, no specific wording is required. (b) Form CG 2279 will not satisfy this requirement. (c) Please see section 1-07.18(2).3 of the contract for a response to this question.
28		Addendum 1, Page 1, Line 26-28: Please confirm the revised General Liability limit requirements of \$10,000,000 can be met through the use of a combination of primary and excess liability policies.	5/19/2014	Confirmed. A combination of primary and excess layers can be used to satisfy this requirement.
29		RFP Chapter 1, Page 111, Line 34-35: The requested additional insured endorsement "CG 20 10 (1985 version)" is no longer commercially available. Will the most current version or an earlier version of the CG 20 10 (Premises/Operations) combined with the CG 20 37 (Products/Completed Operations) be accepted as equivalent?	5/19/2014	A combination of additional insured forms CG 2037 0001 and CG 2010 1001 would be considered equivalent and therefore acceptable to WSDOT.
30		RFP Chapter 1, Pg 108 line 34: Insurance specifications call for coverage "no less comprehensive and no more restrictive than coverage provided by ISO form CG 00 01 12 04". Please confirm if more current versions of the CG 00 01 form will be acceptable?	5/19/2014	Form CG 0001 1207 would be acceptable to WSDOT.

SR 530 / Skaglund Hill Vic to C-Post Road Vic - Emergency Roadway Reconstruction Project
RFP Questions and Answers #3 - May 23, 2014

KEY:
Closed: 
New: 

Question	RFP Reference	Question	Date Received	Response
31		RFP Chapter 1, Pg 108 line 34: Insurance specifications call for coverage “no less comprehensive and no more restrictive than coverage provided by ISO form CG 00 01 12 04”. Coverage no less restrictive than CG 00 01 is not commercially available. Every insurer has certain mandatory exclusions (e.g. asbestos, lead, nuclear energy...) they require certain in addition to the base ISO form. Please confirm that industry standard exclusions in addition to the ISO Form will be acceptable?	5/19/2014	Please refer to section 1-07.18(2).9 of the contract with respect to the unavailability of coverages.
32		Addendum 6, Appendix O-02, Project Analysis, Dated May, 2014: 2 - Fill Slopes Deviation: "Guardrail shall be installed for all fill slopes on the north side of SR 530 because utility poles will be installed along the right-of-way within the clear zone." Is guardrail required along the north side of the road for the entire length of the project due to the power pole relocation?	5/19/2014	Appendix O2 is BC, meaning it is a reference document, except where BC elements are depicted. Guardrail shall be installed based on Mandatory Standard requirements for the Design-Builder's design.
33	2.8	Just to clarify, mitigation purchased from the Pilchuck site is the "calculated" mitigation value and not the "take" value?	5/20/2014	Yes, calculated.
34	2.6	We have heard reports that the 4:1 slopes being constructed by Contract #2 Debris Removal Contract have been moving and not holding stable. What information can WSDOT supply the Design Builder with concerning the current stability of the noted slopes (considering Section 2.6.7.2).	5/20/2014	The Design-Builder is responsible for review, inspection, and examination of the site. Please review General Provisions 1-02.4 Examination of Site of Work . As was mentioned in previous meetings, contact Mark Sawyer's Project office to arrange for review the of Contract 2 site.
35	2.22	Can the Design Builder utilize the Seattle City Light service road outside the listed Section 2.22.4.3.1 SR 530 Full roadway permitted closures?	5/20/2014	No.