

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
1	N/A	Please provide all traffic volumes, as well as all traffic, air, and noise models used during the WSDOT planning of the I-405/NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps I/C Improvements project.	4/8/2009	For Traffic volumes, the freeway and intersection traffic models for the Braids project were provided on CD at the April 14th at the Mandatory Proposers Meeting. Master Plan VISSIM and CORSIM files are available for pickup at the I-405 office front desk on April 15th. As far as the air and noise models, the input data is in the discipline reports, and the models are available at the links provided via email on April 15, 2009.
2	Appendix A2	Please provide all storm structure location and detail survey through the I-405/NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps I/C Improvements project site.	4/8/2009	Storm Structure location and survey is available in "Appendix A2, Microstation, Survey files" on the Contract Ad and Award page: ftp://ftp.wsdot.wa.gov/contracts/i405BELLEVUEBRAIDSAPPENDICES/A/A2/Microstation/Survey%20files/ Look under file names: s2008-01-31A.dgn and s2008-01-31B.dgn
3	Appendix A2	Please provide all InRoads files for the WSDOT I-405 and SR 520 Master Plan.	4/8/2009	This information was provided in Appendix A2 in Addendum No. 2.
4	ITP, Form Q	Appendix R11 is missing from WSDOT docs will you please provide?	4/15/2009	The document was re-posted on 4/16/2009.
5	Appendix R	Appendix R9 is missing from WSDOT's ftp site will you please provide?	4/15/2009	The document was re-posted on 4/16/2009.
6	Appendix U4	Appendix U4, section 12 is missing will you please provide?	4/15/2009	Section 12 is a place holder for additional utility information which will be provided when available. Additional information was provided in Addendum No. 4.
7	Varies	The RFQ required a JV to be officially formed 15 days prior to submittal of a proposal. The RFP does not support this requirement. Has this changed intentionally?	4/15/2009	Section 7.7 of the RFQ requires that the organization documents be included either in the RFQ, or as a supplement to the RFQ. The final organizational documents shall be submitted no later than 15 Calendar days before the Proposal due date. There has been no change in these requirements.
8	2.22.4.2.1.3	Is City of Bellevue law enforcement required for detours through City streets and construction activities on City streets?	4/22/2009	It depends on the specifics of the closure, detour, and/or construction activities and would be primarily determined through the City's permitting process.
9	Standard Specs 9-35.2 Appendix B1 9-35.2	The Standard Specifications requires aluminum sheeting to be used for all construction signs and the "The use of plywood, fiberglass reinforced plastic, fabric rollup signs, and any other preciously approved sign materials except aluminum composite is prohibited". Does this include temporary MOT signs?	4/22/2009	Yes.
10	2.10.3.3	States that Dber shall obtain or ensure that Utility Owners obtain all Government Approvals for Relocations. Is WSDOT aware of any onerous Governmental Approvals associated with SCL pole relocation (UI 487)	4/22/2009	See Section 2.10 and Appendix U.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
11	2.10.4.1.2	The RFP requires DB'er to allow for 14 days of WSDOT review of Draft RAs, but WSDOT's failure to provide comments within the time do not constitute WSDOT approval. DBer is required to obtain WSDOT approval prior to submitting RA to Utility Owner. Please consider removing the "failure to comment" disclaimer from this section and change the 14 day review period to 7 days. Please change the 20 day Final review period to 2 days.	4/22/2009	Due to the varying range of utilities and the owners within the Project we feel that the turn around could also vary. A 14 day review would likely be for a complex relocate. We can not remove the "failure to respond" text. If the Design-Builder were to develop a standard Relocation Agreement that could be used in most or all cases, review times could be reduced. This applies to the 20 day reviews also.
12	2.10.4.2	Requires DBer ensure that Utility Owner submit a revised Franchise application at least 30 days prior to any Relocation work beginning. In the event that a Utility Owner's failure to submit this application causes a project delay, will the Design Builder be entitled to Cost and Schedule relief?	4/22/2009	Refer to General Provisions Section 1-07.17 for the conditions of entitlement related to Utilities.
13		Can we dump surplus excavation at the WSDOT pit in Kirkland?	4/22/2009	Yes, subject to specific site requirements included in Addendums 7 and 8.
14	App H1 sec 2.3.3	Is the owner responsible for the repair and replacement of all cross drains? In appendix H1 section 2.3.3 it states that, "...If repair or replacement is necessary that would be the responsibility of the owner..." The design builder would be responsible for identifying the condition, capacity, and if replacement or repair is required. Confirm that this is the case and the DB has no responsibility for costs or schedule impacts.	4/22/2009	Responsibility for repair and replacement of culverts and cross-drains was clarified in Addendum No. 6.
15	RFP 2.10.1.1 & Appendix U2 (WSDOT Tracking Report)	Verizon Business items UI- 350 & 351 appear on Utility Drawing EU-3. They are not listed in RFP 2.10.1.1 or the WSDOT Utility Tracking Report (U-2). These fiber optic cables appear to be within the NE 12 th St. Bridge. Please verify that UI 350 & 351 should be added to RFP 2.10.1.1 and listed in Appendix U2.	4/22/2009	UI 350 & 351 were added to RFP 2.10.1.1 in Addendum No. 5 and were listed in Appendix U2 in Addendum No. 7.
16	Appendix U2 (WSDOT Tracking Report) & Utility Drawing EU-6	COB item UI-413 (Storm Drain) is not listed on WSDOT Tracking Report (U-2) and does not appear on drawing EU-6. It shows up in RFP 2.10.1.1 - Utility List Item is a Category 2. Please verify the location to determine if a conflict exists and show UI-413 on Utility Drawings (EU-6) and in Utility Tracking Report (U-2) if	4/22/2009	UI-413 will be deleted from RFP 2.10.1.1. This storm drain is not a Utility. Any modification to the storm drain is part of the Design Builder's scope of work via the drainage scope or restoration of the city streets impacted by the project.
17	Appendix U2 (WSDOT Tracking Report) & Utility Drawing EU-10	COB item UI 472 (Storm Drain) is not listed on WSDOT Tracking Report (U-2) and does not appear on drawing EU-10. Shows up in RFP 2.10.1.1 - Utility List Item is a Category 2. Please verify the location to determine if a conflict exists and show UI- 472 on Utility Drawings (EU-10) and in Utility Tracking Report (U-2) if	4/22/2009	UI-472 will be deleted from RFP 2.10.1.1. This storm drain is not a Utility. Any modification to the storm drain is part of the Design Builder's scope of work via the drainage scope or restoration of the city streets impacted by the project.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
18	2.18.4.7.1	RFP requires a new 36-strand SMFO distribution cable be installed along SR 520 between the Northup Hub and NE 40 th Street , and connected to all cabinets and devices in between (apparently including existing cabinets to remain). But Section 2.18.4.7.2.5 states the existing devices outside of the Project Limits that are currently connected to TWP cable shall remain connected to the TWP. Since most of the 36 SMFO cable on SR 520 is outside the Project Limits, these two statements appear to contradict each other. What type of connection is required between the new 36 SMFO cable and the existing cabinets that are to remain on TWP? This could have significant cost implications. Please clarify the RFP intent.	4/22/2009	Clarified in Addendum No. 6.
19	Appendix L2 Pg 3	Page 3 requires the tops of all retaining walls to have a minimum 24' run and be level at the top. The steps at the walls can be a minimum of 2' and a maximum of 4'. This requirement can possibly add a significant amount of additional wall panel quantity. Please clarify if this is your intent.	4/22/2009	Our intent is to have a stepped wall that complies with appendix L.
20	2.20.4.1 - Page 2.20-3	Line 27 – Where new striping is added for new lanes, all striping on existing lanes shall be re-striped within the segment. This project adds a lane of EB 520 but it is not connected to the existing EB 520 except at the east end tie-in. Does this spec require the DB to restripe both EB 520 and WB 520 with profiled MMA (as per 2.20-4 Lines 1-5). Please define the intent of “segment”.	4/22/2009	Clarified in Addendum No. 6.
21	2.20.4.1.1 – Page 2.20-4	If traffic is shifted for temporary work zones on SB 405, EB 520, and WB 520, and a new lane is not being constructed, is it a requirement for profiled MMA to be placed when the road is returned to its original alignment? If profiled MMA is required does the complete project site need to be updated to profiled MMA? Current striping on these roads is not MMA or profiled. Please clarify intent of spec and the limits of profiled MMA.	4/22/2009	Clarified in Addendum No. 6.
22	2.11.4.4 – Page 2.11-3	Line 6-8 – Existing MBGR within the project limits needs to be evaluated and replaced where it does not meet current design standards. Is the intent of this spec to include MBGR within the project limits where no work is being performed? Please clarify the project limits for MBGR retrofit.	4/22/2009	In areas where permanent striping is moved, existing guardrail shall be evaluated and replaced if it doesn't meet current design standards.
23	2.13-11 Lines 20-21	According to the RFP, a maximum skew of 30 degrees is allowed, but the conceptual plans show a 39 degree skew in the NE 12 th St. bridge. Please clarify the allowable skew for the NE 12 th St bridge.	4/22/2009	The allowable skew for the NE 12th St Bridge is 39 degrees.
24	Appendix RR2, Page 2, Article II, paragraph 1,2,3	WSDOT's agreement with BNSF references Exhibits A, B and D to the agreement. Please provide copies of these Exhibits.	4/27/2009	Clarified in Addendum No. 6.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
25	Appendix RR2, Page 2, Article II, paragraph 3	This paragraph states that if construction has not commenced within 6 months of the effective date of the agreement (October 21, 2008), BNSF has the right to revise their estimated cost (identified in Exhibit D). Is the Design-Builder is ultimately responsible for these costs, and if so, how will the transaction be managed?	4/27/2009	Section 2.23 Railroad states that the DB is responsible for all costs. The statement within the C&M agreement is to cover BNSF for the difference in cost estimate between when the agreement is written and the future work.
