

1-5-2012

Martins Point Bridge : Request for Proposals, Book 2 - Project Requirements, October 14, 2011, Amended November 3, 2011 and January 5, 2012

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs

Recommended Citation

Maine Department of Transportation, "Martins Point Bridge : Request for Proposals, Book 2 - Project Requirements, October 14, 2011, Amended November 3, 2011 and January 5, 2012" (2012). *Transportation Documents*. 1460.
https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs/1460

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Transportation at Digital Maine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Transportation Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Maine. For more information, please contact statedocs@maine.gov.



MaineDOT

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

BOOK 2 - PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

**FALMOUTH-PORTLAND
MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE #2515**

DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT

PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X

October 14, 2011

Amendment #1: November 3, 2011

Amendment #2: January 5, 2012



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 - DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT AGREEMENT 1-1

PART 2 - PROJECT REQUIREMENTS..... 2-1

1. GENERAL INFORMATION 2-1

1.1 ISSUANCE OF RFP..... 2-1

1.2 PROCUREMENT OVERVIEW 2-1

1.3 PROJECT GOALS 2-2

1.4 CONTRACT TIME 2-3

1.5 STIPEND..... 2-3

1.6 PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE 2-3

1.7 CONTRACT REPRESENTATIVE..... 2-5

1.8 INSURANCE..... 2-5

1.9 CIVIL RIGHTS CONTRACT COMPLIANCE REVIEW 2-5

1.10 QUALITY ASSURANCE 2-5

1.11 ON THE JOB TRAINING (OJT) 2-5

1.12 DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) 2-5

1.13 WAGE RATES 2-5

1.14 APPENDIX A TO DIVISION 100 DESIGN-BUILD GENERAL CONDITIONS 2-6

2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS 2-6

2.1 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS 2-6

2.2 PROPOSAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS 2-7

3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS..... 2-8

3.1 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSIVENESS REQUIREMENTS 2-8

3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 2-9

4. SCOPE OF DESIGN-BUILD WORK/PROJECT DESCRIPTION 2-19

4.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 2-19

4.2 PROJECT SCOPE 2-19

5. INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO THE PROPOSER..... 2-20

5.1 INFORMATION SUPPLIED..... 2-20

6. PROJECT DESIGN..... 2-22

6.1 DESIGN DOCUMENTS..... 2-22

6.2 DESIGN SUBMITTALS AND REVIEWS..... 2-22

6.3 RE-SUBMITTAL PROCESS 2-22

6.4 RELEASE FOR CONSTRUCTION 2-23

6.5 DESIGN CHANGES..... 2-23

6.6 ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION..... 2-23

6.7 HIGHWAY DESIGN 2-23

6.8 HIGHWAY DESIGN FEATURES..... 2-24

6.9 TRAFFIC ENGINEERING..... 2-25

6.10 GEOTECHNICAL DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION 2-26

6.11 BRIDGE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION 2-27

6.12 RETAINING WALLS 2-31

6.13 DRAINAGE..... 2-31

6.14 SURVEY 2-31

6.15 LANDSCAPING 2-32

7. ENVIRONMENTAL 2-32

7.1	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS	2-32
7.2	SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966 REQUIREMENTS.....	2-32
7.3	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	2-32
7.4	PERMITTING	2-32
7.5	ENDANGERED SPECIES REQUIREMENTS	2-33
7.6	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	2-33
7.7	DREDGE SPOILS REQUIREMENTS	2-34
7.8	EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS	2-34
7.9	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) REQUIREMENTS	2-34
8.	UTILITIES	2-34
8.1	GENERAL DESIGN-BUILDER RESPONSIBILITIES	2-34
8.2	LIST OF KNOWN UTILITY OWNERS AND CONTACTS	2-34
8.3	BURIED UTILITIES	2-35
8.4	AERIAL UTILITIES.....	2-38
8.5	VERIFICATION OF THE LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITIES	2-39
9.	RAILROAD COORDINATION.....	2-39
10.	RIGHT-OF-WAY.....	2-39
10.1	RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION SERVICES	2-39
11.	PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE WARRANTY.....	2-40
11.1	PAVEMENT WARRANTY	2-40
11.2	BRIDGE WARRANTY	2-40
12.	OTHER WORK	2-40
12.1	PUBLIC INFORMATION PLAN.....	2-40
12.2	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN.....	2-41
PART 3 - APPENDICES		3-1
	Appendix A - Federal Wage Rates	
	Appendix B - Contract Forms and Exhibits	
	Appendix C - Public Meeting and Stakeholder Meeting Minutes	
	Appendix D - Existing Plans and Inspection Documents	
	Appendix E - Geotechnical Data and Supplemental Boring Request Form	
	Appendix F - Traffic Data and Accident Data	
	Appendix G - U. S. Coast Guard Construction Requirements	
	Appendix H - Survey Data and Conceptual Alignments/Studies	
	Appendix I - Permits and Other Environmental Information	
	Appendix J - Supplemental Specifications and Special Provisions	
	Appendix K - Hydrology and Hydraulics	
	Appendix L - Utility Conduits	

Part 1 - Design-Build Contract Agreement

Design-Build Contract Agreement

CONTRACT AGREEMENT made on the date last signed below, by and between the State of Maine, acting through and by its Department of Transportation (Department), an agency of state government with its principal administrative offices located at 24 Child, Augusta, Maine, with a mailing address at 16 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333-0016, and

_____,
a corporation or other legal entity organized under the laws of the State of Maine, with its principal place of business located at _____
_____ (Design-Builder).

The Department and the Design-Builder, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth in the Contract Documents, hereby agree as follows:

A. The Work.

The Design-Builder shall be responsible for furnishing all supervision, labor, equipment, tools supplies, permanent materials and temporary materials required to perform the Work including design, construction, quality management including inspection, testing and documentation, all required documentation at the conclusion of the project, warranting its work, and performing all other work indicated in the Contract Documents.

The Department shall have the right to alter the nature and extent of the Work as provided in the Contract Documents; payment to be made as provided in the same.

1. Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project

The Design-Builder agrees to complete all Work as specified or indicated in the Contract including Extra Work and Force Account in conformity with the Contract, WIN No. _____

_____,
for the _____ in the
town/city of _____, County of _____,

Maine. The Work includes design, construction, maintenance during construction, warranty as provided in the Contract Documents, and other incidental work.

B. Time.

The Design-Builder agrees to complete all Work, except warranty work, on or before _____ (date). Further, the Department may deduct from moneys otherwise due the Design-Builder, not as a penalty, but as Liquidated Damages in accordance with Sections 107.7 and 107.8 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

C. Price.

The Lump Sum Price shown on the Price Proposal Form (Form D), a Contract Document, will be used as the basis for determining the original Contract amount and for determining the amounts of the required Performance Surety Bond and Payment Surety Bond. The actual amount of the in lieu fee payment for mitigation will be deducted from the Lump Sum Price.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in the Contract (including provisions for Extra Work and Force Account Work), the Department agrees to pay, and the Design-Builder agrees to accept, the following Lump Sum Price as full and complete compensation for completion of all the Work.

1. Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project:	\$	_____
a. Compensable Portland Water Relocations:	\$	_____
b. Compensable Falmouth Sewer Relocations:	\$	_____
c. FairPoint Conduit Work (Fixed Price):	\$	_____ 77,500.00
d. CMP Conduit Work (Fixed Price):	\$	_____ 175,000.00
Total Lump Sum Price:	\$	_____

D. Contract.

The Contract, which may be amended, modified, or supplemented in writing only through a Contract Modification, consists of the following documents:

1. This Design-Build Contract Agreement;
2. The Design-Builder's Statement of Qualifications (SOQ);
3. All portions of the Request for Proposals (RFP), consisting of the Design-Build General Conditions, Project Requirements, Appendices, and Standard Specifications - Revision of December 2002, with the latest version of the Repair Specification;
4. The Design-Builder's Proposal consisting of its Technical Proposal, inclusive of the Proposal Letter (Form A), and its Price Proposal, inclusive of the Price Proposal Form (Form D);
5. Permits, if applicable;
6. Performance, payment, warranty, and other bonds;
7. All specifications, manuals, guides, laws and all other documents referenced in any of the above documents; and
8. Amendments Nos. 1 to ____ inclusive.

It is agreed and understood that the Contract will be governed by the documents listed above.

E. Certifications.

By signing below, the Design-Builder hereby certifies that to the best of the Design-Builder's knowledge and belief:

1. All of the statements, representations, covenants, and/or certifications required or set forth in the Proposal and the Proposal Documents, including those in Appendix A to the Design-Build General Conditions (Federal Contract Provisions Supplement), and the Contract are still complete and accurate as of the date of this Contract Agreement.
2. The Design-Builder knows of no legal, contractual, or financial impediment to entering into this Contract.
3. The person signing below is legally authorized by the Design-Builder to sign this Contract Agreement on behalf of the Design-Builder and to legally bind the Design-Builder to the terms of this Contract Agreement.

F. Representations.

The undersigned, having carefully examined the site of work, the Project Requirements, RFP Plans, the Design-Build General Conditions, Standard Specifications - Revision of December 2002, Supplemental Specifications, Contract Agreement; and Contract Bonds contained herein for design and construction of:

_____,
State of Maine, on which proposals will be received until the time specified in the "Notice to Design-Builders" does hereby propose and offer to enter into the Contract to supply all the materials, tools, equipment and labor to construct the whole of the Work in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of the Contract and for the lump-sum price herein.

The Design-Builder agrees to perform the work required at the price specified above and in accordance with the terms of the Contract, and to provide the appropriate insurance and bonds if this offer is accepted by the Department in writing.

As Design-Builder also agrees:

First: To do any extra work, which may be ordered by the Department Project Manager, and to accept as full compensation the amount determined as provided in Section 109.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions and as addressed in the Contract Documents.

Second: That the Proposal Guaranty at five percent (5%) of the proposal amount payable to the Treasurer of the State of Maine and accompanying this proposal, shall be forfeited, as Liquidated Damages, if in case this Proposal is accepted, and the undersigned shall fail to abide by the terms and conditions of the offer, and fail to furnish satisfactory insurance and Contract bonds under the conditions stipulated in the Design-Build General Conditions within ten (10) Days of notice of intent to award the Contract.

Third: To begin the Work on the date specified in the Project Requirements and complete the Work within the time limits given in the Contract.

Fourth: That the Lump Sum Price shall remain open for thirty (30) Calendar Days after the date of Price Proposal Opening.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Design-Builder, for itself, its successors and assigns, hereby execute three duplicate originals of this Agreement and thereby binds itself to all covenants, terms, and obligations contained in this Contract.

DESIGN-BUILDER

Date

Witness

(Name and Title Printed)

G. Award.

Your offer is hereby accepted for (see checked boxes):

Item 1 Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project

Total Contract Amount: \$ _____

Execution by the Department consummates the Contract, and the documents referenced herein.

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Date

Commissioner

Witness

Part 2 - Project Requirements

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Issuance of RFP

This Request for Proposal (RFP) dated October 14, 2011, issued by the Maine Department of Transportation (the Department) constitutes a request for the short-listed Design-Build Teams to submit Proposals to design and build the Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project (the Project).

1.2 Procurement Overview

1.2.1 Procurement Process

The Department is using a two-step process to select a Design-Builder to deliver the Project. For the first step, a short-list of eligible Proposers was determined based on the Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) the Department received in response to its Request for Qualifications (RFQ) dated July 20, 2011, as amended. This RFP is issued as the second step of the procurement process. The Department will accept Proposals only from Proposers who have been advised in writing that they have been short-listed.

Pursuant to Title 23, MRSA, Section 753-A, the Department intends to award a Lump Sum Price Design-Build Contract to the responsive and responsible Proposer offering a Proposal that is determined by the Department to provide the Best-Value. The Department reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals.

1.2.2 Draft RFP and Industry Review

The Department will first issue a Draft RFP to solicit questions and feedback from Proposers. The intent of this process is to both enhance the Proposers' understanding of the Project and the RFP and to improve the RFP itself based on the input received.

When reviewing the Draft RFP, Proposers should consider the following:

1. Does the schedule for the procurement process provided in Section 1.6 provide sufficient time to maximize opportunities to meet or exceed the Project goals?
2. Do the Project Requirements provide sufficient definition to support the Project goals, or would it be beneficial for the Department to provide additional detail on what is required?

When reflecting upon these questions, Proposers should note that this RFP has been designed to provide flexibility to Proposers with respect to design concept, schedule and phasing, and stakeholder coordination. The design and construction criteria contained herein are intended to encourage Proposers to develop innovative solutions to achieving the Project goals.

1.2.3 Final RFP

Based on the comments and questions received during the review period, the Department will modify the RFP as it deems appropriate and will issue a final RFP by the date specified in Section 1.6.

1.2.4 Technical Proposal Package and Price Proposal Package

Proposers shall submit their Technical Proposal Package, Proposal Guaranty Package, and Price Proposal Package by the time specified on the date specified in Section 1.6.

