

Maine State Library

Digital Maine

Transportation Documents

Transportation

9-30-2011

Martin's Point Bridge : Responses to Questions Received on the Draft Request for Proposals (Draft RFP), September 30, 2011

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

September 30, 2011

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 Questions Received on the Draft Request for Proposals (Draft RFP)

1. In reference to Book 2, Section 1.6 – Procurement Schedule, what is the purpose or topic of the mandatory one-on-one meetings with MaineDOT scheduled between October 17-21, 2011?
 - A. The purpose of the one-on-one meetings is to provide the Design-Build teams with an opportunity to confidentially present conceptual technical elements prior to submittal of Alternative Technical Concepts (ATCs) and final proposal submittal to determine if they meet the requirements of the contract or if an ATC submittal is needed. The Department will strive to make these determinations during the meeting; however, some determinations may require further consideration. In such cases, the responses will be transmitted confidentially in a timely manner. Attendance by Department personnel will be kept to a minimum to help ensure confidentiality. A determination that an ATC is needed for a concept presented during the meeting does not guarantee that the ATC will be approved if submitted.
2. In reference to Book 2, Section 1.6 – Procurement Schedule, is the department's intent to reply to Alternative Technical Concepts as they are submitted and not just on the December 14, 2011 date identified in the Procurement Schedule? This date is very late in the proposal and design process and it would be difficult to incorporate ATCs into the proposal if proposers did not know they were accepted until December 14th?
 - A. Yes, the Department will respond to ATC submittals in two weeks or less, depending on the complexity of the ATC. The time frame for submitting ATC proposals begins immediately after the final RFP is issued and lasts until the deadline specified in the final RFP. Early ATC submittals are highly encouraged. This will be clarified in the final RFP.
3. In reference to Book 2, Section 3.2, and the statement which reads: *"Proposers should note that the Technical Proposal will be considered the Preliminary Design Report for the bridge as noted in Chapter 2 of the Bridge Design Guide (BDG)."*; must the effort in developing and preparing the technical proposal include all components included in Chapter 2 of the BDG and to the extent noted in the BDG? What level of completion for the hydrology and hydraulics analysis is expected for the proposal?

- A.** No, the Department will accept the winning Technical Proposal in lieu of the standard Preliminary Design Report (PDR), so the forms and reports required for PDRs are not required for this Project. The level of completion for hydrology and hydraulic analyses expected for the Technical Proposal is dependent upon the Proposer's design.
4. In reference to Book 2, Section 3.2.3.1-5 and 8, are the two Style Option Packages as specified in Section 6.11.4, and the photorealistic renderings as specified in Section 12.2 to be included in the 36 page Technical Proposal limit, or are they to be in the separate project plans?
- A.** As per Section 102.3.2.2.2 of Book 1, illustrative and graphical content, such as renderings, are included in the Technical Proposal's 36 one-sided or 18 two-sided page limit; however, an exception will be made for this Project. The final RFP will state that the renderings are to be individually sized to 8.5"x11" or 11"x17" sheets and be separately indexed. Therefore, for this Project, the renderings will not be included in the Technical Proposal's page limit.
- Details of the two Style Option packages can be included in the 11"x17" plan set; however, discussions about them are to be included within the Technical Proposal page limit.
5. In reference to Book 2, Section 3.2.3.1-6 and 7, are the Public Information Plan and Public Involvement Plan to be included within the 36 page Technical Proposal limit, or are they to be attached as Appendices?
- A.** The Public Information Plan and Public Involvement Plan are included in the 36 page limit.
6. In reference to Book 2, Section 3.2.5.1-1(a), is the Design and Construction Organizational Chart to be included within the 36 Technical Proposal page count limit, or is it to be attached as an Appendix? If it is included in the 36 Technical Proposal page count limit and it is on an 11"x17" page, will it count as 1 or 2 pages?
- A.** The organizational chart is included in the 36 page limit. An 11"x17" page is counted as one page if printed on one side or as two pages if printed on both sides.
7. In reference to Book 2, Section 6.11.1-9(a), when will Special Provision 506 be posted to the project website?
- A.** Special Provision 506 has now been posted to the Project website.
8. In reference to Book 2, Section 6.11.3, when will Appendix G – U.S. Coast Guard Construction Requirements be posted to the project website?
- A.** Appendix G has now been posted to the Project website.
9. In reference to Book 2, Section 5.1.1-4, must the new bridge alignment be within the conceptual alignments provided by MaineDOT?
- A.** No, the new bridge alignment does not have to be completely within the conceptual alignment envelope; however, the new bridge alignment will be driven by the impact