26	Chap 2 Section 2.18.4.7.1	Line 15 says to install a new 36-stand SMFO distribution cable between the VMS cabinet at NE 8th Street Interchange at Main St and the Northup HUB. What VMS cabinet is this referring to?	4/27/2009	VMS north of NE 10th Street is being relocated to NE 8th Street on the NE 10th Bridge crossing Project currently under construction. See Sheets IT2 & IT3, Sheets 109 & 110 of 255 in the I-405, NE 10th St Bridge Crossing project.
27	Chap 2 Section 2.18.4.7.1	Line 18 says to install a new 36-stand SMFO distribution cable between the Northup HUB and the camera cabinet on SR 520 at NE 40th Street (over 3 miles from project site), connecting all cabinets and devices in between. Is this section considered to be within the project limits? We received no as-builts for work on SR520, are these available?	4/27/2009	The limits of this work were clarified in Addendum No. 6. We have provided the As-Builts that we have here at the I-405 office. For additional As-builts, please go to NWR HQ at 15700 Dayton Ave N in Shoreline to make copies of additional As-Builts.
28	General Question	Are there functionally obsolete issues with existing 12 th Street Bridge?	4/27/2009	Clearance over I-405 is less than 16' - 6". Inspection reports and as-builts are in Appendix N.
29	App I4 Section 2	It states preterminated patch panels shall be installed in all cabinets where the distribution cable is interfaced and all splices must be done inside a cable vault located no more than 100 feet from the cabinet containing the preterminated panel. For existing ITS cabinets to remain and that are being picked up on the new distribution cable along I-405 and SR 520, and if there is not an existing vault at these locations is a new vault required in the vicinity with a conduit connection to the existing conduit system for the splice to be done?	4/27/2009	Yes. A cable vault is required at each cabinet.
30	App I4 Section 3	New fiber cables are being installed from Northup hub to SE 8th and from the Northup Hub to NE 40th Street on SR 520 with connecting new distribution cables to existing cabinets. It states that cabinets older than 10 years old or that do not meet current WSDOT specifications need to be replaced within the project limits. What are the exact project limits that these rules apply?	4/27/2009	Clarified in Addendum No. 6.
31	App I4 Section 3	New fiber cables are being installed from Northup hub to SE 8th and from the Northup Hub to NE 40th Street on SR 520 with connecting new distribution cables to existing CCTV cabinets. It states that CCTV cameras that are not up to current standards need to be replaced within the project limits. What are the exact project limits that these rules apply?	4/27/2009	The project limits relating to this work will be clarified in a future addendum.
32	Chap 2 Section 2.18.4.1.1	Line 19 states that loop lead-in length shall not exceed 500 feet. Is this just for mainline loops?	4/27/2009	Loop lead-in length shall not exceed 500 feet for any loop.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
33	Chap 2 Section 4.18.4.7.1	Why is it calling out to install a conduit connection for fiber from the ramp terminal traffic signal to nearest CCTV cabinet and nearest ramp meter/data station cabinet?	4/27/2009	We are interconnecting all ramp signals with the ITS system. Preferably to a CCTV cabinet because there is more room in those cabinets.
34	As-builts	SR 405 and SR 520, NE 8th St I/C to Northup I/C HOV plans are missing sheets 306-308. Will these be provided?	4/27/2009	Yes, they have been provided to Proposers via a 4/28/2009 email.
35	Chap 1 Section 1-07.13(1)	The 4th and 5th paragraph don't seem to relate to the section. Do they belong here?	4/27/2009	Deleted in Addendum No. 5.
36	General Question	The excavation for the cNB-line in the vicinity of NE 12th will encounter groundwater. The concept plans and RFP do not stipulate that the trench be constructed with a base seal and impermeable sidewalls to limit groundwater inflow into the trench. Has WSDOT confirmed that the existing downstream stormwater system has the capacity to handle the permanent dewatering flows that will be generated within the trench, in addition to normal highway runoff?	4/27/2009	Groundwater conditions have been defined in the GBR and the Design-builder shall incorporate these conditions in the design and RFP Documents.
37	Appendix U6 and 2.10	UI 423 is listed as "Verizon - Category #2" in MOU in Appendix U6. It is also listed as "360 Networks - Category #1" in RFP 2.10 & on EU 9/ EU 10 plan sheets. Please clarify the proper utility owner, the correct MOU for UI 423 to be listed in, and whether UI 423 is a Category 1 or Category 2 utility.	4/27/2009	UI 423 is owned by 360 Networks and is a Category 1 Utility. An updated MOU was provided in Addendum No. 7.
38	Appendix U2	UI 274 is listed in the draft Utility Tracking Report in Appendix U2 with a description that doesn't match the M.P. stated. Based on the description from Appendix U2, UI 274 should also be shown on plan sheet EU3, but it's not shown. Is the description given in Appendix U2 correct, and if it is, what is the location and category of the utility?	4/27/2009	The description in Appendix U2 is correct. UI 274 is owned by 360 Networks and crosses I-405 at the SE 8th Street bridge near milepost 12.78. This area of I-405 is not shown on the utility plans because we don't anticipate any work in the vicinity. This is a category #1 utility.
39	2.10.1.1	In RFP 2.10.1.1 UI 385 is listed as crossing at MP 14.48, but is shown on EU4 crossing near MP 14.43. In the draft RFP Utility Tracking Report in Appendix U2, UI 385 is listed as "Abandoned per COB as-builts". Is UI 385 actually abandoned as stated in Appendix U2? If not, is the location of UI 385 properly shown on EU4, or is it located where stated in RFP 2.10.1.1?	4/27/2009	UI 385 is abandoned as stated in Appendix U2. UI 385 is properly shown on EU4. City of Bellevue utility record drawings were provided in Addendum No. 7.
40	2.10.1.1	UI 413 is listed in RFP 2.10.1.1 as crossing SR 520 near 116 th St, but is not shown on the expected plan sheet EU6. Please clarify its location.	4/27/2009	UI 413 is not a Utility and has been removed from RFP 2.10.1.1 as part of Addendum #5.
41	2.10.1.1	UI 472 is listed in RFP 2.10.1.1 as crossing SR 520 near 124 th , but is not shown on the expected plan sheet EU10, nor is it listed in Appendix U2. Please clarify the location of this utility.	4/27/2009	UI 472 is not a Utility and has been removed from RFP 2.10.1.1 as part of Addendum #5.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
42	2.10 and Appendix U	There are discrepancies between Utility Agreement UT 1327 in Appendix U5 per RFP 2.10.8.4.3, the Utility Tracking Report in Appendix U2, and plan sheets EU6 & EU 9 relating to the locations of UI 407 and UI 408. Utility Agreement UT 1327 states that the location limits of UI 407 are between SR 520 MP 7.11-7.28. The Utility Tracking Report states that the limits of UI 407 are between MP 7.04-7.09, and the limits of UI 408 are between MP 7.04-7.14. Please clarify the proper limits of these utilities.	4/27/2009	UI 408 is the portion of the Utility on the Lowes' property. A description of UI 408 will be clarified in RFP 2.10 and a revised MOU was provided in Addendum No. 7. Utility Agreement 1327 addresses relocating UI 408.
43	2.10.1.1	UI 489 is shown on plan sheets EUD1-4, but is not listed in RFP 2.10.1.1. Is UI a Category 2 Utility as listed in the draft RFP Utility Tracking Report?	4/27/2009	These storm drains are not considered Utilities and are not listed in RFP 2.10. Updates to the RFP Utility Tracking Report and Plans were provided in Addendum No. 7.
44	2.10.1.1	UI 532 is shown on plan sheet EUD3, but is not listed in RFP 2.10.1.1. Is UI a Category 2 Utility as listed in the draft RFP Utility Tracking Report?	4/27/2009	UI 532 was added to RFP 2.10 as a Service Line in Addendum No. 7. UI 532 is not a Category #2 Utility.
45	2.10.1.1	RFP 2.10.1.1 combines UI 358 and UI 417 as Category #1 utilities. Appendix U2 lists UI 358 as Category #2, and lists UI 417 as Category #1. Are both UI 358 and UI 417 Category #1 utilities, or are their categories properly defined in Appendix U2. If they are defined correctly in Appendix U2, please define the limits of where the two utilities begin and end.	4/27/2009	UI 358 is a Category #2 Utility. RFP 2.10 was corrected in Addendum No. 7. UI 417 is a Category #1 Utility.
46	2.10.1.1	UI 360 is listed twice in RFP 2.10.1.1. The second UI 360 is not shown on the EU plan sheets. Please clarify which utility is correctly labeled UI 360, and identify what the unique identifier is for the other utility.	4/27/2009	UI360 at Milepost 14.54 was changed to be UI 501 in Addendum No. 7. UI360 at Milepost 14.63 is labeled correctly.
47	2.10.1.1	UI 502 is listed in RFP 2.10.1.1, but does not have a corresponding MOU in Appendix U6. Does an MOU exist for "Qwest - Category #2"?	4/27/2009	UI 502 will be added to an MOU with Qwest as a category #2 utility. The revised MOU was provided in Addendum No. 7.
48	Appendix RR	RR-00415 Agreement Exhibits A, B & D not provided. Sample Agreement Exhibits E & F of RR-00415 are requested. What is the status of the BNSF and Port of Seattle purchase negotiations?	4/27/2009	Exhibits A, B and D were provided in Addendum No. 6. Sample Agreement exhibits were provided in Addendum No. 7.
49	Appendix U6	UI 419 is not listed in MOU of Appendix U6 for either Verizon Business or Verizon Northwest. Will UI 419 be added to a MOU in Appendix 6, and if it is, which one?	4/27/2009	UI will be added to the MOU with Verizon Northwest. The revised MOU was provided in Addendum No. 7.
50	ITP Form B	The WSDOT/COB agreement (UT 01294) identifies on Form B Price, Line No. 6, an 8" waterline relocation on I-405 vic. MP 14.52 (UI 380A and UI 380B). Agreement "Exhibit B" and "Exhibit B - Attachment 1" also refer to UI 380 as an 8" waterline. Appendix U2 identifies UI 380A and UI 380B as 12 Inch waterlines. Please verify which is correct; UT 01294, or the Utility Tracking Report.	4/27/2009	The utility tracking report is correct. This is a 12" diameter water line. City of Bellevue record drawings were provided in Addendum No. 7.