1.2.5 Alternate Technical Concepts (ATC)

The Department will consider ATCs submitted by Proposers in accordance with the process set forth in Section 102.4 of the Design-Build General Conditions. Proposers shall identify in their Technical Proposal any approved ATCs incorporated therein, and include the approved Response Summary for ATC #__ forms with the Technical Proposal Package as identified in Subsection 102.3.2.1 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

ATCs may be submitted to the Department on or between the begin date and the final deadline date and time specified in Section 1.6. The Department will provide responses to ATC proposals within two (2) weeks of the ATC submittal date.

1.3 Project Goals

Martin's Point Bridge is an important connection between the Falmouth and Portland communities. The necessity to replace this bridge provides an opportunity to ensure the new bridge better accommodates the current and envisioned multimodal usage of this structure and highway corridor. Documents resulting from work between the Department and the Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee (MPBAC) clearly express expectations that the new bridge design address the multimodal needs of the region while also visually complementing the environmental setting. The MPBAC documents can be found at the Project website: <http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/ac.htm>.

The Department's goals for the Project are:

1. to deliver a cost effective Project;
2. to build a safe, durable, and low maintenance bridge;
3. to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, maritime traffic, recreational users, and vehicular users in a comfortable, attractive, and secure environment;
4. to accommodate bicycles in both directions adjacent to the vehicular traffic lanes;
5. to provide a multi-use pathway providing safety and enjoyment for different activities;

6. to build an aesthetically pleasing bridge that harmonizes with the environmental setting and preserves water views for all users;
7. to minimize and/or avoid environmental and historical impacts; and
8. to minimize impacts to the traveling public, local businesses, abutting landowners, and adjacent neighborhoods during construction.

1.4 Contract Time

1.4.1 Contract Completion Date

All Work, excluding warranty work, required by the Contract must be complete by no later than December 31, 2014. Liquidated Damages will be assessed in accordance with Section 107 of the Design-Build General Conditions for each calendar day that the Work is extended beyond the Completion Date.

If an earlier Completion Date is identified in the Proposal and accepted by the Department, then the earlier Completion Date shall become the baseline completion date and shall be incorporated into the Design-Build Contract Agreement.

1.4.2 Supplemental Liquidated Damages

There are no Supplemental Liquidated Damages on this Project.

1.5 Stipend

Each unsuccessful Proposer that submits a responsive Proposal will be entitled to receive a stipend of \$70,000 pursuant to Section 103.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

1.6 Procurement Schedule

The Department anticipates following the contracting schedule below. Proposers are cautioned that this schedule is subject to change and the Proposer should not rely upon it to determine, for example, when actual construction may commence.

MaineDOT Issues Draft RFP	September 15, 2011
Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Draft RFP Questions and/or Comments	September 22, 2011 at 3:00 PM (EDT)
Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Supplemental Boring Requests	September 22, 2011 at 3:00 PM (EDT)
*MaineDOT Issues Responses to Draft RFP Questions and/or Comments	September 30, 2011
MaineDOT Issues Final RFP	October 14, 2011
Begin Date for Design-Builders to Submit ATC Proposals	October 17, 2011
Design-Builders Attend Mandatory One-On-One Meetings with MaineDOT	One Meeting Per Team Between October 17-21, 2011

Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Final RFP Questions and/or Comments	October 26, 2011 at 3:00 PM (EDT)
*MaineDOT Issues Responses to Final RFP Questions and/or Comments	November 2, 2011
Anticipated NEPA Complete Date	On or about mid to late November 4, 2011
Anticipated Date for Receipt of Permit	On or about late November to early December 15, 2011
MaineDOT Issues Supplemental Geotechnical Data Report (SGDR)	On or about December 21, 2011
Final Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit ATC Proposals	January 4, 2012 at 3:00 PM (EST)
*MaineDOT Issues Final Responses to ATC Proposals	January 18, 2012
Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Technical and Price Proposal Packages	January 25, 2012 at 3:00 PM (EST)
*MaineDOT Issues Notification of Technical Proposal Responsiveness to Design-Builders	February 8, 2012
Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Cure for Technical Responsiveness (if applicable)	February 15, 2012
MaineDOT's Scoring Committees Evaluate and Score Technical Proposals	February-March 2012
Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit Proposal Guaranty Package	March 14, 2012 at 11:00 AM (EDT)
MaineDOT Opens Price Proposals and Final Technical Scores and Calculates Best Value Score	March 14, 2012 at 11:00 AM (EDT)
MaineDOT Awards Contract	March-April 2012
Design-Builder Begins Construction	Summer-Fall 2012
Design-Builder Completes Construction	December 31, 2014

*Follow-up clarification requests to the Department's responses must be submitted within two (2) days to the Contracts and Specification Engineer at scott.bickford@maine.gov or via fax at (207) 624-3431. All follow-up clarification requests must be specific as to what it is about the Department's response that is confusing or unclear. ~~No new questions may be asked.~~ The Department will issue clarification responses within two (2) to three (3) Days after receipt of all follow-up clarification requests. ~~Additional questions may be submitted to the Department up until January 11, 2012 by submitting a Request for Information (RFI).~~

The opening of Price Proposals will take place in the Main Conference Room #216 at the Maine Department of Transportation building on Child Street in Augusta, Maine, on the date and time specified in Section 1.6.

If any dates are changed, the Department will notify the Proposers in advance, in writing. In the event that a time period provided in this RFP falls on a Holiday, Saturday, or Sunday, the party required to act within said time period shall be considered in compliance with said time period provided said party acts as required on the next Departmental business day thereafter.

1.7 Contract Representative

The Contract Representative is:

Scott Bickford, Contracts and Specifications Engineer
Maine Department of Transportation
Bureau of Project Development
16 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0016

The Contract Representative is the sole Department contact person and addressee for clarification requests, ATC submittals, and all other communications about the Project and RFP, and the submission of the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal. The Contract Representative may be changed by written notice from the Department.

1.8 Insurance

Insurance requirements for the Project are set forth in Section 110.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions. This Project will require Owner's and Contractor's Protective Liability Insurance in accordance with the amounts specified in Subsection 110.3.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

Insurance certificates shall be submitted prior to Contract Execution.

1.9 Civil Rights Contract Compliance Review

The scope of this Project in its entirety may undergo a full contract compliance review. The Technical Proposal shall identify the Civil Rights Compliance Manager and describe his or her experience, qualifications, and responsibilities.

1.10 Quality Assurance

The Department will not require the Design-Builder to provide a testing laboratory for QA Testing purposes.

1.11 On the Job Training (OJT)

There is an established OJT requirement of 5,000 hours for this Project. The Proposer is required to meet that goal, if awarded the Project, in accordance with Subsection 105.10 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

1.12 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)

The Department has an annual DBE participation goal of 5.8%. The Department encourages the use of DBE firms to accomplish that goal, in accordance with Subsection 105.10 of the Design-Build General Conditions. The Design-Builder is required to meet all Civil Rights laws.

1.13 Wage Rates

Federal wage rates apply on this Project, in accordance with Subsection 104.3.8 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

1.14 Appendix A to Division 100 Design-Build General Conditions

The federal requirements of Appendix A to Division 100 Design-Build General Conditions apply to this Project.

2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Submission of Proposals

2.1.1 Time and Location

Technical Proposal Packages, Price Proposal Packages, and Proposal Guaranty Packages, must be received no later than time and date specified in Section 1.6. The Proposer must deliver its Technical Proposal Package, Price Proposal Package, and Proposal Guaranty Package to:

Address for U.S. mail, hand, overnight, or courier delivery:

Scott Bickford, Contracts and Specifications Engineer
Maine Department of Transportation
Bureau of Project Development
16 State House Station
24 Child Street
Augusta, ME 04333-0016

2.1.2 Technical Proposal Package

The Technical Proposal Package shall be submitted in a separate container clearly marked as follows:

Proposer's Name
Technical Proposal
Martin's Point Bridge Replacement
Container ___ of ___

2.1.3 Price Proposal Package

The Price Proposal Package must be submitted on the forms supplied by the Department and must be delivered in a sealed envelope capable of holding 8 ½" x 11" documents without folding and clearly marked as follows:

Proposer's Name
Price Proposal
Martin's Point Bridge Replacement

2.1.4 Proposal Guaranty Package

The Proposal Guaranty Package must be delivered separately in a sealed business-sized envelope, such that it can be opened without opening the Price Proposal Package, and clearly marked as follows:

Proposer's Name
Proposal Guaranty
Martin's Point Bridge Replacement

2.2 Proposal Content Requirements

Proposers shall provide responses to all information requested in this RFP. Failure to respond or failure to provide requested information may result in a determination by the Department, in its sole discretion, that a Proposal is non-responsive. Except as provided in Section 103.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions, the Department shall have no obligation to compensate any unsuccessful Proposer for its efforts in preparing a Proposal.

2.2.1 Number of Copies

Proposers shall provide the following number of copies:

1. Three (3) original copies of Form A, bearing original signatures in blue ink;
2. One (1) each of the letter(s) approving changes in Proposer's organization (if applicable);
3. Thirty-five (35) sequentially numbered copies of the Technical Proposal with 11" x 17" plans, each of which will also include one (1) copy of each of the following:
 - a. Approved Response Summary for ATC #__ Forms, separately indexed,
 - b. Preliminary Schedule, separately indexed;
 - c. Renderings as per Section 12.2, separately indexed;
 - d. Design Quality Management Plan (DQMP) outline, separately indexed; and
 - e. Construction Quality Management Plan (CQMP) outline, separately indexed;
4. One (1) original of the Proposal Guaranty (Form C), separately sealed in the Proposal Guaranty Package;
5. One (1) original of the Price Proposal (Form D);
6. One (1) original of the Priced DBE form (Form E), sealed with Form D in the Price Proposal Package; and

7. One (1) CD-ROM containing an electronic copy of the Technical Proposal and the 11” x 17” plan set in Adobe Acrobat PDF format.

Page limits shall be as specified in Subsection 102.3.2.1 of the Design-Build General Conditions, except that the Technical Proposal page limit shall be a maximum of thirty-six (36) one-sided sheets or eighteen (18) two-sided sheets.

3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Department intends to select the Proposer that offers the overall Best Value to the Department, considering price and technical factors as described in 23 MRSA §753-A – Design-Build Contracts. The intent of the Department in this evaluation process is to create a fair and uniform basis for the evaluation of the Proposals in accordance with the State’s legislation governing this procurement.

3.1 Technical Proposal Responsiveness Requirements

The Proposal must comply with the following minimum technical requirements, in addition to all submission requirements specified in Section 102.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions and Section 2, to be responsive:

1. ~~The superstructure design for the new bridge shall not incorporate structural steel for primary or secondary load-carrying elements below the top surface of the deck.~~ All structural steel used as main and/or secondary load-carrying members in the new bridge superstructure shall be coated with a thermal spray coating in accordance with Supplemental Specification 506 Protective Coating – Steel, or they shall be made of stainless steel. This requirement does not apply to reinforcing steel, prestressing strands, or post-tensioning rods/strands that are fully encapsulated within concrete or composite material. This requirement also does not apply to such items as bridge rails, utility supports, plates, bolts, nuts, and miscellaneous hardware, which shall be protected against corrosion using appropriate sacrificial, cathodic, or coated protection systems.
2. The design for the new bridge, excluding any dolphin and fender systems, shall not incorporate timber structural load-carrying elements.
3. The design for the new bridge shall not incorporate trusses.
4. The design of the Project shall not create impacts to any property, permanent or temporary, within the historic boundaries of the Martin’s Point Health Care (MPHC) facility (tax map/lot 434/C/1 and tax map/lot 434/C/5) or within the property boundaries of the City of Portland property (tax map/lot 434/C/7).
5. The design of the Project shall not incorporate any permanent Right-of-Way takes or permanent easements from within the historic boundaries of the Kerry and Stephen Tietjen property (tax map/lot U1/162).

6. All superstructure girder systems for the new bridge must be designed and detailed such that they provide no locations for birds to roost or nest. All exposed or accessible elements of the superstructure girder systems, including main and secondary load-carrying members, that are greater than 2.5” wide must be at a forty-five (45) degree downward slope or greater from a horizontal line, except for Northeast Bulb Tee girders.

