

Maine State Library

**Digital Maine**

---

Transportation Documents

Transportation

---

1-27-2012

**Martin's Point Bridge : Responses to Additional Follow Up Questions Received on the Final Request for Proposals (Final RFP), January 27, 2012**

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalmaine.com/mdot\\_docs](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 27, 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. The Department has provided a report entitled "Preliminary Liquefaction Hazard Analysis Report, Martin's Point Bridge, US Route I, Falmouth and Portland, Maine. MaineDOT PIN 16731 .00," dated 25 August 2011, prepared by Golder Associates (Golder Report). The evaluations conducted by Golder were based on the simplified procedures described by Idriss and Boulanger. The conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report have significant impacts on the foundation design for the replacement of the existing Martin's Point Bridge and approaches.

Due to the considerable cost implications related to the conclusions from this report, we request that the Department provide guidance of how the prospective Design-Build teams should apply the recommendations outlined in the Golder Report.

**A.** [The Preliminary Liquefaction Hazard Analysis Report was provided to the Design-Builders for informational purposes. The Design-Builders can accept and use the analyses, interpretations, and conclusions of the Report or they can develop their own analyses and interpretations.](#)

2. In reference to Book 2, Section 7.5, Endangered Species Requirements, which states: "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.": when are the stipulations regarding the in-water work window to be provided to the Design-Builders? Are there also work window stipulations as well as noise requirements for pile driving and how does it affect the "700 feet of unobstructed passage" buffer noted on Page 22 of the contract permit documents?

**A.** [The draft Special Provision 105, which covers the in-water work window and other environmental requirements for construction, has been developed and will be provided to the Design-Builders.](#)

3. In reference to Book 2, Section 8: if the cost for the Central Maine Power or FairPoint conduits exceed the fixed amounts of \$175,000 and \$77,500 respectively, who is responsible for the additional cost?

**A.** The fixed cost for the Central Maine Power and FairPoint utility work will be full compensation for the work as described in the applicable sections of the contract documents. Costs due to integrating the Central Maine Power and FairPoint utility work into the design and construction, shall be considered in the cost Lump Sum Price Proposal. If either utility requests additional work beyond the scopes specified in Appendix L of the RFP, then the utility will be responsible for the cost of the extra work.

4. In follow up to the question and January 5, 2012 answer below, the question asked what the limits of the “traffic bridge rail” was. Is the intent of the answer to continue the “traffic bridge rail” to the limits of the multi-use path or is another non-bridge “separation” rail or barrier acceptable, and if acceptable must the “separation” rail or barrier have the same crash rating as the “traffic bridge rail”? Since the definition of the limits for rail #2 in the RFP, which states “on the . . . new bridge and adjacent approaches”, is the same for the rails described in 6.11.4 #1 and #3 and given the clarified definition of “approaches” for rail #2 extends all the way to the limits of the multi-use trail, what is MaineDOTs definition or expectation of the approach limits for the rails described in section 6.11.4 #1 and #3?

*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.*

**A.** Without knowing exactly what is being proposed in terms of the actual proposed location of the new bridge, whether or not sideslopes or retaining walls will be needed and to what extent they will be needed, etc., it is difficult for the Department to be very specific on the actual rail limits required for the project. Please disregard the response to question no. 1 in the January 5, 2012 response to RFIs and take the following statements as clarification for determining the limits of the multi-use path and its associated rails.

- The clear path width shall be carried to the limits specified in Section 6.8.1 of the RFP.
- The traffic bridge rail between the multi-use path and the downstream shoulder shall be carried onto the approaches, transitioning to an appropriately designed traffic rail for approaches, to the limits specified in Section 6.8.1, with reasonable allowances for appropriately designed transitions at the ends of the approach traffic rail.
- The bicycle/pedestrian rail on the downstream side of the multi-use path shall be carried onto the approaches, transitioning to an appropriately designed bicycle/pedestrian rail for approaches, to the limits specified in Section 6.8.1, with reasonable allowances for appropriately designed transitions at the ends of the approach bicycle/pedestrian rail and for future access to the City of Portland property on the Portland end.

5. In follow up to the question and January 5, 2012 answer below, MaineDOT’s reply is directing that the same “manhole” be installed at the middle of the bridge as on the approaches and according to the detail in Appendix L. The detail in the Appendix L is for a

precast in-ground vault that has exterior dimensions of 13' long x 7' wide x 8' tall. Is installing this in-ground structure at the center of the bridge actually the intent of this answer?

*2. The requirements described in Appendix L of Book 2, addendum 1 specifies 3 manholes (one manhole at each approach with one at the midpoint of the bridge) whereas section 8.3.7, Book 2, requires a pull box be located on the bridge. A typical CMP manhole detail was provided. Please clarify the pull box/manhole requirements on the bridge.*

*A. CMP requires three manholes, one on either side and one in the middle, as specified in Appendix L of the RFP. Fairpoint requires a pull box for their system and that detail was not included in the RFP. The pull box detail will be provided to the Design- Builders.*

**A.** The CMP manhole located near the middle of the bridge shall be a secured structure. The depth shall be as deep as possible, without extending below the bottom chord of the superstructure, but no deeper than 6 feet. The width (transverse to construction centerline) shall be 4 feet, or the maximum based on beam spacing, whichever is less. The length (longitudinal to construction centerline) shall be 7 feet, or the maximum based on diaphragm configuration, whichever is less.

6. Reference RFP Book 2, Section 6.11.1.11.a Steel pipe piles shall be coated with fusion-bonded epoxy in accordance with Special Provision 506 and Reference Warranty Section RFP Book 1, Section 106.3.4.2.2 Steel Coating Systems. Is the fusion-bonded epoxy considered a "Steel Coating System" for warranty purposes?

**A.** Yes, the fusion-bonded epoxy is considered a steel coating system and is covered by the warranty as required by the RFP.

7. Reference RFP Book 2, Section 6.11.1.11.b Steel pipe piles material shall be in accordance with Special Provision 506. This special provision calls for a structural steel strength of  $F_y=45\text{ksi}$ . May a steel with a higher  $F_y$  be used?

**A.** Yes, steel with a higher  $F_y$  may be used.

8. Reference RFP Book 2, Section 4.2.5: The RFP seems clear that MaineDOT is going to deduct from the Design-Builder's lump sum fee:  $\text{NTWI} \times \$4.38 \times 2$  with  $\text{NTWI} = \text{Net Total Wetland Impacts (permanent \& temporary) minus wetland restoration area}$ .

The RFP requires a plan view showing wetland impacts (permanent & temporary) and a documenting spreadsheet. The Department has also indicated that the final permit approvals will be based on the plans submitted in the Technical Proposal.

Question: Will the Department deduct the NTWI fee based on the Technical Proposal plans or based on the actual, as-built project? If it is based on the as-built project will that deduction be taken at the close-out of the project when as-built plans are provided by the Design-Builder?

**A.** Permit approvals and the NTWI mitigation fee will be based on the plans submitted in the Technical Proposal. Any changes from the Technical Proposal plans to the final proposed design condition would need to be approved in a permit amendment prior to being constructed, which could result in a recalculation of the NTWI mitigation fee.

Typically, the Department pays the NTWI mitigation fee when the project is awarded. The Design-Builder shall include the NTWI mitigation fee in the project schedule of payment as a credit to the Department.

Sincerely,

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

Leanne R. Timberlake, P.E.  
Project Manager