



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

Janet T. Mills  
GOVERNOR

Bruce A. Van Note  
COMMISSIONER

June 5, 2019

**Attention:** Prospective Proposers for Hampden Bundle Bridge Design-Build Project

**Subject:** Hampden Bundle Bridge Design-Build Project (MaineDOT WINS 21673.00/.10, 21728.00/.10, 21729.00/.10, 21730.00/.10, & 23224.00) – Responses to Questions Received on the Draft Request for Proposals (Draft RFP) - **UPDATE**

*This letter was initially sent to the Proposers on May 31, 2019, but it contained an incorrect response to one of the questions (no. 23), which has been corrected here. This letter dated June 5, 2019 supersedes the letter dated May 31, 2019.*

1. Given the volume of information presented in the Draft RFP and its Appendices and the lacking Cold Brook Road bridge information, 1 week is not adequate for a Draft RFP question period. Especially where the answers to the Final RFP questions won't be provided until well after the ATC period is closed. Answers to the Draft RFP questions will be the only real opportunity to gather more information before the ATC process closes. Can the Draft RFP question period be extended?
  - A. The Draft RFP question period has been extended as per the revised procurement schedule will be posted on the Project website.
2. The Draft RFP has added scope to the project beyond what was in the RFSOI at Cold Brook Road, but the stipend remains at \$80,000 which was already on the light side for the original bridge, highway, MOT, and geotechnical scope of work. That's only \$16,000 per bridge site. With only 2 teams short-listed and with 1 team not winning and earning a stipend, it would seem that more funds could be budgeted for the stipend and promote lower construction bidding with a more complete preliminary design. Can the stipend be increased for the single losing proposer to \$120,000?
  - A. Yes, the stipend will be increased to \$100,000.
3. The 2019-2021 MaineDOT Work Plan contains \$35.9 million in 2019 funds and \$1.6 million in 2020/21 funds for design and construction of this project. Is that funding still fully dedicated to this project given recent MaineDOT program cuts?
  - A. Yes.
4. No survey, ROW, wetlands, existing plans, bridge inspection, load rating, or geotechnical information was provided in the Draft RFP for Cold Brook Road bridge. When will that material be provided? Is it expected that the new piers will be

required to meet full LRFD loading and stability/bearing capacity requirements? Will new pier protection from vehicle impact be required?

- A.** The piers for the Cold Brook Road bridge are to be replaced using the original design plans (i.e., "in-kind"), except for the pile caps and piles which will remain. The existing bearings shall be removed, refurbished, and reset. The website will be updated with available existing plans, bridge inspection information, and load rating information. The new piers are not expected to meet current AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications. However, the guardrail in front of the piers closest to the travel way shall be replaced with three-beam guardrail and then transitioned into the existing guardrail.
5. Cold Brook Road bridge piers appear to be on piles according to available MaineDOT plan vault information. The Draft RFP indicates that the piers shall be replaced in kind down to the top of footings, but also explicitly prohibits the re-use of existing piles. Please clarify this conflicting requirement.
- A.** The reuse of existing piles is not allowed for the eight (8) full replacement bridges. This requirement does not apply to the Cold Brook Road Bridge.
6. When in June will the GDR-II containing the supplemental median subsurface investigation be provided? Assessment of median embankment settlement and slope stability will be a significant portion of the preliminary geotechnical and maintenance of traffic design for the technical proposal effort. These are also considerable construction cost considerations. With the One-on-One meetings happening in mid-June and the ATC process ending in early July, this does not leave adequate time to digest the geotech information and incorporate into any related ATC design. Can the overall schedule be adjusted to allow more innovation?
- A.** The GDR-II will be issued on or about June 11th. The procurement schedule has been revised and will be posted on the Project website.
7. Only 2 weeks are provided between receipt of Final RFP answers on questions asked by the Design-Build teams prior to the Technical & Price Proposal deadline, which seems extremely tight given the volume of the scope of work and pricing. Can this timeframe be extended?
- A.** The procurement schedule has been revised and will be posted on the Project website.
8. Can the HECRAS files be provided for the baseline hydraulic analysis highlighted in the Draft Hydraulics Report provided by the Department? Or, can the hydraulic data provided in the RFP be accepted without further hydraulic analysis?
- A.** The intent is for the Proposer to utilize the hydraulic data provided in the RFP without further hydraulic analysis, however the scour depths provided in the RFP are preliminary. It is the responsibility of the Proposer to ensure the proposed design meets or exceeds the hydraulic opening included in the

hydraulic model. The Proposer is also responsible for determining the scour depths based on their proposed structure using the parameters supplied by the Department.

