



State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387

ADDENDUM #14

**RFP #7598876PH2 TITLE: DESIGN/BUILD SERVICES FOR I-95 PROVIDENCE VIADUCT
NORTHBOUND**

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: 5/01/2020 – 11:30 A.M.

See attached.

Lisa Hill

Lisa Hill
Assistant Administrator



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
RIDOT Addendum Notification

**RFP# 7598876PH2A14 – Best Value Design-Build Services for Interstate Route 95 Viaduct Northbound
Bridge Group 75T-5B (I)**

(REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – Phase 2)

ADDENDUM #14

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DUE DATE: May 1, 2020 at 11:30 am

Per issuance of ADDENDUM # 7598876PH2A14 the following additions, revisions and clarifications are noted:

1. Questions asked and answers provided during bid procurement.

APPROVED:

Karen Doyle
for: Lori Fisette
Manager, Project Management

4/24/2020
DATE

Questions and Answers For:

D/B Services for I-95 Viaduct-Northbound-Shortlisted Firms Only 7598876PH2

Please Note: *If this is the first time accessing our system on our new web site, you will be required to reset your password.*

**The ask question function is now disabled;
please call 401-563-4100 with any new questions.**

Date Asked: 04/22/2020

Date Answered: 04/23/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

RFP Part 1 Section 8.4 states "The Proposer shall include in their presentation a rendering(s) of the landscape and streetscape concepts they are proposing..." Can RIDOT please clarify any rendering requirements for the presentation? Is "landscape and streetscape" intended to refer to the actual landscape/streetscape design or is the intent for Proposers to provide general, perspective views of key elements of the Project?

Answer:

These landscape and streetscape elements are not required for the presentation. The sentence "The Proposer shall include in their presentation a rendering(s) of the landscape and streetscape concepts they are proposing to design and construct as part of their proposal" can be deleted from this section of RFP Part 1.

Date Asked: 04/21/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Per RIDOT standard Specification Section 841, Pre-Construction and Post-Construction Surveys need to be performed on both interior and exterior walls of buildings. Per the RFP, pre-construction and post-construction surveys need to be conducted on all structures located within 200 Ft of Vibration inducing activities. Per Section 841, the interior surveys should include all walls, floors, ceilings, doorways, windows, etc.. Some of the buildings that fall with-in that requirement include but are not limited to the Omni Providence Hotel, The Foundry Building, and Providence Place Mall. These are a few of the many large buildings with very difficult coordination challenges to conduct interior surveys of all walls, floors, ceilings, doorways, and windows. Due to the long survey durations required to perform complete interior building surveys, would it be acceptable to perform pre-construction and post-construction interior surveys on the basements and first floors of buildings only?

Answer:

Limits for this Pre- and Post-Construction survey for buildings over 3 stories within the 200 ft limits can be revised to the basement and first floor interiors, and entire exterior of the building.

Date Asked: 04/20/2020**Date Answered:** 04/22/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Based on Q/A on 3/9, you answered "The Transmittal Letter and the Proposal Letter (Form A) are one and the same. It is not necessary to submit Form A and an additional "Transmittal Letter." However, Section 6.3 of the RFP ask that "The Transmittal Letter shall state, among other things, that the Technical Proposal shall remain valid beyond the Proposal Deadline until the Contract is fully executed, or until the Contract is withdrawn and the Project cancelled by the State, whichever occurs first. The Transmittal Letter shall also state the name, title, address, email address, and telephone number of one individual who will respond to State requests for additional information, and, also, of one individual who is authorized to negotiate and execute the Contract on the Proposer's behalf." Can RIDOT please provide an updated Form A that includes all required language, or allow teams to edit Form A to include all required language?

Answer:

Form A will be revised in the next Addendum

Date Asked: 04/17/2020**Date Answered:** 04/22/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

With reference to a previous question under RFP Section 3.16.2.2, the response indicates the "DB Team will be required to provide a concept for under-bridge lighting along Providence Place and Promenade Street...". Please confirm this requirement is specific to a future activity, and that the concept (plan) is not required as part of the Proposal submission.

Answer:

Confirmed, the required concept does not have to be submitted with the Technical Proposal.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020**Date Answered:** 04/23/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Volume 2 Replacement of Smith Street Bridge No. 701, Sheet 10 of 93 shows the removal of 12 – 4" DIA telephone ducts. We understand that the live cables will be relocated by others under a force account agreement. Note 4 on Sheet 10 states "TELEPHONE DUCTS CONTAIN ASBESTOS FIBERS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE REMOVAL AND LEGAL DISPOSAL OF THE DUCTS BY THE UTILITY COMPANY". Please confirm that the Utility Company will perform all work necessary to expose the ducts for proper removal and disposal.

Answer:

The Contractor shall expose the conduits by removing the deck/sidewalk to provide Verizon access to expose the cables, move the cables, and remove and dispose the telephone ducts.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Referencing I-95 SB As Built Volume 3 Sheet 143, regarding Bonding and Grounding of structures over Amtrak. The Division of Work and Material Supply indicates Final Grounding and Bonding to Static Wire will be done by Railroad Force Account. Can we assume that Railroad Force Account will make the same connections for all the bridges in this contract crossing Amtrak?

Answer:

Yes, Amtrak (via railroad Force Account) will make all the final connections between the bridge and the static wire (ground wire) passing under the bridge.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

In response to the question answered on 3/31/20 regarding removal of the island in the intersection of Promenade and Park St, please confirm the pedestrian signal equipment, curb ramps and striping at the intersection need to be up replaced to comply with current ADA standards.

Answer:

Confirmed.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

In response to the question answered on 3/31/20 regarding replacing the mast arm at the intersection of Park St and Hayes St, does the replacement mast arm need to be the fluted steel City standard? Additionally, do the remaining mast arms and pedestrian signals at this intersection need to be replaced?

Answer:

Upgrading equipment to City standards is not required at this intersection. Only equipment impacted by construction activities must be replaced.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Please confirm the ITS visual coverage provided in the BTC is acceptable for the project.

Answer:

The existing CCTV coverage in the area of the project was reviewed by the RIDOT TMC and deemed acceptable.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The latest bridge standard details (published on RIDOT's website), General Notes Sheet 2, Concrete Note #12 requires bridge parapets/barriers to be coated with a concrete surface treatment-protective coating. Neither the RFP, nor the BTC plans require bridge parapets/barriers to be coated. Will it be required to coat parapets/barriers? The SB viaduct bridge does not have a coating on the parapets.

Answer:

Per the latest bridge standard details General Notes Sheet 2, Concrete Note #12 bridge parapets/barriers shall be coated with a concrete surface treatment-protective coating.

Date Asked: 04/16/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Form E, Certification for Dumping Facilities, requires us to list prices for disposal of several categories of contaminated soil disposal. The mandatory Specification 202.9901 appears to require payment based on the actual cost of the disposal at the licensed facility. What are the rates on Form E used for and how are they used in the evaluation of the technical proposal? If these are to be the rates for payment for contractor cost of disposal of contaminated soil, how will these rates be interpreted. The cost at the disposal facility changes each year, typically increasing. We cannot know the future rates for disposal beyond this year. Should we be listing current prices and if so, will any future increases be paid by the State in addition to the current price? Should the form be changed to eliminate the rates and only include a certification that the contractor has identified adequate receiving facilities for each category?

Answer:

The current disposal facility pricing can be listed for informational purposes with the understanding that the actual cost charged by the facility at the time of disposal is what will be used when determining payment. Actual reimbursement will be based on actual billed price.

Date Asked: 04/15/2020

Date Answered: 04/23/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The impact on the project schedule, the supply chain, and labor force resulting from the COVID 19 global pandemic are unknown. Based on the unknowable impacts of COVID-19 (e.g., such as project shutdowns, vendor/subcontractor shutdowns or delays, schedule impacts due to low availability of labor, or due to learning curves of high rotation of personnel due to quarantines or sickness, union restrictions and lack of workers to this project), will the Contractor be entitled to cost and/or time impacts due to the COVID19 pandemic?

Answer:

Any known impacts at the time of submission date shall be incorporated accordingly into the submissions. Impacts occurring after the time of submission may be submitted in accordance the RIDOT's change management procedure and will be reviewed accordingly.

Date Asked: 04/15/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Table in RFP Part 2 - 8.1.3.1 shows Standard and Minimum Utility Duration for Smith Street: NGRID – Electric as 9 Months and Smith St: Verizon as 6 Months. Relocation of the 9-5" Electrical Ducts on smith street bridge is in Phase 2 of the BTC Smith and park St drawings. The installation of the telephone cables in the sidewalk occurs in Phase 3 of the BTC Smith and Park drawings. With the sequencing shown there would be 15 months of utility relocation required to construct the smith street bridge. The Park Street walls are tied to the phasing of the bridge with the north walls being done last. Per RFP Part 2 – 1.3.6 The Milestone for Park street Retaining wall construction completion for Tolling Installation states the Park street wall and any other work on I-95 necessary to install the northbound toll gantry must be completed before June 30, 2021 (revised to November 15, 2021 per Addendum No. 11). Due to the long durations of utility relocations and the sequence of construction required to build the Smith Street Bridge and Park St Walls, please reconsider the Milestone date for completion of the Park street Retaining wall construction and completion of northbound toll gantry installations.

Answer:

Noting the duration clarification provided in the answer below, this work shall be sequenced to be complete by the milestone date.

Date Asked: 04/15/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Table in RFP Part 2 - 8.1.3.1 shows Standard and Minimum Utility Duration for Smith Street: NGRID – Electric as 9 Months. Please confirm the scope under this 9 Month duration is for NGRID to install new 9-5" Electrical Ducts over the 175 ft bridge shown on sheet no. 10 of 93 in the BTC Smith and Park Drawing set.

Answer:

National Grid will run wires through the ducts installed by the DB Team during this duration. This duration starts with the submission of a complete and acceptable utility design submission by the DB Team and is inclusive of National Grid's design and construction time.

Date Asked: 04/15/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

The I-95 Viaduct Southbound Project specified transverse grooving on exposed concrete deck surfaces under 814.03.9, "Grooving". Since, RIDOT has issued a TAC memo (TAC – 0256) stating that all exposed concrete deck and wearing surfaces shall be finished by diamond grinding in accordance with the specification that was released in the compilation of Approved Specification Supplement #14 dated August 2013. Please confirm that the exposed concrete surface shall be longitudinally diamond ground per Specifications 814.03.9.a and not grooved.

Answer:

The exposed concrete surface shall be longitudinally diamond ground per Specifications 814.03.9.a.

Date Asked: 04/14/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Addendum 12 changed the incentive payment for completion of Ramp DB for closures less than 60 days. The disincentive paragraph says there will be a deduction for closures after 45 days. Should this have been changed to 60 also? Please review and correct or explain as necessary.

Answer:

This should have been changed to 60 days and will be clarified by addendum.

Date Asked: 04/13/2020

Date Answered: 04/14/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

In regards to the RIVIP Bidder Certification, RFP Part 1 Section 6.9 (page 32) says "All three pages MUST accompany EACH response submitted..." However, the RIVIP form downloaded from the website indicates in the solicitation title that the form is 4 pages. The 4th page is a cover sheet for Form N and the Form N is attached. Please confirm for use in the proposal we need only submit the three pages of the RIVIP Bidder Certification Form.

Answer:

Confirmed

Date Asked: 04/10/2020

Date Answered: 04/14/2020

Poster: [joel kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

During a coordination meeting with National Grid – Gas, a representative from the gas company stated that there is a regulator station located adjacent to the south side Providence Place below the new I-95SB Viaduct. The location is designated by 2 hatch covers. In addition to providing the location, the representative stated that all work within 200' of the regulator station would require the presence of a National Grid Inspector. Who is responsible for the costs associated with this inspector?

Answer:

The cost of any required National Grid Inspectors will be covered by RIDOT through a Force Account agreement with National Grid.

Date Asked: 04/09/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

The proposed procurement schedule included in Addendum 11 has interviews taking place during the week of May 18th. Given that several of our team members are located in states that have stay-at-home orders currently in effect through the end of May and that Rhode Island is currently restricting travel into that state from other states, it is not possible for us to attend in-person interviews at this time. Is the Department considering conducting these interviews using internet-based platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or Web Ex? If so, does the Department have a preferred platform that you will use to conduct the interviews?

Answer:

These presentations / interviews will be conducted remotely utilizing an internet based platform. Additional direction will be provided to DB Teams prior to the submission due date.

Date Asked: 04/09/2020**Date Answered:** 04/22/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

With Rhode Island's Stay-at-Home order extended through May 8th and the Technical Proposal due May 1st, will the Department reconsider allowing the electronic submission of our Technical Proposal on May 1st rather than requiring us to submit 9 hard copies. This would allow us to abide by the State's mandate to stay home and observe social distancing recommendations to stop the spread rather than needing to congregate in our offices to print, assemble and package the proposal for delivery to RIDOT.

Answer:

The printing requirements have been revised as follows: DB Teams shall submit 1 hard copy and 8 disks to RIDOA no later than the date and time specified in the RFP. This will be clarified by addendum.

Date Asked: 04/08/2020**Date Answered:** 04/09/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Multiple questions have been asked regarding the submission of Form K DBE Utilization and the associated Form L documentation. RIDOT's answers seem to give conflicting direction. In one response dated 3/18/2020 the Department stated "Form K shall be filled out with Design DBE % and submitted with the Technical Proposal. Form K shall be resubmitted with the Price Proposal with both Design and Construction DBE % completed." In another response dated 4/7/2020 the Department stated "submit Forms K and L for Construction qualifying work at least 14 days prior to the start of construction." The latter response is consistent with RFP direction. Please confirm the 4/7/2020 response is correct and takes precedence over the prior 3/18/2020 response.

Answer:

The response dated 4/7/2020 supersedes the response given on 3/18/2020.

Date Asked: 04/08/2020**Date Answered:** 04/09/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Form H Guaranty Form is requested to be submitted with the Technical Proposal as per ITP Section 6.9 Table 2. Is it RIDOT's intent that this form be completed individually by each member of a joint venture for the performance of the JV entity? Please provide further clarification on RIDOT's intent for the Guarantor.

Answer:

Form H will be removed by addendum and is no longer required for this project.

Date Asked: 04/08/2020**Date Answered:** 04/14/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Form E Certification of Dumping Facilities is requested to be submitted with the Technical Proposal as per ITP Section 6.9 Table 2. Since this Form requests cost information, we request that it instead be submitted with the Price Proposal Required Forms (noted in Table 3). Please confirm and update ITP instruction accordingly via addendum.

Answer:

Please submit Form E with the Tech Proposal.