51	2.22.4.1.4.5	Chapter 2 MOT Section 2.22.4.1.4.5 <i>Allowable Ramp and Roadway Closures</i> does not list Westbound SR520 to Southbound I-405. Will any closures be permitted for this Ramp?	4/27/2009	Yes, Section 2.22 was revised by Addendum No. 6.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
52	2.8.4.3.10	Hazardous Materials. Please clarify the owner will be considered the generator of pre-existing hazardous waste on the project site.	5/1/2009	Please see the last sentence of Chapter 1 Section 1-07.14(1).5.
53	Appendix H1 - Appendix A; Facility Summary Table	For ponds F-3, G and I, there is a discrepancy between the "Facility Size (SF)" in the summary table and the area required for detention/treatment in the MGS Flood calculations. Please confirm if required size of these ponds should be based on MGS Flood calculations and not the facility summary table.	5/1/2009	Appendix A is provided for forward compatibility. The intent is for the final design to use the full build-out land cover conditions as the basis of evaluating the forward compatibility for the final design configurations. Physical dimensions are to be developed by the engineer.
54	Appendix H1, Plan I	Stormwater Treatment Wetland Area footprint shown for Pond F-3 appears to be approximately 22,000 square feet. The plan calls out the area as 43,062 square feet. The MGS flood Calcs states that 23,339 square feet are required. Please clarify the correct area.	5/1/2009	The intent is for the final design to use the contributing area as the basis of evaluating the final design configurations. There are several variables involved, so the final physical dimensions are to be developed by the engineer according to the RFP requirements.
55	Referenced Sheets not in A2	11px100_pondwalls.dgn, 11px100_pondwalls_3D.dgn, AREAS.dgn, ex_dr_TDA.dgn, exTDA.dgn, exTDA.dgn	5/1/2009	These are working files and have been provided via email to Proposers.
56	RS2, PV13, SPM13, BR1	The Referenced Drawings have various width for Travel lanes, Buffers, Sidewalks and Multi-use paths. Please Clarify the required crosssection of the 12th St. Bridge	5/1/2009	Page 2.1-2 of Technical requirements Section 2.1 refers to Exhibit D of Appendix O5. The cross-section of the NE 12th St bridge is defined in Exhibit D of Appendix O5.
57	UI 380A & UI 380B - Plan sheet EU5 & UT01294 Exhibit "C" sheet 5	Limits of WSDOT/COB payment responsibility differ between UT01294 Exhibit "C" sheet 5 and Plan sheet EU5. Please clarify payment responsibility limits for UI 380A & UI 380B.	5/1/2009	The limits of WSDOT/COB payment responsibility are shown correctly in UT01294 Exhibit "C: sheet 5. The limits of WSDOT/COB payment responsibility are shown incorrectly on Plan sheet EU5, and were corrected in Addendum No. 7.
58	UI 422 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	Paragraph 2.10.1.1 and Appendix U2 list UI 422 as Category #1; Appendix U6 MOU lists UI 422 as Category #2. Is UI 422 Category #1 or Category #2?	5/1/2009	UI 422 is a Category #1 utility as listed in 2.10 and Appendix U2. The MOU listing was incorrect, and was corrected in Addendum No. 7.
59	UI 495 - Plan sheet EUD1, Appendix U2, Appendix E20 & Appendix U8	Plan sheet EUD1 and Appendix U2 show an existing diesel storage tank (UI 495); Appendix E20 and a portion of Appendix U8 show the 30,000 gallon tank was decommissioned and removed in June of 2006. Is the diesel storage tank (UI 495) still there?	5/1/2009	The diesel storage tank UI495 is still there and it is not covered by the reports in Appendix U8. UI495 is a tank that OHMC is currently using. In Appendix U8 there are reports related to two different underground storage tanks, one has been removed, and one has been decommissioned but remains in the ground. The document "Underground Storage Tank Site Assessment & Decommissioning Report" dated Dec 29, 1999, by Gneiss Contracting refers to UI496, and that tank is there today. The other report "Underground Storage Tank Closure and Site Assessment Report" dated June 16, 2006 by Joe Hall Construction refers to a tank that has been removed and is not shown on the plans.
60	UI 536 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU4 & Appendix U2	UI 563 is listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1 as "Prior Relocation"; UI 536 is not shown on the expected plan sheet EU4; Appendix U2 lists UI 536 as Category #2. Please clarify the cost responsibility for UI 536.	5/1/2009	UI 536 is shown on EU4 but is incorrectly labeled as UI 535. The labeling was corrected in Addendum No. 7. UI 536 will be moved by Puget Sound Energy to the location shown in EU4 as a prior relocation. That prior relocation will be paid for by WSDOT through the Utility Agreement 01370 (see Addendum #1).

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
61	UI 535 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Appendix U5 and Appendix U2	UI 535 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1; UT 01370 identifies approximately 100 LF of relocation and two easement acquisitions by the Utility; UI 535 is listed in Appendix U2 as Category #2. Please verify the relationships between these RFP documents.	5/1/2009	UI 535 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1 because it isn't a likely conflict. UT 01370 does not refer to UI 535. The labeling of UI 536 was corrected in Addendum No. 7.
62	UI 327 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU1, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	UI 327 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1, nor is it shown on the expected plan sheet EU1; UI 327 is listed in Appendix U2 and the "Qwest" MOU in Appendix U6. Please clarify the location of this utility.	5/1/2009	That is all the information that we found regarding UI 327. It is in WSDOT's database under Permit # 7-1358, and that permit is not on file.
63	UI 331 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU1, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	UI 331 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1, nor is it shown on the expected plan sheet EU1; UI 331 is listed in Appendix U2 and the "Qwest" MOU in Appendix U6. Please clarify the location of this utility.	5/1/2009	That is all the information that we found regarding UI 331. It is in WSDOT's database under Permit # 7-0778, and that permit is not on file.
64	UI 547 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU4 & Appendix U2	Paragraph 2.10.1.1 lists crossing at MP 14.43; Plan sheet EU4 lists UI 547 and UI 385 together with only one leader-line; Appdx U2 lists UI 547 as "Near/along NE 19th St." which is at MP 14.48. Are UI 547 and UI 385 the same utility? Please clarify the location of this utility.	5/1/2009	See answer to question #39.
65	UI 350 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU3, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	UI 350 is shown on Plan sheet EU3 together with UI 351; UI350 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1, nor in Appendix U2; UI 350 is listed in "Verizon Business" MOU in Appendix U6 as Category #1. Please verify the location and Category for this utility.	5/1/2009	UI 350 & 351 were added to RFP 2.10.1.1 in Addendum No. 5. UI 350 & 351 was added to Appendix U2 in Addendum No. 7.
66	UI 351 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU3, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	UI 351 is shown on Plan sheet EU3 together with UI 350; UI351 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1, nor in Appendix U2; UI 351 is listed in "Verizon Business" MOU in Appendix U6 as Category #1. Please verify the location and Category for this utility.	5/1/2009	See answer to question #65.
67	UI 484 - Paragraph 2.10.1.1, Plan sheet EU11, Appendix U2 & Appendix U6	UI 484 is not listed in Paragraph 2.10.1.1, nor is it shown on the expected plan sheet EU11; UI 484 is not listed in Appendix U2, but is listed in the "Verizon Business" MOU in Appendix U6 as Category #1. Please verify the location and Category of this utility.	5/1/2009	UI 484 will be removed from the MOU. A revised MOU was provided in Addendum No. 7.
68	Chap 2, Sect 2.10.8.5	Will the contractor be responsible for removal/abandonment of Category 1 utilities once they have been relocated?	5/4/2009	
69	Chap 2, Sect 2.10.3	PSE Overhead Power (UI#358) is classified as a Category 1 Utility; Appendix U2 lists UI#358 as a Category 2 Utility, which one is it?	5/4/2009	See answer to question #45.
70	App M1, EU3	This sheet labels Integra (UI 349) together with UI 350 and UI 351. UI 350 and UI 351 are not listed in Appendix U2 or in Chapter 2.10 of the technical requirements. Does UI 349 include UI 350 and UI 351? Will Integra relocate UI 350 and UI 351 for Verizon?	5/4/2009	See answer to question #65.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
71	Add #2, Chap 2, Sect 2.10.1.1	Chapter 2.10, page 1, Lines 34-37, Addendum 2 deleted the text denoting whether the tank is a Category 1 or 2 Utility and deleted the text denoting whose responsibility it is to relocate the tank as needed. Question A: Is UI 496 a Category 1 or 2 Utility? Question B: Whose responsibility it is to relocate UI 496 as needed?	5/4/2009	The diesel tank is located outside WSDOT R/W and within property owned by Overlake Hospital. Any discussion as to the disposition of the tank if disturbed shall be between Overlake Hospital and the Design-Builder.
72	App U4, 3rd Document	City of Bellevue Waterline survey appears to be missing, is it available? Is the survey information incorporated in the M3 conceptual design files?	5/4/2009	The waterline survey file is in Appendix A2 in the Utility files folder with the file name: SYMB047.DWG.
73	App U4, 4th Document	Seattle City Light survey is missing, is it available? Is the survey information incorporated in the M3 conceptual design files?	5/4/2009	The Seattle City Light surveys are in Appendix A2 in the Survey files folder with the file names: s2008-02-01 and s2008-02-06.
74	Chap 2, Sect 2.10.8.4.2	So-Deep and INCA surveys are listed as documents included in Appendix U8. These documents do not appear to be in Appendix U8, are they available?	5/4/2009	The So-Deep and INCA surveys listed in Appendix U8 are in Appendix A2 with the file names: s2007-09-26 and s2007-01-31.
75	App U3	The Appendix is missing MCI contact information, please provide contact information. Are the proposed MCI relocation drawings available?	5/4/2009	Verizon Business is the company to contact for all MCI related Utilities.
76	Chap 2, Sect 2.16.4.2.6	Are ramps considered to be a "freeway application"? Please clarify what falls under "freeway application." If ramps are considered a freeway application then according to this section they are to have light standards with 50' mounting heights. In some ramps a lower mounting height could be applied.	5/4/2009	Yes, ramps are considered freeway applications and subject to required 50 foot mounting height
77	Add #2, 3.3.8	Will Traffic Staging Plans for NE 12th count toward page limit? It does not specify.	5/4/2009	This was clarified in Addendum No. 6.