3.2 Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria

The information in this Section is intended to assist Proposers in developing and submitting Technical Proposals that address the Department’s goals and expectations for the Project. The Department’s evaluation team will rate and score (in their sole discretion) the Technical Proposals based upon the evaluation criteria described below. The extent to which a Proposal meets or exceeds the evaluation criteria will be rated and reflected in the evaluation team’s scoring of the Proposals submitted. The minimum raw score for this Project is eighty percent (80%). For a related provision, see Subsection 103.2.2.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions. Proposers should note that the Technical Proposal will be considered as the Preliminary Design Report (PDR) for the bridge as noted in Chapter 2 of the Bridge Design Guide (BDG). The various PDR forms identified in the BDG are not required for this Project.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points
3.2.1 Bridge Design Concept	40
3.2.2 Highway Design Concept	20
3.2.3 Community Context and Public Involvement	15
3.2.4 Project Quality Plan for Design and Construction	5
3.2.5 Project Management Plan for Design and Construction	10
3.2.6 Avoidance and Minimization of Wetland Impacts	10
Total =	100

3.2.1 Bridge Design Concept (40 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the Proposer’s approach and commitment to delivering design solutions for the bridge structure and other related structures (e.g. retaining walls) that meet or exceed the minimum technical requirements identified in Section 3.1 and Section 6. The Proposal shall include plans, graphical representations, and narrative descriptions as necessary to enable the Department to understand and evaluate the Proposer’s approach to designing the new bridge.

3.2.1.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Summarize the design and construction of the new Martin’s Point Bridge and its foundations, including assumptions used in developing the substructure and superstructure type and design.

2. Provide the following preliminary plans and details, as applicable:
 - a. a conceptual layout (general plan, elevation, and typical section) for the new Martin's Point Bridge;
 - b. interpretive subsurface profile plan;
 - c. bridge pier and pier foundation plans, elevations, and typical sections;
 - d. bridge abutment plans, elevations, and typical sections;
 - e. retaining walls and other proposed structures adjacent to the new bridge: type, plans, elevations, and typical sections; and
 - f. any additional plans, details, or renderings the Proposer feels is necessary to fully convey its bridge design concept.
3. Discuss the approach to meet the needs for a safe, durable, and low maintenance bridge. Define specific and/or typical maintenance (both routine and periodic), repair, and rehabilitation requirements of the bridge. Provide a discussion on how the proposed design will promote ease of maintenance, drainage, and enhanced durability.
4. Provide a brief interpretation of soil and bedrock conditions based on the geotechnical information available, including the Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report (PGDR), the Supplemental Geotechnical Data Report (SGDR), and other investigations conducted by the Proposer. Discuss the approach to the design and construction of the proposed substructure units, the foundations, and retaining walls adjacent to the new bridge, including considerations for extreme events such as seismic, seismic cyclic softening, liquefaction, scour, flooding, ~~and ice., and vessel collision.~~
5. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal relating to this category.
6. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the proposed design that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category, including any additional warranties offered.

3.2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores in this category will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal demonstrates that the Proposer has considered future inspection and maintenance requirements for the bridge, including concepts that will:

- a. minimize maintenance and rehabilitation costs for the Department during the design life,
 - b. incorporate materials, designs, and methods that will maximize durability, and
 - c. facilitate inspection and maintenance efforts by providing safe and easy access.
2. The Proposal maximizes freeboard while minimizing property impacts, provides adequate bridge drainage, and effectively uses appropriate retaining walls, if needed.
 3. The Proposal contains appropriate superstructure and substructure types for the proposed location that avoid adverse hydrologic/hydraulic impacts on the surrounding area, are appropriately designed for resistance to extreme events as well as normal strength and serviceability loading requirements, and fit in well with the surrounding environment.
 4. The Proposal demonstrates a strong understanding of the potential geotechnical challenges associated with the new bridge. For example,
 - a. the expectation of occurrence of various extreme events and their potential consequences to the design of the substructure units and their foundations are identified and well described, and
 - b. the inclusion of performance testing, such as additional dynamic pile tests, to validate geotechnical design assumptions and account for the variability of subsurface conditions across the site are identified and well described.
 5. The Proposal provides additional enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as additional warranties, additional treatments that further enhance durability and longevity, the use of innovative materials, etc.

3.2.2 Highway Design Concept (20 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the Proposer's approach and commitment to delivering design solutions for the highway approaches and adjoining intersections that meet or exceed the associated minimum technical requirements identified in Section 3.1 and Section 6. The Proposal shall include plans, graphical representations, and narrative descriptions as necessary to enable the Department to understand and evaluate the Proposer's approach to designing the roadway and approaches.

3.2.2.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Provide the preliminary layout plans for the entire Project including horizontal

and vertical alignments, typical sections, and slope limits of roadways, intersections, driveways.

2. Provide plans, elevations, and typical sections for retaining walls and other proposed structures not adjacent to the new bridge.
3. Public concerns have been expressed about making safe left turn movements from Bay Shore Drive onto US Route 1 after the Project is complete. Provide a brief description of how these concerns will be ~~addressed~~ **evaluated**.
4. ~~Provide details of anticipated utility relocations, both compensable and non-compensable.~~
5. Discuss the approach to design and construction of approach roadways, pavement, and embankments, including measures for monitoring and mitigating potential stability and/or settlement issues.
6. Discuss the approach to drainage.
7. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal relating to this category.
8. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the proposed design that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category, including any additional warranties offered.

3.2.2.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal provides an alignment that will:
 - a. avoid or minimize Right-of-Way acquisition requirements,
 - ~~b. avoid or minimize compensable utility relocations,~~
 - c. avoid or minimize impacts to existing landscaping on private properties,
 - d. avoid drainage issues within the roadway and adjacent properties, and
 - e. provide smooth and safe movements and transitions for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic.
2. The Proposal demonstrates a strong understanding of the potential geotechnical challenges associated with the design and construction of approach embankments and roadway. For example:

- a. the expectation of occurrence of various extreme events and their potential consequences to the design of the embankments and retaining walls not adjacent to the bridge are identified and well described, and
 - b. the performance criteria for long-term embankment settlement and stability are identified and well described.
3. The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as additional warranties, instrumentation programs for long-term monitoring of new embankments over soft soils, additional traffic calming measures, etc.

3.2.3 Community Context and Public Involvement (15 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the Proposer's approach to developing and integrating the Project within the community and the approach to be undertaken relative to engaging the public where appropriate in final design choices and informing the public as to the status of the project. The Proposal shall include narrative descriptions and realistic renderings as necessary to enable the Department to understand and evaluate the Proposer's approach to this category.

3.2.3.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Provide conceptual landscape plans that meet the requirements of Section 6.15.
2. Provide a brief discussion of the approach to landscape design and the anticipated maintenance needs for plantings and other landscape elements.
3. Provide a brief discussion of the Proposer's approach to addressing the concerns expressed by nearby property owners about headlight glare, construction noise, hours of construction operation, and construction vehicle and worker parking.
4. Provide the slenderness ratio (SR) for all spans calculated at mid-span, where:
 - a. $SR = L/D$
 - b. L = Span length between centerline of piers and/or centerline of bearings at abutments.
 - c. D = Total superstructure depth, including the exterior girder, blocking, and the deck and sidewalk/curb at the fascia.
5. Provide style package options as specified in Section 6.11.4.
6. Provide a Public Information Plan as specified in Section 12.1.
7. Provide a Public Involvement Plan as specified in Section 12.2.

8. Provide photorealistic renderings as specified in Section 12.2.
9. Provide a discussion of the overall aesthetic concepts and treatments to be included in the Project.
10. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal relating to this category.
11. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the Proposal that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category.

3.2.3.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal provides a preferred superstructure slenderness ratio of seventeen (17) or greater for all spans.
2. The Proposal provides style package options that are reflective of and work well with the MPBAC's desire for a bridge that is slender, open, and graceful; fits in well with its surroundings; and is without excess ornamentation.
3. The Proposal provides landscape elements that are appropriate and native to the area, economical, and easy to maintain.
4. The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of strong and effective Public Information and Public Involvement Plans.
5. The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's success at integrating the Aesthetic Design Professional into the overall design effort.
6. The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as fishing access via small bump outs on the bridge or some other means, green spaces on the Portland end of the Project, trail improvements, dynamic 3D models, etc.

3.2.4 Project Quality Plan for Design and Construction (5 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the Proposer's approach and commitment to delivering a high quality Project that minimizes future maintenance requirements.

3.2.4.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Provide an outline of the proposed Design Quality Management Plan (DQMP)

that meets or exceeds the requirements of Section 106 of the Design-Build General Conditions. The plan should address:

- a. how the Design-Builder's design quality management staff will communicate and coordinate with the Department on issues affecting project quality with specific emphasis on, submittal format and department review timelines, RFI format and Department response timelines;
 - b. the frequency and methods of design review necessary to comply with the DQMP;
 - c. requirements for release of design documents for construction;
 - d. any specific project elements requiring special attention or emphasis, including applicable standards of quality or practice to be met, and the level of design completeness and extent of detailing required prior to issuance of an early release for construction of the design documents related to that element;
 - e. coordination of the work performed by different persons to ensure that conflicts, omissions, or misalignments do not occur between design plans and specifications, and coordination of the review, approval, release, distribution and revision of documents; and
 - f. method for reviewing and addressing field changes to ensure the original design intent is not compromised.
2. Provide an outline of the proposed Construction Quality Management Plan (CQMP) that meets or exceeds the requirements of Section 106 of the Design-Build General Conditions. The plan should address:
- a. how the Design-Builder's construction quality management staff will communicate and coordinate with the Department on issues affecting Project quality with specific emphasis on, inspecting, sampling, testing, checking, and documenting the Work, including work performed by subcontractors, fabricators, suppliers, and other vendors;
 - b. integration of design and construction personnel to ensure quality;
 - c. environmental compliance monitoring;
 - d. corporate involvement;
 - e. prevention of non-conforming work and corrective action procedures to resolve nonconforming work; and
 - f. approach to inspections and callbacks during the warranty period.
3. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal

relating to this category.

4. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the Proposal that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category.

3.2.4.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal demonstrates the expertise and commitment at all levels of the Proposer's organization to provide a high quality Project that achieves the Department's goals.
2. The Proposal demonstrates well-defined and effective Quality Management Plans for design and construction.
3. The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as additional or more stringent quality testing requirements, etc.

3.2.5 Project Management for Design and Construction (10 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the effectiveness of the Proposer's project management approach in ensuring that the Project goals are met.

3.2.5.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Provide brief narrative descriptions of the overall approach to project management. At a minimum, the narrative shall address the following:
 - a. the Design and Construction Organization Chart for the Project, showing key functional positions and organization units to be involved in these efforts and where they will be located, the percent of time that Key Personnel will be dedicated to this Project and where located, the relationships between positions shown on the chart, and the functional relationships with subcontractors;
 - b. the Preliminary Schedule for the Project, including design, public involvement process with respect to the selection of a style package option and finalizing landscape plans, Right-of-Way activities, and construction that will demonstrate that the Proposer has considered public involvement activities; utilities; Right-of-Way mapping, appraisals, and acquisitions; constructability; maintenance of traffic; minimization of impacts to traffic; and

- c. the approach to managing the scope and budget for the Project; and
 - d. the approach to partnering, including a discussion on how the partnering process will be used to efficiently resolve disputes:
 - i. between the Department and the Design-Builder,
 - ii. between the Design-Builder and third parties, and
 - iii. between and among Major Participants on the Design-Builder's team.
2. Provide a brief narrative describing the overall approach to third party coordination. At a minimum, the narrative shall:
 - a. identify a Utility Coordinator who will serve as the Design-Builder's point of contact for utility issues;
 - b. identify all affected utilities, the potential impact to each, and the proposed approach to minimizing impacts to the Project and service disruption to the utilities;
 - c. describe how utilities will be included in the design process and how utility relocation will be phased with construction to reduce impacts to the traveling public and the general populace; and
 3. Provide a brief narrative describing the construction staging and traffic management plan that will be used to safely and efficiently construct each phase of the project.
 - a. Specifically describe how public access will be maintained.
 - b. Include details on plans showing construction stages.
 4. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal relating to this category.
 5. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the Proposal that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category.

3.2.5.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to project management, design and construction quality management, and third party coordination approaches that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal demonstrates the expertise and commitment at all levels of the Proposer's organization to provide a cost effective and high quality Project that achieves the Department's goals.

2. The Proposal ensures the Department will be kept apprised of issues affecting the Project scope, schedule, and budget.
3. The Proposal demonstrates effective collaboration and coordination among design and construction personnel and the Department's personnel throughout the Project.
4. The Proposal effectively uses partnering throughout, and empowers decision-making at the appropriate level.
5. The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of the potential risks to the Project related to third party coordination and identifies appropriate measures for relocation and protection of utilities and to manage and minimize these risks.
6. The Proposal demonstrates an effective plan for the coordination of civil/structural activities, utilities, Right-of-Way activities, traffic maintenance, third party liaison, and public awareness and safety, as they relate to the construction operation.
7. The Proposal provides enhancements of that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as an earlier Contract Completion Date, etc.

3.2.6 Avoidance and Minimization of Wetland Impacts (10 points)

Through this scoring item, the Department will evaluate the Proposer's approach to avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts for the Project. The Proposal shall include plans, graphical representations, and/or narrative descriptions as necessary to enable the Department to understand and evaluate the Proposer's approach to impact minimization.