restrictions of the historic boundaries, wetland impacts, and other requirements of the final RFP and other contract documents.

The conceptual alignments were developed primarily for the Department's benefit in developing the draft RFP requirements and restrictions. The conceptual alignments do not incorporate or represent all of the requirements and restrictions that are included in the draft RFP, and the Department does not guarantee that either alignment is in compliance with the draft RFP as is.

- 10.** In reference to Appendix H - Survey Data and Preliminary Alignments/Studies, are there any other base survey and topographic files available as the survey files appear to be incomplete?
- A.** A complete set of available survey files has now been posted to the Project website.
- 11.** In reference to Appendix K – Hydrology and Hydraulics, is there any additional preliminary hydrology or hydraulic information available other than the flow table provided on the project website?
- A.** No, the Department does not have any additional preliminary hydrology or hydraulic information available.
- 12.** In reference to Book 1, Section 103.5.2, will the referenced “Stipend Agreement” be added to Appendix B of Book 2?
- A.** Yes, the Stipend Agreement will be added to the Final RFP, along with the Stipend Invoice.
- 13.** Please clarify the Technical Proposal page limitation - 25 or 36 one-sided pages? On Page 1-35 of Book 1, it states 25; and on Page 2-7 of Book 2, it states 36?
- A.** The 25 page limit for the Technical Proposal in Book 1 – Design-Build General Conditions is the default amount. The page limit for this Project has been increased to 36 one-sided or 18 two-sided pages in Book 2 – Project Requirements, which supersedes the page limit amount stated in Book 1.
- 14.** Listed under "Proposal Organization" for the Technical Proposal Package, is the Design and Construction Quality Management Plan Outlines. Please confirm these are contained within the Technical Proposal (and the page limitation), as Section 3.2.4, numbers 1 and 2?
- A.** As per Section 2.2.1, the Design and Construction Quality Management Plan outlines are to be separately indexed, which means they are not included in the 36 page limit, but they are part of the Technical Proposal Package.
- 15.** Listed under "Proposal Organization" for the Price Proposal Package, is the Price Proposal (Form D) and Priced DBE Form (Form E). Please confirm these two forms are to be sealed together, and not separately sealed, as Form D is presently identified to be separately sealed and Form E is not.
- A.** Yes, Form D and Form E should be sealed together as a package, and be separate from both the Technical Proposal Package and the Proposal Guaranty Package.