9. Will the Department provide the “conceptual temporary roadway diversions” utilized in the base concept that was used to develop the median boring program, public meeting graphics, programming cost estimate, etc.?

A. PDFs and .dgn files of the conceptual temporary roadway diversions will be provided on the website. Proposers should note that these are conceptual in nature and may not meet the requirements in the Final RFP.

10. What are the TAMING requirements for this project?

A. If the Proposer's maintenance of traffic (MOT) plan meets the requirements of the Final RFP, then the Project will be considered to have met the Department's TAME process. If the Proposer submits an Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) proposal that represents an allowable change to the MOT requirements, MaineDOT will take the proposal to the TAME Committee for consideration, if needed.

11. Who will be responsible for snow removal on the temporary roadway diversion and detour bridges?

A. Section 105.4.3 of Book 1 - Design-Build Low Bid General Conditions covers the snow removal requirements for the Project.

12. The wetlands information provided in the Draft RFP only delineates wetlands in the immediate stream crossing bridges. Are there any wetlands mapped and Emerson Mill Road and within the median for the anticipated project limits?

A. There are two wetlands mapped at the Old Emerson Mill Rd. Crossing. Both wetlands are located on the west side of Old Emerson Mill Rd., one north of the southbound I-95 lane, and one on the south side of the northbound I-95 lane. An additional wetlands.dgn will be provided for this crossing. Wetlands have not been mapped in any of the medians as these areas are typically considered ditches, created and maintained for the sole purpose of draining stormwater. MaineDOT is in the process of delineating jurisdictional wetlands in the median. This information will be provided with the Final RFP.

13. Does the Department anticipate that any of the Section 7 environmental restrictions on in-stream work could be relaxed based on the regulatory agencies having access to the impacts in the submitted Technical Proposal prior to the completion of the formal consultation?

A. At this time, the Proposer should assume that all of the restrictions listed apply.

14. The RFSOI had specific mention of addressing railroad clearance needs at the Emerson Mill Bridges. Can the Department clarify the existing vertical and horizontal clearances compared to the required proposed clearances listed in the Draft RFP? Is the existing vertical clearance deficient? Are survey shots on the tracks available or contained in the data?

A. The representative from the railroad reports that the existing vertical clearance for the northbound structure is 22'-7" and 23'-2" for the southbound structure. Survey data for the existing piers, superstructure beams, and rail is provided in the topo.dgn file.

15. A signed snowmobile trail passes under I-95 along the west side of Emerson Hill Road and then crosses the road just to the south of the bridges. What are the maintenance of traffic requirements for this trail?

A. MaineDOT has limited information on the trail at this time. Information on a local snowmobile club found at the following link indicate the trail is part of the ITS system: [http://www.goodwillriders.com/files/goodwillriders\\_trails.pdf](http://www.goodwillriders.com/files/goodwillriders_trails.pdf). MaineDOT expects the Proposer will coordinate with the public and local snowmobile clubs as part of the public process to understand needs for the trail and accommodations during construction.

16. Ponding occurs along the ditch area adjacent to the RR along Emerson Mill Road and may be wetlands. What are the expectations for draining this area under this project?

A. This area is not mapped as wetland (see wetlands.dgn) and would therefore be considered a maintained ditch. It is non-jurisdictional; therefore, no permits would be required to impact or drain the area during construction.

17. What is the Design schedule?

A. The Proposer is responsible for developing the design and construction schedule within the constraints of the Final RFP.

