

Maine State Library

Digital Maine

Transportation Documents

Transportation

1-13-2012

Martin's Point Bridge : Responses to Additional Follow Up Questions Received on the Final Request for Proposals (Final RFP), January 13, 2012

Maine Department of Transportation

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



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
16 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0016

Paul R. LePage
GOVERNOR

David Bernhardt
COMMISSIONER

January 13, 2012

Attention: Prospective Proposers for Falmouth-Portland, Martin's Point Bridge Replacement Project

Subject: Falmouth-Portland, Martin's Point Bridge Design-Build Project (MaineDOT PIN 16731.00) – Responses to Additional Follow Up Questions Received on the Final Request for Proposals (Final RFP)

1. *(Previously submitted question)* Pursuant to NFPA 502, Section 6.6.1, the proposed bridge exceeds 1000 feet in length, and therefore a horizontal standpipe system for fire suppression must be installed. Per NFPA 502, Section 6.6.2, it is only required on one side of the structure.

Will the Department require that the Design-Build Team comply with the aforementioned, and if so, which side of the Bridge structure should this system be installed?

A. No, the Department does not require the Design-Builders to comply with NFPA 502.

2. *(Previously submitted question)* We have received anecdotal accounts from the 1984 bascule removal contract that the project resident directed the contractor to leave the counterweights inside the machinery pit area because the contractor was unable to demolish or lift them. Assuming that MaineDOT cannot verify the accuracy of this account, we request that if the counterweights are found inside the pit, that their removal be considered a differing site condition and their removal paid under section 109.

A. The Department checked inside both bascule piers and found that the counterweights had been cut off and removed. The following photo is from inside one of the bascule piers.



3. RE: RFI-Fairpoint Communication Cable Conduit System: After meeting with a Fairpoint representative and reviewing the required components of the RFP the following issue has come to our attention. On the Falmouth side the splice will be underground and it will be necessary to have a communications vault (12' x 6' x 7' typ.) to make the connection. It is feasible that a vault will also be required on the Portland approach. The item(s) listed above are not requirements of the RFP nor specified in the detailed scope breakdown for Fairpoint conduit work in Appendix L. Should it may be necessary to install these additional components to complete the transfer; we believe it will add significant cost to the original scope. Will there be additional compensation above the allotted \$77,500.00?

A. All of the materials required to complete the utility work is summarized in the existing Appendix L. Compensation for the work, as outlined in Appendix L, will be \$77,500.

4. Previous Question and Department's Response on 1/5/12:

1. Per section 6.11.4 #2, Style Package Options, the traffic bridge rail for separating the shoulder from the multi-use path on the downstream side of the new bridge is required on the bridge and adjacent approaches. Please define the limits of the separation bridge rail required on the approaches.

A. The limits of the separation rail on the approaches are the same as the limits of the multi-use path as defined in RFP Section 6.8.1, with reasonable allowances for appropriately designed transitions at the ends of the separation rail.

Clarification Question: The right-of-way is severely constrained on the east side of the Portland approach, as made very clear by the Department in the RFP and follow-up responses to questions. In addition to the "reasonable allowances for appropriately designed transitions" of the separation rail may the Design-Builder make a reasonable transition of the width of the multi-use path from the Portland end of the new bridge to the end of the path at the north end of the north drive?

A. No, the clear width of the multi-use path between the rail systems shall be a minimum of 10.5' as per the RFP.

5. Previous Question and Department's Response on 1/5/12:

8. In reference to Book 2, Section 6.11.1 (22), is the multi-use path required to have a bituminous wearing surface on high performance membrane waterproofing? In reference to Book 2, Section 6.11.1 (1(c)), is the raised sidewalk required to have any additional wearing surface protection or is the typical raised structural sidewalk concrete considered adequate wearing surface protection for the bridge deck concrete?

A. Yes, the multi-use path on the bridge is required to be protected by a bituminous wearing surface on high performance membrane waterproofing. No, the raised sidewalk is not required to have additional wearing surface protection as the concrete in the raised sidewalk is considered adequate protection for the bridge deck. The RFP will be amended to clarify wearing surface protection requirements.

Clarification Question: Are we correct to assume that if the Design-Builder elects to use a raised concrete walk on the multi-use path (with the required traffic bridge rail separating the shoulder from the path) the requirements would be the same as the raised sidewalk on the opposite side and this raised walk would not be required to have a membrane and overlay?

A. Yes, that is correct.

6. Per RFP Book 2, Section 6.11.1-11, and project Special Provision Section 711.01, the Design Builders are specifically not allowed to use spiral welded steel pipe pile. Could the Special Provision be amended to allow spiral welded steel pipe pile in that it has been used on the Portland-South Portland D-B Bridge, Boothbay-Knickerbocker Bridge, and many others?

A. No, the RFP will not be amended regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Leanne R. Timberlake". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Leanne R. Timberlake, P.E.
Project Manager