3.2.6.1 Proposal Submittal Requirements

Prepare and submit the information identified below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1. Provide a plan delineating and quantifying the wetland impacts (temporary and permanent) associated with the Proposer's design, including any expected credit for restoration of wetlands.
2. Provide a description of the impacts avoidance and minimization efforts associated with the construction of the new Martin's Point Bridge, construction of the approach embankments, and demolition and removal of the existing bridge.
3. Describe any approved ATCs that have been incorporated into the Proposal relating to this category.
4. Describe any enhancements incorporated into the Proposal that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP for this category.

3.2.6.2 Evaluation Criteria

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

1. The Proposal avoids and/or minimizes the impacts to the environment through all facets of design and construction.
2. The Proposal provides a total net wetland impact area of forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF) or less, based on the Department's wetland delineations.
3. The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of the environmental sensitivity of the area and the connection between the environment and the surrounding communities.
4. The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as restoration of previously filled areas within the Project limits, etc.

4. SCOPE OF DESIGN-BUILD WORK/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

4.1 Project Description

The Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project (the Project) includes the design and construction of a replacement bridge on US Route 1 crossing over the Presumpscot River between Falmouth and Portland, Maine. The existing bridge consists of forty-six (46) spans with a total length of approximately fourteen hundred feet (1,400), a curb-to-curb width of approximately forty-four feet (44'), and one five-foot (5') sidewalk on the downstream (east) side of the bridge.

In addition to the proposed bridge, the Project includes removal of the existing bridge, construction of up to approximately two thousand feet (2,000') of approach roadway and sidewalks, private and public utility alterations, and landscaping.

4.2 Project Scope

There is no additional scope of work anticipated beyond that specified in Subsection 105.1.1 Project Scope of the Design-Build General Conditions.

4.2.1 Anticipated Design Services

There are no additional design services anticipated beyond that specified in Subsection 105.1.1.1 Anticipated Design Services of the Design-Build General Conditions.

4.2.2 Anticipated Right-of-Way Services

There are no additional Right-of-Way services anticipated beyond that specified in Subsection

105.1.1.2 Anticipated Right-of-Way Services of the Design-Build General Conditions.

4.2.3 Utility and Other Third Party Coordination

There are no additional utility or other third party coordination anticipated beyond that specified in Subsection 105.1.1.3 Utility and Other Third Party Coordination of the Design-Build General Conditions.

4.2.4 Anticipated Construction Services

There are no additional construction services anticipated beyond that specified in Subsection 105.1.1.4 Anticipated Construction Services of the Design-Build General Conditions.

4.2.5 Anticipated Environmental Services

The entire permit application package is included in Appendix I. NEPA is incomplete at release of this RFP. The Department is consulting under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and is preparing a NEPA decision document. The Department makes no commitment to any alternatives under evaluation in the NEPA process above, including selection of the no-build alternative. The Department may award this Design-Build contract prior to conclusion of the NEPA process, pursuant to conditions set forth in 23 CFR 636.109. FHWA has the responsibility for the final NEPA decision. Special conditions from issued permits will be provided to the Design-Builder as soon as they are issued. The Department anticipates this to be prior to Award.

The Army Corps of Engineers' (ACOE) Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) is, by default, a structure on or adjacent to the existing alignment. The permits application is for a net total forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF) of combined permanent and temporary coastal wetland impacts, minus any credit received for wetland restoration as defined in Section 7.4.1. Wetland mitigation at the rate of two to one (2:1) will be required for this Project.

The Department has selected a site for this mitigation which will be funded by a mitigation fee from this Project. This mitigation fee is \$4.38 per square foot and the total calculated amount will be deducted from the Lump Sum Price. The mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows:

$$(NTWI) (\$4.38/SF) (2) = MF$$

where:

NTWI = Net Total Wetland Impacts (permanent and temporary, minus wetland restoration area)

MF = Mitigation Fee

5. INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO THE PROPOSER

5.1 Information Supplied

The Department has established a website for this Project, accessible at <http://www.maine.gov/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/index.htm> to convey information related to the Project. The documents posted on the website shall have the same force and effect as if included as an appendix to this RFP.

5.1.1 Plans

Proposers may download electronic files containing the following information in MaineDOT Microstation/InRoads and PDF format from the Project website. A hard copy and CD may also be obtained from the Department upon request and for a nominal fee.

1. Survey data.
2. Existing Right-of-Way data.
3. Wetland delineation data.
4. One (1) existing baseline based on the as-built bridge plans and two (2) conceptual plans for the horizontal alignment. Proposers should note that the conceptual plans are provided for informational purposes only, and do not represent a fixed alignment, nor do they reflect all constraints and requirements specified in this RFP.
5. Aerial view files.
6. Existing plans for the existing Martin's Point Bridge.

5.1.2 Reports

Several reports and other correspondence regarding this Project are included on the Project website for informational purposes. Reports included are:

1. Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report (Part 1), dated November 23, 2010;
2. Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report (Part 2), dated August 2011;
3. Preliminary Liquefaction Hazard Analysis Report, dated August 25, 2011;
4. Existing Conditions/Inspection Reports/Photos for the existing Martin's Point Bridge (multiple dates);
5. Hydrologic Data, dated September 1, 2011;
6. Traffic Data, MaineDOT Interdepartmental Memorandum, dated September 19, 2009;
7. Accident Data, MaineDOT Interdepartmental Memorandum, dated June 10, 2009;
8. MPBAC meeting minutes (multiple dates);

9. Public Involvement Effort; Problem, Need, and Vision Statements; and Historic Photos; and
10. Public Meeting minutes, dated February 25, 2010, July 13, 2011, and August 9, 2011.

5.1.3 Geotechnical Data

Proposers are responsible for reviewing and analyzing the Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report (PGDR). The PGDR is available for download at the Project website. Rock cores that were not submitted for laboratory testing are available for viewing. Arrangements for viewing should be made through the Department's Contract Representative.

Interpretation and interpolation of site conditions between boring locations and between samples shall be at the sole risk of the Proposer.

The Department will contract the services of an independent geotechnical engineering firm, test boring contractor, and testing laboratory to conduct additional geotechnical investigations based on requests by the Proposers to be known as the Supplemental Boring Program. The Supplemental Boring Program will consist of a limited number of borings, soil and bedrock samples, and laboratory testing, and is described in Subsection 105.12.8.1 of the Design-Build General Conditions and Section 6.10.3.

5.1.4 Environmental Approvals

The Department will deliver the following environmental approvals prior to construction:

1. FHWA NEPA decision approval;
2. approved US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) IND permit; and
3. approved MEDEP permit, through the Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA), 38 MRSA §480 and MEDEP Rules Chapters 305 and 310, of wetland impacts.

6. PROJECT DESIGN

6.1 Design Documents

All design documents included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.1 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.2 Design Submittals and Reviews

All design submittals and reviews included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.2 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.3 Re-submittal Process

All design re-submittals included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.4 Release for Construction

All release for construction included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.4 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.5 Design Changes

All design changes included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.6 Administration and Coordination

All administration and coordination included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.6 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.7 Highway Design

In addition to the requirements identified in Section 3.1, the Design-Builder shall meet the following requirements of this Section.

6.7.1 Highway Alignment Design Criteria

The Design-Builder shall define all relevant design criteria for the horizontal and vertical alignments in the Technical Proposal. These criteria shall meet or exceed the following:

1. Design Speed: 40 MPH
2. The south end of the Project shall match into the existing roadway cross-section no further south than the US Route 1 intersection with the main (signalized) entrance to Martin's Point Health Care facility in Portland.
3. The north end of the Project shall match into the existing roadway cross-section no further north than the US Route 1 intersection with Reg Roc Road in Falmouth.
4. The maximum longitudinal grade on US Route 1 shall be five percent (5%).
5. The minimum longitudinal grade on the new bridge shall be one percent (1%). If a crest curve is located on the new bridge, then the minimum grade applies to the two legs coming into the crest curve.
6. The vertical alignment shall accommodate the navigational clearances and freeboard depth requirements of Section 6.11.1.
7. The lane, shoulder, sidewalk, and multi-use path widths specified in Section 6.11.1 shall be carried through the approaches and transitioned into the existing

roadway cross-section at each end of the Project.

6.7.2 Pavement Design

Pavement structure design shall be in accordance with Chapter 13 of the MaineDOT Highway Design Guide, and follow the 1993 AASHTO Guide for the Design of Pavement Structures design procedures. The DARWin 3.1 software (AASHTOWare) may be used for the pavement structure design. The pavement design shall be applied to the travel lane width, with a minimum design life criterion of 20 years. Layer coefficients, materials types, and recycling processes used for the pavement structure design shall be in accordance with Chapter 13 and Section 700 of the 2002 MaineDOT Standard Specifications. The following factors shall be applied to the pavement thickness design:

1. initial serviceability index – 4.5
2. terminal serviceability index – 2.5
3. reliability level – ninety-five percent (95%), and
4. overall standard deviation - 0.45.

Traffic and truck loading (AADT and ESALS) and their respective growth factors shall be as shown in the traffic documentation contained in the Appendix F.

6.8 Highway Design Features

6.8.1 Sidewalks and Multi-Use Path

The Town of Falmouth currently has a three-phase plan for constructing a sidewalk along the east side of US Route 1 that will transition to the sidewalk on the north approach of this Project. The Falmouth sidewalk is expected to be five feet (5') wide, with a possible esplanade (width not yet known) between the sidewalk and the roadway curb line.

The City of Portland is currently working to improve multi-use path, sidewalk, and bike lane connections from the south end of the Project to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Portland. **This includes the City of Portland property (tax map/lot 434/C/7), which is considered by the National Park Service to be part of Martin's Point Park.**

The multi-use path on the downstream (east) side of the new bridge shall continue from the north end of the new bridge to the south side of the Bay Shore Drive intersection, and from the south end of the new bridge to the north side of the northern drive entrance to the MPHC facility, **providing for future access to the Martin's Point Park property from the multi-use path.**

The five foot (5') sidewalk on the upstream (west) side of the bridge shall continue north on the approach up to the Bay Shore Drive intersection location and south from the bridge to tie into the end of the existing sidewalk near the MPHC traffic light signal. A five foot (5') sidewalk shall begin on the north side of the Bay Shore Drive intersection on the downstream (east) side and

continue north to the end of the Project. A crosswalk shall be constructed across US Route 1 at the Bay Shore Drive intersection location and across Bay Shore Drive.

Coordination between the Design-Builder, the Town of Falmouth, the City of Portland, and PACTS is required to assure smooth connections/transitions to create continuous multi-use paths, sidewalks, and bike lanes on both the Falmouth and Portland ends of the bridge.

6.8.2 Property Impacts

The wrought iron fence along the sidewalk in front of the MPHC facility shall not be disturbed or relocated.

No work shall be allowed within the MPHC historical boundaries as identified in Section 7.2.

The Design-Builder shall avoid disturbing or changing existing landscaping on private properties as much as possible.

6.9 Traffic Engineering

All Traffic Engineering included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.7 of the Design-Build General Conditions. In addition, the following requirement shall be satisfied.

6.9.1 Traffic Management Plan

Two (2) twelve foot (12') minimum lanes of traffic with one (1) five foot (5') clear separated sidewalk shall be maintained at all times, except for a short term reduction to one (1) twelve foot (12') minimum lane during working hours only to facilitate the construction of the approach transitions at each end of the Project. No full road closures will be allowed for the duration of the Project. School bus and First Responder services shall be given preference at all times.

The Maine Marathon (www.mainemarathon.org) is scheduled to take place on September 30, 2012; October 6, 2013; and October 5, 2014. The Design-Builder shall accommodate traffic management efforts associated with the Maine Marathon.

Access to both entrances to the MPHC facility shall be maintained at all times, unless otherwise agreed to by MPHC.

6.9.2 Signs: Guide, Warning, and Regulatory

No additional signage other than that specified in Subsection 105.12.7.2 of the Design-Build General Conditions is required.

6.9.3 Pavement Markings

No additional pavement markings other than that specified in Subsection 105.12.7.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions is required.

6.9.4 Traffic Signals

No permanent traffic signals are required for this Project.

6.9.5 Traffic Studies

No additional traffic studies other than that specified in Subsection 105.12.7.5 of the Design-Build General Conditions are required.

6.9.6 Lighting

The Design-Builder shall provide a pedestrian or low level lighting system for the full length of the multi-use path that incorporates LED light fixtures, is highly resistant to vandalism, is easy to maintain and replace broken parts, and has reasonable fixture replacement costs in comparison to other types of lights. The lighting shall be designed to provide even and uniform light distribution without hot or dark spots. Light fixtures shall be downcast to prevent glare and light pollution.

Two meters shall be provided, one for the lights in Falmouth and one for the lights in Portland. No timer is required for the lights.

No roadway or high level lighting is required for this Project. Existing lights on the approaches are owned by Central Maine Power Co. and are to remain in place to the extent practicable. See Section 8.3.1 for more information.

No permanent navigational lighting is required for this Project.