Date Asked: 04/07/2020**Date Answered:** 04/09/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Please confirm if the existing 16" cast iron high service watermain crossing under I-95 NB/SB just south of West Exchange Street is to be relocated and if so please provide additional information including the proposed layout and all other necessary details sufficient for us to properly bid the work.

Answer:

Preliminary layout of a proposed water main relocation has not been developed as part of the BTC. The DB Team will need to coordinate with Providence Water to define the proposed water main location and associated details.

Date Asked: 04/07/2020**Date Answered:** 04/09/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Based upon previous responses to questions for underground utilities, only cabling is by the utility companies and the DB team is responsible for carrying all other costs associated with underground work. Please provide additional information including proposed duct bank configurations and sizes, hand hole locations, and all other relevant details for the Verizon and Century Link underground communications relocations necessary along Park Street and Smith Street for us to properly bid the work.

Answer:

As stated in the RFP, the DB Team is responsible for coordination with any affected utility companies. The determination of any required relocations, duct bank configurations and sizes, handholes, and other relevant details is the responsibility of the DB team through this coordination.

Date Asked: 04/07/2020

Date Answered: 04/09/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Please confirm that the existing National Grid transformer and adjacent utility pole with guy located along the western edge of Park Street at the intersection with Hayes Street are to be relocated by National Grid as part of their force account work. These relocations are not included in the plans issues under Addendum 10 but are necessary due to direct conflict with the BTC alignment.

Answer:

The National Grid transformer and adjacent utility pole were not coordinated with National Grid during the development of the BTC. RIDOT advanced the Smith Street Bridge Replacement project and coordinated with National Grid on that project. The referenced plans are from that previous coordination effort and shall not be considered inclusive of all required utility work for this project. The DB Team will need to coordinate with the affected utility companies to determine the appropriate relocations needed for their design proposals.

Date Asked: 04/07/2020

Date Answered: 04/22/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

The 2011 Geotechnical Interpretive Report included in the RFP recommends an existing pile corrosion reduction of 1/8-inch for all surfaces. This is based on a 1/16-inch section loss given the age of the existing piles, unless more corrosion is discovered when the piles are exposed, and an additional 1/16-inch for potential future corrosion. The BTC indicates that existing piles be re-used and supplemented. The existing pile load test report (PDA 578 N abut.-REVIEWED by GZA.pdf) provided in Amendment 8 indicate that 1/16"-inch section loss was observed on an existing ~30 year old pile tested at the north abutment as part of the Southbound Viaduct project. Only the portion of the pile within the fill layer was evaluated for corrosion loss. The existing circa 1963 H-piles supporting the Northbound Viaduct likely have experienced greater than 1/16" section loss in the fill since they have been in the ground almost twice as long as the Southbound Viaduct pile that was tested. The organic soils present below the fill and along much of the Northbound Viaduct alignment are expected to be significantly more corrosive than the fill soils. Taking into account the existing corrosion rates measured from the tested Southbound pile and including future corrosion for a 75-year design life, there may be no viable section remaining for pile reuse. Does RIDOT want to reconsider the recommended assumed section loss for the 1963 H-piles? Where the existing piles are proposed to be reused, should they be extracted to evaluate the corrosion loss within the fill and organic soil layers? If yes, how many piles per existing substructure should be extracted and evaluated for section loss? How will the design-build team be compensated if a larger section loss is observed when the piles are exposed, and the existing piles are not viable for re-use?

Answer:

The assumed section loss of 1/8 inch should be used for design, however the actual corrosion of the existing piles shall be measured once they have been exposed during construction, and this corrosion rate should be used to estimate future corrosion for the remainder of the pile design life. Depending upon the actual observed corrosion rate, supplemental piles may need to be driven to provide the necessary design capacity. Based upon review of available literature, it is anticipated that the highest corrosion rate will be in disturbed soil (fill) above the groundwater level. Piles driven in undisturbed soils below the groundwater level with little exposure to oxygen are anticipated to have lower corrosion rates at about 0.00047 inches per year. While it would be desirable to extract pile(s) to observe the corrosion rate at various depths, it is anticipated that this may not be possible due to the length of the piles and the time that they have been in the ground. The design-build team may opt to attempt this, however. If corrosion is greater than anticipated, additional required piles will be eligible for additional compensation subject to change order request procedures.

Date Asked: 04/06/2020**Date Answered:** 04/23/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

At this time, bidders cannot reasonably quantify the nature and/or extent of potentially adverse impacts to the Project due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. With that as a backdrop: (i) Can bidders be permitted to qualify their bids to exclude adverse schedule and cost impacts due to the COVID-19 pandemic? (ii) Can RIDOT confirm that it will grant additional time and cover the Contractor's actual increased costs incurred due to adverse impacts caused by the COVID-19 pandemic? If not, what relief will RIDOT afford to the Contractor in the event of adverse schedule and/or cost impacts due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

Answer:

Any known impacts at the time of submission date shall be incorporated accordingly into the submissions. Impacts occurring after the time of submission may be submitted in accordance the RIDOT's change management procedure and will be reviewed accordingly.

Date Asked: 04/03/2020**Date Answered:** 04/07/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Form G - should the list of diesel construction equipment include all the contractors diesel construction equipment (greater than 50 brake horsepower) including newer machines that meet tier 4 standards or only those pieces that have been retrofit to meet EPA PM tier emissions standards?

Answer:

Submit Form G for equipment that has been retrofitted to meet EPA PM tier emissions standards.

Date Asked: 04/02/2020**Date Answered:** 04/07/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

Part 1 Section 6.12 states: "The Proposer is required to complete the Schedule of Participation by Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) Utilization FORM K for the Design Subconsultant qualifying work and provide complete DBE Letter(s) of Intent to Perform from each proposed DBE Design subconsultant along with a copy of the proposed Design subconsultant's current RI state certification letter(s) to be INCLUDED IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. DBE certifications must be approved at the time of the TECHNICAL proposal submission to ensure DBE compliance and availability. The DBE FORM K for "construction qualifying work" shall be submitted by the DB Entity 14-days prior to any construction activity. This also includes complete DBE Letter(s) of Intent to Perform for each proposed DBE subcontractor along with a copy of the proposed subcontractor's current RI state approved at such time." Please confirm that the Proposer is to submit the Design DBE Forms K and L with the Technical Proposal, and that the DB Entity is to submit the Construction Forms K and L 14 days prior to any construction activity.

Answer:

Confirmed - Submit DBE Forms K and L for Design qualifying work with the Technical Proposal. The DB Entity will be required to submit Forms K and L for Construction qualifying work at least 14 days prior to the start of construction activity.

Date Asked: 04/01/2020**Date Answered:** 04/07/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Part 1 Section 6.12 states that Forms K&L need to be submitted for the design subconsultants with the Technical Proposal, and that these forms for "construction qualifying work" don't get submitted until 14 days prior to any construction activity. Please verify if forms K and L need to be submitted with the Price Proposal.

Answer:

Submit DBE Forms K and L for Design qualifying work with the Technical Proposal. The DB Entity will be required to submit Forms K and L for Construction qualifying work at least 14 days prior to the start of construction activity.

Date Asked: 03/30/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to BTC Volume 7, Sheet No. 15. CB-3 Pier South Abutment, approach walls and grout column locations appear to be in direct conflict with the existing 48" drain line, 36" drain Line, 24" drain Line, 12" drain line and drain manhole. Is the intent of the BTC to relocate the existing drain lines and manhole or to modify the abutment, walls and grout columns to accommodate the existing drain line?

Answer:

Drainage solutions are not fully developed at the BTC's preliminary stage. The DB Team will be required to mitigate this issue as with any similar issue that has not been developed at this preliminary stage. The DB Team may relocate the existing drain lines, modify the substructure, or do a combination of both to resolve this conflict.

Date Asked: 03/30/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Since addendum 11 pushed the NTP date out 1 month, will the Substantial Completion date also be pushed out a month?

Answer:

Substantial Completion will be extended to December 15, 2025 by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/27/2020

Date Answered: 04/14/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Figure 5 of the Detailed Exploration Location Plan by GZA indicates there are ground improvement elements under both Walls I and K from approximately Station 631+60 to 632+30. This drawing indicates no other ground improvements under these walls. Sheets 21 through 23 of the Volume 9 BTC drawings, which detail Wall K, indicate no ground improvements under the Wall K footings. Sheets 15 through 19 of the Volume 8 BTC drawings, which detail wall I, indicate ground improvements under the whole length of Wall I. These drawings appear to conflict with each other. Is it the intent of the BTC drawings to install ground improvements under Wall K, from the beginning of Wall K at Station 627+45 through Station 632+30? If ground improvements are necessary under both walls to Station 627+45 they would need to be done during the 45 day closure. Was this information considered when determining the duration of this closure?

Answer:

Figure 5 was developed prior to the BTC. Limits shown on the BTC Wall K plans govern. DB Team may refine the limits of ground improvements during final design provided that alternative limits meet settlement, global stability, and bearing capacity requirements. The duration for this milestone has been adjusted by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/27/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Please refer to BTC Volume 7, Sheet No. 11. CB-3 Pier 5 appears to be in direct conflict with the existing 48" drain trunk line, associated branch lines and drain manholes. Is the intent of the BTC to relocate the existing drain lines or to modify the piers to accommodate the existing drain line?

Answer:

Drainage solutions are not fully developed at the BTC's preliminary stage. The DB Team will be required to mitigate this issue as with any similar issue that has not been developed at this preliminary stage. The DB Team may relocate the existing drain lines, modify the piers, or do a combination of both to resolve this conflict.

Date Asked: 03/27/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Form B, Industrial Safety Record requests safety data for 2018 through 2014, will RIDOT be providing an updated Form that includes 2019?

Answer:

Form B will be revised by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/24/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Please provide the Hydraulic Study Report to support the BTC design.

Answer:

No Hydraulic Study has been prepared for the BTC.

Date Asked: 03/23/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

The very fluid Covid-19 situation is causing delays in receiving responses from utility companies, subcontractors and vendors as many of these people are working remotely. Our contractor and design personnel are also being negatively affected, as we attempt to conduct as much business remotely as possible. As of today, there at least 25 unanswered questions on the RIDOT Q&A. We request a further postponement of both the technical proposal by at least 1 week and the price proposal by 3 weeks.

Answer:

Due dates for Technical and Price proposals are being moved to 5/1 and 5/15, respectively.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Please confirm that the fiber optic communication conduit indicated on sheet 75 of 93, volume #2, which indicates the cable to be relocated (TO BE RELOCATED BY OTHERS), will be relocated by the utility company and that the utility company reimbursement will be by RIDOT through a separate agreement.

Answer:

Yes, Century Link is responsible for relocating the fiber optic cable itself through a separate agreement with RIDOT.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Please confirm that the fiber optic communication conduit indicated on sheet 12 of 93, volume #2, which indicates the cable to be relocated (BY OTHERS) will be relocated by the utility company and that the utility company reimbursement will be by RIDOT through a separate agreement.

Answer:

Yes, Century Link is responsible for relocating the fiber optic cable itself through a separate agreement with RIDOT. DB Teams are required to provide temporary support for Century Link to use as temporary cable support.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

3) Please confirm that the demolition (concrete removal) required per the Preservation Drawings, Volume 3, addendum #5, Sheet A06 of 64 indicated to remove in the existing concrete sidewalk, at the center expansion joint to expose the existing conduit will be completed by the appropriate utility responsible for the lines and paid by the RIDOT thru a separate agreement.

Answer:

DB Team shall coordinate with the utility companies. The referenced work is to be completed by the DB Team with the approval of the utility companies.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Please confirm that the Transformer Room and Switch room which exist in both the existing north abutment and existing south abutment are no longer in service and all equipment has been removed.

Answer:

RIDOT has no equipment in these two rooms. Coordination is ongoing with National Grid to determine the presence of any of their equipment. National Grid will remove any remaining equipment as part of their Force Account with RIDOT.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Per the RIDOT Design Manual, the Visual Analysis and Design Study Report are typically prepared with the 10% design submission. Can you please provide these documents that were prepared for the BTC? Can you also provide the collision diagrams that were used to develop the BTC and the Design Study Report?

Answer:

This information is not available and the DB Team is not required to prepare these documents.

Date Asked: 03/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction

Question:

A response to a question on 3/18/20 stated that a cover sheet indicating which sheets are unchanged from the BTC plans should be provided within the proposal submission. Please confirm that this cover sheet is not required if the plans submitted as part of the Proposer's Technical Proposal satisfy the RIDOT 10% design submission requirements as stated in Part 2 Section 3.4.4.2 of the RFP. The BTC plans provided as part of the RFP exceed a 10% design level as described in Part 2 Section 1.2.3 of the RFP. Therefore, it will not be required for the DB Team to assume responsibility for details included in the BTC exceeding the 10% design level.

Answer:

This cover sheet is not required if a Proposer's Technical Proposal satisfies RIDOT 10% design submission requirements. While the BTC plans in some places exceed a 10% level of design, DB Teams are responsible for certifying any portions of the BTC incorporated into their final design. The DB Team is fully responsible for the design and will stamp and seal all drawings in the final design as the Engineer of Record. If the DB Team chooses to use any portion of the BTC, they do so accepting full responsibility (and liability).

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

If hard copy submissions are still required can RIDOT please clarify the quantity? RFP Part 1, Section 4.1 asks for "9 printed copies" of the Technical Proposal and "an original and 2 separately sealed hardcopies" of the Price Proposal. Is an original Technical Proposal required? If so, please confirm the Department expects 9 sets of the Technical Proposal (an original + 8 copies) and 3 sets of the Price Proposal (an original + 2 copies).

Answer:

9 total copies of the Technical Proposal and 3 total copies of Price Proposal are required.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Part 2, Section 8.2.4 states that the milestone completion date for the Park Street retaining wall is June 18, 2021. Section 8.1.3.1 defines a 9-month duration for the National Grid relocations. Given that the retaining wall construction can't begin until the utilities are relocated and an NTP of June 29, 2020 this does not leave much room for the wall construction. Would the department reconsider extending the Milestone date?

Answer:

This date has been revised to November 15, 2021. Clarification will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/31/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

In response to the question asked on 3/11 regarding NBC sewer lining. Could 'project limits' be more clearly defined? Does this including all local roads passing through the corridor even if there is no planned work on these roads? Could a lining specification also be provided?

Answer:

This requested information was provided in Addendum 11.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

In response to the answer you provide on 3/18/20 to our question regarding lighting on Providence Place Drive and Promenade Street. Would the Department consider adding an allowance bid item for this lighting work as there is no defined scope?