16. Section 8.3.1.1, titled South Approach Water Distribution (PWD), states *"Plans and requirements regarding the PWD distribution water main are included in Appendix L."* However, no information was found in Appendix L.
- A. This information has now been posted on the Project website under Appendix L.
17. Section 8.3.2, titled Transmission Water Main – PWD, states *"Plans and requirements regarding the PWD transmission water main are included in Appendix L."* However, no information was found in Appendix L.
- A. This information has now been posted on the Project website under Appendix L.
18. Section 8.3.3, titled Sewer Facility - Town of Falmouth, states *"Plans and requirements regarding the Falmouth sewer facility are included in Appendix L."* However, no information was found in Appendix L.
- A. This information has now been posted on the Project website under Appendix L.
19. Section 6.11.3, titled Construction, states "The Design Builder shall comply with the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Construction Requirements specified in Appendix G." However, no Appendix G was found.
- A. Appendix G has now been posted to the Project website.
20. Will Maine state wages rates also apply to the project?
- A. No, where this is a federally funded Project, federal wage rates apply.
21. The DGN files posted in Appendix H of the RFP do not include all of the necessary background reference files associated with them. The RW PLAN shows ROW lines but as far as we can determine, no background survey information was included in the files provided.
- A. A complete set of available survey and ROW files have now been posted to the Project website.
22. Ref. 102.2.3.5 What is the deadline for submitting changes to the proposer's organization?
- A. There is no deadline. Changes to the Proposer's organization can happen at any time during the Project.
23. Ref. 106.2.4.9 Will the Department require "an approved testing laboratory building"?
- A. No, as per Section 1.10 in Book 2 – Project Requirements.
24. Ref. 108.3.1 Will the Department make payments twice per month as with other MaineDOT projects?
- A. The Department will give consideration to this request, and if there is agreement on allowing twice monthly payments, this will be stated in the final RFP.
25. Ref 1.6 The schedule for the procurement process does not provide sufficient time to maximize opportunities to meet or exceed the Project goals. Specifically, the time between

MaineDOT's issuing of 1) the Supplemental Geotechnical Data Report (on or about December 21, 2011) and 2) Responses to ATC Proposals (December 14, 2011) and the Deadline for Design-Builders to Submit the Technical and Price Proposal Packages (January 11, 2012) is not sufficient. Since both the SGDR and the ATC responses may affect both design and the construction bid of this large project additional time should be provided.

- A.** The current schedule deadlines for ATC submittals and Department responses are explained in the response to question no. 2. The Proposal submittal date will be delayed two weeks to January 25, 2011 to allow the Proposers more time to utilize the information in the SGDR. To further help the teams with their geotechnical designs, the raw boring logs will be shared with the teams as they become available.

Since the Proposal submittal date will be two weeks later, this will allow revised deadlines for ATC submittals and responses to January 4, 2011 and January 18, 2011, respectively. As stated in the response to question 2, early ATC submittals are highly encouraged.

- 26.** Ref. 2.2.1.6 The Department has asked for thirty-five (35) copies of the Technical Proposal. Will there be 35 separate reviewers providing 35 separate scoring sheets on the Department's evaluation team? If not will some "collection" of reviewers be providing a summary (average) score sheet while others will have individual score sheets? Also, how will the Department ensure that all of the Design-Builder's information contained in the Technical Proposal is not discussed with anyone outside of the Technical Proposal reviewers?

- A.** The number of copies is set to allow one set per individual scorer (number estimated at this point in time), three shared sets each for the Falmouth and Portland scoring teams, one set for the Project Manager, and one extra set. The individual scorers will submit individual scoresheets, and the two municipal scoring teams will each submit one consensus scoresheet.

The Department will conduct a training session to explain the process and the rules to the scorers, and will require signed confidentiality/no conflict of interest certification agreements from every scorer and from the Scoring Administrator. The Scoring Administrator will facilitate and monitor all of the scoring meetings, and he will be the one receiving the scoresheets and compiling the scores.

- 27.** Ref. 2.2.1 6. Is it sufficient to provide a Table of Contents for the required submission of the "outline" of the DQMP and CQMP?

- A.** Whatever is submitted for an outline for the DQMP and CQMP will be evaluated as described in Section 3.2.4.

- 28.** Ref. 3.1 Are fender or dolphin systems considered structural load-carrying elements?

- A.** Yes, fender and dolphin systems are structural load-carrying elements. If fender and dolphin systems are required as part of a Proposer's design, they will not be subject to responsiveness Item 2 in Section 3.1. This will be clarified in the final RFP.

- 29.** Ref. 3.1 Are bridge systems that incorporate superstructures extending above the deck allowed? If so, can structural cables (steel) be incorporated into the new bridge?