78		At BNSF: Define "Half bridge" and what are seismic concerns	5/4/2009	The "Half bridge" is Bridge No. 520/22.5 As-builts are in Appendix N1. Seismic issues are to be addressed by the Design-Builder if their design affects the bridge.
79		Does Trench require a base seal?	5/4/2009	It depends on the Design-Builder's design.
80	Chap 2, Sect 2.7.3.5.3	Replace Portland Cement Concrete Panels, lines 19 and 20, WSDOT has identified 15 existing concrete panels requiring replacement as shown on the Alignment and Paving Sheets of the Conceptual Plans. We are unable to locate the concrete panels in question. Please provide station and offset for these panels.	5/4/2009	We don't plan to offer station and offset for these panels. Language in 2.7 was clarified in Addendum No. 6.
81	App C1, ID 1780	Valley Creek Basin on detention. If there is no temporary or permanent impacts (change in land cover) within the Valley Creek Basin, does flow control need to be provided for this basin?	5/4/2009	Flow control will not be required if there is no change in land cover conditions in that basin. The City has indicated that Valley Creek has a history of flooding, so the proposal for the full build-out condition added flow control even when the land cover change was below the HRM threshold.
82	Chap 2, Sect 2.14.3.5	Please provide a copy of the drainage report and basin map for this vault that may be impacted.	5/4/2009	We have provided what we have. Please contact WSDOT Northwest Region if you need additional information.
83	App U6, Section 2.10	Section 2.10 identifies utility #UI 423 as 360 networks Category 1. MOU in Appendix U6 notes the owner is Verizon Business and it is a Category 2 utility. Who is the owner of this utility? Is this a category 1 or 2 utility?	5/4/2009	See response to question #37.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
84	App U6, Section 2.10	Section 2.10 notes that UI 422 is a category 1 utility. MOU in Appendix U6 shows that UI 422 is a category 2 utility. Is UI 422 a category 1 or 2 utility?	5/4/2009	UI 422 is a Category #1 Utility. The MOU listing was incorrect, and was corrected in Addendum No. 7.
85	M1, Sheet IT1A	We are trying to determine how the fiber is running to the VMS on I-405 south of SE 8th Street, within limits of the active South Bellevue project. May we obtain asbuilts in this area?	5/5/2009	See NE 10th Street Bridge Crossing project Design Plans (Appendix M2).
86		After reviewing the survey data and InRoads DTM data provided by WSDOT as part of the RFP documents, it appears that there are no survey points or dtm data to define the NB 405 pavement grades from NB-RETW STA 1016+00 to STA 1045+00. Is there survey data available to verify the NB-RETW vertically and therefore the profile of the NB405-EB520 LINE? If this data is not available for use, what verification procedures would be recommended by WSDOT?	5/7/2009	This section of I-405 has not been surveyed since completion of the Bellevue Direct Access Project. The aerial topography dtm was modified to remove areas affected by construction during the Bellevue Direct Access Project. Design geometry from Contract 16549 was used to fill in the pavement grades where needed on the loop ramps.
87	Appendix C1 Index # FONSI - 16 Unique ID # 1785	Will Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel Fuel be required for Off Highway Construction Equipment?	5/11/2009	Yes, Commitment 1785 (Appendix C1) states, "Use Ultra low-sulfur diesel for all construction equipment in 2010 and after."
88	2.11.4.4 Roadside Barrier	The RFP states barrier "shall have a minimum exposed height of 42 inches..." Since the extra height is primarily for fall protection can barrier crash loading be designed at the lower 32 inch height?	5/11/2009	Apply the 54 kip impact at a height of 34 inches on the 42 inch barrier. Use the TL-4 Loading with the 42-inch barriers. Please note that in AASHTO, in the commentary of the loadings, it is clear that the design assumption was for a 34 inch height of impact on the barrier. However, if there is a section of the barrier where larger trucks are assumed to impact the barrier, then the TL-5 loading should be applied to that section of barrier.
89	Addenda 2 Page 15 Line 41 to page 16 Line 5 Section 2.1.1.5	The text state "A deviation was requested, but not granted for this super elevation." Is the Design Builder required to raise the grade of the bridges and roadway in the Norhtup area to accommodate the 3% super elevation?	5/11/2009	The deviation was not granted. It is therefore assumed that the final design will meet standards for cross-slope/super elevation. Raising bridge and roadway profiles may be one solution to achieving standards in this area.
90	Appendix R1 ROW Plans R/W D-1 Sr 405/434 Sheet 4 of 5	Parcel 1-19089 (Sterling Realty Org. Co.) shows a large Temporary Construction Easement of approximately 73,000 SF. Is all of this TCE available to the Design Builder for use for the duration of the project?	5/11/2009	The TCE associated with parcel 1-19089 is for demolition only and has expired.
91	Appendix A1 RFP Documents Q1-3	There are no Ventilation studies, models, or "not required" justifications included in the appendix. If any documents related to the project were produced, please provide.	5/11/2009	A ventilation study was not performed.
92	2.10, and Addendum 2	Addendum 2 updated UI 536 information. However, we cannot locate UI 536 on sheet EU4 of Appendix M1. Should this UI number actually be UI 535? Recommend changing the drawing to show both UI 535 & 536 not two UI 535's.	5/15/2009	See amended sheet EU4 as part of Addendum No. 7.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
93	Appendix U2	UI 533 is listed as a Cat 2 relocation, but it is not included in Section 2.10. Will PSE or the DBer be performing the design and construction for this relocation?	5/15/2009	The Design-Builder and the power line owner will determine who will perform the design and construction if the power requires relocation. The Design-Builder is responsible for cost related to design and relocation.
94	2.10.5.2.2	States that WSDOT does not obtain new utility easements that are required off the ROW. However, Section 2.10.8.4.1.1 states that WSDOT has obtained an easement on private property for UI 381. Is this easement documentation along with any other new utility easements associated with project ROW acquisition available to bidders? Similar question for section 2.10.8.4.1.4---UI 488: Is easement documentation available for review?	5/15/2009	WSDOT has secured the property right for the sanitary sewer(UI381). Document to convey this sewer easement to the City of Bellevue has not been drafted. The easement for UI488 is included in negotiations with Keystone/Lowes and the acquisition has not been finalized.
95	2.10.8.4.1.2	Is the DBer responsible for the cost of the easement to be obtained from OHMC for UI 494?	5/15/2009	Yes. If the waterline is relocated outside the existing easement, a new easement shall be obtained and paid for by the Design-Builder. If the waterline is relocated within the existing easement, a new easement is not required.
96	2.10.8.4.1.4	If for some reason, there are technical issues that prohibit the shared use of the Integra easement for UI 488, will WSDOT reimburse the DBer for any additional easement expenses?	5/15/2009	Refer to General Provisions Section 1-07.17 for the conditions of entitlement related to Utilities.
97	Drawing BR10A	At pier 3, in the ultimate configuration, on the Northup Way OP it appears that the abutment is located at the existing edge of pavement. Is your intention to eliminate the sidewalk in the future? The bridge would need to be approximately 10 feet longer in span 2 in order to miss the existing sidewalk.	5/15/2009	Drawing BR10A --It is not our intention to eliminate the sidewalk in the future. The bridge span should be adjusted accordingly.
98	2.16.1 GENERAL, first paragraph	Wording of this paragraph in the RFP: "The Design-Builder shall perform all Work necessary to meet the requirements for temporary and permanent lighting for the Project, including the required illumination specified in Section 840.05 of the WSDOT Design Manual, and all other requirements of this RFP. Refer to Section 2.22 for additional temporary lighting requirements." Proposed rewording of this paragraph: "The Design-Builder shall perform all Work necessary to meet the requirements for temporary and permanent lighting for the Project, including the required illumination specified in Section 840.05 of the WSDOT Design Manual as it applies to illumination design areas identified on the Conceptual Plans, and all other requirements of this RFP. Refer to Section 2.22 for additional temporary lighting requirements."	5/15/2009	No.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
99	2.16.4.1 PERMANENT LIGHTING DESIGN REQUIREMENTS, first paragraph	Wording of this paragraph in the RFP: "The Design-Builder shall provide illumination at all locations identified in Section 840.05 of the WSDOT Design Manual, and as specified in these Technical Requirements. On the interchanges and ramp terminals, the Design-Builder shall use the Light Levels and Uniformity Ratios presented in the WSDOT Design Manual, including the appropriate area classification. <i>Continuous illumination of all mainline, ramp, and ramp terminals is required within the Project limits .</i> " Please insert " <i>as it applies to illumination design areas identified on the Conceptual Plans</i> " after the words "WSDOT Design Manual" and remove the last sentence since it is adequately covered elsewhere in the documents and it adds confusion as to what is required within the Project limits.	5/15/2009	No.
100	2.16.4.2.6	Wording of this paragraph in the RFP: Paragraph 8 – Page 2.16-8 – Lines 3/4 Lighting design along Northup Way, including its intersections with other roads, shall be designed to meet the City of Bellevue's Standards. Proposed rewording of this paragraph: Lighting design along Northup Way, at the 124th Ave. intersection, shall be designed to meet the City of Bellevue's Standards.	5/15/2009	We don't see the need to make this modification.
101	2.16.4.2.6	Wording of this paragraph in the RFP: Paragraph 9 – Page 2.16-8 – Lines 5-7 Lighting design along 116th Ave. NE under Northbound I-405 to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp from 50 feet south to 50 feet north of the new construction shall be designed to the City of Bellevue Standards. Proposed rewording of this paragraph: Lighting design along 116th Ave. NE under the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp from 50 feet south to 50 feet north of the new construction shall be designed to the City of Bellevue Standards	5/15/2009	We don't see the need to make this modification.