6.10 Geotechnical Design and Construction

6.10.1 Additional Design Criteria

In addition to the requirements identified in Subsections 105.12.9 and 105.12.10 of the Design-Build General Conditions, project retaining walls, slopes, embankments, instrumentation programs, and soil modification shall be designed in accordance with AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications, and the Bridge Design Guide (BDG).

6.10.2 General

It is the intent of this Section to convey known and available information regarding the subsurface conditions within the proposed construction corridor of the Project. The Department has completed a Preliminary Geotechnical Data Reports (PGDR), Parts I and II, of the Project corridor. The preliminary investigation included eighteen (18) borings along the existing bridge alignment and upstream and downstream of the existing bridge alignment. Rock cores from borings where rock coring was performed are available for viewing through the Contract Representative. All of the soil samples collected during this investigation were subjected to laboratory soil tests, and the results of the laboratory soil tests are summarized in the PGDRs.

6.10.3 Supplemental Boring Program

A Supplemental Boring Program will be conducted for this Project in accordance with

Subsection 105.12.8.1 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

For the Supplemental Boring Program, each Proposer will be allowed to request a total of three (3) additional borings.

The allotted types and number of standard soil and rock laboratory tests for each Proposer are as follows:

1. Grain size analyses (combined sieve and hydrometer (ASTM D422)) with moisture content (ASTM D2216) tests – 8
2. Incremental consolidation tests (ASTM D2435) with tube handling (ASTM D4220) – 2
3. Consolidated undrained triaxial shear tests, CIUC, (ASTM D4767) - 1
4. Atterberg Limits tests (ASTM D4318) – 4
5. Organic content tests (ASTM D2974) – 4
6. Point Load Strength Index of Rock (ASTM D5731) - 1
7. Unconfined compressive strength of Rock including total unit weight and Elastic Modulus determination (ASTM D7012, D4543-04) – 1

6.10.4 Instrumentation Programs

An instrumentation program in accordance with Subsection 105.12.8.4 of the Design-Build General Conditions will be required for this Project if embankments, **preloads, or surcharges** over compressible soils are proposed **and result in time dependent consolidation settlement, in slope stability factors of safety of less than 1.3**, or if construction activities are expected to impact the existing bridge structures and approach embankments.

6.10.5 Slopes and Riprap Slope Protection

Side slopes for roadway sections with guardrail shall be 2H:1V or flatter.

Slopes in front of abutments and wing walls shall be 1.75H:1V or flatter.

Riprap slope protection for slopes subject to tidal fluctuation and waves shall use heavy riprap in accordance with Section 2.3.11.3 of the BDG and Supplemental Standard Detail 610(02) dated August 2011.

6.11 Bridge Design and Construction

6.11.1 Additional Design and Performance Criteria

In addition to the requirements identified in Subsection 105.12.9 of the Design-Build General Conditions and Section 3.1, the Design-Builder's design shall meet the following requirements:

1. The new bridge typical section shall consist of the following elements:
 - a. two (2) twelve foot (12') minimum width travel lanes,
 - b. two (2) five foot (5') minimum width shoulders,
 - c. one (1) five foot (5') minimum clear width for a raised sidewalk on the upstream side, and
 - d. one (1) ten foot, six inch (10'-6") minimum clear width for a multi-use path on the downstream side, separated from the shoulder by a traffic bridge rail.
2. The design mean high water (MHW) elevation for the entire bridge and the approach causeway is elevation 5.82, which shall accounts for one hundred (100) years of sea elevation rise equal to 1.6'.
3. The minimum horizontal clearance required at the navigational channel is sixty-five feet (65').
4. The minimum vertical clearance required at the navigational channel is fifteen feet (15') above design MHW. ~~The minimum bottom of superstructure elevation for all spans other than over the navigational channel shall be elevation 12.4. The required freeboard depth beneath the new bridge outside of the navigational channel shall meet the requirements of Section 2.3.10.2.B of the Department's Bridge Design Guide (BDG).~~
5. The total horizontal hydraulic opening of the new bridge shall equal or exceed that of the existing bridge.
6. The new bridge shall incorporate a corrosion resistant reinforcing system in all new reinforced concrete locations. The corrosion resistant reinforcing system shall be one of the systems listed in Section 6.2.1.2 of the BDG, except that the system listed under C will not be allowed, and the system under H shall only be used with corrosion inhibitor in the concrete at the rate of 5.5 gallons per cubic yard. The use of corrosion resistant reinforcing shall be consistent with appropriate placement restrictions as specified by AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications.
7. Hybrid composite beams (HCB) are allowed. If HCBs are included in the design of the new bridge, then the Design-Builder shall submit Special Provisions approved by the proprietor for the manufacture and erection of the HCBs to the Department.
8. If the proposed superstructure design incorporates load-carrying structural steel or steel cables above the top of the roadway deck, then the steel shall be either galvanized or coated with a thermal spray coating in accordance with Supplemental Specification 506 Protective Coating – Steel, or the steel shall be made of stainless steel or other steel type with corrosion resistance equal to or

better than stainless steel. This requirement does not apply to bridge rails or light poles.

9. The design of the new bridge shall account for ice loading.
10. The pier designs for the new bridge shall not incorporate structural steel H-piles that extend above a depth of two feet (2') below the scour depth for the design flood without being encased in a pipe pile filled with reinforced concrete.
11. If pile bent piers are included as part of the substructure design, then the piles shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Steel pipe piles shall be coated with fusion-bonded epoxy in accordance with Special Provision 506.
 - b. Steel pipe pile material shall be in accordance with Special Provision 711.01.
 - c. Steel pipe piles may be driven open ended, closed ended, or with internal closure plates. If the design requires concrete, Class A concrete shall be used. ~~shall be filled with reinforced Class A concrete.~~
 - d. Steel pipe piles shall have a minimum sacrificial thickness of 0.25" above the mudline and 0.1" below the mudline on the exterior face.
 - e. If H-piles are included as part of pile bent piers, the H-piles not encased within pipe piles shall incorporate a minimum sacrificial thickness of 0.1" per face.
 - f. Steel pipe piles shall be placed to two feet (2') below the scour depth for the design flood or lower.
 - g. Precast concrete piles are not allowed.
12. Catwalks are not required.
13. Bridge drains shall be bicycle and pedestrian friendly.
14. No bridge drains shall be located within the navigational channel.
15. The bridge shall be designed to minimize or eliminate transverse armored joints in the deck.
16. Longitudinal armored joints in the deck are not allowed.
17. Generic Jersey or F-shaped barrier type bridge rails are not allowed.
18. Impressed current corrosion protection systems are not allowed.
19. The vertical and horizontal navigational clearances of the existing bridge shall be

maintained at all times during construction until the existing bridge is removed.

20. The following Special Provisions for retaining wall systems included in Appendix J were developed using design criteria based on dry conditions. The Design-Builder shall adjust the design criteria as appropriate if any of these retaining wall systems are to be used in saturated conditions.
 - a. 635 - Precast Aggregate-Filled Gravity Wall
 - b. 635 - Precast Concrete Block Gravity Wall
 - c. 635 - Prefabricated Concrete Modular Gravity Wall
 - d. 636 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall
21. Other than pile bent piers, for all substructure units that incorporate steel piles, the steel piles shall incorporate a minimum sacrificial thickness of 0.1” per face for H-piles or 0.1” on the exterior face on pipe piles.
22. The top surface of the new bridge deck, not otherwise protected by a raised curb or raised sidewalk, shall be fully protected by ~~include~~ a bituminous wearing surface on high performance membrane waterproofing.
23. If the Design-Builder’s Proposal includes structural materials or elements for which there are no design, fabrication, and/or construction requirements found in AASHTO design and/or construction standards, then the Design-Builder shall submit appropriate documentation approved by the proprietor, designer, etc. for the design, fabrication, and construction requirements to the Department.
24. Vessel collision loading is not required for this Project.

6.11.2 Demolition of the Existing Bridge

The existing bridge, including abutments and piers, shall be removed to at least one (1) foot below existing substrate/river bottom at a minimum. Demolition of existing bascule piers on or between November 1 and March 31 does not require the work to be done within cofferdams. Demolition of the existing bascule piers ~~shall not~~ occurring on or between April 1 and October 31 requires the work to be done within cofferdams. However, if the installation of cofferdams reduces the existing navigational clearance, then the Design-Builder shall seek approval to do so in accordance with the USCG construction requirements found in Appendix G. The Department cannot guarantee that the USCG will approve any temporary reduction of the navigational channel during construction.

6.11.3 Construction

The Design-Builder shall comply with the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Construction Requirements specified in Appendix G. Also, the USCG requires the following before they can issue a construction approval:

1. Plans and schedule.
2. Working hours/days of week.
3. Contact phone numbers for key personnel.
4. Size and location of any in-water equipment, such as barges.

There are no Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requirements for this Project.

6.11.4 Style Package Options

The Design-Builder shall provide a minimum of two (2) style package options in the Technical Proposal. The Design-Builder will work with the Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee (MPBAC) after Award to select one of the style packages to be used for the Project. The Department will provide a person to **facilitate act as a liaison for continuity in communication and information between the Department, the MPBAC, and the Design-Builder** for this effort. The style package options shall consist of the following elements at a minimum:

1. A combination traffic/pedestrian bridge rail for the upstream (west) side of the new bridge and adjacent approaches.
2. A traffic bridge rail for separating the shoulder from the multi-use path on the downstream (east) side of the new bridge and adjacent approaches.
3. A bicycle/pedestrian bridge rail for the downstream (east) side of the multi-use path on the new bridge and adjacent approaches.
4. Pedestrian level lighting fixtures/treatments for the multi-use path on the downstream (east) side of the new bridge and adjacent approaches.
5. Any other aesthetic treatment choices that the Design-Builder wishes to solicit from the MPBAC, such as concrete surface rustication treatments, color of concrete or coating systems, landscape plans, fishing access via small bump outs on the bridge or some other means, green spaces on the Portland end of the Project, trail improvements, etc.

6.12 Retaining Walls

All retaining walls included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.10 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.13 Drainage

All drainage included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.11 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.14 Survey

All survey included in this Project shall meet the requirements of Subsection 105.12.12 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

6.15 Landscaping

All landscaping included in this Project shall meet the requirements of the applicable subsections of Section 600 of the Standard Specifications and the Repair Spec. All plantings included in the landscape plans shall be appropriately sized and consist of economical native species appropriate to the location that are easy to maintain.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL

7.1 Environmental Compliance and Mitigation Requirements

The Design-Builder shall comply with the requirements of Section 105.8 of the Design-Build General Conditions and Special Provision 105, except for Project specific requirements provided in this Section.

7.2 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 Requirements

There are two National Register eligible historic properties within the project limits. They are the MPHC in Portland (tax map/lot 434/C/1 and tax map/lot 434/C/5) and the Kerry and Stephen Tietjen property in Falmouth (tax map/lot U1/162). The Design-Builder shall provide plan view, profile, and cross sections showing the cut/fill lines along with existing and proposed Right-of-Way along these properties.

The historic boundaries for the two MPHC properties are the same as the property boundaries. The historic boundary for the Tietjen property can be found in Appendix I. This boundary has also been plotted on the existing Right-of-Way plan.

7.3 Stormwater Management Requirements

The Department does not anticipate any MS4 permit requirements for this Project.

7.4 Permitting

7.4.1 Design-Builder Requirements

Permit applications have been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers and Maine DEP for wetland impacts. It is anticipated that conditional permit approvals will be obtained prior to Award. The approvals will be based on the conceptual plans and design parameters outlined in the permit application. The Design-Builder shall design the Project to meet the parameters and conditions outlined in the permit application contained in Appendix I and Special Provision 105, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Provide documentation of efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands. Wetland impacts and avoidance and minimization requirements are discussed in Exhibit 9 of the permit application.
2. Provide a plan view showing permanent impacts and outlining temporary impacts associated with construction. Both temporary and permanent impacts need to be documented in a spreadsheet indicating impacts by stationing and cumulative impacts for the entire project. Temporary and permanent impacts shall not exceed forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF).

Credit will be given for the removal of pre-existing coastal wetland fills and the removal of the existing bridge. If removed, this area shall be graded to match adjacent topography, so as to encourage salt marsh growth and not phragmites, and it cannot be riprapped. There will be no credit given for removal of temporary impacts. Refer to **Figure 7-1** for a schematic illustration.




Figure 7-1 Causeway Wetland Impact Diagram (Not to Scale)

The Department will provide permits upon receipt. Final approvals will be based on the plans and information included in the Technical Proposal. Additional information from the Design-Builder may be needed before final approval is granted. The Design-Builder shall allow up to forty-five (45) calendar days for state and federal agency review after Award.