- A.** Bridge systems that incorporate superstructures extending above the deck are allowed. The Department will give consideration to the allowance of steel cables above the deck and will clarify this allowance in the final RFP.
- 30.**Ref. 3.2.1.1.4 Will the Department please review the vessel impact loading that is provided in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications and specifically comment if it is appropriate for this location? For example, the minimum 195'x35', 200-ton empty hopper barge to be used for the vessel impact loading of the bridge piers may be significantly higher than the waterway usage now or in the future. The Department may want to consider specific vessel impact requirements for this bridge?
- A.** According to the Portland Harbor Master, boat traffic in this area is fairly light, mostly canoes, kayaks, and small recreational vehicles. The Falmouth Fire Department has a vessel that uses this waterway. Vessel collision loads for the Martin's Point Bridge should be commensurate with the size and speed of vessels that routinely use the waterway.
- 31.**Ref. 3.2.1.2.4 Please provide additional information regarding how this Evaluation Criteria sub-item will be scored. It appears that the scorers could be highly subjective in their evaluation.
- A.** The Department will add some additional information to this item in the final RFP.
- 32.**Ref. 6.11.1.2 How much can the navigational opening be shifted northward or southward compared to the opening at the existing bridge?
- A.** The existing navigational opening must be maintained during construction; therefore, the navigational clearance zone cannot be moved. This will be clarified in the final RFP.
- 33.**Ref. 6.11.1.3 What is the minimum 100-year total sea level rise for this site or the average rate to be used over a period of 100-years?
- A.** The value of 1.6' for the total 100 year sea level rise will be included in the final RFP.
- 34.**Ref. 6.11.1.4 Is there a minimum total hydraulic opening required to not have a "significant" change on the extent of tidal flushing action? If not, what are the tolerable values in evaluating "significant" changes to tidal elevations and flushing exchange?
- A.** The final RFP will require that the hydraulic opening of the new bridge be equal to or greater than the existing bridge.
- 35.**Ref. 6.11.7 Will the Department please review the ice loads that are provided in section 3.9 of the Bridge Design Guide and specifically comment if they are appropriate for this location?
- A.** Ice is known to occur at this location, although it is not considered to be severe. The design of the new bridge shall account for ice loading in accordance with the Bridge Design Guide and AASHTO LRFD Bridge Specifications.
- 36.**Ref. 6.11 What is the minimum design scour depth to be used in scour susceptible soils if computations indicate minimal total scour depths?
- A.** Total scour consists of the following three components:

- Long Term Streambed Elevation Changes (i.e. Aggradation/Degradation)
- Contraction or general scour
- Local Scour.

A minimum of 1' of degradation shall be used for long term streambed elevation changes. The requirements in Bridge Design Guide, Section 2.3.11.1 shall also be followed. Otherwise, the equations in the latest edition of Hydraulic Engineering Circular #18 shall be used for computing scour depths.

37. Ref. 12.2 Will the Department please provide an objective definition or standard for the "photorealistic renderings"?

A. It is not the Department's intent to make this a costly item. These could be artist renderings, photoshops, etc. A more appropriate definition will be added to the final RFP.

38. Book 1, Section 106.2.4.1, Page 1-127 bottom paragraph. The RFP requires "*All key personnel performing QC or Acceptance functions shall be exclusively designated to such and shall not be assigned to perform conflicting duties or production work*". This project is not all that large and designating three separate groups (production, QC and Acceptance) that can not overlap seems excessive. Would the Department considering revising these requirements to provide more flexibility in the QC function to allow staff to be involved in production and QC activities, and have Acceptance personnel be separate from production?

A. The Department will give consideration to this suggestion, and if there is agreement on making any changes, they will be included in the final RFP.

39. Book 2, Section 1.5, Page 2-3. Given the number of renderings required by Section 12.2 and the need to provide 2 style packages per Section 6.11.4, our costs to prepare the proposal will be higher than for a more conventional D-B project. Will MaineDOT consider raising the stipend amount to cover a portion of this increased cost? Also see question 43 below on a related note.

A. It is not the Department's intent to make this a costly item. These could be artist renderings, photoshops, etc. A more appropriate definition will be added to the final RFP. The stipend amounts will be increased by \$5,000 to \$70,000 and the number of renderings required will be reduced from five to four in the final RFP.