102	2.18.4.1.1	Many of the loop detectors shown on the conceptual plans are more than 500 feet away from the nearest ES cabinet (such as on sheets IT1 and IT3). RFP Section "2.18.4.1.1 Vehicle Detection" requires that loops be no more than 500 feet from the controller. If the ES cabinets shown on the plans are sufficient to serve the loops shown will the 500-foot requirement be relaxed?	5/15/2009	In general the 500 feet requirement will not be relaxed, except in cases where off-ramp loops would otherwise require a new cabinet.
103	NFPA 502, 2008 ed Chapter 13	What rules and regulations will the AHJ adopt that apply to the transportation of regulated and unregulated cargos above and beneath the partial enclosed structure? (NFPA 502, 2008 ed. Chapter 13). Will there be additional requirements for signage if the AHJ adopts rules for regulated cargo?	5/15/2009	It is assumed that cargo will be regulated and signing will be required.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
104	2.31.4.2	2.31.4.2 Fire Hazard Methodology states, "The engineering analysis of fire hazard shall determine the design fire load, which shall be no less than 70 mega watt fire". Appendix Q2 contains assumptions used to determine the 70 MW Minimum fire output. Can the DBer rely on the 70 MW minimum as a design standard such that if as part finalizing the FIRE HAZARD RPT, either the DBer determines a higher minimum fire output or the AHJ rejects the DBer's determination, the DBer would be entitled to any price or time compensation related to the changed criteria?	5/15/2009	The AHJ (FHWA) has reviewed Appendix Q2 and concurs with the 70 MW fire load determination. If the Design-Builder's Engineer also concurs but then the AHJ will not accept this determination, WSDOT will consider this a change in accordance with Section 1-04. If the Design-Builder's Engineer does not concur with this determination, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for additional costs associated with a higher fire load.
105	NFPA 502 CH 12	Please define the Participating Agencies for Emergency Response.	5/15/2009	NFPA 502 Section 12.4 provides a list of potential participating agencies.
106	NFPA	Who are the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for this project?	5/15/2009	WSDOT/FHWA
107	2.31 & 2.13	2.31 requires NFPA as a mandatory standard, but 2.13 does not include the NFPA as a mandatory standard. Please clarify.	5/15/2009	Mandatory Standards were included in Addendum No. 8.
108	NFPA	Will the COB Fire Department have any Authority in the design of the Fire Safety Systems?	5/15/2009	No. The COB Fire Department is the responding agency. According to Section 2.31.3.1, first paragraph, "Fire and life safety system elements shall be provided for the partially-enclosed areas so that a tenable environment will be available for potentially trapped motorists, and the needs of fire and rescue teams can be met." It is in the best interests of WSDOT to cooperate with the the responding agency to develop the criteria or methodology that meets the needs of the responding agency in the event of an emergency. It is possible that the responding agency will propose issues that improve conditions for responders while introducing additional cost to the Project
109	Appendix A1	Will WSDOT consider changing Appendix Q2 from a Reference to a Contract Document?	5/15/2009	No
110	RFP 2.10.1.1	UI 345 is shown on Drawing EU 3 and also is in Appendix U "Tracking Report" but does not appear in RFP 2.10.1.1 Recommend placing UI 345 in 2.10.1.1	5/15/2009	This is the original utility permit for the NE 12th street bridge. The NE 12th street bridge is not a Utility. Currently WSDOT owns the NE 12th street bridge instead of the City of Bellevue.
111	RFP 2.10.1.1	UI 360 appears two times in RFP 2.10.1.1, one at MP 14..54 and again at MP 14.63. Drawing EU 5 shows UI 360 at MP 14.63 only. Please clarify.	5/15/2009	See question #46. UI 360 and UI 501 were clarified in Addendum No. 7.
112	RFP 2.10.1.1	UI 363 appears on Drawing EU 7 and in Appendix U-02 "WSDOT Tracking Report". Does not appear in RFP 2.10.1.1. Recommend placing UI 363 in 2.10.1.1	5/15/2009	UI 363 will not be added to 2.10.1.1.
113	RFP 2.10.1.1	UT 329 does not appear in RFP 2.10.1.1. UT 329 appears on WSDOT Tracking Report and on Drawing EU 1. Recommend adding to RFP 2.10.1.1	5/15/2009	UI 329 will not be added to 2.10.1.1.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
114	UT 01294	Exhibit "C" – Plans, Sheet 10 shows the COB Sanitary Sewer (UI 429) to be relocated as the abandoned line. Is the relocated UI 429 on sheet 10 a prior relocate? If the relocated line is to be relocated on project, where is it to be relocated to?	5/15/2009	UT 01294, Exhibit "C" - Plans, Sheet 10 incorrectly shows relocating the abandoned line. The intent is to relocate the active line if impacted by the Project. See the City of Bellevue utility record drawings provided as part of Addendum No. 7 for clarification as to which line is active. If the active line is impacted by the Project, the Design-Builder is responsible for the relocation design.
115	Section 2.18.4.2 Ramp Control Signs	Section 2.18.4.2 says the ramp control signs are to be "post or cantilever-mounted." Are there criteria to decide to use post or cantilever? What type of cantilever would be required?	5/15/2009	Concept design assumed a type II signal mast arm for the cantilever. Criteria for choosing between post and cantilever depends on Design Builder's roadway geometry and application of the Mandatory Standards
116	Design Manual M22-01.02, page 840-44; Light Level and Uniformity Ratios (fig. 840-25)	It appears that the pedestrian barrier on the 12th St bridge creates shading on the traveled way and disrupts the lighting uniformity. Is this disruption of lighting uniformity permissible by WSDOT?	5/15/2009	Uniformity requirements shall be maintained on all lighting design areas in accordance with WSDOT Design Manual and City of Bellevue Standards.
117	2.22.3.2	Requires DBer to submit a TMP prior to construction. Most of the required items listed in the section and in Appendix T-18 are either already contained in the public record (EIS/EA), will be contained in approved MOT Plans, or are contained in other required planning documents (i.e., Quality Management Plan and Public Information Plan). As currently outlined, this document will cost thousands of dollars to produce and review. Suggest deleting the word "all" from Line 2 of section 2.22.3.2 and include only bullet points starting on page 2.22-4 lines 4, 7, 21, 28, 33, and on page 2.22-5 lines 2, 8, and 11.	5/15/2009	No. This is a federal requirement.
118	2.22.3.3.3	Please define "vicinity" relative to drop site locations. Also, while the RFP allows the drop sites to be on private property, most private landowners will not cooperate due to liability concerns. Request that WSDOT consider accepting responsibility for selecting and designating Drop Sites.	5/15/2009	No. No. The intent of a drop site is to put disabled vehicles in safe locations that have been preselected with the ability to call for assistance.
119	2.22.3.3.5	Requires design builder to provide staging areas that are accessible from the construction zone for incident response equipment/vehicles and that DBer is responsible for environmental permitting for said areas. As section 2.22.3.3.2 states that DBer will not be required to provide additional Incident Response Team equipment or personnel, are these staging areas for WSDOT's use? Please define area needed, and provide more specific a mainline access /proximity requirements.	5/15/2009	No, it is not intended that the DB provide staging areas for WSDOT use. See future Addendum.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
120	2.22.3.3.11	Requires DBer to submit a written contingency plan 7 days prior to closure, for re-opening every closure. There will be over 1000 closures for the proposed project. The preparation, review, and tracking of these contingency plans will consume significant WSDOT and DBer resources and ultimately will not relieve the DBer of LD responsibility. Request deleting this requirement as the DBer is already responsible for contingency planning visa vi the assessment of LDs.	5/15/2009	Will not delete requirement. It is not the intent of this section to require a formal submittal for each lane closure. It is the expectation that the DB has considered contingency planning for each new activity affecting traffic. WSDOT will require contingency plans for operations having significant impact on traffic, such as major ramp or mainline closures. Acceptance of LDs is not a substitute for good planning. The DB should be avoiding the assessment of LDs through careful <u>planning of the work.</u>
121	2.22.4.1.2	On the South Bellevue project, the definition of MOT plans has been expanded to include all Traffic Control Plans related to any closure, not just the engineered staging plans that depict static work zone traffic shifts/set ups. This expanded definition resulted in over 250 individual TCPs that were prepared and stamped by a PE that then had to undergo a WSDOT approval process which cumulatively cost the DBer and WSDOT over \$1M to process. Suggest defining MOT plans to include the engineered staging plans. TCP can be prepared by a certified TCS and compliance can be measured against the MUTCD.	5/15/2009	In accordance with Section 2.22.4.1.2, WSDOT does not approve MOT Plans. WSDOT will participate in an MOT Task Force, over-the-shoulder review as requested by the DB, and will review and comment on MOT design submittals. WSDOT is interested in alternative and more efficient processes related to the planning and implementation of MOT, particularly when a Design-Builder demonstrates the experience and technical ability necessary to plan for, prepare, manage, and implement the Traffic Control Plans and strategy for the project. Incidentally, fewer than 150 TCPs have been RFC'ed on the S. Bellevue contact which included approximately 20 ramps, widening both inside and outside of both NB and SB 405, and work in all four quadrants of the I-90/I-405 I/C.
122	2.22.4.1.4	Regarding coordination with adjacent projects, ultimately WSDOT NW Region traffic management personnel resolve regional project traffic closure conflicts. Providing the DBer has provided adequate closure notification, in the event that a planned closure is delayed due to regional conflict resolution by NW Region, will DBer be entitled to Cost and Schedule relief for such a delay?	5/15/2009	No.
123	2.22.4.1.4.1	Allowable Closures—Please clarify what is meant by “combining closures will not be allowed”.	5/15/2009	One of our core values is safety and our number one Project goal is to minimize inconvenience to the public during construction. A traffic control plan is typically considered independently with regard to its impact on road users. Combining closures, such as a detour leading into another detour or multiple work operations with lane closures in broken series, is likely to impact to road users at an unacceptable level.
124	2.22.4.3.1.5	In the event that WSDOT adjusts allowable closure hours, will the DBer be entitled to any cost and schedule damage recovery that relates to the hours adjustment?	5/15/2009	No. If the DB requests hours outside the hours listed in the RFP, and the request is approved, do you plan to provide WSDOT a credit?