Answer:

No

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Section 3.11.1 of the RFP references RIDOT's INFRA Grant Application and building the project as a smart corridor. The INFRA Grant Application, however, does not detail the specific types of ITS/CAV applications to be required in this project. The INFRA Grant Application states that the project "could be a staging ground for a pilot that would use V2I communication to let motorists know that there is an active construction zone, using smart traffic apps for freight mitigations". Is this a requirement for this project? If so, please provide the Concept of Operations and software requirements for the smart corridor for the final conditions as well as during construction. Do we need to provide fiber optic cable connectivity between the RSU's and RIDOT TMC so the TMC operator(s) can download MAP revisions to the RSU to support the smart traffic apps that will let motorists know there is an active construction zone and to assist with mitigating freight congestion?

Answer:

Incorporation of this type of communication/smart corridor, or similar technology, will be looked upon favorably during technical review. Any fiber connectivity required based on the system proposed by the DB Team is the responsibility of the DB Team.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

On Plan 4 of the NGrid Electric drawings issued in Addendum 10 show a section of duct bank to be installed on Smith Street at Common Street – 2 Blocks west of the Smith Street Bridge and appears unrelated to the work. Please confirm whether this is included in the scope of this proposal.

Answer:

The BTC proposed traffic control on Smith Street impacts the utility poles between Holden Street and the bridge. National Grid stated the impacts to these poles required improvements further west than the BTC project limits as shown in the provided plans. DB Team shall assume similar impacts to the BTC unless otherwise directed by National Grid during final design.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Since the technical and price proposal submission dates have been extended by one week, please consider pushing out the last day for questions by one week also.

Answer:

The bid portal will remain open for questions until 9 days prior to the Technical Proposal due date.

Date Asked: 03/19/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

RIDOT's INFRA Grant Application states that "RIDOT could require the use of autonomous attenuator trucks within the projects work zone to improve on worker safety." Is this a requirement for this project?

Answer:

This is not a requirement, however the proposed use of autonomous attenuator trucks, or similar technology, would be looked upon favorably during technical review.

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Smith and Park BTC plans clearly show NGrid and Verizon work by others. NGrid and Verizon have told us that the installation of duct banks, structures, adjusting heads and demolition of duct banks and structures will not be part of their force account work for RIDOT, only the cabling work. NGrid requires an NGrid approved contractor to install their facilities. Please clarify if the DB Contractor is to carry the cost of these relocations in their bid or if they are paid for by RIDOT utility force account.

Answer:

For underground utilities, only cabling is by the utility companies. All other work is by the DB Contractor or a utility-approved subcontractor, if required by the utility company. DB Teams are required to carry this cost in their bids.

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please confirm that the \$350,000 allowance under bid item 1.13.6-Amtrak Construction Allocated Work includes all contractor furnished and installed grounding materials on bridge girders and barriers and Amtrak connection of contractor installed grounds to the static wire.

Answer:

DB Team is responsible for the installation of the ground wires for Amtrak to tie into. Amtrak will make the wire connection, adjustments, and tie in the ground wires.

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/19/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Since both the technical proposal date and price proposal date have been delayed 1 week, will the deadline for questions also be delayed 1 week?

Answer:

Yes

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

With the evolving situation around the Covid-19 outbreak, would RIDOT consider accepting an electronic submittal on April 9, 21020, rather than the required hard copy documents? This would reduce the need for people to travel and/or congregate to print, assemble, and deliver the submittal package. Also, at this time, delivery services are not able to guarantee all shipments as work and travel restrictions may affect shipments to and from impacted areas, as well as shipments moving within those areas.

Answer:

Due dates for Technical and Price proposals are being moved to 5/1 and 5/15, respectively. At this time, all hard copies and electronic copies required per the RFP shall be submitted by these dates.

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Overhead signs that are currently located on bridge structures will need to be modified for the project. Will RIDOT allow their replacements to be located on the same bridge structures, or will new sign structures be required?

Answer:

All overhead signs shall be constructed on new foundations unless DB Team determines an existing sign foundation is adequate for current AASHTO design loading. RIDOT will not accept sign structures mounted to bridges.

Date Asked: 03/18/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Overhead signs are currently located on the yellow pedestrian bridge connecting the Providence Place Mall and the Omni, and these likely need to be modified for the project. Who owns the bridge, and if it is not RIDOT, does RIDOT have an existing agreement or easement with the current owner to allow for work on the sign structure?

Answer:

This bridge is not owned by RIDOT, but for bidding purposes, DB Entity shall assume an agreement will be in place allowing for sign modifications.

Date Asked: 03/17/2020**Date Answered:** 03/24/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Does a Joint Venture need Tax ID number to participate in the RFP? If not, should the W-9 form be provided for each equity participant of the JV or just the lead entity? In the SOQ Phase we were instructed to register the JV in RIVIP under the lead entity's Taxpayer ID. Please confirm this is still appropriate for the RFP Phase and how the W-9s should be handled accordingly.

Answer:

The JV should submit a W-9 under the Lead Entity's taxpayer ID.

Date Asked: 03/16/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

On form N issued in PH3 Addendum 1, it appears that Item 1.10 should be blank, since the total will be more than \$370,400 once the m.s.v. totals are entered. Please verify and correct if necessary.

Answer:

An updated form will be issued by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/14/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [Russell Pascetta \(mailto:\)](mailto:Russell.Pascetta@dekshield.com)**Company:** Dek-Shield**Question:**

will Heat Applied Preformed membrane be allowed on ALL bridges?

Answer:

All waterproofing membranes provided in the latest RIDOT Approved Materials List can be used for any of the bridges.

Date Asked: 03/13/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

A revised form N was reissued under 7598876PH3A1. Item 1.13.5 is still shown with one asterisk and the amount is not shown in the S.V. Total column. Please revise the form as questioned on 3/9 and answered by the Department on 3/12. Thank you.

Answer:

An updated form will be issued by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/13/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: joel_kosberg (mailto:)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Due to the overall concerns with the recent outbreak of COVID-19 and the necessity for group meetings that are required to complete a proposal of this complexity, as well as the required group presentation to RIDOT, the DW White/SPS JV respectfully requests an indefinite postponement to the bid deadlines until it is understood how all parties involved will be affected by the outbreak and what course of action will be needed to keep everyone safe.

Answer:

Both Technical and Price Proposal due dates will be delayed 1 week to April 9 and 23 respectively. RFP Part 1 revisions will be issued by addendum incorporating this change.

Date Asked: 03/13/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin](mailto:Steven_Morin) (mailto:)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Section 7.1 of part 2 directs us to Appendix B.14 for the Amtrak Master Agreement, which contains the requirements for RR Protective Insurance. It appears that appendix B.14 has not been issued. Please provide this appendix.

Answer:

This information is included in Appendix B.13.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020

Date Answered: 03/25/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin](mailto:Steven_Morin) (mailto:)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The Chalkstone RR Bridge shows 2ft wide cribbing (limited by intruding into the RR ROW) and limits allowable soil bearing pressure to 2000psf. Based on the 172kip jacking load, the area available is insufficient. Please confirm that the allowable bearing pressure is indeed 2000psf and if so, that alternate methods will be required to jack the bridge. Related to this, can beams be jacked individually to replace bearings?

Answer:

DB Team may evaluate soil bearing properties to determine if a higher bearing pressure is allowable. DB Team may also propose alternative jacking methods (i.e. jack via a new or temporary diaphragm, or jack directly to the girder via a bracket attached to the face of the abutment). DB team may evaluate jacking beams individually, but will be responsible for repairing any cracking that may occur as a result of not jacking all beams together.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin](mailto:Steven_Morin) (mailto:)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

In addition to the RIDEM Air Quality station, it appears that the existing traffic signal system at Park & Hayes Streets will be impacted by the BTC alignment, and a new signal system will need to be installed. What is the BTC's intent regarding the disposition of this traffic signal? No plans for a new signal were provided.

Answer:

New traffic signal equipment will be required at the Park Street/Hayes Street intersection. Please refer to Volume 8 of Appendix B12 RIDOT Miscellaneous - "Previous design not advanced" issued by addendum. Also please note that modifications to the existing signals at Smith Street/Park Street and Dave Gavitt Way/Atwells Avenue will require modification by the DB Team. These plans have been developed to a preliminary design stage and will need to be further designed by the DB Team to meet current RIDOT and City Standards for the proposed intersection configuration. Please note these plans were not updated to align with the BTC for this project. Other intersections shown in Volume 8 do not need to be modified as part of this project. The work required for Smith Street/Park Street is shown in the Smith Street BTC plans in Appendix B03. DB Team is also required to modify Park Street/Promenade Street intersection to remove the island and modify the pedestrian ramps and signal equipment to remove the associated pedestrian crossings.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

The RFP Volume 2 Section 3.13.7.3. issued by RIDOT for I-95 Viaduct Northbound references the DB Entity to modify the north slope paving shown in the BTC to accommodate a 25' wide level area (pocket park) at sidewalk grade, as measured from the back of the existing sidewalk, beneath the structures constructed as part of this contract to facilitate future improvements by the City of Providence as part of the Woonasquatucket Greenway project along Promenade Street. Addendum 9 has included the Woonasquatucket River Greenway 10% design/Concept plan to use the area under I-95 along Promenade Street to highlight the entrance onto the Woonasquatucket Greenway using public art, orientation signage, and distinctive materials. The Woonasquatucket 10% design indicates that the North slope paving area will not be impacted, and that the pocket park described in RFP Volume 2, Section 3.13.7.3. is not required. Please confirm that the 25' pocket park is not required.

Answer:

There is no change to the BTC requirements for this setback.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

The RFP Volume 2 Section 3.13.7.3. issued by RIDOT for I-95 Viaduct Northbound references the DB Entity to modify the substructure locations, as shown along Providence Place in the BTC, to be offset 10 feet beyond the existing back of south sidewalk on Providence Place to allow for future improvements by the City of Providence. Addendum 9 has included the Woonasquatucket River Greenway 10% design/Concept plan to utilize the same area under I-95 along Providence Place. The Greenway 10% design shows this area disturbance to be in the footprint of the existing road and not affecting the area outside of the existing roadway. Providing the additional 10 ft will require relocation of Exit 23, Pier 6. Please confirm if relocating Exit 23, Pier 6 is required.

Answer:

There is no change to the BTC requirements for this setback.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

The BTC has a large amount of drawings and there are many that may not be changed for the proposal. Is it acceptable to RIDOT if the DB Entity uses a cover sheet to identify the drawings that have been changed or updated and include the changed and updated drawings only in our hard copy of the submitted proposal? If this is not acceptable to RIDOT is RIDOT expecting to receive nine copies of the proposal including a printout of all the BTC drawings (changed, updated or not) for this project?

Answer:

Please provide a cover sheet indicating which sheets are unchanged in lieu of providing the full BTC.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Addendum 9 included the Woonasquatucket River Greenway 10% design which has undetermined stormwater cleaning and conveyance to be designed with improvements to I-95. What are the stormwater items that shall be included in the I-95 project? What assumptions should the DB entity include?

Answer:

The Woonasquatucket River Greenway 10% design provided by addendum was for reference only. The DB Team is not required for constructing any components of this project's design.

Date Asked: 03/12/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

There is an Air Sampling Metal Structure that is assumed to be owned and operated by RIDEM located in the grass area between Exit 23/I95 and Park Street just north of the intersection of Park and Hayes Street. This Structure needs to be relocated to install the Park Street Wall at the BTC proposed location. Is it the BTC's intent to relocate this structure? If so, where will this sampling structure be relocated to? What items does the DB entity need to include in its bid for this relocation? Are there any coordination efforts expected by the DB entity? If so, is there contact information for the DB entity to coordinate with and what is needed to relocate this structure?

Answer:

Per RFP Section 3.13.14, the existing air monitoring station, adjacent to Hayes Street shall be relocated by the DB Team to a location to be provided by RIDEM. RIDEM will be providing the location to relocate. RIDEM will remove and reinstall existing container contents and provide the new concrete platform. DB Team is required to coordinate with RIDEM, remove the existing container from its current location and reinstall at RIDEM's proposed new location (tentatively along I-95 NB in Cranston, adjacent to the existing overhead message sign gantry that is south of Laurens Street).

Date Asked: 03/11/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio@laneconstruction.com)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Please confirm that the \$4 million allowance under bid item 1.13.1 – Management & Disposal of Regulated Soils includes all known controlled material handling, transportation and disposal identified on the RIDEM RAWP and C-P SMP.

Answer:

Per mandatory specification 202.9901, the DB Team's base bid (outside this allowance) should include excavation, characterization, handling, storage, and transportation of all soils for disposal. The allowance includes the disposal fee and any additional sampling and analytical testing required to satisfy the disposal facility.

Date Asked: 03/11/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio@laneconstruction.com)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Please confirm that the \$350,000 allowance under bid item 1.13.6-Amtrak Construction Allocated Work includes all contractor furnished catenary material and foundation installation.

Answer:

Yes, this is inclusive of all contractor furnished catenary material, grounding, leads, wires, etc. and foundation installation.

Date Asked: 03/11/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

During a meeting NBC indicated to our team that that the existing brick sewers in the project area shall be lined, video inspected (pre and post) and monitored during construction. Will RIDOT be providing the D/B proposers the limits and criteria for this sewer work? Alternatively, if you cannot provide limits and criteria, we would request that RIDOT allow this work to be bid as an allowance.

Answer:

Sewer lines and manholes shall be lined within the project limits up to and including the next manhole outside the project limit. DB Team is required to video inspect both pre- and post-lining, one year after lining, and at the end of the project (4 inspections total).

Date Asked: 03/11/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Since the price will not be known until after the technical proposal, would the Department allow form K form to be submitted with the price proposal?

Answer:

Form K shall be filled out with Design DBE % and submitted with the Technical Proposal. Form K shall be resubmitted with the Price Proposal with both Design and Construction DBE % completed.

Date Asked: 03/09/2020

Date Answered: 03/12/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Form N item 1.13.5 is shown with one asterisk. This item's listed price of \$613,500 is therefore the required minimum bid price. Should this item have 2 asterisks to indicate that \$613,500 is the required price to be shown in the S.V column on the form?

Answer:

Yes, an updated form will be issued by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/09/2020

Date Answered: 03/12/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

We are in receipt of Addendum 9 which indicates that Price Proposal will now be submitted under RFP# 7598876PH3. The new Form N has deleted Bridge Preservation Items that were added to Form N by Addendum #8. Will Form N be revised again? If not, which bid item should be used for pricing the Bridge Preservation work?

Answer:

An updated form will be issued by addendum to RFP# 7598876PH3.

