

August 13, 2025
September 5, 2025

Attention: Prospective Proposers for the Sidney-Waterville I-95 Bridge Replacement Design-Build Project

Subject: Sidney-Waterville I-95 Bridge Replacement Design-Build Project (WIN 29486.00) – Responses to questions Received on the Draft Request for Proposals (Draft RFP dated July 1, 2025) and Clarifications.

1. **General Question:** The RFP directs, in numerous locations (section 101.3.6G, section 105.12.9, section 106.2.2, p. 71/74 Book 2 supplemental specs, etc.), to use latest versions of design references, supplemental specs, etc. Can Proposers assume this to mean as of the date the Final RFP is issued for all related references in this RFP?
 - A. Latest version of design references at the date of the Final RFP release.
2. **Book 1, Section 105.12.8 Geotechnical Design and Construction:**
 - A. The paragraph prior to section 105.12.8.5 says a precondition survey for structures within 200' of construction is required.

What is the purpose of performing pre-construction building surveys of any structure within two hundred feet of the construction? Can the "construction" be understood from the foundations for any new or temporary bridges or does this extend to limits of all disturbance on the project?

 - A. Clarifications will be provided in the Final RFP.
 - B. The paragraph prior to section 105.12.8.5 says a precondition survey for structures within 200' of construction is required.

What are the minimum requirements of the survey(s) and is there any minimum experience or other requirements that the person(s) performing the surveys are required to have? Will the Design-Builder be required to submit the surveys to the Department?

 - A. Clarifications will be provided in the Final RFP.
3. **Book 1, Section 106.3 Warranty Provisions:** Under section 106.3, Warranty Provisions, is it possible to have Final Acceptance issued per bridge (after ALL work is completed at each site and fully opened to traffic)?
 - A. After each structure is completed and open to traffic, the one-year warranty period will begin.
4. **Book 1, Section 108.3 Progress Payments:** Could progress payments/retainage be made on a per bridge basis?
 - A. Application for progress payments may be made to the Department bi-weekly in accordance with Book 1 - General Conditions Section 108.3 Progress Payments. Progress payments may be submitted by bridge. Retainage shall not be submitted by bridge and shall be held in accordance with Section 108.4 Retainage of Book 1 - General Conditions.

5. **General Question:** The Draft RFP notes in several locations that the final RFP will not be issued and stipends not considered if a BIP Grant Agreement is not executed. What is the anticipated probability of this happening? Similarly, what is the anticipated probability of the RFP being delayed more than say a month or so? Depending on the likelihood and timing, a considerable amount of preliminary design work could be completed at the sole risk of the Design Builder without compensation.
 - A. The probability of executing a Grant Agreement is unknown at this time. Any work completed by the Design-Builder prior to the release of the Final RFP is at the risk of the Design-Builder.
6. **General Question:** Could Price Proposals be Due the same day as Curable Technical Responsiveness Submission (subsequent to the due date of Technical Proposal)?
 - A. Yes, the schedule will be updated in the Final RFP.
7. **Book 2, Section 2.2 Proposal Content Requirements:** Under 2.b. A bridge elevation view is not a standard detailing practice (not in Plan Development Guide). Please confirm this is required for all bridges.
 - A. Proposers shall provide elevations, typically provided with roadway profiles, for the new bridges as required in Book 2, Section 2.2 – Proposal Content Requirements.
8. **Book 2, Section 6.4 Geotechnical Design and Construction:** Under 6.4.5, What is the anticipated settlement threshold that would trigger the requirement of this section to have an instrumentation program? Settlement that exceeds the tolerances in Book 1, p. 146?
 - A. A geotechnical instrumentation program is required if the anticipated settlement exceeds one inch (1") or the Factor of Safety for the structure or embankment slope is less than 1.3. Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.
9. **General Question:** Does book 2 take precedence over book 1?
 - A. Refer to Book 1 Section 101.3.6 - Priority of Conflicting Contract Documents.
10. **Book 1, Section 108.1 Payment:** Several special provisions (that have relatively high contract precedence) include paragraphs for measurement and payment that are not consistent with LS pricing of this project. Are these paragraph sections to be ignored or interpreted differently?
 - A. Special Provision paragraphs for method of measurement and Basis of Payment are not applicable. Refer to Book 1 - Section 108.1 Payment. Clarifications will be provided in the Final RFP.
11. **Book 2, Section 6.9 Special Detours:** Under SP 510, Are the design speeds for any temporary on-site detours to be the same as that given for the new bridges under section 3.1 or is some reduction allowed without a design exception?
 - A. The work zone speed limit shall be 25 mph for Special Detours used on Dinsmore Road, Lyons Road, Drummond Road, Town Farm Road and Trafton Road during construction.