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
125	2.22.4.7.2	Other than girder setting which is permitted to be supported by rolling slowdowns between the hours of 12am and 4am, this section restricts rolling slowdowns for all other reasons such as sign bridge setting only between the hours of 2am and 4 am. This will significantly affect some production activities such as high mast removal, multiple sign structure removal/settings. Please consider reverting back to previous RFP language of general rolling slowdown window from 12am to 4am.	5/15/2009	Rolling slowdowns are not a desirable traffic control method, although they can be effective for certain limited operations that can't be done any other way. The intent is to limit the use.
126	Chapt 2, Sect. 2.14.3.5	This question pertains to the existing detention vault located on the south side of SR-520, MP 7.50. If the project does not change the conveyance system (no change in the area being captured or the discharge location), can we modify the physical location of the vault itself, and therefore keeping the exact same detention volume requirement that the vault was originally designed for?	5/20/2009	Reconstructing the flow control structure/vault would require that the new detention facility meet the current Highway Runoff Manual including the forested predevelopment condition and the HRM's "Off-site, inflow area option" restrictions (that are not met by the current facility).
127	App M1	The new VMS and CCTV camera to be installed for NB I-405 at approximate MP 11.83 will need to be connected to the existing distribution fiber system. There is an existing CCTV camera for NB I-405 around MP 11.95 that will be removed. Based on the existing ITS conduit routing information this CCTV camera is connected to the ITS system via a lateral connection from the VMS/ES cabinets located on SB I-405 located at approximately MP 11.98. Please confirm that the existing fiber distribution line running along SB I-405 that connects the existing VMS/ES cabinets on SB I-405 is a 36CT single mode fiber cable meeting current WSDOT standards.	5/20/2009	The communication conduit system and fiber optic cable in this area has been modified by the I-405 South Bellevue Design-Build Project. The 36 count fiber meets design requirements.
128	Chapt 2, Sect 2.14.4.9	The conceptual design does not provide sufficient space for an off-site storm line within the right-of-way. Can the new off-site stormwater conveyance system be located in the easement, east of the WSDOT right-of-way line while maintaining the required horizontal and vertical separation from the sanitary sewer main?	5/20/2009	From the stormwater discipline perspective, this would be acceptable as long as WSDOT maintenance would have access to the storm line including the necessary property right. Note that this property right does not currently exist and the Design-Builder would be responsible for any cost and schedule impacts related to easement acquisition associated with this option. Also refer to Addendum #8.
129	App M1	The M1 Conceptual Plans indicate the presence of an easement along the east side of the I-405 corridor can soil nails be utilized for the trench wall along the ROW extending beyond the ROW but within this easement shown? Does the easement allow this?	5/20/2009	WSDOT has acquired an easement for sanitary sewer only. The easement specifically states it is for sanitary sewer purposes. Since the sewer facility and easement will be transferred to the City of Bellevue, the City's approval of encumbering the sewer easement with a subterranean easement would be necessary. Any cost or schedule impacts of pursuing this option would be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
130	Chapt 2, Sect 2.13.3.2	Are Precast Voided Slabs considered "Precast solid slab construction" as per 2.13.3.2 of the Technical Requirements in the RFP?	5/20/2009	No.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
131	Chapt 2, Sect 2.13.3.2	Precast deck panels are accepted in many states with a cast-in-place topping slab, and are not considered just 'stay in place forms'. Are Precast Deck Panels considered "Precast solid slab construction" as per 2.13.3.2 of the technical Requirements in the RFP, and therefore acceptable for use on this project?	5/20/2009	No.
132	UI 533 - Plan sheet EU3, paragraph 1-07.17(3).2, paragraph 2.10.1.1, & Appendix U2	UI 533 which is shown on Plan Sheet EU3 is not listed under 2.10.1.1. Appendix U2 lists UI 533 as Category #2. Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), ". . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." Is UI 533 a category #1 or #2 utility?	5/26/2009	UI 533 is a Category #2 Utility as listed in Appendix U2. Addendum No. 9 (in Ch 2.10.1.1) clarified that Appendix U2 provides information regarding the initial determination of whether a Utility is a Category 1 Utility or a Category 2 Utility.
133	UI 487 - Plan Sheet 10, Section 1-07.17, Section 2.10, & UT 01297	Is the D/B obligated to reimburse WSDOT for any of the costs WSDOT has paid or will pay for Seattle City Light to relocate its Category #2 power transmission pole (UI 487)? The following citations raise the question whether agreement UT 01297 costs need to be included within the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 1-07.17, page 110, lines 25-30 - D/B is responsible for all Category #2 utility relocation costs; • Paragraph 2.10.3.1.1 - If WSDOT pays a Utility Owner, the D/B shall reimburse WSDOT within 14 days; • Paragraph 2.10.3.1.1.2 - WSDOT will reimburse Seattle City Light directly (via UT 01297). 	5/26/2009	No, the Design-Builder is not obligated to reimburse WSDOT for any of the costs WSDOT has paid or will pay for Seattle City Light related to Overhead Power Line (UI 487). Per UT01297, Seattle City Light will provide engineering oversight and inspection oversight of the required Utility relocation. Seattle City Light will not perform any of the Utility relocation work.
134	UI 408 - Plan Sheet EU9, Section 1-07.17, Section 2.10, & UT 01327	Is the D/B obligated to reimburse WSDOT for any of the costs WSDOT has paid or will pay for Integra to relocate its Category #2 fiber optic line (UI 408)? The following citations raise the question as to whether agreement UT 01327 costs need to be included within the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 1-07.17, page 110, lines 25-30 - D/B is responsible for all Category #2 utility relocation costs; • Paragraph 1-07,17(1).1 page 111 lines 18 - 20 - The Utility Work . . . include[s] the obligation to reimburse Utility Owners for costs of acquiring Utility Easements, if necessary for the Relocation of any Category #2 Utilities; • Paragraph 1-07.17(4).3 - Except for Prior Relocations, D/B shall reimburse Utility Owners for all Relocation Costs for Category #2 Utilities; • Paragraph 2.10.3.1.1 - If WSDOT pays a Utility Owner, the D/B shall reimburse WSDOT within 14 days; 	5/26/2009	No, the Design-Builder is not obligated to reimburse WSDOT any of the costs WSDOT has paid or will pay for Integra to relocate its Category #2 fiber optic line (UI 408). WSDOT will purchase a replacement easement on private property for relocation of the fiber optic line, at which time the easement document will be finalized. Bid according to the draft easement provided in UI01327.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
135	UI 408 - Plan Sheet EU9, Section 1-07.17, Section 2.10, & UT 01327	<p>Paragraph 2.10.3.1.1.1 - WSDOT will reimburse Integra directly (via UT 01327);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 2.10.5.2.2 - WSDOT does not obtain easements for Utilities outside of the Right of Way. Utility Owners are entitled to reimbursement . . . if . . . they held a pre-existing property right; • Paragraph 2.10.8.4.3 - WSDOT purchased a replacement easement on private property for relocation of the fiber optic line; the easement document within UT 01327 is incomplete. 	5/26/2009	See response to question #134.
136	WSDOT 5/7/09 Q & A #4 Response to RFI #72, Appendix A2 & Appendix U4	<p>WSDOT response to RFI #72 says the file SYMB047.DWG is with the Utility files folder in Appendix 2.</p> <p>WE are unable to find any of the listed utility files on the WSDOT FTP site - Please provide exact file path to SYMB047.DWG.</p>	5/26/2009	SYMB047.DWG is on a DVD that was distributed from the Contract Ad and Award office on March 30th with the Ad Copy of the RFP. It was not posted to WSDOT's FTP site because there are some 700MB+ video files.
137	UT 01294 Section 7, UT 01294 Exhibit A - Attachment 2, & Section 2.10	<p>Please clarify if WSDOT will issue the COB utility permits prior to beginning utility relocation construction, or following completion and acceptance of utility work by COB. The following citations contain conflicting requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 7.1 of UT 01294 states in part, "Following completion and acceptance of the Utility Work, the STATE shall amend or issue to the CITY the necessary permits, franchises or franchise amendments for those CITY UTILITIES located within STATE right of way. The CITY agrees to work with the Design-Builder using the process for . . . "New Franchises and Permits" . . .". • Paragraph 2.10.5.2 states in part, "All Utility Easements (existing and proposed) . . . shall be identified or described by the D/B in the Final Design Documents. . .". • Paragraph 2.10.4.2 states in part, " . . . The D/B shall ensure that a new franchise or permit has been issued by WSDOT prior to beginning construction of any Relocation . . .". <p>How will the D/B ensure the new permits have been issued prior to construction if the STATE amends/issues necessary permits to the CITY following completion and acceptance of the Utility Work?</p>	5/26/2009	The permit requirements in 2.10.5.2 and 2.10.4.2 are stated correctly. The Design-Builder shall ensure that a new franchise or permit has been issued by WSDOT prior to beginning construction of any Relocation. Paragraph 7.1 of UT 01294 references 2.10.4.2 for the process of submittal, review and approval of permits, franchises or franchise amendments. The intent of "Following completion and acceptance of the UTILITY WORK, the STATE shall amend or issue to the CITY the necessary permits, franchises or franchise amendments for those CITY UTILITIES located within STATE right of way" in paragraph 7.1 of UT 01294 is to describe the process of as-builtting the new franchise or permit based upon field changes during construction.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
138	Paragraphs 2.23.4.1 thru 2.23.4.3, Appendix RR-2 - WSDOT/BNSF C and M Agreement RR-00415, Article II, 2. etal. & Exhibit C-1 - BNSF/Contractor Right-of-Entry Agreement.	If WSDOT has paid the \$78,500 for easements (specified in RR-00415 Article II, 2.), is the D/B obligated to reimburse WSDOT? If WSDOT has not paid, who is supposed to pay BNSF for the easements? If WSDOT will pay for the easements in the future, is the D/B obligated to reimburse WSDOT? The easement document (Exhibit B of RR-00415) is incomplete.	5/26/2009	The easement has been paid for and recorded for the BNSF overcrossing on 520. WSDOT has paid the \$78,500 for easements (specified in RR-00415 Article II, 2.), the Design-Builder is NOT obligated to reimburse WSDOT. See RFP Section 2.24 RIGHT OF WAY (ROW) for clarification of who is cost responsible for easements in the future. WSDOT will provide a copy of the recorded easement document in Addendum No 12.