Date Asked: 03/09/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Referring to the previous question I posted regarding postponing submission date, the request should have specified that we request a two-week postponement to both the price AND technical proposal. Please consider postponing both dates by 2-weeks. Thank you.

Answer:

Both Technical and Price Proposal due dates will be delayed 1 week to April 9 and 23 respectively. RFP Part 1 revisions will be issued by addendum incorporating this change.

Date Asked: 03/09/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Due to the multitude of questions (some open and some responded to already) that drive the direction of the preliminary design and technical proposal development, multiple addenda, as well as the short window between ATC approval and proposal submission dates, we respectfully request a two-week delay to the price proposal submission date in order to fully design, analyze, describe in the technical proposal and accurately capture costs associated with these important clarifications and changes.

Answer:

Both Technical and Price Proposal due dates will be delayed 1 week to April 9 and 23 respectively. RFP Part 1 revisions will be issued by addendum incorporating this change.

Date Asked: 03/09/2020

Date Answered: 03/09/2020

Poster: joel_kosberg (mailto:)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

In regard to Proposals, RIDOT had previously stated that the font for captions and labels can be smaller than 11pt. Can tables also be allowed to have font smaller than 11pt and are tables allowed to go outside the 1" margins?

Answer:

Yes, this is acceptable.

Date Asked: 03/06/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: Anna.Greenfield (mailto:)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Will design exceptions need to be approved by FHWA prior to review of the IMR. Please confirm 60 day review period, per RFP Part 2 Section 3.4.4, for the DER and IMR? Can early construction activities begin while FHWA is reviewing the IMR?

Answer:

Coordination with FHWA is ongoing. Guidance will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/06/2020

Date Answered: 03/31/2020

Poster: Anna.Greenfield (mailto:)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Has the scope and scale of the IMR been discussed and agreed upon with FHWA and has it been determined if FHWA review and approval will be done at the division level or be required to go to the Washington DC office? Can the documentation requirements or approved report table of contents be provided?

Answer:

Coordination with FHWA is ongoing. Guidance will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/05/2020

Date Answered: 03/18/2020

Poster: Matt.Mirabilio (mailto:)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Per Section 3.11.2 of the RFP, Any ATC that varies from the BTC construction staging plans must be accompanied by a traffic analysis model. A previous question, asked on 2/21/20, responded to on 2/27/20 states that the DB team shall provide a VISSIM model for each of their phases and show that peak hour traffic conditions are comparable to existing conditions. BTC staging VISSIM models will not be provided by RIDOT during the proposal phase. This differs from Section 3.11.2 which requires modeling only of phasing that is changing the BTC conditions. Please clarify whether models are required to be provided by the DB team to analyze construction phase traffic conditions of stages that follow exactly or are not materially different from the BTC staging (same or better lane count, merge, and weave lengths for all movements). If modeling of BTC phasing condition is not required for proposal, please clarify which changes would trigger a requirement to provide this modelling. It is assumed that post award full staging analysis will be required even if BTC phasing is used.

Answer:

The DB team shall provide a VISSIM model for each of their phases that are materially different from the BTC (lane counts, merge and weave lengths for all movements) to show that peak hour traffic conditions are comparable to existing conditions. If the results are not comparable to existing conditions, the DB team shall provide mitigation to minimize impacts. The DB teams shall include mitigation along alternate routes to accommodate the projected increase in traffic along these alternate routes. DB teams will be scored on their ability to minimize and mitigate traffic impacts on the mainline and local roadways.

Date Asked: 03/04/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

The Job Specific Specification (202.9901) makes reference to the "Engineer" performing a number of duties. Please clarify if "Engineer" in this specification environmental professional hired by the D/B Entity or if it is a role filled by the State.

Answer:

This reference is to the RIDOT Resident Engineer or their authorized representative.

Date Asked: 03/04/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

The Remedial Action Workplan and Construction Phase Soil Management Plan dated August 2011 that was originally prepared for Providence Viaduct Bridge No. 578 Replacement and the Interim letter of compliance (June 20, 2018) was limited to the replacement for the I-95 SB and NB Viaduct. Please confirm that the DEM Office of Waste Management will not require an updated soil management plan that incorporates the additional bridge and retaining wall work that is included as part of the current project.

Answer:

On September 17, 2018, VHB requested permission from RIDEM's Office of Waste Management (OWM) to implement these improvements referred to at the time as the "Park Street Retaining Wall Replacement Project" in accordance with and consistent with a previous approval by the OWM for repairs to piers within the overall Viaduct project limits. Via email dated the same day as the request for approval (September 17, 2018), RIDEM indicated their agreement with submitting a Site Map indicating where the proposed additional work is scheduled to occur and to follow the existing Construction-Phase SMP. On September 30, 2019, a Site map illustrating the Project limits entitled "Replacement of Interstate 95 (I-95) Providence Viaduct Bridge No. 578 Northbound – Alternative B1-A Modified" was provided to and acknowledged by RIDEM via email. The map includes the Park Street and Smith Street Bridge areas. A copy of the Site map provided and email correspondence will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 03/04/2020**Date Answered:** 03/25/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Compensation for contaminated material is covered by RFP Part 2, Section 4.5.8 and also Job Specific Specification 202.9901. Does the job specific specification govern over RFP Part 2? Please confirm that the D/B proposers are to carry costs for the following in the lump sum bid: labor, materials, tools and equipment, excavation, loading, handling, hauling, stockpiling, polyethylene, dust/odor control, soil classification, segregation, soil characterization, health and safety plan, security, runoff protection, erosion control, decontamination, operation logs, submittals, installation and removal of construction entrances/stone stabilized pads, vehicle washing, street sweeping, and all other incidentals required to complete the work as described in the 202.9901, in the RAWP and SMP, and elsewhere as referenced in the Contract Documents, complete in place and accepted by the Engineer.

Answer:

The job specifications under 202.9901 do not govern over Section 4.5.8 or vice versa. Section 4.5.8 indicates the requirements that the DB Entity needs to complete to be entitled to compensation by RIDOT. Management, transportation, and disposal of contaminated material performed in accordance with the goals and objectives of the CMMP and any state, federal, or local environmental approvals (e.g. RIDEM RAWP and SMP), laws, or regulations and approved by RIDOT as conforming to Section 4.5.8 shall be completed in accordance with 202.9901. The required CMMP may reference the previously RIDEM-approved RAWP and SMP.

Date Asked: 03/04/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

There is an existing soil stockpile on site beneath the existing NB Viaduct. Are there characterization data for this stockpile? Are any D/B proposer costs associated with the removal of this stockpile to be compensated from the \$4 million bid allowance?

Answer:

As summarized in the Remedial Action Closure Report for the Southbound portion of the Viaduct Project dated May 2018, in December 2016, RIDOT anticipated changes in the scope for the Viaduct Northbound project which would require a significant amount of fill material. Because of this anticipated change, VHB, on behalf of RIDOT, requested RIDEM permission to have excess Type 1 soils (i.e., soils that exceed R DEC but not I/C DEC) remain on the North infield area until the material can be used for filling purposes on the northbound project which was anticipated to begin in 2018. RIDEM approved the request in an email dated February 22, 2017. The soil stockpiled under the Viaduct overpass was estimated to be approximately 1,000 cubic yards at the time. No characterization data specific to the stockpile exists to VHBs knowledge, but it had previously been categorized as Type 1 and as suitable for site re-use or disposal in accordance with the RAWP. Management and/or disposal of these soils is to be compensated under this contract in the same manner as any other Type 1 soils.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Please clarify the limits of areas where new lighting is required and where existing lighting can be reused.

Answer:

Lighting installed under the Providence Viaduct Southbound project can be reused. All other lighting within the project limits shall be replaced on new poles (of variable height as required by DB Team's lighting design) with LED luminaires. The project limits includes all lighting impacted within the proposed improvements and existing lighting connected to the lighting within the proposed improvements. The DB Team must maintain lighting and not allow an area adjacent to the proposed improvements to go dark because of the proposed improvements.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

The RFP sections 3.16.4.1 and 3.16.4.2 call for cobra head luminaires on 40' poles at the roadway and 30' poles on the ramps. Section 3.16.9 says that "No alternatives to the materials listed above will be accepted." However, the team has observed high mast poles in the area of the project. Are these to be demolished? Can they be reused with new luminaires? Should the masts and luminaires be replaced with new masts and LED luminaires?

Answer:

The DB Team is required to demolish the existing high mast lighting as part of this project. Existing masts and luminaires shall be replaced with new poles (of variable height as required by DB Team's lighting design) and LED luminaires.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction

Question:

The RFP section 3.16.2.2 calls for "dynamic colored lighting" along Providence Place Drive and Promenade Street. Is there a directive drawing or more descriptive text that defines the scope of this feature, and the limits of the area where it will be implemented?

Answer:

There is no defined concept for this item. DB Team will be required to provide a concept for under-bridge lighting along Providence Place and Promenade Street per the referenced section of the RFP and coordinate with the City of Providence and Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council on acceptance.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Will the same treatment requirements detailed in Question 2 (above) apply to the required retrofit of the existing STUs that treat runoff from outside the project limits as identified within Part 2 - Section 4.3.3 of the Request for Proposal? And will the area outside of the project limits that flows to the basins contribute to the treatment goal for the northbound project?

Answer:

The DB Team shall explore retrofits to meet the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual treatment requirements (maintaining what was designed to handle the SB project's stormwater, and adding the required STUs to meet the LSM requirements for the NB project). The DB team needs to explore areas outside the project limits to achieve the treatment goals of this project. The basins needs to be repaired and retrofitted to the MEP as part of the consent decree and in order to meet the stormwater goals required in the Southbound viaduct Water Quality Certification. If however, the STUs are redesigned such that, additional water could be directed to the STUs from the northbound project or off-site, then credits toward the northbound goal for the project would be allowed for the additional stormwater.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Will the project have to meet the treatment requirements of the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual fully, or to the maximum extent practicable? Since the confines of the project restrict the space required for conventional treatment outside the roadway surface, particularly areas outside of the Viaduct and Ramps Interchange, will RIDOT accept subsurface infiltration systems under the travel way as a practicable method of treating stormwater?

Answer:

The DB Team shall explore and document opportunities to meet the treatment requirements of the RIDOT Stormwater Linear Manual. If the DB Team cannot meet the treatment requirements then the DB Team will need to document treatment to the maximum extent practicable. RIDOT will not accept a subsurface infiltration system under Interstate Route 95 and/or interchange ramp roadway. RIDOT will accept subsurface infiltration systems under local roadways, such as Park Street or Smith Street. Areas contributing to the NBC sewer system are not subject to the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual treatment goals. All other drainage areas leading to the Woonasquatucket and Moshassuck Rivers are subject to the requirements of the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual. Both of the aforementioned watersheds are impaired and will require stormwater treatment to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), including offsite opportunities.

Date Asked: 03/03/2020

Date Answered: 03/09/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Will RIDOT please provide specific locations that need to be disconnected from the NBC sanitary system and replaced with a proposed new drainage system and outfall?

Answer:

RIDOT cannot directly answer this question. The DB Team needs to identify what areas within the project limits contribute stormwater runoff to an existing combined sewer system and follow NBC's permitting requirements for the quantity of stormwater that can/needs to be disconnected. Combined Sewer areas are not subject to the consent decree, however, they will likely be subject to the RIPDES regulations, which requires stormwater treatment. In some cases the combined sewer system where the connection is made may not be owned by NBC. However, that facility may be connected to the NBC system. The DB Team will need to present their findings to NBC as their rules and regulations state the following: "Article 4.4 of the NBC's Rules & Regulations states that no person shall make any connection or shed any stormwater flows to the public sewer system unless the NBC determines that this connection is the only reasonable means available and this connection must also receive the NBC's approval. This regulation states that the applicant must bear the cost of developing and submitting a SMP to the NBC."

Date Asked: 03/03/2020

Date Answered: 03/09/2020

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

In reference to question posted on 02/21/2020, we understand that the BTC construction-phase models will not be provided. In order to provide appropriate comparison to BTC construction-phase operations, it is requested that RIDOT please provide appropriate parameters that should be applied to the construction-phase VISSIM models, including specific model behaviors such as lane changing distances, driver behavior, speed distributions, gap acceptances, etc. The RIDOT traffic design manual does not show the average capacity for work zones that maintain the existing number of travel lanes, and therefore it is requested that RIDOT provide the assumed work zone capacity (pc/mi/ln) so that the construction phase model can be calibrated to correctly represent work zone conditions.

Answer:

The capacity along I-95 Northbound between Broadway off-ramp and the Route 146 interchange varies due to the complex transportation infrastructure with closely spaced on- and off-ramps and the heavy weaving movements. Under existing conditions, the capacity (serviced volumes) varies between 1,500 and 1,900 pc/mi/ln. For analysis purposes, it is reasonable to assume that the average capacity could be reduced from 1,750 to 1,600 pc/mi/ln (approximately a 10% reduction) under various construction phases to account for the reduced speeds through the construction zone due to reduced shoulders, traffic control devices, and construction activities. Regarding the Vissim model parameters, there are no Vissim model parameters developed for construction phases; however, the DB team shall adjust the lane changing distances and speed distributions to reflect the traffic control setups under various construction phases. The results of the MOEs (queue and travel time) shall be compared to the existing conditions. It should be noted that there are existing pockets of congestions/bottleneck areas along I-95 Northbound upstream of the Providence Viaduct (I-195 interchange, Thurbers Avenue, Route 37-Route 10). It is critical to ensure that the traffic impacts associated with each construction phase does not extend to and exacerbate the existing congestion/bottleneck areas.

Date Asked: 03/02/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Bridges 707 and 708 have temporary shoring details shown. Note 7 of the "temporary jacking and shoring of stringers" notes says, "The contractor shall simultaneously jack all specified stringers only the amount required to relieve the load". Is the intent to only jack the bearings indicated on the framing plan or must all the beams be jacked simultaneously?

Answer:

The intent is to only jack the stringers that are to receive a bearing replacement.

Date Asked: 03/02/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The Atwells Ave Bridge 575 preservation drawings have a call out for "Limit of concrete surface treatment protective coating". Is the intent to have all the substructures in the volume 13 preservation plan set to receive an Anti-graffiti coating from the top of the bridge seat down to ground, and a film-forming sealer on all pier cap and abutment seats, and backwalls?

Answer:

Yes, refer to "Concrete Notes" 10, 11, and 20 on "Job Specific General Notes 2" Sheet 4 of 64.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)

Company: Lane Construction

Question:

Referencing Appendix B, B03 BTC Architectural, plans show I-95 Southbound traffic barrier with cast anchor panel. From visual inspection we do not see the cast anchors on the relocated I-95 Southbound Bridge parapets. Are cast anchors required for I-95 Northbound and/or Exit Ramp 23 bridges? Are cast anchors required at any other specific locations on the project?