12. **Book 2, Section 3.1 Technical Proposal Responsiveness Requirements:** What is the minimum gross (neglecting rustication) width required for a wall pier and the minimum diameter/dimension of a column for a multi-column pier?
- A. All new piers for the project shall be wall piers. Minimum geometry requirements will be provided in the Final RFP.
13. **General Question:** Has any minimum section loss requirement been established for foundation pile designs? If so, please provide.
- A. Foundation pile designs shall account for 1/16" section loss, or use of other mitigation, if corrosive soils are encountered.
14. **General Question:** Are reduced guardrail berm offsets (2' versus 3') allowed?
- A. Reduced berm offset is allowed.
15. **Book 1, Section 102.4 Alternate Technical Concepts:** Section 3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSIVENESS REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT TO ATC ALLOWANCE) listed in the Book 2 table of contents is not included in Book 2. What Project Requirements are subject to ATC allowance? Are the project design requirements (Book 2, Section 6) subject to ATC allowance as implied by Section 102.4 of Book 1?
- A. As indicated in Book 1, Section 102.4 Alternate Technical Concepts, the Project Requirements listed in Book 2 – Project Requirements are subject to ATC Allowance at the discretion of the Department. "3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSIVENESS REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT TO ATC ALLOWANCE)" will be removed from the table of contents in the Final RFP.
16. **General Question:** Are approach slabs required at all bridges?
- A. Approach slabs are required at all bridges in the project.
17. **Book 1, Section 106.3.3.3 Pavement Performance Criteria:** Is there a roadway settlement threshold value for the area between 100 and 300 feet of abutments?
- A. Roadway settlement between 100 and 200 feet of abutments shall be less than 3".
- As currently written, the draft RFP does not provide settlement criteria for the portion of approach embankment that is located between 100 ft and 300 ft from bridge abutments. Should the Departments response to this question be understood as the roadway settlement between 100 and 300 feet of abutments shall be less than 3 inches?
- A. Roadway settlement between 100 and 300 feet of abutments shall be less than 3".
18. **General Question:** Appendix D of the Draft RFP includes plans for the I-95/Trafton Road Interchange (WIN 18129.10) and these plans (sheet 19 of 182) show the locations of borings drilled for the project. Can the Department provide the geotechnical design report that was prepared for this project including any and all boring logs and results of laboratory testing?
- A. The Geotechnical report for WIN 18129.10 will be included with the final RFP.

If this information is available, can this be provided to Proposers prior to the issuance of the final RFP?

A. The files have been added to the project website.

19. **General Question:** If geotechnical design reports or “soils reports” associated with the original design and construction of the bridges were prepared can they be provided?

A. The soils reports associated with the original design and construction will be included with the final RFP.

If this information is available, can this be provided to Proposers prior to the issuance of the final RFP?

A. *The files have been added to the project website.*

20. **General Question:** Very soft to soft marine clay soils were encountered in borings drilled at Drummond Road (i.e., borings BB-SDRR-102 and BB-SDRR-103) and Town Farm Road (i.e., boring BB-STFR-103) and only one relatively undisturbed Shelby tube sample of this material was collected in boring BB-SDRR-103 at Drummond Road. Laboratory consolidation, laboratory strength, and in-situ vane shear strength testing was not completed. Will the Department consider drilling additional borings for the purpose of conducting in-situ vane shear testing and collecting additional tube samples for purpose of conducting laboratory consolidation and strength testing at these bridge sites?

A. As stated in Book 2, Section 6.4.3, “A Supplemental Boring Program will not be conducted by the Department for this Project.” 200-series borings may be done and provided with the Final RFP.

Will the Department delete paragraph 15 under section 105.12.9.4 of Book 1 that requires at least 90% primary consolidation of compressible soils to occur before installing piles, if used? It is our opinion that the Department has not provided adequate subsurface data to Proposers for their use in quantifying implications on this Project. Because of this, there is no way to determine a construction schedule related to pile installations or measures required to mitigate approach embankment and foundation settlement for temporary and permanent works. Not having adequate data adds a significant risk and cost to the Project. If paragraph 15 is not deleted, it is imperative that sufficient data be provided to Proposers.

A. *Paragraph 15 under section 105.12.9.4 of Book 1 will not be deleted. If the Design-Builder’s calculations indicate the proposed design meets the requirements for post-construction settlement as stated in Book 1 Section 106.3.3.2 of the Design-Build Low Bid General Conditions, and considers downdrag loading, the requirement for 90% consolidation prior to installing pile is waived. 200 series explorations and testing are being conducted at Lyons Road, Drummond Road and Town Farm Road that will include consolidation testing, strength testing, CPT data and additional bedrock elevation data. The data will be included in the final RFP.*

21. **General Question:** Section 11.6.3.7 of the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications (9th Edition, 2020) states that “the evaluation of overall stability of earth slopes with or without a foundation unit should be investigated at the Strength I Load Combination and an appropriate resistance factor” (i.e., factors of safety equal to 1.3 or 1.5 depending on whether the geotechnical parameters are well defined or if they are highly variable or based on limited information). These requirements are specific to permanent earth slopes. Should the minimum factor of safety requirements included in the Draft RFP be revised to be consistent with AASHTO LRFD requirements in terms of whether the slope supports a structure or not?