40. Book 2, Section 1.6, Page 2-4. The current RFP indicates that both the Technical and Price Proposals are due on the same day (1/11/12), which is in keeping with past MaineDOT practice on D-B projects. NHDOT has taken a different approach on the Portsmouth-Kittery Memorial Bridge Replacement project where the Price Proposal is due approximately 3 weeks after the Technical Proposal deadline. This approach allows the D-B teams to focus on the Technical Proposal and to receive comments on technical responsiveness prior to submitting their cost proposals. This staggered approach will reduce risk for the D-B teams and result in fewer contingencies in the bid. Will MaineDOT consider such an approach?

A. Maine State law requires the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal to be submitted at the same time - the Price Proposal cannot be submitted at a later date.

41. Book 2, Section 3.1, Item 1, Page 2-8. This section precludes the use of structural steel appears to conflict with Section 6.11.1 , Items 8 and 9 on page 2-28, which discusses the use of steel piles and pile bents.
- A. It is not a conflict. Item 1 in Section 3.1 refers to superstructure elements. Items 8 and 9 in Section 6.11.1 refer to substructure elements.
42. Book 2, Section 3.1, Item 3, Page 2-8. Tax Map Lot 434/C/11 does not show up on the City of Portland Tax Maps. Is this information available?
- A. This is a typo – it should be 434/C/1. This will be corrected in the final RFP.
43. Book 2, Section 3.2, Page 2-8. The total points for both Community Context & Public Involvement is only 15% of the total score. The aesthetics only portion of this will be less than 15%. Considering that price is the largest determinant of selection, the overall effective weighting of the aesthetics is very small. This small percentage for selection is much smaller than the % of effort we will need to expend to respond to the RFP's aesthetics requirements (on the order to 2 to 3 times as much on a percentage basis). Given the considerable amount of work required to meet the proposal submittal requirements for this element, we believe the weighting of this element should be increased, or the requirements reduced to be more in line with the weighting for selection.
- A. The Department has decided to allow 15 points (15% of the total score) for the Community Context and Public Involvement category. To help with the aesthetic requirements, the stipend amounts will be increased by \$5,000 to \$70,000 and the number of renderings required will be reduced from five to four in the final RFP.
44. Book 2, Section 3.2.1.1(3), Page 2-9. Clarify information desired for "specific maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation requirements." Future repairs and rehab cannot be reliably predicted.
- A. If the proposed structure includes elements that have specific maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation requirements, then those should be defined in the Technical Proposal. Otherwise, define what might typically be required.
45. Book 2, Section 3.2.1.1(4), Page 2-9. Will the Department provide vessel collision data and / or loads?
- A. According to the Portland Harbor Master, boat traffic in this area is fairly light, mostly canoes, kayaks, and small recreational vehicles. The Falmouth Fire Department has a vessel that uses this waterway. Vessel collision loads for the Martin's Point Bridge should be commensurate with the size and speed of vessels routinely using the waterway.
46. Book 2, Section 3.2.1.1(4), Page 2-9. Will this bridge be subject to the requirements of Bridge Design Guide 3.7.2, which requires major bridges to be designed for Seismic Performance Category B, regardless of results determined by AASHTO Standard Specs? If so, for AASHTO LRFD Specs, shall this imply Site Class B or Seismic Performance Zone 2?
- A. No, section 3.7.2 of the Bridge Design Guide will not apply to this Project. The seismic analysis of the bridge, foundations, and slopes shall be performed in accordance with the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications or the AASHTO

Guide Specifications for LRFD Bridge Seismic Design. The soil site class and seismic performance zone shall be determined in accordance with AASHTO LRFD Bridge Specifications.

47. Book 2, Section 3.2.3.2, Page 2-13. The RFP indicates a preferred superstructure slenderness ratio of 17 or greater for all spans. Is this lower limit correct?