Answer:

Cast Anchor Panel details are not required for any bridge as part of this project.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020

Date Answered: 03/09/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

Volume 3, Sheet 1 – Notes to Design Build Team states the teams should carry additional steel repairs in addition to areas shown to account for girder ends that exceed the limiting section loss after sandblasting. Note that Bridges 706 & 708 already indicate to carry additional steel repairs beyond what is shown. Since there is no way for the DB teams to determine how many additional steel repairs may be required after blasting please provide an assumed quantity of added repairs at each bridge location so that each DB entity is carrying the same quantities within their lump sum price. Additional repairs beyond these quantities could then be considered for additional compensation subject to negotiation.

Answer:

There are 13 known repair locations identified in the Preservation Plans (8 detailed in the plans; 5 called out in notes). DB Teams are required to carry costs for 5 additional locations beyond these 13 identified to cover additional repairs that may be warranted after sandblasting if shear section losses exceed 10% and bearing section losses exceed 20%. Additional clarification will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020**Date Answered:** 03/04/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Bridges #707 Ashburton and #708 Charles, indicate to carry an additional four (4) in-kind bearing replacements in our bid. Please specify the bearing type to carry for these additional replacements.

Answer:

The cost of the more expensive bearing replacement should be carried as contingency. Additional bearing replacements beyond what is shown on the plans only need to occur if bearing replacement is justified in the field after award. The state shall make the sole decision on if additional bearings need to be replaced.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020**Date Answered:** 03/04/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

In accordance with BTC Volume #3, Preservation of Bridges, Sheet D01 of 47, Chalkstone Bridge, Note 6 states that all falsework and demolition shield shall be 18" from any live portion of the OCS wiring. It has been observed that the existing wire system is as close as nine inches (9") from the bottom flange of the existing structural steel, thereby making the 18" requirement for falsework and shielding impossible to obtain. Has the DOT requested a waiver of this 18" clear requirement in this area from Amtrak? This does not appear to be Amtrak standard details for this work.

Answer:

DB Team is required to coordinate with AMTRAK on the Chalkstone Bridge and design in conformance with their specifications.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020**Date Answered:** 03/04/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Bridge #704 Park Street, Sheets C02 and C03, indicate the back wall is to be replaced down to and around a portion of 2 gas mains and a water main. Please confirm if the openings shown are steel sleeves within the back wall and that the utilities do not need to be shut down during the reconstruction.

Answer:

The DB Team shall coordinate with each utility entity to confirm requirements for utility shutoff. Per the original plans, utilities are as follows: 12" dia. gas is in 16" dia. pipe sleeve 6" dia. gas is in 10" dia. pipe sleeve 12" dia. Water is in 16" dia D.I.P sleeve. 18" high openings were proposed for 12-5" dia. Electric ducts and 24 - 4" dia. Telephone ducts originally.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

Please confirm Heat-applied Prefabricated Membrane is acceptable as the waterproof membrane for all "Preservation" bridges listed.

Answer:

A Heat-applied Prefabricated Membrane is acceptable provided the membrane used is on the RIDOT Approved Materials List.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

Bridge #578, old I95 Southbound, Sheet B01, Note 2 states to install/repair existing deck joints to a condition that is "...suitable for temporary traffic. See deck joint detail sheets for joint type." Please confirm that the joint systems indicated on sheet B06 and B07 required to be utilized on bridge #578 also comply with Note 22, Sheet 4 of 64 under Structural Steel Notes regarding "... will be compatible with both the ends of the deck..."

Answer:

Sheet B06 is showing that the south abutment joint has already been modified for the installation of an asphaltic plug joint. Sheet B07 shows the existing bridge joints located elsewhere on the bridge that may require modifications/rehab to support live traffic. It's the contractor's responsibility to field verify the details of the joint shown on B06 and B07.

Date Asked: 02/28/2020

Date Answered: 03/04/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

Bridge #578, old I95 Southbound, Sheet B05, Note 2 at "EXPOSED CONCRETE DECK REPAIR DETAILS" states to "... install protective timber shielding". Please indicate if RIDOT is intending to require shielding the entire length and width of the viaduct or to shield only isolated areas at the full deck repair location.

Answer:

Shielding is required at repair locations over roadways, Amtrak, waterways, areas occupied by pedestrian traffic, and locations where there could be damage to property due to falling debris. Timber shielding exists above most roadways and ramps beneath Bridge 578. The contractor is required to inspect, evaluate, prepare report, and upgrade this shielding where protection is deemed insufficient.

Date Asked: 02/24/2020

Date Answered: 02/27/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

The FHWA-1273 & FTA Federal Provision Clauses are "provided for reference". Do they need to be acknowledged with the submittal of the Proposal in any way?

Answer:

These items referenced in the RFP are considered included as part of the contract requirements and do not need specific acknowledgement.

Date Asked: 02/24/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

Can 11" x 17" drawings be provided in a separately bound, 11"x17" appendix, or must they be 'Z folded' to fit in an 8½" x 11" binder?

Answer:

11x17 drawings can be included as a separately bound appendix.

Date Asked: 02/24/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

In reference to Appendix A, A01 Forms A-O. Please distinguish which forms need to be submitted with the Technical Proposal and the Price Proposal.

Answer:

The stipend agreement needs to be submitted with the price proposal. Clarification to Section 4.4 of RFP Part 1 will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/21/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

In a 02/14/2020 response to a question regarding Part 1, 3.10 of the RFP, it was stated that the existing conditions VISSIM model will be provided by addendum. Can the VISSIM models for each phase of the BTC also be provided?

Answer:

The DB team shall provide a VISSIM model for each of their phases and show that peak hour traffic conditions are comparable to existing conditions. VISSIM models for each of the BTC phases will not be provided.

Date Asked: 02/21/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Do the modifications made at the ramps along I-95 NB shown in the BTC require documented justification and FHWA approval per their Policy on Access to the Interstate? If so, has an Interchange Modification/Access Report been prepared and able to be provided?

Answer:

Modifications to the ramps included in the BTC or an ATC will require FHWA approval. The BTC was the preferred alternative in the EA. FHWA issued a FONSI. An Interchange Modification/Access Report has not been prepared. However, RIDOT/VHB prepared an operational analysis that concluded the proposed change in access of the BTC does not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the Interstate 95 or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The DB Team will need to provide an operational and safety analysis that concludes the proposed change in access of the project does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate 95 or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections.

Date Asked: 02/20/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Part 2 Section 1.5.4 Quality Control refers to Mandatory Special Provision "Quality Control Plans" included in Appendix B.01 of Part 2 of the RFP...it does not appear that this Mandatory Special Provision has been provided with the RFP. Please clarify if this provision will be provided in future addendum.

Answer:

The noted specification was intended to reference the "Quality Management Plan" specification which was included along with the "Document Control Specialist for D-B" specification as part of the originally advertised RFP disk. They are located in Appendix B > B01 Mandatory Specs. Additional Mandatory Specifications were added as part of Addendum No. 3.

Date Asked: 02/20/2020**Date Answered:** 03/09/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

References are made throughout the RFP Part 1 to a "Transmittal Letter" and to a "Proposal Letter." Please clarify if the Proposal Letter (Form A) is the Transmittal Letter or if an additional letter is to be provided. RFP Part 1, Section 6.3 is titled "Transmittal Letter" but requests the submission of "Proposal Letter (FORM A)." This section also requests specific information to be included in the Transmittal Letter that does not seem to be covered in the Proposal Letter Form A language. Please clarify.

Answer:

The Transmittal Letter and the Proposal Letter (Form A) are one and the same. It is not necessary to submit Form A and an additional "Transmittal Letter."

Date Asked: 02/20/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Will RIDOT release all of RFP Part 1 Appendix A.01 Forms in Microsoft Word? So far only Form N has been provided in word, the last version of Form A was released as PDF with redlines. Editable or clean versions will be required to complete the forms.

Answer:

A clean version of redline forms will be provided as a PDF by addendum. Purchasing is separately posting 7598876PH3 to reflect the revised due date of April 16 at 11:30am for the Price Proposal.

Date Asked: 02/20/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

What time is the price proposal due? Addendum 7 provided a revised deadline date for the Price Proposal, but does not indicate a time. Please confirm if the price proposal is also due at 11:30 AM EST (as noted in RFP Part 1 Section 4.2)

Answer:

Confirmed. Price proposal will be due at 11:30 AM.

Date Asked: 02/18/2020**Date Answered:** 02/20/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Section 3.6 has a 2 page limit on the Executive Summary for Initial ATC submissions, however Section 3.10 - Final Submission Requirements for ATC's does not state a page limit and includes 16 topics that must be included in the Final ATC submission. The 16 topics to be included is an increase from the 11 included in the initial ATC submission. With more information to be provided and no stated page limit, please confirm that we can submit more than 2 pages for each of our Final ATC's so that we can provide sufficient information to properly support the Final ATC submission

Answer:

Confirmed. Final ATC submissions may contain more than 2 pages per ATC.

Date Asked: 02/18/2020**Date Answered:** 02/27/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

2. Technical Provisions refer to "ITS Construction Plans". Please clarify if this is referring to only these 2 pdfs: A. Furnish and Install RVDS at CCVE 8A B. Potential ITS Conflicts_10172019-01

Answer:

ITS Construction plans refer to the referenced sheets as well as Plan Set "0018C_Volume 1 Highway" sheets 50-63 (ITS Plan Nos. 1-14) for Smith and Park Streets. The design plans are located under the following path "RFP Disk\RFP Appendix B\B03 BTC\BTC Smith and Park - March 2019".

Date Asked: 02/18/2020**Date Answered:** 03/18/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Part 2 Technical Provisions Section 3.17.1 thru 3.17.3 indicate the DB Entity is responsible for the installation and splicing of any new fiber, however, on the Park Street plans provided with the RFP states that fiber relocation work is by others. Please clarify which is governing?

Answer:

RIDOT facilities are within the Century Link system. Century Link is responsible for relocating the existing RIDOT-owned fiber including new fiber, installation, splicing, and relocating where RIDOT fiber is within the Century Link conduit. Relocation of ITS-related fiber and conduit is the responsibility of the DB Team.

Date Asked: 02/10/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Part 1, Page 24, Section 6.2 requires Arial 11-point font for all portions of the Proposal. Please confirm it is acceptable to use smaller font for captions and labels on graphics throughout the Proposal.

Answer:

Using smaller font on captions and labels on graphics in the proposal is acceptable.

Date Asked: 02/10/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

8.2.5.1. Incentive Payments for Bridge Preservation reads: The DB Entity will receive an incentive payment of Five Thousand dollars (\$5,000) per full day less than less than the allotted milestone completion date of November 15, 2021. This incentive is limited to a maximum of ten (10) calendar days for this milestone. Does this mean all 4 of these bridges must be done by November 15, 2021 before being considered for the incentive or do you get \$5,000 per day per each bridge that is finished early? Is the total possible incentive \$50,000 or \$200,000? If the incentive is in fact for all 4 being complete to get any incentive bonus, with Chalkstone RR bridge lumped in with the other bridges it forces the schedule somewhat out of the Contractor's control due to AMTRAK? Would the Dept. Consider removing this bridge from this milestone?

Answer:

This will be clarified in a future addendum, removing Chalkstone RR Bridge from this group. All bridges tied to this incentive must be complete by the milestone date to receive this incentive.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Part 1 Section 3.10 of the RFP, indicates that VISSIM models and synchro analyses are required to be submitted for modified temporary traffic phasing. If temporary traffic phasing maintains the same number of lanes per connection in a similar geometric configuration, VISSIM model and Synchro analysis results would be similar to the BTC. Please confirm that these models are not required if the temporary traffic staging can be justified as operating the same as the BTC temporary conditions.

Answer:

We agree, however if any proposed ATC phasing differs from the BTC phasing, a VISSIM model shall be provided comparing to existing traffic conditions. The existing conditions VISSIM model will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

Can the as-built CAD file or design CAD files for the previously constructed I-95 Southbound Viaduct be provided?

Answer:

This will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

To elaborate on details of proposed ATCs, can the page limit on ATC executive summary write ups be increased from the initial submission of two pages?

Answer:

Responses to initial ATC comments will not be counted toward the 2 page limit.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Matt Mirabilio \(mailto:\)](mailto:Matt.Mirabilio)**Company:** Lane Construction**Question:**

When contacting RIDEM for the Stormwater Management Report associated with STUs for the Southbound project, RIDEM requested the report be provided from RIDOT. Please provide the Stormwater Management Report.

Answer:

This will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Are any bridge preservation activities required for Bridge CB-1? This bridge was not included in the Bridge preservation package, but the inspection reports indicate that painting, bearing replacement, and minor concrete repairs may be needed.

Answer:

No preservation activities are required for this bridge.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please provide CAD files for the Bridge Preservation drawings.

Answer:

This will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/07/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

BTC Volume 3 shows anchor patterns placed on the outside faces of parapets on the I-95 interchange bridges. RFP Part 2 Section 3.14.5 paragraph C related to architectural finishes says, "Viaduct and Ramp barriers to match Relocated I-95 SB Bridge 578 barriers exterior form liner pattern and finishes". The reconstructed Southbound Viaduct does not have these anchor patterns. If the anchor patterns are provided per Volume 3, the parapets will not match the reconstructed Southbound Viaduct bridge. Are the anchor patterns required to be provided or not? If so, are they required on all bridge parapets, including Viaduct NB, Exit 23 bridge and ramps? Some of these parapets are back-to-back with adjacent bridge parapets and the pattern would not be visible to the public.

Answer:

The anchor patterns shown in the architectural plans that were not constructed on the SB bridge are not required for the NB bridge barriers. Formliner patterns shall match those constructed on the new SB bridge.

Date Asked: 02/06/2020

Date Answered: 03/09/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

In RFP Part 1, ITP Section 6.5 Technical Approach, the following four (4) items are listed: 1. Highway/Traffic 2. Bridge, Retaining Walls, and Other Structures 3. Environmental Controls and Approvals 4. Innovation A detailed list of the information that the Proposer is to provide RIDOT for each of these items is contained in this section. In RFP Part 1, ITP Section 8.6 Selection Criteria, Item 1., Technical Approach, the following five (5) items are listed: a. Highway/Traffic (1 above) b. Bridge, Retaining Walls, and other Structures (2 above) c. Schedule and Traffic Staging including impacts to Vehicular, Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic d. Environmental Controls and Approvals (3 above) e. Overall Innovation (4 above) Item c. from Section 8.6 (listed above) is weighted as 30% of the 70% score to be given for the Technical Approach category, but no detailed list of information to be covered for this topic is provided in Section 6.5. Please supply the missing detailed list of information we are to provide for this topic, as is given for the other four (4) items in Section 6.5.