7.5 Endangered Species Requirements

The Department is consulting for an open work window with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) regarding the Atlantic and Shortnose Sturgeon. Consultation is anticipated to be completed in October 2011. Stipulations regarding the in-water work window will be provided to the Design-Builder upon completion of consultation. These stipulations are expected to include requirements for noise monitoring and attenuation during pile driving operations in water. The Design-Builder shall work with the Department to assure that the noise monitoring and attenuation systems are reasonable and satisfactory to both the Department and the permitting agencies. The cost of providing the noise monitoring and attenuation will be paid for via a contract modification.

7.6 Hazardous Materials

Site visit and data review suggest that no issues with petroleum or hazardous material should be encountered.

7.7 Dredge Spoils Requirements

Any excavation of material below MHW must be handled and utilized in accordance with applicable regulations and the Maine DEP Solid Waste Rules Chapter 418.

7.8 Erosion and Sedimentation Control Requirements

The Design-Builder shall provide continuous and effective soil erosion and water pollution control in compliance with Section 105.8.1 of Design-Build General Conditions, Section 656 – Temporary Soil Erosion and Water Pollution Control of the Standard Specifications, and the latest version of the Supplemental Specification (Repair Spec). In addition, the Design-Builder shall comply with Special Provision 656 found in Appendix J.

7.9 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Requirements

It is anticipated that the Department will obtain NEPA authorization prior to Award. Property negotiations cannot occur until after a Categorical Exclusion (CE) has been approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

8. UTILITIES

8.1 General Design-Builder Responsibilities

The Technical Proposal shall address the manner in which utilities will be maintained and/or temporarily or permanently relocated. Utilities may be supported or integrated onto the new bridge.

The Design-Builder is required to coordinate all utility relocations required as part of the Project in accordance with the General Conditions, Maine Department of Transportation Utility Accommodation Policy (17-229 CMR Chapter 210), Title 23 MRSA § 154, and Title 23 CFR § 645.

8.2 List of Known Utility Owners and Contacts

Central Maine Power Company Gerry Norton 162 Canco Road Portland, ME 04103 Tel: (207) 779-9118 Email: Gerry.norton@cmpco.com	Fairpoint Communications Marty Pease 5 Davis Farm Road Portland, Me 04103 Tel: (207) 797-1119 Email: mpease@fairpoint.com
---	--

Maine Com Services Mark Curtis P.O. Box 266 Augusta, Me 04332 Tel: (207) 629-0198 Email: mcurtis@mainecom.com	Time Warner Cable Mark Pelletier 118 Johnson Rd Portland, Maine 04102 Tel: (207) 253-2324 Email: mark.pelletier@twcable.com
Portland Water District (PWD) Ned Pierce P.O. Box 3553 Portland, Me 04104 Tel: (207) 774-5961 Email: npierce@pwd.org	City of Portland (Sewer) John Emerson 389 Congress St Portland, Me 04101 Tel: (207) 874-8468 Email: JWE@portlandmaine.gov
Town of Falmouth (Sewer) Pete Clark 271 Falmouth Rd Falmouth, Me 04105 Tel: (207) 781-5253 Email: PCLARK@town.falmouth.me.us	Unitil Corp. (Gas) Sam Murray 1075 Forest Ave Portland, Me 04103 Tel: 1(800) 933-3821 Email: murray@unitil.com

8.3 Buried Utilities

Buried utility locations were provided by each respective utility and are shown on the existing conditions plans. The locations for the buried utilities are not absolute and may vary from that shown on the plans. Each buried utilities' facilities within the anticipated project limits are summarized as follows.

8.3.1 Water Distribution Facilities - Portland Water District (PWD)

The PWD owns and maintains water distribution facilities within the southern and northern approaches of the project. These facilities consist of a twelve inch (12") ductile iron water main and associated appurtenances consisting of, but not limited to, valve gates and service connections. The distribution water main does not cross the existing bridge.

Any requests for information regarding the work associated with the PWD facilities shall be requested as per the Design-Build General Conditions of the RFP.

8.3.1.1 South Approach Water Distribution (PWD)

Within the southern approach area, the distribution water main extends along US Route 1 and services the Martin's Point Health Care (MPHC) facility, terminating near the northern entrance of the MPHC facility. The water main is located within a thirty foot (30') wide easement, coinciding with the northerly travel lane of Route 1. As the main is located within in existing easement under rights of the PWD, any impacts to the distribution main within the southerly approach are compensable, per 23 MRSA § 154, and are eligible for reimbursement; the cost of which will be part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. In the event that the Design-Builder impacts the PWD transmission facility, the Design-Builder is required to enter into an

agreement, in accordance with the Design-Build General Conditions of this RFP. Plans and requirements regarding the PWD distribution water main are included in Appendix L.

Any suggested changes to the water main resulting from the Proposer's design shall be clearly outlined in the Technical Proposal, including discussion explaining the rationale and engineering justification for the suggested changes. Changes will need to be reviewed and approved by the PWD. Sufficient rationale in regard to any suggested changes to the distribution water main will be considered by the Department in scoring proposals.

8.3.1.2 North Approach Water Distribution (PWD)

Within the northern approach area, the distribution water main extends along US Route 1 and down Bay Shore Drive. The distribution water facilities within the northerly approach are located within the highway Right-of-Way. Any adjustments to these facilities shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project. If the design cannot avoid impact to these facilities, the PWD will be required to relocate or adjust their lines at their expense.

8.3.2 Transmission Water Main - PWD

On the south approach side of the existing bridge, the PWD has a fourteen inch (14") HDPE transmission water main located outside the highway Right-of-Way on the east side of US Route 1. The transmission water main extends from the northerly entrance of the MPH facility to a gate pit located east of the old bridge abutment, as shown on the existing conditions plan. The transmission water main extends below ground from the gate pit, crossing the Presumpscot River, east of the existing bridge. The PWD wants their transmission water main to remain unaffected by the construction of the Project and remain in service.

This transmission water main is in the PWD Right-of-Way and is permitted by the Army Corp and federal government. The transmission water main can be shut down only certain times of the year for short durations. Any impacts to the PWD transmission water main are fully compensable per 23MRS §154, and are eligible for reimbursement, the cost of which shall be included as part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. If the Project impacts the PWD transmission water main, the Design-Builder is required to enter into an agreement in accordance with the General Conditions of this RFP. Plans and requirements for the PWD transmission water main are included in Appendix L.

The Design-Builder's Proposal shall incorporate the transmission water main into the design of the Project if it is impacted by the Project. Any suggested changes to the transmission water main resulting from the Proposer's design shall be clearly outlined in the Technical Proposal, including discussion explaining the rationale and engineering justification for the suggested changes. Changes will need to be reviewed and approved by the PWD. Sufficient rationale for any suggested changes to the transmission water main will be considered by the Department in scoring the Technical Proposals. The cost for adjusting this transmission water main, if needed, shall be included as part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. Any questions for information regarding the work associated with the PWD facilities shall be requested as per the Design-Build General Conditions of this RFP.

8.3.3 Sewer Facility – Town of Falmouth

The Town of Falmouth owns and operates a gravity sewer system in the area of the northern approach of the existing bridge. This line serves consumers east of US Route 1. The gravity line extends along US Route 1 from a manhole on the northwesterly side of US Route 1. A second gravity sewer line extends from the aforementioned manhole, crosses US Route 1, and extends southeasterly down Bay Shore Drive beyond the highway Right-of-Way. The cost for the work associated with sewer adjustments within the highway Right-of-Way shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. Any adjustments to these facilities within the highway Right-of-Way are the responsibility of the Town of Falmouth.

In the event the Design-Builder impacts the Town of Falmouth sewer facilities located outside of the highway Right-of-Way, the impacts are compensable, per 23MRS§154, the cost of which will be part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. By impacting Falmouth sewer facilities located outside the highway Right-of-Way, the Design-Builder is required to enter into agreement, in accordance with the Design-Build General Conditions of this RFP. Plans and requirements regarding the Falmouth sewer facility are included in Appendix L.

Any suggested changes to the sewer facilities located outside of the highway Right-of-Way resulting from the Proposer's design shall be clearly outlined in the Technical Proposal, including discussion explaining the rationale and engineering justification for the suggested changes. Changes will need to be reviewed and approved by the Town of Falmouth. Sufficient rationale in regard to any suggested changes to the sewer facilities will be considered by the Department in scoring proposals. The cost for adjusting the sewer facilities, if needed, shall be included as part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. Any questions for information regarding the work associated with the sewer facilities shall be requested as per the Design-Build General Conditions of this RFP.

8.3.4 Sewer Facility – City of Portland

The City of Portland operates the sewer system on the south side of the existing bridge. The cost for the work associated with any adjustments shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. Any adjustments to these facilities within the highway Right-of-Way are the responsibility of the City of Portland.

8.3.5 Communication Conduit - FairPoint

FairPoint Communications has an existing conduit that runs from a pole on the south side of the existing bridge, through the bridge abutments and hanging under the bridge, continues to a pull box, and then to the pole on the north side of the bridge. This conduit contains a fiber cable that cannot be taken out of service. This fiber cable must remain active and undamaged until the new conduit is installed on the new structure.

FairPoint requires three (3) four inch (4") fiberglass conduits installed on the new bridge with one pull box on both ends and conduits continuing to the closest pole. Fairpoint will pull and supply new cable, but will need the old one to stay in service until the new cable is cut in.

The Department has entered into an agreement with FairPoint for the inclusion of the conduit system described herein as part of the new bridge design and construction. The cost for this work will be fixed at \$77,500.00, and is to be included as part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. A detailed scope breakdown and specifications for the FairPoint conduit work are included in Appendix L.

8.3.6 Gas Line - Unutil

The Unutil Gas Co. has a distribution gas line on the Portland (south) side of the existing bridge. This gas main supplies MPH. The Unutil Gas Co. will be responsible for any adjustments to their line if the Project impacts that area.

8.3.7 Future Power Conduits – Central Maine Power (CMP)

CMP requires two (2) six inch (6”) steel conduits on the new bridge, manholes on both sides, and a pull box in the center with conduits continuing to nearest pole.

The Department has entered into an agreement with CMP for the inclusion of the conduit system described herein as part of the new bridge design and construction. The cost for this work will be fixed at \$175,000.00, and is to be included as part of the Lump Sum Price Proposal. A detailed scope breakdown and specifications for the CMP conduit work are included as part of Appendix L.

8.4 Aerial Utilities

8.4.1 Power Line - Central Maine Power (CMP)

CMP is the owner of the utility poles within the highway Right-of-Way. Any proposed adjustments must comply with the Department’s Utility Accommodation Policy. As the existing locations are provided through permit, proposed Right-of-Way limits shall include sufficient area for CMP to relocate their facilities, and to provide sufficient area for trimming. Right-of-Way must be acquired for these adjustments. The Design-Builder shall communicate with CMP for engineering, design, installation of new poles, and transfer of wires based on the Design-Builder’s design. There is a service drop on the Falmouth side that will need to be coordinated if that pole needs to move. The cost for the work associated with any adjustments shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. CMP will be responsible for any relocation work within the highway Right-of-Way.

8.4.2 CATV - Time Warner Cable (TWC)

TWC has communication cables on both sides of the existing bridge. If pole movements are needed, coordination between the Design-Builder and TWC will need to take place to facilitate timely completion of transfers. There is a service drop on the Falmouth side that will need to be coordinated if that pole needs to move. The cost for the work associated with any adjustments shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. TWC will be responsible for any relocation work within the highway Right-of-Way.

8.4.3 Fiber Cable - Maine Com Services

Maine Com has wires on the poles on both sides of the existing bridge. If pole movements are needed, coordination between the Design-Builder and Maine Com will need to take place to facilitate timely completion of transfers. The cost for the work associated with any adjustments shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. Maine Com will be responsible for any relocation work within the highway Right-of-Way.

8.4.4 Telephone Cable - FairPoint

FairPoint has telephone cables on the poles on both sides of the existing bridge. If pole movements are needed, coordination between the Design-Builder and FairPoint will need to take place to facilitate timely completion of transfers. The cost for the work associated with any adjustments shall be considered additional to the work associated with constructing the Project, and is not to be included in the Lump Sum Price Proposal. FairPoint will be responsible for any relocation work within the highway Right-of-Way.

8.5 Verification of the Location of Existing Utilities

The Design-Builder bears full responsibility for verifying, at its own expense, the existence, exact location, and size of any utility to be relocated or otherwise impacted on either a temporary or permanent basis for the Project. If a surface inspection of the area shows the existence of, or gives the Design-Builder cause to suspect the existence of, any previously unidentified utilities, or the Design-Builder otherwise has cause to suspect that other previously unidentified utilities exist, then Design-Builder shall undertake all appropriate investigations by contacting Utility Owners and conducting field investigations at the expense of the utilities as necessary to verify the existence, location, and size of such utilities.

9. RAILROAD COORDINATION

There are no Railroads within the vicinity of the Project.