A. The project references the latest edition: AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications 10th Edition, 2024 for permanent slopes.

22. **Book 1, Section 6.9.1: Additional Design and Performance Criteria:** Over what period of time is the maximum allowable settlement of Special Detour pavement applicable to? It can be interpreted that the requirements of this Section are more restrictive than those included in Book 1 Section 106.3.3, which are specific to permanent roadways.
- A. The maximum allowable settlement of Special Detour pavement is applicable to the period of time when the Special Detour is in place and in use. The maximum allowable settlement of the Special Detour pavement is 3 inches (3") within 300 feet (300') of abutment backwalls. Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.
23. **General Question:** Will Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria be provided? Section 3.2 is noted in the Table of Contents but Criteria that is Subject to ATC Allowance is not provided in RFP?
- A. As indicated in Book 1, Section 102.4 Alternate Technical Concepts, the Project Requirements listed in Book 2 – Project Requirements are subject to ATC Allowance at the discretion of the Department. "3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSIVENESS REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT TO ATC ALLOWANCE)" will be removed from the table of contents in the Final RFP.
24. **General Question:** Book 2 Section 3.3 notes limitation to using emergency turn cross overs and weigh stations. Beyond traffic and environmental concerns are there any other limitations to laydown area if we stay within ROW?
- A. As indicated in Book 1, Section 106.2.3.4 Storage, the Department may approve portions of land within the Right-of-Way for storage purposes and for the placing of equipment.
25. **General Question:** Does the department anticipate any additional timing restrictions for concurrent projects. Does the department anticipate any further restrictions due to concurrent projects?
- A. The Department does not anticipate any restrictions due to concurrent projects.
26. **Book 2 Section 3.1 Technical Responsiveness Requirements:** Book 2 Section 3.1.5 notes the restrictions of abutments within the clear zone. Please clarify whether the use of guardrail/barrier would allow abutments/piers to be closer to the roadway (within the clear zone).
- A. The use of guardrail/barrier would allow piers to be closer to the roadway (within the clear zone). Abutments shall be located outside the clear zone and a minimum of 10'-0" from the edge of pavement at locations where guardrail is present. Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.
27. **Book 2 Section 6.3.1.3 Traffic Management Plan:** Please clarify: Book 2 Section 6.3.1.3.a requires two paved lanes and two paved shoulders be maintained in each direction. Lyons and Trafton Roads are both one lane in each direction. Does this restriction apply on I-95?
- A. One (1) eleven-foot (11') minimum paved lane and one (1) one-foot (1') minimum paved shoulder in both directions shall be maintained at all times during construction, except as otherwise noted. Clarification will be provided in the final RFP.
28. **Book 1 Section 102.3.2.2.3 Format:** Per Bullet A on Book 1 section 102.3.2.2.3, other illustrative and graphical content may be prepared on 11" x 17" pages. Please advise how these 11" x 17" pages will be counted.
- A. 11x17 pages will be included in the total page count per bullet 'E' in Book 1 Section 102.3.2.2.3 Format.

29. **Book 1 Section 102.3.2.1 Proposal Organization:** Per the proposal components in 102.3.2.1 Proposal Organization, the technical proposal has a 75-page maximum. Per bullet C, all pages need to be numbered sequentially including cover sheets, table of contents, etc. matching the total pages of the document.
- A. Cover sheets and table of contents will not count against the Technical Proposal page limit defined in Section 102.3.2.1 Proposal Organization.
30. **General Question:** The current RFP documents state the winning Design-Builder will be the technically responsive Proposal with the lowest Bid. In order for the Department receive the best possible project for the State of Maine, we respectfully request the RFP be changed to a Best Value approach to provide the Department with the best combination of technical approach, means and methods, schedule, and price for constructing the project.
- A. No changes will be made.
31. **General Question:** The RFP does not appear to have a Base Technical Concept (BTC) Design. Are there plans to include a BTC in the final RFP?
- A. No Base Technical Concept will be provided.
32. **Book 1 Section 105.12.8.1 Supplemental Boring Program:** Book 1, Section 105.12.8.1 Supplemental Boring Program, says that the department will conduct a supplemental boring program as part of the procurement process if specified in the project requirements. Book 2 Project Requirements, Section 6.4.3 Supplemental Boring Program, says that a supplemental boring program will not be conducted by the department for this project. Should it be assumed that all additional borings required for final design will be the responsibility of the design builder, and that no supplemental borings will be completed by the department?
- A. As stated in Book 2, Section 6.4.3, "A Supplemental Boring Program will not be conducted by the Department for this Project." 200-series borings may be done and provided with the Final RFP.

Based on the Departments response to question #20, will the Department provide additional boring and laboratory consolidation and strength testing in the final RFP? As stated above (question #20), not having adequate data adds significant risk and cost to the Project.

- A. Additional subsurface data will be included in the final RFP. 200 series explorations and testing are being conducted at Lyons Road, Drummond Road and Town Farm Road that will include consolidation testing, strength testing, CPT data and additional bedrock elevation data.