Answer:

Clarification will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/06/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)

Company: Barletta Heavy Division

Question:

1. Part 2, PG 44, 3.13.7.3 second paragraph "...back of the existing sidewalk, there shall be a 25' wide level area at sidewalk grade beneath structures ..." This requirement may dramatically affect the new I-95 and Exit 23 North abutment design and the slope pavement indicated for that area, as compared to the grading and slope pavers indicated in the BTC. Will this contract be required to modify the slope paving of the existing southbound I-95, north abutment, which has been recently constructed under a prior contract to conform with the 25' level area behind the sidewalk on Promenade Street. Site observation in the area indicate this 25' set-back requirement for a level area behind the sidewalk was NOT incorporated into the prior project. Please clarify the transition between this contract and the prior Southbound construction in the area of Promenade Street.

Answer:

No modifications are required to the SB bridge slope paving to remain. For bidding purposes, DB Teams shall assume 2:1 slope transition from the SB slope paving limits, laterally transverse to the bridge. Final design coordination will be required with the City and WRWC.

Date Asked: 02/06/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

In the BTC plan set Volume 2 page 80 of Replacement of Smith St. bridge No. 701 and Park St. Retaining Walls Volume 2, note #4 states "All Permanent soil nails shall be located within the Rhode Island Department of transportation right of way" The BTC drawings show the soil nails extending past the RIDOT ROW. Is this note correct or is it meant to be within the City ROW? Will the DB Team be responsible to prepare the ROW plans and Plats for this work?

Answer:

A SFL and SHL run along west side of Park Street from Promenade Street to just south of the Credit Union. The SHL cross Park Street and runs along the east side of Park Street from the Credit Union to Smith Street. The SHL runs along the east side of Park street north of Smith Street. The City owns from Promenade to just south of the Credit Union. The State owns from just south of the Credit Union to Orms Street. DB Teams are responsible for preparing ROW plans for takings and easements where work is occurring in the City ROW.

Date Asked: 02/04/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Can RIDOT post or issue by addendum the original Microsoft Excel files for the draft TMP and attachments included in the BTC?

Answer:

This will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 02/03/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Please refer to the bridge preservation set provided in Addendum #5. The following locations indicate patch repair of bridge deck; however, location, area and depth are not provided. • Atwells Bridge No. 575 (Sheet No. A01) • Park St. Bridge No. 704 (Sheet No. C01) • Chalkstone Bridge No. 706 (Sheet Nos. D01) Please provide location, area and depth of these repairs.

Answer:

For deck repairs, assume one-half deck thickness for partial depth repairs. For Atwells Ave Bridge No. 575 assume 5% of the total deck area needs partial depth repairs and 2% of the total deck area needs full depth repairs. For Park street Bridge No. 704 assume 10% of the deck area needs partial depth repairs and 5% of the deck area needs full depth repairs. Deck repairs are not called for at Chalkstone RR Bridge. Preference may be given to teams proposing to include an additional percentage of repairs beyond the 20% contingency identified in the BTC Preservation Plans.

Date Asked: 02/03/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** joel_kosberg (mailto:)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to the bridge preservation set provided in Addendum #5. Sheet No. 6 Notes 1, 2 & 3 reference three types of structural concrete repair. The following locations require abutment/column repairs; however, no depth is provided to distinguish the type of repair required. • Atwells Bridge No. 575 (Sheet Nos. A02, A03, A04) • Park St. Bridge 704 (Sheet No. C01) • Chalkstone Bridge No. 706 (Sheet Nos. D03, D04) • Ashburton Bridge No. 707 (Sheet No. E03) • Charles Bridge No. 708 - (Sheet F03) Please provide depths for these repairs.

Answer:

For bidding purposes assume substructure repair depths of 4". Preference may be given to teams proposing to include a higher percentage of repairs over those identified in the BTC Preservation Plans.

Date Asked: 02/03/2020**Date Answered:** 02/06/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin](mailto:Steven_Morin) (mailto:)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Please provide CAD files missing from the BTC package. Pipe Network Local Roads 17.dwg is referenced to the Park and Smith Drainage Tables but cannot be found.

Answer:

This will be provided by a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/30/2020**Date Answered:** 02/06/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin](mailto:Steven_Morin) (mailto:)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Please provide CAD files for BTC Detour plans.

Answer:

This will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/28/2020

Date Answered: 02/14/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Our review of the roadway geometry that was provided in the BTC has found that a minimum stopping site distance of 200' has not been provided for ramps DB-2, CB-2, CB-3 and AC. This stopping site distance of less than 200' will introduce additional design exceptions for these ramps. Are the D/B Proposers to assume that these additional design exceptions will be approved by RIDOT and FHWA and can be carried thru the proposal design and final design?

Answer:

CB-3 Ramp was designed for 30 mph. The sight distance issue occurs on the 7% upgrade which has a needed stopping sight distance of 184' (adjusted for grade). This could be met with restriping a 2' right shoulder. CB-2 Ramp was designed for 30 mph and to follow the geometry of the existing CB ramp. The sight distance issue is located on the steep upgrade allowing for a sight distance of 184'. By moving the lane over to a 2' shoulder on the right a sight distance of 180' can be achieved. A design exception would be required for $180 < 184$. DB-2 Ramp was designed for 30 mph. The sight distance issue occurs at the top of the ramp before the merge with CB-3 at the 250' radius curve with barrier on the right. This occurs on the infill area and may be mitigated or at least improved upon by putting the barrier to the outside of the infill area and/or modifying striping. Ramp AC Ramp was designed for 30 mph. The only sight distance issue would be the guardrail protecting the abutment of Ramp CB-2. The BTC shows this guardrail running at the roadway edge. This issue could be mitigated by either flaring the guardrail closer to the abutment or continuing the barrier to tie into the abutment edge to protect with curb or just edge of pave at the edge of the roadway. Final approval of all required design exceptions will be the responsibility of the D/B team. Proposals that minimize or eliminate design exceptions will be looked upon favorably by the evaluation team. For bidding purposes, DB Teams shall assume that all design exceptions shown in the BTC will be accepted by RIDOT and FHWA. Approval of any additional design exceptions resulting from an alternative design (ATC) are at the DB Team's risk.

Date Asked: 01/27/2020

Date Answered: 02/06/2020

Poster: [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)

Company: DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

We note that one or more of the permanent guide signs will likely be located outside of the project limits as shown in the BTC. Is the furnishing and erection of these signs included as part of this contract, and if so, will RIDOT provide any guidance regarding permanent guide signage design, size, location, or whether they will be mounted on new or existing structures?

Answer:

Yes, furnishing and erection of these signs on all approaches is included as part of this contract. While layout of these signs and locations has not been developed, the DB Team will be required to meet MUTCD and RIDOT design standards, including replacing existing signs where required on new structures/foundations. If the DB Team proposes to reuse existing sign structures, analysis showing design meets current criteria will be required.

Date Asked: 01/27/2020

Date Answered: 01/29/2020

Poster: [Anna.Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Could RIDOT please provide the Finding of No Significant Impact issued by RIDOT/FHWA?

Answer:

This will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/27/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Page 23, Section 5.3, discusses the submission of escrow documentation. Is there a specific timeframe after submission of the proposal for Escrow documentation to be submitted?

Answer:

The documents must be placed in escrow prior to execution of the contract.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Page 39, Section 8.6, lists Technical Approach and Project Management Selection Criteria. In general these align with the Technical and Management Sections of the Proposal. However, Utilities and Railroad Management is included under Project Management Criteria while the Utilities and Amtrak Coordination proposal section is part of the Technical Approach. Are the proposal sections intended to align with specific evaluation criteria? And if so can RIDOT please clarify which proposal content will be reviewed in evaluation of each item?

Answer:

Utilities and Amtrak Coordination will be moved from the Technical Section of the proposal to the Project Management section to follow the order of Section 8.6.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Page 35, Section 6.14 requires "submission a copy of the State's original RFP and any supplemental addenda, as applicable." And on page 26 states "The Original RFP & All Addenda listed above shall be included in the Technical Proposal Appendix." The RFP includes extensive documentation, including information in multiple file formats (PDF, word, CAD, etc.). In lieu of submitting the full RFP and addenda with every copy of the proposal, will RIDOT accept a signed acknowledgement of having reviewed the RFP documentation and all Addenda? Alternatively, can the RFQ and addenda be submitted with the electronic copy only?

Answer:

Proposers shall submit written acknowledgement of receipt of the RFP and all addenda. Clarification will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

RFP Page 25, Section 6.2, states "any inserts or cover pages at the start of sections will count toward the total page limit." Please confirm this does not include standard divider tabs used solely for the purpose of indexing information. Typically tabs are not considered as part of the proposal content and would not be page numbered.

Answer:

Confirmed - Tabs will not count towards the page limit

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Page 20, Section 4.1, states "The Proposer shall submit nine (9) printed copies and two (2) digital copies of the Technical Proposal and the required submittals included in Appendix "A", including the bid bond." Is it intended that 9 printed copies of the bid bond are included? Or should just the original bid bond be included in the separately sealed envelope?

Answer:

Submit the original bid bond in a separately sealed envelope and a copy in each Tech Proposal.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Page 19, Section 3.10, requests "Copies of State letters granting final approval of an ATC for the Project shall be included in the Technical Proposal." Please confirm these should go in the Technical Proposal Appendix.

Answer:

These letters shall go in the Appendix and will not be counted towards the total page count of the Proposal.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Page 32, Section 6.9 says all forms "must also be completed, executed and submitted in accordance with the Schedule of Forms & Submissions included in Appendix A." We do not see a Schedule of Forms & Submissions in Appendix A, just the forms themselves. Please clarify if this is intended to refer to Table 2 or if the Schedule of forms is missing.

Answer:

This is intended to refer to Table 2

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

RFP Page 33, Table 2 Required Forms for Technical Proposal, please clarify which forms, if any, need to be submitted by the Designer

Answer:

These forms are for the DB Contractor to fill out, not the design consultant(s).

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Page 35, Section 6.13 Trainees says "The Proposer must also provide a written statement in the RFP submission using Form O provided in Appendix A..." Form O is the Stipend Agreement – please confirm this section intended to reference Form J – On-The-Job Training Acknowledgement & Statement of Compliance

Answer:

This should refer to Form J and will be clarified in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/24/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

RFP Page 25, Section 6.2, states the proposal must be formatted "on 8 ½ by 11-inch sheets of paper with top, bottom, right and left margins of at least one inch..." Can header/footer text (identifying Proposer name, Project name, Section number, page number) be located within that 1-inch margin?

Answer:

Yes

Date Asked: 01/23/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

NGRID has indicated that their liaison, Kelson McDaniel, is working with RIDOT as to how NGRID is to proceed with requests from the design-build teams. Please provide guidance as to how the D/B Teams shall coordinate with both NGRID Gas and NGRID Electric. They have indicated that they will not meet or coordinate with our team until they have "worked things out" with RIDOT.

Answer:

If a utility company is unavailable to meet, please forward any questions for these organizations via the Bid Portal or the confidential email address, as appropriate.

Date Asked: 01/16/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

RFP Part 2 Section 3.13.13 - Bridge Ratings. To complete a load rating report, an initial inspection must be completed. Will RIDOT be conducting the initial inspections, or will the design build team be required to conduct the initial inspections?

Answer:

RIDOT will perform initial inspections.

Date Asked: 01/16/2020**Date Answered:** 02/06/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Does RIDOT want to over design the northbound STU's to compensate, knowing that the southbound project did not meet the RI linear stormwater manual requirements?

Answer:

No. The DB Team shall develop stormwater treatment to address requirements of RIDEM and the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual as impacted by this project itself, not the SB project.

Date Asked: 01/13/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

RFP Part 2 Section 3.11.3 (Addendum 4). Since there are no RIDOT standard bridge barriers that comply with MASH, will RIDOT accept the MassDOT CF-PL3 barrier, with a rear face modified to satisfy the architectural requirements, as TL-4 and TL-5 MASH compliant for this project?

Answer:

MassDOT CF-PL3 barrier is acceptable. Modification of the rear face to satisfy the architectural requirements shall not reduce the cross section of the CF-PL3.

Date Asked: 01/13/2020**Date Answered:** 01/14/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

RFP Part 2 Section 3.13.13 - states that load rating reports are required to be submitted within 30 days for all newly constructed bridges or phases thereof that are open to traffic. FHWA Q&A regarding inspection of new/reconstructed/staged bridges per 23 CFR 650 Subpart C states that SI&A information (including bridge load rating) is not required to be put in the bridge database until (1) in the case of staged construction, the entire bridge is open to traffic, and (2) within 90 days of the bridge opening to traffic. Will RIDOT change the bridge load rating requirements to conform to the FHWA guidance?

Answer:

No, the current RIDOT policy requirements as outlined in the RFP will govern over the referenced FHWA guidelines.

Date Asked: 01/13/2020**Date Answered:** 01/14/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Will bridge ratings be required for bridges in the bridge preservation package?

Answer:

No.

Date Asked: 01/09/2020

Date Answered: 02/06/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Can any prepared GS, CS, JS sections the DOQ and any other available draft contract documents for Smith St Bridge project be supplied as draft BTC documents?

Answer:

The DB Team is required to prepare these documents for their design.

Date Asked: 01/09/2020

Date Answered: 02/06/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Where third party utility force accounts provided to RIDOT for the Smith St. Bridge project and if so, can these be supplied as draft documents for the D/B Team's benefit?

Answer:

These will be provided to the successful DB Team as they become available.

Date Asked: 01/09/2020

Date Answered: 02/06/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Is a minimum vertical clearance of 14'-3" acceptable for the following locations: Ramp CB-3 crossing under the Exit 23 Bridge, Ramp DB-2 crossing under the Ramp CB-2 bridge and Exit 23 Bridge?

Answer:

Minimum vertical clearance for these locations shall be no less than 15'-6" or the final proposed Smith Street Bridge vertical clearance, whichever is greater.

Date Asked: 01/09/2020

Date Answered: 01/13/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

When discussing the Stormwater Treatment Units (STU)s constructed in the southbound project, the RFP states "The DB Entity shall maintain and retrofit these STUs as necessary to meet RIDEM and RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual Standards." Please provide the Stormwater Management Report associated with these STUs.

Answer:

The DB Team shall obtain a copy of the stormwater report from RIDEM.

Date Asked: 01/09/2020**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Please provide cross-sections and all pertinent details for the Park Street retaining walls (Walls A & B in Addendum No. 3) north and south of Smith Street?