10. RIGHT-OF-WAY

10.1 Right-of-Way Acquisition Services

The Design-Builder shall provide Right-of-Way acquisition services for properties not acquired by the Department prior to Award, including Right-of-Way mapping and appraisals, in accordance with Subsection 105.12.15 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

10.2 Right-of-Way Plan

All determinations on potential property impacts and avoidance should be made in reference to the Right-of-Way plan (rowplan.dgn) dated September 29, 2011.

11. PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE WARRANTY

11.1 Pavement Warranty

The Design-Builder shall provide a Warranty for Pavement in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

11.2 Bridge Warranty

11.2.1 Ten (10) Year Warranty Items

11.2.1.1 Bridge Deck Joints

The Design-Builder shall provide a Warranty for bridge deck joints, if used, in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

11.2.1.2 Waterproofing Membrane

The Design-Builder shall provide a Warranty for waterproofing membrane, if used, in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

11.2.2 Five (5) Year Warranty Items

11.2.2.1 Bearings

The Design-Builder shall provide a Warranty for bearings in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

11.2.2.2 Steel Coating Systems

The Design-Builder shall provide a ~~No~~ Warranty for steel coating systems, if used, in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions. ~~is required for this Project.~~

11.2.2.3 Concrete Wearing Surface

The Design-Builder shall provide a Warranty for concrete wearing surfaces, if used, in accordance with Section 106.3 of the Design-Build General Conditions.

12. OTHER WORK

The Design-Builder shall provide a Public Information Plan and Public Involvement Plan in the Technical Proposal as described herein.

12.1 Public Information Plan

The Public Information Plan shall identify strategies and personnel to be used for outreach to the traveling public, municipal officials, First Responders, local residents, and businesses. Personnel may include an advertising agency or specific individuals with communication backgrounds.

The plan should include tasks associated with public meetings, the design phase as well as the construction phase. Strategies in the Public Information Plan may include print ads in newspapers, press releases, media tours, brochures, posters, computer based presentations, website, informational public meetings, opening event, etc. The Design-Builder shall participate in an informational public meeting to introduce the Design-Builder and winning Proposal to the public, and to respond to questions from the public about the Project.

12.2 Public Involvement Plan

The Public Involvement Plan shall describe the Proposer's approach to working with the Department and the MPBAC after Award to address the following:

1. development of dynamic 3D models to aid the MPBAC in visualizing how the new bridge will look in its setting with the proposed style package elements;
2. selection of a style package option as specified in Section 6.11.4, and
3. reviewing of landscape plans to provide input on potential changes to the proposed plans. All changes to the proposed landscape plans will need to be agreed to by the Department.

The Design-Builder shall provide photo-realistic images or artistic type renderings of the proposed Project in the Technical Proposal. These may be artist renderings, photoshops, snapshot views from architectural modeling software, etc. that will enable visualization of the new bridge in its final setting. Each image or rendering shall be full-sized on separate sheets, either 8.5"x11" or 11"x17". The following views at a minimum are required:

1. looking downstream towards the new bridge from I-295,
2. looking upstream towards the new bridge from Mackworth Island,
3. an elevated side view looking northward from the Portland end or looking southward from the Falmouth end, and
4. looking from the water near the bridge up towards the underside of the bridge.

Part 3 - Appendices

Appendix A – Federal Wage Rates

APPENDIX A

Federal Wage Rates

The Federal Heavy and Bridge wage rates for Cumberland County can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- 2011 Federal Heavy and Bridge Wage Rates for Cumberland County

Appendix B - Contract Forms and Exhibits

FORM A – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

**Martin’s Point Bridge
Project No. BR-1673(100)X**

(Name of Proposer)

The above Proposer hereby submits its Technical Proposal, consisting of the following items:

(Instructions: Specifically list all items submitted with the Technical Proposal, including number of drawings, number of narrative pages, type of containers, etc. Attach or incorporate additional pages as necessary. Refer to the Project Requirements for additional instructions regarding Technical Proposal submission.)

By signing below, the above Proposer hereby certifies that to the best of the Proposer’s knowledge and belief:

1. The Proposer has received and considered complete copies of Amendments numbered ____ through ____.
2. The Proposer has reviewed and considered all materials and items supplied by the Department and posted on the Project website at <http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.
3. The Design-Builder, Designer, other Major Participants and key personnel indicated by the Proposer in its Statement of Qualifications will be used on this Project in the same manner and to the same extent as so indicated.
4. All of the statements, representations, covenants and/or certifications set forth in the Proposer’s Statement of Qualifications are still complete and accurate as of the date hereof.
5. All representations and/or certifications required of the Proposer by the RFP and Contract, including those contained in RFP Section 102.3.2.3 and RFP Appendix A, are complete and accurate.
6. This Technical Proposal is responsive.
7. The person signing below is legally authorized to do so.

[Any exceptions to the above certifications must be explained in detail on pages attached hereto.
Number of pages attached, if any: ____.]

PROPOSER

Date

[Sign in Ink]
By: _____
[Name and Title Printed]

FORM C – PROPOSAL GUARANTY FORM
Martin's Point Bridge
Project No. BR-1673(100)X

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT _____
_____, of the _____ of
_____ and State of _____ as Principal, and Surety, a
corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of _____ and having a usual
place of business in _____ and hereby held and firmly bound unto
the Treasurer of the State of Maine in the sum of _____,
for payment which Principal and Surety bind themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors
and assigns, jointly and severally.

The condition of this obligation is such that if the Principal has submitted to the Maine
Department of Transportation, hereafter Department, a certain proposal, attached hereto and incorporated
as a part herein, to enter into a written contract for the construction of

and if the Department shall accept said proposal and the Principal shall execute and deliver a contract in
the form attached hereto (properly completed in accordance with said proposal) and shall furnish bonds
for his faithful performance of said contract and for the payment of all persons performing labor or
furnishing material in connection therewith, and shall in all other respects perform the agreement created
by the acceptance of said proposal, then this obligation shall be null and void; otherwise it shall remain in
full force and effect.

Signed and sealed this _____ day of _____, 20__

WITNESS:

PRINCIPAL:
By: _____
By: _____
By: _____

WITNESS:

SURETY:
By: _____
By: _____
Name of Local Agency

FORM D – PRICE PROPOSAL
Martin’s Point Bridge
Project No. BR-1673(100)X

(Name of Proposer)

The above named Proposer hereby offers to perform and complete all Work specified or indicated in the Contract Documents in conformity with the same for the Price shown below.

1. TOTAL LUMP SUM PRICE – MARTIN’S POINT BRIDGE PROJECT

(Total Lump Sum Price in words – typed or printed in ink)

\$ _____
(Total Lump Sum Price in numbers – typed or printed in ink)

By signing below, the above Proposer hereby certifies that to the best of the Proposer’s knowledge and belief:

1. All representations and/or certifications required of the Proposer by the RFP and the Contract, are complete and accurate.
2. The Proposer’s Price Proposal is complete and accurate and conforms to all applicable requirements of the RFP and the Contract.
3. The person signing below is legally authorized to do so.

[Any exceptions to the above certifications must be explained in detail on pages attached hereto. Number of pages attached, if any: _____.]

PROPOSER

Date

[Sign in Ink.]

By:_____

**FORM E - MaineDOT DESIGN-BUILDER'S DBE/SUBCONSULTANT
PROPOSED UTILIZATION FORM**

Must be provided by the Design-Builder as an attachment to the Price Proposal.*

Design-Builder: _____ Telephone: _____ Ext _____

Contact Person: _____ Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

TOTAL CONTRACT/MODIFICATION AMOUNT: \$ _____ DATE OF EXECUTION: _____
(For Department Use Only)

FEDERAL PROJECT # _____ PROJECT LOCATION: _____

TOTAL ANTICIPATED DBE _____ % PARTICIPATION FOR THIS CONTRACT

W B E •	D B E •	Non DBE	Firm Name	Description of Work	Anticipated \$ Value
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Subcontractor Total >					
DBE Total >					

**Note: This information is used to track and report anticipated DBE participation in all federally funded MaineDOT contracts. The anticipated DBE amount is voluntary and will not become a part of the contractual terms.*

(MAINEDOT INTERNAL USE ONLY)

Form received: ___/___/___ Verified by: _____
Civil Rights Office Representative

**For a complete list of certified firms and company designation (WBE/DBE) go to
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/disadvantaged-business-enterprises/dbe-home.php>.**

FORM F – CONTRACT PERFORMANCE BOND

**Martin’s Point Bridge
Project No. BR-1673(100)X**

BOND # _____

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE BOND

(Surety Company Form)

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That _____
_____ **in the State of** _____, as principal,
and.....
a corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of and having a
usual place of business
as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto the Treasurer of the State of Maine in the sum
of _____ **and 00/100 Dollars (\$** _____ **),**
to be paid said Treasurer of the State of Maine or his successors in office, for which
payment well and truly to be made, Principal and Surety bind themselves, their heirs,
executors and administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally by these
presents.

The condition of this obligation is such that if the Principal designated as Proposer in the
Contract to construct Project Number _____ in the Municipality of
_____ promptly and faithfully performs the Contract, then this
obligation shall be null and void; otherwise it shall remain in full force and effect.

The Surety hereby waives notice of any alteration or extension of time made by the State
of Maine.

Signed and sealed this day of, 20.....

WITNESSES:

Signature.....
Print Name Legibly

Signature

SURETY ADDRESS:

.....
.....
.....
TELEPHONE.....

SIGNATURES:

PROPOSER:

.....
Print Name Legibly

SURETY:

.....
Print Name Legibly

NAME OF LOCAL AGENCY:

ADDRESS
.....
.....

FORM G – CONTRACT PAYMENT BOND

**Martin’s Point Bridge
Project No. BR-1673(100)X**

BOND # _____

CONTRACT PAYMENT BOND

(Surety Company Form)

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That _____
_____ **in the State of** _____, as principal,
and..... a
corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of and having a usual place
of business in, as Surety, are held and firmly bound
unto the Treasurer of the State of Maine for the use and benefit of claimants as herein below
defined, in the sum of _____ **and 00/100 Dollars**
(\$ _____) for the payment whereof Principal and Surety bind themselves, their heirs,
executors and administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally by these presents.

The condition of this obligation is such that if the Principal designated as Proposer in the
Contract to construct Project Number _____ in the Municipality of
_____ promptly satisfies all claims and demands incurred for all labor and
material, used or required by him in connection with the work contemplated by said Contract,
and fully reimburses the obligee for all outlay and expense which the obligee may incur in
making good any default of said Principal, then this obligation shall be null and void; otherwise
it shall remain in full force and effect.

A claimant is defined as one having a direct contract with the Principal or with a Subcontractor
of the Principal for labor, material or both, used or reasonably required for use in the
performance of the contract.

Signed and sealed this day of, 20

WITNESS:

SIGNATURES:

PROPOSER:

Signature.....

Print Name Legibly

SURETY:

Signature.....

Print Name Legibly

SURETY ADDRESS:

NAME OF LOCAL AGENCY:

..... ADDRESS

.....

TELEPHONE

FORM H – OPINION OF COUNSEL

Martin’s Point Bridge

Project No. BR-1561(800)

*[Letterhead of Independent Law Firm or in-House Counsel – Must Be Licensed to Practice in
Maine]*

MaineDOT

Bureau of Project Development
State House Station 16
Augusta, ME 04333
Attn: Scott Bickford, P.E.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have acted as counsel for _____, a _____ (“Proposer”) and *[list partners/joint venturers/members]* in connection with that certain Design-Build Contract (the “Contract”) for the Martin’s Point Bridge Replacement Project dated _____, _____, entered into between Proposer and the MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (“Department”). The capitalized terms used in this opinion shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Contract unless they are otherwise defined herein or the context otherwise requires.

In connection with the foregoing we have examined originals or copies of the Contract, the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of Proposer, minutes reflecting proceedings of the board of directors of Proposer, certificates of public officials, certificates of one or more officers of Proposer and such other documents as we deemed relevant and necessary for purposes of this opinion. In such examination we have assumed:

1. The genuineness of all signatures on documents which we have not seen executed, the authenticity of all documents submitted to us as originals, and the conformity to original documents of all copies thereof submitted to us; and
2. The Contract has been or will be duly authorized and validly executed and delivered by the Department, and constitutes the legal, valid and binding obligation of Department, enforceable in accordance with its terms against Department.