139	Appendix U6	Addendum 7 "Memoranda of Understanding" replacement file did not contain an MOU for MCI Category #1. Should UI 505 be added to the Verizon Business Category #1 MOU (per WSDOT response to RFI #75), or should the D/B execute an MOU for MCI Category #1?	5/26/2009	WSDOT added to the Verizon Business Category #1 MOU in Addendum No. 9.
140	Appendix U6	Addendum 7 "Memoranda of Understanding" replacement file did not contain MOUs for Puget Sound Energy Category #1 or Category #2. Will the D/B be required to execute MOUs with PSE for Category #1 and Category #2 utilities?	5/26/2009	Puget Sound Energy Category #1 and Category #2 MOU was provided in Addendum No 11.
141	Appendix U6	Addendum 7 "Memoranda of Understanding" replacement file did not contain an MOU for Qwest Category #1. Will the D/B be required to execute an MOU with Qwest for Category #1 utilities?	5/26/2009	No. WSDOT provided the MOU for Qwest Category #1 utilities in Addendum No. 9.
142	2.15.4.1.9	The paragraph state " Color shall be applied to all above ground exposed surfaces including, but limited to bridge structures including all sides of every girder, all sides of the superstructure, ..." This requirement is contrary to normal WSDOT practice. Will Color be required to all sides interior girder, interior sides of outer girders and soffits of Bridge Decks?	5/26/2009	See Addendum #9. Refer to Appendix L2, page 29. On bridges over I-405, NE 12 th . color B shall be applied to the right, bottom, and left sides, not top or ends, of all, both interior and exterior, girders. Color A shall be applied to visible surfaces of the bridge barrier and the bridge soffit/overhang to the point of intersection with the exterior girders. The under side of the deck between girders is exempt from color application. On bridges parallel to I-405, NE10-SR520 Ramp and the NB405-SR520 Braid, Color A shall be applied to visible surfaces of the bridge barrier, the bridge soffit/overhang, and the exterior face and bottom of the exterior girders, similar to WSDOT's standard detail for pigmented sealer application on bridges. On SR 520, NB405-EB520 Ramp bridges over 116th, BNSF, Northup, and 124th, use WSDOT's standard detail for pigmented sealer application on bridges, visible surfaces of the bridge barrier, the bridge soffit/overhang, and the exterior face and bottom of the exterior girders.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
143	2.16.4.1	Please clarify the "Project limits" on I-405 and SR 520 referred to in Section 2.16.14.1, within which illumination is to be analyzed/evaluated and potentially modified and supplemented. Does it extend south to "Begin Project I-405 MP 13.50" (Concept Plan sheet SPM1C), north to "End Project I-405 MP 15.0" (Concept Plan sheet IT8), and east to "End Project SR 520 MP 7.9" (Concept Plan sheet IT11)? Is it limited to the hatched "Illumination Design Areas" delineated on the IT sheets of the Concept Plans? Or is there another definition of "Project limits"?	5/27/2009	The limits for illumination design and construction will be defined by the final design documents. The Design-Builder shall evaluate the illumination for all areas that the final design changes (from existing conditions): the number/type/location of ramps/overpasses/underpasses/interchanges, number of lanes on highways or local roads, alignment of lanes on highways or local roads. The lighting analysis shall be expended from these specific areas as necessary to ensure design standards are met. That is, the Design-Builder shall consider the effects of the existing lighting system on the new roadways (configurations), and the effects of the new lighting system on the existing roadways.
144	2.19.4.1.2	Please clarify conflict between the RFP and the Conceptual Design Plans (Appendix M) Sheet SPM13 and SPM4 for the location of the two new Sign Structures. 1. Is WSDOT going to deviate from the 100 feet spacing requirement for these two sign bridges? 2. Or will WSDOT approve mounting the new signs on the NE 12th Street Bridge structure (southbound signs on the north side and northbound signs on the south side of the bridge?)	5/27/2009	1. The sign structures shown on the Conceptual Plans represent the approximate location of required structures. Locations of sign structures may need to be modified to comply with design criteria, such as distance from bridges. 2. The urban design criteria does not allow mounting signs on new structures and the 12th Street Bridge is on a heavy skew which creates additional structural issues to consider. WSDOT would permit mounting these signs on the bridge only if there are no other feasible alternatives.
145	Addendum No 2 3.3.15 Price Proposal Part 1 D 1.3.5 Validity Period: Notice to Proceed	1. The second sentence of the section states "The letters of commitment from Sureties....". Can the word "commitment" be changed to "intent"? 2. Also can the letter be set to expire concurrent with the Bid Bond at the end of the Validity Period or Notice to Proceed?	6/2/2009	1. No, we require a "commitment" from the surety, not just "intent". 2. Yes, the surety letter shall expire no sooner than 90 days after the Proposal Due Date in accordance with Section 1.3.5 of the ITP, or upon Notice To Proceed.
146	Appendix F2 Contract Bond	Paragraph 3 of the Contract Bond provides that the bond "shall not cover errors or omissions in the design documents supplied by Principal in accordance [with] the Contract Documents." However, General Provisions 1-03.4 provides that the "Contract Bond shall ... [guarantee that the surety shall indemnify, defend, and protect WSDOT against any claim of direct or indirect loss resulting from the failure ... [o]f the Design-Builder ... to faithfully perform the Contract..." Paragraph 3 of the Contract Bond seems to conflict with General Provision 1-03.4. As such will the Department clarify the Contract Bond's coverage?	6/2/2009	The intent of the Contract and the associated bond is that all Contract Work regardless of whether it is design or construction is treated equally under the Bond guarantee. In Addendum No. 11, WSDOT modified the Contract Bond Form to eliminate the inconsistency.
147	Addenda No. 9 Appendix F12 and F13	The Noncollusion Declaration and the Lobbying Certification Form we added as part of Addenda No.9. Are these forms required to be included in Appendix A of the Proposal?	6/2/2009	Yes.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
148	UI 521, UI 524, UI 413, and UI 472 - Existing Utilities plan sheets; Section 1-07.17; Section 2.10; UT 01294 Amendment 1; and Appendix U2	<p>Please clarify why storm drains UI 521, UI 524, UI 413 and UI 472 are defined in UT 01294 Amendment No. 1 (part of Addendum #9) as Category #2 Utilities. The following citations lead to our request for further clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storm drains UI 521, UI 524, UI 413 and UI 472 are listed as Category #2 Utilities under subsection 4.6 in Exhibit "A" of UT 01294 Amendment No. 1. • Neither UI 521 nor UI 524 are listed in Section 2.10.1.1. • Both UI 413 & UI 472 were removed from Section 2.10.1.1 in Addendum #5 per WSDOT responses to RFIs #16 & #40, and #17 & #41, respectively. • Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), ". . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." • UI 521, UI 524, UI 413 and UI 472 are not shown on Existing Utilities plan sheets. • UI 521 & UI 524 are not listed in Appendix U2. 	6/2/2009	UI 521, UI 524, UI 413 and UI 472 will be removed from the UT 01294 Amendment No. 1. These storm drain facilities are not Utilities. See Ch 2.14.1.1 General for information on City of Bellevue owned storm drains.
149	UI 522, UI 523 - Existing Utilities plan sheets; Section 1-07.17; Section 2.10; UT 01294 Amendment 1; and Appendix U2	<p>Please clarify the locations of sanitary sewers UI 522 & UI 523, and verify they are Category #2 Utilities as defined in UT 01294 Amendment No. 1 (part of Addendum #9). The following citations lead to our request for further clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitary sewers UI 522 & UI 523 are listed as Category #2 Utilities under subsection 4.6 in Exhibit "A" of UT 01294 Amendment No. 1. • Neither UI 522 nor UI 523 are listed in Section 2.10.1.1. • Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), ". . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." • UI 522 & UI 523 are not shown on Existing Utilities plan sheets or listed in Appendix U2. 	6/2/2009	UI 522 and UI 523 are old utility numbers that are now superseded by UI 525. UI 522 and UI 523 will be removed from the UT 01294 Amendment No. 1.
150	UI 526 - Section 1-07.17; Section 2.10; UT 01294 Amendment 1; and Appendix U2	<p>Please verify UI 526 is a waterline, and that it is a Category #2 Utility as defined in UT 01294 Amendment No. 1 (part of Addendum #9). The following citations lead to our request for further clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both a sanitary sewer and a waterline are referred to as UI 526, and both are listed as Category #2 Utilities under subsection 4.6 in Exhibit "A" of UT 01294 Amendment No. 1. • UI 526 is not listed in Section 2.10.1.1. • Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), ". . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." • UI 526 is shown on plan sheet EU3 as a waterline. • UI 526 is listed as a waterline in Appendix U2. 	6/2/2009	UI 526 is a waterline and a Category #2 Utility. The sanitary sewer was incorrectly labeled UI 526 and will be correctly labeled UI 525 in the Amendment No. 1.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
151	UI 527, UI 528, UI 542, and UI 544 - Section 1-07.17; Section 2.10; and UT 01294 Amendment 1	<p>Please verify that sanitary sewers UI 527, UI 528, UI 542, and waterline UI 544 are Category #2 Utilities as defined in UT 01294 Amendment No. 1 (part of Addendum #9). The following citations lead to our request for further clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitary sewers UI 527, UI 528, UI 542, and waterline UI 544 are listed as a Category #2 Utility under subsection 4.6 in Exhibit "A" of UT 01294 Amendment No. 1. • UI 527, UI 528, UI 542, and UI 544 are not listed in Section 2.10.1.1. • Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), " . . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." 	6/2/2009	UI 527, UI 528, UI 542 and UI 544 are all Category #2 Utilities. Chapter 2.10.1.1 has been clarified in Addendum #9 So that Appendix U2 provides an initial determination of whether a Utility is a Category #1 Utility or Category #2 Utility.