Answer:

The plans were included in Addendum 3. Refer to B04a03 Existing Plans, Bridge Contracts, 1962, sheets: co_6291_br_701+702_b73.tif co_6291_br_701+702_b74.tif

Date Asked: 01/09/2020**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Considering the complexity of the project and the number of ATC's to be reviewed, we anticipate multiple design discipline leads will be required to properly address RIDOT's questions. As such, we request that the limit on attendees at the initial ATC meeting be increased from 10 team members to 12 team members.

Answer:

Due to the size of the room where these meetings will be held, it is respectfully requested to maintain the limit of 10 team members per D/B team.

Date Asked: 01/08/2020**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali.Alkouraishi)**Company:** The Lane Construction Corporation**Question:**

Some stormwater treatment areas/BMP/STUs are shown in the BTC plans, is an ATC required if the types or locations of these treatments are modified?

Answer:

No. The DB Team shall develop stormwater treatment to address requirements of RIDEM and the RIDOT Linear Stormwater Manual.

Date Asked: 01/08/2020**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [joel kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Part 2, Technical Provisions of the November 21, 2019, I-95 Viaduct Northbound Providence RFP, page 9, Section 1.4.6 Hazardous Materials, of Section 1, Project Requirements and Provisions for Work, the following reference to RIDEM submittals and approvals, "a Remedial Action Closure Report (RACR) was submitted to RIDEM on June 14, 2018 and approved via an Interim Letter of Compliance (ILOC) from RIDEM to RIDOT on June 20, 2018." Will copies of the June 14, 2018 report and the June 20, 2018 ILOC be made available to the bidders for review?

Answer:

The 2018 RACR and ILOC mentioned in the RFP in this section refer to the Southbound Viaduct work already completed to provide background information relative to the work completed on Southbound, the RIDEM regulatory process and requirements. These items will be included in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/08/2020**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

1. BTC Volumes 4 - 11, Job Specific General Notes 2, Concrete Notes, Note 1 call for use of synthetic fibers in deck concrete in accordance with Section 604 of the specifications. The 2018 Amended edition of the RIDOT Standard Specifications list Section 604 as "Not Used". Additionally, the Supplemental Specifications issued with the bid documents delete section 604. Please clarify whether synthetic fibers are to be used in bridge deck concrete.

Answer:

Synthetic fibers shall not be used per the Standard Specifications.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

All new foundation elements will be designed using LRFD methods. The piles that support existing structures would have been designed, installed and load tested using ASD methods. For the reuse of existing piles, is their capacity to support future loads to be assessed using ASD or LRFD methods?

Answer:

The existing piles shall be evaluated using LRFD methods. It shall be assumed that the geotechnical design capacity of the existing piles was verified using a static load test with a Factor of Safety of 2. The nominal geotechnical resistance of the piles shall therefore be assumed to be no more than twice the design capacity. The designer shall consider an appropriate future corrosion section loss for the evaluation of the structural capacity.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 02/14/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Can RIDOT please provide all the geotechnical reports and geotechnical design memoranda completed for the recently completed I95 SB Viaduct project?

Answer:

Available information will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Can RIDOT please provide pile load testing data, static and/or dynamic, including pile installation records and location plans of piles tested from the I-95 SB viaduct replacement project?

Answer:

This information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Is the GIR that was included in Appendix B9 of the RFP (entitled Geotechnical Interpretive Report, Replacement of I-95 Viaduct Bridge No. 578, Providence, Rhode Island," prepared by GZA, dated October 2011 and revised August 2012) the report that was used to develop the final "for construction" set of plans and technical special provisions for the I-95 SB Viaduct replacement project? If not, can RIDOT please provide the project specific GIR for the I-95 SB Viaduct replacement project?

Answer:

Yes, that is the report that was used for the SB Viaduct final plans and special provisions.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 02/06/2020**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

The BTC shows the following: 1. Ramp CB1 widened side having a 2 Bar Rail on the bridge and wing walls that call out a TL-5 crash level conforming to RIDOT Std Dwg 10.35, but maintains the existing non tested two bar rail on the other side. 2. On the bridge of Ramp DB1 a 2 Bar Rail is shown which would indicate a TL-4 crash level according to RIDOT Standard Dwg 10.30 3. On Wall K & Wall B1 of Ramp DB1 a 3'-6" high concrete barrier with a 7'-6" moment slab is shown (seemingly indicating a TL-5 crash level) 4. On Ramp BR 4 a 3'-6" high concrete barrier is shown (seemingly indicating a TL-5 crash level) 5. On Ramps CB2, CB3, DB2 and their adjacent walls a 2 Bar Rail is shown which would indicate a TL-4 crash level according to RIDOT Standard Dwg 10.30 Would RIDOT clarify the crash level required for the railings/barriers along all the ramps? Would RIDOT clarify if use of either a concrete barrier or a two bar rail is acceptable along on all the ramps & on ramp structures? If a TL-4 level is acceptable along the ramp structures, would a 2'-11" concrete barrier height as shown on RIDOT Standard Drawing 10.10 be acceptable?

Answer:

MASH TL-5 concrete "F" shape barriers shall be used on the mainline, Exit 23, and all on-off ramps connecting to the mainline. Smith Street and Park Street parapets shall be as shown in BTC plans.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020**Date Answered:** 01/29/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

2. Section 8.2 of the RFP limits incentive amounts to ten (10) weekdays less than the allotted 45 day weekdays for the Atwells Avenue Bridge Preservation, Park Street Bridge Preservation and the Ramp DB Full Closure. Will RIDOT consider removing the 10 day incentive limit for these 3 bridge?

Answer:

RIDOT has removed the Ramp DB Full Closure incentive limit. This will be clarified in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 01/06/2020

Date Answered: 01/29/2020

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

1. Section 3.7.2 (Estimated Cost Items) of Part 2 of the RFP indicates that bidders should include a bid price of \$3,000,000 for Item 1.13.5, Incentive Credit. However, Section 8.2 (Incentive/Disincentive Requirements) appears to limit the maximum achievable incentive at \$219,000. Please indicate how the incentive credit amount was determined.

Answer:

RFP Part 2 Incentive/Disincentive sections will be updated in a future addendum. The Bid Price for Item 1.13.5 will be updated to match the maximum achievable incentive based on these Part 2 revisions.

Date Asked: 12/30/2019

Date Answered: 01/06/2020

Poster: [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali.Alkouraishi)

Company: The Lane Construction Corporation

Question:

Will the use of soldier pile and lagging for permanent retaining walls, that do not have exposed steel and lagging, require an ATC for use on the project?

Answer:

Yes, this warrants an ATC.

Date Asked: 12/30/2019

Date Answered: 01/06/2020

Poster: [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali.Alkouraishi)

Company: The Lane Construction Corporation

Question:

The Department has stated that the preservation plans are to be included in a future addendum, can the Department provide, in advance, a summary of the scope of the planned project preservation work?

Answer:

The scope includes joint repairs, deck repairs, bearing replacement, and steel repairs. Additional information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/20/2019

Date Answered: 12/23/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

What is the expected response time for confidential questions submitted to the confidential email? Is there a deadline for email submission to generate a response before the initial ATC meetings the week of January 13? Would it be possible to send a confirmation email receipt to assure senders that the emails have been received, or is there another way to check to be sure that the emails have been received and responses are being generated?

Answer:

Responses to confidential emails will be sent as expeditiously as possible. There is no specific deadline for questions related to the Initial ATC meetings. A confirmation email receipt will be provided to senders.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019

Date Answered: 12/23/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Section 5.5 of the RFP states the following: "The DB Entity shall notify the Department of all utility coordination meetings and shall not conduct a meeting without a Department representative present." Please confirm that this requirement does not apply during the proposal phase.

Answer:

Confirmed.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019

Date Answered: 12/23/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The Park Street retaining wall plans provided as the BTC identify temporary SOE but does not dictate the type of SOE. Part 2, Section 3.12.11 states the following: "The BTC requires that all temporary excavation support for Park Street wall shall be drilled and socketed soldier pile and lagging system.". Please confirm that the only acceptable SOE is a drilled and socketed soldier pile and lagging system.

Answer:

Pre-existing foundations are anticipated in this area. This SOE system was prescribed to limit risk. DB Teams are permitted to propose alternate SOE measures as an ATC. If obstructions are found during implementation of SOE, the DB Team shall implement an alternative SOE system at no additional cost to the State.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019

Date Answered: 12/23/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The BTC shows the following substructures as being re-used: Smith Street West Abutment, Ramp BR-4 North and South Abutments. Since they are being shown as re-used in the BTC, will the design builder be required to certify and/or be retrofitted to meet current AASHTO and RIDOT design criteria, including reinforcement strength and detailing? Or can they be assumed to be acceptable as shown in the BTC?

Answer:

There has been no investigation of substructure condition or load testing performed on the existing substructures to be reused. Reuse of substructures, including those identified to be reused in the BTC, requires certification by the Design-Builder that these components are suitable for reuse to meet current design criteria.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/02/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Are there CAD files available for the existing and proposed impervious areas across the site?

Answer:

This information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/06/2020**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Please provide the CAD drawings for Ramp DB-1 (Bridge No. 1383) that show the proposed footing and pier locations.

Answer:

This information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/06/2020**Poster:** [joel kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

S.V. Total for RFP Appendix A, Form N - Cost Proposal Form Item No. 1.10 Owner Specified General Condition Items (subtotal of m.s.v. 1.10.1 to 1.10.5) includes m.s.v Totals for sub-items 1.10.1 to 1.10.6. Please clarify if sub-item 1.10.6 is to be included in the S.V. Total for Item No. 1.10.

Answer:

This information will be clarified in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/06/2020**Poster:** [joel kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

RFP 7598876 Part 2, Article 3.7.2, Estimated Cost Items includes Item No. 1.13.3 Truck Mounted Attenuator m.s.v \$1,000,000 which does not exist on RFP Appendix A Form N - Cost Proposal Form. Additionally, the item numbering for the estimated cost items is different at these two locations. Please clarify if this item is required and revise the numbering to reflect the changes.

Answer:

This information will be clarified in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/06/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

RFP Appendix A Form N - Cost Proposal Form has a minimum m.s.v. of \$350,000.00 for Item No. 1.10.4 Document Control Specialist. RFP 7598876 Part 2 Article 3.7.1 Minimum Price Items has a minimum m.s.v. of \$375,000.00 for Item No. 1.10.4 Document Control Specialist. Please clarify the minimum m.s.v for item 1.10.4 Document Control Specialist.

Answer:

This information will be clarified in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/13/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer again to Volume 2, Sheet 8 where in Phase 5 Ramp CD-DB/I-95 is shifted east and will require redesign and construction of the Park St/Hayes St traffic signals as well as other electrical boxes. Who owns the control boxes and where can they be relocated?

Answer:

Four electrical boxes are located along I-95 across from Hayes Street in Providence. Moving from north to south based on an interpretation of record information: ♦ 1st box is an electric meter and traffic signal controller for the Park Street and Hayes Street intersection. ♦ 2nd box is an electrical meter for the traffic signal controller at the intersection of Smith Street and Park Street (State). Please note conduit run heads north along Park Street. ♦ 3rd box is an electrical meter for the street lights for Park Street, Avenue of the Arts, Francis Street, and Hayes Street (City) ♦ 4th box is electrical and conduit runs between the electric manhole at the Park Street and Hayes Street intersection, this box, and the electric manhole at the Smith Street and Park Street intersection (NGrid) The DB Team shall evaluate the following: ♦ Keeping the 1st box near the traffic signal at Park Street and Hayes Street intersection. ♦ Moving the 2nd box near the signal at Smith Street and Park Street intersection. ♦ Keeping the 3rd box near the Park Street and Hayes Street intersection to avoid major revisions to the existing conduit run ♦ Coordinating with NGrid to determine the function of this box. As the project was only preliminarily advanced, the utility relocation of these boxes has not been advanced.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 01/02/2020**Poster:** [joel_kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to Volume 2 Sheet 8. In Phase 5 Ramp CD-DB/I-95 is relocated through a modular steel structure. What is this structure, who owns it, and is the DB entity responsible for its relocation and associated costs?

Answer:

The BTC temporary bridge is built in Phase 2A. Conceptual plans are shown in Volume 11. The DB Entity is responsible for design, procurement, erection, monitoring, maintenance and removal of the temporary bridge. DB Entity is responsible for all lane shifts.

Date Asked: 12/19/2019**Date Answered:** 12/23/2019**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to Volume 4, Sheet 9 and Sheet 23 of the Atwells Ave Ramp BR-4 Bridge. The two sheets respectively depict the southeast corner of SOE 2 and the southeast corner of the east pier foundation to be installed outside of the State Freeway Line. Has the DOT obtained all necessary easements for this foundation and earth support and if not, who is responsible for securing the easement?

Answer:

The State has not begun acquiring easements and/or acquisitions associated with the Atwells Avenue Bridge. The DB Team will be required to identify the ROW necessary to perform the work required in the project. The DB Team will be required to prepare ROW Plans and Plats including descriptions to the satisfaction of the RIDOT. RIDOT will then begin ROW actions. The DB Team shall assume ROW will be secured 6 months after RIDOT approves the ROW Plans and Plats (including descriptions).

Date Asked: 12/18/2019**Date Answered:** 12/23/2019**Poster:** [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali Alkouraishi)**Company:** The Lane Construction Corporation**Question:**

To the mutual benefit of the Department and the Proposers, will RIDOT schedule an informational meeting with the Utility Agencies/Companies and Amtrak to review the project scope of the work?

Answer:

RIDOT has met with these stakeholders and they are aware of the scope of work for this project. DB Teams are permitted to consult directly with these stakeholders during procurement.

Date Asked: 12/18/2019**Date Answered:** 12/23/2019**Poster:** [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali Alkouraishi)**Company:** The Lane Construction Corporation**Question:**

RIDOT Standards allow for the use of lightweight concrete for structural components with the approval of the managing Bridge Engineer. Is an ATC required for the use of lightweight concrete?

Answer:

Lightweight concrete will not be approved for use on this project.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/19/2019**Poster:** [Anna.Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Minimum vertical clearance on plans (Vol.4, Sheet 9) shows 14'-3", however BTC Design Criteria spreadsheet shows minimum vertical clearance of 14'-5"* (*indicates previous RIDOT Approval). Please provide the requested minimum vertical clearance for the Atwells Ramp?

Answer:

The referenced vertical clearance of 14'-3" shown in the BTC is the minimum clearance that would be found acceptable to RIDOT for this location. A proposal that increases this clearance would be looked upon favorably during the review process.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Are the Record Plans for all existing bridges within the project area going to be made available to Proposers via future Addendum?