18. Book 1 – General Conditions: Page 1-172, Section 109.2.1: Please consider the following recommended changes:

109.2.1 Definition. "Differing Site Conditions" are subsurface or latent physical conditions ~~of a man-made nature~~ that, at the time of submittal of the Proposal are:

A. Materially different from conditions indicated in the RFP and Reference Documents;

~~B.— Not Discoverable from a reasonable investigation and analysis of the site, including subsurface conditions, prior to submittal of Proposal;~~

C. Materially different from conditions generally recognized as inherent in the nature of the Work in the area of the site of Work; and

~~D.— Actually unknown to the Design-Builder, and its Subcontractors.~~

**A.** The verbiage in Section 109.2 of Book 1 - Design-Build Low Bid General Conditions will not be changed.

**19.** Book 1 – General Conditions: Page 1-172, Section 109.2.2: Please consider the following recommended changes:

109.2.2 Risk of Other Conditions. All costs, Work, Delays, or other damages related to or arising from site conditions that are not Differing Site Conditions **and not otherwise caused by the Department** are the sole risk and responsibility of the Design-Builder

**A.** The verbiage in Section 109.2 of Book 1 - Design-Build Low Bid General Conditions will not be changed.

**20.** Page 1-3, Section C & Page 1-4, Section F: Section 110 Indemnification, Bonding, and Insurance – will all the bonding requirements (Including FORM F and FORM G) flow down to subcontractors? If not, it should so state. (Section 104.5.7 Flow Down indicates that insurance provisions flow down).

**A.** No, MaineDOT does not require separate bonding from the sub-contractors. The prime contractor's bonds cover all the work done on the contract, including sub-contractor work.

**21.** Page 2-4, Section 1.4.2: Will MaineDOT consider adjusting the supplemental liquidated damages section to facilitate short closures to allow accelerated bridge construction approaches such as lateral slides?

**A.** Proposers can submit ATC proposals on this topic.

**22.** Page 2-4, Section 1.6: Will the Department consider two One-on-One Meetings? Can one of the meetings be scheduled before the Final RFP is issued?

**A.** Yes, an additional One-on-One Meeting has been scheduled for June 3, 2019 and it takes place before the Final RFP will be issued.

**23.** Page 2-4, Section 1.6: Can Price Proposals be submitted the same day as Cure for Technical Defects?

**A.** No, State of Maine law requires that the Price Proposal and Technical Proposal be submitted at the same time.

**24.** Page 2-4, Section 1.6: The procurement schedule around the ATC process is difficult since the Department's decision on a given ATC can significantly change the course of the proposal. Please consider the following schedule revisions:

May 29-31: One-on-One Meeting #1

June 11: MaineDOT Issues Final RFP

June 12: Begin Date for Proposers to Submit ATC Proposals

June 12: Begin Date for Proposers to Submit Questions on Final RFP  
June 24-26: One-on-One Meeting #2  
July 2: Deadline for Proposers to Submit ATC Proposals  
July 16: MaineDOT Issues Response to ATC Proposals  
July 23: Deadline for Proposers to Submit Questions on Draft RFP  
August 6: MaineDOT Issues Responses to Questions Received on the Final RFP  
August 27: Deadline for Proposers to Submit Technical Proposals  
September 17: MaineDOT Issues Notice of Technical Proposal Responsiveness  
September 24: Deadline for Proposers to Cure Technical Defects and Submit Price Proposals  
October 2: Opening of Price Proposals

**A.** The procurement schedule has been revised and will be posted on the Project website.

**25.** Page 2-11, Section 3.1.10.a & 11.a: This section specifies a horizontal clearance of 18' to the west and 32' to the east from the existing track centerline for the CMQR bridge and a 23' vertical clearance from the top of rail. What does the train clearance envelope include? Does the entire offset need to have the full 23' vertical clearance? Is there a provision for a second rail line to the east of the existing rail line?

**A.** See clearance diagram shown in Figure 2-1 of the MaineDOT Bridge Design Guide for lateral limits of the vertical clearance. The representative from the railroad states, "The lateral clearances are to provide room for a ditch on the west side, and a second track (at 14' track center) and ditch on the east side."