On the basis of the foregoing and in reliance thereon and on all other matters that we deem relevant under the circumstances, we are of the opinion that:

1. Proposer is a _____ which has been duly organized and is validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of _____. Proposer has the requisite power to own and operate its properties and assets and to carry on its business as presently operated, make the Proposal, enter into the Contract and it is duly qualified and in good standing as a _____ in the State of Maine. *[Provide same opinion for all partners/joint venturers/members of Proposer.]*
2. The execution, delivery and performance of the Contract and the Proposal have been duly authorized by Proposer. *[Provide same opinion for all partners/joint venturers/members of Proposer.]*
3. The Contract (including the provisions contained therein regarding Liquidated Damages, Retainage and limitations on Proposer's ability to recover damages or compensation) against Proposer constitutes the legal, valid and binding obligation of Proposer, enforceable in accordance with its terms, except as the same may be limited by bankruptcy and similar laws of

general application affecting creditor's rights and remedies and equitable doctrines. [*Provide same opinion for all partners/joint venturers/members of Proposer.*]

4. All required approvals have been obtained with respect to execution, delivery and performance of the Proposal and the Contract; and that neither the Proposal nor the Contract conflicts with any agreements to which Proposer is a party [if Proposer is a partnership/joint venture/limited liability company, add: and its joint venture members/general partners/managing members are a party] or with any orders, judgments or decrees by which Proposer is bound [if partnership/joint venture/limited liability company, add: and its joint venture members/general partners/managing members are bound].
5. Execution, delivery and performance of all obligations by Proposer under the Proposal and the Contract do not conflict with, and are authorized by, the articles of incorporation and bylaws of Proposer [if Proposer is a partnership, replace articles of incorporation and bylaws with partnership agreement and (if applicable) certificate of limited partnership; if joint venture, replace articles of incorporation and bylaws with joint venture agreement; if limited liability company, replace articles of incorporation and bylaws with operating agreement and certificate of formation].
6. Execution and delivery by the Proposer of the Proposal and the Contract do not, and the Proposer's performance of its obligations under the Proposal and the Contract will not, violate any current statute, rule or regulation applicable to the Proposer or to transactions of the type contemplated by the Proposal or the Contract.

This opinion is solely for information and use of you and the Maine Department of Transportation and may not be relied upon by any other person without our prior written consent.

Respectfully submitted,

**EXHIBIT A
 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FALMOUTH-PORTLAND, MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE
 PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X
 RFP SCORESHEET**

Design-Builder: _____

Control # _____

Scorer ID: _____

Date: _____


1. BRIDGE DESIGN CONCEPT	Maximum Score: 40 Points
---------------------------------	---------------------------------

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores in this category will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

- The Proposal demonstrates that the Proposer has considered future inspection and maintenance requirements for the bridge, including concepts that will:
 - minimize maintenance and rehabilitation costs for the Department during the design life,
 - incorporate materials, designs, and methods that will maximize durability, and
 - facilitate inspection and maintenance efforts by providing safe and easy access.
- The Proposal maximizes freeboard while minimizing property impacts, provides adequate bridge drainage, and effectively uses appropriate retaining walls, if needed.
- The Proposal contains appropriate superstructure and substructure types for the proposed location that avoid adverse hydrologic/hydraulic impacts on the surrounding area, are appropriately designed for resistance to extreme events as well as normal strength and serviceability loading requirements, and fit in well with the surrounding environment.
- The Proposal demonstrates a strong understanding of the potential geotechnical challenges associated with the new bridge. For example,
 - the expectation of occurrence of various extreme events and their potential consequences to the design of the substructure units and their foundations are identified and well described, and
 - the inclusion of performance testing, such as additional dynamic pile tests, to validate geotechnical design assumptions and account for the variability of subsurface conditions across the site are identified and well described.
- The Proposal provides additional enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as additional warranties, additional treatments that further enhance durability and longevity, the use of innovative materials, etc.



Supporting Comments by Scorer: _____



**EXHIBIT A
 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FALMOUTH-PORTLAND, MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE
 PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X
 RFP SCORESHEET**

Design-Builder: _____

Control # _____

Scorer ID: _____

Date: _____


2. HIGHWAY DESIGN CONCEPT	Maximum Score: 20 Points
----------------------------------	---------------------------------

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

- The Proposal provides an alignment that will:
 - avoid or minimize Right-of-Way acquisition requirements,
 - avoid or minimize temporary construction easements on historically significant properties,
 - avoid or minimize compensable utility relocations
 - avoid or minimize impacts to existing landscaping on private properties, and
 - provide smooth and safe movements and transitions for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic.
- The Proposal demonstrates a strong understanding of the potential geotechnical challenges associated with the design and construction of approach embankments and roadway. For example:
 - the expectation of occurrence of various extreme events and their potential consequences to the design of the embankments and retaining walls not adjacent to the bridge are identified and well described, and
 - the performance criteria for long-term embankment settlement and stability are identified and well described.
- The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as additional warranties, instrumentation programs for long-term monitoring of new embankments over soft soils, additional traffic calming measures, etc.



Supporting Comments by Scorer: _____



**EXHIBIT A
MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FALMOUTH-PORTLAND, MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE
PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X
RFP SCORESHEET**

Design-Builder: _____

Control # _____

Scorer ID: _____

Date: _____

**3. COMMUNITY CONTEXT AND
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Maximum Score: 15 Points

This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP for this category and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

- The Proposal provides a preferred superstructure slenderness ratio of seventeen (17) or greater for all spans.
- The Proposal provides style package options that are reflective of and work well with the MPBAC's desire for a bridge that is slender, open, and graceful; fits in well with its surroundings; and is without excess ornamentation.
- The Proposal provides landscape elements that are appropriate and native to the area, economical, and easy to maintain.
- The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of strong and effective Public Information and Public Involvement Plans.
- The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's success at integrating the Aesthetic Design Professional into the overall design effort.
- The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as fishing access via small bump outs on the bridge or some other means, green spaces on the Portland end of the Project, trail improvements, dynamic 3D models, etc.



Supporting Comments by Scorer: _____

RAW SCORE DEFINITION



Raw Score for this item: _____%

**EXHIBIT A
 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FALMOUTH-PORTLAND, MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE
 PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X
 RFP SCORESHEET**

Design-Builder: _____

Control # _____

Scorer ID: _____

Date: _____

**5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR
 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

Maximum Score: 10 Points


This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to project management, design and construction quality management, and third party coordination approaches that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

- The Proposal demonstrates the expertise and commitment at all levels of the Proposer's organization to provide a cost effective and high quality Project that achieves the Department's goals.
- The Proposal ensures the Department will be kept apprised of issues affecting the Project scope, schedule, and budget.
- The Proposal demonstrates effective collaboration and coordination among design and construction personnel and the Department's personnel throughout the Project.
- The Proposal effectively uses partnering throughout, and empowers decision-making at the appropriate level.
- The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of the potential risks to the Project related to third party coordination and identifies appropriate measures for relocation and protection of utilities and to manage and minimize these risks.
- The Proposal demonstrates an effective plan for the coordination of civil/structural activities, utilities, Right-of-Way activities, traffic maintenance, third party liaison, public awareness and safety, and environmental mitigation as they relate to the construction operation.
- The Proposal provides enhancements of that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as an earlier Contract Completion Date, etc.



Supporting Comments by Scorer: _____

RAW SCORE DEFINITION



Raw Score for this item: _____%

**EXHIBIT A
 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FALMOUTH-PORTLAND, MARTIN'S POINT BRIDGE
 PROJECT NO. BR-1673(100)X
 RFP SCORESHEET**

Design-Builder: _____ Control # _____
 Scorer ID: _____ Date: _____

6. AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION OF WETLAND IMPACTS	Maximum Score: 10 Points
---	---------------------------------


This category will be evaluated and scored based on the quality of the following items. Superior scores will be awarded to Proposals that exceed the minimum requirements in the RFP and/or provide additional items of positive value that were not required in the RFP.

- The Proposal avoids and/or minimizes the impacts to the environment through all facets of design and construction.
- The Proposal provides a total net wetland impact area of forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF) or less.
- The Proposal demonstrates the Proposer's understanding of the environmental sensitivity of the area and the connection between the environment and the surrounding communities.
- The Proposal provides enhancements that exceed the requirements identified in the RFP or were not required by the RFP, such as restoration of previously filled areas within the Project limits, etc.



Supporting Comments by Scorer: _____

RAW SCORE DEFINITION



Raw Score for this item: _____%

EXHIBIT B
PROJECT SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

(To be signed by authorized signatory of Proposer)

Month (or Part of Month) Number (Starting with Month in which NTCW Occurs)	Early Finish Cost Amount	Cumulative Early Finish Cost Amount (Early Finish Cost Schedule)
1	\$	\$
2	\$	\$
3	\$	\$
4	\$	\$
5	\$	\$
6	\$	\$
7	\$	\$
8	\$	\$
9	\$	\$
10	\$	\$
11	\$	\$
12	\$	\$
13	\$	\$
14	\$	\$
15	\$	\$
16	\$	\$
17	\$	\$
18	\$	\$
19	\$	\$
20	\$	\$
21	\$	\$
22	\$	\$

Stipend Agreement

The Stipend Agreement and Stipend Invoice form can be found at:
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

Appendix C - Public Meeting and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

APPENDIX C

Public Meeting and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

The minutes for the following public meetings can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- Preliminary Public Meeting held on February 25, 2010
- Informational Public Meeting held on July 13, 2011
- Informational Public Meeting held on August 9, 2011

The minutes for the Martin's Point Advisory Committee meetings can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/ac.htm>.

Appendix D - Existing Plans and Inspection Documents

APPENDIX D

Existing Plans and Inspection Documents

The available existing construction and rehabilitation plans and inspection documents for the Martin's Point Bridge can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

Appendix E - Geotechnical Data and Supplemental Boring Request Form

APPENDIX E

Geotechnical Data Reports

The following reports can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- Preliminary Geotechnical Data Report, Parts 1 and 2
- Preliminary Liquefaction Hazard Analysis Report

Supplemental Boring Request Form

By: _____

Requested Boring Identifications	BB-FPPR-301	BB-FPPR-302	BB-FPPR-303	
Boring Location: Coordinates				
Requested Soil or Rock Lab Testing (<i>indicate depths for requested test</i>)				
Grain Size Analyses (combined sieve and hydrometer (ASTM D422) with moisture content (ASTM D2216) - 8				
Grain size analysis 1 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 2 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 3 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 4 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 5 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 6 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 7 with moisture content				
Grain size analysis 8 with moisture content				
One Dimensional Incremental Load Consolidation Tests (ASTM D2435) with Tube Handling (ASTM D4220) - 2				
Consolidation Test 1				
Consolidation Test 2				
Consolidated Undrained Triaxial Shear Test, CUIC, (ASTM D4767) - 1				
CIUC Test 1				
Atterberg Limits Tests (ASTM D4318) - 4				
Atterberg Limits 1				
Atterberg Limits 2				
Atterberg Limits 3				
Atterberg Limits 4				
Organic Content Tests (ASTM D2974) - 4				
Organic content 1				
Organic content 2				
Organic content 3				
Organic content 4				
Point Load Strength Index of Rock Core (ASTM D5731) - 1				
Strength Index Test				
Unconfined Compressive Strength Of Rock Core, Including Total Unit Weight and Elastic Modulus Determination (ASTM D7012, D4543-04) - 1				
UCT on rock 1				

Appendix F - Traffic Data and Accident Data

APPENDIX F

Traffic Data and Accident Data

Traffic Data and Accident Data can be found at:
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

Appendix G - U. S. Coast Guard Construction Requirements

APPENDIX G

U. S. Coast Guard Construction Requirements

The U. S. Coast Guard Construction Requirements can be found at:
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

Appendix H - Survey Data and Conceptual Alignments/Studies

APPENDIX H

Survey Data and Conceptual Alignments/Studies

Survey data and conceptual alignments can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

Appendix I - Permits and Other Environmental Information

APPENDIX I

Permits and Other Environmental Information

The permit application and other environmental information can be found at:
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- USACE/MDEP Permit Application
- Wetland Delineation Data
- Historic Boundaries

Appendix J – Supplemental Specifications and Special Provisions

APPENDIX J

Supplemental Specifications and Special Provisions

The following Supplemental Specifications and Special Provisions can be found at:
<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- 104 General Rights and Responsibilities (Electronic Payroll Submission)
- 105 General Scope of Work (Environmental Requirements)
- 202 Removing Structures and Obstructions (Aluminum Bridge Rail) (revised)
- 209 Wick Drains
- 211 Sand Blankets
- 501 Drilled Shafts
- 506 Protective Coating – Steel
- 634 Highway Lighting - Light Fixtures with LED Luminaires for Multi-Use Path
- 635 Precast Aggregate-Filled Gravity Wall
- 635 Precast Concrete Block Gravity Wall
- 635 Prefabricated Concrete Modular Gravity Wall
- 636 Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall
- 639 Engineering Facilities (Telephone)
- 656 Temporary Soil Erosion and Water Pollution Control
- 711 Miscellaneous Bridge Material (Steel Pipe Piles)

Appendix K – Hydrology and Hydraulics

APPENDIX K

Hydrology and Hydraulics

The following information can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- Hydrology Data

Appendix L – Utility Conduits

APPENDIX L

Utility Conduits

The following information can be found at:

<http://www.state.me.us/mdot/martinspointbridgedb/documents.htm>.

- FairPoint Conduit System
- CMP Conduit System
- PWD Water Main Plans
- Falmouth Sewer Plans