Answer:

Yes, this information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Per the BTC plans, Volume 2 is referenced to include traffic signals, overhead signs, and traffic control plans. However, the Volume 2 files in Appendix B only show the construction phasing. Please provide the plans for traffic signals, overhead signs, and traffic control plans.

Answer:

Traffic signals, overhead signs, and traffic control plans were not developed as part of the BTC. Additional clarification of final design requirements for these elements will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

The BTC VISSIM files provided appear to have been clipped or cropped from a more extensive model. The signal at the Dean Street on-ramp to 6/10 NB is missing and ramp volume inputs are missing in the AM model. Please provide the full VISSIM files that were used to develop the BTC, INFRA Grant Application, and permitting documents.

Answer:

Additional information to include the referenced signal will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

Please provide the traffic analysis used to prepare the INFRA Grant Application and environmental permitting documents.

Answer:

This information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/16/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [anna.greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:anna.greenfield@skanska.com)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Please provide the future (2040) traffic volumes used to develop the BTC.

Answer:

This information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Is the DB Entity responsible to satisfy the same minimum requirements outlined in RFP Part 2, Section 3.12.7 for piles that are shown as being reused as part of the BTC?

Answer:

Yes, the same minimum requirements outlined in RFP Part 2, Section 3.12.7 shall be satisfied for piles that are shown as being reused as part of the BTC.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Did RIDOT address the same minimum requirements for the BTC re-used piles that are required for piles to be reused as part of an ATC (as stated in RFP Part 2 Section 3.12.7) and if so can RIDOT provide this information?

Answer:

There has been no investigation of pile condition or load testing performed on the existing piles. This will need to be performed by the DB Team during construction when they have been exposed.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/18/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

RFP Part 2, Section 3.12.7 outlines minimum requirements for the DB Entity if pile foundation re-use is to be pursued as part of an ATC. The BTC plans show pile re-use at several substructure locations throughout the site. What testing/calculations has RIDOT completed to determine the physical condition and load carrying capacity of the piles in order to confirm that re-use of piles at these locations is technically feasible?

Answer:

The nominal capacity of piles to be reused was assumed to be the twice the original design capacity (assuming a Factor of Safety of 2 on design capacity). The physical condition of the piles will need to be observed by the DB Team during construction to verify if there is corrosion or damage that will affect the remaining design life, and a field testing program (static load test or dynamic pile testing) will need to be performed for each pile type and capacity to verify the in-place capacity by the DB Team.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/17/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Can RIDOT provide electronic gINT files for the boring logs included in the geotechnical reports in Appendix B9 of the RFP?

Answer:

These files will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/19/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to sheet 7 of BTC Volume 2 Smith & Park Street Bridges. The Longitudinal Section indicates a minimum vertical clearance of 15'-1" under I-95 NB. Has the agency been granted an exception to the 16'-0" minimum federal standard?

Answer:

The referenced vertical clearance shown in the BTC is the minimum clearance that would be found acceptable to RIDOT for this location. A proposal that increases this clearance would be looked upon favorably during the review process.

Date Asked: 12/11/2019**Date Answered:** 12/17/2019**Poster:** [joel.kosberg_\(mailto:\)](mailto:joel.kosberg@dwwhite.com)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Please refer to sheet 44 of BTC Volume 11 Ramp Exit 23 drawings. Stay-In-Place Form Note 1 states that SIP forms are required over AMTRAK but will not be allowed at other spans. Please confirm SIP forms will be allowed at all proposed bridge spans.

Answer:

SIP forms will be allowed at all proposed bridge spans as specified in RFP Part 2 Section 3.13.9.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019

Date Answered: 12/12/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

RFP Part 2, Section 3.13.15. Is an ATC required if the D/B proposer intends to use an abutment comprised of spread footing supported on top of an MSE wall system if it is shown on the BTC plans?

Answer:

This type of abutment is permitted without an ATC only where shown on the BTC plans. Any other similar use of this abutment type requires an ATC.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019

Date Answered: 12/12/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please provide plans of the existing Park Street retaining wall.

Answer:

These plans will be provided by addendum.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019

Date Answered: 12/12/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The Atwells Avenue Bridge BTC plans (Volume 4) shows work outside of the State right-of-way for construction of the pier foundation. Is an ATC required If the D/B Proposer does not exceed the limits of work shown in the BTC drawings?

Answer:

In this instance described, if the proposed footprint does not exceed the specific footprint shown in the BTC, then an ATC is not required. The DB Entity's Designer shall still be required to provide all documentation for this location as outlined in RFP Part 2, Section 3.8.8

Date Asked: 12/10/2019

Date Answered: 12/12/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

The RFP does not reference TAC-298 – Design Loads for simple and continuous span bridges at Strength and Service Limit State? Does this TAC apply to this project?

Answer:

As stated in the RFP, all TAC memos apply to this project.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019

Date Answered: 12/18/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please provide the traffic analyses and reports that were prepared during the development of the BTC.

Answer:

The Existing, No-Build and Build (BTC) morning and evening peak hour traffic volume figures and the hourly traffic volumes used to develop the TMP will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

Several of the BTC bridges re-use existing abutments. Will the Department accept the assumption that the existing abutments are adequate as long the loads imparted by the new superstructures don't exceed that imposed by the original superstructure, or will the Successful Proposer be required to certify or upgrade the existing abutments to meet current AASHTO and RIDOT design criteria?

Answer:

The successful team shall be required to certify or upgrade abutments to meet current criteria.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

RFP Part 2, Section 3.13.9 Design Criteria states the bridges shall be constructed with a minimum 75 year design life. However, the INFRA grant application provided in Addendum No. 2 states the replacement Northbound Viaduct will have a design life of 100 years. Please confirm that the 75 year design life is the governing design life for this project.

Answer:

Confirmed. The governing design life for the project is 75 years.

Date Asked: 12/10/2019**Date Answered:** 12/17/2019**Poster:** [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)**Company:** CARDI CORPORATION**Question:**

The BTC CAD drawings have Civil3D Data Shortcuts to various data objects which are not found on the RFP CD. Can you please provide surface files for all BTC drawings containing Civil3D data shortcuts?

Answer:

This will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/07/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali.Alkouraishi)**Company:** The Lane Construction Corporation

Question:

Staging depicted at the RIDOT Pre-Proposal Meeting is different from proposed staging provided in BTC Volume 2. Please clarify which staging plan governs as the BTC or if both staging plans are acceptable for use on the project?

Answer:

Clarification was provided as part of Addendum No. 2.

Date Asked: 12/07/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [Ali Alkouraishi \(mailto:\)](mailto:Ali Alkouraishi)**Company:** The Lane Construction Corporation**Question:**

Type your questions here.

Answer:

We assume this was posted in error.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Specification section 3.12 Geotechnical, sub section 3.12.7 Existing Foundations states, "If reuse of existing pile foundations is to be pursued as part of an ATC, the DB Entity must address the following, at a minimum, in the ATC submission as well as the statement of geotechnical intent:.." The contract drawings show reuse of existing foundation piles as part of the BTC. Assuming this is the intent of the BTC, is an ATC required for re-use of existing foundation piles?

Answer:

Yes. Any piles that are to be reused that aren't already identified in the BTC to be reused shall be submitted as an ATC.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

Specification section 8.2 Incentive/Disincentive Requirements ties the incentives and disincentives to specific dates. Would the Department consider tying the incentives and disincentives to NTP rather than to these dates?

Answer:

No. If NTP date as provided in the RFP is not achieved, RIDOT will evaluate the schedule impacts to other contract dates at that time.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/23/2019**Poster:** [joel_kosberg \(mailto:\)](mailto:joel_kosberg)**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc

Question:

Please refer to specification section 3.13 Bridge Design and Other Structures, sub section 3.13.15 Potential Alternatives, would switching the superstructure of the bridges from a plate girder carrying member to a prefabricated bridge require an ATC?

Answer:

Yes, this warrants an ATC.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** joel.kosberg**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

3. Please clarify what is deemed to be an ATC.

Answer:

Please submit any confidential questions that would have been requested as part of the pre-ATC meeting to the confidential email address listed in Part 1 Section 1.2 of the RFP. All questions not specific to an ATC being considered for inclusion by a DB Team shall continue to be posted in the Q&A Portal.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** joel.kosberg**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

2. Part 1 of the instructions to Bidders provides deadlines for the Design Build bid process. At the informal pre-construction meeting held to discuss the BTC it was stated that no formal submission was necessary for the December 18, 2019 Confidential Pre-ATC Meeting however, submission of ATCs is required 5 days before the January 13, 2020 Initial ATC Deadline. Please clarify the intent of the entire ATC process.

Answer:

Clarification was provided as part of Addendum No. 2.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/12/2019**Poster:** joel.kosberg**Company:** DW White Construction, Inc**Question:**

1. Specification section 3.13 Bridge Design and Other Structures, sub section 3.13.16 Disallowed Alternatives, Paragraph A stipulates that "Elimination of any of the spans of the proposed Viaduct NB Bridge by means of filling between the spans shown on the BTC drawings" will not be accepted. Please clarify the Department's reasoning for prohibiting this approach as an ATC.

Answer:

ATCs are permitted for filling spans. Spans filled need to avoid impacting/overloading existing structure foundations. Additionally, spans filled need to not interfere with sight distance criteria, need to allow for all structures in the area to be inspectable, and not compromise aesthetics. Any ATCs that fill spans need to clearly identify how the above mentioned items are addressed.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/23/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please provide details of the design submittal review process expected for the 6 bridges requiring preservation activities to be complete within 12 months of NTP. This was discussed in the pre-bid meeting, but the answer was not very clear. Is the work expected to be complete directly from the plans provided in the RFP or is there design to be complete and design submittals to be reviewed/approved prior to construction? If so, please detail these submission requirements, which will need to be tailored for the short duration. With an expected NTP at the end of June, design work potentially to complete and have approved, winter conditions, and construction, 12 months is a very short period to complete the work. Preservation work often includes work that is very difficult to complete in the winter without significant extra cost.

Answer:

Clarification will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019

Date Answered: 12/06/2019

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

3. RFP Part 1, Section 3.5 Submission of Potential ATC Concepts/Pre-ATC Meeting, Paragraph 5 states that each proposer will have a 3 hour meeting. Since all teams cannot meet on December 18, 2019 as stated in Section 2.3, Proposed Procurement Schedule, can RIDOT issue a schedule for the Pre-ATC Meetings so that the proposers can properly plan?

Answer:

See Addendum 2 for revisions to the ATC process. Confidential Initial ATC meetings will be held with each team during the week of January 13. As much notice as possible will be given to each team regarding the specific date and time for these meetings.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019

Date Answered: 12/06/2019

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

2. Please confirm that there are no deliverables required at the Pre-ATC Meeting as stated in the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting on December 4, 2019.

Answer:

The ATC process is being revised as part of Addendum 2.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019

Date Answered: 12/06/2019

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

1. RFP Part 1, Section 3.5 Submission of Potential ATC Concepts/Pre-ATC Meeting, Paragraph 2 states that a list of potential ATC's must be submitted five business days prior to the Pre-ATC meeting. Please confirm that this requirement is waived based the Q&A at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting on December 4, 2019.

Answer:

Confirmed. The ATC process is being revised as part of Addendum 2.

Date Asked: 12/06/2019**Date Answered:** 12/06/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

Has RIDOT secured all easements for the construction of the Park Street wall?

Answer:

RIDOT is currently advancing the acquisitions / temporary easements shown on the BTC with anticipation of having these properties available prior to NTP. Any additional ROW needed as part of a proposal shall be identified in advance as an ATC.

Date Asked: 12/05/2019**Date Answered:** 12/09/2019**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

There are two different sets of construction staging plans included in Appendix B. One is B03 BTC\BTC Viaduct - April 2018\BTC Volume 2 Construction Phasing.pdf, and the other is B03 BTC\BTC Conceptual Sequence of Construction\Viaduct NB Conceptual Phasing.pdf Please clarify which is the correct set that proposers should be using.

Answer:

Clarification was provided as part of Addendum No. 2

Date Asked: 12/05/2019**Date Answered:** 12/06/2019**Poster:** [Linda Sanson \(mailto:\)](mailto:Linda.Sanson)**Company:** Barletta Heavy Division**Question:**

At the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting, it was stated that potential conflicts of interest are to be submitted on a form. Please identify this form and where it can be located.

Answer:

Potential conflicts of interest should be submitted via letter with a revised due date of December 11. Additional clarification will be provided in Addendum 2.

Date Asked: 12/03/2019**Date Answered:** 12/17/2019**Poster:** [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield)**Company:** Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.**Question:**

The Department is requested to provide proposed locations, layout, details and other pertinent information related to its ongoing tolling and gantry installation Contract, for any of which may conflict with required work outlined by this RFP.

Answer:

All currently available information will be provided in a future addendum.

Date Asked: 12/03/2019

Date Answered: 12/19/2019

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

The proposed design speed for I-95 is 50 MPH, while the posted speed on I-95 is 55 MPH. Has a design exception been granted from FHWA?

Answer:

The required design speed is 50 MPH. As stated in RFP Part 2, Section 3.4.4.1, the DB Team is required to obtain all design exceptions required of the final design. Regarding the speed limit, RIDOT will perform a speed study at the conclusion of the project based on the final geometry of the project and determine appropriate speed posting.

Date Asked: 12/03/2019

Date Answered: 12/06/2019

Poster: [Anna Greenfield \(mailto:\)](mailto:Anna.Greenfield@skanska.com)

Company: Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.

Question:

With respect to the Department's outline and sequence for ATC development, will any ATC not previously submitted by the Design-Builder for evaluation at the "potential ATC" submission phase be allowed for further development and consideration at subsequent(i.e. "initial" and "final") phases? Are any and all ATC's required to be submitted and discussed at the "potential" phase?

Answer:

The ATC process is being revised as part of Addendum 2.

Date Asked: 11/27/2019

Date Answered: 11/27/2019

Poster: [Steven Morin \(mailto:\)](mailto:Steven.Morin@cardi.com)

Company: CARDI CORPORATION

Question:

Please provide Volume 13 (Bridge Preservation plans). This volume is referenced on the key plans but was not provided as part of the Appendix B materials provided on the CD.

Answer:

The bridge preservation plans are being updated based on the most recent bridge inspection data and will be provided by a future addendum.

RIDOT

Two Capitol Hill

Providence, RI 02903

[Directions to All Our Offices \(http://www.dot.ri.gov/about/index.php#directions\)](http://www.dot.ri.gov/about/index.php#directions)

CONTACT US

Phone: (401) 222-2450