A. A preferred superstructure slenderness ratio of 17 or greater is correct.

48. Book 2, Section 3.2.6, Page 2-17. Wetland minimization is a scored criterion and also has an associated fee in Section 4.2.5. Isn't this double counting the impact cost?

A. The mitigation fee is meant to help pay for the mitigation site chosen by the Department as compensation for the wetlands impacted by the Martin's Point Bridge Project. Despite the mitigation fee and the allowance of up to 40,000 SF of wetland impacts requested in the permit application, the Department and the environmental agencies still desire that wetland impacts be avoided or minimized as much as possible. The Proposer's approach to avoiding or minimizing wetland impacts and the net result are what are being evaluated and scored in the Avoidance and Minimization of Wetland Impacts category.

49. Book 2, Section 6.11.1-part 3, Page 2-27. This section states "*The MHW elevation shall account for one hundred (100) years of sea elevation rise.*" - How is this determined? Can MaineDOT provide a structure/format to all teams as to how this element should be determined so that all teams are using the same basis for design? Is the 15' clearance to be measured to current sea level or 100 years from now?

A. The value of 1.6' for the total 100 year sea level rise will be included in the final RFP. The vertical navigational clearance at mean high tide shall include the 100 years of sea level rise. This will be clarified in the final RFP.

50. Book 2, Section 6.11.1(9), Page 2-28. Are pipe piles expected to corrode 2.5 times faster than H-piles? It seems like these should be the same.

A. In general, steel piles immersed in water corrode at a higher rate than steel piles below the mudline. If H-piles are used in conjunction with pipe piles, then they will be protected from air and free-flowing salt water by being encased in a concrete filled pipe pile down to the required elevation and then protected by soil further down.

51. Book 2, Section 6.11.1(9f), Page 2-28. Please clarify intent of this provision.

A. The intent is to avoid having steel H-piles become exposed to air or free-flowing water during the design scour event.

52. Book 2, Section 7.4, Page 2-31. The last paragraph of this section indicates "*In the event that regulations change or new procedures are implemented, the Design-Builder shall adhere to the new requirements with regard to design and their submittals required for permit application.*" If such a change were to take place that placed an increased cost on the D-B team, would this additional cost be reimbursed by MaineDOT?

A. Yes, the Department would be responsible for the cost; however, this statement will be removed from the final RFP since it is unlikely that this situation will occur.

53. General. Are any plans of the previous bridge (before the current bridge) available?

A. No, there are no plans available of the previous bridge. There are only photos available taken during the construction of the current bridge, which are posted on the Project website on the Advisory Committee page.

54. Geotechnical. Will the Department accept an equal-cost substitution for selected elements of the geotechnical laboratory testing program in order to allow the testing to better fit the needs on the proposer's geotechnical design?

A. No, the Department cannot accept a substitution in the laboratory testing program; however, the list of requested soil and rock laboratory tests will be compiled and shared with the Proposers. At that time, the Department will assess the compiled lab test program and will consider additional testing beyond what was allowed in Section 6.10.3 with the intent of sharing the additional lab test results with all Proposers.

55. Geotechnical. What is the basis of precluding the use of precast concrete piles for bent piers?

A. The concern with precast concrete piles is that there is a lack of redundancy in the protection system for structural members that may be rather slender, resulting in reduced durability and longevity and in increased maintenance. Since this is not one of the responsiveness items identified in Section 3.1, Proposers may submit an ATC proposal for the Department's consideration for a precast pile system that they feel offers an equal or better protection system for long-term durability and low maintenance needs.

56. Appendix H. The Aerial.DGN file on the website has a number of reference files that are not available to us. Can these be provided?

A. A complete set of available survey and ROW files have now been posted to the Project website, along with an updated Aerial.dgn file.

57. 4.2.5 Anticipated Environmental Services: To calculate the Net Total Wetlands Impacts (permanent & temporary) do we deduct the wetland area created from removing the existing bridge and causeway from the permanent and temporary wetland impact area for the new structure.