152	Page 2.16-10 / Section 2.16.4.3 / Line 31 thru 34	<p>Some but not all of existing City Of Bellevue traffic signal j-boxes on each end of the 12th Street overpass will need to be relocated due to the new alignment. COB conversations and site investigation reveals that the systems are currently co-mingled. The referenced section states that the systems need to be in their own respective conduit and j-boxes. Is it the intent for the entire signal and illumination system conduit and j-box delivery system to be re-built to current standards or just that portion that is modified by this contract. Rebuilding the entire system would require new bases currently in sidewalks, street crossings and additional interruptions to the traveling public in a very busy intersection.</p> <p>Requested Change: Only those systems that are modified by this contract.</p>	6/2/2009	It is intended that the Design-Builder bring to current standards only those portions of the City of Bellevue systems that are impacted by this contract.
153	Page 2.18.13 / Section 2.18.4.6 / Lines 11 thru 14	<p>These 2 references discuss connections between "traffic signal controller cabinets at each ramp terminal traffic signal within the Project limits," and the nearest ES or VC cabinet. Since the Project Limits are not clearly defined, it is not clear which traffic signal controllers are intended for this requirement. Please provide a list of all the "ramp terminal traffic signals within the Project limits." It is clear that the new intersection on the NE 10th Street ramp is within the Project limits, but what about the intersection of Northup Way/124th Ave NE, or either of the NE 8th Street intersections?</p> <p>Requested Change: Define which ramp terminal traffic signals and traffic signal controller cabinets are to be affected by this requirement.</p>	6/2/2009	NE 10th Street and 124th Avenue are affected by the referenced requirement.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
154	RFP sections 2.18.4.6 (second-last paragraph) and 2.18.4.7.1 (paragraph after bullets)	This section discuss connections between “traffic signal controller cabinets at each ramp terminal traffic signal within the Project limits,” and the nearest ES or VC cabinet. Since the Project Limits are not clearly defined, it is not clear which traffic signal controllers are intended for this requirement. Please provide a list of all the “ramp terminal traffic signal within the Project limits.” It is clear that the new intersection on the NE 10 th Street ramp is within the Project limits, but what about the intersection of Northup Way/124 th Ave NE, or either of the NE 8 th Street intersections?	6/2/2009	NE 10th Street and 124th Avenue are affected by the referenced requirement.
155	RFP Appendix H1: Appendix D; Memo RE: NE 10th Street Pond Dated April 9, 2008, RFP Appendix H1: Appendix C, and Appendix A2; NB Braids Drainage Survey (FINAL DRAFT) microstation file (s2008-01-31A.dgn) dated 8/4/2008.	This question is in regards to the existing 18” concrete cross drain under I-405 at MP 14.14 (Cross drain No. 10). From the survey points shown in the drainage survey file (s2008-01-31A.dgn) this line drains to the east picking up the roadside ditch on the west side of I-405 and crossing under I-405; both northbound and southbound and outletting on the east side. This is consistent with the description given in Appendix C of RFP appendix H1. This information described above does not match with RFP assumptions regarding this pipe; specifically the memo included in Appendix D of RFP Appendix H1 dated April 9, 2008 RE: NE 10th Street Pond Future Development. Please clarify if the intent of the RFP concept was to provide a new crossing at this location (draining to the west) or re-use the existing crossing.	6/4/2009	The intent of the preliminary design was to include runoff from this area to flow west as needed to meet the equivalent catchment area requirements for this TDA. The preliminary design assumed that is would be a new crossing. This was planned as a permanent change from the existing (easterly) flow condition, so re-using the existing pipe would not be acceptable.

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
156	RFP Appendix H1: Appendix C and City of Bellevue Stormwater As-Builts	<p>This question is in regards to the existing 24" concrete cross drain under SR520 at MP 7.15 (Cross drain No. 37). According to the RFP this pipe currently has an upstream tributary area of approximately 96 acres and drain to the south across both directions of SR520. Under the developed condition this pipe would be utilized as our outfall from the proposed pond I-1. From the City of Bellevue As-Builts this line drains to the south at approximately 2.17%.</p> <p>Preliminary capacity calculations show that this pipe may not have adequate capacity for the predeveloped tributary area.</p> <p>In the event that the existing capacity of this pipe is not adequate please clarify if this would be the design builders responsibility to replace or the owners? Also, please clarify that the capacity of the downstream system (private 18" pipe) is not the responsibility of the design builder.</p>	6/4/2009	<p>In accordance with Section 2.14.4.2, "Where the actual capacity of an existing drainage structure does not provide the capacity required for the completed Project, and the capacity of the drainage structure as shown in the as-built documents and survey information provided by WSDOT was not adequate for the completed Project, the Design-Builder shall replace the structure at the required capacity with no additional compensation." In this case, the Design-Buidler will be required to replace the deficient storm sewer from a logical point within the impact area on the north side of SR 520 to the outlet or a structure near the WSDOT Right-of-Way limit on the south side of SR 520. The Design-Builder is not responsible for replacing the 18" pipe outside of WSDOT Right-of-Way.</p>
157	ITP 2.14.1	<p>Section 2.14.1 of the ITP indicates that the DB's Proposal must include a commitment letter from a Surety. The commitment letter may not include "conditions, qualifications, or reservations for underwriting or otherwise, other than a statement that the commitment is subject to award of the Contract to the Proposer within the time specified in this ITP. The closest we could find to a specific time for the expiration date in the ITP is Section 2.13 which states: "WSDOT anticipates that Contract award or Proposal rejection will occur within 60 Calendar Days after the Proposal Due Date. If the Apparent Best Value Proposer and WSDOT agree, this deadline may be extended. If they cannot agree on an extension by the deadline, WSDOT reserves the right to award the Contract to the next Apparent Best Value Proposer or reject all Proposals. Can you confirm that 60 days is the expiration of the surety letter and that that the surety may state that this letter may be extended by mutual consent of the Proposer and its surety?"</p>		<p>The surety letter shall expire no sooner then 90 days after the Proposal Due Date in accordance with Section 1.3.5 of the ITP, or upon Notice To Proceed.</p>
158	UI 533 - Q&A #7 RFI 132 response; Existing Utilities plan sheet EU3; Section 1-07.17; Section 2.10; WSDOT/PSE MOU in Addendum 10; and Appendix U2	<p>Please clarify whether UI 533 is Category #1 or Category #2. The following citations lead to our request for further clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q&A #7 RFI 132 response says it's Category #2. • UI 533 is not listed in Section 2.10.1.1. • UI 533 is listed as Category #1 in the WSDOT/PSE MOU from Addendum No. 10. • Paragraph 1-07.17(3).2 states in part (on lines 40 - 42), ". . . if not [in section 2.10 or in an applicable RFP-MOU], then the Utility shall initially be in Category #1." • UI 533 is shown on Existing Utilities plan sheet EU3. • UI 533 is listed in Appendix U2 as Category #2. 	6/5/2009	<p>Puget Sound Energy's facilities in the vicinity of 116th Ave NE and NE 12th Street and called out UI 533 on sheet EU3 is a Category #2 Utility. The OHMC owned facilities that run from said Puget Sound Energy facilities to OHMC is a service line to OHMC. UI 533 was incorrectly listed as a Category #1 Utility in the WSDOT/PSE MOU from Addendum No. 10.</p>

**I-405/ NE 8th St to SR 520 Braided Ramps Interchange Improvements Project
Question and Answer #9 - June 18, 2009**

KEY: New/ Updated

Question or RFI #	RFP Reference	Question / RFI	Date Received	Answer
159	GP 1-07.17(9), and GP 1-07.17(5)	The RFP provides very limited vertical location information for underground utilities. Reasonable Accuracy—States that there is no limitation relative to vertical accuracy. Since there is little to no vertical underground utility information provided in the RFP, is it a correct interpretation that any Major Underground Utility not included as a Relocation in TS 2.10 that is later found to require relocation based on any vertical project conflict discovered by DBer’s post-NTP Utility Investigations would be the subject of a Change in Contract Time, Contract Price and compensation for disruption damages? Is WSDOT or DBer responsible for vertical utility locations?	6/5/2009	It is not a correct interpretation that any Major Underground Utility not included as a Relocation in TS 2.10 that is later found to require relocation based on any vertical project conflict discovered by DBer’s post-NTP Utility Investigations would be the subject of a Change in Contract Time, Contract Price and compensation for disruption damages. Please reference Section 1-07.17(9) which addresses price adjustments and time extensions for inaccurate utility information. If a Utility lies within the limits of Reasonable Accuracy as defined in Section 1-07.17(9).3, then there is no right to a change order. The definition of Reasonable Accuracy specifically excludes any limitation on vertical location. WSDOT is not responsible for vertical location of utilities.”
160	GP 1-07.18(1)	Section 1-07.18(1) Required Insurance, 2. Commercial General Liability states that "The Design-Builder shall maintain such insurance through the expiration of the Warranty period" . . . , and that "products and completed operations coverage apply for a minimum of three years following Physical Completion." Will the Products and Completed Operations coverage satisfy the requirement that insurance be maintained during the Warranty period, or is Premises Liability coverage required during the Warranty period?	6/5/2009	The products/completed operations coverage will not, in and of itself, satisfy the insurance requirements for the Warranty period. Commercial General Liability (CGL) coverage (which must include the products/completed operations coverage, and all of the other requirements of the insurance spec) will need to be in place for the Warranty period, as defined in the specs. Also, products/completed operations coverage is required for 3 years after “physical completion.” This is a coverage typically provided for under a CGL policy and we are not aware of any company that provides products/completed operations coverage without also providing CGL coverage during that period. In short, to our knowledge, you cannot obtain a policy which provides only products/completed operation coverage. Therefore, it will be necessary for the DB to maintain some form of CGL coverage for the project during that 3 year “post completion” period.
161	ITP 1.3.8	Does inclusion of a modified Form 272-056, DBE Utilization Certification, in the Proposal meet the requirements of the ITP?	6/5/2009	Use of a modified 272-056 demonstrating at least 5% DBE utilization would meet the requirements of the ITP assuming all firms listed are appropriately certified and accurately represented at the time of Award. In addition to the form, WSDOT recommends the Proposal include a commitment to modify DBE utilization as needed to meet the 5% requirement, including performance of good faith efforts if necessary.