**26.** Page 2-12, Section 3.2.1: This section states "All piers supporting the new water crossings in the Hampden Bridge Bundle shall be mass concrete piers on spread footings/distribution slabs with concrete seals founded on bedrock, drilled shafts, or piles." Can you please clarify this requirement?

**A.** Piers for the new water crossings shall be a concrete wall pier type of construction. Spread footings on soil are prohibited.

**27.** Page 2-12, Section 3.2.1: When designing scour protection at abutments, can the designer assume that all standard maintenance, including repairs to riprap slopes, will be performed by the Department over the 75-year design life of the structures?

**A.** The Department will maintain the structure and slopes in front of abutments.

**28.** Page 2-12, Section 3.2.4: If temporary bridges are used, can the lane/shoulder width requirements on the bridges be reduced from the specified interstate roadway requirements?

**A.** No, the lane/shoulder width requirements for temporary bridges shall meet the specified interstate roadway requirements in Section 3.2, Item 4.

**29.** Page 2-14, Section 5.1.1.5 and Page 2.-15, Section 5.1.4: Will a preliminary overall or bridge specific wetland impact envelope be designated by MaineDOT in the permitting process? If so, when would that be available to inform the preliminary designs for the RFP response or based on Section 7.9's assumption of a Categorical Exclusion, should we assume wetland impacts are below the USACE General permit thresholds?

**A.** MaineDOT has not identified preliminary wetland impact envelopes. However, there are several requirements in the draft RFP to ensure that the Technical Proposal results in permissible impacts:

1. Special Detours or temporary roads shall be constructed in the median;
2. At each bridge, there shall be no net increase in in-water structure footprint (piers and abutments);
3. Abutments shall be located no closer to the stream than existing abutments;
4. Any temporary fill in Souadabscook Stream for construction access or temporary bridges may not extend into the stream more than 22 feet from the shoreline at each crossing. This maximum distance is cumulative (e.g., maximum 22 feet extending from one side of the stream, or up to 11 feet on each side of the stream).
5. Existing riprap or roadway embankments at stream crossings below Elevation 120 shall not be disturbed except for removal of all existing piers and placement of up to one (1) new pier. Riprap shall be placed per the standard detail to fill in the areas disturbed due to pier removal and pier placement. Above Elevation 120, riprap shall be placed on a slope of 1.75H:1.0V or flatter.

**30.** Page 2-15, Section 5.1.2.3: Will the hydraulic model developed for the RFP be made available to proposers?

**A.** Yes, the hydraulic models will be provided.

**31.** Page 2-21, Section 6.11.1.23: Please confirm that the new bridges at the stream crossings can only contain one pier in the stream. Can new piers be placed in the same locations as the existing piers?

**A.** No more than one (1) pier is allowed.

**32.** Page 2-23, Section 6.15.3: Please confirm that the Detour Maintenance Plan is not part of the Technical Proposal.

**A.** The Detour Maintenance Plan is not a required component of the Technical Proposal. It shall be addressed in the Design Package Work Package and be

subject to the Design Submittal Process per 105.12.2 Design Submittals and Reviews.

- 33.** Page 2-24, Section 7.4: If a USACE Section 404 Permit is required, will it be necessary to conduct surveys to confirm the impacts contained within the preliminary impact envelope?
- A.** MaineDOT will complete pre-construction wetland survey and wetland.dgns will be updated and provided with the Final RFP. As part of the Technical Proposal, provide documentation of efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and Souadabscook Stream. Also, as part of the Technical Proposal, provide 11x17 plan view(s) showing location and square footage of permanent and temporary impacts to wetlands and streams associated with the project design and construction. All temporary impacts and permanent impacts need to be documented in a spreadsheet or table indicating impacts by stationing and cumulative impacts for the entire Project. The Design-Builder is expected to ensure that the project is constructed as permitted.
- 34.** Page 2-25, Section 7.5: If the Formal Section 7 Consultation by MaineDOT and FHWA raises any questions beyond those addressed in Section 7.5, how should the Design-Builder address this scenario in our Proposal? In other words, is the Design-Builder or subs expected to be present for the Consultation and any additional activities costed in?
- A.** MaineDOT will complete Section 7 using best available information and will try to maintain as much contractor flexibility as possible. It is not anticipated that additional services from the Design-Builder will be required as long as the restrictions listed in Section 7.5 are incorporated into project proposal. Project-specific information regarding proposed construction schedule and means and methods may be required from the Design-Builder to assess the effects to Atlantic salmon.
- 35.** Page 2-26, Section 7.5.11: Please confirm that all clean riprap or other scour countermeasures for the new piers and abutments must be placed within a cofferdam.
- A.** All in-water riprap or other scour countermeasures that require excavation shall be placed inside a cofferdam.
- 36.** Page 2-26, Section 7.5.16: Are we to assume that no fish evacuation or electrofishing will be required by the Design-Builder? Alternatively, is there a minimum or maximum amount of fish evacuation/electrofishing that we should consider in our bid?
- A.** MaineDOT will perform fish evacuation and electrofishing. The Design-Builder shall accommodate this activity in project scheduling. Electrofishing will be required for installation of all cofferdams. The Design-Builder shall