A. Yes, that is correct.

58. We question the designation of this project as a Heavy Construction project under Davis-Bacon. Please review whether this should correctly be classified as Highway.

A. Federal regulations require that Heavy Construction rates be used for bridges over tidal waters.

The General Wage Decision for Heavy rates have been recently published and also amended within the last month, with no change to the Cumberland County rates. USDOL has been questioned by MaineDOT regarding the validity of these rates. Although USDOL continues to review some rates which include Laborer – Concrete Worker and Laborer – Demolition, the USDOL currently advises that these rates are not considered “industrial” at this time based on the summary data provided in the

most recent survey information, and therefore MaineDOT is required to use these rates in this classification on our projects. USDOL advises that this is the case even if the rate changes, due to their continued analysis, and it will not be retroactive. Any interested party wishing to appeal these rates should follow the instructions included with the General Decision.

59. The RFP contains references to Railroad Protective. Is this applicable?

A. As per Section 9 of Book 2 – Project Requirements, there are no Railroads within the vicinity of this Project; therefore, Railroad Protective is not applicable.

60. The RFP has increased requirements for renderings compared to previous RFP that are very costly. Would MDOT consider increasing the stipend to help offset the additional rendering costs?

A. It is not the Department's intent to make this a costly item. These could be artist renderings, photoshops, etc. A more appropriate definition will be added to the final RFP. The stipend amounts will be increased by \$5,000 to \$70,000 and the number of renderings required will be reduced from five to four in the final RFP.

61. We cannot find the PWD information that is supposed to be included in Appendix L.

A. This information has now been posted on the Project website under Appendix L.

62. Section 3.1, Item 3 -The tax map/lot for MPH facility denotes 434/C/11 - the ROW mapping shows map/lot 434/C/1. Please clarify if this is the same location.

A. Yes, this is a typo – it should be 434/C/1. This will be corrected in the final RFP.

63. Please clarify the mitigation requirements of the DB team. Section 3.2.5.2, Item 6 denotes that the proposal will be evaluated based on an effective plan for environmental mitigation. Section 3.2.6.1, Item 3 also requests a description of the proposed mitigation efforts. However, Section 4.2.5 denotes a mitigation site has been determined and a fee will be assessed based on the wetland area disturbed.

A. Section 4.2.5 is correct. The mitigation wording in Item 6 in Section 3.2.5.2, will be removed from the final RFP. Item 3 in Section 3.2.6.1 will be removed from the final RFP.

64. Section 6.11 - Will there be any requirements for protection of the piers of the navigational channel, i.e. fender system, dolphins?

A. The Department is not requiring fender and dolphin systems; however, if the design of the new piers adjacent to the navigational channel requires additional protection due to the vessel collision loading, then appropriate protection shall be provided.

65. Section 6.11.1, Item 3 - If possible please provide the MHW elevation based on 100 years of sea level rise.

A. The value of 1.6' for the total 100 year sea level rise will be included in the final RFP.

66. Section 6.14 - Does MaineDOT plan to conduct or have available any additional field surveys that will be shared with the DB Teams?

A. The Department will not be conducting any more surveys for this Project, other than in support of locating the supplemental borings; however, a complete set of available survey files have now been posted to the Project website.

67. Section 7.3 - MS4 Permit -Can MaineDOT clarify any stormwater treatment or special requirements for this project that may be required by the MS4 Permit?

A. This is not expected to apply to the Project, and this language will be removed from the final RFP.

68. Can MaineDOT provide the following files:

- The wetland delineations (.dgn file)
- The subsurface hydrographic survey data (.dgn and .dtm files)
- The horizontal alignment files (as .alg files)
- The existing bridge alignment (.dgn and .alg files)
- The existing bridge surface (.dtm file)

A. A complete set of available survey, ROW, and other files have now been posted to the Project website. The wetland delineation file is located in Appendix I.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Leanne R. Timberlake". The signature is written in a cursive style and is set against a light gray rectangular background.

Leanne R. Timberlake, P.E.
Project Manager