account for 2 weeks initial notice to Environmental Office, with 2-3 business days to confirm fish evacuation schedule for each cofferdam.

**37.** Page 2-26, Section 7.5.17: Does riprap at the new piers in the stream require special fill?

**A.** Yes, riprap in the stream requires special fill which shall be placed in accordance with Special Provision 203.

**38.** Page 2-26, Section 7.5.17: According to Special Provision 203 in Appendix J, Special Fill is a granular material. What is meant by riprap is to be filled and “sealed” with Special Fill?

**A.** Special Provision 203 will be clarified and provided with the Final RFP.

**39.** Page 2-26, Sections 7.5.18 & 19: Is there a minimum hydraulic opening that needs to be maintained during construction?

**A.** The hydraulic model for the existing and assumed proposed condition will be provided to the Proposers for the purpose of modeling the "during construction" condition.

**40.** Page 2-26, Section 7.5.19: This section states “Pile supported structures may extend beyond the limits of temporary fill.” Please confirm this means pile-supported piers are allowed in the stream for temporary structures.

**A.** Yes, the temporary bridges may be supported on piles beyond the limits of the temporary fill.

**41.** Page 2-27, Section 7.5.25: In case the Department’s 4(d) Consultation results in any findings or the need for Northern Long-Eared Bat surveys and/or clearing, should we make an assumption of a minimum and/or maximum level of effort and cost OR should we make an assumption that no clearing will be necessary and anything above and beyond that will be costed separately?

**A.** At this time, MaineDOT does not anticipate the need for NLEB surveys. MaineDOT expects that clearing will be required to construction the project. Potential effects to Northern Long-Eared bat will be evaluated by MaineDOT. The Proposer shall provide the approximate acreage of clearing associated with the Project in the Technical Proposal.

**42.** Page 2-27, Section 7.6: This section notifies the Design-Builder that hazardous materials may be present at two bridge locations. What, if any, are the responsibilities of the Design Builder if they are found?

**A.** The draft RFP noted that bridge numbers #1430 and # 5969 are located adjacent to the former Sawyer Landfill that may have potential methane gas and groundwater leachate issues. The Design-Builder is expected to take

precautions to address worker health and safety in accordance with applicable regulations.

**43.** Page 2-27, Section 7.9: MaineDOT made a preliminary determination that the NEPA Class of Action is a Categorical Exclusion. Does the Design-Builder need to confirm or consider/bid any other actions OR make an assumption that no additional NEPA is requested in our Low Bid scenario?

**A.** The Design-Builder is expected to provide information regarding the following in support of NEPA: project design information, including efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands, streams, and wildlife; public process; and construction schedule.

**44.** Page 2-30, Section 12: Please confirm that the Public Information Plan is not part of the Technical Proposal.

**A.** The Public Information Plan is not a required component of the Technical Proposal. It shall be addressed in the Design Package Work Package and be subject to the Design Submittal Process per 105.12.2 Design Submittals and Reviews.

Sincerely,



Leanne R. Timberlake, P.E.  
Senior Project Manager